

The influence of coordinated behavior on toxicity

Edoardo Loru¹, Matteo Cinelli², Maurizio Tesconi³, and Walter Quattrociocchi²

¹Sapienza University of Rome

²Department of Computer Science, Sapienza University of Rome

³Institute of Informatics and Telematics, National Research Council

Abstract

In the intricate landscape of social media genuine content dissemination may be altered by a number of threats. Coordinated Behavior (CB), defined as orchestrated efforts by entities to deceive or mislead users about their identity and intentions, emerges as a tactic to exploit or manipulate online discourse. This study delves into the relationship between CB and toxic conversation on Twitter. Using a dataset of 11 million tweets from 1 million users preceding the 2019 UK General Elections, we show that users displaying CB typically disseminate less harmful content, irrespective of political affiliation. However, distinct toxicity patterns emerge among different CB cohorts. Compared to their non-CB counterparts, CB participants show marginally elevated toxicity levels only when considering their original posts. We further show the effects of CB-driven toxic content on non-CB users, gauging its impact based on political leanings. Our findings suggest a nuanced but statistically significant influence of CB on digital discourse.

1 Introduction

Social media are nowadays one of the main arenas for public debate where users get their information and interact with other peers under the potential influence of feed algorithms used to prioritize their engagement with like-minded content [1, 2, 3]. According to recent studies, such systems can challenge democracy in various ways [4, 5, 6]. Problems include the fast spread of false information [7, 8, 9, 10, 11], more division among groups [12, 13, 14, 15, 16], and harmful behaviors online [17, 18, 19]. Despite efforts to fix these issues, solutions are hard to find [5, 6].

Further complicating this ecosystem is the phenomenon of Coordinated Behavior (CB), which can be defined as an unexpected, suspicious, or exceptional similarity among users of a group [20]. Social media campaigns, such as online activism, protests, and disinformation campaigns [21, 22, 23], generally involve participants coordinating their actions to disseminate content widely. Initially, scientific research focused on the benefits of coordination for social movements. However, it has become evident that benign actors, such as activists, are using similar techniques and malicious actors are engaged in political astroturfing [24] and the dissemination of inappropriate content. Coordinated behavior on social media can have negative consequences, including distorting public opinion and contributing to the polarization of society. Recognizing these problems, researchers and practitioners are working on strategies to identify, characterize, and mitigate coordinated behavior [25, 26, 27]. In particular, the characterization of coordinated groups is a crucial aspect discussed in the existing literature [25]. This can be done at different levels of depth but remains essential due to the absence of ground-truth data for detection tasks. To assess the harm of coordinated behavior, established methods in the literature can be used, primarily the analysis of content shared by coordinated users, which includes the identification of fake news [28, 29], hate speech and toxicity detection [18, 30].

In the context of the rapidly evolving digital landscape, the 2019 UK General Elections provide a pertinent setting to explore the dynamics of online behavior. Our study aims to disentangle the complex relationship between CB and the prevalence of toxic content on the Twitter platform. For this purpose, we analyze a dataset encompassing 11 million tweets from a diverse pool of 1 million users. From our analysis, a salient observation emerges: users demonstrating high coordination in online activities tend to disseminate less toxic content. This propensity holds regardless of their political leaning, suggesting that coordination might not necessarily be synonymous with malicious intent or negative discourse. However, when we delve deeper into the subsets of coordinated users, nuanced toxicity patterns begin to materialize, indicating a varied landscape of content sharing




Figure 1: Empirical Cumulative Distribution Function (ECDF) of the number of tweets posted by superspreaders compared to the rest of the users, taking into account original tweets (left panel) and retweets (right panel).

even within these coordinated groups. In more detail, we observe that the extensive retweeting activity of coordinated users plays a role in evaluating their toxicity levels. Both coordinated and non-coordinated users tend to post original content with a higher toxicity level compared to that they disseminate through retweets, with the former category being even more toxic than the latter. Beyond merely observing these trends, our study delves into the consequential effects of content stemming from CB efforts. Specifically, we explore how interacting with toxic content, particularly when associated with CB, affects the behaviors of non-coordinated users. A key aspect of this examination is understanding the potential modulation of reactions by political orientations. Does a user’s political inclination amplify or attenuate their reaction to CB-driven toxicity? After carefully considering these dynamics, our results point towards a subtle yet undeniably present influence of CB on online conversations and narratives. While the impact might not always be overtly visible in direct content comparisons, the undercurrents shaping digital discourse reveal a significant role in coordinated behaviors.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Data

In this work, we use a publicly available¹, large collection of tweets gathered in the run-up to the 2019 UK general election [20], spanning from 12 November 2019 to 12 December 2019 (election day). Within this time frame, all tweets that featured at least one of the predefined election-related hashtags in Table 1 were collected; some of the hashtags have a clear political alignment (Labour or Conservative), while the rest only refer to the election itself and can be considered neutral. Additionally, the dataset includes all tweets published by the official accounts of the two parties and their leaders and all interactions they received (i.e., retweets and replies), as summarized in Table 2. The final dataset combines these two collection processes, resulting in a set of 11,264,280 tweets posted by 1,179,659 distinct users.

