

# You are a Bot! - Studying the Development of Bot Accusations on Twitter

Dennis Assenmacher<sup>1</sup>, Leon Fröhling<sup>1</sup>, and Claudia Wagner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Germany

{dennis.assenmacher, leon.froehling, claudia.wagner}@gesis.org

<sup>2</sup>RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

## Abstract

The characterization and detection of social bots with their presumed ability to manipulate society on social media platforms have been subject to many research endeavors over the last decade, leaving a research gap on the impact of bots and accompanying phenomena on platform users and society. In this systematic data-driven study, we explore the users' perception of the construct bot at a large scale, focusing on the evolution of bot accusations over time. We create and analyze a novel dataset consisting of bot accusations that have occurred on the social media platform Twitter since 2007, providing insights into the meanings and contexts of these particular communication situations. We find evidence that over time the term bot has moved away from its technical meaning to become an "insult" specifically used in polarizing discussions to discredit and ultimately dehumanize the opponent.

## 1 Introduction

Automated accounts on social media platforms (bots) have gained a lot of attention from a broader public in recent times, as tech entrepreneur Elon Musk, in a turbulent year for the social media platform Twitter, started bringing up his quest to combat bots among the main motivations to acquire the platform in spring 2022. He then did not agree with Twitter's estimates of the prevalence of bots on the platform and tried to use this disagreement as justification for terminating the agreed-upon deal. After ending up acquiring the platform anyway, Musk made *fighting the bots* a top priority for the platform's remaining resources. While the academic discourse on bots usually receives a lot less attention than during the months of the Twitter takeover, the questions of

*whether, how many, and what types of bots* act on online discussion platforms have a tradition of being heavily discussed. The issues of who is considered a bot and what their prevalence and influence really is did not just arise in 2022, but researchers have been investigating the phenomenon of social bots for years. Bots have been found (partly) responsible for many electoral surprises, like the outcome of the Brexit referendum [14] and the election of Donald Trump as U.S. president in 2016 [5], or large-scale disinformation campaigns, for instance around many aspects of COVID-19 [13, 7]. These studies focus on identifying and measuring the influence that bots, through the propagation of certain opinions and sentiments in online networks, have on human users, allowing the bot operators to not only steer the online discourse but also impact important offline events.

While most research on social bots is focussed on the development of detection methods and the characterization of suspected bot operations [30], in this exploratory study, we switch perspectives and approach the issue of bots on social media platforms in general and Twitter in particular through the user's perspective. Similar to some more recent studies, we propose to explore what ordinary Twitter users think about bots on the platform, how they perceive them and how they interact with them. However, instead of relying on settings where participants are faced with constructed bot accounts in an experimental setup and later surveyed for their experiences [31, 27], we follow an empirical approach and analyze inter-user communications, in particular situations in which one Twitter user *accuses* another one of being a bot<sup>1</sup>. This allows us to not only explore the characteristics of the accounts frequently identified as bots by other Twitter users, but also gives us insights into the topical contexts as well as the motivation and reasoning provided in the ac-

---

<sup>1</sup>We refer to a *user* as a Twitter account that could be potentially controlled by either a real human or an automated software

cusations, as they often contain justification for the verdict. Leveraging data from Twitter’s inception in 2007, we explore the context and meaning of the bot accusations from different perspectives and track their evolution over the long term.

Concretely, we follow three distinct research questions:

- RQ1: How did bot accusations change over time?
- RQ2: What are the contexts in which Twitter users accuse others of being a bot?
- RQ3: Do the definitions of bots internalized by Twitter users align with the definitions used in popular bot detection methods?

With this exploratory analysis, we publish the underlying “You’re a bot!” dataset, containing the accusation situations that we analyze throughout the following pages<sup>2</sup>. This dataset allows for a number of follow-up studies, including an investigation of the campaigns and types of bots recognized by Twitter users and a more in-depth, qualitative study of the Tweet patterns and user profile features that might have triggered the bot accusation. While this dataset contains the accounts that are recognized as and accused of being bots by other Twitter accounts, we advise against using these accounts as training or evaluation data for research developing bot detection methods. As we hope to motivate in the following study, we would rather like to see research efforts being redirected towards studying the effects of bot accusations on individual users and the impacts of the dismissal of human opinions as “bot chatter” on the public discourse.

## 2 Related Work

Only very recently, bot research has begun to move from working on detection possibilities to focusing on the user perspective, asking how platform users interact with and are affected by bots. Wischniewski et al. study the perceptions of political social bots on Twitter in an experimental study and investigate their participants’ ability to distinguish explicitly partisan bots they created from human Twitter users. Their *motivated reasoning* hypothesis assumes that *opinion-incongruent* accounts, i.e., accounts of different political beliefs, are more likely to be perceived as bots. While they have to reject this hypothesis for the main set of participants, they find that it holds true for the more experienced Twitter users, leading them to speculate that this effect stems from a different usage of the term (social) bot

<sup>2</sup>Upon publication, the dataset, including Tweet IDs and analysis scripts, will be publicly released, using a dataset sharing service. For reviewers, we attach everything needed for replication of our results as supplementary material.

between the two groups. According to the authors, “*participants with prior knowledge of social bots and participants who spend more time on social media might apply the term social bot as a pejorative term to indicate disagreement and discredit accounts*” [27]. While they speculate that the desire to “show disagreement by labeling accounts as social bots (expressive disagreement)” amplifies the effect of motivated reasoning, they do not find other evidence for this claim than a single blog post from 2019<sup>3</sup> and a general reference to “popular media”.

