

Towards Ethics by Design in Online Abusive Content Detection

Svetlana Kiritchenko

Isar Nejadgholi

National Research Council Canada
{svetlana.kiritchenko, isar.nejadgholi}@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca

Abstract

To support safety and inclusion in online communications, significant efforts in NLP research have been put towards addressing the problem of abusive content detection, commonly defined as a supervised classification task. The research effort has spread out across several closely related sub-areas, such as detection of hate speech, toxicity, cyberbullying, etc. There is a pressing need to consolidate the field under a common framework for task formulation, dataset design and performance evaluation. Further, despite current technologies achieving high classification accuracies, several ethical issues have been revealed. We bring ethical issues to forefront and propose a unified framework as a two-step process. First, online content is categorized around personal and identity-related *subject matters*. Second, *severity of abuse* is identified through comparative annotation within each category. The novel framework is guided by the Ethics by Design principle and is a step towards building more accurate and trusted models.

1 Introduction

With the increased use of social media, especially among young people, serious concerns about safety and inclusion in online communications have been raised. Up to 40% of users have reported being subjected to online harassment, cyberbullying, and other types of abuse (Duggan, 2017; Hinduja and Patchin, 2020). Often, the victims of online abuse are the most vulnerable parts of society: ethnic minorities, LGBTQ community, or people with disabilities. In response, many social media platforms strive to monitor online content and quickly remove abusive posts, but the sheer volume of posts poses significant problems. Automatic detection of abusive content can provide assistance and (partially) alleviate the burden of manual inspection.

Much NLP research has been devoted to the problem of automatic abusive content detection.¹ It has been studied under a plethora of names, such as detection of flaming (Spertus, 1997), cyberbullying (Dadvar et al., 2013), online harassment (Golbeck et al., 2017), hate speech (Djuric et al., 2015; Davidson et al., 2017), toxicity (Dixon et al., 2018; Aroyo et al., 2019), and others. While these sub-areas of the general space of abusive language tackle similar problems, they differ in their focus and scope. Recent surveys by Schmidt and Wiegand (2017); Fortuna and Nunes (2018); Mishra et al. (2019); Vidgen et al. (2019); Vidgen and Derczynski (2020); Salawu et al. (2020) summarize the advancements in these areas focusing mostly on the technical issues and the variety of machine learning approaches proposed for the tasks.

In this paper, we examine the general area of abusive language detection from the ethical viewpoint. We bring together all the related sub-fields, and survey the past work focusing on the different formulations of the task and the common data collection and annotation techniques. We discuss challenges that the field faces from the ethical perspective, including fairness and mitigation of unintended biases, transparency and explainability, safety and security. In accordance with the Ethics by Design principle, we propose to bring the ethical issues to the early stages of system development: the task formulation and data collection and annotation.

Typically, the task has been defined as a binary classification problem (abusive vs. non-abusive). However, the social and ethical implications of the task call for more fine-grained labelling of abuse. A few attempts have been made to separate abusive language into sub-categories, such as hate speech, threats, aggressive, or offensive

¹We use the term *abusive* broadly, covering the full range of inappropriate and disturbing content, from simple profanities and obscene expressions to threats and severe insults.

language, but the obscure boundaries between the sub-categories make the task challenging even for human annotators (Poletto et al., 2017; Founta et al., 2018). To overcome this challenge, we propose to annotate abusive texts for severity of abuse using comparative annotation techniques. We argue that severity is a simpler yet more practical dimension for abuse categorization. Further, employing comparative annotation would generate fine-grained (or continuous) severity scores while improving the overall reliability of annotations (Goffin and Olson, 2011; Kiritchenko and Mohammad, 2017).

Besides severity of abuse, the subject matter (or the target of abuse) is a crucial aspect of an abusive text (Waseem et al., 2017; Vidgen et al., 2019; Zampieri et al., 2019a). Knowing if the text (abusive or non-abusive) talks about an individual, a group of people, or an entity closely associated with a specific identity group (e.g., Muslims, gay people, etc.) can help in measuring and mitigating unintended biases in data and model outputs, and in transparency and explainability of the models.

