

# Social-LLM: Modeling User Behavior at Scale using Language Models and Social Network Data



Julie Jiang

University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA, USA  
juliej@isi.edu

Emilio Ferrara

University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA, USA  
emiliofe@usc.edu

## 1. Learn Social-LLM user embeddings



## 2. User Prediction Task




Figure 1: Caption

## ABSTRACT

The proliferation of social network data has unlocked unprecedented opportunities for extensive, data-driven exploration of human behavior. The structural intricacies of social networks offer insights into various computational social science issues, particularly concerning social influence and information diffusion. However, modeling large-scale social network data comes with computational challenges. Though large language models make it easier than ever to model textual content, any advanced network representation methods struggle with scalability and efficient deployment to out-of-sample users. In response, we introduce a novel approach tailored for modeling social network data in user detection tasks. This innovative method integrates localized social network interactions with the capabilities of large language models. Operating under the premise of social network homophily, which posits that socially connected users share similarities, our approach is designed to address these challenges. We conduct a thorough evaluation of our method across seven real-world social network datasets, spanning a diverse range of topics and detection tasks, showcasing its applicability to advance research in computational social science.

## KEYWORDS

Social Network, User Detection, User Behavior, Network Homophily

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The surge in popularity of social media over recent decades has provided computational social scientists with an exciting avenue for empirical data-driven mining of human behavior [18, 35]. Leveraging social network data has enabled the tracking of mass sentiment, health trends, political polarization, the spread of mis/disinformation,

social influence, behavior contagion, and information diffusion, all at an unprecedented scale. Social network data comprises two crucial elements: content—*what* people share—and network—who, when, and how frequently users interact with each other. The text-based content aspect of social network data has become more manageable due to recent advancements in large language models (LLMs). However, effectively handling the network element requires methods such as graph representation learning, which often struggle to scale up to large social network data [38, 57].

This paper introduces a pragmatic approach for modeling large-scale social network data by leveraging localized social network interactions, building upon the assumption of social network homophily. The social network homophily theory suggests that socially connected users are more likely to be similar [41]. Specifically, we harness the power of LLMs by drawing inspiration from the theory of linguistic homophily in social networks, which posits that users with similar language styles are more likely to be friends [34]. Our proposed model, named *Social-LLM*, is influenced by *Retweet-BERT* [32], initially designed for political leaning detection using retweet interactions and user profile descriptions. We extend *Retweet-BERT* by generalizing to all social network interactions, incorporating additional types of content, and applying the model to a diverse range of computational social science applications, including political polarization, online hate speech, account suspension, and morality. Our summary of contributions is as follows:

- We propose Social-LLM, a scalable social network representation model that combines user content cues with social network cues for inductive user detection tasks.

- We conduct a thorough evaluation of Social-LLMs on 7 real-world, large-scale social media datasets of various topics and detection tasks.
- We showcase the utility of using Social-LLM embeddings for visualization.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Detecting users is a crucial element in computational social science research, encompassing a spectrum of areas like identifying ideologies [2, 30], spotting inauthentic accounts [13, 40], flagging hateful or toxic behavior [31, 49], recognizing influential figures [50], assessing vulnerability to misinformation [1, 60], and beyond. Most user detection methods that utilize social network features only consider them to the extent of network statistics (e.g., node centrality measures) and not the complex relationships among individuals [13, 40].

In many cases, the lack of social network data is due to practical limitations: it’s challenging to obtain the network data, and it is also challenging to effectively model them. While the challenge of obtaining network data lies beyond our control, we can address the second limitation with graph representation learning [24, 37]. These methods effectively capture crucial higher-order proximity information within social networks yet often demand substantial computational resources during training or have elevated hardware requirements. The scale of large social network data can surpass device capacities that cannot be solved by distributed training, parallelism, or batching due to the inherent inability to partition the graph [52]. Other methods use sampling approaches to reduce training complexity [38]. However, there remains an inherent scalability trade-off when attempting to model very large graphs [57]. In this work, we preserve social network data but utilize them in the simplest manner by considering only the first-order proximity (i.e., the edges themselves). We show that such graph approximation is often sufficient for user detection on social media datasets.

Our method, Social-LLM, utilizes multi-relational data among users coupled with user features. Perhaps the most similar method to ours is TIMME, a scalable end-to-end graph neural network (GNN) user classification method that utilizes multi-relational social network data [58], or GEM, another heterogeneous GNN designed for malicious account detection [37]. Both methods can also take user content features as node feature input. Because these methods inherently rely on social network relations, it is not possible to deploy them inductively on out-of-sample users. Social-LLM, however, can be applied to any unseen users as long as we have the same user content features without retraining.

## 3 METHOD

We propose Social-LLM, a model that leverages network homophily and user features to learn user representations scalably. This representation model can then be applied inductively for a range of downstream user detection tasks. Social-LLM draws from two types of social network features: content cues from each user and network cues from social interactions.

### 3.1 Content Cues

The content cues are derived mainly from the textual content on their social media but can also be from other contextual metadata. We primarily utilize users’ profile descriptions, which are self-provided mini-biographies. For most user detection task purposes, users’ biography encodes a substantial amount of personal information with personal descriptors (e.g., “*Mother*”, “*Senator*”, “*Research Scientist*”) and, in some cases, self-identities and beliefs (e.g., “*Democratic*”, “*#BLM*”, “*LGBTQ*”). Capped at a limit of 160 characters, these descriptions have to be short, incentivizing users to convey essential information they wish to share about themselves succinctly and attractively. The use of Twitter profile descriptions, not the tweet texts, has proved useful in a large number of computational social science research [29, 32, 44, 51, 55]. From a practical standpoint, using user profiles instead of all of the tweets by a user also vastly reduces the complexity of the computation problem as well as alleviates data collection challenges. In addition to profile descriptions, we also leverage, when applicable, user metadata features (e.g., follower counts, account creation date, etc.) and user tweets.

