

# Analyzing Regrettable Communications on Twitter: Characterizing Deleted Tweets and Their Authors

Parantapa Bhattacharya, Saptarshi Ghosh and Niloy Ganguly  
{parantapa,saptarshi,niloy}@cse.iitkgp.ernet.in

December 27, 2022

## Abstract

Over 500 million tweets are posted in Twitter each day, out of which about 11% tweets are deleted by the users posting them. This phenomenon of widespread deletion of tweets leads to a number of questions: what kind of content posted by users makes them want to delete them later? Are users of certain predispositions more likely to post regrettable tweets, deleting them later? In this paper we provide a detailed characterization of tweets posted and then later deleted by their authors. We collected tweets from over 200 thousand Twitter users during a period of four weeks. Our characterization shows significant personality differences between users who delete their tweets and those who do not. We find that users who delete their tweets are more likely to be extroverted and neurotic while being less conscientious. Also, we find that deleted tweets while containing less information and being less conversational, contain significant indications of regrettable content. Since users of online communication do not have instant social cues (like listener’s body language) to gauge the impact of their words, they are often delayed in employing repair strategies. Finally, we build a classifier which takes textual, contextual, as well as user features to predict if a tweet will be deleted or not. The classifier achieves a F1-score of 0.78 and the precision increases when we consider response features of the tweets.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

With the increasing popularity of Online Social Networks (OSNs), millions of users take resort to these media for sharing their thoughts and ideas with hundreds and thou-

---

<sup>1</sup>This work is an extended version of the short paper: P. Bhattacharya and N. Ganguly, “Characterizing Deleted Tweets and Their Authors”, In Proceedings of the 10th AAAI International Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM), pp 547–550, 2016.

This study was conducted during the year 2016 when Parantapa Bhattacharya was a student at Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur. The datasets collected for these studies have since been permanently deleted.

This study was conducted respecting the guidelines set by our institute’s ethics board and with their knowledge and permission.

sands of others. However, in doing so, the OSN users have also become susceptible to inadvertently exposing potentially private and embarrassing information. Unwittingly exposing personal information and opinions can have wide ranging negative consequences – from harmless awkwardness to much more severe ones such as losing jobs<sup>2</sup> and even getting prosecuted<sup>34</sup>.

Once a user realizes that she regrets a post that she has made, the repairing strategy that is most commonly adopted is to delete the offending post [36, 33]. We observe that over 11% of tweets created, are deleted either by Twitter or the users posting them.

In light of the substantial portions of content being regularly removed from Twitter by their authors, a number of interesting questions arise naturally – (1) Are all Twitter users equally likely to delete their tweets, or is it that only users of particular predispositions account for the majority of tweet deletions? (2) Can distinctive characterizations be obtained for tweets that are deleted in the future, compared to tweets that are not deleted by their authors? (3) Do responses from other users lead the author of a tweet into realizing the potential impact of their tweet, prompting them to delete it?

For researchers and developers, it is fundamentally important to understand the above issues, if they are to build systems that help users in managing potentially regrettable posts. A user’s personality, her desired public image, and her general writing style overwhelmingly determine what she finds regrettable. Whether she chooses to delete one of her own posts or not is heavily dependent on her personal preferences. Understanding these factors and taking them into account is essential for every privacy conscious system.

There have been some previous works [36, 33] which mainly relied on user surveys to understand these issues. While such first hand accounts provide useful insights into the process of tweet deletion, it is difficult to directly utilize them to build systems, that help users manage potentially regrettable posts. Further, when a user makes a regrettable remark in an offline conversation, her audience’s response, especially body-language, lets her quickly gauge the situation. This missing aspect of interaction often delays users from realizing their errors in online communications [33]. Existing studies of deleted tweets [1, 38] have generally ignored this aspect of communication when trying to understand reasons behind tweet deletions.

With an eventual aim to build a classifier for early identification of potentially regrettable tweets, this paper tries to answer the following research questions:

- Q1: Do deleted tweets demonstrate significantly higher indications of regrettable content? (Section 4)
- Q2: Does there exist significant differences in personality, between users who delete their tweets and those who do not? (Section 5)
- Q3: Are there significant linguistic differences between the deleted and non-deleted tweets of the same user? (Section 6)

---

<sup>2</sup><http://www.businessinsider.com/twitter-fired-2011-5?IR=T>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-30903294>

<sup>4</sup><http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/oct/20/man-jailed-antisemitic-tweet-labour-mp>

- Q4: Does the sentiment of replies to tweets that are deleted in the future, show significant variations when compared to replies to tweets that are not deleted? (Section 7)
- Q5: With what degree of confidence can a classifier predict that a tweet will be deleted or not? (Section 8)

In this paper, we present a large scale empirical study of all tweets posted and deleted by over 200 thousand users during a four week period in August 2015, to answer the questions presented above.

Note that, in their study of tweet deletions, Almuhiemedi et al. [1] reported to being unable to find differences in “distributions of stereotypically regrettable topics” due to the “sheer volume and variety of reasons” for which tweets are deleted. To alleviate this problem, we undertook a systematic data cleaning procedure, to remove malicious users, automated tweets, superficial deletion, and deleted retweets from our dataset (Section 3).

In Sections 5 and 6 we present personality based characterizations of users who are more likely to delete their tweets, and demonstrate detailed linguistic differences between deleted and non-deleted tweets of same users. The differences discovered in both cases, were significantly facilitated by the rigorous data cleanup procedure undertaken for this work.

Earlier user survey based studies [36, 33], that analyzed regrettable content on Twitter, had found that regrets in online communication can be categorized into a small set of classes such as, “Direct attack”, “Direct criticism”, “Implied Criticism”, etc. To understand what percentage of deleted tweets actually fit into those classes, we performed a manual annotation study, whereby 100 deleted and 100 non-deleted tweets were manually annotated by human annotators into those classes. Surprisingly, we found that the annotators agreed that only 16 out of the 100 deleted tweets looked regrettable, while 6 out of 100 non-deleted tweets also looked regrettable. While this difference is statistically significant (using Fisher’s Exact test with Odds Ratio=0.33 and  $p = 0.04$ ) it seems that for the majority of deleted tweets (84%) the personal nature of the underlying regrettable cause, which triggered the deletion of the tweet, is difficult to uncover for third party viewers, from just the content of the tweets.

While it may be difficult for third party human annotators to infer the underlying causes of regret which triggered the deletion of a specific tweet, there still may exist systematic characteristic in tweets that are deleted, that can be helpful in identifying them early. Thus, we undertook an analysis, trying to identify the salient personality traits of users who are more likely to delete their tweets, as well as uncovering detailed linguistic differences between tweets that are deleted and those that are not.

We found that users who are more likely to delete their tweets show systematic differences in their Big-Five personality characteristics [5] compared to non-deleters; they are more likely to be extroverted and neurotic while being less conscientious. Further, we also found that deleted tweets generally contain less informative content and are also less conversational. Surprisingly, we found that deleted tweets show definite signs of being thoughtfully constructed although use of profanity and swear words is significantly higher in them, compared to tweets that are not deleted. Additionally, deleted

tweets are less likely to get responses, but when they do, they get significantly more negative replies.

Utilizing the insights on personality characteristics of users and linguistic characteristics of tweets, we were able to build a classifier which uses textual, contextual, as well as user features to distinguish between deleted and non-deleted tweets of users, with a F1-score of 0.78. The classifier was built in two stages to effectively utilize high-dimensional but sparse text features, as well as low dimensional and dense contextual features and user features. Interestingly, we find that user features, despite not having any direct information about the tweet, are the most discriminating features for predicting tweet deletion probabilities. We postulate that they do so by indirectly encoding signals about the author’s personality.

## 2 Related Work

The Twitter microblogging network is one of the most popular online social networking platforms with over 500 million tweets posted per day [11]. Twitter has been very popular among social networks researchers. A recent work by Liu et al. [16] chronicles the evolution of Twitter over the years.

Users in Twitter post tweets, which are microblogs limited to 140 characters in length. In Twitter, users follow each other to receive tweets. If user A follows user B, user A receives all tweets posted by user B. Here A is termed as a *follower* of user B. While B is termed as a *followee* of user A.

For this work, we distinguish three types of tweets: regular *tweets* that are received by all followers of the user posting them, *replies* which are tweets characterized by the screen name of the recipient user at the beginning of the tweet, and *retweets* which are copies of tweets made by other users. Retweets, like regular tweets, are circulated to followers of the user retweeting them, while replies created by a user are not received by her followers.

Twitter doesn’t provide any option for editing or changing a tweet. However, a user can choose to delete her tweets. Once, a tweet is deleted, it is no longer visible by anyone.

### 2.1 Regrettable communications in the offline world

Often when speaking to someone, people say regrettable things with or without really meaning what they had said. Knapp et al. [15] studied the problem of regrets in verbal communications. They surveyed 155 participants and came up with a list of eleven major categories of regrets as reported by the participants. They found that blunders, direct attacks/criticism, group reference, and revealing too much accounted for 73.8% of the stated causes of regret in their surveys.

Meyer in two separate works [21, 20] studied the context in which regrettable communications were made. They also studied the aftermath of regrettable communications and repair strategies used by individuals to remedy the situations. In the two separate studies, the authors surveyed 204 [21] and 173 [20] undergraduate students at a large midwestern university. The survey participants were asked about their emotional state

when making the regrettable communication and the repair strategies undertaken by them. These studies concluded that, the regretted communications were rarely directed towards more than one person and negative emotional states were often at fault when making a regrettable remark.

## **2.2 Regrettable communications in online social networks**

Most communications in online social networks happen in broadcast mode. This makes communications reach large audience quickly and easily. However, with posts having such large visibility the problems of regrettable communications multiply.

