

FediverseSharing: A Novel Dataset on Cross-Platform Interaction Dynamics between Threads and Mastodon Users

Ujun Jeong
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
ujeong1@asu.edu

Alimohammad Beigi
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
abeigi@asu.edu

Anique Tahir
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
artahir@asu.edu

Susan Xu Tang
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
Susan.Tang@asu.edu

H. Russell Bernard
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
asuruss@asu.edu

Huan Liu
Arizona State University
Tempe, USA
huanliu@asu.edu

Abstract

Traditional social media platforms, once envisioned as digital town squares, face growing criticism over corporate control, content moderation, and privacy concerns. Events such as Twitter’s acquisition (now X) and major policy changes have driven users toward alternative platforms like Mastodon and Threads. However, this diversification has led to user dispersion and fragmented discussions across isolated social media platforms.

To address these issues, federation protocols like ActivityPub have been adopted, with Mastodon leading efforts to build decentralized yet interconnected networks. In March 2024, Threads joined this federation by introducing its Fediverse Sharing service, which enables interactions such as posts, replies, and likes between Threads and Mastodon users as if on a unified platform.

Building on this development, we introduce FediverseSharing, the first dataset capturing interactions between 20,000+ Threads users and 20,000+ Mastodon users over a ten-month period. This dataset serves as a foundation for studying cross-platform interactions and the impact of federation as two separate platforms integrate. The data and code will be available upon acceptance.

Keywords

Platform Integration, Community Interaction, Mastodon, Threads

ACM Reference Format:

Ujun Jeong, Alimohammad Beigi, Anique Tahir, Susan Xu Tang, H. Russell Bernard, and Huan Liu. 2025. FediverseSharing: A Novel Dataset on Cross-Platform Interaction Dynamics between Threads and Mastodon Users. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference’17, Washington, DC, USA

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YYYY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>




Figure 1: Federation for cross-platform interactions enabled by the ActivityPub protocol¹. On the left, Mastodon users from two servers; on the right, Threads users, can post, reply, and like. These actions are synchronized across platforms by replicating data across their databases. In other cases, when multiple users from each platform like the same post, their actions are also shared across Threads and Mastodon.

1 Introduction

Growing frustrations with traditional social media platforms—rooted in concerns over content moderation, privacy measures, and corporate influence—have led many users to seek alternative spaces for online interaction [10]. This discontent became particularly evident following Twitter’s acquisition on October 27, 2022, which triggered a mass exodus of users exploring alternatives [5, 12, 17]. As a result, the social media landscape has become increasingly divided between centralized and decentralized platforms, each offering distinct features and user bases.

Several prominent alternatives emerged in the wake of this shift [16]. *Threads*, a centralized platform created by Meta, operates under corporate control and algorithmic content recommendation, amassing over 130 million users. In contrast, *Mastodon* is a non-profit, open-source project with a decentralized network of independent instances, allowing users greater control over moderation and data, and has over 10 million users.

¹Technical details are available at <https://www.w3.org/TR/activitypub/>, with the basic mechanism of federation covered in the preliminaries section of this paper.

However, this growing diversification has also introduced challenges, particularly in isolating discussions, trends, and content within separate platforms [2, 8]. The limited communication between platforms restricts information flow, while user migration splits communities, making it harder to stay engaged and connected to their original networks [20, 21, 26]. As a result, users had to either maintain multiple accounts across different platforms or risk missing out on relevant discussions outside their chosen platform.

Fortunately, federation-based protocols like *ActivityPub* have emerged as a solution to the growing fragmentation of social media platforms [33]. By connecting independent networks through standardized mechanisms, ActivityPub allows users to interact across different instances. Mastodon is an early adopter of ActivityPub, using it to synchronize posts, replies, and likes within its federated network. A major milestone was later reached on March 17, 2024, when Threads adopted ActivityPub through its Fediverse Sharing feature, enabling direct interaction between Threads and Mastodon users. Figure 1 illustrates how ActivityPub facilitates these cross-platform interactions by synchronizing actions and replicating data across respective platform databases [29].

In this paper, we present *FediverseSharing*, the first large-scale dataset capturing cross-platform interactions between Threads and Mastodon users. Collected through Mastodon’s public API, the dataset includes profiles and behaviors of 20,000+ Threads users who opted into FediverseSharing and 20,000+ Mastodon users who interacted with them. Spanning ten months post-launch, it documents posts, replies, and likes shared across the platforms. By examining these interactions, we provide insights into how federation-driven platform integration impacts user engagement, content creation, and intergroup dynamics within a federated network.