In a follow-up study from the same research group, using a similar experimental design, Wischniewski et al. investigate the willingness of Twitter users to interact with *social bots*. They hypothesize and subsequently show that users are more likely to interact with *bots* that are more human-like, and that they are generally more likely to interact with *opinion-congruent* bots, i.e., those bots perceived to be of the same partisanship as the user [28]. While their hypothesis that affirmative actions (following and retweeting) are more likely to be directed towards opinion-congruent accounts holds, their assumption that *motivated reasoning* does not apply to more ambiguous actions (quote-tweeting and replying) is rejected. Their hypotheses that those actions are thus equally likely to be directed towards *opinion-congruent* and *-incongruent* accounts do not hold. They thus find that Twitter users are more likely to interact with other accounts they perceive to be of the same partisanship, no matter whether in actions signaling agreement or being of a more ambiguous nature.

As an exception from the purely experimental studies presented before, Halperin investigates the user discourse about automated manipulation on Facebook pages in the context of the lead-up to Israel’s national elections in 2019 in a data-driven way. The author qualitatively assesses 525 user comments originating from Israeli politicians’ posts in which bots are explicitly mentioned. He finds that users widely differ in their understanding of the construct and use it to push their political agenda. Moreover, he finds that partisan commenters “*strip the term of its original technical connotations and recast it as a pejorative concept used to belittle and delegitimize human right-wingers*” [10]. He concludes that this new direction in the discourse on automated accounts leads to new possibilities to attack opponents in an online conversation and may even increase the division between political camps. While the study provides interesting insights into discussions and accusations around bots, it’s anecdotal nature (focus on a small sample of comments in context of a concrete political event) is mentioned as a limitation by the author, who emphasizes the need for larger studies across the social media sphere with additional

<sup>3</sup><https://saornik.medium.com/everybody-i-dont-agree-with-is-a-russian-bot-or-how-it-is-easier-to-believe-an-evil-mastermind-ca02391055cb>

textual analyses.

Törnberg develops a model for the increased polarization of society, rejecting the echo chamber hypothesis (selective exposure and isolation from opposing views drive polarization) in favor of one based on affective polarization, where the interactions outside of the local bubble, facilitated by social media, drive polarization [26]. Affective polarization literature finds that opposing partisans have grown to "dislike, even loathe" each other [15]. The rejection of the echo chamber hypothesis by Törnberg is supported by empirical evidence, finding that social media users of opposing political worldviews do indeed interact with each other [3]. However, Törnberg describes these interactions as "contentious and conflictual" rather than "rational arguments and deliberations" held in good faith. In conclusion, Törnberg describes the affective polarization arising on social media as characterized by "difference, distrust, and disdain for one's political opponent".

### 2.1 Bot Definitions

Providing a clear definition of what a bot is remains one of the main challenges for any research on bots in a social media context. Researchers often ground their definition of the concept bot in past publications, citing a range of studies that report having found bots acting in different contexts (e.g., manipulating the discourse on a certain topic or influencing voters and impacting elections). Grimme et al. provides an overview of the changing understandings of the concept of "bot" in academia. In the early years, bots occurred only as chat-bots, built for a specific topic and deployed in one-to-one communication settings [9]. This changed when spam-bots were initially developed, specialized in one-to-many-communication, and therefore key to quickly and widely amplifying content. Finally, a more recent definition that goes beyond the aspects of automation and one-to-many-communication comes from Ferrara et al., who define a bot as a program "that automatically produces content and interacts with humans on social media" [8]. This definition is often additionally extended by the notion that these bots attempt to mimic human users [1, 24]. In political contexts, a specific objective is frequently added to the definition; smearing opposing candidates [19], drowning political discussions [25], or interfering with important political events [29, 4, 5]. Once the first hurdle of providing a definition is cleared, researchers need to operationalize that definition to differentiate between bots and non-bots in a given dataset. A frequent reason for a deficit in validity in social media research is a mismatch between the definition for a specific construct (e.g., bot) and an operationalization that is measuring a different construct [23]. While some researchers use account characteristics (username, profile description, profile image), activity (frequency of posting,




Figure 1: Dataset structure with different accusations situations over time. Because of the data collection strategy, the objects  $user_A$  and  $tweet_A$  are always present in any accusation situation, whereas the objects  $user_O$  and  $tweet_O$  could be missing for API availability reasons.

share of retweets), or content (amount of hashtags, amount of URLs) as features to construct rules upon [16], which are then used to classify accounts as bots, many others rely on the data-driven nature of supervised Machine Learning (ML) methods. The most prominent example of this approach is *Botometer* [6]. Since its publication, *Botometer* has been used to detect bots in several studies in different contexts, with its API and the corresponding ease of use contributing strongly to its popularity. Supervised ML approaches do not require hand-craft rules based on which accounts are classified but leverage the ability of ML to identify patterns in a large number of features and thereby learn classification rules directly from the provided training data. The operationalization in these approaches is then not stated explicitly but induced by the training data and represented by the trained model. This makes it even more complicated to align definition and operationalization, requiring researchers to check whether the characteristics of the instances labeled as bots in the training data are the same as those implied by definition.

