

MAPPING THE TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE: A TOPIC, SENTIMENT, AND EMOTION ANALYSIS IN SOCIAL MEDIA DISCOURSE

ALINA LANDOWSKA, MACIEJ SKÓRSKI, AND KRZYSZTOF RAJDA

Abstract

People worldwide are currently confronted with a number of technological challenges, which act as a potent source of uncertainty. The uncertainty arising from the volatility and unpredictability of technology (such as AI) and its potential consequences is widely discussed on social media. This study uses BERTopic modelling along with sentiment and emotion analysis on 1.5 million tweets from 2021 to 2023 to identify anticipated tech-driven futures and capture the emotions communicated by 400 key opinion leaders (KOLs). Findings indicate positive sentiment significantly outweighs negative, with a prevailing dominance of positive anticipatory emotions. Specifically, the 'Hope' score is approximately 10.33% higher than the median 'Anxiety' score. KOLs emphasise 'Optimism' and benefits over 'Pessimism' and challenges. The study emphasises the important role KOLs play in shaping future visions through anticipatory discourse and emotional tone during times of technological uncertainty.

Key words and phrases Anticipatory Discourse, Anticipatory Emotions, Twitter, Discourse Analysis, Corpus Linguistics, Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, Topic Modelling

1. INTRODUCTION

The future appears to be dominated by Artificial Intelligence (AI). Technology — particularly AI — exemplifies anticipation and uncertainty by replicating human intelligence. To the extent that we concern ourselves with the future, we oscillate between hope and anxiety. Hope and anxiety are recognised as uncertainty emotions (Gordon, 1969, 1987). On the other hand, broader anticipatory emotions include hope, trust, fear, and anxiety (Castelfranchi and Miceli, 2011; Feil et al., 2022).

Anticipation plays a critical role in decision-making and behaviour (Moore and Hoffman, 2011; Grabenhorst et al., 2021) as the desire to reduce uncertainty is a potent motivator of social behaviour (Hirsh et al., 2012), as people constantly seek to estimate and reduce uncertainties in social interactions to enhance their productivity, well-being, and ultimately their survival as social beings (FeldmanHall and Shenhav, 2019). The ability to navigate and adapt to uncertain futures becomes crucial.

The discourse on social media is replete with envisaged future scenarios. These scenarios serve as a roadmap for users, guiding their expectations and informing their actions (Koivunen et al., 2023; Tavory and Eliasoph, 2013). Influencers play a significant role in shaping public perceptions and the narrative surrounding these uncertainties (Acerbi, 2022, 2019; Jin and Phua, 2014; Landowska et al., 2023; Spry et al., 2011; Tur et al., 2022). For instance, their anticipation of AI and automation, while often seen as progress, also brings up concerns about job loss, privacy, and tech power concentration. This study not

only uncover the anticipatory discourse on the X platform but also scrutinizes the power dynamics in tech discourse, particularly the impact of key opinion leaders (KOLs) in moulding public views of tech futures. Based on a corpus of anticipatory discourse (Table 1) from Twitter spanning 2021 to 2023, this study integrates BERTopic modelling, sentiment, and emotion analyses to explore the futures represented by technology influencers on social media and to assess the emotional impact of these anticipated visions articulated to the public audiences.

Research on how individuals anticipate and structure future events has been central in social theory, e.g., (Adam, 1990; Bergmann, 1992; Emirbayer and Mische, 1998; Abbott, 2001; Mische, 2009). Every human interaction inherently involves a connection to future events (Tavory and Eliasoph (2013)). When individuals engage with each other, they orient themselves towards future circumstances, and consequently it becomes imperative for individuals to simultaneously navigate the inherent uncertainties associated with these future-oriented interactions (*ibid.*, p. 909).

By employing a triangulated methodological approach (e.g., (Egbert and Baker, 2019)), we aim to integrate three distinct methods for discourse analysis of a tweet-based corpus: BERTopic modelling (contextual corpus analysis), Keywords analysis (non-contextual corpus analysis), and lexicon-based analysis (sentiment, emotion, attitude analyses). Our goal is to identify the leading technologies and KOLs, how technological topics (anticipated futures) evolve and interrelate over time, and the sentiments, anticipatory emotions, and attitudes associated with them within

Topic	Futurist’s anticipatory tweet
9	”Next level of #remotework - will working from home (#WFH) be the new standard for the #futureofwork?”
40	’Will you learn to trust artificial intelligence next year?’
54	’How is Artificial Intelligence Revolutionizing the Educational Sector?’
78	’#Who’s Next? Security Guards? Yet another job that will be replaced by robots?’
90	’When will we see the first #AI generated hit song? Book? 🤖’

TABLE 1. Examples of Anticipatory Discourse of Future Influencers in the Analysed Corpora

a corpus of approximately 1.5 million tweets spanning the years 2021 to 2023. Through this combination, we seek to address the following research questions:

- **[Rq1]** What specific technology-driven futures are being anticipated by KOLs on platform X and how do they evolve over time and interrelate with each other as well as to what extent are these anticipated futures aligned with the concepts of ‘present future’ and ‘future present’?
- **[Rq2]** Who are the Key Opinion Leaders (KOLs) driving these discussions, and how does their influence shape the prominence of specific technologies on platform X?
- **[Rq3]** What are the specific sentiments (either positive or negative), anticipatory emotions, and attitudes (either optimistic or pessimistic) expressed by KOLs towards specific technology-oriented futures?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Anticipating (Abstract or Concrete) Futures.

We recognise two main categories of the future: a. ‘present futures’ (Luhmann, 1982) are ‘pre-given futures’ rooted in the past, i.e., lived ones (Adam and Groves, 2011); and b. ‘future present’ (Luhmann, 1982) are ‘futures-in-the-making’ that are possibly latent, growing, and changing ones, i.e., living ones (Adam and Groves, 2011). The ‘present future’ refers to the concrete, i.e. practical, presentational, explicit, (Poli, 2017, 2014) and it is the contextual, embodied, and embedded future (Adam and Groves, 2007); and the ‘future present’ refers to the abstract (symbolic, representational, implicit) future that lacks context and content, creating an opportunity for exploration and processing (Adam and Groves, 2007). ‘Present futures’ are linear continuations of the past in the

present (Poli, 2014), which shape the future by present means (Adam and Groves, 2007; Miller, 2007). The value of these closed-type futures is calculated against its alternatives (forecasts) and traded as commodities (Adam and Groves, 2007); the future with the highest value is the one with the largest profit. Because of the optimistic or pessimistic character of their transformed or reinterpreted visions, they serve as projections aiming at evoking hope or fear (Luhmann, 1982).

‘Future presents’ are latent, but they can be recognised and foreseen, thus impacting the present by entering into it and being used in the present (Adam and Groves, 2011). These futures are conceptualised, isolated from their contexts, and technologically prejudiced (Luhmann, 1982), which makes them limitless possibilities, leading to high uncertainty (Adam and Groves, 2007; Beckert, 2013; Poli, 2014, 2017). These abstract futures are open-type futures with abstract values that are freely traded on the assumption that they can be computed at any location and at any time, and it may be used for any situation (Adam and Groves, 2007). The ‘future presents’ are unpredictable and evoke fictional expectations based on the “as if” rule (Beckert, 2013). Future presents seems to be anticipatory in their character because of their ‘use-of-the-future’ orientation (Poli, 2017).