Our key contributions are as follows:

- **First Cross-platform Interaction Dataset:** We propose a unique way to collect data for user interactions between Threads and Mastodon, including posts, replies, and likes.
- **Impact of Federation-driven Platform Integration:** Our longitudinal data provides an analysis of users’ behavioral shifts before and after the introduction of Fediverse Sharing.
- **Insights into Federated Social Network:** We analyze different instances within a federated network, highlighting key factors associated with federation and user interactions.

2 Related Work

We review two key aspects of this dataset project in the context of social media: (1) platform interactions and (2) community interactions, discussing their implications for cross-platform interaction.

2.1 Platform Integration

Platform integration is a strategic business decision, often structured as a two-sided market, where platforms act as intermediaries connecting user groups with complementary needs [9, 27, 30]. This model facilitates interactions between distinct user segments, driving engagement and market expansion. By linking services, integrations enhance accessibility and create new revenue streams. For example, Google’s integration of YouTube with Search refines content recommendations, reinforcing creator-audience relationships while increasing ad revenue [14, 24].

Social media platforms have historically emphasized content visibility over direct cross-platform engagement. Facebook’s early integrations with TripAdvisor and Yelp enabled content sharing through Facebook but did not support interaction between users across different services [4, 14]. Similarly, Facebook and Instagram facilitate content distribution while maintaining distinct user bases, leveraging network effects to increase audience reach [1].

Recently, open-source platforms like Mastodon and Bluesky have promoted federation-driven social media, shifting control away from corporate-owned platforms [15, 20]. Protocols like ActivityPub and AT Protocol foster interoperability, allowing different platforms to communicate. However, these integrations raise new challenges regarding governance, content moderation, and the long-term sustainability of federated social networks [32].

2.2 Community Interaction

Community dynamics play a fundamental role in shaping human behavior, as individuals’ actions are influenced by their group identity, perceptions of outsiders, and the stability of their communities [29]. Offline research, such as studies on ethnogenesis, examines how intergroup interactions contribute to the formation of new collective identities [23]. When cultures clash between communities, individuals actively share and signal aspects of their identity to build trust within their group, reinforcing social cohesion while delineating boundaries with outsiders [3].

Similarly, online communities function as digital tribes, where trust is built through the exchange and reinforcement of community norms [7, 25]. Platforms like Reddit illustrate how engagement in toxic or partisan subreddits can spread hostility, influencing the behavior of adjacent communities [19, 28]. Research on political polarization suggests that exposure to diverse perspectives, including out-group perspectives, can reduce animosity and affective polarization, fostering better understanding of opposing groups [6]. While such exposure may lower outgroup animosity, it is often shown to be insufficient to alter polarization.

Federated social networks offer a new model of community interaction, distinguished by decentralized governance and inconsistent moderation. Unlike corporate platforms with standardized policies, federated networks rely on community-driven oversight, leading to variations in content regulation and trust-building [30]. While this grants users more autonomy, it also raises concerns about stability, harmful content, and ideological fragmentation. Without centralized enforcement, it remains uncertain whether these platforms will foster healthier discourse or deepen divisions.

2.3 Implications of Our Study

We distinguish our study as the first to analyze cross-platform interactions at the platform level within a federated social media ecosystem. Our FediverseSharing dataset offers key insights into the relationship between platform integration and user behavior. We examine the first integration between these structurally distinct platforms, highlighting how federation reshapes online interactions. As large-scale social media research faces growing challenges from fragmentation, restricted access, and diverse governance structures [22], our dataset serves as a crucial resource for understanding the new social media landscape.

3 Preliminaries

Understanding the Fediverse Sharing feature requires familiarity with key concepts, including ActivityPub, Federation, Fediverse, and specific social media platforms such as Mastodon and Threads.

3.1 ActivityPub

ActivityPub is a decentralized social networking protocol that enables seamless interaction across compatible services. It establishes a structured framework for sharing posts, replies, likes, and follows between interconnected systems. Each user on an ActivityPub-compliant service is represented as an actor, capable of sending and receiving interactions within the network. The protocol standardizes the distribution of status—any user-generated message, either in the form of a post or a reply. By ensuring a uniform way to handle these interactions, ActivityPub enables seamless interoperability between diverse services within the Fediverse.

3.2 Federated Social Network (Fediverse)

The Fediverse is a decentralized network of interconnected social media instances that operate using open protocols such as ActivityPub. Unlike centralized social networks, where a single entity controls user data and interactions, the Fediverse is composed of independently hosted instances (i.e., servers) that form a decentralized ecosystem. These instances interconnect while ensuring user autonomy and data ownership, fostering a more private, user-controlled, and community-driven online environment [17].

