ONLINE DISINFORMATION AND THE ROLE OF WIKIPEDIA

A PREPRINT

Diego Saez-Trumper

Wikimedia Foundation diego@wikimedia.org

October 29, 2019

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to find key areas of research that can be useful to fight against disinformation on Wikipedia. To address this problem we perform a literature review trying to answer three main questions: (i) What is disinformation? (ii) What are the most popular mechanisms to spread online disinformation? and (iii) Which are the mechanisms that are currently being used to fight against disinformation?.

In all these three questions we take first a general approach, considering studies from different areas such as journalism and communications, sociology, philosophy, information and political sciences. And comparing those studies with the current situation on the Wikipedia ecosystem.

We found that disinformation can be defined as non-accidentally misleading information that is likely to create false beliefs. While the exact definition of misinformation varies across different authors, they tend to agree that disinformation is different from other types of misinformation, because it requires the intention of deceiving the receiver. A more actionable way to scope disinformation is to define it as a problem of information quality. In Wikipedia quality of information is mainly controlled by the policies of neutral point of view and verifiability.

The mechanisms used to spread online disinformation include the coordinated action of online brigades, the usage of bots, and other techniques to create fake content. Underresouced topics and communities are especially vulnerable to such attacks. The usage of sock-puppets is one of the most important problems for Wikipedia.

The techniques used to fight against information on the internet, include manual fact checking done by agencies and communities, as well as automatic techniques to assess the quality and credibility of a given information. Machine learning approaches can be fully automatic or can be used as tools by human fact checkers. Wikipedia and especially Wikidata play double role here, because they are used by automatic methods as ground-truth to determine the credibility of an information, and at the same time (and for that reason) they are the target of

many attacks. Currently, the main defense of Wikimedia projects against fake news is the work done by community members and especially by *patrollers*, that use mixed techniques to detect and control disinformation campaigns on Wikipedia.

We conclude that in order to keep Wikipedia as free as possible from disinformation, it's necessary to help *patrollers* to early detect disinformation and assess the credibility of external sources. More research is needed to develop tools that use state-of-the-art machine learning techniques to detect potentially dangerous content, empowering *patrollers* to deal with attacks that are becoming more complex and sophisticated.

Keywords Disinformation · Wikipedia · Wikimedia · Fake News

1 Introduction

Concepts like disinformation, fake news and post-truth has become popular in the last years (see Figure 1). Even thought that usage and spread of false information with political purposes is not new, the changes in technology can have an important impact in the way that people receive and process information [90]. The rise of user generated content (UGC) brings a lot of opportunities for getting more diverse, faster and complete information, but also creates new challenges in terms of quality and reliability of information. But have have changed in the last few years? While during the first years of growth of UGC platforms most of the problems where related to quality of information (spread of hoaxes and rumors) [12, 48], more recently social media has become a battle-field, having potential impact on political decisions and elections [16]. While researchers and western media have paid special attention to the impact of online propaganda during the 2016 US presidential elections [30, 28], or the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom [3, 8], other similar cases have been registered in countries such as Brazil [71], India [46] and Kenya [49]. What all the aforementioned cases have in common is the existence of groups of people organized to disseminate false information for electoral purposes. Techniques used to introduce such disinformation might include the usage of bots, online activists and *click farms* [45, 43]. Moreover, the creation of filter bubbles [54] where people are only exposed to ideas and sources that reinforce their previous beliefs, the concept of fake-news has been used as a rhetorical device to discredit information that affects a given point of view [60]¹.

Given the relevance and complexity of this problem, online disinformation has been studied from a wide spectrum of disciplines such as philosophy [23, 21, 19], communication [45], political [74] and computer science [9, 92]. In this work we give an overview of these studies, trying to answer these three questions:

- 1. What is disinformation?
- 2. What are the most popular mechanism to spread online disinformation?
- 3. Which are the mechanisms that are currently being used to fight against disinformation?

Given the extension, diversity and complexity of the literature in this field, we focus our efforts in getting actionable answers for these three questions, and putting special emphasis on the role of Wikimedia projects in the information/disinformation ecosystem. Differently from other platforms and online communities, Wikipedia (and Wikidata) have a double role in this space,

¹This is idea is well described by the title of the cited paper: "Everything I Disagree With is# FakeNews":



Figure 1: Number of page views for the *Fake News* article in the English Wikipedia. The interest about this topic has grown significantly (note that the y-axis is logarithmic) since the end of 2016.

being at the same time part of the battle-field were different visions tries to reflect their ideas, but also being the ground-truth [72] (or reference) used by automatic and manual fact checking systems.

The remainder of this document is organized as follows: first we mention other surveys and literature reviews in the area of disinformation, describing the main differences with our work, next we dedicate a section for each of the three questions listed above and finally we discuss potential lines of research that will be useful to keep Wikipedia as free as possible from disinformation and depict our conclusions.