In Twitter, the primary mechanism for restricting ones visibility is by making their account protected. Only the followers of a protected account can view the tweets posted by the account. However, Meeder et al. [19] conducted a study showing the flawed nature of such a simplistic privacy mechanism. Tweets from protected accounts can be widely circulated (beyond the protected user’s follower circle) if it is retweeted by any of her followers. Such, unintended audience increases the probability of a user’s communications to become regrettable.

The work by Mao et al. [18] showed that despite knowing the public nature of social networks, users often post private and sensitive information online. Wang et al. [36] presented a qualitative study on regrettable communications in Facebook. They observed that the major causes of regrettable communications in Facebook were “centered around sensitive topics, emotional content, and unintended audience”.

One of the primary methods by which users avoid situations of regrettable communications is via self censorship. Sleeper et al. [32] performed a survey based study and concluded that users on Facebook self-censor primarily to maintain self images across large audience that compromises of their many friend circles. Das and Kramer [6] performed a large scale empirical study with 3.9 million users where they monitored user behavior when posting content to Facebook. They concluded that about 71% of Facebook users self-censor to avoid regrettable communications.

## **2.3 Regrettable communications and deleted tweets in Twitter**

In a survey of 1,221 users, recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk, Sleeper et al. [33] asked participants to describe “one thing they had said and then later regretted”, on Twitter and in the offline world. Using the categorization system developed by Knapp et al. [15], the authors categorized the stated regrets in Twitter and the offline world into eleven categories. The authors found that blunders, direct attacks/criticism, group reference, and revealing too much accounted for 83% of the stated causes of regret.

Mondal et al. [22] in a very recent work, performed a large scale measurement study trying to understand how users control the exposure of their publicly posted content over longer periods of time. Interestingly, they found that for all posts that were published over six years ago, over 28% of them are no longer available on Twitter. Mondal et al. attribute this removal of public content to privacy conscious users, who have either deleted their Twitter account, or have made their account protected. Further, they go on to show that although such content has been made private by their authors,

significant details about such content can be inferred using responses to such posts that are still publicly available.

Preliminary works on deleted tweets have tried building classifiers to predict whether a tweet will be deleted or not. Petrovic et al. [25] collected a 75 million tweet sample from the Twitter streaming API, out of which 2.4 million were deleted. Using an SVM classifier with a linear kernel and a bag of words feature model, they achieved a very low F1-score of 0.27. Bagdouri and Oard [2] used Logistic Regression on a dataset of 80 million Arabic tweets from 91 thousand users, out of which 3.64% were deleted. They used bag of words and tweet attribute features, and user features to obtain a moderate F1-score of 0.45.

One of the first large scale studies of deleted tweets was presented by Almuhiemedi et al. [1]. Over a period of one week, Almuhiemedi et al. [1] collected all tweets posted by 292 thousand Twitter users, which also included tweets later deleted by their authors. On comparing the deleted and non-deleted tweets in their dataset, the authors were able to find differences along various dimensions such as location of origin of the tweet and the Twitter client used for posting the tweet. However, the authors also noted that the major cause of tweet deletions in their dataset was superficial reasons such as typos and rephrasings.

In a very recent work, Zhou et al. [38] built a classifier for *content-identifiable regrettable tweets*. They defined content-identifiable regrettable tweets, as those which third party human annotators think are regrettable. The authors crafted a set of 10 closed vocabulary features representing words related to sensitive topics such as alcohol use, drug use, violence etc. For the classification task they limited themselves to choosing a set of 10,000 deleted and 10,000 non-deleted tweets such that they had words related to the above 10 categories. Using a decision tree classifier they were able to achieve a F1-score of 0.714.

**Novelty of present work:** The present work also tries to build a classifier to predict if a tweet will be deleted or not. However, unlike Zhou et al. [38] we do not restrict ourselves to the 18% subset of deleted tweets that they define as content-identifiable regrettable tweets. Moreover, unlike Petrovic et al. [25] Bagdouri and Oard [2], and Zhou et al. [38] we use a mixed model with open-text bag of words features along with closed-text features, and author features to obtain a significantly higher classification accuracy of 0.78 F1-score, for all deleted tweets. Further, we also look at the possibility of using features from responses to tweets, which boosts our accuracy to a F1-score of 0.817.

Additionally, the current work makes a number of novel contributions related to understanding of deleted tweets and their authors. First, one of the major focuses of this work is to understand the underlying personality differences between users who delete their tweets and those who do not. Second, this work presents a thorough linguistic analysis of deleted tweets and non-deleted tweets from the same user set. Third, we look at responses to deleted and non-deleted tweets which provide additional strong signals about the likelihood of a tweet being deleted. Almuhiemedi et al. [1] reported to being unable to find differences in “distributions of stereotypically regrettable topics” due to the “sheer volume and variety of reasons” for which tweets are deleted. This work tries to solve this problem by undertaking an extensive cleanup process to

remove spam, malware, automated tweets and superficial deletions from our dataset. This cleanup procedure allows us to bring forward the characteristic qualities of regrettable content present in deleted tweets.

Finally, a preliminary version of the current work has been published as a short paper [3]. The current work significantly improves and extends the analysis presented in [3]. For instance, while [3] simply noted the difference in language use between deleted and non-deleted tweets, the current submission analyses the phenomenon at a deeper level, by analyzing it both at an aggregate level, using Normalized Tweet Difference (NTD), as well as at an individual user level, using Normalized User Difference (NUD). Further, the current submission includes a completely new user survey based analysis of deleted tweets that tries to categorize them with respect to known categories of regrettable communications established in earlier works [33]. Additionally, the current study also includes the design of a two stage classifier, which uses textual, contextual, as well as user features to predict whether a tweet is likely to be deleted in the future.

### 3 Dataset

One of the major objectives of this work is to understand tweet deletion behavior of *real and active* Twitter users. To select a representative sample of real and active Twitter users, we began by selecting a random set of 2.5 million Twitter users whose tweets were included in the 1% Twitter Random Sample<sup>5</sup> during the month of October 2014 and whose majority tweets were in English. To filter out malicious users, that is users who had been suspended or users who had deleted their account, their profiles were re-crawled during March 2015. Further, we crawled up to 3,200 tweets for each user to check if they had posted any *unsafe* links. For every url that is tweeted, Twitter uses its own url shortening service t.co to shorten it. Apart from reducing the size of url posted, t.co also filters out and warns users from visiting malicious urls<sup>6</sup>. We considered users to be potentially malicious if they had posted any url that was marked unsafe by Twitter.

Of the users who still had an active account and were not marked potentially malicious, we randomly selected 250,000 users who also met the following criteria: they had posted at-least 10 tweets in their lifetime and had at least 10 followers and 10 followees. These criteria were enforced to ensure that only active Twitter users were selected. During the four week period of August 3, 2015 to August 30, 2015, we followed these users and collected all tweets posted by them as well as replies and retweets of their tweets, using the Twitter Streaming API.

The Twitter Streaming APIs send out tweets in near realtime, i.e. as soon as they are posted. Thus, when tweets are later deleted by their authors, the steaming api endpoints have to send out status deletion notices to inform whoever is collecting the tweets of the tweet deletion<sup>7</sup>. As there can be significant delays between when a tweet is posted

<sup>5</sup><https://blog.gnip.com/tag/spritzer/>

<sup>6</sup><https://support.twitter.com/articles/90491-unsafe-links-on-twitter>

<sup>7</sup>[https://dev.twitter.com/streaming/overview/messages-types#status\\_deletion\\_notices\\_delete](https://dev.twitter.com/streaming/overview/messages-types#status_deletion_notices_delete)

and when it is deleted, we collected status deletion notices for an additional week, that is during the five week period of August 3, 2015 to September 6, 2015.

The first part of Table 1 shows the total count of tweets that were captured in our dataset. Out of the selected 250 thousand users, 214 thousand users had posted a total of 43 million tweets, during the four week period. About 71.14% users in our dataset had deleted at-least one tweet. The total fraction of tweets that were deleted was 11.11%.

### 3.1 Dataset cleanup

As stated earlier, the objective of this study is to analyse the *human factors* leading to deletion of tweets. In other words, we wanted to focus on those tweets which were deleted because of human factors like regrettable content. Since tweets can be deleted due to various other reasons, we undertook a systematic cleanup procedure of removing certain specific types of tweets, as described below.

*Non-English tweets:* For this work, we focus only on English tweets. Tweet objects, obtained from Twitter streaming and REST APIs, have language fields populated by Twitter’s automatic language detection methods [28]. To filter out non-English tweets, we removed any tweet that did not have ‘en’ as the language attribute.

*Automated tweets:* As Twitter has grown in popularity, developers have created automated tweeting systems to use Twitter in creative new ways. However, for this analysis, we removed automated tweets from our dataset, since automated tweets are usually posted for promotion purposes and hence, are unlikely to be deleted due to human factors (on which we want to focus). The key insight that used to filter automated tweets is — most automated tweets are posted using specialized Twitter clients. For this work, we whitelisted Twitter clients which are popularly used and whose main functionality is to allow their users to post tweets. These include the official Twitter clients for web and mobile platforms, as well as other popular third party Twitter clients such as TweetDeck, HootSuite, etc. The top Twitter sources that were excluded from the whitelist included: (i) automated tweeting systems like: RoundTeam, If this then that, Buffer, and twittbot.net (ii) account management tools such as: flwr and Crowdfire App, and (iii) clients for specific websites like: Twittascope, Ask.fm, and WordPress.com.

*Deleted retweets:* When a tweet is deleted, any retweet of the said tweet is also deleted by Twitter<sup>8</sup>. Since, status deletion notices sent out by Twitter do not contain the information about whether the original tweet or the retweet was deleted, analysis of deleted retweets is left out from this work.