Anticipatory Emotions. Anticipation plays a crucial role in the generation of emotions, and the literature distinguishes between future-oriented emotions for anticipatory and anticipated experiences. Anticipatory emotions encompass present feelings related to an upcoming event (Bagozzi et al., 1998; Baumgartner et al., 2008; Feil et al., 2022), whereas anticipated emotions pertain to the expected emotional responses a person may have when faced with a future occurrence (Baumgartner et al., 2008; Feil et al., 2022; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001). Anticipatory emotions primarily manifest as prospective feelings of hope and fear and anticipated emotions tend to be retrospective, including sensations like relief, satisfaction, disappointment, and anger (Baumgartner et al., 2008; Feil et al., 2022). Hope responds to possible future outcomes, while fear is associated with negative ones (Castelfranchi and Miceli, 2011; MacLeod, 2017; Vazard, 2024). Unmet hope is leading to disappointment, whereas the absence of a feared event brings relief (Baumgartner et al., 2008; Mowrer, 1960).

Moreover, (Plutchik, 1980) identifies anticipation as one of the eight primary bipolar emotions. At primary dyads, it interacts with joy to create optimism, and with anger to result in aggressiveness (Plutchik, 2001). Secondary dyads, two petals apart, pair anticipation with trust, leading to hope, and with disgust,

Unique accounts	400
Unique texts	1,200,003
Unique tweets (timestamp+text)	1,458,018

TABLE 2. Dataset summary statistics

culminating in cynicism (*ibidem*). Tertiary dyads, three petals apart, combine anticipation with sadness, resulting in pessimism, and with fear, leading to anxiety (*ibidem*). In this emotional spectrum, anticipation stands in contrast to surprise (*ibidem*).

3. DATA AND METHODS

Data Collection. The dataset was collected using the scraping library `snsscrape` (JustAnotherArchivist, 2023). Tweets were sourced from about 400 technology influencers’ feeds published in the time-frame from January 1, 2021, to March 31, 2023. The selection of KOLs was meticulously carried out by our team of experts. Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the size and diversity of our dataset.

Data Cleaning. To ensure the accuracy of this analysis, we preprocessed the tweets by removing URLs, emails, and user handles, which are identifiers for X users.

Data Analysis. We employed a comprehensive suite of Natural Language Processing techniques to conduct an in-depth analysis of the data we collected. Appropriate non-parametric statistical tests were used to assess significance of findings.

Contextual Corpus Analysis. Following prior work on extracting topics from Twitter data (Bogdanowicz and Guan, 2022; Egger and Yu, 2022; Landowska et al., 2023; Yang and Saffer, 2021), we trained the state-of-the-art BERTopic model implemented in the BERTopic library (Grootendorst, 2022). As the default setting of BERTopic is vulnerable on data volume, to perform analysis efficiently, we used an online implementation of the algorithm using: *IncrementalPCA* dimensionality reduction model, *MiniBatchK-Means* clustering algorithm and a *OnlineCountVectorizer* vectorisation scheme, with an *all-MiniLM-L6-v2* embeddings base applied to raw tweets. BERTopic analysed the dataset and categorised it into 100 contextually coherent, distinct topics. We visualised the topics using the method of (Sievert and Shirley, 2014), implemented in the library `pyLDAvis` (Mabey, 2021).

Non-contextual Corpus Analysis. Our analysis of the non-contextual corpus consists of identifying KOLs and keywords. KOLs in tech discussions were identified based on their tweet volume on the X platform (Casaló et al., 2020). Indicating keywords required utilising a compact English model from the

Spacy¹ package. This model analyses the given corpus, assigning respective metadata to each sentence and word, ultimately generating an annotated corpus. The textual data underwent processing through lemmatisation and Part-of-Speech (POS) tagging. The lemmatised form of any word serves as a keyword, excluding stop words. Subsequently, we computed the global attributes of the corpus, including the most distinctive keywords.

Sentiment and Emotions Analysis. To analyse sentiment, we leveraged the Brand24 model (Augustyniak et al., 2023; Rajda et al., 2022). This recent model is based on a fine-tuned multilingual LLM and is specifically tailored for analysing social media data. The Brand24 sentiment classifier operates in a three polarities (positive, negative, and neutral). The average sentiment score was defined as follows:

$$(1) \quad \text{Score} = \frac{N^+ - N^-}{N^- + N^0 + N^+}$$

where N^- , N^0 and N^+ denote the number of tweets classified as positive, neutral, and negative, respectively. For analysing emotions, we chose to adopt the enhanced and expanded model introduced by (Mohammad et al., 2018), which is accessible as a functional framework shared by (Camacho-Collados et al., 2022). We utilised the official implementation available from the HuggingFace repository². The model classifies emotions in a multi-label schema, meaning that each text is assigned a separate score for each of the 11 emotions (sadness, disgust, anger, fear, anticipation, surprise, joy, love, trust, pessimism, optimism). Pessimism and optimism scores were rejected. Following Plutchik (1980), to define scores of hope and anxiety, for each topic, we paired anticipation with trust to obtain hope scores, while also linking anticipation with fear, resulting in anxiety (please refer to Equation (1)).

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Score(Anxiety)} &= \text{Score(Anticipation)} + \text{Score(Fear)} \\ \text{Score(Hope)} &= \text{Score(Anticipation)} + \text{Score(Trust)}, \end{aligned}$$

and the topics are scored by averaging, respectively. We incorporated an emotion colour palette inspired by Plutchik’s wheel of emotions from (Semeraro et al., 2021). This visually enhanced our findings and provide a more intuitive representation of emotional states. Despite the frequent use of the terms optimism and pessimism, there is a noticeable lack of consensus on their precise definitions. In this study, we propose a coherent approach by interpreting them

¹<https://spacy.io/>

²<https://huggingface.co/cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-emotion-multilabel-latest>

as a manifestation of a ‘can-do’ attitude (Bortolotti, 2018; Jefferson et al., 2017). We suggest, according to (Plutchik, 2001) and (TenHouten, 2023), to define optimism as the cumulative score of anticipation and joy, while pessimism as the combined score of anticipation and sadness. This approach provides a more structured and verified method to measure these attitudes as follows:

(3)

$$\text{Score}(\text{Optimissism}) = \text{Score}(\text{Anticipation}) + \text{Score}(\text{Joy})$$

$$\text{Score}(\text{Pessimism}) = \text{Score}(\text{Anticipation}) + \text{Score}(\text{Sadness})$$

4. RESULTS

4.1. Technology-Driven Topics. Distinct Topics.

After several rounds of training the BERTopic model, we determined that the optimal number of distinct topics was 100. Each topic is linked to a specific set of tweets, enabling a deeper understanding of the principal themes within the dataset. For a comprehensive list of all topics (please refer to the supplementary repository). The Coherence Value measure (please see (Röder et al., 2015)) for 25 topics is about 66%, demonstrating that topics are of high-quality (as evidenced by other studies on Twitter/X data, under this metric, BERTopic rarely achieves scores higher than 70% (Campagnolo et al., 2022; Santakij et al., 2024; Austin et al., 2024) unless for small and coherent corpora (Chen et al., 2023)).

Hierarchical Clustering. BERTopic model also generated 21 unique clusters from 100 topics (please refer to Table 3). The relationships between the documents and these themes are elucidated, as depicted in the hierarchical clustering dendrogram (please refer to Figure 1). These groups show how different tech themes like AI, ML, and Data Science are influencing each other as they develop within the discussing community. The dendrogram illustrates how topics are related to each other based on their distance in the high-dimensional space, where topics are closer if they are more similar (please refer to Intertopic Distance Map in the supplementary repository).