2 Related Work

Because this paper is a literature review, we consider as related work other studies having similar purposes. As mentioned earlier, the phenomena of disinformation has been studied from different areas of knowledge. In the field of philosophy we found a comprehensive essay by Fallis [20], discussing the definition of disinformation. We build on top of that essay in section 3. In that section we contrast Fallis outputs with an interesting work by Wardle & Derakhshan [75], that describes disinformation from a communication and political science point of view. From the computer science perspective, a very detailed and complete survey has been done by Zhou and Zafrani in 2018 [92], we build on top of their work adding some of the last work in the field and adding the Wikipedia perspective.

All the studies mentioned in this section are complementary to our work, but they are focused in a specific area of knowledge, and don't put emphasis on the importance of the Wikimedia projects in the disinformation ecosystem. They are good material in case that the reader wants to go deeper in any of the aforementioned fields.

3 What is disinformation?

According to Fallis [20] disinformation has these three characteristics:

• Disinformation is a type of information.

Table 1: Following the taxonomy proposed by Zhou and Zafrani [92] and adding the definitions proposed by Wardle and Derakhshan [75], Fallis [20], a summary of the different concepts related with disinformation, according two their Authenticity (ie. veracity) and intention.

	Authenticity	Intention
Disinformation	False	Bad
Misinformation	False	Unknown
Mal-Information	True	Bad
Fake News	False	Bad
Satire News	False	Not Bad
Imposter Content	False	Unknown
Fabricated Content	False	Bad
Manipulated Content	Unknown	Bad
Rumor	Unknown	Unknown

- Disinformation is a type of misleading information; that is information that is likely to create false beliefs.
- Disinformation is non accidentally misleading information.

Summarizing, the three claims above, we can define:

Definition 1. Disinformation is non-accidentally misleading information that is likely to create false beliefs.

Similarly, Wardle and Derakhshan says: "Disinformation is when false information is knowingly shared to cause harm" [75], adding definitions two other relevant concepts:

Definition 2. Misinformation is when false information is shared, but no harm is meant.

Interestingly, they [75] also introduce the concept of *mal-information*, where the focus is not in faking the information, but in publishing sensitive private information with the aim causing harm.

Definition 3. Mal-information is when genuine information is shared to cause harm, often by moving information designed to stay private into the public sphere.

An analogous definition for *fake news* is given Zhou and Zafrani: "Fake news is intentionally and verifiably false news published by a news outlet" [92], for them disinformation is a related concept to fake news, that implies inauthentic content and bad intention. Interestingly, they introduce a set of other related concepts such as: Maliciously false news (false and bad intention), Satiric News (without bad intention), Misinformation (where authenticity is unknown but there is no bad intention) and rumors (where the authenticity and intentions are unknown), and categorize them according to the information authenticity and emisors' intention (see Table 1).

Wardle and Derakhshan [75], also describe 7 types of mis/disinformation:

- Satire Content: Without intention to cause harm.
- Misleading Content: misleading use of information to frame an issue.
- Imposter Content: impersonating genuines sources.
- Fabricated Content: completely fake content designed to deceive.

- False Connection: When headlines, visuals or captions don't support the content.
- False Context: when genuine content is shared with false contextual information.
- Manipulated Content: when genuine or fake content is manipulated to deceive.

While these definitions are consistent among them, they are not directly actionable because they assume the existence of false beliefs (and as a consequence the existence of true beliefs) that are verifiable, and the need of asses the intention behind a given piece of information. In many cases the authenticity of a given information is verifiable, but this is not the case for controversial topics [5].

A more actionable approach is proposed by Castillo [11], where mis/disformation, and the assessment of veracity, is scoped as problem of quality of information, proposing a set of practices and metrics to evaluate the quality of a given piece of information.

3.1 Wikipedia: Verifiability and Neutral Point of View

Considering the information quality approach to define understand disinformation, in the context of Wikipedia we can consider the 3 core content policies as the axis to assess the quality of a given information. These policies are:

- Neutral Point of View (NPOV): "which means representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without editorial bias, all of the significant views that have been published by reliable sources on a topic." [77]
- Verifiability: "means other people using the encyclopedia can check that the information comes from a reliable source." [79]
- No original research: "Wikipedia articles must not contain original research". [78]

While the first-one address the aforementioned problem of having a unique truth, the second one addresses the problem of assessing the authenticity of given content.

These 3 policies are actionable, allowing to deal with many of the practical problems of writing encyclopedic content in a collective manner [1]. However, from an epistemic perspective, they transfer the responsibility of assessing the quality and credibility of a content to third parties named reliable sources. In practice, this helps the Wikimedia movement to write Wikipedia, but it can't avoid the existence of controversies [5] and edit wars [70, 76]. Even though some studies shows that the existence of such disputes might end up in producing higher quality articles [66].

