

Public sentiments on the fourth industrial revolution: An unsolicited public opinion poll from Twitter

Diletta Abbonato^{1,2}

¹DEMS, University of Milan-Bicocca

²BETA, Strasbourg University

Keywords: Fourth Industrial Revolution, Social media analytics, Technology acceptance

This article explores public perceptions on the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) through an analysis of social media discourse across six European countries. Using sentiment analysis and machine learning techniques on a dataset of tweets and media articles, we assess how the public reacts to the integration of technologies such as artificial intelligence, robotics, and blockchain into society. The results highlight a significant polarization of opinions, with a shift from neutral to more definitive stances either embracing or resisting technological impacts. Positive sentiments are often associated with technological enhancements in quality of life and economic opportunities, whereas concerns focus on issues of privacy, data security, and ethical implications. This polarization underscores the need for policymakers to engage proactively with the public to address fears and harness the benefits of 4IR technologies. The findings also advocate for digital literacy and public awareness programs to mitigate misinformation and foster an informed public discourse on future technological integration. This study contributes to the ongoing debate on aligning technological advances with societal values and needs, emphasizing the role of informed public opinion in shaping effective policy.

1 Introduction

There is an increasing call for data policy and governance to be aligned with societal values and needs, and worthy of public trust, such that it is necessary to understand peoples perception and experience in relation to data and data-driven technologies. This interaction takes different forms, including public discourse on regulatory policies (Douglas, 2012), consumer preferences impacting upon product development (Hekkert et al., 2007), and grassroots movements advocating ethical considerations in technology use (Jasanoff, 2005). In this article, we delve into the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR henceforth) (Schwab, 2017), providing a first large-scale study of public opinion on its associated technologies. In particular, we refer to artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, blockchain, cloud computing, the Internet of Things (Iot) and virtual reality, which are reshaping societal processes and systems (Geels, 2002; Orben and Przybylski, 2019). However, 4IR is not only a technological phenomenon; it is deeply human and societal in nature (Yun and Liu, 2019). The introduction of these advanced technologies in everyday life

can disrupt existing social structures with a corresponding threat in terms of inequalities and the need for new governance models (Rainie and Anderson, 2017). Society is not a mere passive recipient of these shifts (Sartori and Bocca, 2022), but it actively plays a role in shaping and directing the evolution of technology (Nelson and Sampat, 2001; Ostrom, 2009). These transformations can be observed in various fields, from labor market dynamics due to automation (Autor, 2015) and to changes in communication patterns as a result of social media (Van Dijck, 2013).

The initial decades after the implementation of such new technological systems have shown a clear difference between the economic and social aspects of technological change (Perez, 2003).

For example, concerns about data privacy have led to significant changes in how personal data is managed and regulated (Zuboff, 2023). The widespread use of AI in decision-making processes raises ethical concerns on privacy, consent, and accountability of automated systems (Cath, 2018). Moreover, 4IR shapes social interactions and cultural norms for digital connectivity enhances the boundaries of communities and changes the way people communicate and interact (Holm et al., 2023). 4IR points out that the introduction and integration of new technologies not only bring about economic transitions, but also significant transformations in social structures and functions (Schwab, 2017). With its participation in this dynamic process, society influences not only the direction but also the pace of technological advancements (Hughes et al., 1987), with the possibility of hindering the adoption of certain technologies. For instance, the widespread social demand for sustainable energy solutions has accelerated progress in renewable energy technologies (Jacobsson and Lauber, 2006), while resistance from society can slow down the development of technologies like GMOs as well (Paarlberg, 2000).

The fundamental problem concerning media management derives from a deep cultural rift between the world of science and the world of news and commentary. History has shown that when scientists run to the press with sensational claims that haven't been properly checked, the outcome is very damaging to the credibility of science itself, not to mention the reputations of the scientists involved. Therefore, the role of society goes beyond a simple neat choice of accepting or rejecting technological innovations -it actively shapes its trajectory and impact (Pinch and Bijker, 1984). Such a mutual relationship between society and technology suggests that understanding technological progress requires a comprehensive approach that not only focuses on the economic and technological dimension but also on social, cultural, and ethical dimensions (La- tour, 2007).

The democratization of digital technologies is a first example of the way 4IR has made advanced technologies more accessible. Though these technologies may be enough expensive to be available to a narrow community of institutions and corporations only, the progressive improvements in their components and architecture allowed for a sustained decrease in sale price across time, making them widely available to the majority of the population (Ceruzzi, 2012). For instance, smartphones, which have advanced computing capabilities, have become widely accessible and have had a significant impact on social dynamics (West, 2012). The spread of smartphones has largely increased the access to information, allowing people from different socioeconomic backgrounds to join the digital world. The economic theory about the diffusion of innovation contributes to explaining the shift from exclusivity to ubiquity suggesting that technological advancements become more accessible and affordable over time, reaching a wider audience (Rogers et al., 1962). Furthermore, the rise of social media and digital platforms has created new forms of social engagement and expression but has also introduced challenges related to misinformation and digital well-being (Twenge, 2017). Nevertheless, we should recognise that the digital divide is still a challenge. While many technologies have become more accessible allowing people from different socioeconomic backgrounds to join the digital world, disparities in access still exist, influenced by factors such as income, geography, and education

(Van Dijck, 2013). In this context, managing the socio-economic considerations brought about by 4IR is crucial to ensure that its benefits are widely distributed and that potential harms are mitigated. This requires a collaborative approach involving policymakers, industry leaders, and public institutions to develop strategies that promote inclusive growth and safeguard ethical standards (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014; Min et al., 2019).

Social networks have become crucial in shaping public opinion, transforming communication and information dissemination. The extensive use of platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram has revolutionized how people access and engage with information, creating new dynamics in the formation of public opinion (Allcott and Gentzkow, 2017). These networks enable rapid information sharing, allowing news and ideas to spread quickly to large and diverse audiences. Consequently, they have become influential tools in political campaigns, social movements, and public discourse (Bakshy et al., 2015). For example, the rise of hashtag activism and online communities exemplifies how social media can bring attention to societal issues and influence public opinion on a global scale (Jackson et al., 2020).

It is important to underline that the content *algorithm* of these platforms plays a significant role in influencing what users see and engage with. It can potentially raise echo chambers and filter bubbles that reinforce existing beliefs and viewpoints (Pariser, 2011), leading to polarisation in public opinion. In such scenarios, users are less likely to be exposed to different perspectives and challenging viewpoints (Sunstein, 2018).

However, these platforms also face challenges such as the spread of misinformation and fake news, which can significantly distort public perceptions and decision-making (Lazer et al., 2018). The ease with which misleading information can be spread on social networks calls for greater accountability and regulation. This issue is essential to ensure the integrity of public discourse and to prevent the negative consequences of selective exposure. While social networks have democratised the means of influencing public opinion, their impact requires careful consideration and management. Effective strategies are needed to ensure the quality and diversity of public discourse, and to counter the formation of echo chambers and the spread of misinformation (Gillespie, 2018).