Engagement in discussions on futures. The range of tweet counts across topics is 23,144 tweets (from 7,633 to 30,777). The average engagement of discussion (the mean count of tweets per topic) is 14,580 tweets. Approximately 41.75% of the topics exceed this mean count. After excluding non-technology related discussions like ‘Time Reflections’ or ‘Gratitude,’ the top 5 tech-driven topics include Topic 25 (27,231 tweets), Topic 0 (27,103 tweets), Topic 83 (22,485 tweets), Topic 6 (21,827 tweets), and Topic 46 (21,635 tweets). These topics are discussed significantly more frequently than the bottom 5 below the median, such as Topic 70 (7,633 tweets), Topic




FIGURE 1. The Hierarchical Clustering of Anticipated Technology-Driven Futures

99 (8,418 tweets), Topic 68 (8,430 tweets), Topic 79 (8,792 tweets), and Topic 14 (9,096 tweets).

Futures Evolution. Some topics exhibit seasonal patterns, characterised by regular peaks and troughs, while others demonstrate clear trends—either increasing or decreasing over time (refer to Figure 2). Time trends for each topic can be accessed in the supplementary repository. Certain topics consistently reached all-time highs over the examined time period compared to other topics. For instance, Topic 53 shows sustained interest and growth, reflecting its evolving role in shaping future technological landscapes. In contrast, other topics demonstrate fluctuating patterns, suggesting shifts in interest and relevance over time. Certain topics demonstrate sharp increases or decreases at specific points. For instance, Topic 0 (the blue line) reached an all-time high with




FIGURE 2. The Dynamics of Selected Topics Over Time

two significant peaks. The first peak occurred during the WEF from 17 to 21 January 2022, and the second during the 27th UN COP 27 held from 6 November until 20 November 2022. Topic 46 (the red line) showed a peak around of the Special Annual Meeting of the WEF from May 25-28, 2021. Some topics, such as 83 (the violet line), manifest notable fluctuations, while others like Topic 78 (the pink line) remain relatively stable until they drop off at the end. All topics demonstrate a consistent presence over time, with none of them showing a drop-off, indicating their sustained relevance. Finally, there are clear intertopic relations over time. For instance, Topics 27 (the light green line), 32 (the dark green line), and 54 (the orange line) resonate with each other.

4.2. KOLs and Trending Technologies. Leading performers. KOLs are subject matter experts who make significant contributions to specific topics and the prominence of specific technologies on platform X. A small number of them dominate the discourse, with the top 10 KOLs generating 13% (187,645 tweets) of the total tweets (refer to Figure 3). They play a pivotal role in steering discussions across 22 topics, dominating these conversations with a substantial share of over 49%. The data clearly shows distinct specialisation among the KOLs, except for jamesvgingerich, who is active in 46 topics. Figure 4 showcases the top performers jamesvgingerich is the standout performer, leading in all 10 topics. Among the other key performers, digital_trans4m is the leading contributor in Topic 47, while kirkdborne leads in Topic 6, and evankirstel leads in Topic 8. However, these users do not hold leading positions in other topics. While most topics (e.g., Topic 32) are evenly distributed among users, Topic 88 stands out as an exception (please refer to Figure 5). Here, user jamesvgingerich has a significant lead responsible for a staggering 70% of all tweets on this topic, amounting to 7502 tweets. In comparison, the second-highest contributor, ronald_vanloon, has made 951 tweets, which constitutes 9% of the total contributions to this topic.

Cluster	Topics	Leitmotiv
1	35, 6, 54, 20, 53, 40, 27	AI, ML, DL, Big Data, NLP
2	91, 50, 58	Entertainment and Gaming
3	97, 29	Fashion and Lifestyle
4	71, 65, 0, 93, 79, 87	AV, Automatic Industry, EV, Eco-energy, Climate Change, Innovative engineering, Drones, Space
5	68, 92	Healthcare, AI
6	60, 61, 99	Covid-19 and Quarantine
7	78, 88, 30, 11, 70	Automation, Robots Engineering, Robotics, Autonomous Robots, AI
8	47, 15, 46	IoT, 5G, Security, Digital Transformation, Industry 4.0, Edge Computing
9	14, 10, 81, 43, 62, 37, 21, 33	Quantum Computing, Data Analytics, Digital Transformation, Tech Innovations, Metaverse
10	26, 18, 76, 38, 22, 32, 67, 98, 82	Women in Tech, Social Media, Payments, Retail, Privacy, Security
11	44, 5, 52, 64	Start-up, Fintech, Cryptocurrency
12	19, 2, 56	Cybersecurity, War, Ukraine
13	74, 80, 31, 24	CX, UX, Future of Claims, Insurtech
14	9, 94, 95, 51	Future of Work, Future of Leaders, Leadership of Change, Strategy, Management
15	48, 73, 23, 39, 42	AI, Data Science, AV, VR, Digital Transformation, Metaverse
16	59, 89, 1, 96, 17	Gratitude (Thanks, Acknowledgements)
17	85, 45, 63	Appreciation (Thanks, Great)
18	75, 84, 36, 55, 3	Mathematics, Life, Questioning
19	77, 66, 4, 25, 8	Time Reflections (Year, Mypov, Women in History)
20	41, 83, 69, 13, 86, 90, 49, 28	Politics, Policies, Ukraine War, Social Media
21	57, 12, 16, 7, 72, 34	Future, Economics, Education, People Skills, Collaborative Enterprise, Climate, Teamwork

TABLE 3. The organisation of Topics into Clusters by BERTopic Analysis




FIGURE 3. Topic leaders.




FIGURE 4. Number of Tweets by Top-Performing KOLs in the Corpus




FIGURE 5. Contribution Distribution Across Topics in Robotics/Robots Engineering versus VR/AR/Audio Technology



FIGURE 6. The Most Frequently Occurring Keywords

Leading technologies. We also identified the top 100 keywords (the most discussed in the dataset) based on their frequency of occurrence in the entire dataset (refer to Figure 6). Table 4 showcases the most representative keywords for 5 randomly selected topics. Every keyword, each representing a distinct topic, can be found in the (name removed for reviewing) repository. Keywords, although frequently oversimplified markers, lack context and nuance. However, through analysis, they enable the identification of leading technologies extensively discussed among KOLs (refer to Figure 7).

4.3. Sentiment and Emotions Across Topics and Clusters. Sentiment Score. The sentiment analysis of the dataset reveals that a significant majority, i.e. 68.9% of the tweets are classified as neutral, followed by positive (21.5%) and then negative (9.6%) (please refer to Figure 8). The most neutral scores

Topic	Related keywords
2	'cybersecurity', 'privacy', 'security', 'cyber', 'cyberattack', 'cyberwar', 'cybercrime', 'hackers', 'data', 'ukraine'
11	'robotics', 'automation', 'robot', 'ai', 'artificialintelligence', 'robots', 'robotic'
40	'artificialintelligence', 'ai', 'intelligence', 'artificial', 'nlp', 'machinelearning', 'robots', 'deeplearning', 'read', 'bigdata'
43	'quantum', 'latest', 'computing', 'trends', 'cloud', 'quantumcomputing', 'tech'
79	'innovation', 'engineering', 'energy', 'technology', 'scientists', 'interesting', 'future', 'space', 'science', 'world'

TABLE 4. The Most Representative Keywords in Selected Topics




FIGURE 7. Leading Technologies

associated to Topics 0, 6 25, 46, 40, 33, 27, 24, 47, 20, 44. The most positive sentiment dominates in Topics such as 59, 89, 1, 96, 17 85, 45, 63. The most negative sentiment is associated with Topic 83, 41, 18, 86, 2, and 56. The average sentiment score ranges from -0.5038 (very negative) to 0.8419 (very positive), with a mean of approximately 0.116 , indicating an overall positive sentiment across all topics. This is evidenced by the statistically significant result of the one-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank test ($p = 2 \cdot 10^{-18}$) for comparison of positive and negative sentiment across topics.