### 3 The You're a Bot Dataset

We are interested in accusation situations; communication situations in which one Twitter user accuses another user of being a bot. We operationalize these situations by searching for Reply-Tweets that explicitly contain a bot accusation. The accusation situations we collect therefore always follow the same pattern. One Twitter user ( $user_O$ ) posts a Tweet ( $tweet_O$  - we refer to this Tweet as the *origi-*

nal Tweet, since it is the first Tweet in our accusation situation, however, it is not necessarily the first Tweet in the full conversation) of any type or content, to which another Twitter user ( $user_A$ ) replies with a Tweet containing a bot accusation ( $tweet_A$ ) (see Figure 1). To construct a dataset of situations in which one Twitter user accuses another Twitter user of *being a bot*, we split the dataset creation process into two phases. During the first phase, we collect as many *candidate* accusation situations as possible, accepting an increased number of false positives while aiming for a high recall. In the second phase, we filter out instances deemed irrelevant to our research design, hoping to reduce the number of false positives while ideally maintaining high precision. In the following, we describe the data collection (first phase) and data processing (second phase) and provide some descriptive statistics for the final dataset.

### 3.1 Data Collection

For data collection, we used the academic access to the Twitter v2 API in order to obtain access to its full-archive search endpoint<sup>4</sup>. This endpoint returns all Tweets matching a given query. It is important to note that the endpoint employs a token-based strategy for matching the keyword specified in the query, meaning that only Tweets containing the keyword either as a freestanding word or preceded and/or followed by a punctuation mark are matched by the API. Together with the other known but inevitable limitation of Tweets that have been removed or deleted from the platform not being available for retrospective collection through the API, this collection strategy allows us to collect all Tweets matching our query since the inception of Twitter in 2007.

We utilized the query `"bot is:reply lang:en"` to match all Tweets containing the key-token "bot" that are sent as a reply to another Tweet and that are classified as written in English by the Twitter API. Our choice of query and particularly the focus on Reply-Tweets reflects our research design and serves as the first necessary step to collect what we are calling accusation situations, i.e., situations in which one user accuses another user of *being a bot*. By restricting our data collection to English Tweets, we avoid complications associated with the processing and analysis of textual data in different languages. As English is the main language used on Twitter and the default language used by international and professional audiences, we are confident that even with this restriction, we can still cover a decent share of the bot accusations on Twitter. While we might miss the properties of bot accusations in different linguistic and cultural contexts, this allows us to focus on the parts of

<sup>4</sup><https://developer.twitter.com/en/docs/twitter-api/tweets/search/api-reference/get-tweets-search-all>

the public discourse in which the discussion around bot accounts seems most advanced and the general public is most aware of connected issues. However, any findings will, by design, only apply to English-speaking user communities and practices.

After the data retrieval for the whole available period, beginning April 2007 and ending with a predefined cut-off date, July 2022, we were left with a dataset containing 35,876,388 Tweets; replies that matched our query and that we thus consider *potential* accusation situations. As visualized in Figure 1, each accusation situation ideally consists of four different objects (and their associated metadata). However, since we are matching any potential accusation situation from the Twitter API solely based on  $tweet_A$ , we can only be sure that  $tweet_A$  and  $user_A$ , i.e., the *accusing* Tweet and the user who sent it, are actually available in our dataset. This is because both objects must have been available at the moment of data collection, as otherwise they would not have been matched via the API.  $tweet_O$  and  $user_O$ , on the other hand, were only included in the dataset if they were available at the moment of data collection and have otherwise been marked as missing.

### 3.2 Data Processing

We were expecting the data collected in the first phase to be high in recall but low in precision (a lot of the collected reply situations would not represent the accusation situations we are interested in). To increase the precision of our final dataset, we filtered the situations, retaining only the ones in which  $tweet_A$ , the *accusing* Tweet, contained the regular expression `"you are a [a-z]*bot|you're a [a-z]*bot"`. While this inevitably lowered the recall of our dataset by dropping situations in which the bot accusation does not explicitly follow our template (e.g., "You look like a bot to me.") or is more verbose in its use of the template (e.g., "You are a stupid bot!"), we deliberately decided to trade off some of the high recall from phase one for a very high precision after phase two. Using this rather strict template, we are confident that our dataset almost exclusively contains actual bot accusation situations. While there undeniably are some cases in which the phrase "you are a bot" is not equivalent to accusing someone of being a bot, for example if used ironically or in paraphrasing someone else, they are still part of the context and usage of the phrase and therefore worth including in our analysis.

