

# Multilingual Multimodal Digital Deception Detection and Spread across Social Platforms

Maria Glenski, Ellyn Ayton, Josh Mendoza, and Svitlana Volkova

Data Sciences and Analytics Group  
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory  
Richland, Washington 99352

{maria.glenski, ellyn.ayton, joshua.mendoza, svitlana.volkova}@pnnl.gov

## Motivation

There is a deluge of information flooding feeds, timelines, and forums online but even in the wake of this, users are increasingly relying on these platforms for *news* and information to base not only their opinions but actions. An August 2018 survey from the Pew Research Center found that 68% of Americans report that they get at least some of their news from social media (Matsa and Shearer 2018) while another found that the rate of Americans who *often* get their news online in some way increased from 38% in 2016 to 43% in 2017 (Bialik and Matsa 2017). Alongside the increased access to information and on-demand news about local and global events alike, there has been a deluge of misleading or deceptive misinformation. The spread of this “digital disinformation” within and across networks is of great concern.

The impact of digital disinformation has been seen in several areas from natural disasters and other crisis events (Starbird et al. 2014; Starbird 2017; Takahashi, Tandoc, and Carmichael 2015) to politics (Hadgu, Garimella, and Weber 2013), health-related conspiracies (Seymour et al. 2015; Jolley and Douglas 2014), and more. At the level of individual experiences, recent Pew Research Center studies have found that the average user is highly concerned about misinformation in their general use: 31% see inaccuracy as the top concern when consuming news from social media, 64% of adults believe fake news stories caused a great deal of confusion (Mitchell, Holcomb, and Barthel 2016), and 57% of social media users who consume news from one or more of those platforms expect the news they see to be “largely inaccurate” (Matsa and Shearer 2018).

## Recent Work

Many studies focused on digital deception, in particular deception in open-source data including social media, have focused on rumor and misinformation detection with a primary focus on the network’s role in information diffusion models (Qazvinian et al. 2011; Kwon et al. 2013; Wu, Yang, and Zhu 2015; Kwon, Cha, and Jung 2017). Other studies compare and contrast the behavior of traditional and alternative media (Starbird 2017), classify media

sources into sub-categories of misinformation (Wang 2017; Pérez-Rosas and Mihalcea 2015; Volkova et al. 2017; Baly et al. 2018), or attempt to detect rumor-spreading users (Rath et al. 2017).

Our main contribution in this work is novel results of multilingual models that go beyond typical applications of rumor or misinformation detection in English social news content to identify fine-grained classes of digital deception across multiple languages (*e.g.*, Russian, Spanish, etc.). In addition, we present models for multimodal deception detection from images and text and discuss the limitations of image only and text only models. Finally, we elaborate on the ongoing work on measuring deceptive content (in particular disinformation) spread across social platforms.

## Identifying linguistic markers of digital deception and their contribution to detection models in English

First, we examined linguistic cues of digital deception across a spectrum (disinformation, propaganda, conspiracy, hoaxes, and satire) to develop predictive models with which we classified 130 thousand news posts on Twitter as suspicious or verified, and predicted four sub-classes of suspicious news: satire, hoaxes, clickbait and propaganda (Volkova et al. 2017). Similar to Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral 2018 and Grinberg et al. 2019, we relied on source-based annotations rather than content-level annotations to capture the intent behind spreading deceptive content.

Through this study, we identified several key differences between news tweets of different sub-classes when spread online. For example, we saw that credible news tweets (*i.e.*, those that did not spread digital deception) contain significantly less bias markers, hedges and subjective terms and less harm/care, loyalty/betrayal and authority moral cues compared to news tweets spreading varied types of digital deception.

The best performing models built to detect these fine-grained classes achieved accuracy of 0.95 on the binary predictive task and F1 of 0.91 on the multi-class. This work was built upon in a subsequent studies (Rashkin et al. 2017; Volkova and Jang 2018) that examined linguistic and lexical features of various types of deceptive news articles and disinformation statements to show that these features con-



Figure 1: Key findings from the analysis of multimodal deception detection model behavior from (Volkova et al. 2019).

tribute to the understanding of the differences between reliable news sources and those that spread disinformation which can also be leveraged for effective detection models.