Toxicity To estimate the toxicity conveyed by a message, we leveraged the publicly available Perspective API [31], which is an established standard for toxic speech detection. We will thus follow the definition of “toxic content” it is based upon, which is “a rude, disrespectful, or unreasonable comment that is likely to make people leave a discussion”. To achieve more robust results, we standardized all tweets in our dataset by enforcing UTF-8 encoding, converting them to lower-case, and stripping them of all hashtags, URLs, and emojis. Therefore, we input them to Perspective API and assign to each the toxicity score output by the model, a value in the range [0, 1] that represents “the likelihood that someone will perceive the text as toxic” [31].

¹<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4647893>

Coordinated communities By applying the state-of-the-art method proposed in [20], we subsequently identified the coordinated users within our dataset, assigning each user a score between 0 and 1 that measures the extent of coordination exhibited by that user. Firstly, we selected the top 1% retweeters in the dataset, which from this point onward we will refer to as *superspreaders*, resulting in a subset of 10,782 users. Despite being characterized by an extremely prolific retweeting activity, in Fig. 1 we show that superspreaders also tend to produce more original tweets than other users.

Secondly, we computed the TF-IDF vector of the IDs of the tweets retweeted by each superspreader, thus obtaining for each a retweet-based feature vector. This weighting allows us to place more importance to the action of retweeting of unpopular tweets, which is a telltale sign of suspicious behavior. By computing the pairwise cosine similarities between user vectors, we thus obtained a weighted undirected similarity network, whose nodes are the superspreaders we identified earlier and the weight of the edges between them represents their similarity in retweet activity. We then extracted the multiscale backbone [32] of the similarity network as to only retain statistically relevant connections, resulting in a network containing 276,775 edges, and performed community detection with the Louvain clustering algorithm [33]. On this dataset, Nizzoli *et al.* (2021) [20] detected seven clusters of coordinated users, which they subsequently characterized politically by means of their hashtag usage. In this work, we will focus on providing a toxicity-based characterization for the three largest communities: the LAB and CON clusters, populated by users supporting the Labour and Conservative party, respectively, and the TVT cluster, a community promoting liberal democrats, tactical voting, anti-Brexit, and anti-Tory campaigns. In addition to being the largest, we argue that these communities are also the most representative of the dataset, and thus most valuable for investigation: the first two have distinctly politically slanted narratives, while the latter can serve as a benchmark to validate the interplay between political alignment, toxicity, and coordinated behavior. Finally, we applied the algorithm proposed in [20] to assign each user a coordination score in the range $[0, 1]$.

For the purposes of this study, we label as *coordinated* all superspreaders having a coordination score above the median of the coordination score empirical distribution, which is approximately equal to 0.8, resulting in a set of 5,450 coordinated accounts. We consider the set of remaining users – including all other superspreaders – to be *non-coordinated*.

2.2 Political leaning inference

We aim to investigate the role of political leaning and its relationship with coordination and toxicity. The alignment of a user on the political spectrum can be estimated by studying hashtag usage [34, 35]. Specifically, we built a tweet-hashtag bipartite network starting from the sets of all tweets in our dataset and the hashtags in them. Then, we projected this network onto a hashtag co-occurrence network, whose nodes represent hashtags and an edge between two hashtags indicates the two have appeared at least once in the same tweet; the weight of the edge is a positive integer representing the number of such co-occurrences. The co-occurrence network resulting from this projection contains a total of 100,461 nodes and 822,420 edges. This network can then be used to infer the leaning of each hashtag by applying a label propagation algorithm, using the set of hashtags we defined for the data collection step as an initial seed of known polarity in a way similar to [9]. The algorithm builds upon the multiscale backbone extraction method [32] to identify relevant connections (i.e., co-occurrences) among the network’s hashtags. All nodes are initially assigned an “undefined” political leaning score, except for the initial seed of hashtags of known polarity used for data collection (Table 1). A single iteration i of the algorithm consists of two main operations: extraction of the backbone of the co-occurrence network with a disparity filter α_i ; and simultaneous update of all hashtags with undefined leaning at step i . The leaning assigned to a hashtag is equal to the average of the leaning of its neighbors, weighted by the number of co-occurrences with each. In this computation, all neighbors that weren’t already assigned a leaning in a previous step are temporarily assigned a leaning of 0. At step $i + 1$, a larger disparity filter $\alpha_{i+1} > \alpha_i$ is used to extract the backbone; this corresponds to a softer filtering that allows more nodes to be part of the extracted network. The newly added hashtags and those that haven’t been labeled in the previous steps will thus be assigned a political leaning score. The algorithm stops when all hashtags have been assigned a score or when a disparity filter equal to 1 is employed, meaning the update is performed on the entire network. In the latter case, all hashtags that still haven’t been updated at the end of the algorithm will be assumed to be neutral and assigned a political leaning score of zero. The length of the sequence of disparity filters will have an impact on the final result of the label propagation, as it’s strongly dependent on the network it is applied on and on the nodes used as the initial seed: defining an excessively short sequence may lead to many