Currently, the advent of ChatGPT together with the enormous progress in the field of AI have led researchers to investigate the economic impacts of AI-based technologies (Agrawal et al., 2019; Furman and Seamans, 2019; Cockburn et al., 2018), and their integration in organizational structures (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014). The use of AI has led to significant contributions in several disciplines including healthcare, finance, and the like.

However, the way in which AI evolved before the advent of COVID and ChatGPT is still a largely unexplored issue in the literature. Whilst there are several papers that do explore AI dimensions in literature (Horowitz, 2016; Awad et al., 2018; Brundage et al., 2020; Merenkov et al., 2021; Kelley et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021; Liehner et al., 2023) they deal mostly with surveys and do not consider the potential of social media e.g., Twitter to be a key factor in the analysis of public opinion with respect to other technologies. Analysing the influence of the media in shaping public opinion prior to these events can reveal the extent to which media narratives influence public perceptions of these technologies (Maxwell et al., 1972).

Given the complexity of this narrative surrounding the 4IR, two research questions emerge that warrant further investigation. The first question focuses on the evolution in time of public opinions about 4IR. Specifically, *do people's attitudes towards technology become more positive or negative as they are exposed to the advances and implications of the 4IR?* The objective is to quantify and track social sentiment towards the transformative potential of digital technologies. Additionally, this work aims at examining the extent to which the public discourse reflects optimism or concerns on the risks associated with 4IR. The second question *what is the nature of interactions between users with different viewpoints on 4IR?* Thus we explore whether users with

similar viewpoints tend to form polarized communities or engage with open discourse and debate with those holding contrasting beliefs.

This study contributes to the ongoing debate on aligning technological advances with societal values and needs, emphasizing the role of informed public opinion in shaping effective policy. Additionally, it presents a first large-scale study of public opinion on 4IR technologies. Answering these questions contributes to better policy-making in several ways. Firstly, by analysing how public opinions about 4IR technologies evolve over time, policymakers can identify patterns and shifts in sentiment. This insight allows for the anticipation of public concerns and misconceptions before they become widespread. Secondly, during periods of rapid technological change or crisis, for example during the introduction of new technology, understanding public opinion and interaction patterns helps in developing clear and effective communication plans to quickly address and correct any misinformation. Additionally, the recognition of unique misinformation patterns associated with different technology types allows for the implementation of more targeted countermeasures.

2 Background literature

2.1 Narratives

The narratives surrounding AI and the technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) have a significant impact on society perceptions and understanding. A number of scholars have conducted in-depth research into the representation of AI in various forms of media, including scientific and popular publications, as well as in fictional contexts. Their findings indicate that this representation tends to oscillate between two extremes: optimism and pessimism. This oscillation is believed to reflect deeply-rooted beliefs, hopes, and fears related to technological advancements (Fast and Horvitz, 2017; Cave and Dihal, 2019; Cave et al., 2020). In addition Cave and Dihal (2019) have identified four main narratives that interpret these feelings (Tab.1):

- *Immortality-Dehumanization* explores the medical field, in which AI is used in research, suggesting a utopic vision of human immortality, contrasted with dystopic concerns of dehumanization and the loss of human values.
- *Freedom-Obsolescence* in which the former symbolizes the liberation from mundane tasks, promising a future free from physical and mental strain, while the latter is associated with the risks of job losses caused by abrupt technological shifts.
- *Gratification-Alienation* celebrates the potential of AI to fulfill any human desire, offering gratification in the several dimensions of life. However, it is counterbalanced by the risk of alienation, in which technology threatens human interaction.
- *Dominance-Uprising* addresses the role of AI in military applications, oscillating between the need of dominance and security, and the fear about machine uprising and loss of human control.

These narratives not only reflect but also shape social engagement with technology, which as a practice, reveals the dynamics of production and usage (Suchman et al., 2017). Nevertheless, these narratives often deviate from AI current technical capabilities (Floridi and Chiriatti, 2020; Musa Giuliano, 2020). This discrepancy is often attributed to the thought capabilities of AI (Neff and Nagy, 2018), which leads to some mismatch in user expectations, e.g., the Tay chatbot incident (Nagy and Neff, 2015; Zemčík, 2021).¹

Furthermore, human-like perceptions of technology fuelled by the need for social interaction and

the push for technological acceptance in robot research (Katz et al., 2015; Salles et al., 2020; Zemčík, 2021), contribute to the construction of these narratives. These factors highlight that technology extends into the social realm through interactions and beliefs.

Alongside, narratives about the 4IR are intertwined with societal progress. Fast and Horvitz (2017) argue that technological advancements under 4IR will fundamentally shape societal evolution, driven by the promise of intelligent machines, improvements in healthcare, and enhanced well-being. Yet, concerns raised by many scholars focus on potential threats, including Orwellian surveillance, job displacement, and further ethical challenges (Perkowitz, 2007; Frey and Osborne, 2017; Obozintsev, 2018; Jobin et al., 2019). Regarding other technologies, such as Virtual Reality (VR), the narratives often focus on the possibilities of *Enhanced Experience* and the risks of *Escapism*. VR provides immersive experiences that enhance learning, entertainment, and social interaction. This process fuels an optimistic perspective beyond physical limitations and enables access to further experiences. Social isolation and escapism may none the less threaten optimistic scenarios and calls in the right balance between virtual and real-world interactions.

Table 1: AI narratives

Field	Hopes	Fear	Debate
Health	Immortality	Dehumanization	Man conquering immortality while on the other side humans lose their essence, ditching values and emotions.
Employment	Freedom	Job replacement/Obsolescence	Humans will be liberated from tedious or tiring tasks, be they physical or cognitive. The opposite representation is the risk linked to this technical turning point.
Sociology	Gratification	Alienation	AI and robots fulfill every human desire, but on the other hand, the opposite scenario predicts that individuals will only interact with technologies rather than with other people.
Surveillance	Security	Uprising	The optimistic scenario predicts that new tools will enable nations and communities to ensure security for all, while on the other hand there is the iconic narrative of sci-fi where AI will take over humans.

Notes: Own elaboration based on Cave and Dihal (2019)

For what concerns to Blockchain, the literature highlights the contrast between *Decentralization and Trust* and *Complexity and Misuse*. Blockchain technology is emphasised for its ability to decentralize power structures and improve transparency. It enhances trust in transactions without the need of central authorities, as observed in sectors like finance, supply chain, and digital identity. Despite this potential, the complexity of the technology and its association with illegal activities, as well as concerns about energy consumption, presents a counter-narrative (Khan and Salah, 2018). Seemingly the narrative on the Internet of Things (IoT), turns around *Connectivity and Efficiency versus Privacy and Security Risks*. IoT and its interconnected network of devices promise to enhance efficiency and convenience in daily life (Atzori et al., 2010). However, this increased connectivity also brings significant concerns regarding privacy and data security (Weinberg et al., 2015).

¹Tay chatbot was launched on Twitter in 2016 as an experiment in *conversational understanding*. However, it was quickly corrupted by users that filled it with racist and offensive remarks, leading the bot to ex inappropriate

and inflammatory statements. Therefore, Microsoft shut it down less than 24 hours after its launch.