Before we used the template to single out the accusation situations, we cleaned the Tweet texts. We used regular expressions to remove any @-mentions and URLs from the Tweets, as we make no use of them in the subsequent analyses and their presence would only interfere with the embeddings and clustering. Additionally, we dropped situations in which  $user_O$  and  $user_A$  were the same (based




Figure 2: Absolute number and relative share of "[you're|you are] a bot" accusations in Tweets containing the token "bot" over time. The high relative share of accusations in the first years is mainly due to the denominator being comparatively small.

on their Twitter user ID), as those instances do not correspond to accusations in the sense of our research design, but usually represent Tweet threads that overcome the character limitation of a single Tweet by chaining together multiple Tweets. These processing steps leave us with a final *accusations* dataset consisting of 267,170 *accusation* situations.

### 3.3 Dataset Characteristics

Figure 2, by simply showing the number of absolute accusations over time, hints at a shift that appears to have happened in the usage of the phrase "[you're|you are] a bot" around 2017. Prior to 2017, we collected a total of 15,379 accusations over a span of 10 years. In the years since 2017, the average number of accusations collected per year was 45,955, with the year 2022, for which we collected data only for the seven months until July, already included in that average. The relative number of accusations, calculated as the share of "[you're|you are] a bot" accusations in the total number of Tweets collected with the token "bot" in the *main* text<sup>5</sup> of the Tweet, shows a similar steep increase from the year 2017 on. This suggests that the increase in the number of accusations seen after 2016 is not just due to a general increase of traffic on Twitter, but that it might be indicative of a change in how the term "bot" as well as the phrase "[you're|you are] a bot" is since being used to accuse a Twitter user of *being a bot*.

As discussed above, it was not possible to collect the full accusation situation as depicted in Figure 1 for all instances

<sup>5</sup>We created a reduced version of the dataset described in our data collection by removing Tweets that had the bot token only in the Tweet's mentions (and not in the remaining *main* text), as these Tweets might be directed towards an account with *bot* as part of the username without then being on the topic of bots, e.g. "@bot123 how is your day?"

in the dataset. Of the 267,170 total accusation situations included in the dataset, 156,462 are complete, with information on *tweet<sub>O</sub>*, *tweet<sub>A</sub>*, *user<sub>O</sub>* and *user<sub>A</sub>* successfully collected. Of the 110,708 incomplete instances, 93,259 lack information on *user<sub>O</sub>*, and for 110,689 no information on *tweet<sub>O</sub>* could be collected.

While all *tweet<sub>A</sub>* in the dataset are unique by design, all other objects might be included multiple times in the dataset. There are 153,627 unique *tweet<sub>O</sub>*, 143,348 unique *user<sub>O</sub>* and 159,734 unique *user<sub>A</sub>* in the dataset. The *user<sub>O</sub>* most often accused of being a bot was accused 1,319 times, by 981 different accusers. The *user<sub>A</sub>* responsible for the highest number of accusations has accused 747 different *user<sub>O</sub>*, through 1,344 Tweets. 12,305 different *user<sub>O</sub>* have been accused by more than one *user<sub>A</sub>* of being a bot, being accused on average by 3.16 different users. 19,969 *user<sub>A</sub>* have accused more than one *user<sub>O</sub>* of being a bot, accusing on average 3.67 different *user<sub>O</sub>* of being bots.

## 4 Methods

In the following we present the computational mixed-methods used to answer the research questions posed in 1.1<sup>6</sup>.

### 4.1 Word embeddings over time

Word-embeddings capture semantic similarity via word co-occurrences in vector space. Similar to previous work on shifts in the meaning of individual words over time, we track the evolution of bot accusations by training Word2Vec-embeddings on the *tweet<sub>A</sub>* collected for each year between 2007 and 2022 and inspecting the words that are most closely associated with the term *bot*. We approximate the distance between words through their cosine-similarity. We use Gensim's implementation of Word2Vec with negative sampling and CBOW (as we are interested in the evolution of a high-frequency word)<sup>7</sup>. To account for the well-known nondeterministic behavior of embedding models [12], we train five different embeddings for each year and consider only *stable* neighbors, i.e. those words that are closely associated with the term *bot* in all five embedding spaces. As the first years of the data collection consist of considerably lower numbers of Tweets (see Figure 2), we aggregate the years from 2007 to 2015 into one collection and treat each following year individually.

<sup>6</sup>We will make our evaluation scripts publicly available as *Jupyter Notebooks* upon publication. During the review, we share the code as a supplementary archive.

<sup>7</sup><https://radimrehurek.com/gensim/models/word2vec.html>

## 4.2 Clustering

To understand in which topical contexts users on Twitter are accused of being bots, we identify prominent clusters in the accused users’ Tweets through unsupervised learning. We transform their Tweets ( $tweet_O$ ) into document embeddings using sentence transformers [21]. Similar to the embedding approach, we use cosine-similarity to approximate distance in the resulting vector space and to group together documents in close proximity. We tested several thresholds and found that a threshold value of 0.7 resulted in the most coherent clusters. The resulting clusters are projected into two-dimensional space using Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) [18]. For each identified cluster, we calculate a class-based variant of TFIDF (cTFIDF), which aggregates all cluster documents into one artificial document. This ensures that only the important tokens characterizing each cluster are highlighted.