**Understanding patterns of engagement and information spread from deceptive news sources** In a large-scale study of news in social media, we analyzed 11 million posts and investigated the propagation behavior of users that directly interact with news accounts identified as spreading credible information versus digital deception (Glenski, Weninger, and Volkova 2018c). Unlike previous work which primarily looks at specific rumors or events, we focused on news sources in an effort to bridge the gap in the understanding of how users react to *news sources* of varying credibility and how their various initial responses contribute to the spread of digital deception.

Our analysis identified several key differences in propagation behavior from credible versus suspicious news sources such as high inequity in the diffusion rate based on the source of deception, with a small group of highly active users responsible for the majority of disinformation spread overall and within various demographics. Our demographics-based analysis found that users with lower annual income and education share more from disinformation sources compared to their counterparts. In a subsequent study, we further identified significant differences in the patterns of engagements from automated “bot” accounts versus humans (Glenski, Weninger, and Volkova 2018a) and how user-reactions to deceptive and credible news sources remain consistent as well as differ across multiple platforms (Glenski, Weninger, and Volkova 2018b).

**Explaining multimodal digital deception detection** Another recent area of interest has been the incorporation of image-based features to more accurately identify multimodal digital deception.

In this recent study (Volkova et al. 2019), we presented multi-modal deceptive news classification models and an in-depth quantitative and qualitative analysis of their behavior when classifying various classes of digital deception that incorporates imagery alongside text. Key findings of the analysis of model behavior are highlighted in Figure 1. When we compared the performance of models that rely on text or image features alone along with models trained on text and images jointly, we found that the latter models outperform the individually trained model with F1 scores as high as 0.74 for binary classification of deceptive (propaganda or disinformation) versus credible. Our quantitative analysis reveals that when considering only one aspect of the content, the text only models outperform those that just leverage image features (by 3-13% absolute in F-measures). Finally, we also presented a novel interactive tool ErrFILTER<sup>1</sup> that allows users to explain model prediction by characterizing text and image traits of suspicious news content and analyzing patterns of errors made by the various models, which can in turn be used to inform the design of future digital deception detection models.

## Multilingual Deception Detection

The main contribution of this extended abstract focuses on the results of our predictive models that identify fine-grained classifications of digital deception and related deceptive content from multilingual social media postings. Similarly to the recent work described above that focused on multi-platform and multi-modal deception detection, we focus on multi-dimensional computational approaches to identifying multilingual digital disinformation and misinformation being spread in social media.

<sup>1</sup>ErrFilter is available at <https://github.com/pnml/errfilter>




Figure 2: Distribution of languages represented in the large multilingual dataset of 7M Twitter posts from 2016.

**Detection Task** In this work, we concentrate on deception detection in multilingual social media postings structured as two multi-class classification tasks :

1. 4-way Classification

Given a social media posting, classify the text as Propaganda, Conspiracy, Hoax, or Clickbait.

2. 5-way Classification

Given a social media posting, classify the text as Disinformation, Propaganda, Conspiracy, Hoax, or Clickbait.

**Multilingual Twitter Data** The dataset used in this work comprises 7M posts in a variety of languages from English to Russian, German, and Spanish. We present the distribution of languages represented in this dataset in Figure 2. Here, we see that the majority (47%) of the data collected has text written in Russian, followed by English posts (36%) with the remainder composed of Spanish, German, French, Arabic, Ukrainian, Portuguese, Italian, and other languages.

**Multilingual Deception Detection** Building off of previous, related tasks (Volkova et al. 2017), we use a similar neural architecture for this task. This architecture, composed of a network and/or linguistic cues sub-network (left) and a text representation (as word or characters) sub-network (right).

As typical with other multi-classification tasks, we report the macro F1 scores for each of our models on the 4-way and 5-way classification tasks. We highlight one of our key findings in Figure 3 which illustrates the model performance in terms of macro F1 scores on the multilingual dataset. Unlike for English (explored in (Volkova et al. 2017; Rashkin et al. 2017)), text representations in *characters* in combination with DeepWalk representation network features achieve the best performance of 0.76 for both the 4-way and 5-way classification tasks.