Figure 2 illustrates how federation works, using the example of Mastodon instances connecting with Threads and other Mastodon servers. When platforms implement ActivityPub, they automatically establish connections between instances. This structure allows users to interact with both local members and those on other recognized federated instances. Additionally, users or instance administrators can manually block communication with specific instances or users if they choose to de-federate.

3.3 Mastodon and Threads

The Fediverse comprises a diverse range of services, including microblogging, photo sharing, and more. Among them, Mastodon remains the largest, representing 58.5% of ActivityPub-based instances². It functions as a decentralized microblogging platform akin to Twitter but operates across independently managed instances. Each instance has its own administrator, policies, and community guidelines while still enabling users to follow and engage with others across different instances through ActivityPub. Threads, a text-based social media platform launched by Meta on July 5, 2023, as a competitor to Twitter/X, has recently integrated with the Fediverse. On March 17, 2024, Meta introduced Fediverse Sharing, enabling Threads to federate with Mastodon. This platform integration comes with certain options for cross-platform interactions, which will be discussed in the following section.

3.4 Interactions Between Threads and Mastodon

Currently, Fediverse Sharing supports cross-platform interactions in three different ways:

²<https://fedib.org/>




Figure 2: Three key scenarios illustrating how federation is established between ActivityPub-based instances. Federation occurs when a user in a source instance becomes aware of a target instance through one of the following actions: (1) direct search, (2) following a user, or (3) interacting with a post (e.g., liking or replying). Each of these scenarios independently triggers message exchanges between instances.

- **Status (Post and Reply):** Users on both platforms are allowed to create and share posts and replies. Mastodon users can also reply to posts generated by Threads users.
- **Like:** Users on both platforms can like each other’s posts and replies. Users are notified when their content is liked and who likes it across the platforms.
- **Follow:** Threads users can follow Mastodon accounts, and Mastodon users can follow Threads accounts, expanding content visibility across platforms.

Since the launch of Fediverse Sharing on March 17, 2024, Threads has enhanced its interoperability with Mastodon. However, certain limitations persist. For instance, Threads users cannot reply to replies from Mastodon users, restricting the flow of sequential interactions between the two platforms. Additionally, due to privacy concerns, Threads’ social graph—which displays followers and followees—remains inaccessible to Mastodon users.

4 Data Collection

The official Threads API³ does not currently support profile searches⁴ or any read permissions. This limitation restricts the collection of any users directly on Threads. To address this, we leveraged Mastodon’s official API⁵, which provides access to Threads users who voluntarily enabled *Fediverse Sharing*, which makes their profiles and status publicly accessible on Mastodon.

However, Mastodon’s API imposes a 10,000-account limit on profile searches, limiting a scalable data collection strategy. To overcome this, we introduce **Interaction-Driven Snowball Sampling (IDSS)**, as shown in Figure 3, which consists of three key stages:

³<https://developers.facebook.com/docs/threads/>

⁴Profile search differs from a keyword search in the Threads API, which only allows retrieving a user’s posts containing a specific keyword and requires user approval via the Meta Developer App.

⁵<https://docs.joinmastodon.org/api/>




Figure 3: Data collection process with Interaction Driven Snowball Sampling (IDSS), where new Threads users are discovered through their replies to the posts of initial seed users.

- (1) **Seed User Collection:** Identify a set of Threads accounts with Fediverse Sharing through our Mastodon instance.
- (2) **User Interaction Collection:** Retrieve posts of Threads users and repliers on those posts by Mastodon’s API.
- (3) **Snowball Sampling through User Interaction:** Expand the seed user set by collecting additional Threads users who have replied on posts, then repeat the process from Stage 1.

4.1 Seed User Collection

Seed user collection is flexible and up to the study’s design choice, even possible through a manual sampling from Threads. In our case, we automated this process by maximizing the Mastodon API’s capabilities within the platform’s constraints. Specifically, we searched for profiles containing @threads.net on mastodon.social, one of the largest and most widely federated Mastodon instances, founded by Eugen Rochko. This method yielded 9,635 publicly accessible Threads user profiles after removing false positives where the keyword appeared outside the account handle.

4.2 User Interaction Collection

We selected mastodon.social as the primary query endpoint of the Mastodon API to collect user statuses, including posts and replies, due to its extensive federation with other Mastodon instances. This broad connectivity provides access to a diverse range of users across the Fediverse, including not only Threads users but also those from various Mastodon instances federated with mastodon.social. Using this endpoint, we first retrieved the complete set of posts from Threads users available on Mastodon, along with all replies associated with those posts. Note that Threads users’ posts are accessible on Mastodon only after they enable Fediverse Sharing, and only posts made afterward will be available.