*Superficial deletions:* Twitter doesn’t provide a method to edit tweets. Users thus have to delete the bad tweet and create a new one, to fix typos or grammatical errors. Superficial deletions like these are ignored by the current work as we focus mainly on analyzing and understanding regrettable communications. To check if a tweet deletion is superficial or not we take an approach similar to Almuhiemedi et al. [1]. For every deleted tweet, we check the next (chronologically) three tweets made by the same user who deleted the tweet. If we find any of the three tweets to be similar to the deleted tweet, we term the deletion superficial. We call two tweets to be similar if the edit

---

<sup>8</sup><https://support.twitter.com/articles/18906-deleting-a-tweet>



<b>Dataset before cleanup</b>	
# Tweets posted	43,119,286
# Tweets deleted	4,793,101 (11.11%)
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	214,471
# Users who deleted at-least 1 tweet	152,591 (71.14%)
<b>Non-english tweets</b>	
# Tweets posted	8,891,985
# Tweets deleted	908,659 (10.21%)
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	180,997
# Users who deleted at-least 1 tweet	84,495 (46.68%)
<b>Automated tweets</b>	
# Tweets posted	2,330,486
# Tweets deleted	310,585 (13.32%)
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	49,144
# Users who deleted at-least 1 tweet	12,041 (24.50%)
<b>Retweets</b>	
# Tweets posted	18,939,729
# Tweets deleted	2,898,029 (15.30%)
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	187,916
# Users who deleted at-least 1 tweet	124,953 (66.49%)
<b>Superficial deletions</b>	
# Tweets posted	288,934
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	69,976
<b>Dataset after cleanup</b>	
# Tweets posted	17,147,771
# Tweets deleted	1,210,434 (7.05%)
# Users who posted at-least 1 tweet	194,495
# Users who deleted at-least 1 tweet	91,785 (47.19%)

Table 1: Total number of tweets posted and deleted by users in our dataset, before and after, removal of non-english tweets, automated tweets, retweets, and superficial deletions.

distance between texts of the tweets is less than 5 or the cosine similarity between terms of the tweets is greater than 0.6. Similar to Almuhiemedi et al. [1], we found that according to the above measure, 14.45% of tweet deletions in our dataset were classified as superficial errors or typos.

The second part of Table 1 shows the final count of tweets and users in our dataset after removal of non-English tweets, automated tweets, retweets, and superficial deletions.

Finally, to understand the impact of bot accounts in our analysis, we randomly sampled a set of 100 users from our clean dataset, and manually checked them for bot accounts. We found that out of the 100 users accounts 97 were personal accounts belonging to normal users, while 3 belonged to different organizations. However, none of the 100 accounts were bot accounts. This confirms the effectiveness of our cleanup methodology and ensures that the inferences obtained from our analysis are unlikely to be significantly effected by bot accounts.

## 4 Understanding causes of tweet deletion

Earlier studies [33, 15], in an effort to better understand regrettable communications, tried to categorize them into a finite set of classes. In the current section, we try to answer the question: *what fraction of deleted tweets relate to these categories of regrettable communications?*

### 4.1 Categories of regrettable communications

Sleeper et al. [33], utilized the categories of regrettable communications presented in [15], to classify regrettable communications in Twitter and in the offline world. The classes of regrets used were as follows:

- *Blunder*: errors in formulating statements, including typos, and factual errors.
- *Direct attack*: critical statements directed towards a person.
- *Group reference*: critical statements directed towards a group (ethnicity, race, etc.)
- *Direct criticism*: criticism directed towards “something specific about a person”.
- *Reveal/explain too much*: revealing personal, potentially embarrassing information.
- *Agreement changed*: statements of agreement that were later changed by the author.
- *Expressive/catharsis*: emotional statements not directed towards any specific person.
- *Lie*: intentionally stating something that is not true.
- *Implied criticism*: statements of criticism that are implicit, such as teasing remarks.
- *Behavioral edict*: asking someone to behave in a particular manner.

In the study conducted in [33], the authors asked survey participants to recall and report a regrettable communication that they had made on Twitter or in the offline world.

	Del Tweets	Non-Del Tweets
Reveal too much	30	27
Expressive	19	32
Direct attack	11	9
Behavior edict	2	8
Regrettable	16	6

Table 2: Number of tweets (out of a random sample of 100) which fall under a given category according to majority decision of the annotators classifying the tweet. Tweets for which there was no majority decision are not counted in the table.

A limitation of this method is that participants are more likely to report memorable regrets rather than the most prevalent regrets.

## 4.2 Categorizing deleted tweets

To understand the relative prevalence of different types of regrettable communications in tweets, we manually annotated tweets with the categories discussed above. However, for the annotation process, we merged the groups “Direct attack”, “Direct criticism”, and “Implied Criticism”. This was primarily done because in our preliminary studies we found that the annotators were having problems distinguishing between these three categories, from the limited context available from 140 character tweets. Also removed was the “Blunder” category, as we had identified and removed superficial deletions during our data cleanup process. Further, as it is not possible for a third party annotator to understand, without context, if a person has lied or have changed their viewpoints, we removed those categories as well. Every tweet was independently annotated by three annotators. The annotators were graduate students from the authors’ institute, but none of them were authors of this paper. For each tweet evaluated by the annotators, they were asked a yes or no question on whether the tweet belonged to a given category. The annotators had three options, yes, no, and can’t say. Additionally, the annotators were asked to answer if they thought “the author posting the given tweet may regret posting it later”.

Overall one hundred deleted and one hundred non-deleted tweets, were annotated. The annotators had unanimous agreement on 56% cases and majority agreement on 96% cases. We consider a tweet to belong to a category if at-least two of the three annotators thought that it did belong to the category.

Table 2 and Table 3 show the results of the annotation experiment and some sample deleted tweets from the different categories. Interestingly we observe that, while deleted tweets had slightly more tweets in the categories “Reveal too much” and “Direct attack”, non-deleted tweets had a larger fraction belonging to categories “Expressive” and “Behavior edict”.

Surprisingly, we found that for only 16 out of the 100 deleted tweets the majority annotators agreed that the author posting the tweet might regret it later. Additionally, for 6 out of 100 non-deleted tweets the majority annotators agreed that those tweets might

---

**Reveal too much:**

- @[username] ....it was aliens wasnt it. (Im at work and wont get home till 6 friiiiick me)
- Help me save our lands from the Koch Brothers! via @[username] [url]

**Expressive:**

- @[username] im done fuckin with you!
- School isn't for me. I hate it. It's annoying. It's boring. It's too easy. It's a waste of my time.

**Direct attack:**

- Not only does @[username] buy useless shit for herself she also buys it for her cats :-J ;)
- @[username] hey faggot!! Lol :D [url]

**Behavior edict:**

- A hopeless person sees difficulties in every chance, but a hopeful person sees chances in every difficulty. @[username]
  - "Better to have little, with godliness, than to be rich and dishonest." Proverbs 16:8 NLT  
@[username]
- 

Table 3: Sample deleted tweets belonging to the different regrettable categories. The tweets have been anonymized by replacing mentioned usernames and urls

cause their authors to regret posting them later. While this difference is statistically significant (using Fisher's Exact test with Odds Ratio = 0.33 and  $p = 0.04$ ) it seems that for the majority of deleted tweets (84%) the personal nature of the underlying regrettable cause, which triggered the tweet deletion, is not understandable by any third party viewers, from only the content of the tweets. Further, as discussed earlier in this section, for cases belonging to regrettable categories such as "Lie" and "Agreement Changed", it is nearly impossible for third party annotators to identify the underlying regrettable cause without sufficient context, and were thus not even included in our annotation experiment. This result is in agreement with a similar finding made by Zhou et al. [38]. Due to the difficulty in differentiating between deleted tweets that were deleted due to regrets, and those that were deleted for other causes, Zhou et al. [38] studied a subset of deleted tweets that they defined as *content-identifiable regrettable tweets*. Zhou et al. defined content-identifiable regrettable tweets as those which third party human annotators think are regrettable. They noted that only 18% deleted tweets in their corpus matched the above definition.

## 5 Characterizing users who delete their tweets and those who do not

While we noted in the previous section, that it may be significantly difficult for third party humans to figure out the regrettable cause behind the deletion of particular tweets, from the text of the tweet alone, it may still be possible to extract high level of characteristics of tweets that are deleted and their authors who deleted them. In this section, we answer the question — *does there exist any characterizing differences between users who delete tweets and those who do not?* To answer this question, we analyze tweets from two subsets of users from our dataset. (i) *non-deleters*: the set of 102 thousand




Figure 1: Distribution of user attributes for users in the deleter and non-deleter sets. All four distribution pairs presented here have statistically significant differences when compared using Mann-Whitney U test with  $p < 0.001$ .

users who had posted at least one tweet, but had either not deleted any tweet or all their tweet deletions (if any) were classified as superficial deletions, and (ii) *deleters*: the set of 92 thousand users who had deleted at least one tweet, that was not a superficial deletion.

### 5.1 Big-Five personality traits

It is expected, that any significant differences in tweet deletion practices among the user groups (if they exist) would stem from their underlying personality differences. The Big-Five personality traits, also known as the Five factor model, is a very popular system for modeling human personality in terms of five orthogonal dimensions [5]. The five characteristic traits, using which the Big-Five system models human personality, are:

- *Openness to experience*: Users scoring high on openness generally are appreciative of art and are open to new experiences and diverse ideas.
- *Conscientiousness*: Conscientious individuals have high degrees of self-discipline while tending to be high achievers and meticulous planners.
- *Extraversion*: Extroverted people are highly social, and are generally friendly, drawing energy from social situations.

- *Agreeableness*: Agreeable users have an optimistic outlook and try to maintain social harmony.
- *Neuroticism*: Neurotic individuals tend to be moody with high propensity to feel negative emotions.