4 Which mechanism are used to spread online disinformation?

In order to understand the mechanisms used for spread misinformation we split them in two groups: social and technological attacks (for details see Table 2). We consider social attacks those mechanisms that exploits weakness in information systems but without requiring programming or coding knowledge. For example, social attacks will include mechanisms such as *sock-puppeting*, and *click farms*. Social attacks can be done by individuals or groups of people, but tends to be more effective when kmore people is involved. On the other hand technological attacks, will include all kind of mechanism that requires coding skills, such as the creation of bots, or *deepfake* techniques [29]. While these attacks can be done by groups of people, they are usually designed to increase the impact of individual users in a community. In reality, both types of attacks can be combined generating hybrid mechanisms that could be more difficult to detect [43]

Weakness exploited	Description	Example
Social System	When reputation systems	Use bots or sock-puppets to over-
	are hacked to introduce	represent an opinion or confirm
	disinformation.	a false information.
Lack of Information	When the lack of informa-	Spread disinformation during on-
	tion is used to introduce	going events like natural disas-
	disinformation.	ters or manipulate search engines
		results in topics without enough
		information.

Table 2: Social attacks classified by the type of weakness they exploit.

4.1 Social Attacks

Within the social attacks we can differentiate two types, the ones that explodes the weakness in social systems, and others that explodes the weakness of the information itself.

4.1.1 Exploiting the weaknesses of social systems

.

Individuals or groups of people can exploit the weakness of information systems to promote their ideas or to deliberately spread disinformation. Marwick and Lewis have studied the behavior of hate groups to manipulate online information, finding some common patterns in such groups: "they act as organized brigades which engage in a cooperative competition to increase harm to their victims, reinforcing social dominance over marginalized groups" [45]. While these cybermobs are usually related with attacks to specific people or communities [40], they can also be used to promote disinformation in a broader sense [13].

Another technique of using crowds to deceive online communities is the usage of click farms [51]. While this concept was originally referring to people (low) paid to click on advertisements, it has also been described as "An undercover operation in which individuals fraudulently interact with a website to artificially boost the status of a client's website, product or service." [10] Recently, during the 2018 Brazilian elections, the usage of click farms to spread disinformation has been reported [43].

On the other hand, there are individuals that creates multiple online identities to increase their influence in online communities, this usually known as *sock-puppeting* [85] or *sybil attacks* [86]. Sock puppets can be different purposes from avoiding bans [56], submit multiple votes in online pooling systems (Ballot stuffing) [24], to make point of view to look ridiculous [53] or to give fake or artificial appearance of support (meatpuppets) [91].

4.1.2 Exploiting the lack of information

•

However, it is not necessary to create multiple accounts or coordinate groups of people to introduce disinformation. For example, during natural disasters single users can introduce rumors (or disinformation, depending on the intention) in platforms such as Twitter that will receive similar amount of attention than real information, even thought that community might refute those tweets [47].

Moreover, attackers can exploit the lack of information in a given topic to manipulate the results retrieved by video recommender systems [61] or the search engines. This kind of weakness of information are called *data voids* [26].

4.2 Technological Attacks

As defined above we refer as technological attacks the ones that requires coding skills. The most popular attacks on this field are related with the usage of social bots. In this context we define social bots as software agents that acts in social media trying to influence the course of discussion [69]. "Bots often imitate or replace a human user's behavior and they typically they do repetitive tasks, and they can do them much faster than human users could" [14]. There are several reports on the usage of bots in Twitter to manipulate that social network [35, 36]. Just to mention some examples the bots has been used to interfere in elections in Brazil [2], Japan [63], USA [4, 37], Germany [6] and the UK [35]. For example in the USA bots were used to influence the social media discussion on the presidential debates. Similar with meatpuppets, bots can be used to create a fake idea of support for an idea or a person, sending messages to support an idea, or creating *human-like* accounts to increase the reputation (ex. number of followers) of a given person, this usually known as Astroturfing [69]².

But beyond bots, there are new techniques to introduce disinformation. *Deepfake* is the usage of generative adversarial networks to create composed videos that looks real [44]. There are examples of fake videos where Barack Obama insults Donald Trump that looks credible [64]. While there are no massive reports on the usage of this kind of videos on social media yet, they open a big challenge both for human fact checkers and machines to filter such content [29, 39, 41]. Also, companies like Facebook are showing concern about this issue [17].

4.3 Attacks on Wikipedia

Within the same Wikipedia community we can find several reports of possible disinformation social attacks. From interest groups trying to impose their views and narratives in some political [80] or religious topics [84], until the finding of large groups of paid editors[81]. Moreover, there are claims of interests groups trying to overtake a full Wikipedia project³ [83]. Wikimedians have responded this attacks investigating the reported complaints and banning users that don't comply the movement policies. An interesting case has been reported in the Bulgarian Wikinews community, where they have voted to close Bulgarian Wikinews as they view that there is insufficient community time to combat disinformation and propaganda there⁴ [82].

Not only the Wikimedians cares about the disinformation on Wikipedia. The press is also looking to this problem. Similarly with the examples above, newspapers have published about political groups overtaking full projects, trying to modify a set of historical articles to impose their own narrative and views [62]. Moreover, some journalists have been looking to the discussion pages of some controversial articles, questioning the community decisions about which information to include or exclude there [7]. This is interesting because it shows at the same time one weakness of Wikipedia (specialists on a given topic probably having some biases), but also the strength of having an accountable system to understand when and how an (dis)information has been added or removed from Wikipedia.