Figure 2: Joint distributions of different metrics for the superspreaders in the three largest communities of the similarity network. Color intensity indicates the number of users in a bin, with red regions highlighting peaks. (a) Coordination score and toxicity of users, with the dotted line (median coordination) indicating the threshold used to label a superspreader as “coordinated”; (b) toxicity of users and weighted average of their neighborhood’s toxicity; (c) cluster-normalized (least to most extreme) political leaning of users and their toxicity; (d) political leaning of users and weighted average of their neighborhood’s leaning.

neutral hashtags, while a long one – although preferable – can become computationally expensive if the network involved is large. For our purposes, we have found choosing a sequence of values that scale logarithmically and span across several orders of magnitude to be the optimal choice, in contrast to setting a fixed increment to be added at each iteration.

Knowing the polarity of hashtags allows us to get an estimate of the political leaning of each tweet, which we define as equal to that of the hashtag in it with the highest score in absolute value (i.e., most polarized); this avoids the leaning of polarized hashtags being averaged out in tweets where they are used in conjunction with many politically neutral hashtags. Finally, we estimate the political leaning of a user as the average political leaning score of its tweets and retweets.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Toxicity across coordinated communities

To analyze variations in toxicity across coordinated communities, each user was assigned a toxicity score. This score is determined by averaging the toxicity of a user’s top 10% most toxic original tweets and retweets. By focusing on this metric, we aimed to gauge the peak toxicity a user can manifest and disseminate [36, 18] rather than their standard activity levels. Fig. 2(a) displays the joint Probability Density Function (PDF) of the coordination scores of superspreaders from the three largest clusters within the similarity network, aligned with their toxicity (as defined previously). A discernible trend emerges: strongly-coordinated users tend to display below-average toxicity. This implies a propensity among coordinated users to disseminate content with low toxicity levels. This pattern is particularly pronounced within the Labour and Conservative clusters, representing the most distinctly politically aligned communities among superspreaders. Furthermore, Fig. 2(a) highlights the coordination score threshold employed to classify a superspreader as ‘coordinated’; subsequent analyses will center on this specific user subset.

Fig. 2(b) depicts the joint PDF of each coordinated user’s toxicity against the average toxicity of their neighboring users. These neighbors are factored by their similarity (i.e., edge weight) to the user. The displayed PDF exposes observable toxicity-based homophily in the CON cluster and, to a lesser extent, in the TVT cluster, suggesting that users with comparable retweet behaviors within these clusters also exhibit similar toxicity levels. To confirm this intuition, we can consider the subgraph corresponding to each cluster and estimate its assortativity [37] with respect to the toxicity of the users within, resulting in a score of 0.54 for the CON cluster, 0.30 for the TVT




Figure 3: Comparison between coordinated and non-coordinated users in terms of expressed toxicity, defined as the average of the top 10% most toxic original tweets or retweets. (a) Tweeting activity and user toxicity smoothed via a LOESS curve (the shaded region indicates the corresponding 95% CI), with the observed user toxicity distribution for both groups in miniature; (b) bootstrap distribution of the average user toxicity; (c) bootstrap distribution of the average user toxicity obtained by ignoring retweets.

cluster, and 0.06 for the LAB cluster. Shuffling the toxicity scores among users of the same cluster allows us to validate these estimates further [38]; after 10,000 random shuffles, we obtain an average assortativity coefficient approximately equal to zero and a Z-score $\gg 1$ for the observed coefficients of the CON and the TVT clusters.