Emotions. The distribution of emotions is presented in Figure 9, for more numerical details please refer to the repository. The 5 topics with the highest



FIGURE 8. Comparative Analysis of Positive and Negative Sentiment Distribution Across Various Topics

emotion scores (above the median) and the 5 topics with the lowest emotion scores (below the median) please refer to Table 5. For top anticipation scores please refer to Figure 12. The statistical correlation analysis was performed with the use of non-parametric Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, demonstrating significance of correlation presence in all emotion pairs ($p = 10^{-16}$ for joint significance after Benferoni correction). The results are summarised in Figure 10 and reveal that: i. the correlation (0.455) between anticipation and trust indicates that anticipation enhances trust; ii. With a moderate negative correlation (-0.353), that higher anticipation is associated with lower sadness; iii. the weak positive correlation (0.217) b implies that as anticipation increases, fear also tends to increase slightly; iv. the very weak correlation (0.007) suggests that anticipation and joy are largely independent. When anticipation increases, joy does not necessarily increase or decrease significantly.

At aggregated level, the data indicates a strong dominance of 'Anticipation' (48%) and 'Joy' (46%) across all topics (please refer to Figure 11). The remaining 6% of topics were primarily characterised by




FIGURE 9. Distributions of Emotions Across the Corpus




FIGURE 10. Spearman's Rho Correlation of Emotions Across the Corpus

negative emotions, i.e. 'Disgust' (3%), 'Fear' (2%), and 'Anger' at a minimal level of 1%.

Anticipatory Emotions. 'Anticipation' correlates with both 'Trust' (leading to 'Hope') and 'Fear' (leading to 'Anxiety'), for the frequency of these emotion scores across topics please refer to Figure 13. The median 'Hope' score (0.6345) is approximately 10.33% higher than the median 'Anxiety' score (0.5751). The highest 'Hope' scores were found in topics, e.g. 51, 94, 80, 14, 95, topics with the lowest 'Hope' scores were, e.g., 7, 0, 57, 9, 60. The highest 'Anxiety' scores were observed in topics, e.g. 94, 14, 31, 43, 79, whereas the lowest scores included, e.g. 51, 7, 80, 95, 0. The

Emotion	Topics	
	Highest Score	Lowest Score
Joy	34, 94, 14, 42, 31	52, 99, 55, 72, 13
Anticipation	94, 14, 31, 77, 43	99, 55, 72, 13, 4
Trust	51, 34, 94, 7, 80	72, 71, 47, 13, 4
Disgust	7, 80, 95, 0, 24	65, 78, 48, 39, 20
Suprise	77, 43, 79, 81, 84	17, 10, 96, 93, 49
Anger	34, 7, 80, 95, 0	78, 48, 39, 20, 62
Sadness	34, 7, 80, 95, 0	52, 1, 82, 99, 48
Fear	7, 95, 0, 81, 92	17, 96, 29, 37, 35
Love	34, 7, 80, 95, 14	68, 36, 19, 27, 40

TABLE 5. Highest and Lowest Emotion Scores in Topics




FIGURE 11. Dominance of Emotions Across All Topics




FIGURE 12. Emotions in Top-Anticipating Topics

non-parametric one-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank test shows the 'Hope' dominates over 'Anxiety' across topics ($p = 5.58 \times 10^{-7}$).




FIGURE 13. Distribution of Anticipation, Trust, and Fear in Topics




FIGURE 14. Distribution of Optimism and Pessimism Across All Topics

Optimistic and Pessimistic Attitudes. At level of Topics, the median 'Optimism' score (0.9979) is approximately 71.15% higher than the median 'Pessimism' score (0.5830) (please refer to Figure 14). The highest 'Optimism' scores were found in topics, e.g. 35, 43, 73, 53, 65, topics with the lowest 'Optimism' scores were, e.g., 0, 8, 10, 4. The highest 'Pessimism' scores were observed in topics, e.g. 20, 54, 81, 24, 97, 10, whereas the lowest scores included, e.g. 8, 23, 41, 39, 95. A bimodal distribution of 'Optimism' is observed (please refer to Figure 15). Non-tech topics like Topics 51 and 94 show the highest 'Optimism,' while tech topics like 79 or 81 have a narrower range of 'Optimism' scores. At level of Clusters, the median 'Optimism' score (0.4963026) is approximately 73.29% higher than the median of 'Pessimism' score (0.2864076). Clusters demonstrating the highest 'Optimism' scores are Clusters 7, 1, and 5, while the highest 'Pessimism' score are Clusters 1, 7, and 5 (please refer to Figure 16).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Anticipated 'Futures-in-the-Making'. Amongst tech-driven discussions, topics related to 'Disruptive TV/Video,' 'Climate Change,' 'War in Ukraine,' 'ML/Data Science/DL/AI,' and 'IoT' generate the most dynamic engagement. In contrast, the topics of 'Robotics,




FIGURE 15. Distribution of Optimism and Pessimism Across the Corpus




FIGURE 16. Pessimism and Optimism Across Topic Clusters

Robots,' 'COVID-19, quarantine, things to do,' 'Health-care, AI,' 'Innovation engineering, energy technology,' and 'Manufacturing, Agtech, sustainability, innovation' are discussed less frequently. All of them are open-ended 'future present' (Luhmann, 1982), still evolving (Adam and Groves, 2011).

Major events trigger topic spikes, amplifying tech dialogues globally. These peaks can guide tech progress and shape discourse (Allcott and Gentzkow, 2017; Falkenberg et al., 2022; Hopke and Hestres, 2018; Liang and Lu, 2023). Inter-topic dynamics, like the alignment in 'AI,' 'VR/AR,' and 'Big Data,' highlight the interconnectedness of tech advancements. These topics clearly stimulate developments in others, revealing a complex network of technological interrelations (Porter and Cunningham, 2005). AI serves as a prime example of this phenomenon.

5.2. Influence of KOLs in Shaping Anticipatory Discourse. KOLs like Jamesvgingerich, digital_trans4m, and kirkdborne shape discourse in fields such as 'Climate Change' and 'Robotics.' They foster communities and gain recognition in distinct subjects (Furini, 2024; Haupt, 2021; Lichti et al., 2023). They not only establish an influential 'anticipatory news infrastructure' (Ananny and Finn, 2020), but also enhance their tweets and foster societal approval for new technologies by integrating anticipatory emotions into the formation of futures (Valente and Pumpuang, 2007). The discourse power concentration among few influencers highlights their central role in content creation and dissemination (Martin and Sharma, 2022; Oueslati et al., 2023). A few voices significantly shape public perceptions of technological futures, what raises questions about the diversity and inclusivity of the tech discourse.

5.3. Positive Sentiment, Hope, and Optimism Towards Anticipated Futures. Most of the discourse remained neutral, indicating that influencers tended to provide informative yet potentially ambiguous information (e.g., 'Machine Learning,' 'Deep Learning,' 'Climate Change,' 'Disruptive TV/Video,' 'AI,' 'Future of Claims,' 'Digital Transformation,' and 'IoT'), possibly due to professional reasons. The prevailing positive sentiment favours the benefits, often without fully addressing the accompanying challenges of technological progress. Conversely, negative sentiments primarily centred on non-technology subjects also discussed by KOLs, such as politics (e.g., 'War in Ukraine,' 'Trump Politics'), or social issues resuting from technology (e.g. 'Privacy,' 'Cybersecurity').