²For a detailed categorization of social bots please refer to Stieglitz et al work [69].

³In this context we call Wikipedia Project to a Wikipedia in a given language.

⁴At the time of publication of this work (September 2019), the proposal was still under study.

Table 3: Summary	of the mos	t nonular mechai	nism to spread	online	disinformation
Table 3. Sullillial	or me mos	i populai ilicciiai	nsm to spicat	1 OIIIIIIC	uisiiiioiiiiaiioii.

Mechanism	Description	Type	Wikipedia's
			Vulnerability
Bots	Software used to automatize the spread	Technical	Low
	of messages, generating the idea that of		
	a lot people is given an specific opinion		
	or interest about a topic		
Sock-puppets	Multiple Online identities used for pur-	Social	Medium
	poses of deception.		
Web Brigades	A set of users coordinated to introduce	Social	High
	fake content by exploiting the weakness		
	of communities and systems.		
Click farms	Where a large group of low-paid work-	Social	Medium
	ers are hired to perform some micro-		
	tasks to deceive online systems.		
Deepfake	AI a technique for human image syn-	Technical	Medium
	thesis that can be used to create fake		
	videos of celebrities or notable people.		
Data Voids	Exploiting missing data to manipulate	Social	Medium
	search results		
Circular reporting	A situation where a piece of informa-	Social	High
	tion appears to come from multiple in-		
	dependent sources, but in reality comes		
	from only one source.		

Also, the western mass-media is usually reporting disinformation attacks presumably being organized or supported by foreign governments [32, 67]. On the other hand there is no documentation on mass-media about the participation of western governments in disinformation campaigns on Wikipedia, although that the massive surveillance programs executed by those governments might have affected Wikipedia's readers behavior [55].

While journalists and Wikipedians are scanning Wikipedia to prevent disinformation, the relationship between these two actors can also be a weakness. *Circular reporting* or *Citogenesis* in Wikipedia is a problem where some piece of (dis)information is introduced on Wikipedia and later being used as a reference for an external source (with or without citing Wikipedia). If that source is considered reliable, later it can be used as a reference to support the original piece of (dis)information introduced on Wikipedia [33, ?]. While good practices from Wikipedia editors (not adding statements without references), and from journalists (using Wikipedia as a third-party source [87]), there are several cases of circular reporting involving Wikipedia [88].

4.3.1 Vulnerability of Wikipedia

Considering the cases described above, social attacks such as the case of Web Brigades and Click farms can be considered two of the most sensitive to Wikipedia. The success of such attacks would be related with the volume attackers (paid or volunteers) respect to size of the existing community, thus projects smaller amount of (good-faith) volunteers might be more sensitive to such attacks. More traditional attacks such as sock-puppets are well-known [89] and not solved

problem, however due to the nature and reach of those attacks, they arguably might have a more localized impact, not being able to overtake a full project. Similarly, the usage of *data voids* for introducing disinformation, will be directly related with the community capacity to cover all the topics, but the harm created will be again focused on specific topics without enough content. For previous experience (see section 4.3) circular reporting is still a big problem in the Wikipedia context.

Technological attacks will depend a lot in quality, sophistication and development of such techniques. However, currently with the current status of such technologies, and considering the expertise of Wikipedia patrollers (see Section 5.3.1) such attacks don't seem to most dangerous in the present times. Nevertheless, it's important to keep tracking the evolution of those technologies and generate awareness about them within the Wikipedia community.

5 How to fight Online Disinformation

The main way to fight against disinformation is to check the credibility of information, in the field of news this is usually known as fact checking. For the analysis we can split fact checking strategies in two main groups: manual fact checking, and automatic fact checking. The former refers to techniques where humans looks to a given information and evaluate its credibility. In the latter, machine learning algorithms do this task. In practice, both approaches work together, with human evaluators relaying in software to perform their tasks, or with machines learning from human annotated data.

Fact checking strategies can also be classified by the action taken by the platform used to spread that information, while in some cases the content can be filtered or deleted, in other cases platforms will add warnings with contextual information about the source or the content itself [34, 27].

5.1 Manual Fact Checking

Manual fact checking can be done by communities, like in Wikipedia, or by specialized entities known as fact checking agencies. For example, Facebook hires a large number of fact checking agencies around the world [42] (see Table 4).

There are also websites dedicated to fact checking, like Politifact⁵ focused in USA politics, or Snopes⁶ dedicated to internet rumors in general.

There are also machine learning approaches that intend to gather information for facilitating the work of human fact checkers. For example, by creating search tools that allows fact checkers to find diverse version of the same fact [65]; finding suspicious behavior on news spread through Whatsapp [58]; or to assess of the political leaning of news source [59].