4.3 Snowball Sampling through User Interaction

Since Mastodon’s API does not provide direct access to the social graph of Threads users, we expanded our dataset using an interaction-driven approach. Specifically, we identified Threads users by filtering accounts with handles ending in @threads.net that had replied to seed users’ posts. These newly discovered Threads

users were then saved as additional seed users through an iterative process inspired by snowball sampling.

4.4 Data Validation and Privacy Measures

As of January 17, 2025, we identified 79.1% (20,456 out of 25,873) of all Threads accounts on mastodon.social, verified with the instance administrator. We confirmed these users’ activity in the Fediverse using WebFinger⁶, a protocol for decentralized account discovery that retrieves user metadata from their domain.

The data collection also left us with data on 20,231 Mastodon users across 1,417 instances who interacted with these Threads users. To protect user privacy, user-specific attributes, status content, and metadata will not be shared directly; instead, Mastodon API scripts with status IDs will be provided.

5 Novel Study on Cross-platform Interaction

This is the first study on cross-platform interaction. For simplicity of our study, we denote \mathcal{U}_T as the set of collected Threads users who enabled Fediverse Sharing and \mathcal{U}_M as those Mastodon users who interacted with \mathcal{U}_T by replying on their posts.

5.1 Characteristics of Users on Each Platform

5.1.1 Joining Fediverse. We analyzed peak trends in joining dates to understand user motivations in adopting federated networks. Figure 5 shows that Threads users had two peaks: the launch of FediverseSharing Beta (March 17, 2024) and cross-platform interactions (July 5, 2024). In contrast, Mastodon users spiked on October 27, 2022, aligning with Twitter’s leadership change. This suggests Threads users joined due to platform features, while Mastodon users migrated in response to external disruptions [5, 12, 17].

5.1.2 Numerical Profile Attributes. We analyzed numerical attributes in user profiles to understand key differences in users’ characteristics between Threads and Mastodon. Figure 4 visualizes these variations, revealing the distinct characteristics of each platform. Key observations include:

- **#Followers:** Both platforms exhibit similar follower distributions, though Threads has a higher median and a wider spread, with more extreme values.
- **#Following:** The distribution of followings is similar across both platforms, although Mastodon shows a marginally higher median and a broader range of extreme values.
- **#Status:** The number of statuses follows a comparable distribution on both platforms. However, Mastodon has a higher median and a broader spread of extreme values.

Given the absence of algorithmic recommendations, Mastodon users must actively expand their social connections and post more frequently to maintain engagement. This differs from Threads, where follower counting plays a more central role, aligning with the findings on common social media’s focus on audience reach [16, 17].

5.1.3 Language Diversity. The primary audience and country of each platform may vary, and language serves as a key indicator of the diversity of the user base. To assess this, we employed LangID, a language detection model by Meta with 99.6% accuracy on standard

⁶<https://github.com/heliomass/Threads-Federation-Tracker>




Figure 4: Violin plots comparing three numerical attributes of user profiles in log-scaled values for Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M) and Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T). The width of each plot indicates the density of values, central tendency, and potential outliers. Each pair of distributions are statistically different based on the KS-test with a significance of $p < 0.05$.




Figure 5: Joining dates of users on Mastodon since 2022. Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T) joined Mastodon by activating Fediverse Sharing, while Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M) joined by registration.




Figure 6: Distribution of languages in user biographies, sorted from most to least frequent. The remaining languages are grouped under the category “Others” for simplicity.

datasets [18]. We detected users’ primary language based on their biographies. The result revealed that over 90% of \mathcal{U}_M prefer English, while only 75% of \mathcal{U}_T do. This suggests that Threads users exhibit greater linguistic diversity within the federated network.

Summary 1 (User Profile Analysis)

Users joined platforms for different reasons—Mastodon users, many migrating from Twitter, focused on status count and network curation, while Threads users prioritized new features and follower count. Mastodon is more English-centric, while Threads supports wider languages.

5.2 How Do Users Interact Across Platforms?

5.2.1 Daily Status Trend. Figure 7 illustrates the daily volume of statuses from Threads and Mastodon users, along with statuses mentioning platform-related keywords. After the beta release of Fediverse Sharing, we observed a gradual upward trend in status activity, which peaked following the second update on July 5th. This update introduced enhanced features such as users in Threads can like and reply to statuses in Mastodon.

To assess how much attention each platform received, we analyzed how users mentioned them in their statuses. Mentions of the other platform were minimal, while users predominantly referenced their own. This self-referencing pattern reflects identity-marking behaviors, where individuals emphasize their group affiliation. Ethnogenesis studies suggest this is a common phenomenon, as people tend to assert their identity explicitly to build trust during initial interactions with other groups [3].