### 3.2 Network Cues

Online social media platforms offer a variety of ways to engage with one another, such as by following, liking, or re-sharing. These acts of social interaction can be gathered to form social networks. The Twitter API enables us to obtain three types of social interactions: retweeting, mentioning, and following. Though the following network is perhaps the most useful indication of user interaction, it is rarely in empirical research used due to the API rate limits set by Twitter [39]. As such, following the vast majority of computational social science research on Twitter (e.g., [12, 16]), we use the retweet and mention networks in this research. *Retweet* refers to the act of re-sharing another user’s tweet directly, without any additional comments. *Mention* includes all other acts of mentioning (using ‘@’) another user, including retweeting with comments (i.e., quoting), replying, or otherwise referencing another user in a tweet. We draw a distinction between retweets and mentions because they may represent two distinct motivations of social interaction: retweeting is usually understood as an endorsement [5, 42] while mentioning could be used to criticize publicly [25].

### 3.3 Social-LLM Framework

We train Social-LLM in an unsupervised manner to learn user representations in a  $d$ -dimensional embedding space (Figure 1, step 1). Once we train the user representation module, we can apply the user representation module to any user content input to obtain the user embeddings. Additional layers can be trained on top of any downstream user detection task (Figure 1, step 2).

**3.3.1 User representation module.** The user representation module mainly takes in the pre-trained LLM model to be applied to the user’s profile description. This LLM model is trainable in order to allow for fine-tuning in our training process. If user metadata features and/or the averaged LLM embeddings of the user tweets are provided, they will be directed through a series of dense layers. We concatenate these outputs into one single embedding and apply

another dense layer to produce a single  $d$ -dimensional embedding  $u_i$  for user  $i$ .

**3.3.2 Unsupervised training via Siamese architecture.** The user representation module is wrapped in a Siamese model architecture in a manner similar to Sentence-BERT [48]. Specifically, we apply an identical representation module on the user content cue and optimize the resulting embeddings based on the network cues. A training instance of Social-LLM is a tuple  $(i, j, k)$  where  $i$  and  $j$  are two users who are connected by a social network interaction (i.e., an edge) of type  $k$ . We want to train the user embeddings  $u_i$  and  $u_j$  so that they are as similar as possible. Reimers and Gurevych [48] and Jiang et al. [32] achieve this by optimizing the cosine similarity of embeddings. However, we also want to consider (1) multiple edge types—modeling retweets distinct from mentions—and (2) directionality—user  $A$  retweeting from user  $B$  is not the same as user  $B$  retweeting from user  $A$ . To account for multiple edge types, we initialize a learnable weight matrix  $W^k$  for every edge type  $k$ . To account for directionality, we can use separate weight matrices  $W^{k_{in}}$  and  $W^{k_{out}}$  for the in- and out-edges. We then calculate the cosine similarity scores between  $W^k u_i$  and  $W^k u_j$ , or  $W^{k_{in}} u_i$  and  $W^{k_{in}} u_j$  in the directional case, as the final output. We can also account for edge weights by weighting each training instance proportionally to their weight.

**3.3.3 Multiple negatives ranking loss.** We train the model with a ranking loss function, pitching positive examples against negative examples. All edges in the graph serve as positive examples, and all other pairs of users, i.e., user  $i$  and user  $j$  who are *not* connected by an edge, can serve as negative examples. To speed up the training procedure, we use the multiple negatives loss function [26], which has shown to work well in Jiang et al. [32]. Essentially, all other pairs of users in the same batch serve as negative examples. For instance, if the input batch contains positive examples  $[(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), \dots]$ , then  $\{(i_x, j_y)\}$  for all  $x \neq y$  are negative examples. This will encourage users who are truly connected in the graph to have more similar representations than users who do not. To minimize training complexity, we alternate the training of different types of edges in a round-robin fashion. For example, if we want to accommodate for both  $k = \text{retweet}$  and  $k = \text{mention}$  edges, we will train one batch of retweet-only edges, followed by one batch of mention-only edges, and so on.

**3.3.4 Downstream task application.** The Social-LLM model produces reusable user representation that can be used on any downstream user prediction tasks (Figure 1, step 2). We can fine-tune the representation module further or freeze the layers and add task-specific fine-tuning layers on top. We can also append any user-specific features (profile LLM embeddings, user metadata features, etc.) that we used during the Social-LLM training process to the learned Social-LLM user embeddings at this step.

## 3.4 Advantages and Disadvantages

Social-LLM builds on traditional user detection methods by adding social network components. There are two main advantages of Social-LLM over similar GNN approaches.

- **Ease of training:** The time complexity of step 1 is  $O(|E|)$ , and that of step 2 is even quicker at  $O(|V|)$ . Crucially, since

we forgo training the complete graph and only focus on edges as if they are independent, we can fit very large datasets via batching.

- **Inductive capabilities:** Since step 2 of the framework no longer relies on the network, we can extend our model to produce embeddings for any users, provided we have their content information, without needing their network information and refitting the whole model. This is called inductive learning, and most graph-embedding approaches either cannot natively support this (e.g., [20, 61], or they do so at a significantly higher training complexity [23]).
- **Reusability:** The Social-LLM embedding training process is separate from the downstream applications so that we can reuse any learned embeddings for different applications.

The advantages of Social-LLM come with costs. Notably, we sacrifice precision and thoroughness for speed and efficiency. Our model focuses only on first-order proximity, or users who are connected immediately by an edge. This undoubtedly loses valuable information from the global network structures or higher-order proximities. However, as we will demonstrate in this paper, in the cases of many user detection problems on social networks, it is *sufficient* to model the localized connections for a *cheap boost* to performance compared to a framework that does not use the social network at all. For these large but sparse real-world social network datasets, the more powerful graph embedding methods may require a lot more training time, memory footprint, or hardware resources for a marginal gain in performance.

## 4 DATA

We describe the dataset we use to validate our approach. The first two datasets, COVID-POLITICAL and ELECTION2020, were used in Retweet-BERT [32], focusing only on using user profile descriptions and retweet interactions to predict political partisanship. To demonstrate the additional capabilities of Social-LLM, we introduce several other datasets that encompass more heterogeneous user metadata and network features. In addition, our new datasets add diversity to the types of labels (partisanship, morality, account suspension, toxicity), prediction methods (classification and regression; single output and multi-output), time spans, and data sizes to demonstrate the robustness of our approach. The summary statistics of all of our datasets are displayed in Table 1.