In the Big-Five model, the five traits capture five orthogonal dimensions of human personality. The Big-Five model has been well accepted for being able to account for human behavior in a number of studies [5]. Traditionally, to elicit a person’s relative score in terms of the five dimensions, the user has to fill out a personality questionnaire consisting of self descriptive questions [5]. However, recently a number of studies have tried to characterize the Big-Five personality traits of social media users, by developing classification models that correlate the user’s social media profile features with their personality traits [29, 10, 31, 27]. The rest of the current section, tries to uncover the differences in personality between Twitter users in the deleter and non-deleter user sets by comparing their social and linguistic attributes.

## 5.2 Differences in social characteristics

Earlier studies [27] have noted the strong relations between a Twitter user’s social features and their Big-Five personality traits. Quercia et al. [27] in their effort to predict the personality of Twitter users, found strong correlations between a users Big-Five personality traits and their social features (number of followers, number of followees, etc.). Here, we leverage the insights of [27] by comparing the differences between users of the deleter and non-deleter user sets in terms of their social features.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of these attributes between the two user sets. We find that, users in the deleter set have significantly higher follower count (Figure 1a), with median follower counts for users in the deleter and non-deleter sets being 508 and 375 respectively. Also, when considering the full distribution, we see in Figure 1c that users in the deleter set have significantly lower listed count (the number of Twitter Lists they are a member of). Figure 1d shows that the median tweet rate of users in the deleter set is nearly twice the tweeting rate of the users in the non-deleter set (8.85 tweets/day compared to 4.74 tweets/day). However, the difference between the distributions of followee count (Figure 1b) is not that prominent; we observe that median followee count for the users in the deleter and non-deleter sets are 403 and 394 respectively.

The statistically significant differences presented above, in conjunction with the strong and significant correlations presented by Quercia et al. [27], suggests that users in the deleter set are more likely to be *extroverted*, *neurotic*, and less *open* compared to users in the non-deleter set.

## 5.3 Differences in linguistic style

The correlations in writing style and Big-Five personalty scores of users have been well studied in social media [8, 31]. Golbeck et al. [8] demonstrated that similar correlations exist between the Big-Five personality traits of Twitter users and their tweets when analyzed using the LIWC toolkit<sup>9</sup>. Here we try to use the significant correlations

<sup>9</sup><http://www.liwc.net>

	Non-Deleters	Deleters	Predicted Deleter Personality
<b>LIWC Features</b>			
2nd Person Pronouns	1.39%	1.92%	$A, C$
Articles	3.43%	3.29%	-
Auxiliary Verbs	5.87%	7.40%	$\bar{C}$
Future Tense	0.49%	0.69%	$\bar{C}$
Negations	1.11%	1.71%	$\bar{C}$
Quantifiers	1.45%	1.68%	$O$
Social Process	6.42%	7.42%	$E$
Family	0.02%	0.25%	$E$
Humans	0.50%	0.73%	$O$
Negative Emotions	1.41%	2.17%	$\bar{C}$
Sadness	0.15%	0.36%	$\bar{C}$
Cognitive Mechanisms	9.28%	10.49%	$\bar{C}$
Causation	0.83%	1.01%	$\bar{A}, O$
Discrepancy	0.85%	1.25%	$\bar{C}$
Certainty	0.82%	1.10%	$O$
Hearing	0.23%	0.41%	$N$
Feeling	0.25%	0.43%	$\bar{C}, N$
Biological Processes	1.49%	2.19%	$\bar{O}$
Body	0.35%	0.74%	$\bar{O}$
Health	0.19%	0.35%	$\bar{E}$
Ingestion	0.08%	0.26%	$A$
Work	0.95%	0.91%	$\bar{C}, \bar{O}$
Achievement	1.08%	1.02%	$A$
Money	0.28%	0.33%	$\bar{A}$
Religion	0.06%	0.21%	$N$
<b>Non LIWC Features</b>			
w/ +ve Sentiment	69.23%	63.63%	$\bar{O}$
w/ -ve Sentiment	29.16%	36.36%	
w/ Hashtags	5.0%	2.47%	$O$
w/ Urls	29.05%	16.66%	$\bar{C}$

**Table 4:** Median percentage of words from different LIWC categories tweeted by users in the non-deleter and deleter sets. Also presented are the median percentage of tweets with positive and negative sentiments, as well as median percentage of tweets with hashtags and urls. The final column presents the likely personality trait predicted for the deleter set due to the difference in the category.

For example,  $A$  means higher likelihood of users in the deleter set having agreeableness trait, while  $\bar{C}$  represents lower likelihood of users in the deleter set having conscientious trait. Here  $O$  stands for openness,  $C$  for conscientiousness,  $E$  for extraversion,  $A$  for agreeableness, and  $N$  for neuroticism.

$\bar{C}$  is predicted by 10 features: auxiliary verbs, future tense, negations, negative emotions, sadness, cognitive mechanisms, discrepancy, feeling, work, and presence of urls, while the converse is predicted by only one feature: second person pronouns.  $N$  is predicted by 3 features: hearing, feeling, and religion. The results for other personality traits are mixed.

All pairwise differences between deleter and non-deleter sets presented here are statistically significant, when compared using Mann-Whitney U test with  $p < 0.001$ .

presented by Golbeck et al. [8] to gain further insights into the differences between the users in the deleter and non-deleter sets.

Table 4 shows the differences in the median percentage of words for different LIWC categories, used by users in the deleter and non-deleter sets. Also presented are the median percentage of tweets with positive and negative sentiments, as well as percentage of tweets with hashtags and urls. To understand the differences in the sentiment of tweets posted by the users, we used the Vader sentiment analysis tool [14]. Only those categories for which significant correlations with personality types were shown by Golbeck et al. [8] are presented. The last column of Table 4 shows the personality trait predicted for the deleter user set when using the significant correlations presented by Golbeck et al. [8] for the given category. For example *A* represents higher agreeableness while *C* represents less conscientiousness. It can be observed that while the differences are small, significant differences exist across all the categories.

From the differences presented in Table 4 we observe that the users in the deleter set are likely to be *less conscientious* as predicted by the ten features (while the converse is predicted by only one feature) Also, users in the deleter set are more likely to be *more neurotic* as predicted by the three features. However, the predictions from the other three personality traits are not clear from the results in Table 4 as they contain mixed signals.

## 5.4 Summary

Overall, our analysis shows that users who delete tweets are more likely to be extroverted, neurotic, and less conscientious. We hypothesize that, extroverted and spontaneous (less conscientious) users are more likely to speak up their minds, altering their opinions as more information becomes available to them. Further, as neurotic users are more likely to be prone to stress and worrying, it is intuitive that they might post more critical/offensive remarks in their moments of stress. Sleeper et al. [33] noted that both change of opinions and posting of critical/offensive content can become regrettable for the users posting them. One of the major actions taken by users when they later realize them, is to delete their tweets. This falls in line with our findings of the personality of users who delete their tweets.

One limitation of the analysis in this section is that we do not have ground truth personality information of the users in our dataset. We use strong and significant correlations reported in earlier studies [27, 8] to gain understanding of user personality. However, we feel that although our observations about user personalities are indirect, they provide valuable and usable insights into the issue.

## 6 Comparing tweets which are deleted to those that are not

In this section, we try to answer the question: *does there exist any characteristic difference between tweets that are deleted and those that are not?* To answer this question, we compared 1.2 million deleted and 15.9 million non-deleted tweets posted *only by*



the users in the deleter set, across different dimensions, such as: presence of mentions, lexical density, use of different linguistic features, etc.

These differences are compared at two levels. To understand the overall difference with respect to a given attribute, we first compare the relative presence of the attribute in deleted and non-deleted tweets at an aggregate level. For this purpose, we define *Normalized tweet difference (NTD)* of deleted tweets with respect to non-deleted tweets. For a given attribute  $a$ , let  $\text{DelTweetFrac}_a$  be the fraction of deleted tweets with the given attribute, and  $\text{NonDelTweetFrac}_a$  be the fraction non-deleted tweets with the given attribute. Then, we define  $\text{NTD}_a$  as follows:

$$\text{NTD}_a = \frac{\text{DelTweetFrac}_a - \text{NonDelTweetFrac}_a}{\text{NonDelTweetFrac}_a} \times 100$$

For any attribute  $a$ ,  $\text{NTD}_a$  is in the range  $[-100, \infty)$ . A positive  $\text{NTD}_a$  indicates that the attribute  $a$  has higher relative prevalence in the deleted tweet set, compared to the non-deleted tweet set. A negative  $\text{NTD}_a$  represents the converse.

However, as tweet deletion is a very personal choice, we also measure the differentiating power of different attributes at an individual level using *Normalized user difference (NUD)*. For the given attribute  $a$ , let  $\text{DelUserFrac}_a$  be the fraction of users for whom the attribute  $a$  is found significantly more in their deleted tweets, and  $\text{NonDelUserFrac}_a$  be the fraction of users for whom the attribute  $a$  is found significantly more in their non-deleted tweets. Then, we define  $\text{NUD}_a$  as follows:

$$\text{NUD}_a = \frac{\text{DelUserFrac}_a - \text{NonDelUserFrac}_a}{\text{NonDelUserFrac}_a} \times 100$$

As with  $\text{NTD}_a$ , for any attribute  $a$ ,  $\text{NUD}_a$  is in the range  $[-100, \infty)$ .