5.2.2 Average Status Volume Shift. To account for potential shifts in the average number of statuses, we analyzed the status volume of \mathcal{U}_M following the Fediverse Sharing updates. To enable meaningful comparisons, we first normalized the status volume by considering the number of users eligible to create a status. Here, the average activity levels before and after the updates were adjusted based on the duration of each period. The normalization was defined:

$$\text{Normalized Status} = \frac{\#Status}{\#Joined\ Users \times Days\ in\ Period}$$

Subsequently, we conducted a T-test on two distribution pairs. As shown in Table 1, the increase in status was more pronounced than in replies, likely due to the limited implementation of sequential replying. Nevertheless, both the average of posts and replies demonstrated statistically significant increases ($p < 0.001$). This analysis focused on the status of \mathcal{U}_M , as historical data for \mathcal{U}_T is unavailable. Due to API limit in Mastodon, the status for Threads users is only accessible from the point they joined federated networks, preventing retrospective analysis of their prior activity.

5.2.3 Cross-platform Interaction Asymmetry. Figure 8 shows that cross-platform interactions between Threads and Mastodon follow a power-law distribution, dominated by a few interactions. The estimated power-law exponent is 1.24 for Mastodon-to-Threads and 1.39 for Threads-to-Mastodon, highlighting distinct engagement patterns. Mastodon-to-Threads interactions are more frequent, while Threads-to-Mastodon interactions are significantly lower, indicating asymmetry. The smaller α for Mastodon-to-Threads suggests concentrated engagement driven by a few highly active users.




Figure 7: Daily post volume trends for Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T) and Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M). The blue line represents the total number of posts, the orange line highlights posts mentioning threads.net, and the green line shows posts mentioning one of Mastodon instances, which comprises a total of 1,417 instance names (e.g., mastodon.social, mstdn.social, etc.)

Time Point	Status Type	Avg. Before	Avg. After	Change Rate	t -statistic	p -value
t_1 (Mar 13th, 2024)	Post	3.03	3.96	30.63%	-11.11	0.000***
	Reply	1.57	1.80	14.45%	-8.16	0.000***
t_2 (July 5th, 2024)	Post	3.17	4.35	37.22%	-24.80	0.000***
	Reply	1.60	1.89	18.12%	-15.33	0.000***

Table 1: Average status levels in \mathcal{U}_M before and after the introduction of Fediverse Sharing, measured at two distinct time points: t_1 (beta launch) and t_2 (post-update). The p -value is rounded to three digits, with significance indicated as $p^{***} < 0.001$.




Figure 8: Scatter plot of cross-platform interactions between Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T) and Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M) through reply or like. Both interactions follow a power-law distribution.




Figure 9: Average user toxicity scores between Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T) and Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M). A user's toxicity score is calculated as the average toxicity score across all their posts.

Summary 2 (Cross-platform Interaction Analysis)

The monthly average of status updates increased after the Fediverse Sharing updates, with a large number of statuses referencing the platform itself rather than the other. Cross-platform interaction is asymmetrical, with Mastodon users engaging more frequently than Threads users.

5.3 What Do Users Express through Contents?

5.3.1 Toxicity across User Generated Contents. Understanding how toxicity varies among users is important because exposure to different levels of toxicity can reveal group identify, platform moderation levels, and the overall quality of discourse. Encountering a broad spectrum of toxicity can present challenges for maintaining civil

discussions, while also offering valuable insights into how various online communities will respond to different groups with hostility.

Figure 9 shows the distribution of user-level toxicity scores, measured using the Perspective API⁷. This multilingual model assigns a toxicity score between 0 and 1, and we averaged the toxicity scores across users' status to determine their average toxicity level. Our analysis revealed differences in user-level toxicity across platforms. Mastodon exhibits higher toxicity levels than Threads, though both platforms have averages below 0.1 (very low toxicity). Mastodon has a wider range of toxicity scores, likely due to its decentralized structure, lack of central moderation, and fewer content restrictions. In contrast, Threads' centralized platform and active corporate moderation result in a more friendly user experience.

⁷<https://perspectiveapi.com>




Figure 10: Gini coefficients of topic distribution over time for status by Threads users (\mathcal{U}_T) and Mastodon users (\mathcal{U}_M).

5.3.2 Topic Diversity Trend. Figure 10 illustrates the evolution of topic diversity in historical status from \mathcal{U}_M and \mathcal{U}_T , quantified using the Gini coefficient:

$$\text{Gini Coefficient} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^2$$

where p_i represents the proportion of status in cluster i , and n is the total number of clusters.