In KOLs' tweets, a high presence of 'Anticipation' as an emotion (48%) exceeds the English tweet average (13.9%) (Mohammad et al., 2018). 'Anticipation,' linked to future positive events (TenHouten, 2023), and 'Joy,' as a response to favourable stimuli, are prevalent in the corpus (Emmons, 2020). 'Fear,' 'Disgust,' and 'Anger' often coexist, indicating discussions touch on moral or ethical issues (Cannon, 1927; Zhan et al., 2015; Russell and Giner-Sorolla, 2013). For example, war, politics, and data privacy discussions trigger 'Disgust' and 'Anger,' while 'Cybersecurity' debates elicit 'Anger' and 'Fear.' These emotions, especially in morally charged situations, have distinct triggers and outcomes, and can predict moral outrage (Hutcherson and Gross, 2011; Salerno and Peter-Hagene, 2013). They play a key role in decision-making and behaviour (Butz et al., 2007; Butz and Kutter, 2017; Feil et al., 2022; Hoffmann, 2003; Odou and Schill, 2020), influencing choices and actions based on future expectations, leading to optimism and motivation or caution.

Referring strictly to anticipatory emotions, 'Hope' prevails over 'Anxiety' throughout the corpus. Topics with the highest 'Hope' scores include 'Leadership of Change,' 'Change Management,' 'CIO,' 'Business,' 'Future of Work,' 'Agile,' 'Customer,' 'CX,' 'Customer Experience,' 'Employees,' 'Manufacturing,' 'Agtech,' 'Sustainability,' 'Innovation,' and 'Leadership, Leaders, Kate Nasser.' 'Trust' fosters 'Hope' (Pleeging et al., 2022, 2021). Hope is inherently tied to anticipation, fostering a forward-looking perspective that helps individuals manage present challenges by focusing on potential future successes (TenHouten, 2023). This combination can drive proactive behaviour and resilience in the face of adversity (Pleeging et al., 2021). Conversely, lower 'Hope' scores in topics such as 'People Skills Chat,' 'People, Work RT,' 'Climate Change,' 'Education, Future Economy,' 'Remote Work, Future of Work,' and 'Digital, Transformation, Business, Future' suggest that these areas are perceived with more uncertainty or challenges. This reflects concerns about current issues and future outcomes, highlighting the perceived difficulties and risks associated with these topics. For instance, the ambiguity surrounding climate change's economic consequences contributes to a pervasive sense of uncertainty (Cerrea-Vioglio et al., 2022). Additionally, economic policy uncertainty related to environmental regulations can lower hope and increase anxiety about future outcomes (Barnett et al., 2022).

Topics with the highest 'Anxiety' scores include 'CIO, Business, Future of Work, Agile,' 'Manufacturing, Agtech, Sustainability, Innovation,' 'CX, Customer, Customer Experience, Experience,' 'Quantum Computing,' and 'Innovation, Engineering, Energy Technology.' In contrast, topics with the lowest 'Anxiety' scores encompass 'Leadership of Change, Change Management,' 'People Skills Chat, People, Work RT,' 'Customer, CX, Customer Experience, Employees,' 'Leadership, Leaders, Kate Nasser, Future of Work,' and 'Climate Change.' The expectations related to these topics, as set by KOLs, introduce 'Fear,' which is a response triggered by the appraisal of imminent danger (Kurth, 2015, 2018). This 'Fear' can subsequently activate preparatory behaviours for an anticipated future (Castelfranchi and Miceli, 2011). Additionally, it is linked with 'Anticipation' (together inducing 'Anxiety') related to the uncertainty surrounding certain threats (Kurth, 2015, 2018), particularly the ambiguity regarding their occurrence (Liu et al., 2024; Vazard, 2024).

Dominant KOLs' 'Optimism' might impact followers' views on tech's potential, reflecting a trend towards techno-optimism (Königs, 2022). Although there

is some 'Pessimism' that prompts reflection on technology's potential drawbacks—like privacy concerns or job displacement—this tends to be minimal.

6. CONCLUSION

Incorporating topic modelling, sentiment, and emotion analyses into the context of discourse analysis of 1.5 million tweets allowed us to discover anticipatory discussions on technological futures introduced by KOLs to a public audience. The most talked-about topics on X were 'ML/Data Science/DL/AI,' 'Disruptive TV/Video,' 'IoT,' 'Climate Change,' and 'War in Ukraine.' The results underscore the profound influence of KOLs in shaping these discussions.

Integrated into discourse analysis, we find that technological discourse is inherently anticipatory, with KOLs setting a hopeful emotional tone. The high presence of 'Anticipation' combined with 'Trust' results in 'Hope,' while combined with 'Fear,' it leads to 'Anxiety.' Clearly, KOLs propagate 'Hope' rather than 'Anxiety.' This often overlooks potential future threats from technological uncertainty and fosters users' anticipation of a positive technological future. The high presence of 'Anticipation' coupled with 'Joy' leads to 'Optimism,' whereas paired with 'Sadness,' it results in 'Pessimism.' KOLs emphasise 'Optimism' and its associated technological advantages, favouring it over 'Pessimism' and its technological challenges.

This study contributes to understanding the meaning of anticipatory discourse and its use in influencing public expectations and behaviours. It underscores the significant role of KOLs in guiding societal responses to technological advancements and shows how techno-optimism is propagated in public discourse about future technologies. Moreover, this study advances the field methodologically by employing advanced quantitative methods such as state-of-the-art topic modelling, sentiment analysis, emotion analysis, and attitude analysis. These methods provide a more nuanced and contextually aware analysis of large text corpora, enhancing the precision and scalability of topic modelling in social media discourse.

This study carries at least two substantial theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the analysis of emotion correlations suggests that anticipation enhances positive feelings (like trust) while also potentially introducing mild concerns (like fear). This indicates that anticipation and trust together can reliably measure hope. Secondly, the relationship between anticipation and fear, although weaker, can still be used to measure anxiety. The moderate negative correlation between anticipation and sadness supports using anticipation and sadness together to

measure pessimism, as increased anticipation is associated with decreased sadness. Finally, given the very weak correlation between anticipation and joy, this combination may not be as effective for measuring optimism. It is worth considering other combinations or additional factors to measure optimism more accurately. From a practical standpoint, this study underscores the potential of integrating anticipatory discourse into AI simulations. Doing so enhances our ability to prepare for and navigate future uncertainties, making it a critical tool for various fields striving to stay ahead of the curve. This method can complement traditional forecasting and scenario planning techniques, offering a more comprehensive toolkit for anticipating future developments.

It is important to acknowledge limitations of our findings. Firstly, the analysis was limited to a selected group of technology influencers, which may not capture the full spectrum of opinions on future technologies, thus affecting the generalisability of our conclusions. Additionally, we focused solely on tweets, excluding replies and comments that could offer deeper insights into public perceptions. Secondly, our keyword analysis disregarded context and domain, factors that significantly influence word meanings and precision. Thirdly, while this study provides valuable insights into the correlations between emotions, the weak correlation between anticipation and joy suggests that this combination may not be effective for measuring optimism. Future research should explore other combinations or additional factors to measure optimism more accurately. Additionally, the relationship between anticipation and fear, though usable for measuring anxiety, is relatively weak and may benefit from further investigation. Future research should include comparative studies with other media sources, conduct longitudinal studies to track discourse evolution, and refine quantitative methods by incorporating additional data and developing more sophisticated models to capture nuances in anticipatory discourse.

REFERENCES

- Robert M Gordon. Emotions and knowledge. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 66(13):408–413, 1969. ISSN 0022-362X. Publisher: JSTOR.
- Robert M Gordon. *The structure of emotions: Investigations in cognitive philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 1987. ISBN 0-521-39568-2.
- Cristiano Castelfranchi and Maria Miceli. Anticipation and Emotion. In Roddy Cowie, Catherine Pelachaud, and Paolo Petta, editors, *Emotion-Oriented Systems: The Humaine Handbook*, pages 483–500. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. ISBN 978-3-642-15184-2. doi: 10.