## 4.3 Toxicity

To measure the toxicity of Tweets over time, we utilize the pretrained Detoxify classifier [11]. The model offers a fine-grained labeling schema and is able to classify Tweets at scale. We use the pretrained base models without fine-tuning. To offer an approximation of the overall toxicity on Twitter as a benchmark, we collect a dataset of generic English-language replies with the same settings described in our data collection, using the query *”a is:reply lang:en”*. This benchmark, however, is limited to showing overall trends and patterns in the toxicity on Twitter, and we do not use it to compare absolute levels of toxicity.

## 4.4 Bot Scores

We utilize the latest *Botometer* version [22] to see how far the perceptions and understandings of bots by Twitter users, as operationalized through their accusations, align with the definition operationalized in a popular tool for bot detection on Twitter. Botometer is a supervised ML model, with the latest version using an ensemble of specialized Random Forest classifiers that were trained on a plethora of existing *ground truth* bot datasets (different annotation strategies were used to identify bots in these datasets, such as honeypot traps, manual annotation, or self-report). Apart from calculating an overall score indicating how *”bot-like”* an account is, the classifier also returns multiple subscores corresponding to more specific bot definitions, such as *”spammer”* or *”fake follower”*. Although the Botometer classifier is a helpful tool for understanding the degree of automation of a Twitter account, it comes with significant limitations. Several studies have previously demonstrated the limits of such classifiers due to concept drift in data and

the uncertainty of the underlying ground truth [17, 20]. For our experiments, we utilize the method as a means to measure how the understanding of the concept bot held by Twitter users aligns with the academic construct definition operationalized by the classifier. We do not use the tool to determine how many and which accounts are bots and thus do not intend to construct a labeled ground truth dataset from our data. However, we extract a subset of accounts that are repeatedly accused of being bots by different Twitter users, for which we then collect their Botometer scores. To increase validity and tackle noise, we collect scores only for those  $user_O$  that have been accused of being bots by at least two *different*  $user_A$ . This leaves us with 10,475 users that are accused of being bots by multiple other users for which we collect the *bot*-scores from the Botometer API<sup>8</sup>.

## 4.5 Ideology

We measure the ideology of accounts by utilizing Barberá’s method for ideal point estimation [2]. The method infers ideology by examining the political following network of Twitter accounts, assuming that social networks are homophilic. Since the method was developed using a posterior set of political accounts in the United States, we restrict our analysis to users from there. We thus only consider accusation instances in which both  $user_O$  and  $user_A$  self-report as being from the United States. We use the meta-information *location*, a free-text field used by some Twitter users to indicate their location, in combination with Google’s Geolocation API<sup>9</sup> to automatically parse the location information and retrieve the corresponding country. 60,064 of the accusation situations in our dataset had *location*-information for both users and occurred after 2016. We randomly extract a 10% sample, leaving us with 6,006 pairs of  $user_O$  and  $user_A$  for which we parse the location information with the Geolocation API. In this sample, we found 1,154 conversation pairs where both accounts are from the US, which we use as input for our ideology estimation method.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 RQ1: Evolution of accusations

Table 1 shows the nearest neighbor embeddings (see Section 4.1) of the term bot over the years covered in our dataset. As the number of accusations for the early years up to 2016 is significantly lower (see Figure 2), we aggregate the accusations made in those years to get a sufficient number of observations for training the embeddings. The color

<sup>8</sup><https://botometer.osome.iu.edu/api>

<sup>9</sup><https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/geocoding/overview>

Table 1: Nearest embedding vectors to the term *bot* over the years. We highlight terms associated with mechanics for automation in blue and dehumanizing/insulting terms in red.

2008-	spammer, reply, tweeter, robot, human,
2015	real, person
2016	joking, feelthebern, walking, robot
2017	real, troll, agent, sadly, honestly, idiot, human, delusional, cunt, person
2018	moron, stupid, troll, shill, account, human, botcheck, english, delusional, real, person
2019	moron, troll, honestly, idiot, parody, human, trollbot, real, robot, person
2020	moron, stupid, algorithm, troll, shill, idiot, parody, twt, human, trollbot, real, robot, person
2021	moron, algorithm, troll, robot, human, real, person
2022	moron, stupid, scammer, troll, shill, account, human, real, robot, person

coding we applied to the nearest embeddings vectors displayed in Table 1 shows how the meaning of the bot accusations shifted over the years. In the years leading up to 2016, the term *bot* is closely and firmly associated with terms representing the automated behavior often used in academia to conceptualize bots. These include simple and repetitive tasks that seem easy to automate, like *spamming*, *replying*, or *tweeting*. In the following years, the wording of the bot accusations shifted away from such signs of automation in favor of terms used to insult the accused user. Terms like *moron*, *stupid*, *idiot*, and *shill* dehumanize the conversation partner, question and deny their intelligence, and in last consequence, deny them their right to hold and communicate their own opinions.

