Controversy on Social Media: Collective Attention, Echo Chambers, and Price of Bipartisanship Gianmarco De Francisci Morales ISI Foundation

> with Kiran Garimella Aristides Gionis Michael Mathioudakis

## Controversy: from Latin contra (against) vertere (turn) "turned against, disputed"



## Amid Outcry, Trump Continues Campaign of Controversy

by ALI VITALI



## Amid Outcry, Trump Continues Campaign of Controversy

by ALI VITALI



January 12, 2016, 06:00 am

## Trump puts Cruz off balance by fanning 'birther' controversy

By Alexander Bolton





## Amid Outcry, Trump Continues Campaign of Controversy

by ALI VITALI



January 12, 2016, 06:00 am

## Trump puts Cruz off balance by fanning 'birther' controversy

By Alexander Bolton





**ELECTIONS / U.S. POLITICS** 

#### Controversy Arrives Well Ahead of Trump's Burlington Visit

POSTED BY TERRI HALLENBECK ON MON, JAN 4, 2016 AT 8:39 PM





The gap grows



The gap grows

#### Goal

# Understand how controversies unfold in social media



















### Quantifying Controversy in Social Media

WSDM 2016, TSC 2018



### Black/Blue or White/Gold?

#### Desiderata

- In the wild
- Not necessarily political
- No domain knowledge
- Language independent
- Allows comparison

#### **Problem Formulation**

- Graph-based unsupervised formulation
- Conversation graph for a topic (endorsements)
- Find partition of graph (represents 2 sides)
- Measure distance between partitions (random walks)

#### Endorsement Graph



#### Pipeline



#### Example



#### Example



#### #beefban

#### #марш

#### #sxsw #germanwings

#### Example



#beefban #марш Controversial

#sxsw #germanwings Non controversial

### **RWC Rationale**

- Random Walk Controversy score
- Zaller's RAS model (Receive, Accept, Sample)
  "The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion"
  - Response Axiom: "Individuals form opinions by averaging across the considerations that are immediately salient or accessible to them"
- Authoritative (influential) users with high degree set opinions
- Measure likelihood of user to be exposed to opinions from influential users on either side

#### Random Walk



#### Random Walk



#### Random Walk



#### **RWC Definition**

Consider two random walks, one ending in partition X and one ending in partition Y, RWC is the difference of the probabilities of two events: (i) both random walks started from the partition they ended in and (ii) both random walks started in a partition other than the one they ended in

$$RWC = P_{_{XX}}P_{_{YY}} - P_{_{YX}}P_{_{XY}}$$

 $P_{AB} = Pr[$ start in partition  $A \mid$  end in partition B]

### **RWC Properties**

- Probabilities are conditional on ending in either partition
  - Random walks end on either side with equal probability
  - Not skewed by size of each partition
  - Not skewed by total degree of vertices in each partition
- Close to 1 when probability of crossing sides low (high controversy)
- Close to 0 when probability of crossing comparable to that of staying (low controversy)



Figure 3: Controversy scores on *retweet* graphs of various controversial and non-controversial datasets

Figure 4: Controversy scores on *follow* graphs of various controversial and non-controversial datasets.

### **Controversy Detection**




**Fig. 10:** *RWC* scores for synthetic Erdös-Rényi graphs planted with two communities.  $p_1$  is the intra-community edge probability, while  $p_2$  is the inter-community edge probability.

#### Planted Synthetic Graphs

# Summary

- RWC: a measure for how controversial a discussion on a topic is on social media
- Graph-based measure: no domain knowledge, language agnostic
- Intuitive semantics founded on opinion formation models
- Captures controversy better than state-of-the-art
- User-level polarization measure easy to derive

#### The Effect of Collective Attention on Controversial Debates on Social media

WebSci 2017 (Best Paper Award)

The Effect of Collective Attention on Controversial Debates on Social media



The Effect of Collective Attention on Controversial Debates on Social media

#### The Effect of Collective Attention on Controversial Debates on Social media

#### "Trump taxes" on Google





#### "Trump taxes" on Google



### Obamacare on Twitter



# Gun Control on Twitter



#### Literature so far

- Controversial debates examined in isolation
- As static snapshots

### Contribution

- Controversial debates are dynamic
- They change with collective attention

- Analyze controversial debates over time
- Particularly when collective attention increases
  - When external 'event' happens

#### Data

- Twitter
- 4 longitudinal polarized topics
  - Obamacare, Abortion, Gun control, Fracking
- 5 years (2011 -- 2016)
- Hundreds of thousands of users
- Millions of tweets

### Definitions

- Retweet Graph
- Reply Graph
- Core Users



**#Obamacare** is dead. Insurance markets are collapsing & millions don't have choices. Americans deserve better. 45.wh.gov/VPWHwG

**Follow** 





# Reply graph





President Trump 🤣

#Obamacare is dead. Insurance markets are collapsing & millions don't have choices.
Americans deserve better.
45.wh.gov/VPWHwG

Follow

 $\sim$ 



### Core



### Core



#### Core Users

# Experiments



#### Experiments





# 1) New users enter the discussion



1) New users enter the discussion

2) Most retweets to existing core users



1) New users enter the discussion

2) Most retweets to existing core users



#### 3) Cross-side / retweets decrease

1) New users enter the discussion

2) Most retweets to existing core users



3) Cross-side / retweets decrease 4) Within-side retweets increase

#### Controversy Measure



Figure 2: RWC score as a function of the activity in the retweet network. An increase in interest in the controversial topic corresponds to an increase in the controversy score of the retweet network.