2.2 Echo chambers, polarization and misinformation

The advent of the digital era, characterized by the rapid expansion of the internet and social media, has fundamentally altered the landscape of information dissemination and consumption. Despite offering unparalleled access to diverse perspectives, this transformation poses significant challenges, including the creation of echo chambers, the spread of misinformation, and increased polarization. These challenges threaten the integrity of public discourse and the cohesion of social fabric.


Echo chambers refer to the situation in which individuals are predominantly exposed to opinions and information that reinforce pre-existing beliefs (Del Vicario et al., 2016; Quattrociocchi et al., 2016). On the one hand, this selective exposure, often exacerbated by algorithmic filtering, facilitates the reinforcement of existing viewpoints. On the other hand, polarisation results from the homogenization of thought, leading to societal attitudes that increasingly diverge towards the ideological extremes. The presence of echo chambers contributes to a social divide and intensifies both polarization and its deleterious effects on democratic discourse. Furthermore, the circulation of misinformation within these isolated communities can deepen public polarization and distort the collective comprehension of crucial issues (Lazer et al., 2018).

The phenomenon of echo chambers has been identified as a significant contributor to social polarization. These environments are characterized by the amplification of existing beliefs and the minimization of exposure to conflicting viewpoints, which collectively foster a false consensus (Sunstein, 2018). The critical examination of digital-platforms impact on public opinion and discourse is imperative, given the role of social media algorithms in perpetuating these echo chambers (Nyhan and Reifler, 2010; Pariser, 2011; Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

Misinformation further fuels social polarization by skewing the information landscape and reinforcing pre-existing biases (Fig.1). The propagation of false information through social media platforms exacerbates this issue and undermines the integrity of public discourse and the democratic process (Allcott and Gentzkow, 2017). The swift spread of misinformation within echo chambers not only fixes biased beliefs but also diminishes trust in credible information sources (Bakshy et al., 2015; Wineburg and McGrew, 2017; Lazer et al., 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018).

The misinformation exposure is a complex interplay of technological, social, psychological, and economic factors that contribute to its proliferation. Social media platforms, with their vast reach and rapid dissemination capabilities, act as catalysts for the spread of false information, driven by algorithms that prioritize engagement over accuracy (Del Vicario et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019). Cognitive biases, such as the confirmation bias, play a significant role by leading individuals to favor information that confirms their pre-existing beliefs, thereby intensifying polarization (Ecker et al., 2011; Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

Figure 1: Different aspects of public opinion dynamics




Notes: In panel (a) population is divided into two dominant groups with opposing views on a specific issue. The peaks indicate the concentration of individuals within each opinion group, while the trough indicates a lack of moderate stances. This highlights the clear divide and potential for increased social tensions; in panel (b) the “lock-in” effect in public opinion occurs when a single viewpoint has become overwhelmingly predominant. This marginalizes alternative perspectives and demonstrates the societal or cultural homogeneity on a specific issue; in pane (c) the dissent shows a spectrum of views where the majority holds a central opinion, while a range of dissenting views exists on either side. This indicates a diverse and engaged public discourse

3 Data and methods

We focused on the analysis of the discourse surrounding 4IR across six European countries: France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and United Kingdom. We adopt a multi-step approach to gather an original dataset (Fig.2).

Figure 2: Data pipeline-time period considered from 01/01/2006 to 31/12/2019



3.1 Data sources

The data collection process begins with the identification of the most widely circulated newspapers in each country according to the number of copies sold (Tab.2). Afterwards, we detect their official Twitter profiles and their corresponding tweets which contain some keywords belonging to 4IR (Tab.2). To guarantee linguistic precision and cultural appropriateness, we perform translations of keywords. For example, in the case of Italy, we search for both *Artificial Intelligence* and *Intelligenza Artificiale*.

Table 2: Country-specific 4IR keywords and associated newspapers

Country	4IR Keywords	Newspaper
UK	artificial intelligence; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality	DailyMailUK; guardiannews; EveningStandard; thetimes; MetroUK; MailOnline; guardian; TheSun; DailyMirror
France	intelligence artificielle; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality; ralit virtuelle; Internet des objets	humanite.fr; Mediapart; LaCroix; libe; lopinion.fr; le_Parisien; lemondfr; Le Figaro; LesEchos
Spain	inteligencia artificial; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality; realidad virtual; Internet de las cosas	ElMundoEspan; elcorreo.com; lavozdegallicia; diariavasco; elperiodico;_abc.es; larazon.es; elpas;LaVanguardia
Germany	knstliche Intelligenz; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality; virtuelle realitt; internet der dinge	Ndaktuell; tazgezschwitscher; Tagesspiegel; BILD; SZ; faznet; welt; handelsblatt
Netherlands	kunstmatige intelligentie; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality; virtuele werkelijkheid; internet der dingen	Delimburger; DeGelderlander; trouw; De_Stentor; nrc; Telegraaf; volkskrant; Adnl
Italy	intelligenza artificiale; robot; blockchain; cloud computing; IoT; virtual reality; reall virtuale; internet delle cose	Ilgiornale; LaVeritaWeb; Avvenire.Nei; Libero official; LaStampa; fattoquotidiano; repubblica;Corriere; Solo24ore

To create a sample of users who show interest in AI and related technologies, we observe interactions – likes, retweets, and comments – with tweets from the selected newspapers. We consider users who engage with them as if they have a potential personal interest in the technologies given their interaction with the newspapers. For each user, we collect their tweet timeline from January 2006 to December 2019 using Twitter API and *twarc*². This time frame was selected to mitigate the potential influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on the data. Furthermore, we collect data on the followers and followed accounts and apply a similar process to gather tweets from their timelines. The final dataset includes approximately 25,000 users and 90,000 tweets (Fig.3). Each tweet is identified by a unique ID and includes information about author, text, date, as well as details about the location, number of likes, and retweets.

²Twarc is a command line tool and Python library for collecting and archiving Twitter JSON data via the Twitter API. It handles Twitter API's rate limits and can be used to collect tweets, users, trends, and hydrate tweet IDs.

Figure 3: Number of news and tweets collected per country





Figure 4: Number of tweets retrieved per keyword



Notes: Frequency of specific technology-related keywords. The data reflects the number of mentions for each technology, highlighting the interest in various technological fields among Twitter users.