- 1007/978-3-642-15184-2_25. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15184-2_25.
- Katharina Feil, Susanne Weyland, Julian Fritsch, Hagen Wäsche, and Darko Jekauc. Anticipatory and Anticipated Emotions in Regular and Non-regular Exercisers – A Qualitative Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 2022. ISSN 1664-1078. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.929380. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.929380>.
- David T. Moore and Robert R. Hoffman. Data-Frame Theory of Sensemaking as a Best Model for Intelligence. *American Intelligence Journal*, 29(2):145–158, 2011. ISSN 0883072X. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26201963>. Publisher: National Military Intelligence Association.
- Matthias Grabenhorst, Laurence T. Maloney, David Poeppel, and Georgios Michalareas. Two sources of uncertainty independently modulate temporal expectancy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(16):e2019342118, April 2021. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2019342118. URL <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2019342118>. Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
- Jacob B. Hirsh, Raymond A. Mar, and Jordan B. Peterson. Psychological entropy: A framework for understanding uncertainty-related anxiety. *Psychological Review*, 119(2):304–320, 2012. ISSN 1939-1471(Electronic),0033-295X(Print). doi: 10.1037/a0026767. Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- Oriel FeldmanHall and Amitai Shenhav. Resolving uncertainty in a social world. *Nat. Hum. Behav.*, 3(5):426–435, April 2019. ISSN 2397-3374. doi: 10.1038/s41562-019-0590-x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0590-x>. Publisher: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- Anu Koivunen, Kaarina Nikunen, Julius Hokkanen, Vilja Jaaksi, Vilma Lehtinen, Anne Soronen, Karoliina Talvitie-Lamberg, and Sanna Valtonen. Anticipation as Platform Power: The Temporal Structuring of Digital Everyday Life. *Television & New Media*, page 15274764231178228, June 2023. ISSN 1527-4764. doi: 10.1177/15274764231178228. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/15274764231178228>. Publisher: SAGE Publications.
- Iddo Tavory and Nina Eliasoph. Coordinating Futures: Toward a Theory of Anticipation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4):908–942, 2013. ISSN 00029602, 15375390. doi: 10.1086/668646. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/668646>. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- Alberto Acerbi. From Storytelling to Facebook. *Human Nature*, 33:132–144, 2022. ISSN 1936-4776. doi: 10.1007/s12110-022-09423-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-022-09423-1>.
- Alberto Acerbi. *Cultural Evolution in the Digital Age*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2019.
- Seung-A Annie Jin and Joe Phua. Following Celebrities’ Tweets About Brands: The Impact of Twitter-Based Electronic Word-of-Mouth on Consumers’ Source Credibility Perception, Buying Intention, and Social Identification With Celebrities. *Journal of Advertising*, 43(2):181–195, April 2014. ISSN 0091-3367. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2013.827606. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.827606>. Publisher: Routledge.
- Alina Landowska, Marek Robak, and Maciej Skorski. What Twitter data tell us about the future? 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.02035. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.02035>. Publisher: arXiv.
- Amanda Spry, Ravi Pappu, and T. Bettina Cornwell. Celebrity endorsement, brand credibility and brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(6):882–909, January 2011. ISSN 0309-0566. doi: 10.1108/03090561111119958. URL <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561111119958>. Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Benjamin Tur, Jennifer Harstad, and John Antonakis. Effect of charismatic signaling in social media settings: Evidence from TED and Twitter. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(5):101476, October 2022. ISSN 1048-9843. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101476. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S104898432030103X>.
- Barbara Adam. *Time and Social Theory*. Polity, Cambridge, 1990.
- Werner Bergmann. The Problem of Time in Sociology. *Time & Society*, 1(1):81–134, January 1992. ISSN 0961-463X. doi: 10.1177/0961463x92001001007. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0961463x92001001007>. Publisher: SAGE Publications.
- Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische. What Is Agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4):962–1023, January 1998. ISSN 0002-9602. doi: 10.1086/231294. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/231294>. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- Andrew Abbott. *Time Matters: On Theory and Method*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2001.
- Ann Mische. Projects and Possibilities: Researching Futures in Action. *Sociological Forum*, 24(3):694–704, 2009. ISSN 08848971, 15737861. doi:

- 10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.01127.x. Publisher: [Wiley, Springer].
- Jesse Egbert and Paul Baker, editors. *Using corpus methods to triangulate linguistic analysis*. Routledge, September 2019. ISBN 978-1-315-11246-6. doi: 10.4324/9781315112466. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315112466>.
- Niklas Luhmann. *The differentiation of society*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1982.
- Barbara Adam and Chris Groves. Futures Tended: Care and Future-Oriented Responsibility. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 31(1):17–27, February 2011. ISSN 0270-4676. doi: 10.1177/0270467610391237. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610391237>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Roberto Poli. *Introduction to Anticipation Studies*, volume 1. Springer International Publishing AG, Electronic, January 2017. ISBN 978-3-319-63021-2. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-63023-6.
- Roberto Poli. Anticipation: A New Thread for the Human and Social Sciences? *PromotingCADMUS: Leadership in Thought that Leads to Action*, 2(3): 23–36, 2014.
- Barbara Adam and Chris Groves, editors. *Future matters. Action, Knowledge, Ethic*. Brill, Leiden & Boston, 2007. ISBN 90-04-16177-5.
- Riel Miller. Futures Literacy: A Hybrid Strategic Scenario Method. *Futures*, 39(4):341–362, 2007.
- Jens Beckert. Capitalism as a System of Expectations: Toward a Sociological Microfoundation of Political Economy. *Politics & Society*, 41(3):323–350, September 2013. ISSN 0032-3292. doi: 10.1177/0032329213493750. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329213493750>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Richard P. Bagozzi, Hans Rudolf Baumgartner, and Rik Pieters. Goal-directed Emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 12:1–26, 1998. doi: 10.1111/acer.14513. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143822376>.
- Hans Baumgartner, Rik Pieters, and Richard P. Bagozzi. Future-oriented emotions: conceptualization and behavioral effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(4):685–696, June 2008. ISSN 0046-2772. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.467. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.467>. Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Marco Perugini and Richard Bagozzi. The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goal-directed behaviors: Broadening and deepening the theory of planned behavior. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40:79–98, March 2001. doi: 10.1348/014466601164704.
- Andrew MacLeod. Anticipatory feelings. In Andrew MacLeod, editor, *Prospection, well-being, and mental health*, page 0. Oxford University Press, February 2017. ISBN 978-0-19-872504-6. doi: 10.1093/med:psych/9780198725046.003.0005. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780198725046.003.0005>.
- Juliette Vazard. Feeling the Unknown: Emotions of Uncertainty and Their Valence. *Erkenntnis*, 89(4):1275–1294, April 2024. ISSN 1572-8420. doi: 10.1007/s10670-022-00583-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-022-00583-1>.
- Orval H. Mowrer. *Learning Theory and Behavior*. Wiley, New York, 1960.
- Robert Plutchik. A general psychoevolutionary theory of emotion. In Robert Plutchik and Henry Kellerman, editors, *Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience. Theories of Emotions.*, volume 1, pages 3–33. Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- Robert Plutchik. The Nature of Emotions. *American Scientist*, 89(4):344–350, July 2001. ISSN 00030996. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27857503>. 344.
- JustAnotherArchivist. snsrape, March 2023. URL <https://github.com/JustAnotherArchivist/snsrape.git>.
- Alexander Bogdanowicz and ChengHe Guan. Dynamic topic modeling of twitter data during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE*, 17(5):e0268669, May 2022. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0268669. URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268669>.
- Roman Egger and Joanne Yu. A Topic Modeling Comparison Between LDA, NMF, Top2Vec, and BERTopic to Demystify Twitter Posts. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7:886498, May 2022. ISSN 2297-7775. doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2022.886498. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9120935/>.
- Aimei Yang and Adam J Saffer. Standing out in a networked communication context: Toward a network contingency model of public attention. *New Media & Society*, 23(10):2902–2925, October 2021. ISSN 1461-4448. doi: 10.1177/1461444820939445. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820939445>. Publisher: SAGE Publications.
- Maarten Grootendorst. BERTopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based TF-IDF procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*, 2022.
- Carson Sievert and Kenneth Shirley. LDavis: A method for visualizing and interpreting topics. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Interactive Language Learning, Visualization, and Interfaces*,