5.2 Automatic Fact Checking

The main problem with manual fact checking is that requires human intervention making difficult to scale to huge amounts of information. That is one of the main reasons to fully automate the process using Natural Language Processing techniques. Automatic fact checking has two main steps: fact extraction and fact checking. In the first one, given a piece of information, the idea is to extract the facts and/ or claims contained there, this requires to extract the entities associated

⁵politifact.com

⁶snopes.com

Table 4: Categories used fact checking agencies hired by Facebook to tag content credibility [18].

Category	Description
False	The primary claim(s) of the content are factu-
	ally inaccurate.
True	The primary claim(s) of the content are factu-
	ally accurate.
Mixture	The claim(s) of the content are a mix of accu-
	rate and inaccurate.
False Headline	The primary claim(s) of the article body con-
	tent are true, but the primary claim within the
	headline is factually inaccurate.
Not eligible	The content contains a claim that is not verifi-
	able.
Satire	The content is posted by a Page or domain that
	is a known satire publication.
Opinion	The content advocates for ideas and draws con-
	clusions based on the interpretation of facts
	and data.
Prank Generator	Websites that allow users to create their own
	"prank" news stories.

with such information and a timestamp [25]; in the second one that claims are contrasted with a trustable knowledge base [72].

Several datasets and challenges has been released during the last years, for example: The Fake news challenge⁷, FEVER⁸ and the clickbait challenge⁹. Those datasets consists of a set of news or piece of text containing claims, and human labels assessing the credibility of such information. Currently, most competitive solutions relies on the usage of deep neural networks [73].

A detailed taxonomy of automatic fact checking techniques can be found in the work proposed by Zhou and Zafrani [92].

5.3 Fact Checking and Wikipedia

There to components to be analyzed when discussing about fighting against disinformation and Wikipedia. One is how Wikipedia editors check the content added to the online encyclopedia, and another is how third-parties uses Wikipedia to fight disinformation.

5.3.1 Fighting against disinformation within Wikipedia

As mentioned earlier, the mechanism to fight against disinformation in Wikipedia is approached as an information quality problem, that relies on the usage of reliable sources. In practice, the quality control is community process, where a specialized users called *patrollers*, watches for the compliance of the community norms. These users look for recent changes in Wikipedia articles, check the creation of new pages, or detect vandalism, among other things. Their work, includes some tools such as anti-vandalism bots and watchlists (a tool for tracking recent changes on

⁷http://www.fakenewschallenge.org/

⁸http://fever.ai

⁹https://www.clickbait-challenge.org/

articles) [50]. There are other tools like ORES that allows to automatically assess the quality of every single article revision [31]. Also NLP approaches have been proposed to detect unsupported statements [57]. However, currently the involvement of machine learning techniques on fighting disinformation is low, and process relies mainly manual procedures [50].

5.3.2 Third-parties using Wikipedia to fight against disinformation

Wikipedia has been considered a reliable source for fact checking, due its NPOV policy [52]. Also Wikidata it is key resource for doing entity linking and recognition [68]. Algorithms can use Wikidata to extract entities learning its characteristics and the relationship among them, and use them for fact checking tasks [72].

But there are other ways to use Wikipedia for fighting against disinformation. One of the most interesting is to use Wikipedia to provide contextual information to the users [15]. For example, Youtube has announced the usage Wikipedia to provide "information cues" on conspiracy theory videos. The idea is simple, when a user is watching a video about a given topic, the system will provide Wikipedia-based information about that topic, assuming this information will be reliable, although that Wikimedia Foundation Executive Director has been skeptical declaring that "Frankly, we don't want you to blindly trust us. Sure, we're mostly accurate - but not always! We want you to read Wikipedia with a critical eye" [22]. A slightly different approach has been taken by Facebook, they are using Wikipedia to provide information about the published of a given content [38].

6 Discussion and Final remarks

We found that Wikipedia plays an important role in the disinformation ecosystems, both as battle-field were attackers try to introduce disinformation but also as a reliable source for machines and humans to contrast disinformation. We have defined two types of attacks social and technological, finding that Wikipedia usually suffers more from the former than the latter. However, the rise of sophisticated techniques such as deepfake or the growth of click farms, impose new challenges for Wikipedia editors, that currently are not extensively using AI tools to fight disinformation. Also, most of the patrolling work is focusing on detecting misbehavior for single users, but without enough tools to look for coordinated attacks including multiple users. Moreover, the manual fact checking done by Wikipedia editors it is difficult to scale in projects without enough volunteers, increasing the risks of attacks in smaller or under-resourced communities. In those contexts is where machine learning techniques can be extremely helpful.

During this literature review we have not found studies on disinformation attacks on multiple projects. Currently, we don't know if attacks occurs similarly in different Wikipedia languages. Can we train a machine learning algorithms with knowledge generated in the English Wikinews project, to apply it the Bulgarian one? Which will be the implications and biases introduced by such an approach? Moreover, given that smaller languages usually have less NLP resources, can we directly apply methods that will work well in the best resourced languages?