In general, for finding users with significant differences in their deleted and non-deleted tweets, for computation of  $\text{NUD}_a$ , we use Fisher’s Exact test with  $\alpha = 0.05$ , when the comparison is between ratio of items with and without the given attribute (such as in Table 5, first six attributes of Table 6, and Table 7). However, when having to compare the difference in median of distributions (such as lexical density of tweets and percentage of dictionary words, as in Table 6) we use Mann-Whitney U test with  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Further, when looking for users with significant difference in their deleted and non-deleted tweets, we restricted our analysis to the set of 19,739 users (out of 92 thousand users in the deleter set) for whom we have at-least 10 deleted and 10 non-deleted tweets in our dataset.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 compare the normalized tweet difference and normalized user difference for different attributes. Other than the few cases marked with •, we find that in general both metrics agree with each other.

## 6.1 Comparing tweet attributes

Due the short and succinct nature of tweets, enforced by a 140 character limit, Twitter users often use hashtags and urls to supplement the information contained in their tweets. Our previous studies [7, 37] had noted that tweets containing hashtags and urls are generally more informative. Hashtags help in contextualizing tweets by linking them to the bigger discussion, while additional sources of information are often

	NTD	NUD
Tweets w/ hashtags	-50.29%	-6.31%
Tweets w/ urls	-51.32%	78.54%
Tweets w/ mentions	-27.90%	-71.63%
Replies	-24.79%	-71.07%

Table 5: Normalized Tweet Difference (NTD) and Normalized User Difference (NUD) with respect to fraction of tweets that are replies and fraction of tweets that contain hashtags, urls, and mentions. Interestingly, we find that the trends obtained with respect to urls reverses when seen from tweet (NTD) and user (NUD) point of view. The fraction of deleted and non-deleted tweets (used to compute NTD) have statistically significant difference with respect to all given attributes, when compared using Fisher’s Exact test with  $p < 0.001$ .

provided by the embedded urls. To analyze the differences in information content, we compared deleted and non-deleted tweets relative to these attributes.

Table 5 compares deleted and non-deleted tweets with respect to the percentage of them being replies or those that contain mentions, hashtags and urls. We find that, when compared to non-deleted tweets, the percentage of deleted tweets that contains hashtags and urls is nearly half (50.29% drop for hashtags and 51.32% drop for urls). This indicates that overall, *information content of tweets in the deleted set is significantly lower* when compared to tweets that are not deleted. Interestingly, while at the aggregate level deleted tweets contain significantly less urls, for a larger fraction of users their use of urls is significantly more in their deleted tweets. On checking, we found that in many cases the urls pointed to photos uploaded on Twitter, which were also deleted along with the tweets.

One may postulate that this lack of informative content can be attributed to the more conversational nature of deleted tweets. Replying to tweets posted by others and mentioning other’s user names in tweets are ways of starting and continuing conversations on Twitter. To compare the percentage of conversational tweets that are deleted, we compared the fraction of tweets that contain mentions and those that are replies, in the deleted and the non-deleted tweet sets. Table 5 shows that fewer deleted tweets (24.79% less) are replies and a lesser fraction of them (27.9% less) contain mentions. Similar results are found in the user level comparison. This indicates that overall *conversational tweets are less likely to be deleted*.

Earlier studies have noted that across cultures, peoples mood show repeating patterns of variations over daily and seasonal cycles [9]. To understand if such patterns would also be visible in regrettable communications on Twitter, specifically in tweet deletion patterns, we compared the tweet creation times of deleted and non-deleted tweets in our dataset. Figure 2 shows the percentage of tweets in the deleted tweet set and the non-deleted tweet set created during every hour of the day. It can be observed that tweets that are later deleted have a significantly greater probability of getting created during the night hours in between 8pm and 6am. Our observation is similar to that of Wang et al. [34], who had observed that while the volume of tweets with curses




Figure 2: Percentage of tweets created during every hour of the day. Tweets that are later deleted, are more likely to be created between 8pm and 6am.

follows the volume of all tweets, cursing in Twitter reaches its peak during midnight.

## 6.2 Comparing linguistic features

Hu et al. [13] on comparing Twitter to other written communication mediums concluded that tweets are quite formal in construct. To understand if deleted tweets are more or less formal than non-deleted tweets, we compared their part-of-speech distribution. For this purpose, we used the CMU Twitter POS tagger [23] to tag all tweets in our dataset. For every tweet we also computed its lexical density. Lexical density of a piece of text, is the fraction of words in the text of types, noun, verb, adjective, and adverb. Lexical density is often used to measure the terseness of a piece of text. Further, for every tweet we computed the fraction of words contained in it that are included in an English dictionary. For this purpose, we used the Hunspell English dictionary<sup>10</sup>.

Table 6 shows the difference in deleted and non-deleted tweets with respect to use of different part-of-speech types, lexical density scores, and percentage of dictionary words in tweets. While we find that deleted and non-deleted tweets are similar in terms of lexical density scores, for a larger proportion of users lexical density scores are significantly lower in their deleted tweets. Also, notable is that the percentage of proper nouns used in deleted tweets is significantly lower (9.71% drop) than those in non-deleted tweets. This observation seems to also be in agreement with the fact that deleted tweets have lower mention counts. We postulate that this maybe because users writing these tweets are aware of their controversial contents and thus avoid mentioning specific people in these tweets.

We also note that there is the marked reduction of emoticons in deleted tweets (15% drop). Further, while deleted tweets have a slightly higher percentage of words from the English dictionary, for a large fraction of users (103.74% more) their deleted tweets contain significantly more dictionary words. This taken together with the less use of emoticons, suggest that *deleted tweets are more likely to be formal* than tweets that are not deleted.

<sup>10</sup><http://hunspell.sourceforge.net/>

	NTD	NUD
Proper Noun	-9.71%	3.15%•
Common Noun	2.25%	11.42%
Verb	3.84%	136.69%
Adjective	-0.85%	-27.41%
Adverb	3.22%	54.03%
Emoticon	-15.00%	-40.52%
Lexical density	-0.70%	-57.57%
Dictionary words	4.76%	103.74%

Table 6: Normalized Tweet Difference (NTD) and Normalized User Difference (NUD) with respect to different parts of speech categories, emoticon usage, lexical density, and percentage of dictionary words used. For proper nouns, the trend observed from tweet (NTD) and user (NUD) perspective reverses. The fraction of tweet vocabulary consisting of part-of-speech tags and emoticons (used to compute NTD) in deleted and non-deleted tweets have statistically significant difference when compared using Fisher’s Exact test with  $p < 0.001$ , while median lexical density and median fraction of dictionary words (used to compute NTD) in deleted and non-deleted tweets have statistically significant difference when compared using Mann-Whitney U test with  $p < 0.001$ .

To understand the differences in language use, we compared the deleted and non-deleted tweet corpuses using the LIWC 2007 toolkit. The difference in tweet vocabulary usage, in deleted tweets and non-deleted tweets, corresponding to the different LIWC categories, is shown in Table 7. We find that a much higher fraction of deleted tweets have third person pronoun usage, while use of first person plural pronouns decreases significantly (10.41% drop). Interestingly, we find that there is a small increase in the percentage of users who use more first person plural pronouns in tweets they later delete. However, the percentage of users who use more third person singular and plural pronouns in deleted tweets is more than 2.5 times higher. These observations can be explained as follows. Earlier studies on *ingroup outgroup bias* [4] have shown that users are more likely to talk about others, whom they do not think of as part of their ingroup, in a harsher language. Note, we also observe in Table 7 that deleted tweets show significantly more negative emotion than non-deleted tweets. We postulate that the above facts may be caused because subjects of deleted tweets are much less likely to be viewed by the tweet’s author as part of her ingroup.

Additionally, we find significantly higher use of past and present references in deleted tweets (3.49% increase for past tense and 2.41% increase for present tense), with the use of future references dropping slightly (1.14% decrease). However, we find that the normalized user difference with respect to use of future referencing vocabulary increases to 182.35%. As the percentage of users who use future tense significantly more in non-deleted tweets, compared to their deleted tweets, is very low (less than 1%) this doesn’t indicate a significant trend. Similarly, for present tense, the trend reverses when we consider user metric. From the consistent trend exhibited in past tense

	NTD	NUD
<b>Pronouns</b>		
1st Person (singular)	5.82%	12.22%
1st Person (plural)	-10.41%	110.74%•
2nd Person	1.65%	5.10%
3rd Person (singular)	10.46%	279.47%
3rd Person (plural)	6.66%	251.46%
Impersonal	6.50%	139.73%
<b>Tense</b>		
Past	3.49%	62.98%
Present	2.41%	-19.60%•
Future	-1.14%	182.35%•
<b>Emotion</b>		
Positive Emotion	-13.03%	-69.90%
Negative Emotion	16.23%	269.27%
Anxiety	3.70%	425.58%
Anger	23.74%	566.10%
Sadness	6.25%	218.52%
<b>Cognitive Process</b>		
Insight	5.44%	144.68%
Causation	6.55%	241.74%
Discrepancy	5.09%	164.43%
Tentative	7.86%	266.43%
Certainty	1.49%	70.88%
Inhibition	4.34%	420.75%
Inclusive	0.40%	82.01%
Exclusive	8.48%	224.03%
<b>Swear Words</b>		
Swear Words	30.10%	691.84%
Sexual References	7.44%	145.95%

Table 7: Normalized Tweet Difference (NTD) and Normalized User Difference (NUD) with respect to LIWC 2007 categories.

For 1st Person (plural) pronouns, present tense words, and future tense words, the trends are reversed when seen from the tweet (NTD) and user (NUD) point of view.

Differences in percentage of words belonging to different LIWC 2007 categories (used to compute NTD), in deleted and non-deleted tweets are significantly different when compared using Fisher’s Exact test with  $p < 0.001$ .

and carefully examining the tweets we find that in many of the cases deleted tweets are *comments about past incidents*.