In line with the described shift in the nearest neighbor embeddings, we observe an increase in the degree of toxicity over time. Figure 3 shows the toxicity for *tweet<sub>O</sub>* and *tweet<sub>A</sub>* over time, as well as a benchmark serving as a proxy for how the overall toxicity in tweet-reply-situations developed in parallel. It is evident that beginning with the year 2016, the toxicity of the *tweet<sub>A</sub>* increased strongly, settling at a new plateau around the year 2017. The benchmark shows that this increase can not just be explained by the rise of the overall toxicity on Twitter, as the toxicity for replies outside our bot accusation context remains sta-




Figure 3: Development of *Detoxify* toxicity scores for *tweet<sub>O</sub>* and *tweet<sub>A</sub>* objects. Comparison with the baseline of generic reply-Tweets indicates that the observed increase in toxicity for the accusations (*tweet<sub>A</sub>*) after 2016 cannot be explained through an overall increase of toxicity on Twitter over time.

ble and relatively low. Similarly, the toxicity of the original Tweets leading up to the accusations is comparatively low and has a much less pronounced increase around 2016.

## 5.2 RQ2: Accusation context

The shift we observed when we analyzed the accusations over time is also manifested in the topical analyses we conducted in our study. A manual investigation of the cluster solutions produced by the method discussed in Section 4.2 for the early years (2007-2016) revealed that users were frequently accused because they showed signs of automation, such as spamming repetitive content, for instance:

*"follow me i follow you"*  
*"i'm a human i'm a human i'm a human"*  
*"good morning! you deserve a fantastic day today!"*.




Figure 4: Top clusters for the Tweets sent by  $user_O$  (the user accused of being a bot) for 2021 projected onto a 2-dimensional space with UMAP. Clusters are annotated with their highest cTFIDF terms. Users are not anymore accused only in the context of automated behavior [1,5,6,7,9,13,18,20] but specifically in the context of polarizing debates such as covid/mask/vaccine [2,4,12,15,19,22], election/Biden/Trump [3,16,21], Scottish independence [8], or racism [14]. Additionally, we observe a cluster containing only insults [17], highlighting the increased toxicity around the bot accusations.

Additionally, corporate accounts that automatically respond to public customer complaints with standardized replies like

*"please dm your concern to help us assist you."*

were frequently accused of being bots. We also found a considerable number of accounts that were accused because they openly discussed that they reached the limit of accounts they could follow or ran into rate limits for sending out new Tweets, such as

*oh dear, twitter says i'm not allowed to follow anymore people. what's that all about then?.*

The tweet content posted by different  $user_O$  that had led to an accusation situation has significantly changed over the years. Recently (especially since 2020), most  $user_O$  are accused of being bots in the context of controversial, polarizing political topics such as elections (Biden vs. Trump), the pandemic (vaccination, mask mandates), or the Brexit vote (Boris Johnson). Figure 4 exemplary displays the top cluster distribution for the year 2021. Of the ten biggest clusters (in terms of cluster size) in 2021, seven were concerned with political debates, and only the remaining three focused on repetitive automation behavior. We found that specifically  $user_O$  and  $user_A$  communication pairs that accuse each other in the context of these political topics exhibit opposing ideologies, e.g., Trump vs. Biden. (see colored observations in Figure 5). Interestingly, most accusers are more left-leaning, while accounts that are accused are more right-leaning (bottom-right quadrant in Figure 5). When it

comes to intra-ideology conversation pairs, it is evident that accounts on the political Right tend to not accuse each other (upper right quadrant), while accounts that are associated with the political Left accuse each other more frequently, especially in the context of political debates.




Figure 5: Ideology scores for  $user_O$  and  $user_A$  according to Barberá[2]. Negative scores are associated with Left-leaning ideology, while positive scores are associated with Right-leaning ideology.






Figure 6: Distribution and development over time of Botometer scores for  $user_O$  (users accused of being bots).

### 5.3 RQ3: Accusations vs. Bot Scores

We investigate the alignment between bot accusations and the bot probabilities assigned by popular detection mechanisms by inspecting the Botometer scores for the  $user_O$  in our dataset. Figure 6 displays the distribution of the bot probabilities for the accused accounts as calculated by the Botometer model. The scores follow a bimodal distribution, indicating that accounts are quite confidently assigned into one of the two classes *human* or *bot*, with a larger fraction of accounts having lower scores and thus tending towards the *human* category. Consequently, there seems to be a discrepancy between the operationalization of the bot construct employed by *Botometer* and the perception of the Twitter users. In a subsequent analysis, we explored how bot scores developed over time. The results are depicted in the bottom part of Figure 6. Interestingly, the accounts accused between 2008 and 2016 exhibit significantly higher bot scores than those between 2017 and 2022. This decrease in bot scores is well in line with the shift in the meaning of the accusations that we found in Section 5.1, with accusations not being exclusively used for actual automation behavior anymore. Apparently, in the early years, the *Botometer* scores were aligned with the accusations made by the Twitter users - the accused users,  $user_O$ , also have high Botometer scores. These were the years in which the majority of  $user_O$  were accused for their automation behavior (repetitive tasks such as (re)-tweeting or large-scale following). With the observed transformation of bot accusations into a dehumanizing insult (starting in 2017), the average bot scores dropped significantly. While this is not necessarily an indicator of fewer bot occurrences (potential model errors), it is a clear indicator that the underlying understanding of the construct bot slowly diverged.