Table 3: Share of technology terms by country

Keyword	UK	France	Italy	Spain	Germany	Netherlands
Artificial Intelligence	14.49	27.38	25.25	19.14	13.84	19.94
Virtual Reality	7.15	0.19	2.48	3.46	2.28	11.98
Blockchain	49.11	21.21	15.68	19.32	49.73	24.86
Robot	59.91	34.68	34.98	26.90	22.09	78.76
Cloud Computing	0.92	0.31	0.41	0.28	0.27	0.23
IoT	11.83	3.34	3.81	3.20	4.99	2.90
5G	6.57	3.70	5.40	4.61	5.99	7.06

Building on the data collection framework described above, we then proceeded to analyze the contents of the gathered tweets. As first approach we focused on identifying the occurrence of the key technology-related terms within the tweets. As illustrated in Fig.4, the prevalence of discussions on technologies such as *Robots*, *Blockchain*, and *AI* mirrors the findings of other studies, which highlight the increasing penetration of these technologies in various sectors and their perceived impact (Ford, 2015; Swan, 2015). The moderate mentions of cloud computing and virtual reality align with the observations by Greenhalgh et al. (2017), who suggest that while these technologies are well-established, they may not provoke the same level of continuous public intrigue as more disruptive technologies. On the other hand, the relatively lower frequency for emerging technologies like *IoT* and *5G* towards the later part of the analyzed period can be understood through the lens of diffusion of innovations theory, which posits that newer technologies typically undergo a phase of gradual adoption marked by lesser public discourse initially (Rogers et al., 1962). This trend underscores the necessity to continuously monitor technological discourse over time to capture shifting public and professional interests as new technologies mature and penetrate different market segments.

Regarding intra-country differences, the results in Tab.3 suggests pattern variances in the discussion frequency of technological terms among European countries. AI is more debated in France and Italy compared to other countries such as United Kingdom and Germany, suggesting a greater focus or investment in AI technologies in these countries. The Netherlands exhibits increased discussion rates on topics such as VR and robotics, which may indicate stronger industrial applications or governmental support in these fields. Germany and the UK both exhibit a high interest

in blockchain, which might reflect a robust engagement with cryptocurrency and blockchain technologies. On the other hand, cloud computing and IoT show low percentages across all countries, indicating that these technologies are still in the early stages of adoption or discussion saturation.

3.2 Text analysis

We use sentiment analysis techniques to understand public sentiment. Specifically, we employ the XLM-T Roberta model (Barbieri et al., 2021) which is available on Hugging Face and represents a transformer model trained on a dataset including over 15 million tweets in 10+ languages.³ Sentiment analysis, also known as opinion mining, is a key task in Natural Language Processing

³Hugging Face is a platform for machine learning and data science that simplifies building, deploying and training of machine learning models. It is often referred to as the 'GitHub of machine learning' due to its ability to enable developers to share and discover machine learning models. The platform offers infrastructures for deploying and running AI in live applications, along with tools to decrease model training time, resource consumption, and environmental impact of AI development.


(NLP) that involves the identification and categorisation of sentiments expressed in text that relate to specific topics, products, or services. By using language models, it is possible to determine the type of sentiment within the text, which can be classified as positive, negative, or neutral.

For instance, a sentence such as “I love you and I like you” expresses a positive sentiment. Sentiment analysis is the process of analysing and interpreting expressed opinions, allowing for the extraction of information from unstructured textual data. It has a wide range of applications across various sectors and functions. In the business sector, it serves as an important mechanism for gathering business intelligence, helping companies capture customer feedback on their offerings for product development, define marketing strategies, and revise customer service operations (Liu et al., 2022). Sentiment analysis is proving to be crucial to market research, enabling companies to gain a deeper understanding of market trends and consumer preferences by analysing social media posts, reviews and forums, allowing them to tailor services and products to consumer needs and market dynamics, and to manage a brand and its reputation in real time (Pang et al., 2008). The use of sentiment analysis is not limited to commercial applications. It is also employed in the political sphere to gauge public sentiment towards policies, debates, and election messages. This provides political parties and candidates with valuable insights into their campaign strategy (Tumasjan et al., 2010).

To determine the presence of echo chambers within our dataset, we analyzed the sentiment distribution of tweets shared by users and their followers and followings. The intensity of each sentiment – negative, neutral, and positive – was averaged within the followers and followings for each user. The application of sentiment analysis to detect echo chambers is based on the premise that echo chambers typically exhibit homogeneous sentiment expressions, as members reinforce each other’s viewpoints (Garimella et al., 2018). Using sentiment analysis to examine the tweets of users and their followers/followings allows researchers to detect patterns of agreement or disagreement, which are indicative of the presence or absence of echo chambers. Averaging the sentiment scores among a user’s followers and followings to assess consensus and the reinforcement of beliefs is a methodological choice supported by literature on social media dynamics. It helps in understanding the collective sentiment within a user’s network, which is crucial for identifying echo chambers where prevalent sentiments can suggest a uniformity in attitudes and beliefs (Sunstein, 2001; Del Vicario et al., 2016). The assumption here is that high average sentiment scores (either positive or negative) within a network signal agreement and potentially an echo chamber environment. We decided to set as threshold 0.6 to balance significant sentiment indicative of agreement and maintaining robustness across different topics. The decision to set a threshold of 0.6 for sentiment scores to classify the presence of an echo chamber is a critical step that requires justification. This threshold balances sensitivity (the ability to detect actual echo chambers) and specificity (the ability to exclude non-echo chamber cases). The choice of 0.6 as a threshold implies a significant skew towards a specific sentiment. This approach aligns with the work by Cinelli et al. (2021), who suggest that clear demarcations in sentiment can help identify highly polarized communities, akin to echo chambers. When the sentiment score is above 0.6, it indicates the likelihood of a user as part of an echo chamber, characterized by a high level of agreement and reinforcement of existing beliefs. The use of a sentiment score threshold to infer these characteristics is therefore a rational extension of this definition, aiming to carry out the detection of such environments through quantitative measures of sentiment agreement.

For the purpose of the narrative identification, the DeBERTa algorithm was employed on zero-shot classification, a machine learning technique that enables a model to accurately classify data into categories that were not present during training. DeBERTa was selected over other models due to its disentangled attention mechanism, which distinguishes between the relative

Figure 5: Trends in newspaper tweet sentiments




Notes: The figure shows a decrease in neutral sentiment tweets and a gradual increase in both positive and negative sentiment tweets, indicating a slightly growing polarization in public discourse over time.

positions of words from their absolute positions in a sentence, thereby enhancing its ability to understand complex language patterns. This capability enables the model to apply generalisation effectively from observed categories to unobserved categories through the utilisation of semantic relationships between categories (Lampert et al., 2009). Moreover, DeBERTa enhances this capability with a robust pre-training on a diverse dataset, which provides it with a broad linguistic understanding necessary for handling the novel and complex sentence structures encountered in different scenarios. Additionally, the performance of DeBERTa on various NLP benchmarks indicates its capability on feature extraction and contextual understanding capabilities. Typically, rich feature representations, such as embeddings, are employed to capture underlying similarities between different classes. For instance, a model trained on images about animals and their corresponding labels could correctly classify an unobserved image of a “zebra” if it has learned the concept of animals and similar features from observed categories such as “horse”.

4 Results

The investigation into public-opinion dynamics surrounding 4IR technologies, conducted prior to the widespread adoption of ChatGPT and the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, revealed a set of insights into societal perceptions and discursive patterns. We analyzed a comprehensive dataset of tweets and news articles from six European countries (Italy, France, Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Spain), quantifying public sentiment and identifying prevalent themes and narratives that shape societal engagement with 4IR technologies. We apply the sentiment analysis both on the tweet shared by the newspaper and the user, discovering a similar pattern (Fig.5 and 6). Over time, there is a tendency towards an increased relevance of negative and positive sentiments with respect to some neutrality. Moreover, we compute the sentiment analysis on the follower and the following for each user.