As expected, we find that use of words with negative emotions increase (16.23% increase) significantly in deleted tweets, while a smaller percentage of deleted tweets (13.03% drop) have words related to positive emotions compared to non-deleted tweets. Additionally, we find that while there is a minor increase in use of anxiety and sadness related words in deleted tweets, a significantly higher percentage of deleted tweets (23.74% more) contain words related to anger.

Also notable, is that for all categories of words related to cognitive processes, a larger fraction of deleted tweets contain words related to them. Similar trend is seen in the percentage of users using significantly more cognitive process related words in their deleted tweets compared to their non-deleted tweets. These demonstrate that in general *tweets that are deleted in Twitter are more carefully constructed* than general tweets in the non-deleted set.

Finally, in accordance with our observation regarding negative emotions, we see that a larger fraction of tweets in the deleted tweet set contain swear words (30.10% increase), and words related to sexual references (7.44% increase). This trend is also seen in the percentage of users, who use significantly more swear words and sexual references in their deleted tweets.

### 6.3 Summary

Overall we find that when compared to non-deleted tweets, deleted tweets are simultaneously less informative and less conversational. Deleted tweets have comparable lexical density with non-deleted tweets, but have a significant lack of emoticon usage and higher use of dictionary words indicating a more formal tone. A linguistic analysis of the two tweet sets shows that deleted tweets are likely to be referring to an unnamed third person, having a negative sentiment, and have high increase in swear word usage. Deleted tweets also show significant increase in words related to cognitive process indicating thoughtful construction. In general, we find that aggregate differences in tweet features follow the individual user differences.

## 7 Comparing responses to deleted and non-deleted tweets

When a speaker makes a regrettable remark in an offline conversation, her audience's response, especially non-verbal cues, allows her to realize it quickly and respond accordingly. In Twitter, replies are the primary form of feedback that a user receives when tweeting. However, existing studies of deleted tweets [1, 38] have generally ignored this aspect of communication when trying to understand why a tweet is being deleted. Interestingly, Mondal et al. [22] noted that in some cases partial content of a tweet that has been deleted can be guessed from non-deleted tweets that had replied or manually retweeted the original deleted tweet. Here, we try to answer the following question: *do tweets which are deleted later, receive significantly more negative replies, than tweets that are not deleted?*

	Del Tweets	Non-Del Tweets
Tweets w/ replies	15.50%	23.24%
Tweets w/ retweets	10.26%	16.14%
Tweets w/ quotes	0.16%	0.20%

Table 8: Percentage of tweets that were replied to, retweeted, and quoted in the deleted and non-deleted tweet sets.

	Del Tweets	Non-Del Tweets
Tweets w/ +ve reply	63.13%	69.94%
Tweets w/ -ve reply	36.86%	30.05%

Table 9: Percentage of tweets which had received replies with positive and negative sentiments, out of tweets that had received any reply, in the deleted and non-deleted tweet sets.

The percentage of tweets in our dataset receiving different forms of responses are shown in Table 8. As we can see, deleted tweets receive significantly fewer responses when compared to non deleted tweets. In our dataset, 23.24% of non-deleted tweets received replies, while the same for deleted tweets is 15.5%. We also find that 16.14% non-deleted tweets in our dataset received one or more retweets, while the same for deleted tweets is 10.26%. The trends for percentage of tweets quoted are also similar.

One may be inclined to postulate that, the reason behind deleted tweets receiving fewer responses is that they have a smaller lifetime and thus lesser opportunity to receive them. However, we find that deleted tweets get ample opportunity to receive replies. The median time to receive the first reply is 128 seconds for all tweets in our dataset. Whereas, the median time duration after which a tweet is deleted is 1 hour and 12 minutes. For deleted tweets which received replies in our dataset, the median time to receive first reply was only 85 seconds. Further, the median time duration after which such a tweet was deleted is 5 hours and 49 minutes.

Finally, to answer the question — whether deleted tweets receive significantly more negative replies — we computed the sentiment scores for replies to all deleted and non-deleted tweets in our dataset. Table 9 shows percentage of deleted and non-deleted tweets for which the first reply received had positive and negative sentiments. We find that a significantly lesser percentage of deleted tweets receive positive replies when compared to non-deleted tweets (9.73% drop). While, the percentage of deleted tweets that receive negative replies is significantly larger when compared to non-deleted tweets (22.66% increase). Hence, it can be concluded that negative response (replies) from the audience is correlated with deletion of tweets by the authors.

From an author’s point of view, it would have been better to have mechanisms that predict and warn against posting of regrettable tweets, than to depend upon replies to realise the regret. In the next section, we attempt to develop such an early prediction system.

## 8 Early detection of tweets that are deleted in future

In this section, we try to exploit the differences in user attributes and tweet features that we observed between deleted and non-deleted tweets in the previous sections, to build a classifier that can predict if a tweet is likely to be deleted later.

A machine learning based system for predicting possible tweet deletions can be utilized in two complimentary ways. First, a system that can predict tweet deletion from only post time features can be useful for nudging and cautioning its users even before they have posted a possibly regrettable tweet. Second, after the tweet has been posted, the system can monitor the responses that the tweet receives and can quickly alert its author before the tweet gets a chance to cause too much damage. Thus, in this section we study two sets of classification tasks: (i) predicting if a tweet is likely to be deleted using only those features that are available at posting time, and (ii) predicting if a tweet is likely to be deleted from post time features as well as features obtained from the responses received by the post.

To create a balanced dataset for training and testing the classification process, we randomly sampled a set of 200,000 deleted tweets and 200,000 non-deleted tweets *from the set of tweets posted by users in the deleter set*. We ensured that equal number of deleted and non-deleted tweets are selected from the same user. For the purpose of this work, we used classifier implementations from the scikit-learn project<sup>11</sup>.

### 8.1 Features for the classification models

Table 10 shows the different features used for the classification tasks. The features are broadly divided into *post time features* and *response time features*.

*Raw open text features*, generated using bag of words model, are high dimensional and sparse features. To use them together with other low dimensional and dense features, we first convert them into a single discriminative scalar feature. This is done by training a classifier with the raw open text features, and using it to predict a possible deletion score for all tweets. We call this deletion score the *derived open text feature*. Later, we use the derived open text feature along with other dense features to perform the final prediction. To compute the raw open text features, we tokenized all tweets in our dataset using the CMU Twitter POS Tagger [23]. After removal of mentions and urls, this resulted in a word corpus of 11.7 million unique terms. Raw open text feature for a tweet is the sparse 11.7 million dimensional tf-idf vector corresponding to the terms of the given tweet.

The LIWC 2007 English dictionary categorizes words into 64 different categories [17]. The *Close text features (LIWC)* of a given tweet is a 64 dimensional vector feature, representing scores corresponding to the 64 LIWC categories. The *Close text feature (Sentiment)* of a tweet is a scalar feature representing the sentiment score of the tweet computed using the Vader toolkit [14]. Both LIWC and Vader toolkits have a predefined fixed corpus of words (closed set), using which they score different pieces of text and thus produce the set of close text features.

---

<sup>11</sup><http://scikit-learn.org/>



Post time features	<i>Raw open text features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TF-IDF score features computed using a bag of words model (11.7 million sparse features)</li> </ul>
	<i>Close text features (LIWC)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LIWC scores corresponding to 64 categories (64 features)</li> </ul>
	<i>Close text feature (sentiment)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tweet sentiment score computed using Vader toolkit</li> </ul>
	<i>Part-of-speech features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word counts for 25 part of speech categories (25 features)</li> </ul>
	<i>Tweet attribute features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time of the day when the tweet was posted (in UTC)</li> <li>• Day of the week when the tweet was posted (in UTC)</li> <li>• Timezone of the author posting the tweet</li> <li>• Whether the tweet is a reply to another tweet</li> <li>• Whether the tweet quotes another tweet</li> <li>• Number of urls present in the tweet</li> <li>• Number of users mentioned in the tweet</li> <li>• Number of hashtags used in the tweet</li> <li>• Whether the tweet has location information</li> </ul>
	<i>User attribute features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation time of the user's account</li> <li>• Whether the user has customized his profile</li> <li>• Whether the user has a custom profile image</li> <li>• Length of the bio posted by the user</li> <li>• Whether the user has enabled geo tagging of tweets</li> <li>• Whether the user has location information in his profile</li> <li>• Whether the user has a homepage url in his profile</li> <li>• Number of tweets favorited by the user</li> <li>• Number of accounts the user is following</li> <li>• Number of accounts that are following the user</li> <li>• Number of lists the user is a member of</li> <li>• Number of tweets that the user has posted</li> </ul>
Response time features	<i>Retweet features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of times the tweet has been retweeted</li> <li>• Number of other tweets quoting the tweet</li> </ul>
	<i>Reply features</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of replies the tweet has received</li> <li>• Aggregated LIWC feature vector for replies</li> <li>• Aggregated POS feature vector for replies</li> <li>• Aggregated Sentiment feature for replies</li> </ul>

Table 10: Different features used for classification of deleted and non-deleted tweets

The CMU Twitter POS Tagger [23] distinguishes between 25 different parts of speech types. Using it, we computed the *parts-of-speech features*, representing the parts of speech distribution for every tweet.

*Tweet attribute features* consist of nine features obtained from each tweet object. These consist of: time of day and day of week when the tweet was posted (2 features), time zone of the author (1 feature), whether the tweet is a reply or a quote (2 features), number of hashtags, urls, and user mentions in the tweet (3 features), and whether the tweet has location information (1 feature).

*User attribute features* consist of twelve features obtained from the author information associated with the tweet. These consist of: age of the author’s account (1 feature), whether the user customized her profile and profile image (2 features), length of the user’s Twitter bio (1 feature), whether the user has location and homepage url on her profile (2 features), whether the user has enabled geotagging (1 feature), number of followers, followees, and listed count (3 features), and number of tweets posted and favorited by the user (2 features).