But also we have find research than can be adapted and tested on the Wikipedia context. For example, automatically assigning a credibility score for third-party sources, or assessing their political leaning.

In general, we can say that the current manual approaches in Wikipedia are working correctly in well resourced communities, but the complexity and amount of attacks might increase in the future, therefore, it is important to help the communities, especially the smaller ones, with state-of-the-art techniques that can simplify their work and amply their results.

References

- [1] ARAZY, O., MORGAN, W., AND PATTERSON, R. Wisdom of the crowds: Decentralized knowledge construction in wikipedia. In 16th Annual Workshop on Information Technologies & Systems (WITS) Paper (2006).
- [2] ARNAUDO, D. Computational propaganda in brazil: Social bots during elections. *Project on Computational Propaganda* 8 (2017).
- [3] BASTOS, M. T., AND MERCEA, D. The brexit botnet and user-generated hyperpartisan news. *Social Science Computer Review 37*, 1 (2019), 38–54.
- [4] BESSI, A., AND FERRARA, E. Social bots distort the 2016 us presidential election online discussion. *First Monday 21*, 11-7 (2016).
- [5] BORRA, E., WELTEVREDE, E., CIUCCARELLI, P., KALTENBRUNNER, A., LANIADO, D., MAGNI, G., MAURI, M., ROGERS, R., VENTURINI, T., ET AL. Contropedia-the analysis and visualization of controversies in wikipedia articles. In *OpenSym* (2014), pp. 34–1.
- [6] Brachten, F., Stieglitz, S., Hofeditz, L., Kloppenborg, K., and Reimann, A. Strategies and influence of social bots in a 2017 german state election-a case study on twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.07562* (2017).
- [7] Brandom, R. How gun buffs took over Wikipedia's AR-15 page. Verge (Mar 2018).
- [8] CADWALLADR, C. The great british brexit robbery: how our democracy was hijacked. *The Guardian* 7 (2017).
- [9] CARDOSO DURIER DA SILVA, F., VIEIRA, R., AND GARCIA, A. C. Can machines learn to detect fake news? a survey focused on social media. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (2019).
- [10] CARR, S. What Is a Click Farm? Uncovering The Dark Truth Behind Fake Likes. *PPC Protect* (Sep 2019).
- [11] CASTILLO, C. *Big crisis data: social media in disasters and time-critical situations.* Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [12] CASTILLO, C., MENDOZA, M., AND POBLETE, B. Information credibility on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web* (2011), ACM, pp. 675–684.
- [13] CITRON, D. K. Cyber mobs, disinformation, and death videos: The internet as it is (and as it should be). *Michigan Law Review, Forthcoming* (2019).
- [14] CLOUDFLARE. What Is a Bot? | Bot Definition | Cloudflare, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [15] COHEN, N. Perspective | Conspiracy videos? Fake news? Enter Wikipedia, the 'good cop' of the Internet. *Washington Post* (Apr 2018).
- [16] DIMITROVA, D. V., AND MATTHES, J. Social media in political campaigning around the world: Theoretical and methodological challenges, 2018.
- [17] FACEBOOK. Creating a data set and a challenge for deepfakes, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].

- [18] FACEBOOK. Facebook Media and Publisher Help Center, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [19] FALLIS, D. A conceptual analysis of disinformation. iconference. *Chapel Hill, NC, California, USA* (2009).
- [20] FALLIS, D. What is disinformation? *library trends* 63, 3 (2015), 401–426.
- [21] FETZER, J. H. Disinformation: The use of false information. *Minds and Machines 14*, 2 (2004), 231–240.
- [22] FIELD, M. YouTube will use Wikipedia to tackle fake news but failed to tell Wikipedia, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [23] FLORIDI, L. The philosophy of information. OUP Oxford, 2013.
- [24] FRIEDMAN, E., RESNICK, P., AND SAMI, R. Manipulation-resistant reputation systems. *Algorithmic Game Theory* 677 (2007).
- [25] GETOOR, L., AND MACHANAVAJJHALA, A. Entity resolution: theory, practice & open challenges. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment 5*, 12 (2012), 2018–2019.
- [26] GOLEBIEWSKI, M., AND BOYD, D. Data Voids: Where Missing Data Can Easily Be Exploited. Data & Society, 2018.
- [27] GOOGLE. See fact checks in search results Google Search Help, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [28] GRINBERG, N., JOSEPH, K., FRIEDLAND, L., SWIRE-THOMPSON, B., AND LAZER, D. Fake news on twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Science* 363, 6425 (2019), 374–378.
- [29] GÜERA, D., AND DELP, E. J. Deepfake video detection using recurrent neural networks. In 2018 15th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Video and Signal Based Surveillance (AVSS) (2018), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [30] GUESS, A., NYHAN, B., AND REIFLER, J. Selective exposure to misinformation: Evidence from the consumption of fake news during the 2016 us presidential campaign. *European Research Council* 9 (2018).
- [31] HALFAKER, A., AND TARABORELLI, D. Artificial intelligence service "ores" gives wikipedians x-ray specs to see through bad edits, 2015.
- [32] HARDING, L. Ex-Trump aide Paul Manafort approved 'black ops' to help Ukraine president. *the Guardian* (Apr 2018).
- [33] HARRISON, S. The Dizzying Problem of Citationless Wikipedia "Facts" That Take On a Life of Their Own. *Slate Magazine* (Mar 2019).
- [34] HATMAKER, T., AND CONSTINE, J. Reports of a Facebook fake news detector are apparently a plugin. *TechCrunch* (Dec 2016).
- [35] HOWARD, P., KOLLANYI, B., AND WOOLLEY, S. C. Bots and automation over twitter during the third us presidential debate.
- [36] HOWARD, P. N., AND KOLLANYI, B. Bots,# strongerin, and# brexit: computational propaganda during the uk-eu referendum. *Available at SSRN 2798311* (2016).
- [37] HOWARD, P. N., WOOLLEY, S., AND CALO, R. Algorithms, bots, and political communication in the us 2016 election: The challenge of automated political communication for