Overall, the contributions of this work are as follows:

- We survey the existing works on abusive language detection (including various sub-areas, such as detection of hate speech, cyberbullying, online harassment, etc.) focusing on task formulation and data collection and annotation methods;
- We enumerate the main challenges of the task with regard to ethical issues, such as fairness, explainability, and safety;
- We propose a novel framework comprising two dimensions, severity of abuse and subject matter of an utterance, and outline the ways in which data collection and annotation can be adjusted to the framework. While identifying target groups subjected to abuse have been explored in previous work, annotating for severity of abuse using comparative annotation techniques has not been considered before. We further discuss how the proposed framework can help in addressing the technical and ethical issues.

We focus on abuse detection in online texts, though the framework can be applied to other media (images, video, speech) and multimodal contexts.

2 Overview of the Common Practices

We start with reviewing the common practices of formulating the task of online abuse detection and the methods for collecting and annotating datasets.

2.1 Task Formulation for Automated Abuse Detection

The abusive content detection task has typically been defined as a supervised classification problem across various definitions and aspects of abusive language. In addition to the main task of determining whether a text is abusive or not, several other dimensions have been explored, including expression of abuse, target of abuse, and legality of abuse (Waseem et al., 2017; Fišer et al., 2017; Poletto et al., 2017; Vidgen et al., 2019; Niemann et al., 2019; Zufall et al., 2020).

Expression of abuse: Online abuse can be expressed in different forms, such as hate speech, insults, physical threats, stereotyping, and more. Focusing on slightly different aspects of abuse, these categories have obscure boundaries, and are often challenging for humans and machines to split apart (Poletto et al., 2017; Founta et al., 2018).

Another practical distinction is whether the abusive language is explicit or implicit (Waseem et al., 2017). Explicit abuse is relatively easy to recognize as it contains explicit obscene expressions and slur. Implicit abuse, on the other hand, is not immediately apparent as it can be obscured by the use of sarcasm, humor, stereotypes, ambiguous words, and lack of explicit profanity. In many existing datasets implicit abuse can be found in only a small proportion of instances (Wiegand et al., 2019). Furthermore, implicit abuse presents additional challenges to human annotators as sometimes specific background knowledge and experience are required in order to understand the hidden meaning behind implicit statements. To deal effectively with this class of abuse, large annotated datasets focusing on implicitly abusive language are needed so that automatic detection systems are exposed to a wide variety of such examples through their training data.

Target of abuse: Abusive speech can be directed towards particular person(s) or entities, or contain undirected profanities and indecent language (Zampieri et al., 2019a). While obscene language, in general, can be disturbing to some audiences, abuse targeting specific individuals or groups is often perceived as potentially more harmful and more concerning for society at large. Therefore, majority

of research on abusive language detection has been devoted to targeted abuse. [Waseem et al. \(2017\)](#) distinguished two target types: an individual and a generalized group. They argued that the distinction between an attack directed towards an individual or a generalized group is important from both the sociological and the linguistic points of view. Thus, this distinction may call for different handling of the two types of abusive language when manually annotating abusive speech and when building automatic classification systems. For example, in research on cyberbullying, where abusive language is directed towards specific individuals, more consensus in task definition and annotation instructions can be found, and higher inter-annotator agreement rates are often observed ([Dadvar et al., 2013](#)).

A third target type—entity or concept—can also be considered ([Zampieri et al., 2019a](#); [Vidgen et al., 2019](#)). Acceptable criticism of an entity (e.g., country), a concept (e.g., religion), an organization, or an event, can be semantically similar to abusive language. However, there is often a thin line between criticizing a concept and attacking people associated with the concept (e.g., an anti-Islamic propaganda can induce hatred towards Muslims).