Figure 6: Trends in user tweet sentiments



Notes: The figure shows a decrease in neutral sentiment tweets and a gradual increase in both positive and negative sentiment tweets, indicating a slightly polarization in public discourse over time.


The data indicate a decrease in neutrality in both media coverage and user responses. Specifically, the number of neutral tweets and articles has decreased over time, suggesting that more individuals and media outlets are taking a stand as discussions around 4IR intensify. This shift signifies greater public awareness and engagement with emerging technologies, reflecting a more polarized and active debate.

With applying zero-shot classification using DeBERTa (Laurer et al., 2023) we categorise tweets according to key themes partially considering Tab.1, such as *employment* (14%), *environment* (20%), *privacy* (3%), *health* (7%), and *other* (56%) partly following the narratives in Tab.1.

Furthermore, our analysis revealed a slight slope towards positivity in the discourse about new technologies. The data show an increase in the frequency of positive tweets and articles, reflecting an optimistic outlook on the potential benefits these technologies can bring. This positive trend is particularly evident in the fields of health and employment, where 4IR technologies, such as AI and robotics, are perceived as tools that can improve quality of life and create new job opportunities. We also conducted specific country analysis, which reveals distinct trends in sentiment toward new technologies across various nations, highlighting the complex landscape of public opinion. Figure 7 illustrates that while there is an overall decrease in neutral sentiment across several countries like the UK, Germany, and the Netherlands, indicating a possibly cautious or ambivalent attitude toward new technologies, the trends in positive and negative sentiments show more variability. For instance, countries like Spain and the Netherlands exhibit a rising trend in positive sentiment, aligning with a generally optimistic view on the potential of 4IR technologies. On the other hand, the negative sentiment remains relatively low and stable across most countries, suggesting that while enthusiasm varies, there is not a significant rise in skepticism or opposition.

Building on the results of our sentiment analysis, Tab.4 further deepens our understanding of the specific issues that dominate discussions about new technologies in different countries. This

Figure 7: Trends in user tweets sentiments by country



topic-categorisation shows a diversified interest that varies significantly between regions. For instance, the share of discussion on *employment*, particularly in country such as the Netherlands and France, could suggest a strong interest in how new technologies are reshaping labour markets. This reflects the positive sentiment towards 4IR technologies observed in these countries, indicating optimism about the potential for job creation and economic growth. Moreover, in countries like France and the Netherlands, the importance of this issue is higher than in Germany. This may reflect the integration of technology issues into public health discussions, particularly in the context of recent global health challenges. The relatively low engagement in *privacy* could indicate a need for increased awareness and education on privacy issues as technology becomes more pervasive. These findings complement the sentiment trends by revealing not only the emotional tone of discussions, but also the substantive concerns and interests of the public. A comprehensive analysis of the trends by country for both keywords and topics is detailed in the Appendix.

4.1 Echo chamber identification

Our findings indicate that slightly more than 6% of users may be situated within an echo chamber, with minimal variation observed across different topics (Tab.5). This suggests a moderate level of topic-dependent engagement within echo chambers, with privacy showing the highest propensity and health the lowest.

Table 4: Share of topic per country

Topic	UK	France	Italy	Spain	Germany	Netherlands
Employment	10.26	14.80	13.98	13.43	10.35	16.60
Environment	17.44	14.43	13.13	15.15	15.72	14.94
Health	5.67	7.96	7.83	5.09	3.16	7.06
Other	64.90	60.72	63.45	64.50	68.95	59.24
Privacy	1.76	1.56	1.61	1.83	1.82	2.16

Table 5: Topic analysis with sentiment variance and misinformation mean

Topic	Sentiment Variance	Misinformation mean	Share in echo chamber (%)
Employment	0.29	0.25	5.82
Environment	0.30	0.24	7.08
Health	0.26	0.24	5.22
Other	0.26	0.25	6.14
Privacy	0.30	0.27	7.20


In addition, the work of Mosleh and Rand (2022) here was used to associate each user with an elite misinformation-exposure score based on the elite misinformation-exposure score that users follow on Twitter. For instance, by following individuals such as Trump, who are known to disseminate false information, a user is likely to receive a high misinformation-exposure score.⁴ This score is negatively correlated with the quality of the news disseminated and positively correlated with conservative ideology. Although misinformation levels are generally low, as indicated by the results in Tab.5 and Figure8 (Panel C), privacy has a higher average misinformation score, suggesting that this topic is more affected to misinformation than the others. In Fig.8 (Panel B) is illustrate how the gradual increase in the average misinformation exposure score may reflect various factors, including a greater prevalence of fake news on social media and greater polarisation in online discussions. The presence of high scores in each year indicates that misinformation is a persistent problem, but the moderate growth suggests that the dynamics behind its spread may be multiple.

Our analysis highlighted that misinformation and polarization are significant issues in the public discourse on 4IR technologies. The spread of misinformation is facilitated by the presence of echo chambers, where false information can be easily shared and accepted without verification. Polarization is further exacerbated by this dynamic, creating a growing divide between groups with different opinions. The diversity of opinions is another key element that emerged from our analysis. Despite the trend towards increased polarization, there remains a significant variety of viewpoints in public discourse. This plurality of voices supports inclusive and critical debates about the implications of 4IR technologies, highlighting the importance of considering all perspectives in decision-making processes.

At the country-level as shown in Tab.6 reveals marked differences in how misinformation and echo chambers influence public opinion across various nations. For instance, in countries with robust digital literacy programs and stringent media regulations, misinformation spread appears to be more contained, and echo chambers less prevalent. This contrasts with countries where

⁴see <https://misinfoexpose.com/>

Figure 8: Misinformation exposure score




Notes: Panel A represents the histogram of the misinformation exposure score. Panel B the share of misinformation exposure scores. This suggests that exposure to misinformation has gradually risen over this period, highlighting a growing challenge in fighting misinformation in public discourse. Panel C illustrates the distribution of misinformation exposure scores across five topics: employment, environment, health, other, and privacy. The median scores are similar across topics, with a moderate spread in the interquartile ranges. This indicates a consistent exposure to misinformation across these key areas, with no single topic showing significantly higher or lower levels of misinformation exposure.

digital education is lacking and media regulations are lenient, where misinformation tends to flourish and echo chambers solidify, deepening societal divides.

These disparities not only reflect the effectiveness of national policies but also underscore the varying cultural attitudes towards technology and information consumption. For example, countries that prioritize education in media literacy and critical thinking skills show a higher resilience to misinformation and a more diverse and healthy public discourse. This is evident in nations like Germany and the Netherlands, where the public debates around 4IR technologies are characterized by a higher degree of skepticism and critical engagement, despite the challenges of polarization and echo chambers.