**Ongoing Work: Measuring Cross-Platform Spread of Disinformation**

Intuitively, the next steps need to focus on measuring *cross-platform* spread of disinformation. Social media platforms on which digital disinformation is released and promoted do not exist in a vacuum, and, thus, the connections between




Figure 3: Macro F1 scores for 4-way and 5-way classification tasks in a multilingual setting.

platforms and communities have a potentially significant impact on the spread and virality of digital disinformation. Although we have previously examined the concurrent spread of information from news sources on multiple platforms, our continued efforts in this area focus on incorporating the cross-platform links between users who actively spread or engage with disinformation and the cross-platform URLs associated with disinformation narratives.

Under DARPA SocialSim program<sup>2</sup>, we developed a unified framework for measuring information spread and evolution within and across social platforms, that was presented at the ICWSM 2019 tutorial<sup>3</sup>. Our framework will allow us to measure disinformation spread within and across social platforms e.g., Twitter, Youtube and Telegram focusing on specific social phenomena – information cascades, recurrence, persistent groups and coordinated effort. More specifically, we will focus on several user cases of known disinforma-

<sup>2</sup><https://www.darpa.mil/program/computational-simulation-of-online-social-behavior>

<sup>3</sup><https://sites.google.com/alumni.nd.edu/icwsm19t3/>

tion: the White Helmets<sup>4</sup>, Syrian airstrikes<sup>5</sup> and NATO exercises<sup>6</sup>. Additionally, we will be measuring disinformation spread and the effect of censorship during internet outages during crisis events in Venezuela<sup>7</sup> and Sri Lanka<sup>8</sup>.

## Biographical Notes

**Maria Glenski** received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA, in 2019. She is currently a Data Scientist in the Data Sciences and Analytics group, National Security Directorate, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Her research in social media analysis, rating systems, and social news consumption has been published in the ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media, ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, and the ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing.

**Ellyn Ayton** Ellyn Ayton is a Data Scientist at Pacific Northwest National Lab. Her work focuses on machine learning and natural language processing, with applications to deceptive news detection and social media analytics. Ellyn received her MS in Computer Science from Western Washington University in 2018.

**Josh Mendoza** Joshua Mendoza is currently a Data Scientist in the Data Sciences and Analytics group, National Security Directorate, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. His work focuses on deep learning and engineering, with applications in natural language processing and computer vision. Joshua received his bachelors degree with honors in 2015 from the University of Washington.

**Svitlana Volkova** received the Ph.D. degree from Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA, in 2015. She is currently a senior scientist at the Data Sciences and Analytics group, National Security Directorate, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Her research focuses on advancing machine learning, deep learning and natural language processing techniques to build novel predictive and forecasting social media analytics. Her models advance understanding, analysis, and effective reasoning about extreme volumes of dynamic, multilingual, and diverse real-world social media data. She was awarded the Google Anita Borg Memorial Scholarship in 2010 and the Fulbright Scholarship in 2008. Dr. Volkova is a Vice Chair of the ACM Future of Computing Academy.

<sup>4</sup>[https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/russian-disinformation-campaign-targets-syrias-beleaguered-rescue-workers/2018/12/18/113b03c4-02a9-11e9-8186-4ec26a485713\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/russian-disinformation-campaign-targets-syrias-beleaguered-rescue-workers/2018/12/18/113b03c4-02a9-11e9-8186-4ec26a485713_story.html)

<sup>5</sup><https://www.foxnews.com/world/russian-trolls-ramp-up-disinformation-campaign-after-syria-airstrikes-pennagon>

<sup>6</sup><https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1649146/nato-moves-to-combat-russian-hybrid-warfare/>

<sup>7</sup><https://www.npr.org/2019/01/26/688868687/amid-chaos-venezuelans-struggle-to-find-the-truth-online>

<sup>8</sup>[https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/04/22/sri-lankas-social-media-shutdown-illustrates-global-discontent-with-silicon-valley/?utm\\_term=.6166a484a0c7](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/04/22/sri-lankas-social-media-shutdown-illustrates-global-discontent-with-silicon-valley/?utm_term=.6166a484a0c7)