Legality of abuse: Some types of abusive statements, such as hate speech and defamatory allegations, are not only morally unacceptable, but also illegal in several countries. To automatically determine if a statement is illegal, the corresponding laws need to be translated into manageable NLP tasks ([Fišer et al., 2017](#); [Zufall et al., 2020](#)). However, the definitions of illegal online abuse vary across jurisdictions and typically cover only the most severe cases of abuse that can threaten the society at large. Therefore, the NLP research community should focus on a broader problem and design solutions that can be easily configurable for a specific set of requirements.

2.2 Data Collection

Several datasets manually annotated for abuse detection have been made available. Datasets can be collected from a single platform, such as Yahoo! ([Djuric et al., 2015](#)), Wikipedia ([Wulczyn et al., 2017](#)), Facebook ([Kumar et al., 2018](#)), Twitter ([Waseem and Hovy, 2016](#); [Davidson et al., 2017](#); [Founta et al., 2018](#)), or from multiple discussion forums ([Van Bruwaene et al., 2020](#)).

Generally, it is laborious and costly to build an abuse detection corpus that is balanced with re-

spect to hateful and harmless comments ([Schmidt and Wiegand, 2017](#)). Since abusive behaviour is relatively infrequent, random sampling results in datasets extremely skewed towards benign samples ([Founta et al., 2018](#)). Existing sampling strategies rely on known abusive/profane words, words describing the target populations, or monitoring users known for abusive behavior. A combination of random sampling and targeted search have also been used ([Chatzakou et al., 2017](#); [Wulczyn et al., 2017](#); [Founta et al., 2018](#)).

Sometimes, specific data collection procedures are defined based on the task at hand. For example, [Hosseinmardi et al. \(2015\)](#) used a snowball sampling method starting from a small number of users who posted offensive content on Instagram. [Waseem and Hovy \(2016\)](#) focused on sexism and racism, and collected tweets matching query words that are likely to occur in these cases. [Davidson et al. \(2017\)](#) used a lexicon of words and phrases identified by users as related to hate speech.

2.3 Data annotation

[Tversky and Kahneman \(1974\)](#) were the first psychologists that showed how humans employ heuristics to make judgements under uncertainty. These heuristics are formed based on complex factors and lead to systematic personal biases. On top of the general issue of subjectivity, in the case of abuse detection, a different understanding of what to consider abusive language resulted in sometimes contradictory annotation guidelines, and incompatible and erroneous datasets. For example, [van Aken et al. \(2018\)](#) questioned 10–15% of manually obtained labels on two widely used datasets, Kaggle Toxicity by Jigsaw and Google² and the one by [Davidson et al. \(2017\)](#). [Waseem et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Nobata et al. \(2016\)](#) observed that expert annotators reach higher inter-rater agreements and produce better quality annotations compared to crowd-sourced workers.

To minimize the effect of subjectivity, some of the datasets are annotated by multiple annotators. The proportion of majority votes per instance represents the level of agreement, and can serve as a rough estimate for severity of abuse. However, most often the votes are aggregated into a single label. [Wiegand et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Davidson et al. \(2017\)](#) used majority voting whereas [Gao](#)

²<https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-toxic-comment-classification-challenge>

and Huang (2017) annotated a statement as hate speech if at least one annotator labeled it as hateful. Golbeck et al. (2017) collected judgements from two trained annotators, and a third annotator was employed only if the first two disagreed.

3 Current Technical and Ethical Challenges

In this section, we highlight common technical and ethical issues related to the currently employed task definition and the available datasets, regardless of applied machine learning techniques.

Task Formulation: In practical applications, the definitions of abusive language heavily rely on community norms and context and, therefore, are imprecise, application-dependent, and constantly evolving (Chandrasekharan et al., 2018). To make the task more tractable and focused, previous research has mostly concentrated on specific types of online abuse (e.g., hate speech, sexism, personal attacks). However, it has been shown that defining and annotating types of abuse are challenging tasks and often result in inconsistent definitions across studies, highly overlapping categories, and low inter-annotator agreements (Waseem et al., 2017; Poletto et al., 2017; Founta et al., 2018).