We began by sampling 10K statuses per month to ensure balanced coverage across both platforms and reduce bias from unequal sample sizes. To identify topic clusters, we employed a transformer-based embedding paraphrase-multilingual-MiniLM-L12-v2. We then applied BERTopic [11], a DBSCAN-based algorithm that does not require a predefined number of clusters. After filtering out unassigned dummy clusters and those with 10 or fewer statuses, we calculated the Gini coefficient for each month.

Figure 10 shows that Mastodon’s topic distribution imbalance decreases over time, while Threads exhibits an increase. However, since all values remain below 0.43, both platforms still maintain relatively balanced topic distributions. This divergence in trends is worth further examination to better understand how federation relates to conversational dynamics across platforms.

5.3.3 Out-group Animosity across Platforms. We analyzed the distribution of status referencing toward Mastodon and Threads to assess user sentiment toward the opposing platform. Animosity toward an out-group—has been shown to reinforce polarization, potentially hindering the successful integration of these platforms.

To quantify sentiment toward each platform, we analyzed the text content of statuses $a \in \mathcal{A}$ using a fine-tuned Aspect-Based Sentiment Analysis model built on DeBERTa [13, 31]. This model classifies sentiment into three categories—*positive*, *neutral*, or *negative*—for two aspects: *Threads* and *Mastodon*.

We denote sentiment classification from the source to the target platform as $\text{cls}(a, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$, where \mathcal{S} is the source platform of the status and user, and \mathcal{T} is the target platform toward which the sentiment is expressed. Our analysis was performed at two levels:

- (1) **Status-level:** For each status $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we examined the distribution of sentiment labels $\text{cls}(a, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ to determine how users express sentiment toward the target platform.
- (2) **User-level:** For each user $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with their corresponding set of statuses \mathcal{A}_u , we computed the user’s overall sentiment

Source	Target	Level	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Mastodon	Threads	Status	7.66%	82.26%	10.07%
		User	8.93%	78.46%	12.61%
Threads	Mastodon	Status	22.12%	68.41%	9.47%
		User	27.36%	58.27%	14.38%

Table 2: Aspect-based sentiment distribution in two directions: (1) from Mastodon users to Threads and (2) from Threads users to Mastodon. Sentiment is analyzed at two levels: “Status” indicates the sentiment in each post or reply, while “User” represents the overall sentiment of each user.

toward the target platform based on the most frequent status labels, where the user’s sentiment is determined by the most frequent sentiment label across their statuses.

Table 2 presents sentiment distribution across source and target platforms. Threads users express more positivity toward Mastodon, while Mastodon users exhibit slightly greater negativity toward Threads. However, neutrality remains dominant on both platforms. Despite Mastodon’s slight negativity, the prevalence of neutral and positive sentiment in Threads suggests potential for constructive cross-platform engagement in the future.

Summary 3 (User Generated Content Analysis)

Users from Threads and Mastodon show distinct content preferences. Toxicity is low on both, but Mastodon has a higher variance. Topic diversity evolved in opposite directions between platforms, though both remain balanced. While sentiment towards the other platform is mostly neutral, Threads users express more positivity toward Mastodon, indicating further openness to Mastodon.

5.4 What Instances Federate and Interact?

Each Mastodon user $u \in \mathcal{U}_M$ is affiliated with an instance i denoted as \mathcal{I}_M , formally defined as:

$$\mathcal{I}_M = \{i \mid i = \text{home instance of } u, u \in \mathcal{U}_M\}$$

5.4.1 Instances Interacting with Threads. Figure 11 shows the distribution of home instances among \mathcal{U}_M . Among the 1,417 Mastodon instances, 63.1% (12,907 out of 20,456) of users in \mathcal{U}_M belong to mastodon.social, one of the largest instances in Mastodon.

5.4.2 Instance Size, Federation, and User Interaction. We examined how instance size, defined by the number of registered users, impacts federation and interaction with Threads. Table 3 presents statistical relationships involving three key independent variables:

- **#Unique Interacted Users:** The proportion of users within an instance who interacted with Threads users.
- **#Cross-Platform Interactions:** The frequency of interactions between an instance’s users and Threads users.
- **#Federated Instances:** The number of Mastodon instances an instance has federated with.

The linear regression analysis shows that the overall cross-platform interaction count ($\beta = -0.667$) has a negative relationship with




Figure 11: Distribution of those interacted Mastodon users' home instances (I_M). The top 10 instances are labeled with their respective percentages.