Unlike the *post time features* presented above, *retweet features* and *reply features* are *response time features*, and consist of attributes which are not available at the time of posting, and varies as the tweet accumulates more responses. The retweet and reply features of a tweet consists of three scalar features, corresponding to the count of other tweets, retweeting, quoting, or replying, to the given tweet. In addition, we compute aggregate features by adding up the LIWC feature vectors, the parts-of-speech feature vectors, and sentiment features of the replies that the tweet has received.

## 8.2 Predicting tweet deletions at posting time

Combining millions of sparse raw open text features and few hundreds of other dense features, to create input for a single classifier is a difficult task. This is because, different types of classifiers work better for different types of input features. Naive Bayes and SVM with Linear kernel are most popular classifiers in the text classification context and can easily work with large number of open text features [30], while AdaBoost and SVM with RBF kernel can capture more complex relations in data, but are very resource expensive when training with millions of sparse features [12]. Thus, in this study we separately train classifiers with only raw open text features for the purposes of computing the *derived open text feature*. The *derived open text feature* is a scalar score produced by this first stage classifier and is then used alongside other dense features for the second stage classifier that utilizes all post time features.

**Predicting tweet deletions using only raw open text features:** For predicting tweet deletions using the raw open text features, and computing the derived open text feature in the process, we used two classifiers well suited for the task: (i) Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier (Naive Bayes) and (ii) Support Vector Machine classifier with linear kernel (Linear SVM). The hyper-parameters chosen for the two classifiers were:  $\alpha = 0.1$  for the Naive Bayes classifier, and  $C = 10^{-6}$  for the Linear SVM classifier with L2 regularizer. The hyper-parameters were chosen using grid search on the parameter space. A ten-fold cross validation was performed for each parameter combination. The final parameters were selected to maximize the mean F1-Score on test sets.

Classifier	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Naive Bayes	0.541	0.705	0.612
Linear SVM	0.572	0.605	0.588

Table 11: Classifier performance in distinguishing deleted tweets from non-deleted tweets using raw open text features only.

Classifier	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
SVM	0.630	0.756	0.687
AdaBoost	0.796	0.765	0.780

Table 12: Classifier performance in distinguishing deleted tweets from non-deleted tweets using all post time features.

Table 11 shows the performance of the classifiers in predicting the likelihood of a tweet being deleted. While the Naive Bayes classifier produces a higher F1-Score (0.612 for Naive Bayes vs. 0.588 for Linear SVM) due to higher recall, its precision is significantly lower (0.541 for Naive Bayes vs. 0.572 for Linear SVM) when compared to the Linear SVM classifier.

Due to the higher precision and comparable recall of the Linear SVM classifier, we used distance of tweet features from the SVM decision boundary as the derived open text feature. As classifiers used in the later sections use dense low dimensional features, the derived open text feature serves as a dense scalar proxy for the sparse high dimensional features.

**Predicting tweet deletions using all post time features:** For predicting tweet deletions using the derived open text feature and other dense features obtainable at posting time, we used two classifiers: (i) Support Vector Machine classifier with RBF kernel (SVM) and (ii) AdaBoost classifier with Decision Tree (AdaBoost). The parameters chosen for the classifiers were:  $C = 0.1$  with kernel coefficient  $\gamma = 0.001$  for the SVM classifier, and maximum tree depth = 5 with 100 estimators for the AdaBoost classifier. As before, the hyper-parameters were chosen using grid search on the parameter space. A ten-fold cross validation was performed for each parameter combination. The final parameters were selected to maximize the mean F1-Score on test sets.

Table 12 shows that the AdaBoost classifier performs significantly better than the SVM classifier with a F1-Score of 0.780 compared to 0.687 for SVM.

### 8.3 Importance of features in predicting tweet deletions

To understand the relative importance of different feature groups for the classification process, we trained AdaBoost classifiers by dropping one group of features at a time and comparing the resultant classifier’s performance with the baseline AdaBoost classifier (Table 12) trained with all post time features.

Table 13 shows that the largest loss of performance (F1-score) comes on removal of user features. The second largest loss is observed on removing the derived open text

Dropped Feature(s)	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
User features	81.52%	85.44%	83.46%
Derived open text feature	97.29%	97.19%	97.24%
Tweet features	99.53%	99.17%	99.34%
Sentiment feature	99.43%	99.52%	99.47%
POS features	99.32%	99.71%	99.51%
LIWC features	99.67%	99.73%	99.89%

Table 13: Relative classifier performance with respect to baseline AdaBoost classifier (Table 12) trained with all features, on dropping one of the sets of features for the task of distinguishing deleted tweets from non-deleted tweets.

Classifier	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
SVM	0.709	0.676	0.692
AdaBoost	0.825	0.809	0.817

Table 14: Classifier performance in distinguishing deleted tweets from non-deleted tweets using post time as well as response features.

feature score. Removal of LIWC features leads to the lowest loss in performance.

## 8.4 Predicting tweet deletions after posting

To understand the utility of feedback from other users in predicting if a tweet will be deleted or not, we train another set of classifiers using posting time as well as response features. Further, we took only the subset of deleted tweets that had received at-least one reply, (30,152 tweets) and an equal sized subset of non-deleted tweets that had also received at-least one reply. Table 14 shows that using response features indeed improves classifier performance. The F1-Score of the AdaBoost classifier increases to 0.817, compared to baseline (without the response features) AdaBoost classifier with a F1-Score of 0.780. While, the F1-Score of the SVM classifier increases to 0.692.

## 8.5 Differences from previous classifiers

Preliminary works trying to classify deleted tweets [25, 2] combined large number of sparse open text features and tweet attribute features into a single classifier. This re-

Classifier	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Petrovic et al. [25]	0.587	0.646	0.615
Bagdouri and Oard [2]	0.604	0.676	0.638

Table 15: Performance of classifiers for distinguishing deleted tweets from non-deleted tweets, presented in earlier works, on our dataset.

quired them to use classifiers with simple decision boundaries that could efficiently handle such large number of sparse open text features. For example Petrovic et al. [25] used Linear SVM, while Bagdouri and Oard [2] utilized a Logistic Regression classifier.

To understand, how these methodologies would perform on our dataset, we reconstructed the classifiers proposed in these studies using the same set of features reported by them. Table 15 shows the performance of these classifiers on our dataset. We find that our classifier, constructed with all post time features, performs significantly better (with F1-score 0.78) compared to classifiers trained using the methodologies presented by Petrovic et al. [25] and Bagdouri and Oard [2].

We posit, that the primary source of our classifier’s better performance comes from the use of the multi stage classification system. Our methodology is able to incorporate classifiers with more complex decision boundaries (such as SVM with RBF kernel and AdaBoost classifiers) because we first convert the sparse and high dimensional raw open text features into a single derived open text feature using Linear SVM. This allows us to utilize benefits of both sparse open text features and powerful classifiers with complex decision boundaries.

Zhou et al. [38] in their work had used ten closed text features, but limited themselves to 18% subset of tweets, that they defined as content-identifiable regrettable tweets. They obtained a classification F1-score of 0.714. However, this study was able to create a classifier that is able to classify *all* deleted and non-deleted tweets with a F1-score of 0.78.

## 8.6 Summary

In summary, we find that while the decision to delete a tweet is a personal one, classification models can be built that can predict with significant accuracy whether a tweet will be deleted or not. Surprisingly, we find that user features contribute heavily to the performance of such a model, despite not directly containing any information about the tweet. We hypothesize that, the reason why user features have strong effect on classification accuracy is that they encode significant signals about a user’s personality. We also find that responses to tweets can demonstrably improve the prediction accuracy of such models, indicating strong relation between the author’s choice of deleting her tweet and the responses that tweet has received.

## 9 Conclusion and discussion

The current paper presented a large scale empirical analysis of deleted tweets and their authors. It utilized a series of innovations, including: undertaking a thorough data cleaning procedure, endeavoring to differentiate linguistic differences in construction of deleted and non-deleted tweets, and attempting to infer personality based correlations pertaining to post deletion behavior of Twitter users. This study also presented the design of a two-stage classifier for predicting if a tweet will be deleted or not. The classifier utilized open-text features, closed text features, user features, tweet features, as well as contextual features to perform the above prediction task.

We developed several insights during the course of our study. In particular, we found that there exists significant differences in personality between users who delete their tweets (even low numbers) and those who do not. Users who delete their tweets are more likely to be extroverted and neurotic while also being less conscientious. We also found that vocabulary of tweets, that are later deleted, contain significantly higher fraction of swear words and markers indicating anger, anxiety, and sadness. Interestingly, a significant proportion of them were written in a more formal tone. Surprisingly, when manually annotating tweets to understand their causes of deletion, we found that causes of deletion of regrettable tweets could be only guessed for 16% of the deleted tweets. In Twitter, replies are the primary method for users to respond to a tweet’s author. We found that replies to tweets that are deleted later, have higher negative sentiments, which prompts us to postulate that authors of the original tweets take these responses into account when choosing to delete their tweets. Finally, using the insights obtained from the analysis of deleted tweets and their users, we built a classification model which can predict, at the time of posting, if a tweet will be deleted or not, with a F1-score of 0.78. Further, F1-score of the classification model increases to 0.81, when features from responses to the original tweets are included.

One major source of tweet deletions (14%) in our dataset turned out to be superficial deletions, that is the tweets were deleted by their authors to post a fixed or slightly modified version of the original tweet. Twitter as of date doesn’t provide a method to edit tweets. The result of which is that any user trying to edit any of her tweets needs to first delete the offending tweet and compose a new one. While there has been considerable demand for editing facility from celebrities and popular media,<sup>12</sup> allowing users to edit tweets definitely has its pros and cons. On one hand, deleting and re-composing the tweet is often a problem for users as the process severs the links between the tweet and its responses. On the other hand, allowing users to edit tweets can produce numerous forms of gaming systems where a user of a highly retweeted tweet can change the content of the original tweet which may not be in agreement with the users who did the retweeting.