Recently, the complexity of the task formulation has been brought to the attention of the community, and several studies have proposed multi-level frameworks to address the task. Waseem et al. (2017) mapped the different types of abuse to two-dimension: identity- versus person-directed abuse and explicit versus implicit abuse. They argued that inter-annotator agreement is high when the abuse is directed to a person and explicit and low when the abuse is generalized and implicit. Founta et al. (2020) demonstrated that many different definitions are being used for equivalent concepts, which makes most of the publicly available datasets incompatible. They suggested that hierarchical multi-class annotation schemas should be deployed to formulate the online abuse detection task. Sap et al. (2020) formulated offensive language detection as a hierarchical task that combines structured classification with reasoning on social implications. They trained a model that translates an offensive statement to the implied stereotype that is hurtful to the target demographic. Assimakopoulos et al. (2020) formulated hate speech as hierarchical and multi-layer inferences on sentiment, target, expression of abuse and violence.

Because of the complexities of task formulation, most of the studies focus on one specific dataset, and combining existing datasets is not a trivial task. Moreover, the scope of studied abusive behaviors has been limited (Jurgens et al., 2019).

Sampling Bias: Sampling techniques deployed to boost the number of abusive examples may result in a skewed distribution of concepts and entities related to targeted identity groups. These unintended entity misrepresentations often translate into biased abuse detection systems. Dixon et al. (2018) and Davidson et al. (2019) focused on the skewed representation of vocabulary related to racial demographics in the abusive part of the dataset, and showed that adding counter-examples (benign sentences with the same vocabulary) would mitigate the bias to some extent. Park et al. (2018) measured gender bias in models trained on different abusive language datasets and suggested various mitigation techniques, such as debiasing an embedding model, proper augmentation of training datasets, and fine-tuning with additional data. Nejadgholi and Kiritchenko (2020) explored multiple types of selection bias and demonstrated that the ratio of offensive versus normal examples leads to a trade-off between False Positive and False Negative error rates. They concluded that this ratio is more important than the size of the training dataset for training effective classifiers. They also showed that the source of the data and the collection method can lead to topic bias and suggested that this bias can be mitigated through topic modeling.

Annotation Bias: Besides skewed data representations resulting from data sampling, annotator bias is another barrier for building fair and robust systems. Wilhelm and Joeckel (2019) studied the influence of social media users' personal characteristics on the evaluation of hate comments, focusing on abuse aimed towards women and sexual minorities. Their results indicate that moral judgments can be gendered. Breitfeller et al. (2019) used the degree of discrepancies in annotations between male and female annotators to surface nuanced microaggressions. Also, it has been shown that annotators' knowledge of different aspects of hateful behaviour can have a significant impact on the performance of trained classification models (Waseem, 2016). Similarly, annotators' insensitivity or unawareness of dialect can lead to biased annotations and amplify harms against racial minorities (Waseem et al., 2018; Sap et al., 2019).

Quantifying Bias: Even though the developers of datasets and models are cognizant of the risk of various biases, quantifying the extent of this risk is challenging. [Dixon et al. \(2018\)](#) proposed a way of measuring bias in trained models by building a synthetic dataset and using an evaluation metric that computes error disparity across identity groups. Kaggle competition on the Unintended Bias in Toxicity Classification, introduced a set of metrics that measure unintended bias for identity references across multiple dimensions. Also, different definitions and frameworks of fairness have been used for the evaluation of automatic abuse detection systems to encourage the development of systems that are optimized not only for the overall performance but also for fair outputs across different target groups ([Borkan et al., 2019](#); [Garg et al., 2019](#)). [Dinan et al. \(2020\)](#) decomposed gender bias in text along several pragmatic and semantic dimensions and proposed classifiers for controlling gender bias.