- pages 63–70, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/W14-3110. URL <http://aclweb.org/anthology/W14-3110>.
- Ben Mabey. pyLDAvis, 2021. URL <https://github.com/bmabey/pyLDAvis>. original-date: 2015-04-09T22:48:03Z.
- Luis V. Casaló, Carlos Flavián, and Sergio Ibáñez-Sánchez. Influencers on Instagram: Antecedents and consequences of opinion leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 117:510–519, September 2020. ISSN 0148-2963. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.005. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296318303187>.
- Lukasz Augustyniak, Szymon Woźniak, Marcin Gruza, Piotr Gramacki, Krzysztof Rajda, Mikołaj Morzy, and Tomasz Kajdanowicz. Massively Multilingual Corpus of Sentiment Datasets and Multifaceted Sentiment Classification Benchmark. 2023.
- Krzysztof Rajda, Lukasz Augustyniak, Piotr Gramacki, Marcin Gruza, Szymon Woźniak, and Tomasz Kajdanowicz. Assessment of Massively Multilingual Sentiment Classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.wassa-1.13>.
- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. SemEval-2018 Task 1: Affect in Tweets. In *Proceedings of The 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1–17, New Orleans, Louisiana, 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/S18-1001. URL <http://aclweb.org/anthology/S18-1001>.
- Jose Camacho-Collados, Kiamehr Rezaee, Talayeh Riahi, Asahi Ushio, Daniel Loureiro, Dimosthenis Antypas, Joanne Boisson, Luis Espinosa Anke, Fangyu Liu, and Eugenio Martínez Cámara. TweetNLP: Cutting-Edge Natural Language Processing for Social Media. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–49, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-demos.5. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-demos.5>.
- Alfonso Semeraro, Salvatore Vilella, and Giancarlo Ruffo. PyPlutchik: Visualising and comparing emotion-annotated corpora. *PLOS ONE*, 16(9):e0256503, September 2021. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0256503. URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256503>.
- Lisa Bortolotti. Optimism, agency, and success. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 21(3):521–535, 2018. ISSN 1386-2820. Publisher: Springer.
- Anneli Jefferson, Lisa Bortolotti, and Bojana Kuzmanovic. What is unrealistic optimism? *Consciousness and Cognition*, 50:3–11, 2017. ISSN 1053-8100. Publisher: Elsevier.
- Warren TenHouten. The Emotions of Hope: From Optimism to Sanguinity, from Pessimism to Despair. *The American Sociologist*, 54(1):76–100, March 2023. ISSN 1936-4784. doi: 10.1007/s12108-022-09544-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-022-09544-1>.
- Michael Röder, Andreas Both, and Alexander Hinneburg. Exploring the Space of Topic Coherence Measures. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 399–408, Shanghai China, February 2015. ACM. ISBN 9781450333177. doi: 10.1145/2684822.2685324. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2684822.2685324>.
- João Marcos Campagnolo, Denio Duarte, and Guilherme Dal Bianco. Topic Coherence Metrics: How Sensitive Are They? *Journal of Information and Data Management*, 13(4), October 2022. ISSN 2178-7107, 2178-7107. doi: 10.5753/jidm.2022.2181. URL <https://sol.sbc.org.br/journals/index.php/jidm/article/view/2181>.
- Pakorn Santakij, Samai Srisuay, and Pongporn Pungpeng. Analyzing COVID-19 Discourse on Twitter: Text Clustering and Classification Models for Public Health Surveillance. *Computer Systems Science and Engineering*, 0(0):1–10, 2024. ISSN 0267-6192. doi: 10.32604/csse.2024.045066. URL <https://www.techscience.com/csse/online/detail/20083>.
- Eric Austin, Shraddha Makwana, Amine Trabelsi, Christine Largeron, and Osmar R. Zaiane. Uncovering Flat and Hierarchical Topics by Community Discovery on Word Co-occurrence Network. *Data Science and Engineering*, 9(1):41–61, March 2024. ISSN 2364-1541. doi: 10.1007/s41019-023-00239-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41019-023-00239-2>.
- Weisi Chen, Fethi Rabhi, Wenqi Liao, and Islam Al-Qudah. Leveraging State-of-the-Art Topic Modeling for News Impact Analysis on Financial Markets: A Comparative Study. *Electronics*, 12(12):2605, January 2023. ISSN 2079-9292. doi: 10.3390/electronics12122605. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/12/12/2605>. Number: 12 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

- Hunt Allcott and Matthew Gentzkow. Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31:211–236, May 2017. doi: 10.1257/jep.31.2.211.
- Max Falkenberg, Alessandro Galeazzi, Maddalena Torricelli, Niccolò Di Marco, Francesca Larosa, Madalina Sas, Amin Mekacher, Warren Pearce, Fabiana Zollo, Walter Quattrociochi, and Andrea Baronchelli. Growing polarization around climate change on social media. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(12):1114–1121, December 2022. ISSN 1758-6798. doi: 10.1038/s41558-022-01527-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01527-x>.
- Jill E. Hopke and Luis E. Hestres. Visualizing the Paris Climate Talks on Twitter: Media and Climate Stakeholder Visual Social Media During COP21. *Social Media + Society*, 4(3):2056305118782687, July 2018. ISSN 2056-3051. doi: 10.1177/2056305118782687. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118782687>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fan Liang and Shuning Lu. The Dynamics of Event-Based Political Influencers on Twitter: A Longitudinal Analysis of Influential Accounts During Chinese Political Events. *Social Media + Society*, 9(2):20563051231177946, April 2023. ISSN 2056-3051. doi: 10.1177/20563051231177946. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231177946>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Alan L. Porter and Scott W. Cunningham. *Tech Mining: Exploiting New Technologies for Competitive Advantage*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, January 2005.
- Marco Furini. X as a Passive Sensor to Identify Opinion Leaders: A Novel Method for Balancing Visibility and Community Engagement. *Sensors*, 24(2), 2024. ISSN 1424-8220. doi: 10.3390/s24020610.
- Joachim Haupt. Facebook futures: Mark Zuckerberg’s discursive construction of a better world. *New Media & Society*, 23(2):237–257, February 2021. ISSN 1461-4448. doi: 10.1177/1461444820929315. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820929315>. Publisher: SAGE Publications.
- Constantin Lichti, Endrit Ademi, and Andranik Tomasjan. *Decentralized Opinion Leadership: A Study of Crypto Influencers in the Twitter Discourse on Bitcoin*. September 2023.
- Mike Ananny and Megan Finn. Anticipatory news infrastructures: Seeing journalism’s expectations of future publics in its sociotechnical systems. *New Media & Society*, 22(9):1600–1618, September 2020. ISSN 1461-4448. doi: 10.1177/1461444820914873. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820914873>. Publisher: SAGE Publications.
- Thomas W. Valente and Patchareeya Pumpuang. Identifying Opinion Leaders to Promote Behavior Change. *Health Education & Behavior*, 34(6):881–896, December 2007. ISSN 1090-1981. doi: 10.1177/1090198106297855. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198106297855>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Justin D. Martin and Krishna Sharma. Getting news from social media influencers and from digital legacy news outlets and print legacy news outlets in seven countries: The “more-and-more” phenomenon and the new opinion leadership. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 43(3):276–299, September 2022. ISSN 0739-5329. doi: 10.1177/07395329221105507. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/07395329221105507>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Wided Oueslati, Siwar Mejri, Shaha Alotaibi, and Sarra Ayouni. Recognition of Opinion Leaders in Social Networks Using Text Posts’ Trajectory Scoring and Users’ Comments Sentiment Analysis. *IEEE Access*, PP:1–1, January 2023. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3329049.
- Robert A. Emmons. Joy: An introduction to this special issue. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 15(1):1–4, January 2020. ISSN 1743-9760. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2019.1685580. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1685580>. Publisher: Routledge.
- Walter B. Cannon. The James-Lange Theory of Emotions: A Critical Examination and an Alternative Theory. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 39(1/4):106–124, 1927. ISSN 00029556. doi: 10.2307/1415404. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1415404>. Publisher: University of Illinois Press.
- Jun Zhan, Jun Ren, Jin Fan, and Jing Luo. Distinctive effects of fear and sadness induction on anger and aggressive behavior. *Front. Psychol.*, 6, June 2015. ISSN 1664-1078. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00725. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00725>. Publisher: Frontiers Media SA.
- Pascale Sophie Russell and Roger Giner-Sorolla. Bodily moral disgust: what it is, how it is different from anger, and why it is an unreasoned emotion. *Psychol. Bull.*, 139(2):328–351, March 2013. ISSN 0033-2909. doi: 10.1037/a0029319. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029319>. Publisher: American Psychological Association (APA).
- Cendri A Hutcherson and James J Gross. The moral emotions: a social-functionalist account of anger,