In Fig. 2(c), we present the joint distribution of user toxicity juxtaposed with a normalized political leaning score. Interestingly, the distribution pertaining to the coordinated users in the CON cluster suggests that the toxicity they express and their political alignment are negatively correlated; in fact, for the two metrics we obtain a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of $\rho = -0.44$, statistically validated with a t -test ($p < 0.001$) against the hypothesis of no correlation. For additional context, Fig. 2(d) illustrates the relationship between the political leaning of coordinated users and their neighbors. The distributions for the LAB and TVT clusters are mostly centered around a singular peak; this is especially evident in the latter, where users predominantly employ non-polarized hashtags and thus form a distinct peak around zero. On the other hand, the distribution of the CON cluster is characterized by two separate peaks, one close to 0.5 – similarly to the LAB cluster, although with opposite alignment – and the other close to zero. This result suggests that the CON cluster might effectively house at least two sub-communities, as denoted by the two observed peaks. The peak around 0.5 may be comprised of coordinated users sharing tweets with a distinct political connotation, which is determined by hashtags often co-occurring with the conservative hashtags of polarity (+1) used for data collection (Table 1). On the other hand, the coordinated users distributed around zero may still be sharing tweets with a clear conservative perspective, however, their focus might be on topics characterized by hashtags that are not tightly linked to our predefined set of conservative hashtags. This observed within-cluster bi-modality is further strengthened by our previous analysis on the relationship between polarity and toxicity: the users in these potential sub-communities not only share tweets with different political content, as suggested by their hashtag usage but also with different linguistic content, as suggested by the toxicity they express. Specifically, users sharing more distinctly politically aligned tweets do so with seemingly non-toxic language. This result further highlights the nuanced behavior of coordinated users in regard to the topics they promote and how they promote them from a linguistic viewpoint.

3.2 Toxicity in coordinated and non-coordinated users

In our subsequent analysis, we sought to measure the difference in toxicity exhibited by coordinated and non-coordinated users, applying for both the “user toxicity” definition we presented in 3.1. For

what concerns this comparison, we only considered users with a minimum of 5 tweets or retweets, as including all users would generate a user toxicity distribution with a heavy positive skew for both groups, thus making the comparison less valuable for an assessment of the overall behavioral differences. Fig. 3(a) shows that the toxicity expressed by coordinated users remains relatively unchanged across different activity levels, suggesting that the more active coordinated users don't share content that is any more or less toxic. In contrast, increased activity in non-coordinated users appears to correlate with reduced toxic behavior.

Examining the user toxicity distributions for both user groups in Fig. 3(a) further highlights this difference: coordinated users display a distribution that is more sharply concentrated around its mean ($\bar{x} = 0.43, \hat{\sigma} = 0.12$), while non-coordinated users are characterized by larger fluctuations ($\bar{x} = 0.46, \hat{\sigma} = 0.17$). In addition, our results provide an indication that coordinated users manifest on average lower toxicity than their non-coordinated counterparts, which we have statistically validated ($p < 0.001$) by means of the Anderson Darling k -sample test with 10,000 simulations. We can quantify this discrepancy in average toxicity via bootstrap resampling to account for the inherent difference in sample size between the two groups. In Fig. 3(b), we report the distributions resulting from 50,000 bootstrap replicates, which confirm our previous observation that coordinated users are on average less toxic than the non-coordinated ones; for the former, we obtain $\hat{\mu} = 0.4269$ (95% CI: [0.4238, 0.4300]), while for the latter $\hat{\mu} = 0.46129$ (95% CI: [0.45947, 0.46308]). We argue that this result follows from the difference in tweeting activity of the two groups. In fact, we have defined coordinated users as a subset of the most prolific retweeters in the dataset, hence their activity being mostly characterized by sharing other accounts' content suggests that coordinated behaviors may favor promoting content that is less toxic than average. To assess whether this result effectively stems from the difference in tweeting patterns, we repeated the same analysis upon exclusion of retweets, thus solely focusing on original tweets: out of the 5450 coordinated users we initially identified, this filtering reduced the set of coordinated users to 4515. The densities obtained via bootstrap reported in Fig. 3(c) indicate that extensive retweeting activity does play a role, and also elicit an interesting observation: both coordinated and non-coordinated users tend to post original content with a higher toxicity level compared to that they disseminate through retweets. In fact, we measure $\hat{\mu} = 0.5161$ (95% CI: [0.5040, 0.5281]) for coordinated users, and $\hat{\mu} = 0.4821$ (95% CI: [0.4759, 0.4883]) for the non-coordinated. In addition, our analysis highlights that coordinated users produce original tweets that are distinctly more toxic than those they spread via retweeting, whereas non-coordinated users tend to produce and retweet content of similar toxicity. Indeed, unlike our previous analysis that included retweets, the average toxicity of the coordinated users is now higher than that estimated for the non-coordinated. This suggests that coordinated behaviors aiming to maximize exposure might be strategically orchestrated to disseminate toxic content while remaining wary of triggering platform moderation mechanisms.