Embedding models are one of the important sources of bias in natural language processing systems. There has been an active line of work that aims to quantify bias and stereotypes in language models that generate text representations. Early works focused on gender and racial bias and introduced association tests for measuring bias in word embeddings ([Bolukbasi et al., 2016](#); [Caliskan et al., 2017](#); [Manzini et al., 2019](#)). For contextualized word embeddings, [May et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Kurita et al. \(2019\)](#) used pre-defined sentence templates, and [Nadeem et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Nangia et al. \(2020\)](#) collected crowd-sourced sentences to measure stereotypical biases hidden in language models. Not only do pre-trained neural language models reflect social biases, they are also prone to generating racist, sexist, or otherwise toxic language which hinders their safe deployment ([Gehman et al., 2020](#)). However, it is still unclear how the bias and toxicity present in language models impact the output of the trained classifiers.

Generalizability: [Wiegand et al. \(2019\)](#) showed that sampling bias can limit the generalizability of trained models. Depending on the sampling method and the platform that the dataset is collected from, some datasets are mostly comprised of explicitly abusive texts while others mainly contain sub-types of implicit abusive language such as stereotypes. The study demonstrated that models trained on datasets with explicit abuse and less bi-

ased sampling perform well on other datasets with similar characteristics, whereas datasets with implicit abuse and biased sampling contain specific features usually not generalizable to other datasets. [Nejadgholi and Kiritchenko \(2020\)](#) demonstrated that platform-specific topics can negatively impact the generalizability of the trained classifiers. They showed that removing over-represented benign topics can improve the generalization across datasets.

Explainability: As the impact of AI becomes more significant in our daily lives, developers of automatic systems are expected to earn the trust of users by providing explanations for automatically made decisions. Traditional lexicon and feature-based models are interpretable to some extent as they use features understandable by humans. Several lexicons of abusive expressions have been built manually, automatically, and semi-automatically ([Razavi et al., 2010](#); [Gitari et al., 2015](#); [Wiegand et al., 2018](#)). In feature-based systems, bag-of-words and character n-grams have been most frequently used, but some other explainable features, such as the ones derived from sentiment analysis, tone analysis, subjectivity, and topic modelling, have also been employed ([Fortuna and Nunes, 2018](#)). However, the accuracy of lexicon and feature-based systems is often significantly lower than the accuracy of deep learning models ([Dixon et al., 2018](#); [Gunasekara and Nejadgholi, 2018](#); [Founta et al., 2019](#)).

Neural networks, on the other hand, are effectively black boxes. Recent research has leveraged the LIME (locally interpretable model-agnostic explanations) algorithm in an attempt to interpret a model's representation of abusive statements ([Srivastava and Khurana, 2019](#); [Mahajan et al., 2020](#)). LIME's explanations consist of words highly weighted by the model, but no further information is provided on why a text is classified as abusive ([Ribeiro et al., 2016](#)). Similarly, attention mechanisms embedded in deep learning architectures were used to identify the abusive parts of a text ([Chakrabarty et al., 2019](#)). However, it is not clear if such mechanisms provide meaningful explanations of a model's decisions ([Jain and Wallace, 2019](#); [Wiegrefe and Pinter, 2019](#)).

Output probability (or confidence) scores produced by classifiers have been used to explain the severity of abuse ([Hosseini et al., 2017](#); [Gröndahl et al., 2018](#)). However, it is not clear how well these probabilities correspond to the human perception

of severity and in what ways they might be affected by sampling methods.

Another approach to explainability is through more comprehensive data annotation so that more particulars can be learned directly from training data. For example, models trained on the Kaggle Toxicity dataset labelled for five sub-categories of toxicity provide more information than the previous versions of this dataset annotated with binary labels (Wulczyn et al., 2017). Another example is the OffensEval dataset that includes annotations for the target of abuse (individual, group, or other) (Zampieri et al., 2019b). Sap et al. (2020) employed modern large-scale language models in an attempt to automatically generate explanations as social bias inferences for abusive social media posts that target members of identity groups. They asked human annotators to provide free-text statements that describe the targeted identity group and the implied meaning of the post in the form of simple patterns (e.g., “women are ADJ”, “gay men VBP”). They showed that while the current models are capable of accurately predicting whether the online post is offensive or not, they struggle to effectively reproduce human-written statements for implied meaning.