- election law and administration. *Journal of information technology & politics 15*, 2 (2018), 81–93.
- [38] HUGHES, T., SMITH, J., AND LEAVITT, A. Helping People Better Assess the Stories They See in News Feed with the Context Button | Facebook Newsroom, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [39] KOOPMAN, M., RODRIGUEZ, A. M., AND GERADTS, Z. Detection of deepfake video manipulation. In *Conference: IMVIP* (2018).
- [40] KRUMSIEK, A. Cyber Mobs: Destructive Online Communities. Greenhaven Publishing LLC, 2017.
- [41] LI, Y., AND LYU, S. Exposing deepfake videos by detecting face warping artifacts. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1811.00656 2 (2018).
- [42] LYONS, T. Hard Questions: How Is Facebook's Fact-Checking Program Working? Facebook Newsroom, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [43] MAGENTA, M., GRAGNANI, J., AND SOUZA, F. WhatsApp weaponised in Brazil election, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 19. Sep. 2019].
- [44] MARAS, M.-H., AND ALEXANDROU, A. Determining authenticity of video evidence in the age of artificial intelligence and in the wake of deepfake videos. *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof* 23, 3 (2019), 255–262.
- [45] MARWICK, A., AND LEWIS, R. Media manipulation and disinformation online. *New York: Data and Society Research Institute* (2017).
- [46] MCLAUGHLIN, T. How WhatsApp Fuels Fake News and Violence in India. *Wired* (Dec 2018).
- [47] MENDOZA, M., POBLETE, B., AND CASTILLO, C. Twitter under crisis: Can we trust what we rt? In *Proceedings of the first workshop on social media analytics* (2010), ACM, pp. 71–79.
- [48] MESSNER, M., AND SOUTH, J. Legitimizing wikipedia: How us national newspapers frame and use the online encyclopedia in their coverage. *Journalism Practice* 5, 2 (2011), 145–160.
- [49] MIRIELLO, N., GILBERT, D., AND STEERS, J. Kenyans face a fake news epidemic. vice. https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/43bdpm/kenyans-face-a-fake-news-epidemic-they-want-to-know-just-how-much-cambridge-analytica-(Accessed on 09/18/2019).
- [50] MORGAN, JONATHAN. Research: Patrolling on Wikipedia/Report Meta, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 23. Sep. 2019].
- [51] MUNSON, L. What is a Click Farm?, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 19. Sep. 2019].
- [52] NAKASHOLE, N., AND MITCHELL, T. M. Language-aware truth assessment of fact candidates. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (2014), pp. 1009–1019.
- [53] ORITA, A. 4.5 accountable or casual anonymity? a classification of anonymity based on linkability. In *Organizations and Society in Information Systems (OASIS) 2007 Workshop* (2007), p. 33.
- [54] PARISER, E. The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you. Penguin UK, 2011.