Additionally, we investigated how Botometer’s bot scores are correlated to the number of unique accusers for each  $user_O$  in the subset described in Section 4.4, expecting to find that the number of accusers increases with




Figure 7: Scatter plot showing the relationship between the number of accusers and the Botometer score for the accused users. The left subfigure includes accusations made before 2017 and the right accusations made from 2017 onwards.

the bot score if the underlying definitions of both are well aligned. Similar to our previous analyses, we again differentiate between the years before 2017 and from 2017 onwards. Calculating Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient, we find a negligible positive correlation for the years after 2017 ( $\rho = 0.06$ , p-value  $< 0.0001$ ) and only a weak positive correlation for the early years before 2017 ( $\rho = 0.23$ , p-value = 0.0001). However, a visual inspection of the scatter plots in Figure 7 clearly reveals that Botometer assigns only small bot-probabilities for accounts with few accusations during the early years, whereas for all Tweets with more than three accusations, the scores tend to be in the higher regions (between 0.6 and 1). On the contrary, there is no clear pattern for the years from 2017 onwards (right sub-plot). Even with an increasing number of accusations, both low and high Botometer scores are present, indicating that the hypothesized and limitedly shown correlation between both variables does not hold anymore.

## 6 Discussion & Limitations

Our results indicate that bot accusations on the Twitter platform significantly changed over the last decade (RQ 1). Before 2017, platform accounts were mainly accused when they exhibited some automation behavior. Over time, users increasingly accused other accounts, intending to dehumanize them, denying their intelligence and right to express their opinion. In accordance with this observation, we find that bot accusations in the years from 2017 onwards primarily occur in the context of controversial, polarizing debates like elections or covid/vaccination (RQ 2). In other words, the term “bot” has transformed into a political term that is used as an insult. This starkly contrasts with the ways in which bot accounts are currently discussed in academia, focussing more on the means of automation to distribute (often) malicious content and their supposed impact on the public discourse rather than the actual perceptions of the public, as exhibited in the bot accusations. Indeed, we

found that in the early years, the bot scores (calculated by Botometer) of accused accounts were significantly higher than in later years, when accusations mainly occurred as an insult to dehumanize other "people" in the network. This central finding supports the recent assumptions and anecdotal evidence that the Bot term is applied as a pejorative term to indicate disagreement and discredit [28, 10] on a larger scale. In addition to the investigation of how automated accounts on social media influence users on social media platforms, future research should be concerned with the impact these accusations have on individuals. Additionally, it should be investigated how bot accusations could be countered efficiently. The structure of our dataset paves the way for a plethora of follow-up research in these directions. With additional scarping effort, one could retrieve not only accusation pairs but also the whole conversation around accusations.

Our study is not without limitations. While we tried to reduce the false positives of our initial dataset using a strict regular expression, undoubtedly increased our false negative rate, leaving out relevant accusation pairs. As we publish the IDs of all reply-Tweets mentioning the term "bot", we allow for the ability to replicate our analyses using additional filter criteria. Also, we highlight that our ideology analysis only considered accusation situations in which both users were located in the United States. To use the method on accounts outside the US, the model must be trained again on a new initial seed of accounts. Even though we are the first to conduct a data-driven, large-scale analysis of the meaning and context of bot accusations, we are still subject to platform (Twitter) and language (English) bias. Future endeavours will show, if

## 7 Ethics Statement and Broader Impact

This study used publicly-accessible user-generated content online as its data source. Using this type of data carries risks for privacy and the "right to be forgotten". The data contains potentially false accusations of accounts being "Social Bots". We stress that these accusations originate from subjective opinions and should under no circumstances be used to infer the degree of automation of any account (especially since we find that there currently is a discrepancy between the construct definition and the user's understanding of it). To address these concerns, only the Tweet IDs will be publicly released in this study. For reproducibility purposes, we share the full dataset only with researchers that sign a non-disclosure agreement.

With our new data-centered evidence that the term bot has changed to an insult over the years, we pave the way to new social science studies that may investigate the impact of these offenses on actual humans. How do bot accusations influence the public discourse? Are real human users really

offended and how do they react to those accusations? These are just a few directions that should be investigated in the future.