Transparency: Mitchell et al. (2019) introduced the concept of model cards as a means to address transparency of deep learning models. They urged the developers of models to report the details of data on which the models were trained and clarify the scope of use, including the applications where the employment of the model is not recommended. As an example, they presented a model card for an automatic abuse detection system, Perspective API (Jigsaw, Perspective API, 2017). Similar concepts, data statements (Bender and Friedman, 2018) and datasheets for datasets (Gebru et al., 2018), were proposed to standardize the process of documenting datasets. Bender (2019) explained how transparent documentation can help in mitigating the ethical risks.

Safety and Security: Several studies have shown that trained abuse detection systems can be deceived or attacked by malicious users. Hosseini et al. (2017) demonstrated that an adversary can query the system multiple times and find a way to subtly modify an abusive phrase resulting in significantly lowering confidence that the phrase is abusive. Gröndahl et al. (2018) showed that adding a positive word such as ‘love’ to an abusive

comment can flip the model’s predictions. They studied seven models trained for hate speech detection and concluded that although character-based models are more resistant to attacks, model variety is less important than the type of training data and labelling criteria. Further, Kurita et al. (2020) observed that in spite of rich sub-word representations, a BERT-based classifier can be deceived by inserting a specific rare word to an abusive sentence. Kalin et al. (2020) proposed a structured approach for securing a toxicity detection classifier in a production setting.

4 A Novel Framework for Abusive Language Detection

To address some of the issues outlined in the previous section, we propose a novel framework for categorizing online abusive language. We identify two primary dimensions of interest, designed to cover the full range of the spectrum, from most genial, non-abusive to extremely abusive texts:

1. subject matter of utterance
2. severity of abuse

Subject Matter: As previous research demonstrated, it is essential from both legal and linguistic points of view to identify the target of abuse—who (or what) the abuse is directed towards. We extend this idea to cover both abusive and non-abusive texts, and propose to specify the subject matter of an utterance. We define subject matter as the topic of a factual statement or the target of an opinion. Having all types of texts, positive, negative, and neutral opinions as well as factual statements, annotated for subject matter can help in balancing the distribution of abusive and non-abusive instances for different types of targets and broadening the range of instances related to the same subject matter. However, we consider only subject matters that can potentially be targets of abuse, namely people (individuals and groups) and entities related to identity groups. All other subject matters are grouped under the category ‘other’. Identity groups are sections of population with significant membership that are usually defined by ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual orientation, but can also be defined by other characteristics, such as physical appearance, occupation, political affiliation, etc. Entities related to identity groups include concepts (e.g., Islam is related to Muslims), events (e.g., Pride Parade is related to the LGBTQ community), ideas, etc. While negative remarks towards entities would normally




Figure 1: Taxonomy for subject matter of an utterance.

constitute an acceptable form of criticism, having such instances in the training datasets would ensure the systems’ exposure to examples of non-abusive texts linguistically similar to abusive instances.

When the subject matter is people, we distinguish personal and identity group related reference. If the subject matter (whether a single person or a group) is referred to by identity terms associated with an identity group, we call it ‘related to identity group’; otherwise, we classify it as ‘personal’. Notice that unlike previous research, we do not distinguish subject matters at the level of individuals and groups as similar legal considerations and linguistic patterns are observed for both types. Identity group related subject matters can be further characterized by the basis on which the identity group is defined (e.g., race) as well as by the specific identity (e.g., African-Americans).

Figure 1 shows the full multi-level hierarchical taxonomy for subject matters. Since an utterance can refer to more than one identity group, multiple categories can be assigned to an instance.

Severity of Abuse: Online abusive content embodies a spectrum of practices that differ in motivation, expression, and consequences (Shepherd et al., 2015; Pohjonen and Udupa, 2017). While separating different forms of online abuse (e.g., threats, insults, hate speech) proved problematic, a more attainable, yet valuable objective can be determining the level of severity of abuse—a point on the scale from non-abusive, friendly instances to extremely abusive, violent messages. Ordering textual instances by the severity of abuse can help human moderators to prioritize messages for manual inspection and to promptly respond to potentially dangerous ones.