Features	Coef.	SE	p -value	OR
#Unique Interacted Users	2.426	0.177	0.000	11.314
#Cross-Platform Interaction	-0.667	0.144	0.000***	0.513
#Federated Instances	1.162	0.086	0.000***	3.196

Table 3: Results from OLS regression analyses exploring the relationship between instance size and three instance-level features. The table reports coefficient estimates (Coef.), standard errors (SE), and odds ratios (OR). Statistical significance at $p^{*} < 0.001$. All values are rounded to three decimal places.**

instance size, suggesting a possible bottleneck limiting the volume of interactions. However, given the small magnitude of this coefficient, this constraint appears to have only a minor impact, indicating that even smaller instances can sustain a high interaction volume with Threads. Conversely, the number of users experiencing cross-platform interaction ($\beta = 2.426$) is positively correlated with instance size, suggesting that larger instances offer greater opportunities for users to engage in cross-platform interactions at least once. Additionally, the number of federated instances ($\beta = 1.162$) positively relates to instance size, indicating that federation is mainly driven by users communicating across multiple instances.

Thus, although larger instances generally federate more extensively, increased federation alone does not necessarily lead to greater interaction specifically with Threads. Instead, it provides more chance for users to experience cross-platform interactions.

Summary 4 (Federation of Instances Analysis)

Most Mastodon users who interacted with Threads are from mastodon.social, the largest Mastodon instance. However, a bottleneck in cross-platform interaction exists, as total interactions do not scale with instance size growth. Given that federation is driven primarily at the user level, maintaining user motivation and engagement becomes even more critical to sustainable platform integration.

6 Limitations

Threads users are not discoverable through the Mastodon API unless a Mastodon user attempts to access their account or status. Since inactive Threads users leave no persistent records on any instance, their visibility remains limited. Additionally, replies from Threads users who have not activated Fediverse sharing are invisible to Mastodon users, which can hinder the understanding of complete conversations across platforms. Our findings are based on a subset of Threads users who manually opted into Fediverse sharing and should not be generalized to the entire Threads user base. Furthermore, we could not analyze the following feature between Threads and Mastodon, introduced on December 2, 2024, as Threads restricts access to user networks, rendering this aspect of the study infeasible.

7 Future Work

We will establish a controlled methodology to derive generalized causal effects in cross-platform interactions using the difference-in-differences (DID) analysis [4]. To construct a control group, we will survey Mastodon users who were unaware of Threads. This will help determine whether increased status update activity results from platform integration, providing insights into how interconnected ecosystems shape user engagement [14]. Furthermore, we will examine whether trust-building behavior influences self-referencing in status updates, assessing trust as a causal factor in how users present their platform affiliation. Ethnogenesis studies suggest that trust drives identity disclosure in initial interactions, making it essential to explore similar patterns in cross-platform dynamics [3, 23]. Last, we will investigate whether behavioral differences between Threads and Mastodon users stem from their structural differences, with Threads being centralized and Mastodon decentralized. These differences likely reflect variations in users' goals and ways of engaging with each platform, which may also impact the extent of cross-platform interactions [17, 21].

8 Conclusion

This study introduces the FediverseSharing dataset, a novel resource capturing cross-platform interactions between users on Threads and Mastodon. Through a detailed analysis of user behavior, we uncover key insights into Fediverse joining patterns, engagement trends, and shifting preferences resulting from platform integration. Our findings highlight how integration unfolds across different interaction levels and topic diversities, revealing nuanced changes in users' content preferences between platforms. Additionally, we examine emerging trends in user sentiment, topic diversity, and interaction disparities across the platforms. This research provides a foundational dataset and analytical framework for future studies on cross-platform interaction dynamics within federated environments. By making this dataset publicly available, we encourage further exploration into the effects of platform integration, federated social networks, and broader shifts within the evolving online platform ecosystem.