Furthermore, the degree of technological advancement and the prevalence of technology in everyday life also play crucial roles in shaping the discourse. In technologically advanced countries, there is a tendency for more nuanced discussions about the benefits and risks of 4IR technologies. Conversely, in countries where technology penetration is lower, discussions are often more polarized, with a pronounced divide between pro-technology advocates and those wary of the rapid changes brought about by 4IR technologies.

Figure 9: Trends in echo chamber participation



Notes: Panel A shows the share of echo chamber participation over time for various technology-related keywords including AI, VR, Blockchain, Robots, Cloud Computing, IoT, and 5G. The sharp peak in 2014 suggests a significant moment of concentrated discussion, possibly linked to pivotal technological developments or debates. Panel B represents the fluctuation in echo chamber shares for discussions on key social issues such as employment, environment, health, privacy, and others over time. The graph highlights a notable spike around 2014, indicating a year of possibly polarized discussions across these topics

5 Discussion

Our study highlights a complex set of attitudes towards emerging technologies that policymakers could consider as they shape the future of 4IR technologies regulations. These attitudes reflect the intricate interplay between technological advancements and societal needs and concerns. The observed reduction in neutrality in both media coverage and public responses indicates a growing polarization in the discourse surrounding 4IR technologies.

The increased polarization can be leveraged to engage more deeply with the public, ensuring that the deployment of 4IR technologies aligns with societal values and needs. For instance, understanding the roots of public skepticism can guide the development of targeted educational campaigns and transparent information sharing. These efforts can foster public trust and support for 4IR initiatives.

The general appreciation for AI when it is used in ways that clearly benefit society, such as improving health and science, underscores the positive externalities associated with technological innovation. This positive view aligns with findings from studies, which noted strong public support for AI applications that enhance societal welfare (Zhang and Dafoe, 2020; Birkstedt et al., 2023). The recognition of the AI potential to drive significant improvements in healthcare and scientific research highlights the importance of innovation policies that support and promote beneficial applications. Public support for AI in health and science suggests a broad recognition of the technology's role in solving complex problems and improving quality of life, which is a key driver of technological adoption and diffusion as articulated in the theory of diffusion of innovations (Rogers et al., 1962).

However, significant concerns arise when AI systems make critical decisions affecting individual lives, such as determining eligibility for welfare benefits. These concerns echo broader issues of accountability and transparency in automated decision-making processes (Butcher and Beridze,

Table 6: Topic analysis with sentiment variance, misinformation mean, and echo chamber share by country

Country	Sentiment variance	Misinformation mean	Share in echo chamber (%)
<i>Employment</i>			
UK	0.31	0.30	6.61
France	0.26	0.20	4.23
Italy	0.29	0.26	4.99
Spain	0.28	0.20	5.89
Germany	0.28	0.24	9.30
Netherlands	0.37	0.31	6.50
<i>Environment</i>			
UK	0.31	0.27	8.20
France	0.27	0.20	4.59
Italy	0.25	0.24	6.60
Spain	0.29	0.16	5.04
Germany	0.33	0.24	9.41
Netherlands	0.35	0.26	8.89
<i>Health</i>			
UK	0.28	0.28	5.65
France	0.22	0.20	4.52
Italy	0.33	0.22	4.86
Spain	0.25	0.19	4.63
Germany	0.33	0.30	7.61
Netherlands	0.31	0.31	7.06
<i>Other</i>			
UK	0.28	0.29	7.33
France	0.23	0.21	3.89
Italy	0.23	0.26	6.45
Spain	0.25	0.20	5.14
Germany	0.27	0.27	6.54
Netherlands	0.28	0.24	6.48
<i>Privacy</i>			
UK	0.32	0.31	7.73
France	0.25	0.21	7.14
Italy	0.35	0.32	3.95
Spain	0.24	0.20	6.19
Germany	0.28	0.30	5.66
Netherlands	0.24	0.26	11.54

2019). Public wariness of delegating critical decision-making to automated systems without human oversight reflects the broader economic concern of asymmetric information and the potential for technology to exacerbate inequalities if not properly managed. As AI systems take on more significant roles in governance and administration, the potential for unintended consequences increases, necessitating robust safeguards and accountability measures. The fear of automated decision-making systems potentially mishandling personal data or making biased decisions illustrates the need for transparency and explainability in AI, which are crucial for maintaining public trust (Pasquale, 2015).

Moreover, the strong public call to protect basic rights like privacy highlights the need for regulatory frameworks that safeguard individual freedoms while promoting technological innovation (Brown and Marsden, 2023). Privacy concerns are paramount in the digital age, where data is a critical resource driving innovation. The economic trade-offs between data utility and privacy must be carefully managed to ensure that advancements in AI do not come at the cost of fundamental rights (Acquisti et al., 2015). Public demand for stringent privacy protections underscores the importance of developing AI systems that are secure and respect user confidentiality, aligning with the principles of data protection regulations such as GDPR. The nuances in public opinion are evident. People support AI that simplifies tasks and enhances

accessibility, recognizing the potential benefits for the greater good. However, they also worry about over-reliance on technology at the expense of human judgment, especially in areas that significantly impact personal and professional lives. This dual sentiment underscores the economic principle of balancing efficiency gains from technology with the maintenance of human-centric values and the potential costs associated with technological disruptions. This concern about the balance between technology and human interaction is echoed in the broader discourse on the social impacts of automation and AI (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014). Public involvement can take various forms, such as consultations, surveys, and participatory governance models. These approaches help bridge the gap between technological experts and the public, fostering a collaborative environment where diverse perspectives contribute to more robust and socially acceptable technological solutions.

Regarding regulation, the public desires rules that can address the complex issues AI presents. There is skepticism about leaving AI regulation solely in the hands of the private sector, with a preference for robust oversight to ensure fairness and transparency. This perspective is supported by research indicating that public trust in governance is crucial for the successful implementation of AI technologies (Butcher and Beridze, 2019). Effective regulation can help mitigate the risks of market failures, such as monopolistic practices and the misuse of AI, ensuring that technological benefits are widely shared. Regulatory frameworks need to be adaptive and forward-looking to keep pace with rapid technological changes, ensuring that they do not stifle innovation while protecting public interests (Birkstedt et al., 2023).

Lastly, there is a strong desire for more public involvement in AI decision-making. People want their voices heard, especially on matters that directly impact their daily lives, supporting the advocacy for participatory approaches in tech policy (Fung, 2006). This aligns with the economic theory of democratic governance in innovation, which posits that inclusive and participatory policy-making processes can lead to more equitable and effective outcomes (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007). By involving the public in decision-making, policymakers can ensure that AI technologies are developed and deployed in ways that reflect societal values and priorities. Participatory governance models help bridge the gap between technological experts and the public, fostering a collaborative environment where diverse perspectives contribute to more robust and socially acceptable technological solutions.