## References

- [1] Abokhodair, N., Yoo, D., and McDonald, D. W. (2015). Dissecting a social botnet: Growth, content and influence in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work & social computing*, pages 839–851.
- [2] Barberá, P. (2015). Birds of the same feather tweet together: Bayesian ideal point estimation using twitter data. *Political analysis*, 23(1):76–91.
- [3] Barberá, P., Jost, J. T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J. A., and Bonneau, R. (2015). Tweeting from left to right: Is online political communication more than an echo chamber? *Psychological science*, 26(10):1531–1542.
- [4] Bastos, M. T. and Mercea, D. (2019). The brexit botnet and user-generated hyperpartisan news. *Social science computer review*, 37(1):38–54.
- [5] Bessi, A. and Ferrara, E. (2016). Social bots distort the 2016 us presidential election online discussion. *First Monday*, 21(11-7).
- [6] Davis, C. A., Varol, O., Ferrara, E., Flammini, A., and Menczer, F. (2016). Botornot: A system to evaluate social bots. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference companion on world wide web*, pages 273–274.
- [7] Ferrara, E. (2020). What Types of COVID-19 Conspiracies are Populated by Twitter Bots? *First Monday*. arXiv:2004.09531 [physics].
- [8] Ferrara, E., Varol, O., Davis, C., Menczer, F., and Flammini, A. (2016). The rise of social bots. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(7):96–104.
- [9] Grimme, C., Preuss, M., Adam, L., and Trautmann, H. (2017). Social bots: Human-like by means of human control? *Big Data*, 5(4):279–293.
- [10] Halperin, Y. (2021). When bots and users meet: Automated manipulation and the new culture of online suspicion. *Global Perspectives*, 2(1):24955.
- [11] Hanu, L. and Unitary team (2020). Detoxify. Github. <https://github.com/unitaryai/detoxify>.
- [12] Hellrich, J. and Hahn, U. (2016). Bad Company—Neighborhoods in neural embedding spaces considered harmful. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics:*

- Technical Papers*, pages 2785–2796, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- [13] Himelein-Wachowiak, M., Giorgi, S., Devoto, A., Rahman, M., Ungar, L., Schwartz, H. A., Epstein, D. H., Leggio, L., and Curtis, B. (2021). Bots and Misinformation Spread on Social Media: Implications for COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(5).
- [14] Howard, P. N. and Kollanyi, B. (2016). Bots, #StrongerIn, and #Brexit: Computational Propaganda during the UK-EU Referendum.
- [15] Iyengar, S., Sood, G., and Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public opinion quarterly*, 76(3):405–431.
- [16] Kollanyi, B., Howard, P. N., and Woolley, S. C. (2016). Bots and automation over twitter during the first us presidential debate. *Comprop data memo*, 1:1–4.
- [17] Martini, F., Samula, P., Keller, T. R., and Klinger, U. (2021). Bot, or not? comparing three methods for detecting social bots in five political discourses. *Big Data & Society*, 8(2):205395172111033566.
- [18] McInnes, L., Healy, J., and Melville, J. (2018). Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426*.
- [19] Metaxas, P. T. and Mustafaraj, E. (2012). Social media and the elections. *Science*, 338(6106):472–473.
- [20] Rauchfleisch, A. and Kaiser, J. (2020). The false positive problem of automatic bot detection in social science research. *PloS one*, 15(10):e0241045.
- [21] Reimers, N. and Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [22] Sayyadiharikandeh, M., Varol, O., Yang, K.-C., Flammini, A., and Menczer, F. (2020). Detection of Novel Social Bots by Ensembles of Specialized Classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management, CIKM '20*, pages 2725–2732, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [23] Sen, I., Flöck, F., Weller, K., Weiß, B., and Wagner, C. (2021). A total error framework for digital traces of human behavior on online platforms. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 85(S1):399–422.
- [24] Stieglitz, S., Brachten, F., Ross, B., and Jung, A.-K. (2017). Do social bots dream of electric sheep? a categorisation of social media bot accounts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.04044*.
- [25] Thomas, K., Grier, C., and Paxson, V. (2012). Adapting social spam infrastructure for political censorship. In *5th USENIX Workshop on Large-Scale Exploits and Emergent Threats (LEET 12)*.
- [26] Törnberg, P. (2022). How digital media drive affective polarization through partisan sorting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(42).
- [27] Wischniewski, M., Bernemann, R., Ngo, T., and Krämer, N. (2021). Disagree? You Must be a Bot! How Beliefs Shape Twitter Profile Perceptions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '21*, pages 1–11, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [28] Wischniewski, M., Ngo, T., Bernemann, R., Jansen, M., and Krämer, N. (2022). “I agree with you, bot!” How users (dis)engage with social bots on Twitter. *New Media & Society*, 0(0):14614448211072307.
- [29] Woolley, S. C. and Howard, P. N. (2016). Political communication, computational propaganda, and autonomous agents: Introduction. *International journal of Communication*, 10.
- [30] Yan, H. Y. and Yang, K.-C. (2022). The landscape of social bot research: a critical appraisal.
- [31] Yan, H. Y., Yang, K.-C., Menczer, F., and Shanahan, J. (2021). Asymmetrical perceptions of partisan political bots. *New Media & Society*, 23(10):3016–3037. Publisher: SAGE Publications.