### 4.1 COVID Politics

The COVID-19 pandemic left an unprecedented impact on everyone worldwide. Research has shown that COVID-19 was politicized, with partisanship steering online discourse about the pandemic [6, 30]. As such, our prediction task is to detect user partisanship from this COVID social network. Our dataset, COVID-POLITICS, is based on a real-time collection of tweets related to the COVID-19 pandemic [10] between January 21 and July 31, 2020, which was further preprocessed in Jiang et al. [32] to remove bots [13, 59]. It also consists of the following user metadata features: initial follower count, final follower count, number of tweets, number of original tweets, number of days active (post at least once), and whether the user is verified.

**Table 1: Summary statistics of our Twitter datasets.**

Dataset	# Users	# Retweet Edges	# Mention Desc.	Profile Edges	Metadata Features	Tweet Texts	Time Span	Label(s)	Pred. Type
COVID-POLITICAL	78,672	180,928	-	✓	✓	✗	6 Months	Partisanship (1)	Cls.
ELECTION2020	78,932	2,818,603	-	✓	✗	✗	3 Months	Partisanship (1)	Cls.
COVID-MORALITY	119,770	609,845	639,994	✓	✓	✗	2 Years	Morality (5)	Reg.
UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED	56,440	135,053	255,476	✓	✓	✓	1 Month	Suspension (1)	Cls.
UKR-RUS-HATE	82,041	166,741	414,258	✓	✓	✗	1 Month	Toxicity (6)	Reg.
IMMIGRATION-HATE-08	5,759	63,097	83,870	✓	✓	✗	All times	Toxicity (5)	Reg.
IMMIGRATION-HATE-05	2,188	4,827	7,993	✓	✓	✗	All times	Toxicity (5)	Reg.

The ground truth partisanship labels from Jiang et al. [32] are derived from a blend of two heuristics-labeling methods. The first uses annotated political hashtags used in user profile descriptions, and the second uses the partisanship leaning of new media URLs mentioned in users’ tweets. This dataset contains 78,672 labeled users with 180,928 retweet interactions. The distribution of users is unbalanced, with approximately 75% of them labeled as left-leaning.

## 4.2 Election 2020

The 2020 US presidential election took place amidst the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic. Former Vice President Joe Biden, the Democratic nominee, defeated the incumbent Republican President Donald Trump. The ELECTION-2020 dataset is based on a real-time collection of tweets regarding the 2020 US presidential election [8] from March 1 to May 31, 2020. This dataset was similarly preprocessed to remove bots and users with low degrees [32]. Since this is specifically a dataset on US politics, the user label we are interested in predicting is partisanship. We use the same partisanship labels from Jiang et al. [32], which labeled 78,932 users as either left-leaning or right-leaning. The distribution split is even, with around 50% of the users labeled as left-leaning. These users encompass the ELECTION2020 dataset with 2.8 million retweet interactions.

## 4.3 COVID Morality

The COVID-MORALITY dataset is also compiled from the previously mentioned real-time collection of COVID-19 data as COVID-POLITICS [10], but spans a longer time period and is focused on a different prediction task. This data spans from February 2020 to October 2021 for 21 full months. Our task is to predict the moral foundations of users. The Moral Foundation Theory (MFT) decomposes human moral reasoning into five dimensions: care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, purity/degradation [22].<sup>1</sup> Research on moral foundation and network homophily found that moral values of purity can predict social network distances between two users, suggesting that social networks exhibit *purity homophily* [14]. On the subject of COVID-19, numerous studies have established a link between moral values and decision-making regarding health-related behaviors during the pandemic, such as wearing masks or getting vaccinated [7, 15, 17]. It stands to reason that user morality may play a role in facilitating online communication patterns on COVID-19.

<sup>1</sup>A sixth dimension, liberty/oppression [21], was later added. However, we only use the first five following Rao et al. [47].

To detect moral values in the tweets, we use the morality detector [47] fine-tuned specifically for this dataset. It predicts the 10 moralities (each dimension contains two opposite labels for virtues and vices) in a multilabel manner. We retain tweets that have at least one of the ten moralities present. Of the users who produced these tweets with moral values, we filtered for active users by retaining users who posted at least 10 tweets during any month. We then sampled 150,000 users from this set. With this set of users, we build a network of retweet and mention interactions. As with Jiang et al. [32], we keep only edges with weights  $\geq 2$ , leaving us with 119,770 users sharing 609,845 retweet edges and 639,994 mention edges.

Our prediction task is a multi-output regression problem. Due to the way the moral datasets are typically annotated, a tweet could be labeled as having any of the 10 morality, even if we don’t need to differentiate virtues and vices for the purposes of analyzing moral foundations [27]. For example, a tweet labeled as having care but no harm, harm or no care, or both care and harm all reflect a moral foundation in the care/harm dimension. Therefore, for each tweet, we aggregate the 10 labels into 5, assigning a value of 1 to the moral foundation if both polar opposites are present, 0.5 if either the virtue or vice is present, and 0 otherwise. We then calculate 5 moral scores for users by computing the average moral foundation score across all of their tweets.

This dataset includes the following user metadata features: account age, number of followers count, number of people they are following, number of lists the user is a member of, the total number of tweets ever posted by this user, the number of posts favorited by the user, and whether they are verified. Additionally, we calculate the number of original tweets, retweets, quoted tweets, and replies by each user contained in our dataset.