3.3 Influence of coordination on toxicity

We further examine whether coordinated activity directly affects the toxic behaviors of non-coordinated users. To achieve this, we classify the tweets each non-coordinated user has been involved in into two main categories: 'productions' (i.e., the original tweets the user has written) and 'interactions' (i.e., the tweets the user has retweeted or replied to). This classification allows us to encode user activity within the context of the electoral debate as a sequence of productions and interactions, which we can study from a toxicity viewpoint. As we aim to investigate whether interacting with toxic content influences the toxicity of the following productions, for each user we discard the first sequence of tweets if they are original productions and the last sequence if they are interactions. In addition, to assess the role of CB, we only focus on sequences of interactions that involve only coordinated or non-coordinated users. Finally, we assign to each sequence of productions a toxicity score equal to the average toxicity of its tweets. In Fig. 4(a), we report the density of the average toxicity produced by non-coordinated users, obtained via bootstrap resampling, upon interacting with both groups of users. The resulting estimates suggest that non-coordinated users who have exclusively interacted with coordinated behavior tend to manifest slightly higher toxicity levels than those who haven't at all; we obtain $\hat{\mu} = 0.20274$ (95% CI: [0.20124, 0.20425]) for the former, and $\hat{\mu} = 0.18918$ (95% CI: [0.18794, 0.19042]) for the latter.

Fig. 4(b) displays how factoring in the toxicity of the content a user has interacted with affects the previous outcome. In this analysis, we consider a sequence of interactions to be 'toxic' if all the tweets that constitute it have a toxicity score above 0.6; this is the threshold suggested by PerspectiveAPI to classify a tweet as toxic, as it indicates with reasonable confidence that more than half the readers would classify that message as such. In contrast, a sequence is considered 'non-toxic' if all of its tweets have a toxicity score below 0.6. Finally, we discard all sequences




Figure 4: Average toxicity of tweets produced by non-coordinated users, obtained with bootstrap resampling. (a) Distributions of the average toxicity produced following exclusive interactions with non-coordinated users or coordinated users; (b) estimates with their 95% CI obtained by factoring in the toxicity of the interactions, using a score of 0.6 as the threshold to label a tweet as ‘toxic’, and their political leaning.




Figure 5: Hourly average toxicity of the tweets produced by non-coordinated users compared with that of the tweets by coordinated users they have interacted with, overlaid with LOESS curves (the shaded regions indicate their respective 95% CI) for easier visualization. The size and visibility of a point are proportional to the number of tweets observed within the corresponding hour. On the right side, empirical distributions of the two metrics across the entire time period.

with a mix of toxic and non-toxic tweets. Our results indicate that the level of toxicity a user expresses upon interacting with toxic content doesn’t significantly change when the author of that content is a coordinated user (the two samples originate from the same population with $p = 0.093$, Anderson Darling k -sample test). In fact, the two bootstrap estimates overlap: $\hat{\mu} = 0.2374$ (95% CI: [0.2293, 0.2455]) following interactions with coordinated users, and $\hat{\mu} = 0.2486$ (95% CI: [0.2409, 0.2561]) with non-coordinated users. We measure on the other hand a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.001$) in the case of interactions with non-toxic tweets, however, the increase is only minimal: $\hat{\mu} = 0.20127$ (95% CI: [0.19970, 0.20279]) following interactions with coordinated users, and $\hat{\mu} = 0.18694$ (95% CI: [0.18570, 0.18819]) with non-coordinated users. This suggests that the observed increase in produced toxicity should likely be attributed to the nature

of the tweets shared by coordinated users. In fact, as coordinated efforts are typically orchestrated to disseminate and boost specific agendas, the tweets they spread might be more polarizing or controversial in character rather than inherently toxic. To investigate this further, we consider the political alignment of the content a user has interacted with and compare it to the user’s own alignment: if the average leaning of the interactions has an opposite sign to that of the user, we consider that sequence of interactions to have ‘opposite leaning’, otherwise ‘same leaning’. To avoid ties, we exclude from this analysis all users with a political leaning score equal to 0. Surprisingly, Fig. 4(b) shows that users interacting with content of opposite political alignment exhibit only marginally higher toxicity levels than those interacting with politically aligned content. In addition, these findings point towards coordinated behavior having only a minor role in affecting the toxicity of tweets produced by non-coordinated users: both the toxicity level and the political content of the tweets being shared seemingly have a larger impact than the coordination degree of its author. In fact, our measurements suggest that the ‘volume’ of tweets, which is characteristic of coordinated behaviors, has a less pronounced effect on the toxic behavior of non-coordinated users than the political message they convey and how they convey it from a toxicity viewpoint.