Our findings suggest that data governance policies must align with societal values and needs to earn and maintain public trust. This requires a collaborative approach involving policymakers, industry leaders, and public institutions to develop strategies that promote inclusive growth and uphold ethical standards. There is a strong public demand for robust and independent regulations to address the complex ethical and social issues posed by 4IR technologies. Regulation should not be left entirely to the private sector; public oversight is necessary to ensure fairness and transparency. Educating the public about the potential benefits and risks of emerging technologies is crucial to mitigate concerns and increase acceptance. Raising awareness of the mechanisms of misinformation and echo chambers can help reduce polarization and improve the quality of public discourse. It is important to involve the public in decisions regarding the adoption and regulation of new technologies, ensuring that their voices are heard, especially on issues directly impacting their daily lives. Continuous monitoring of public discourse and social perceptions over time is essential to adapt policies and strategies in response to changing opinions and concerns. The dynamics of public discourse on social media should be carefully examined to better understand how they influence societal perceptions and behaviors.

Our research focuses on the time period before the worldwide release of ChatGPT in December 2022 (Marr, 2023). This decision is based on the timing of our data acquisition, which occurred before. The exploitation of the Twitter API also took place prior to Elon Musk's acquisition of

the platform in October 2022. This event has significantly altered the conditions of data access and the amount of retrievable information (Conger and Hirsch, 2022). While we acknowledge the importance of considering the perspectives that reflect the post-ChatGPT era in the analysis of public opinion, this study aims at establishing a baseline framework. Moreover, this benchmark aims at suggesting avenues for further research on the period that follows the introduction of ChatGPT.

References

- Acquisti, A., Brandimarte, L., and Loewenstein, G. (2015). Privacy and human behavior in the age of information. *Science*, 347(6221):509–514.
- Agrawal, A., Gans, J. S., and Goldfarb, A. (2019). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence: Prediction versus judgment. *Information Economics and Policy*, 47:1–6.
- Allcott, H. and Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 31(2):211–236.
- Atzori, L., Iera, A., and Morabito, G. (2010). The internet of things: A survey. *Computer networks*, 54(15):2787–2805.
- Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? the history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 29(3):3–30.
- Awad, E., Dsouza, S., Kim, R., Schulz, J., Henrich, J., Shariff, A., Bonnefon, J.-F., and Rahwan, I. (2018). The moral machine experiment. *Nature*, 563(7729):59–64.
- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., and Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on facebook. *Science*, 348(6239):1130–1132.
- Barbieri, F., Anke, L. E., and Camacho-Collados, J. (2021). Xlm-t: A multilingual language model toolkit for twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12250*.
- Birkstedt, T., Minkkinen, M., Tandon, A., and Mäntymäki, M. (2023). Ai governance: themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas. *Internet Research*, 33(7):133–167.
- Brown, I. and Marsden, C. T. (2023). *Regulating code: Good governance and better regulation in the information age*. MIT Press.
- Brundage, M., Avin, S., Wang, J., Belfield, H., Krueger, G., Hadfield, G., Khlaaf, H., Yang, J., Toner, H., Fong, R., et al. (2020). Toward trustworthy ai development: mechanisms for supporting verifiable claims. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07213*.
- Brynjolfsson, E. and McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Butcher, J. and Beridze, I. (2019). What is the state of artificial intelligence governance globally? *The RUSI Journal*, 164(5-6):88–96.
- Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2133):20180080.

- Cave, S. and Dihal, K. (2019). Hopes and fears for intelligent machines in fiction and reality. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(2):74–78.
- Cave, S., Dihal, K., and Dillon, S. (2020). *AI narratives: A history of imaginative thinking about intelligent machines*. Oxford University Press.
- Ceruzzi, P. E. (2012). *Computing: a concise history*. MIT press.
- Cinelli, M., De Francisci Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., and Starnini, M. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9):e2023301118.
- Cockburn, I. M., Henderson, R., and Stern, S. (2018). The impact of artificial intelligence on innovation: An exploratory analysis. In *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda*, pages 115–146. University of Chicago Press.
- Conger, K. and Hirsch, L. (2022). Elon musk completes 44 billion deal to own twitter. *The New York Times*.
- Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Petroni, F., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., Stanley, H. E., and Quattrociocchi, W. (2016). The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the national academy of Sciences*, 113(3):554–559.
- Douglas, D. G. (2012). *The Social Construction of Technological Systems, anniversary edition: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. MIT press.
- Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., Swire, B., and Chang, D. (2011). Correcting false information in memory: Manipulating the strength of misinformation encoding and its retraction. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 18:570–578.
- Fast, E. and Horvitz, E. (2017). Long-term trends in the public perception of artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 31.
- Floridi, L. and Chiriatti, M. (2020). Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30:681–694.
- Ford, M. (2015). *The Rise of the Robots: Technology and the Threat of a Jobless Future*. Basic Books.
- Frey, C. B. and Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public administration review*, 66:66–75.
- Furman, J. and Seamans, R. (2019). Ai and the economy. *Innovation policy and the economy*, 19(1):161–191.
- Garimella, K., De Francisci Morales, G., Gionis, A., and Mathioudakis, M. (2018). Political discourse on social media: Echo chambers, gatekeepers, and the price of bipartisanship. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*, pages 913–922.
- Geels, F. W. (2002). Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multilevel perspective and a case-study. *Research Policy*.

- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsis, C., Lynch, J., Hughes, G., Hinder, S., Fahy, N., Procter, R., Shaw, S., et al. (2017). Beyond adoption: a new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment, and challenges to the scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care technologies. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 19(11):e8775.
- Hekkert, M. P., Suurs, R. A., Negro, S. O., Kuhlmann, S., and Smits, R. E. (2007). Functions of innovation systems: A new approach for analysing technological change. *Technological forecasting and social change*, 74(4):413–432.
- Holm, J. R., Hain, D. S., Jurowetzki, R., and Lorenz, E. (2023). Innovation dynamics in the age of artificial intelligence: introduction to the special issue.
- Horowitz, M. C. (2016). Public opinion and the politics of the killer robots debate. *Research & Politics*, 3(1):2053168015627183.
- Hughes, T. P. et al. (1987). The evolution of large technological systems. *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology*, 82:51–82.
- Jackson, S. J., Bailey, M., and Welles, B. F. (2020). *# HashtagActivism: Networks of race and gender justice*. Mit Press.
- Jacobsson, S. and Lauber, V. (2006). The politics and policy of energy system transformation explaining the german diffusion of renewable energy technology. *Energy policy*, 34(3):256–276.
- Jasanoff, S. (2005). *Technologies of humility: Citizen participation in governing science*. Springer.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., and Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of ai ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(9):389–399.
- Katz, J. E., Halpern, D., and Crocker, E. T. (2015). In the company of robots: views of acceptability of robots in social settings. In *Social robots from a human perspective*, pages 25–38. Springer.
- Kelley, P. G., Yang, Y., Heldreth, C., Moessner, C., Sedley, A., Kramm, A., Newman, D. T., and Woodruff, A. (2021). Exciting, useful, worrying, futuristic: Public perception of artificial intelligence in 8 countries. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 627–637.
- Khan, M. A. and Salah, K. (2018). Iot security: Review, blockchain solutions, and open challenges. *Future generation computer systems*, 82:395–411.
- Lampert, C. H., Nickisch, H., and Harmeling, S. (2009). Learning to detect unseen object classes by between-class attribute transfer. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 951–958. IEEE.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oup Oxford.
- Laurer, M., van Atteveldt, W., Casas, A., and Welbers, K. (2023). Building Efficient Universal Classifiers with Natural Language Inference. arXiv:2312.17543 [cs].