## References

- Baly, R.; Karadzhov, G.; Alexandrov, D.; Glass, J.; and Nakov, P. 2018. Predicting factuality of reporting and bias of news media sources. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 3528–3539.
- Bialik, K., and Matsa, K. E. 2017. Key trends in social and digital news media. *Pew Research Center*.
- Glenski, M.; Weninger, T.; and Volkova, S. 2018a. How humans versus bots react to deceptive and trusted news sources: A case study of active users. In *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, 654–661. IEEE.
- Glenski, M.; Weninger, T.; and Volkova, S. 2018b. Identifying and understanding user reactions to deceptive and trusted social news sources. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 176–181.
- Glenski, M.; Weninger, T.; and Volkova, S. 2018c. Propagation from deceptive news sources who shares, how much, how evenly, and how quickly? *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 5(4):1071–1082.
- Grinberg, N.; Joseph, K.; Friedland, L.; Swire-Thompson, B.; and Lazer, D. 2019. Fake news on twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Science* 363(6425):374–378.
- Hadgu, A. T.; Garimella, K.; and Weber, I. 2013. Political hashtag hijacking in the us. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web*, 55–56. ACM.
- Jolley, D., and Douglas, K. M. 2014. The effects of anti-vaccine conspiracy theories on vaccination intentions. *PLoS one* 9(2):e89177.
- Kwon, S.; Cha, M.; Jung, K.; Chen, W.; and Wang, Y. 2013. Prominent features of rumor propagation in online social media. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 1103–1108. IEEE.
- Kwon, S.; Cha, M.; and Jung, K. 2017. Rumor detection over varying time windows. *PLoS One* 12(1):e0168344.
- Matsa, K. E., and Shearer, E. 2018. News use across social media platforms 2018. *Pew Research Center*.
- Mitchell, A.; Holcomb, J.; and Barthel, M. 2016. Many americans believe fake news is sowing confusion. *Pew Research Center*.
- Pérez-Rosas, V., and Mihalcea, R. 2015. Experiments in open domain deception detection. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 1120–1125.
- Qazvinian, V.; Rosengren, E.; Radev, D. R.; and Mei, Q. 2011. Rumor has it: Identifying misinformation in microblogs. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 1589–1599. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rashkin, H.; Choi, E.; Jang, J. Y.; Volkova, S.; and Choi, Y. 2017. Truth of varying shades: Analyzing language in fake news and political fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2921–2927.

- Rath, B.; Gao, W.; Ma, J.; and Srivastava, J. 2017. From retweet to believability: Utilizing trust to identify rumor spreaders on twitter. *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*.
- Seymour, B.; Getman, R.; Saraf, A.; Zhang, L. H.; and Kalenderian, E. 2015. When advocacy obscures accuracy online: digital pandemics of public health misinformation through an antifuoride case study. *American journal of public health* 105(3):517–523.
- Starbird, K.; Maddock, J.; Orand, M.; Achterman, P.; and Mason, R. M. 2014. Rumors, false flags, and digital vigilantes: Misinformation on twitter after the 2013 boston marathon bombing. *iConference 2014 Proceedings*.
- Starbird, K. 2017. Examining the alternative media ecosystem through the production of alternative narratives of mass shooting events on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 11th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*. AAAI.
- Takahashi, B.; Tandoc, E. C.; and Carmichael, C. 2015. Communicating on twitter during a disaster: An analysis of tweets during typhoon haiyan in the philippines. *Computers in Human Behavior* 50:392–398.
- Volkova, S., and Jang, J. Y. 2018. Misleading or falsification: Inferring deceptive strategies and types in online news and social media. In *Proceedings of the Web*, 575–583.
- Volkova, S.; Shaffer, K.; Jang, J. Y.; and Hodas, N. 2017. Separating facts from fiction: Linguistic models to classify suspicious and trusted news posts on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, volume 2, 647–653.
- Volkova, S.; Ayton, E.; Arendt, D.; Huang, Z.; and Hutchinson, B. 2019. Explaining multimodal deceptive news prediction models. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Vosoughi, S.; Roy, D.; and Aral, S. 2018. The spread of true and false news online. *Science* 359(6380):1146–1151.
- Wang, W. Y. 2017. “Liar, liar pants on fire”: A new benchmark dataset for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of ACL*, 422–426.
- Wu, K.; Yang, S.; and Zhu, K. Q. 2015. False rumors detection on sina weibo by propagation structures. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, 651–662. IEEE.