An alternative approach we can employ to explore how CB might potentially influence toxic production is to study the phenomenon from a strictly temporal perspective. In this regard, we construct two-time series spanning the entire time frame of our data: one is built by sequencing the hourly average toxicity of original tweets produced by non-coordinated users, while the other by averaging the toxicity of the tweets they have interacted with that have been shared by coordinated users. Fig. 5 shows that while the former appears stable and concentrated around a small range of values, the latter is characterized by evident oscillations. This hints at coordinated users adopting a noticeably more toxic and non-stationary tone in the context of specific events in the campaign (such as TV debates between political leaders) and less toxic in others. As we have suggested in 3.2, a possible explanation for this behavior might reside in CB being specifically employed to inject inflammatory content or trigger toxic responses while simultaneously avoiding the platform moderation mechanism.

Additionally, from Fig. 5 we can observe that the two-time series nearly mirror each other in proximity to election day, which might serve as compelling evidence of one influencing the other. To verify this, we can quantitatively measure the information flow between the two by applying the transfer entropy method [39], which is based on the concept of entropy. Unlike other methods such as Granger causality [40], transfer entropy can capture not only non-linear dependencies between two time series but also the dominant direction of the flow, by estimating the net gain in information about the future observations of one derived from the past observations of the other. As entropy requires discrete data, we discretize the average toxicity scores of the two-time series and assign them to 4 bins with bounds equal to the quantiles at $\mathbf{p} = (0.05, 0.5, 0.95)$ of their respective empirical distributions. The selection of these quantiles is made to emphasize the tails of the distributions, as they include the least and most toxic observations; to this end, we compute the Rényi transfer entropy with a weighting parameter of $q = 0.5$, which puts more weights on the tails when calculating transfer entropy [41]. Our findings indicate that the toxicity shared via CB affects the toxic tendencies of non-coordinated users and that the information flow from the former to the latter is statistically relevant ($p = 0.034$), as tested using the method proposed by Dimpfl and Peter (2013) [42] and implemented by Behrendt *et al.* (2019) [41], whereas that in the opposite direction is not ($p = 0.78$). This is an additional indication of CB’s role, suggesting that even passive interactions with coordinated activities can significantly shape the toxicity levels expressed by non-coordinated users.

Our findings expose a marginal yet measurable shift in the production of toxic content when non-coordinated users engage with CB. However, this increase is likely attributed to the nature of the content being shared, suggesting that the ‘character’ of the message might be more influential than the extent of coordination of the efforts that channeled it. Additionally, our results are somewhat counterintuitive concerning the current assumption regarding political polarization.

4 Conclusions

In the context of the 2019 UK General Elections, we systematically analyze the interplay between Coordinated Behavior (CB) and content toxicity on Twitter. Drawing from a dataset of 11 million tweets from 1 million unique users, we aim to better understand the subtleties of this relationship on a significant digital communication platform. Our findings underscore that users with higher coordination scores predominantly circulate content with diminished toxicity levels. This trend is pronounced in politically-affiliated clusters, indicating that coordination, while strategic, does

not necessarily result in promoting harmful content. The primary aim of these coordinated users is amplification and influence rather than explicit toxicity dissemination. Clear patterns emerge when analyzing coordinated versus non-coordinated users: both groups exhibit comparable average toxicity levels. However, coordinated users maintain consistent toxicity levels regardless of their activity volume. Conversely, increased activity among non-coordinated users typically aligns with decreased toxic behavior, suggesting a more intentional toxicity regulation by coordinated entities.

In examining the non-coordinated user group, we find that exposure to CB subtly heightens their toxic behavior. Notably, this rise is not solely driven by the volume of toxic exposure but is significantly influenced by the character of the content. Political alignment, while a factor in toxicity, does not show a direct linear relation with toxicity intensity. From a temporal perspective, using Renyi entropy reveals the immediacy of CB’s impact on non-coordinated user toxicity. A discernible flow from exposure to production suggests CB’s subtle influence in shaping regular user behaviors.

In conclusion, our study highlights the nuanced manner in which CB functions online. While coordination does not directly spread toxicity, its influence on user behaviors is evident. The interplay between content nature and its dissemination strategy is crucial. Future research should investigate the motivations behind coordinated activities, the socio-political environments nurturing them, and their broader effects on digital conversations.

Tables

Table 1: Data collected via hashtags [20]. Neutral (N) hashtags have been assigned a political leaning score of 0, whereas hashtags linked to the Labour (L) and Conservative (C) parties have been assigned a score of -1 and $+1$, respectively.