## 4.4 Ukraine-Russia Suspended Accounts

When the Ukraine-Russian war erupted in early 2022, social media quickly became a platform to spread content about the conflict, not all of which are truthful. Early research suggests that Russian mis/disinformation campaigns, state-sponsored content, and otherwise suspicious activities were rampant on social media [28, 46]. We use a real-time collection of tweets about the conflict [9] for a full month in March 2022. Many of these users who tweeted about the war were since suspended by Twitter,<sup>2</sup> and they were often found to be newer, more active (spamming), and more toxic than

<sup>2</sup>See Twitter’s help page on account suspension: <https://help.twitter.com/en/managing-your-account/suspended-x-accounts>

users that are not suspended [45]. We theorize that suspended users and normal users reflect different communication characteristics due to different agendas, motivations, and needs from social media.

Our task is to predict whether a user was eventually suspended from their user metadata and network features. Our raw dataset contains around 10 million non-suspended users and 1 million suspended users. We filter for users who posted a minimum of 10 tweets to remove inactive users and a maximum of 130 tweets to remove spamming bots. At this time of the research, we no longer had access to the Botometer [13] tool due to Twitter’s API cutoff [11]. Therefore, we resort to using the maximum tweet amount as a rough elimination criterion. 130 is the 90% threshold of the number of tweets per user after removing users with less than 10 tweets. Having 130 tweets in one month represents 4.19 tweets per day, which we feel is a reasonable number of tweets an authentic account could post. After filtering, we have 1.4 million non-suspended and 73,000 suspended users. Since the dataset is heavily imbalanced, we sampled a roughly equal proportion of users who were not suspended. We then built the retweet and mention network using the edge weight  $\geq 2$  criteria and removed any users who were isolated in the network following [32]. Our final UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED dataset consists of 56,440 users, 135,053 retweet edges, and 255,476 mention edges. Around 58% of the users were suspended. We also retained the same user metadata features as we did in the COVID-MORALITY dataset (§4.3). Unlike other datasets, the ground-truth labels were not derived from the tweet texts themselves, so we additionally explore including the tweet texts as a content feature in our model.

#### 4.5 Ukraine-Russia Hate

Beyond misinformation and coordinated activity, the online discourse regarding the Ukraine-Russia war is also riddled with toxic language [54]. As a spin-off from the previous UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED dataset (§4.4), we experiment with whether we can detect users’ toxicity levels from their Twitter behavior and activity. Our preprocessing step diverges from the UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED dataset (§4.4) after filtering for users based on the min and max number of tweets.

We employ the Perspective API,<sup>3</sup> a widely used toxicity detector used in similar studies [19, 33]. The Perspective API returns a TOXICITY score for each text on a scale of 0 (not toxic) to 1 (very toxic). Besides the flagship TOXICITY score, the API also computes 5 other toxicity measures: IDENTITY\_ATTACK, INSULT, PROFANITY, THREAT, and SEVERE\_TOXICITY. We apply the Perspective API to users’ original tweets. Occasionally when the tweet is not written in an unsupported language or contains only URLs, the Perspective API will fail to produce toxicity scores. Therefore, we filter for users who have at least 10 original tweets rated by the Perspective API. There are 82,041 users in this UKR-RUS-HATE dataset. We save all 166,741 retweet edges and 414,258 edges, neglecting to remove the edges with weights  $< 2$  as we did previously since the density of the network is comparatively smaller. The user metadata features we retain are the same as we did in the UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED (§4.4) and COVID-MORALITY (§4.3) datasets.

<sup>3</sup><https://perspectiveapi.com/>




Figure 2: Distribution of user bot scores prior to user preprocessing for the IMMIGRATION-HATE datasets.

#### 4.6 Immigration Hate

We compile another hate speech dataset, this time forgoing breadth for depth by collecting a relatively full set of historical tweets by a smaller set of users. This dataset is based on another dataset collected by Bianchi et al. [3], which consists of annotated tweets from 2020-2021 that reference immigration hate terms. We attempted to rehydrate the 18,803 tweets that were found to be uncivil, intolerant, or both. 8,790 (47% of the total) tweets by 7,566 unique users were successfully retrieved; the rest of the tweets were no longer available. Since these users are known to have tweeted hateful immigration tweets at least at some point, we use them to snowball our IMMIGRATION-HATE dataset with the Twitter historical API, collecting the hateful users’ most recent tweets up to a maximum of 3,200. This resulted in 21 million tweets, of which 2.9 million tweets were original. We focus only on original tweets in this work.

We apply the Perspective API on the tweets for five measures of toxicity: TOXICITY, IDENTITY\_ATTACK, INSULT, PROFANITY, and THREAT, then we aggregate toxicity scores for users by computing the average toxicity score of their tweets. Using Botometer [13, 59], we found that bots seem especially prevalent in the dataset (Fig. 2). Therefore, to mitigate the influence of bots, we remove users according to two thresholds of bot score: 0.8, which is a conservative choice given the peak in the distribution of bot scores, and 0.5, which would leave us substantially fewer users but with a higher certainty that they are genuine. Since the number of users is already small, we retain all network edges. In the IMMIGRATION-HATE-08 dataset, 5,759 users with bot scores less than or equal to 0.8 share 63,097 retweet and 83,870 mention edges. In the IMMIGRATION-HATE-05 dataset, 2,188 users with bot scores less than or equal to 0.5 share 4,827 retweet and 7,993 mention edges. The user metadata features we use include account age, whether they are verified, number of followers, number of followings, number of total tweets posted, and the number of lists they are a member of.

### 5 EVALUATION

We evaluate our method in step 2 of our overall workflow (Figure 1). We conduct an extensive comparison of Social-LLM with baseline methods, as well as several sensitivity and ablation studies.

## 5.1 Baseline Methods

For a thorough evaluation of our approach, we use a series of state-of-the-art baseline methods divided into three camps: content-based, network-based, and hybrid methods. The content-based and network-based models provide an alternative user embedding that we can utilize in the evaluation procedure (Figure 1 step 2). All input embeddings undergo similar training processes for target task prediction. For the hybrid method, we use TIMME, an end-to-end user detection method that also uses both user features and network features. We conduct a thorough hyperparameter tuning process for all of the baseline models.