- Lazer, D. M., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, K. M., Menczer, F., Metzger, M. J., Nyhan, B., Pennycook, G., Rothschild, D., et al. (2018). The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380):1094–1096.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., and Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the post-truth era. *Journal of applied research in memory and cognition*, 6(4):353–369.
- Liehner, G. L., Biermann, H., Hick, A., Brauner, P., and Ziefle, M. (2023). Perceptions, attitudes and trust towards artificial intelligence: an assessment of the public opinion. *Artificial Intelligence and Social Computing*, 72(72).
- Liu, X., Zhao, J., Liu, R., and Liu, K. (2022). Event history analysis of the duration of online public opinions regarding major health emergencies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13:954559.
- Marr, B. (2023). A short history of chatgpt: How we got to where we are today. *Forbes*. Accessed on May, 23:2023.
- Maxwell, M., Donald, S., et al. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2):176–187.
- Merenkov, A. V., Campa, R., and Dronishinets, N. (2021). Public opinion on artificial intelligence development. *KnE Social Sciences*, pages 565–574.
- Min, Y.-K., Lee, S.-G., and Aoshima, Y. (2019). A comparative study on industrial spillover effects among korea, china, the usa, germany and japan. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*.
- Mosleh, M. and Rand, D. G. (2022). Measuring exposure to misinformation from political elites on twitter. *nature communications*, 13(1):7144.
- Musa Giuliano, R. (2020). Echoes of myth and magic in the language of artificial intelligence. *AI & society*, 35(4):1009–1024.
- Nagy, P. and Neff, G. (2015). Imagined affordance: Reconstructing a keyword for communication theory. *Social Media+ Society*, 1(2):2056305115603385.
- Neff, G. and Nagy, P. (2018). Agency in the digital age: Using symbiotic agency to explain human-technology interaction.
- Nelson, R. R. and Sampat, B. N. (2001). Making sense of institutions as a factor shaping economic performance. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, 44(1):31–54.
- Nyhan, B. and Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, 32(2):303–330.
- Obozintsev, L. (2018). *From Skynet to Siri: An exploration of the nature and effects of media coverage of artificial intelligence*. University of Delaware.
- Orben, A. and Przybylski, A. K. (2019). The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. *Nature Human Behaviour*.
- Ostrom, E. (2009). *Understanding institutional diversity*. Princeton university press.

- Paarlberg, R. (2000). The global food fight. *Foreign Aff.*, 79:24.
- Pang, B., Lee, L., et al. (2008). Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and Trends® in information retrieval*, 2(1–2):1–135.
- Papadopoulos, Y. and Warin, P. (2007). Are innovative, participatory and deliberative procedures in policy making democratic and effective? *European journal of political research*, 46(4):445–472.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. penguin UK.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Perez, C. (2003). Technological revolutions and financial capital: The dynamics of bubbles and golden ages. *Foreign Affairs*.
- Perkowitz, S. (2007). Hollywood science. In *Hollywood Science*. Columbia University Press.
- Pinch, T. J. and Bijker, W. E. (1984). The social construction of facts and artefacts: Or how the sociology of science and the sociology of technology might benefit each other. *Social studies of science*, 14(3):399–441.
- Quattrociocchi, W., Scala, A., and Sunstein, C. R. (2016). Echo chambers on facebook. *Available at SSRN 2795110*.
- Rainie, L. and Anderson, J. (2017). The future of jobs and jobs training.
- Rogers, E. M., Singhal, A., and Quinlan, M. M. (1962). Diffusion of innovations. In *An integrated approach to communication theory and research*, pages 432–448. Routledge.
- Salles, A., Evers, K., and Farisco, M. (2020). Anthropomorphism in ai. *ajob neuroscience* 11 (2), 88-95.
- Sartori, L. and Bocca, G. (2022). Minding the gap (s): public perceptions of ai and sociotechnical imaginaries. *AI & SOCIETY*, pages 1–16.
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Currency.
- Suchman, L., Blomberg, J., Orr, J. E., and Trigg, R. (2017). Reconstructing technologies as social practice. In *The Anthropology of Organisations*, pages 431–447. Routledge.
- Sunstein, C. (2018). *# Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton university press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2001). *Echo chambers: Bush v. Gore, impeachment, and beyond*. Princeton University Press Princeton, NJ.
- Swan, M. (2015). *Blockchain: Blueprint for a new economy*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- Tumasjan, A., Sprenger, T., Sandner, P., and Welpe, I. (2010). Predicting elections with twitter: What 140 characters reveal about political sentiment. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 4, pages 178–185.

- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood—and what that means for the rest of us*. Simon and Schuster.
- Van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., and Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *science*, 359(6380):1146–1151.
- Weinberg, B. D., Milne, G. R., Andonova, Y. G., and Hajjat, F. M. (2015). Internet of things: Convenience vs. privacy and secrecy. *Business Horizons*, 58(6):615–624.
- West, D. M. (2012). *Digital schools: How technology can transform education*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Wineburg, S. and McGrew, S. (2017). Lateral reading: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information.
- Wu, L., Morstatter, F., Carley, K. M., and Liu, H. (2019). Misinformation in social media: definition, manipulation, and detection. *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, 21(2):80–90.
- Yun, J. J. and Liu, Z. (2019). Microand macro-dynamics of open innovation with a quadruplehelix model. *Sustainability*.
- Zemčík, T. (2021). Failure of chatbot tay was evil, ugliness and uselessness in its nature or do we judge it through cognitive shortcuts and biases? *AI & SOCIETY*, 36:361–367.
- Zhang, B., Anderljung, M., Kahn, L., Dreksler, N., Horowitz, M. C., and Dafoe, A. (2021). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence: Evidence from a survey of machine learning researchers. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 71:591–666.
- Zhang, B. and Dafoe, A. (2020). Us public opinion on the governance of artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 187–193.
- Zuboff, S. (2023). The age of surveillance capitalism. In *Social Theory Re-Wired*, pages 203–213. Routledge.

6 Appendix

Figure 10: Sentiment over time per keywords




Figure 11: Sentiment overtime per topics




Figure 12: Country sentiment overtime AI




Figure 13: Country sentiment overtime VR

Virtual reality




Figure 14: Country sentiment overtime Blockchain




Figure 15: Country sentiment overtime Robot




Figure 16: Country sentiment overtime Cloud Computing

Cloud computing




Figure 17: Country sentiment overtime IoT




Figure 18: Country sentiment overtime 5g




Figure 19: Country sentiment overtime employment




Figure 20: Country sentiment overtime Environment




Figure 21: Country sentiment overtime Health




Figure 22: Country sentiment overtime Other




Figure 23: Country sentiment overtime Privacy