Hashtag	Leaning	Users	Tweets
#GE2019	N (0)	436,356	2,640,966
#GeneralElection19	N (0)	104,616	274,095
#GeneralElection2019	N (0)	240,712	783,805
#VoteLabour	L (-1)	201,774	917,936
#VoteLabour2019	L (-1)	55,703	265,899
#ForTheMany	L (-1)	17,859	35,621
#ForTheManyNotTheFew	L (-1)	22,966	40,116
#ChangeIsComing	L (-1)	8,170	13,381
#RealChange	L (-1)	78,285	274,254
#VoteConservative	C ($+1$)	52,642	238,647
#VoteConservative2019	C ($+1$)	13,513	34,195
#BackBoris	C ($+1$)	36,725	157,434
#GetBrexitDone	C ($+1$)	46,429	168,911
Total		668,312	4,983,499

Table 2: Data collected via accounts [20]. The two accounts linked to the Labour party (L) have been assigned a political leaning score of -1 , whereas the two linked to the Conservative party (C) a score of $+1$.

Account	Production		Interactions	
	Leaning	Tweets	Retweets	Replies
@jeremycorbyn	L (-1)	788	1,759,823	414,158
@UKLabour	L (-1)	1,002	325,219	79,932
@BorisJohnson	C ($+1$)	454	284,544	382,237
@Conservatives	C ($+1$)	1,398	151,913	169,736
Total		3,642	2,521,499	1,046,063

References

- [1] Carlo M Valensise, Matteo Cinelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. The drivers of online polarization: Fitting models to data. *Information Sciences*, 642:119152, 2023.
- [2] Michela Del Vicario, Gianna Vivaldo, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. Echo chambers: Emotional contagion and group polarization on facebook. *Scientific reports*, 6(1):37825, 2016.
- [3] Ferenc Huszár, Sofia Ira Ktena, Conor O’Brien, Luca Belli, Andrew Schlaikjer, and Moritz Hardt. Algorithmic amplification of politics on twitter. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(1):e2025334119, 2022.
- [4] S. González-Bailón, D. Lazer, P. Barberá, and et al. Asymmetric ideological segregation in exposure to political news on facebook. *Science*, 381(6656):392–398, 2023.
- [5] A.M. Guess, N. Malhotra, J. Pan, and et al. How do social media feed algorithms affect attitudes and behavior in an election campaign? *Science*, 381(6656):398–404, 2023.
- [6] A.M. Guess, N. Malhotra, J. Pan, and et al. Reshares on social media amplify political news but do not detectably affect beliefs or opinions. *Science*, 381(6656):404–408, 2023.
- [7] Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Fabio Petroni, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the national academy of Sciences*, 113(3):554–559, 2016.
- [8] David MJ Lazer, Matthew A Baum, Yochai Benkler, Adam J Berinsky, Kelly M Greenhill, Filippo Menczer, Miriam J Metzger, Brendan Nyhan, Gordon Pennycook, David Rothschild, et al. The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380):1094–1096, 2018.
- [9] Alexandre Bovet and Hernán A Makse. Influence of fake news in twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Nature communications*, 10(1):7, 2019.
- [10] Jonas L Juul and Johan Ugander. Comparing information diffusion mechanisms by matching on cascade size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(46):e2100786118, 2021.
- [11] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Nikhil Jindal, and Emilio Ferrara. Propaganda and misinformation on facebook and twitter during the russian invasion of ukraine. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Web Science Conference 2023*, pages 65–74, 2023.
- [12] R. Kelly Garrett. Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective exposure among internet news users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(2):265–285, 2009.
- [13] Christopher A Bail, Lisa P Argyle, Taylor W Brown, John P Bumpus, Haohan Chen, MB Fallin Hunzaker, Jaemin Lee, Marcus Mann, Friedolin Merhout, and Alexander Volfovsky. Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37):9216–9221, 2018.
- [14] Joshua A Tucker, Andrew Guess, Pablo Barberá, Cristian Vaccari, Alexandra Siegel, Sergey Sanovich, Denis Stukal, and Brendan Nyhan. Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political polarization, and political disinformation: a review of the scientific literature (March 19, 2018)*, 2018.
- [15] Matteo Cinelli, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Michele Starnini. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9):e2023301118, 2021.
- [16] Max Falkenberg, Alessandro Galeazzi, Maddalena Torricelli, Niccolò Di Marco, Francesca Larosa, Madalina Sas, Amin Mekacher, Warren Pearce, Fabiana Zollo, Walter Quattrociocchi, et al. Growing polarization around climate change on social media. *Nature Climate Change*, pages 1–8, 2022.
- [17] Justin Cheng, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Jure Leskovec. Antisocial behavior in online discussion communities. In *Proceedings of the international aaai conference on web and social media*, volume 9, pages 61–70, 2015.