**5.1.1 Content-Based Methods.** For Content-Based Methods, we primarily investigate using embeddings from pre-trained LLMs. Fine-tuning the LLMs for our specific purpose is also one option; however, doing so on the COVID-POLITICS and ELECTION2020 dataset did not deliver a substantial enough improvement to justify the added training cost. In this work, we experiment with the following three LLMs applied to the profile descriptions: (1) RoBERTa [36] (roberta-base), (2) BERTweet [43] (vinai/bertweet-base), a RoBERTa fine-tuned on Twitter data, and (3) SBERT-MPNet (sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2), a Sentence-BERT [48] model based on MPNet [53] and is currently the best-performing Sentence-BERT model.<sup>4</sup>

For datasets with additional metadata features, we also experiment with using only the raw metadata features as the “user embeddings” as well as with concatenating the LLM embeddings with the raw metadata features. For UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED, we additionally experiment with applying the aforementioned three LLMs on users’ tweets, averaging one LLM embedding per user.


**5.1.2 Network-Based Methods.** We use two purely network-based methods as the network-based baseline: node2vec [20] and ProNE [61]. While GraphSAGE [23] is another obvious choice for inductive graph representation learning with node attributes, it is difficult to train on a large graph within reasonable time limits and can therefore underperform [32]. These network embedding methods do support weights and directions but heterogeneous edge types. Therefore, we run a separate network model on the (1) retweet edges only, (2) mention edges only, and (3) indiscriminately combining retweet and mention edges as one edge (with edge weights equal to the sum of the retweet edge and mention edge weights).

**5.1.3 Hybrid Method.** We use TIMME as our hybrid method baseline, providing it with the user content features and network features as our Social-LLM model. The original model was only designed for user classification tasks, but we modified the open-sourced code to enable regression. As TIMME is primarily advertised as a multi-relational model, we mainly apply it on both retweet and mention edges, but we also experiment with combining these edges indiscriminately.

## 5.2 Experimental Setup

For every dataset and its corresponding set of user embeddings, we conduct the same train-test procedure repeated 10 times, splitting the dataset randomly using 10 pre-selected random seeds. Unless

<sup>4</sup>[https://www.sbert.net/docs/pretrained\\_models.html](https://www.sbert.net/docs/pretrained_models.html) (Accessed 2023-11-10).



**Figure 3: Ablation study of user tweet embeddings on the UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED dataset (Experiment 5).**

otherwise indicated, we use a 60%-20%-20% train-val-test split. The validation sets are used for early stopping and for model selection. The model architecture and hyperparameters are fixed for all experiments. The classification tasks are evaluated using Macro-F1, and the regression tasks are evaluated using Pearson’s correlation. For regression tasks with multiple labels, we average the Pearson’s correlation across labels.

## 6 RESULTS

Below, we discuss our experimental results and interpret our findings. For model selection within the same family of methods, we use the validation sets to select the final model. Most results are presented in Table 2, which shows the average result over 10 repeated random train-test splits.

### 6.1 Experiment 1: Choice of LLMs


We first experiment with the choice of LLMs, which determines both the best baseline method for LLMs and which LLM we should use in our Social-LLM models. We selected the clear winner, SBERT-MPNet, which outperformed RoBERTa and BERTweet on all datasets. We note that, given rapid innovations in NLP and LLMs, SBERT-MPNet may not be the best model or could soon be replaced by a better successor. However, the contribution of Social-LLM is not tied to a single LLM but rather a model training paradigm that can be paired with any LLM. Our choices of LLMs are driven by ease of use, costs, and reproducibility [4].

### 6.2 Experiment 2: Main Experiments

In Table 2 Experiment 2, we underline the best baseline model and boldface the best model (either a baseline or the Social-LLM model) for each dataset. We also indicate the percentage gain or loss in performance using Social-LLM compared to the best-performing baseline. Regarding baseline methods, there is no clear winner among the content-based, network-based, or hybrid models. Network-based models face much higher variability in performance across datasets, pointing at issues when using solely network features. Notably, we observe that Social-LLM is superior in nearly all cases, with improvements ranging from a substantial 26% to a modest

**Table 2: Results of Social-LLM on various datasets compared to baseline models. The best model is in bold, and the best baseline model is underlined.**

	C	N	ELECTION	COVID-	UKR-RUS-	COVID-	UKR-RUS-	IMMIGRATION-HATE-	
			2020	POLITICAL	SUSPENDED	MORALITY	HATE	05	08
			Cls. (Metric: Macro-F1)			Reg. (Metric: Pearson)			
<i>Experiment 1: LLMs</i>									
RoBERTa	✓	✗	80.11	78.41	56.21	32.84	36.54	12.06	9.30
BERTweet	✓	✗	79.31	78.42	55.69	30.72	40.38	14.33	12.03
SBERT-MPNet	✓	✗	<b>86.47</b>	<b>82.99</b>	<b>56.79</b>	<b>36.77</b>	<b>43.35</b>	<b>17.16</b>	<b>16.76</b>
<i>Experiment 2 (Main): Baselines vs Social-LLM</i>									
(a) Profile LLM	✓	✗	<u>86.47</u>	82.99	56.79	36.77	43.35	17.16	16.76
(a) + (b) Metadata	✓	✗	-	83.26	70.75	40.43	<u>45.38</u>	17.72	17.32
(a) + (b) + (c) Tweet LLMs	✓	✗	-	-	<u>81.74</u>	-	-	-	-
(d) node2vec	✗	✓	-	88.65	72.33	50.53	39.97	10.70	12.18
(e) ProNE	✗	✓	76.28	64.04	77.95	<u>51.13</u>	<u>45.38</u>	5.47	14.30
(f) TIMME	✓	✓	84.81	81.85	72.91	30.47	43.46	<u>20.98</u>	<u>18.67</u>
<b>Social-LLM</b>	✓	✓	<b>97.87</b>	<b>90.82</b>	<b>82.71</b>	50.15	<b>57.27</b>	<b>21.17</b>	<b>20.11</b>
%↑			13%	2%	1%	-2%	26%	1%	7%
<i>Experiment 3: Ablation on edge types in Social-LLM models</i>									
RT	✓	✓	-	-	70.71	46.57	48.18	18.85	18.18
MN	✓	✓	-	-	71.32	45.33	49.55	18.73	17.92
RT & MN (distinct)	✓	✓	-	-	71.99	20.40	51.20	14.75	18.89
RT + MN (indistinct)	✓	✓	-	-	<b>72.10</b>	<b>47.51</b>	<b>50.73</b>	<b>19.05</b>	<b>18.53</b>
<i>Experiment 4: Ablation on edge directions and weights in Social-LLM models</i>									
(best edge combo model)	✓	✓	97.78	90.68	72.10	47.51	50.73	18.53	19.05
+ w	✓	✓	97.78	90.55	71.85	46.98	51.46	18.70	18.81
+ d	✓	✓	<b>97.85</b>	<b>90.82</b>	71.77	<b>50.15</b>	<b>57.19</b>	<b>18.95</b>	18.77
+ d + w	✓	✓	97.82	90.42	<b>72.17</b>	46.89	49.35	17.67	<b>19.21</b>