- [55] PENNEY, J. W. Chilling effects: Online surveillance and wikipedia use. *Berkeley Tech. LJ* 31 (2016), 117.
- [56] POLAND, B. Haters: Harassment, abuse, and violence online. U of Nebraska Press, 2016.
- [57] REDI, M., FETAHU, B., MORGAN, J., AND TARABORELLI, D. Citation needed: A taxonomy and algorithmic assessment of wikipedia's verifiability. In *The World Wide Web Conference* (2019), ACM, pp. 1567–1578.
- [58] RESENDE, G., MESSIAS, J., SILVA, M., ALMEIDA, J., VASCONCELOS, M., AND BENEVENUTO, F. A system for monitoring public political groups in whatsapp. In *Proceedings* of the 24th Brazilian Symposium on Multimedia and the Web (2018), ACM, pp. 387–390.
- [59] RIBEIRO, F. N., HENRIQUE, L., BENEVENUTO, F., CHAKRABORTY, A., KULSHRESTHA, J., BABAEI, M., AND GUMMADI, K. P. Media bias monitor: Quantifying biases of social media news outlets at large-scale. In *Twelfth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (2018).
- [60] RIBEIRO, M. H., CALAIS, P. H., ALMEIDA, V. A., AND MEIRA JR, W. "everything i disagree with is# fakenews": Correlating political polarization and spread of misinformation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05924* (2017).
- [61] RIBEIRO, M. H., OTTONI, R., WEST, R., ALMEIDA, V. A., AND MEIRA, W. Auditing radicalization pathways on youtube. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08313* (2019).
- [62] SAMPSON, T. How pro-fascist ideologues are rewriting Croatia's history. *Daily Dot* (Dec 2015).
- [63] SCHÄFER, F., EVERT, S., AND HEINRICH, P. Japan's 2014 general election: Political bots, right-wing internet activism, and prime minister shinzō abe's hidden nationalist agenda. *Big data* 5, 4 (2017), 294–309.
- [64] SCHWARTZ, O. You thought fake news was bad? Deep fakes are where truth goes to die. *the Guardian* (Nov 2018).
- [65] SHANG, J., SHEN, J., SUN, T., LIU, X., GRUENHEID, A., KORN, F., LELKES, Á. D., YU, C., AND HAN, J. Investigating rumor news using agreement-aware search. In *Proceedings* of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (2018), ACM, pp. 2117–2125.
- [66] SHI, F., TEPLITSKIY, M., DUEDE, E., AND EVANS, J. A. The wisdom of polarized crowds. *Nature human behaviour* 3, 4 (2019), 329.
- [67] SHUBBER, K. Russia caught editing Wikipedia entry about MH17. WIRED UK (Oct 2017).
- [68] SPITZ, A., DIXIT, V., RICHTER, L., GERTZ, M., AND GEISS, J. State of the union: A data consumer's perspective on wikidata and its properties for the classification and resolution of entities. In *Tenth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (2016).
- [69] STIEGLITZ, S., BRACHTEN, F., ROSS, B., AND JUNG, A.-K. Do social bots dream of electric sheep? a categorisation of social media bot accounts. *arXiv* preprint *arXiv*:1710.04044 (2017).
- [70] SUMI, R., YASSERI, T., ET AL. Edit wars in wikipedia. In 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Social Computing (2011), IEEE, pp. 724–727.

- [71] TARDÁGUILA, C., BENEVENUTO, F., AND ORTELLADO, P. Opinion | Fake News Is Poisoning Brazilian Politics. WhatsApp Can Stop It., Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 18. Sep. 2019].
- [72] THORNE, J., VLACHOS, A., CHRISTODOULOPOULOS, C., AND MITTAL, A. Fever: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and verification. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1803.05355 (2018).
- [73] THORNE, J., VLACHOS, A., COCARASCU, O., CHRISTODOULOPOULOS, C., AND MITTAL, A. The fact extraction and verification (fever) shared task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.10971* (2018).
- [74] TUCKER, J. A., GUESS, A., BARBERÁ, P., VACCARI, C., SIEGEL, A., SANOVICH, S., STUKAL, D., AND NYHAN, B. Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature (March 19, 2018)* (2018).
- [75] WARDLE, C., AND DERAKHSHAN, H. Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making. *Council of Europe Report* 27 (2017).
- [76] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia:edit warring. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia: Edit_warring. (Accessed on 09/18/2019).
- [77] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia:neutral point of view. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view. (Accessed on 09/18/2019).
- [78] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia:no original research. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:No_original_research. (Accessed on 09/18/2019).
- [79] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia:verifiability. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia: Verifiability. (Accessed on 09/18/2019).
- [80] WIKIPEDIA. Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 20. Sep. 2019].
- [81] WIKIPEDIA. Orangemoody editing of Wikipedia Wikipedia, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 20. Sep. 2019].
- [82] WIKIPEDIA. Proposals for closing projects/Deletion of Bulgarian Wikinews Meta, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 21. Sep. 2019].
- [83] WIKIPEDIA. Requests for comment/Do something about azwiki Meta, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 20. Sep. 2019].
- [84] WIKIPEDIA. Scientology, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 20. Sep. 2019].
- [85] WIKIPEDIA. Sockpuppet (Internet), Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 19. Sep. 2019].
- [86] WIKIPEDIA. Sybil attack, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 19. Sep. 2019].
- [87] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia: Academic use, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 21. Sep. 2019].
- [88] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia:List of citogenesis incidents, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 21. Sep. 2019].
- [89] WIKIPEDIA. Wikipedia: Sock puppetry, Oct 2019. [Online; accessed 14. Oct. 2019].
- [90] ZEITZ, J. Lessons From the Fake News Pandemic of 1942, Sep 2019. [Online; accessed 18. Sep. 2019].
- [91] ZHANG, J., CARPENTER, D., AND KO, M. Online astroturfing: A theoretical perspective.

[92] ZHOU, X., AND ZAFARANI, R. Fake news: A survey of research, detection methods, and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00315* (2018).