- [18] Matteo Cinelli, Andraž Pelicon, Igor Mozetič, Walter Quattrociocchi, Petra Kralj Novak, and Fabiana Zollo. Dynamics of online hate and misinformation. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):22083, 2021.
- [19] Yonatan Lupu, Richard Sear, Nicolas Velásquez, Rhys Leahy, Nicholas Johnson Restrepo, Beth Goldberg, and Neil F. Johnson. Offline events and online hate. *PLOS ONE*, 18(1):1–14, 2023.
- [20] Leonardo Nizzoli, Serena Tardelli, Marco Avvenuti, Stefano Cresci, and Maurizio Tesconi. Coordinated behavior on social media in 2019 uk general election. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 15, pages 443–454, 2021.
- [21] Kate Starbird. Disinformation’s spread: bots, trolls and all of us. *Nature*, 571(7766):449–450, 2019.
- [22] Luis Vargas, Patrick Emami, and Patrick Traynor. On the detection of disinformation campaign activity with network analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Cloud Computing Security Workshop, CCSW’20*, page 133–146, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [23] Kai Shu, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. Mining disinformation and fake news: Concepts, methods, and recent advancements. In *Disinformation, misinformation, and fake news in social media*. Springer, 2020.
- [24] Franziska B. Keller, David Schoch, Sebastian Stier, and JungHwan Yang. Political astroturfing on twitter: How to coordinate a disinformation campaign. *Political Communication*, 37(2):256–280, 2020.
- [25] Diogo Pacheco, Pik-Mai Hui, Christopher Torres-Lugo, Bao Tran Truong, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Uncovering coordinated networks on social media: methods and case studies. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 15, pages 455–466, 2021.
- [26] Matteo Cinelli, Stefano Cresci, Walter Quattrociocchi, Maurizio Tesconi, and Paola Zola. Coordinated inauthentic behavior and information spreading on twitter. *Decision Support Systems*, 160:113819, 2022.
- [27] David Schoch, Franziska B Keller, Sebastian Stier, and JungHwan Yang. Coordination patterns reveal online political astroturfing across the world. *Scientific reports*, 12(1):4572, 2022.
- [28] Kai Shu, Limeng Cui, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. Defend: Explainable fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD ’19*, page 395–405, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [29] Somya Ranjan Sahoo and B.B. Gupta. Multiple features based approach for automatic fake news detection on social networks using deep learning. *Applied Soft Computing*, 100:106983, 2021.
- [30] Fabio Del Vigna, Andrea Cimino, Felice Dell’Orletta, Marinella Petrocchi, and Maurizio Tesconi. Hate me, hate me not: Hate speech detection on facebook. In *Italian Conference on Cybersecurity*, 2017.
- [31] Google Jigsaw. Perspective api, 2022.
- [32] M. Ángeles Serrano, Marián Boguñá, and Alessandro Vespignani. Extracting the multiscale backbone of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(16):6483–6488, 2009.
- [33] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.
- [34] Juan Martinez-Romo, Lourdes Araujo, Javier Borge-Holthoefer, Alex Arenas, José A Capitán, and José A Cuesta. Disentangling categorical relationships through a graph of co-occurrences. *Physical Review E*, 84(4):046108, 2011.

- [35] Alexandre Bove, Flaviano Morone, and Hernán A Makse. Validation of twitter opinion trends with national polling aggregates: Hillary clinton vs donald trump. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):8673, 2018.
- [36] Justin Cheng, Michael Bernstein, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Jure Leskovec. Anyone can become a troll: Causes of trolling behavior in online discussions. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work and social computing*, pages 1217–1230, 2017.
- [37] Mark EJ Newman. Mixing patterns in networks. *Physical review E*, 67(2):026126, 2003.
- [38] Aris Anagnostopoulos, Ravi Kumar, and Mohammad Mahdian. Influence and correlation in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '08, pages 7–15, New York, NY, USA, August 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [39] Thomas Schreiber. Measuring Information Transfer. *Physical Review Letters*, 85(2):461–464, July 2000.
- [40] C. W. J. Granger. Investigating Causal Relations by Econometric Models and Cross-spectral Methods. *Econometrica*, 37(3):424–438, 1969.
- [41] Simon Behrendt, Thomas Dimpfl, Franziska J. Peter, and David J. Zimmermann. RTransfer-Entropy — Quantifying information flow between different time series using effective transfer entropy. *SoftwareX*, 10:100265, July 2019.
- [42] Thomas Dimpfl and Franziska Julia Peter. Using transfer entropy to measure information flows between financial markets. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics*, 17(1), January 2013.