**Figure 4: Sensitivity to embedding dimension  $d$  (Experiment 6).**

1%. Using a one-sided  $t$ -test, we find that all improvements are statistically significant. The only dataset where Social-LLM performs comparatively worse than the baselines is COVID-MORALITY, where the network embedding models are slightly superior, but the Social-LLM model still demonstrates commendable performance. In summary, Social-LLM emerges as the most consistent model, exhibiting robustness across various tasks and data sizes.

### 6.3 Experiment 3: Edge Type Ablation

We perform an edge-type ablation experiment to evaluate the importance of each edge type on datasets containing both retweets and mention edges. When using only one type of edge, we find they perform comparably. The combination of retweets and mentions as two distinct edge types occasionally results in improved performance but can also lead to deteriorated outcomes. However, combining them indiscriminately as one edge type yields the best performance consistently. This suggests that both retweets and mentions carry important signals, yet the distinctions between the two actions might not be substantial enough to warrant differentiation for our objective tasks.

### 6.4 Experiment 4: Edge Weights and Directions

Using the best edge-type model (RT for ELECTION2020 and COVID-POLITICAL, and RT + MN for all others), we then experiment with adding edge weights (+ w) and edge directions (+ d). The inclusion of directions always yields better performance, and occasionally, the performance is further enhanced if we stack on weights as well. The importance of directionality emphasizes the value of understanding the flow of information exchange on social networks.

### 6.5 Experiment 5: User Tweet Embeddings

UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED is the only dataset for which the ground truth labels were not derived directly from the tweet texts; therefore, we can additionally include user tweet embeddings as features. In Fig. 3, we see that using user tweet embeddings leads to an average improvement of 4% Macro-F1 between otherwise identically configured models. This experiment underscores the importance of including user tweets, when applicable and suitable, in user prediction tasks.

### 6.6 Experiment 6: Sensitivity to Dimension Size

For every dataset, we select the Social-LLM model with the best edge type, edge weight, and edge direction configuration to plot the sensitivity to embedding dimension  $d$ . The results are presented in Figure 4. Performance generally increases with rising dimensions, with  $d = 258$  being a popular choice; however, we note that Social-LLM usually performs quite well even with very low dimensions.

### 6.7 Visualization

Finally, we highlight the utility of using Social-LLM embeddings as visualization tools. In Figure 5, we use TSNE [56] to reduce the embedding dimension from selected datasets and visually represent them. We observe a distinct separation of liberals and conservatives in COVID-POLITICS, and this distinction is even pronounced in ELECTION2020, emphasizing the political differences among users on a more politics-oriented topic. In the UKR-RUS-SUSPENDED dataset,

the global separation between suspended and non-suspended accounts is less apparent, but localized clusters of suspended and non-suspended users emerge. In sum, Social-LLM embeddings offer valuable support in visualizing complex social networks.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This paper presents Social-LLM, a scalable social network embedding method that integrates user content information, primarily from user profile descriptions, with social interaction information (e.g., retweets and mentions) for user detection. By combining the state-of-the-art innovations in LLMs with straightforward modeling of first-order proximity—specifically, considering only the edges themselves—from the social network by exploiting characteristics of social network sparsity and homophily. Leveraging 7 different large Twitter datasets drawn from the real world, with a diverse range of meaningful user detection tasks, we showcase the advantage and robustness of our method against state-of-the-art methods that rely solely on content or network features. Importantly, Social-LLM, once fitted to the social network, can be applied to numerous downstream user prediction tasks even *in the absence* of the original social network, underscoring its efficiency and generalizability to out-of-sample users. We show that Social-LLM works best when modeling both retweet and mention edges indiscriminately and when accounting for the directionality of social network interactions. Using additional tweet content embeddings also improves the performance. Further, Social-LLM embeddings prove useful when visualization large-scale social networks.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sinan Aral and Dylan Walker. 2012. Identifying Influential and Susceptible Members of Social Networks. *Science* 337, 6092 (2012), 337–341.
- [2] Pablo Barberá, John T Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. 2015. Tweeting From Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber? *Psychological Science* 26, 10 (2015), 1531–1542.
- [3] Federico Bianchi, Stefanie Hills, Patricia Rossini, Dirk Hovy, Rebekah Tromble, and Nava Tintarev. 2022. “It’s Not Just Hate”: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective on Detecting Harmful Speech Online. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 8093–8099. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.553>
- [4] Mitchell Bosley, Musashi Jacobs-Harukawa, Hauke Licht, and Alexander Hoyle. 2023. Do We Still Need BERT in the Age of GPT? Comparing the Benefits of Domain-Adaptation and In-Context-Learning Approaches to Using LLMs for Political Science Research. (2023).
- [5] Danah Boyd, Scott Golder, and Gilad Lotan. 2010. Tweet, Tweet, Retweet: Conversational Aspects of Retweeting on Twitter. In *HICSS 2010*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [6] Dustin P. Calvillo, Bryan J. Ross, Ryan J. B. Garcia, Thomas J. Smelter, and Abraham M. Rutchick. 2020. Political Ideology Predicts Perceptions of the Threat of COVID-19 (and Susceptibility to Fake News About It). *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 11, 8 (2020), 1119–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620940539>
- [7] Eugene Y Chan. 2021. Moral Foundations Underlying Behavioral Compliance During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Personality and Individual Differences* 171 (2021), 110463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110463>
- [8] Emily Chen, Ashok Deb, and Emilio Ferrara. 2022. #Election2020: The First Public Twitter Dataset on the 2020 US Presidential Election. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 5 (2022), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-021-00117-9>
- [9] Emily Chen and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Tweets in Time of Conflict: A Public Dataset Tracking the Twitter Discourse on the War Between Ukraine and Russia. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, Vol. 17. 1006–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v17i1.22208>
- [10] Emily Chen, Kristina Lerman, Emilio Ferrara, et al. 2020. Tracking Social Media Discourse About the COVID-19 Pandemic: Development of a Public Coronavirus Twitter Data Set. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance* 6, 2 (2020), e19273. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19273>
- [11] Coalition for Independent Technology Research. 2023. Letter: Twitter’s New API Plans Will Devastate Public Interest Research. (3 April