References

- [1] Nizar Abdelkafi, Christina Raasch, Angela Roth, and Rajaguru Srinivasan. Multi-sided platforms, 2019.
- [2] Oxford Analytica. Social media fragmentation raises disinformation risks. *Emerald Expert Briefings*, (oxan-db), 2024.
- [3] Madhumita Banerjee, Paurav Shukla, and Nicholas J Ashill. Situational ethnicity and identity negotiation.“indifference” as an identity negotiation mechanism. *International Marketing Review*, 39(1):55–79, 2022.
- [4] Zike Cao, Yingpeng Zhu, Gen Li, and Liangfei Qiu. Consequences of information feed integration on user engagement and contribution: A natural experiment in an online knowledge-sharing community. *Information Systems Research*, 35(3):1114–1136, 2024.
- [5] Lucio La Cava, Luca Maria Aiello, and Andrea Tagarelli. Drivers of social influence in the twitter migration to mastodon. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):21626, 2023.
- [6] Taya R Cohen, Brian P Meier, Verlin B Hinsz, and Chester A Insko. Competitive group interactions: Why they exist and how to overcome them. *The handbook for working with difficult groups*, pages 223–236, 2010.
- [7] Stéphanie Demoulin, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, and John F Dovidio. *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities*. Psychology Press, 2013.
- [8] Edoardo Di Martino, Alessandro Galeazzi, Michele Starnini, Walter Quattrociochi, and Matteo Cinelli. Characterizing the fragmentation of the social media ecosystem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16826*, 2024.
- [9] David S Evans. Matchmakers: the new economics of multisided platforms. *Harvard Business Review Press*, 2016.
- [10] Casey Fiesler and Brianna Dym. Moving across lands: Online platform migration in fandom communities. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW1):1–25, 2020.
- [11] Maarten Grootendorst. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*, 2022.
- [12] Jiahui He, Haris Bin Zia, Ignacio Castro, Aravindh Raman, Nishanth Sastry, and Gareth Tyson. Flocking to mastodon: Tracking the great twitter migration. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference*, pages 111–123, 2023.
- [13] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*, 2020.
- [14] Ni Huang, Yili Hong, and Gordon Burtch. Social network integration and user content generation. *MIS quarterly*, 41(4):1035–1058, 2017.
- [15] Ujun Jeong, Bohan Jiang, Zhen Tan, Russell Bernard, and Huan Liu. Bluetempnet: A temporal multi-network dataset of social interactions in bluesky social. *IEEE Data Descriptions*, 2024.
- [16] Ujun Jeong, Ayushi Nirmal, Kritshekhar Jha, Susan Xu Tang, H Russell Bernard, and Huan Liu. User migration across multiple social media platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2024 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, pages 436–444. SIAM, 2024.
- [17] Ujun Jeong, Paras Sheth, Anique Tahir, Faisal Alatawi, H Russell Bernard, and Huan Liu. Exploring platform migration patterns between twitter and mastodon: A user behavior study. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 738–750, 2024.
- [18] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.01759*, 2016.
- [19] Srijan Kumar, William L Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. Community interaction and conflict on the web. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*, pages 933–943, 2018.
- [20] Lucio La Cava, Sergio Greco, and Andrea Tagarelli. Understanding the growth of the fediverse through the lens of mastodon. *Applied network science*, 6:1–35, 2021.
- [21] Lucio La Cava, Sergio Greco, and Andrea Tagarelli. Network analysis of the information consumption-production dichotomy in mastodon user behaviors. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 16, pages 1378–1382, 2022.
- [22] Lynnette Hui Xian Ng, Samantha C Phillips, and Kathleen M Carley. Smi-5: Five dimensions of social media interaction for platform (de) centralization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15509*, 2024.
- [23] Jonathan Y Okamura. Situational ethnicity. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 4(4):452–465, 1981.
- [24] Geoffrey Parker, Marshall Van Alstyne, and Xiaoyue Jiang. Platform ecosystems. *MIS quarterly*, 41(1):255–266, 2017.
- [25] Thomas F Pettigrew and Linda R Tropp. Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? recent meta-analytic findings. In *Reducing prejudice and discrimination*, pages 93–114. Psychology Press, 2013.
- [26] Aravindh Raman, Sagar Joglekar, Emiliano De Cristofaro, Nishanth Sastry, and Gareth Tyson. Challenges in the decentralised web: The mastodon case. In *Proceedings of the internet measurement conference*, pages 217–229, 2019.
- [27] Jean-Charles Rochet and Jean Tirole. Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the european economic association*, 1(4):990–1029, 2003.
- [28] Giuseppe Russo, Manoel Horta Ribeiro, and Robert West. Stranger danger! cross-community interactions with fringe users increase the growth of fringe communities on reddit. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 1342–1353, 2024.
- [29] Rainer Schmidt, Rainer Alt, and Alfred Zimmermann. The concept of platform federations—a case study of chatgpt browser plugins. 2025.
- [30] Maximilian Schrieck, Jan Ondrus, Manuel Wiesche, and Helmut Krcmar. A typology of multi-platform integration strategies. *Information Systems Journal*, 34(3):828–853, 2024.
- [31] Heng Yang, Biqing Zeng, Mayi Xu, and Tianxing Wang. Back to reality: Leveraging pattern-driven modeling to enable affordable sentiment dependency learning. *Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.08604*, 2021.
- [32] Peixian Zhang, Yupeng He, Ehsan-Ul Haq, Jiahui He, and Gareth Tyson. The emergence of threads: The birth of a new social network. In *International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*, pages 69–78. Springer, 2024.
- [33] Matteo Zignani, Sabrina Gaito, and Gian Paolo Rossi. Follow the “mastodon”: Structure and evolution of a decentralized online social network. In *ICWSM*. AAAI Press, 2018.