An obvious next future work would be to develop an online system that can nudge users into making better judgments, of whether to post a tweet or not. A practical challenge in doing that, however, would be in collection of enough personal deleted data to learn the class of tweets that the user is likely to regret and delete later. Earlier works [26, 2] trying to predict the possibility of a tweet getting deleted focused mostly on the content of the tweet itself. However, as we note in the current study, whether the author of a tweet finds a tweet to be regrettable or not, depends deeply on the author herself. Thus, it is imperative for developers, trying to create systems that nudge users towards better choices, to ensure that the classifiers they develop are personalized and take into account personality and behavior of the individual user when making such predictions.

An even bigger challenge, however, for developers of nudging systems such as the one described above, would be to find a balance, such that while being useful and delivering appropriate nudges, the system refrains from actively nagging and antagonizing its users. Wang et al. [35] in their study to nudge users towards better usage of privacy

---

<sup>12</sup><http://www.wired.com/2013/04/what-twitter-needs/>

features noted that about half the users in their survey held negative or indifferent attitudes towards the widgets presented to help them. A similar response could be seen in users of Google Mail Goggles,<sup>13</sup> many of whom found it annoying rather than helpful. We hypothesize that whether a user finds it useful to trade off ease of use for increased privacy, depends heavily on the personality of the user as well as the importance the user places on the requirement of privacy. Thus, it is important for system designers to not only understand the personality of the users being exposed to such systems but also to educate and convince them of the problems their system is designed to solve. Otherwise, systems of these categories run the risk of being mostly ignored.

Another interesting and unanswered question that remains, is that if a tweet has received significant negative response, what should be done with? Mondal et al. [22] noted that even when deleted, much of the content of tweets can be guessed from the non-deleted responses that remain, which leads potentially significant privacy leaks.

In our future studies, we intend to investigate the above issues.

## References

- [1] H. Almuhiemedi, S. Wilson, B. Liu, N. Sadeh, and A. Acquisti. Tweets Are Forever: A Large-scale Quantitative Analysis of Deleted Tweets. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 897–908, 2013.
- [2] M. Bagdouri and D. W. Oard. On Predicting Deletions of Microblog Posts. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1707–1710, 2015.
- [3] P. Bhattacharya and N. Ganguly. Characterizing Deleted Tweets and Their Authors. In *Proceedings of the 10th AAAI International Conference on Web and Social Media*, pages 547–550, 2016.
- [4] M. B. Brewer. The Psychology of Prejudice: Ingroup Love and Outgroup Hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3):429–444, 1999.
- [5] P. T. Costa and R. R. McCrae. *Neo Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R)*. Psychological Assessment Resources, 1992.
- [6] S. Das and A. Kramer. Self-Censorship on Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 7th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, pages 120–127, 2013.
- [7] S. Ghosh, M. B. Zafar, P. Bhattacharya, N. Sharma, N. Ganguly, and K. P. Gum-madi. On Sampling the Wisdom of Crowds: Random vs. Expert Sampling of the Twitter Stream. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1739–1744, 2013.

---

<sup>13</sup>Mail Goggles [24] was an optional widget available with Google Mail during October 2008 to May 2012. When enabled, Mail Goggle users were required to answer simple math questions to demonstrate cognitive abilities before it allowed them to send emails. The service was intended to stop drunk email late at night.

- [8] J. Golbeck, C. Robles, M. Edmondson, and K. Turner. Predicting Personality from Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 3rd IEEE International Conference on Social Computing*, pages 149–156, 2011.
- [9] S. A. Golder and M. W. Macy. Diurnal and Seasonal Mood Vary with Work, Sleep, and Daylength Across Diverse Cultures. *Science*, 333(6051):1878–1881, 2011.
- [10] S. D. Gosling, A. A. Augustine, S. Vazire, N. Holtzman, and S. Gaddis. Manifestations of Personality in Online Social Networks: Self-Reported Facebook-Related Behaviors and Observable Profile Information. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(9):483–488, 2011.
- [11] R. Holt. Twitter in Numbers. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/twitter/9945505/Twitter-in-numbers.html>, 2013. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [12] C.-W. Hsu, C.-C. Chang, , and C.-J. Lin. A Practical Guide to Support Vector Classification. <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/papers/guide/guide.pdf>, 2003. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [13] Y. Hu, K. Talamadupula, and S. Kambhampati. Dude, srsly?: The Surprisingly Formal Nature of Twitter’s Language. In *Proceedings of the 7th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2013.
- [14] C. Hutto and E. Gilbert. VADER: A Parsimonious Rule-Based Model for Sentiment Analysis of Social Media Text. In *Proceedings of the 8th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2014.
- [15] M. L. Knapp, L. Stafford, and J. A. Daly. Regrettable Messages: Things People Wish They Hadn’t Said. *Journal of Communication*, 36(4):40–58, 1986.
- [16] Y. Liu, K. S. Chloe, and A. Mislove. The Tweets They Are a-Changin’: Evolution of Twitter Users and Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 8th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2014.
- [17] Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count. <http://www.liwc.net/>, 2007. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [18] H. Mao, X. Shuai, and A. Kapadia. Loose Tweets: An Analysis of Privacy Leaks on Twitter. In *Proc. ACM WPES*, pages 1–12, 2011.
- [19] B. Meeder, P. G. K. J. Tam, and L. F. Cranor. RT @IWantPrivacy: Widespread Violation of Privacy Settings in the Twitter Social Network. In *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshop on Web 2.0 Security and Privacy*, 2010.
- [20] J. R. Meyer. Regretted Messages: Cognitive Antecedents and Post Hoc Reflection. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 30(4):376–395, 2011.



- [21] J. R. Meyer and K. Rothenberg. Repairing Regretted Messages: Effects of Emotional State, Relationship Type, and Seriousness of Offense. *Communication Research Reports*, 21(4):348–356, 2004.
- [22] M. Mondal, J. Messias, S. Ghosh, K. P. Gummadi, and A. Kate. Forgetting in Social Media: Understanding and Controlling Longitudinal Exposure of Socially Shared Data. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security*, pages 287–299, 2016.
- [23] O. Owoputi, B. O’Connor, C. Dyer, K. Gimpel, N. Schneider, and N. A. Smith. Improved Part-of-Speech Tagging for Online Conversational Text with Word Clusters. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 380–390, 2013.
- [24] J. Perlow. New in Labs: Stop sending mail you later regret. <http://gmailblog.blogspot.in/2008/10/new-in-labs-stop-sending-mail-you-later.html>, 2008. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [25] S. Petrovic, M. Osborne, and V. Lavrenko. I Wish I Didn’t Say That! Analyzing and Predicting Deleted Messages in Twitter. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.3107>, 2013. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [26] S. Petrovic, M. Osborne, and V. Lavrenko. I Wish I Didn’t Say That! Analyzing and Predicting Deleted Messages in Twitter. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.3107>, 2013. Accessed On, April 25, 2014.
- [27] D. Quercia, M. Kosinski, D. Stillwell, and J. Crowcroft. Our Twitter Profiles, Our Selves: Predicting Personality with Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 3rd IEEE International Conference on Social Computing*, pages 180–185, 2011.
- [28] A. Roomann-Kurrik. Introducing new metadata for Tweets. <https://blog.twitter.com/2013/introducing-new-metadata-for-tweets>, 2013. Accessed on January 14, 2017.
- [29] T. Ryan and S. Xenos. Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between the Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook usage. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(5):1658–1664, 2011.
- [30] A. Schulz, C. Guckelsberger, and B. Schmidt. More Features Are Not Always Better: Evaluating Generalizing Models in Incident Type Classification of Tweets. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 421–430, 2015.
- [31] H. A. Schwartz, J. C. Eichstaedt, M. L. Kern, L. Dziurzynski, S. M. Ramones, M. Agrawal, A. Shah, M. Kosinski, D. Stillwell, M. E. P. Seligman, and L. H. Ungar. Personality, Gender, and Age in the Language of Social Media: The Open-Vocabulary Approach. *PLoS One*, 8(9), 2013.

- [32] M. Sleeper, R. Balebako, S. Das, A. L. McConahy, J. Wiese, and L. F. Cranor. The Post That Wasn't: Exploring Self-censorship on Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 793–802, 2013.
- [33] M. Sleeper, J. Cranshaw, P. G. Kelley, B. Ur, A. Acquisti, L. F. Cranor, and N. Sadeh. “I Read My Twitter the Next Morning and Was Astonished”: A Conversational Perspective on Twitter Regrets. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 3277–3286, 2013.
- [34] W. Wang, L. Chen, K. Thirunarayan, and A. P. Sheth. Cursing in English on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 415–425, 2014.
- [35] Y. Wang, P. G. Leon, A. Acquisti, L. F. Cranor, A. Forget, and N. Sadeh. A Field Trial of Privacy Nudges for Facebook. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 2367–2376, 2014.
- [36] Y. Wang, G. Norcie, S. Komanduri, A. Acquisti, P. G. Leon, and L. F. Cranor. “I Regretted the Minute I Pressed Share”: A Qualitative Study of Regrets on Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 7th Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security*, pages 1–16, 2011.
- [37] M. B. Zafar, P. Bhattacharya, N. Ganguly, K. P. Gummadi, and S. Ghosh. Sampling Content from Online Social Networks: Comparing Random vs. Expert Sampling of the Twitter Stream. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 9(3):12:1–12:33, June 2015.
- [38] L. Zhou, W. Wang, and K. Chen. Tweet Properly: Analyzing Deleted Tweets to Understand and Identify Regrettable Ones. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 603–612, 2016.