Figure 5: Visualization of Social-LLM embeddings on select datasets.

- 2023). <https://independenttechresearch.org/letter-twiters-new-api-plans-will-devastate-public-interest-research/> Accessed: October 11, 2023.
- [12] Michael Conover, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Matthew Francisco, Bruno Gonçalves, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2011. Political Polarization on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, Vol. 5. 89–96.
- [13] Clayton Allen Davis, Onur Varol, Emilio Ferrara, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2016. Botnotot: A System to Evaluate Social Bots. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web (WWW Companion)*. 273–274. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872518.2889302>
- [14] Morteza Dehghani, Kate Johnson, Joe Hoover, Eyal Sagi, Justin Garten, Niki Jitendra Parmar, Stephen Vaisey, Rumen Iliev, and Jesse Graham. 2016. Purity Homophily in Social Networks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 145, 3 (2016), 366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000139>
- [15] Rodrigo Díaz and Florian Cova. 2022. Reactance, Morality, and Disgust: The Relationship Between Affective Dispositions and Compliance With Official Health Recommendations During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Cognition and Emotion* 36, 1 (2022), 120–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2021.1941783>
- [16] Emilio Ferrara, Onur Varol, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2016. The Rise of Social Bots. *Commun. ACM* 59, 7 (2016), 96–104.
- [17] Kathryn B Francis and Carolyn B McNabb. 2022. Moral Decision-Making During COVID-19: Moral Judgements, Moralisation, and Everyday Behaviour. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12 (2022), 6484. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.769177>
- [18] Linton C. Freeman. 2004. *The Development of Social Network Analysis: A Study in the Sociology of Science*. Empirical Press.
- [19] Jeremy A Frimer, Harinder Aujla, Matthew Feinberg, Linda J Skitka, Karl Aquino, Johannes C Eichstaedt, and Robb Willer. 2023. Incivility is Rising Among American Politicians on Twitter. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 14, 2 (2023), 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506221083811>
- [20] Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. 2016. Node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. In *KDD 2016*. 855–864.
- [21] Jonathan Haidt. 2012. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good people are Divided by Politics and Religion*. Vintage.
- [22] Jonathan Haidt and Craig Joseph. 2004. Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues. *Daedalus* 133, 4 (2004), 55–66.
- [23] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *NIPS 2017*, Vol. 30.
- [24] William L Hamilton. 2020. *Graph representation learning*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [25] Jeff Hemsley, Jennifer Stromer-Galley, Bryan Semaan, and Sikana Tanupabrunsun. 2018. Tweeting to the Target: Candidates’ Use of Strategic Messages and @Mentions on Twitter. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 15, 1 (2018), 3–18.
- [26] Matthew Henderson, Rami Al-Rfou, Brian Strope, Yun-Hsuan Sung, László Lukács, Ruiqi Guo, Sanjiv Kumar, Balint Miklos, and Ray Kurzweil. 2017. Efficient Natural Language Response Suggestion for Smart Reply. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00652* (2017).
- [27] Joe Hoover, Gwenyth Portillo-Wightman, Leigh Yeh, Shreya Havaladar, Aida Mostafazadeh Davani, Ying Lin, Brendan Kennedy, Mohammad Atari, Zahra Kamel, Madelyn Mendlen, Gabriela Moreno, Christina Park, Tingyee E. Chang, Jenna Chin, Christian Leong, Jun Yen Leung, Arineh Mirinjian, and Morteza Dehghani. 2020. Moral Foundations Twitter Corpus: A Collection of 35k Tweets Annotated for Moral Sentiment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 11, 8 (2020), 1057–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619876629>
- [28] Indiana University’s Observatory on Social Media. 2022. Suspicious Twitter Activity around the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. (2022). [https://osome.iu.edu/research/white-papers/Ukraine\\_OSOMe\\_White\\_Paper\\_March\\_2022.pdf](https://osome.iu.edu/research/white-papers/Ukraine_OSOMe_White_Paper_March_2022.pdf)
- [29] Julie Jiang, Emily Chen, Luca Luceri, Goran Murić, Francesco Pierri, Ho-Chun Herbert Chang, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. What are Your Pronouns? Examining Gender Pronoun Usage on Twitter. In *Workshop Proceedings of the 17th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*. <https://doi.org/10.36190/2023.02>
- [30] Julie Jiang, Emily Chen, Shen Yan, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara. 2020. Political Polarization Drives Online Conversations About COVID-19 in the United States. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies* 2, 3 (2020), 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.202>
- [31] Julie Jiang, Luca Luceri, Joseph B Walther, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Social Approval and Network Homophily as Motivators of Online Toxicity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07779* (2023).
- [32] Julie Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Retweet-BERT: Political Learning Detection Using Language Features and Information Diffusion on Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, Vol. 17. 459–469. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsml.v17i1.22160>
- [33] Jin Woo Kim, Andrew Guess, Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2021. The Distorting Prism of Social Media: How Self-Selection and Exposure to Incivility Fuel Online Comment Toxicity. *Journal of Communication* 71, 6 (2021), 922–946. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqab034>
- [34] Balazs Kovacs and Adam M Kleinbaum. 2020. Language-Style Similarity and Social Networks. *Psychological Science* 31, 2 (2020), 202–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619894557>
- [35] David Lazer, Alex Pentland, Lada Adamic, Sinan Aral, Albert-László Barabási, Devon Brewer, Nicholas Christakis, Noshir Contractor, James Fowler, Myron Gutmann, Tony Jebara, Gary King, Michael Macy, Deb Roy, and Marshall Van Alstyne. 2009. Computational Social Science. *Science* 323, 5915 (2009), 721–723. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167742>
- [36] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A Robustly Optimized BERT pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [37] Ziqi Liu, Chaochao Chen, Xinxing Yang, Jun Zhou, Xiaolong Li, and Le Song. 2018. Heterogeneous Graph Neural Networks for Malicious Account Detection. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM ’18)*. 2077–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3269206.3272010>
- [38] Hehuan Ma, Yu Rong, and Junzhou Huang. 2022. Graph Neural Networks: Scalability. *Graph Neural Networks: Foundations, Frontiers, and Applications* (2022), 99–119.
- [39] VenkataSwamy Martha, Weizhong Zhao, and Xiaowei Xu. 2013. A Study on Twitter User-Follower Network: A Network Based Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*. 1405–1409.
- [40] Faiza Masood, Ahmad Almogren, Assad Abbas, Hasan Ali Khattak, Ikram Ud Din, Mohsen Guizani, and Mansour Zuair. 2019. Spammer Detection and Fake User Identification on Social Networks. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 68140–68152.
- [41] Miller McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M Cook. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 1 (2001), 415–444.
- [42] Panagiotis Metaxas, Eni Mustafaraj, Kily Wong, Laura Zeng, Megan O’Keefe, and Samantha Finn. 2015. What do Retweets Indicate? Results From User Survey and Meta-Review of Research. In *ICWSM 2015*, Vol. 9. 658–661.
- [43] Dat Quoc Nguyen, Thanh Vu, and Anh Tuan Nguyen. 2020. BERTweet: A Pre-Trained Language Model for English Tweets. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP): System Demonstrations*. 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.2>