# **Core-Periphery Openness**



Figure 12: Core-periphery openness as a function of activity in the retweet network. As the interest increases, the number of core-periphery edges, normalized by the expected number of edges in a random network, increases. This suggests a propensity of periphery nodes to connect with the core nodes when interest increases.

### Reply Graph



Cross-side edges increase: more discussion





#### **Content becomes uniform across the sides**



# Long-Term Polarization



# Summary

- Controversial debates during external events
- Polarization increases
- Retweet graph becomes hierarchical (core-periphery)
- More replies across sides
- Content becomes more uniform
- Many more results in the paper!

Political Discourse on Social Media Echo Chambers, Gatekeepers, and the Price of Bipartisanship

WWW 2018

# Political Discourse on Social Media

- Characterized by heavy polarization
- Emergence of echo chambers ("Hear your own voice")
- Might hamper deliberative process in democracy
  - Lack of shared world view
- Concern expressed by former US Presidents, Facebook, Twitter, and more

### Polarization Cause

- Selective exposure?
  - People see only content that agrees with their preexisting opinion
- Biased assimilation?
  - People pay more attention to content that agrees with their pre-existing opinion
## Echo Chamber Definition

- Echo = opinion
- Chamber = network
- Joint content + network definition
- Echo chamber = political leaning of content that users receive from network agrees with that of content they share to the network

## Production/Consumption

- Consumption
  - What you receive in your feed
  - What your followees tweet
- Production
  - What you tweet



## Political Leaning Scores

- Based on source of the content (500 domains)
- Score derived by self-declared affiliation of sharers on FB
- FoxNews.com is aligned with conservatives (CP = 0.9), HuffingtonPost.com is aligned with liberals (CP = 0.17)



# Production/Consumption Scores

- Polarity scores based on "content" leaning (from source)
- Production score
  - Average political leaning of the content the user tweets
- Consumption score
  - Average political leaning of the content the user receives on their feed
  - Results of selection by the user

## δ-partisanship



Figure 1: Example showing the definition of  $\delta$ -partisan users. The dotted red lines are drawn at  $\delta$  and 1- $\delta$ . Users on the left of the leftmost dashed red line or right of the rightmost one are  $\delta$ -partisan.

#### δ-{partisan,consumer,gatekeeper}

- $\delta$ -partisan: produces content with polarity beyond  $\delta$ 
  - $\delta$ -bipartisan: produces content with polarity within  $\delta$
- $\delta$ -consumer: consumes content with polarity beyond  $\delta$
- δ-gatekeeper: δ-partisan but not δ-consumer
  - consumes from both sides but produces content aligned with only one side
  - blocks information flow towards its community

#### Network Measures

- Network-based latent-space user polarity
  - Based on following politicians with aligned ideology
- Network centrality (PageRank)
- Local clustering coefficient
- Retweet/favorite rates and volumes

#### Correlation



Figure 3: Distribution of production and consumption polarity, for POLITICAL (first row) and NON-POLITICAL (second row) datasets. The scatter plots display the production (x-axis) and consumption (y-axis) polarities of each user in a dataset. Colors indicate user polarity sign, following [6] (grey = democrat, yellow = republican). The one-dimensional plots along the axes show the distributions of the production and consumption polarities for democrats and republicans.

## Correlation: Gun Control

Guncontrol, Pearson Corr: 0.86



#### Variance



Figure 4: Top: Production polarity variance vs. production polarity (mean). Bottom: Consumption polarity variance vs. consumption polarity (mean).

#### Variance



# Frice of Expantisanship



Figure 6: Pagerank for  $\delta$ -partisan and  $\delta$ -bipartisan users.

## Price of Bipartisanship: PR



#### Partisans vs Bipartisans Gatekeepers vs Non-gatekeepers

Features	Partisans	Gatekeepers
PageRank	1	$\checkmark$
clustering coefficient	$\checkmark$	✓ (-)
user polarity	$\checkmark$	✓ (-)
degree	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
retweet rate	$\checkmark$	×
retweet volume	$\checkmark$	×
favorite rate	$\checkmark$	×
favorite volume	$\checkmark$	×
# followers	×	×
# friends	×	×
# tweets	×	×
age on Twitter	×	×

# Summary

- Find echo chambers in political discussion on Twitter
- Definition of echo chambers with two elements:
  - Content (echo) + Network (chamber)
- Data supports the selective exposure theory
- Bi-partisan users pay a price in terms of network centrality and content appreciation

## Conclusions

- How do controversies unfold on social media?
- Measuring is the first step (RWC)
- Controversies are dynamic (time is an important factor)
  - Collective attention increases polarization
- Echo chambers associated with controversies
  - Evidence of selective exposure and price of bi-partisanship

## What's next?

- Joint opinion formation + network generation model
- Adding data to opinion dynamics models
- Temporal dynamics of the process
- Application to other contexts (Reddit, Facebook)
- Interventions: can we do something about it?

## Thanks! Questions please!