- disgust, and contempt. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 100 (4):719–737, April 2011. ISSN 0022-3514. doi: 10.1037/a0022408. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022408>. Publisher: American Psychological Association (APA).
- Jessica M. Salerno and Liana C. Peter-Hagene. The interactive effect of anger and disgust on moral outrage and judgments. *Psychological Science*, 24(10):2069–2078, 2013. ISSN 1467-9280(Electronic),0956-7976(Print). doi: 10.1177/0956797613486988. Place: US Publisher: Sage Publications.
- Martin V. Butz, Olivier Sigaud, Giovanni Pezzulo, and Gianluca Baldassarre, editors. *Anticipatory Behavior in Adaptive Learning Systems: From Brains to Individual and Social Behavior*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. ISBN 978-3-540-74262-3.
- Martin V. Butz and Esther F. Kutter. Behavioral Flexibility and Anticipatory Behavior. In Martin V. Butz and Esther F. Kutter, editors, *How the Mind Comes into Being: Introducing Cognitive Science from a Functional and Computational Perspective*, pages 131–154. Oxford University Press, Oxford, January 2017. ISBN 978-0-19-873969-2. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198739692.003.0006. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198739692.003.0006>.
- Joachim Hoffmann. Anticipatory Behavioral Control. In Martin V. Butz, Olivier Sigaud, and Pierre Gérard, editors, *Anticipatory Behavior in Adaptive Learning Systems: Foundations, Theories, and Systems*, pages 44–65. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. ISBN 978-3-540-45002-3. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-45002-3_4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45002-3_4.
- Philippe Odou and Marie Schill. How anticipated emotions shape behavioral intentions to fight climate change. *Journal of Business Research*, 121:243–253, December 2020. ISSN 0148-2963. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.08.047. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296320305518>.
- Emma Pleeging, Job van Exel, and Martijn Burger. Characterizing Hope: An Interdisciplinary Overview of the Characteristics of Hope. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 17(3):1681–1723, June 2022. ISSN 1871-2576. doi: 10.1007/s11482-021-09967-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-021-09967-x>.
- Emma Pleeging, Martijn Burger, and Job van Exel. The Relations between Hope and Subjective Well-Being: a Literature Overview and Empirical Analysis. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 16(3): 1019–1041, June 2021. ISSN 1871-2576. doi: 10.1007/s11482-019-09802-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-019-09802-4>.
- Simone Cerreia-Vioglio, Lars Peter Hansen, Fabio Maccheroni, and Massimo Marinacci. Making Decisions under Model Misspecification. *arXiv [econ.TH]*, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.01071>.
- Michael Barnett, William Brock, and Lars Peter Hansen. Climate Change Uncertainty Spillover in the Macroeconomy. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 36:253–320, May 2022. ISSN 0889-3365. doi: 10.1086/718668. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/718668>. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- Charlie Kurth. Moral anxiety and moral agency. 2015.
- Charlie Kurth. *The Anxious Mind: An Investigation into the Varieties and Virtues of Anxiety*. The MIT Press, April 2018. ISBN 978-0-262-34549-1. doi: 10.7551/mitpress/11168.001.0001. URL <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11168.001.0001>.
- Xiqin Liu, Guojuan Jiao, Feng Zhou, Keith M. Kendrick, Dezhong Yao, Qiyong Gong, Shitong Xiang, Tianye Jia, Xiao-Yong Zhang, Jie Zhang, Jianfeng Feng, and Benjamin Becker. A neural signature for the subjective experience of threat anticipation under uncertainty. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):1544, February 2024. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-45433-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-45433-6>.
- Peter Königs. What is Techno-Optimism? *Philosophy & Technology*, 35(3):63, July 2022. ISSN 2210-5441. doi: 10.1007/s13347-022-00555-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00555-x>.

LIST OF TABLES

1	Examples of Anticipatory Discourse of Future Influencers in the Analysed Corpora	2
2	Dataset summary statistics	3
3	The organisation of Topics into Clusters by BERTopic Analysis	5
4	The Most Representative Keywords in Selected Topics	7
5	Highest and Lowest Emotion Scores in Topics	8

LIST OF FIGURES

1	The Hierarchical Clustering of Anticipated Technology-Driven Futures	4
2	The Dynamics of Selected Topics Over Time	5

3	Topic leaders.	6
4	Number of Tweets by Top-Performing KOLs in the Corpus	6
5	Contribution Distribution Across Topics in Robotics/Robots Engineering versus VR/AR/Audio Technology	6
6	The Most Frequently Occurring Keywords	6
7	Leading Technologies	7
8	Comparative Analysis of Positive and Negative Sentiment Distribution Across Various Topics	7
9	Distributions of Emotions Across the Corpus	8
10	Spearman's Rho Correlation of Emotions Across the Corpus	8
11	Dominance of Emotions Across All Topics	8
12	Emotions in Top-Anticipating Topics	8
13	Distribution of Anticipation, Trust, and Fear in Topics	9
14	Distribution of Optimism and Pessimism Across All Topics	9
15	Distribution of Optimism and Pessimism Across the Corpus	9
16	Pessimism and Optimism Across Topic Clusters	9

7. DECLARATIONS

Data availability. The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available in the OSF repository, and can be accessed via the following link: <https://osf.io/z925y>.

Competing Interests. The authors declare no potential conflict of interests.

Ethical approval. Ethical approval was not required for this study.

Informed Consent. This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Author contributions. The manuscript was collaboratively drafted by all authors, who also conducted critical revisions and editing. The first author conceptualised the analysis and designed the methods. The second author collected data and performed BERTopic analysis, while the third author focused on sentiment, emotions, and attitude analyses. All authors approved the version to be published.