- [44] Guangyuan Piao and John G Breslin. 2017. Inferring User Interests for Passive Users on Twitter by Leveraging Followee Biographies. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: ECIR 2017*. Springer, 122–133. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56608-5\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56608-5_10)
- [45] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Emily Chen, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. How Does Twitter Account Moderation Work? Dynamics of Account Creation and Suspension on Twitter During Major Geopolitical Events. *EPJ Data Science* 12, 1 (2023), 43. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-023-00420-7>
- [46] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Nikhil Jindal, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Propaganda and Misinformation on Facebook and Twitter during the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Web Science Conference 2023 (WebSci)*. 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3578503.3583597>
- [47] Ashwin Rao, Siyi Guo, Sze-Yuh Nina Wang, Fred Morstatter, and Kristina Lerman. 2023. Pandemic Culture Wars: Partisan Asymmetries in the Moral Language of COVID-19 Discussions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18533* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.18533>
- [48] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings Using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019*.
- [49] Manoel Ribeiro, Pedro Calais, Yuri Santos, Virgílio Almeida, and Wagner Meira Jr. 2018. Characterizing and Detecting Hateful Users on Twitter. In *ICWSM 2018*, Vol. 12.
- [50] Sebastián A Rios, Felipe Aguilera, J David Nuñez-Gonzalez, and Manuel Graña. 2019. Semantically Enhanced Network Analysis for Influencer Identification in Online Social Networks. *Neurocomputing* 326 (2019), 71–81.
- [51] Nick Rogers and Jason J Jones. 2021. Using Twitter Bios to Measure Changes in Self-Identity: Are Americans Defining Themselves More Politically Over Time? *Journal of Social Computing* 2, 1 (2021), 1–13.
- [52] Marco Serafini and Hui Guan. 2021. Scalable Graph Neural Network Training: The Case for Sampling. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 55, 1 (2021), 68–76.
- [53] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. MPNet: Masked and Permuted Pre-Training for Language Understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 16857–16867.
- [54] Surendrabikram Thapa, Aditya Shah, Farhan Ahmad Jafri, Usman Naseem, and Imran Razzak. 2022. A Multi-Modal Dataset for Hate Speech Detection on Social Media: Case-Study of Russia-Ukraine Conflict. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Challenges and Applications of Automated Extraction of Socio-political Events from Text (CASE)*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.case-1.1>
- [55] Mike Thelwall, Saheeda Thelwall, and Ruth Fairclough. 2021. Male, Female, and Nonbinary Differences in UK Twitter Self-Descriptions: A Fine-Grained Systematic Exploration. *Journal of Data and Information Science* 6, 2 (2021), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jdis-2021-0018>
- [56] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing Data Using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9, 11 (2008).
- [57] Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and Philip S. Yu. 2021. A Comprehensive Survey on Graph Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 32, 1 (2021), 4–24. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2020.2978386>
- [58] Zhiping Xiao, Weiping Song, Haoyan Xu, Zhicheng Ren, and Yizhou Sun. 2020. TIMME: Twitter Ideology-Detection via Multi-Task Multi-Relational Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2258–2268.
- [59] Kai-Cheng Yang, Emilio Ferrara, and Filippo Menczer. 2022. Botometer 101: Social Bot Practicum for Computational Social Scientists. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 5 (2022), 1511–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-022-00177-5>
- [60] Jinyi Ye, Luca Luceri, Julie Jiang, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Susceptibility to Unreliable Information Sources: Swift Adoption with Minimal Exposure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05724* (2023).
- [61] Jie Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, Yan Wang, Jie Tang, and Ming Ding. 2019. Prone: Fast and Scalable Network Representation Learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-19)*, Vol. 19. 4278–4284. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/594>