The common technique for annotating items on a fine-grained ordinal scale is rating scales. How-

ever, traditional rating scales suffer from a number of shortcomings, including inconsistencies in annotations by different annotators and by the same annotator over time, scale region bias, and fixed granularity (Baumgartner and Steenkamp, 2001; Presser and Schuman, 1996). To overcome these problems, human annotators can be asked to provide comparative judgements instead (Goffin and Olson, 2011; Aroyo et al., 2019).

An efficient comparative technique, widely used in marketing research, is Best–Worst Scaling (Loui-viere and Woodworth, 1990; Louviere et al., 2015). In Best–Worst Scaling (BWS), an annotator is presented with n items (where n is typically 4 or 5) and asked to select the *best* item (*the most abusive*) and the *worst* item (*the least abusive*). All the items to be annotated are organized in m n -tuples in such a way that ensures each item is annotated multiple times and compared with a diverse set of other items. After annotating around $1.5 \times N$ to $2 \times N$ such n -tuples (where N is the total number of textual instances to be annotated), a real-valued score of severity can be calculated for each textual instance, and a ranked list of instances by severity can be obtained (Flynn and Marley, 2014; Kiritchenko and Mohammad, 2016).

Since BWS tuples are formed randomly (though, ensuring the diversity of comparisons for each item), for some tuples the choice of the most abusive and/or least abusive texts might be apparent for most annotators. Extremely abusive texts would be often selected as the *most abusive* and get a high severity score while genial and friendly texts would mostly be selected as the *least abusive* and get low scores. Yet, in some tuples two or more texts might express similar levels of severity. In such cases, since annotators are forced to make a decision for each tuple, the answer by each annotator would be selected randomly between these similarly abusive items. This means that the items would be chosen (on average) by the same number of annotators, and, therefore, the aggregated scores for these items would be close to each other.

It has been shown that Best–Worst Scaling produces more reliable annotations as compared to the traditional rating scales, especially on linguistically more complex items (Kiritchenko and Mohammad, 2017). Figure 2 demonstrates an example of a hypothetical BWS annotation for severity of abuse. Table 1 shows examples of texts annotated according to the entire framework.

Text	Subject matter	Severity score
Claiming to be transgender is a sign of mental illness. The military has no place for people with mental disabilities.	People, Transgender	0.8
Transgender people have a gender identity or gender expression that differs from their sex assigned at birth.	People, Transgender	0.0
Shove it up your f*cking *ss and burn in hell.	People, Personal	0.9
This movie was a f*cking piece of sh*t.	Entities, Other	0.5
I personally believe that Islam requires a Reformation or an Enlightenment.	Entities, Islam	0.2

Table 1: Examples of texts with hypothetical annotations. Severity scores are on the scale from 0 (least abusive) to 1 (most abusive). The absolute values of severity scores are not meaningful but the relative values distinguish between facts, criticism, obscene sentences, and highly abusive contents. Some of the texts are taken from the Kaggle Unintended Bias in Toxicity dataset by Jigsaw and Google.

Subject Matter : People , Women

1) Most high earning women are chain smoking, manly buffalos. The goodlooking young ones tend to be airheads.	2) Agreed. This is also not her first crash. The woman should not be piloting an aircraft.
3) New study reveals representation of women in films is getting worse.	4) I just adore older women who aren't politically correct.

Least Abusive	3
Most Abusive	1

Figure 2: Example of a BWS annotation for severity.

5 Advantages of the Novel Framework

The proposed framework addresses some of the problems outlined earlier.

Task Formulation: The framework focuses on a general class of abusive behavior and aims to extend the scope of studied online abuse without the painful process of enumerating and precisely defining a myriad of types. Instead, many types can be roughly defined as regions in the proposed two-dimensional space of subject matter and severity of abuse. For example, ‘physical threat’ can be mapped to (subject matter: people, severity: high), and ‘personal attack’ can be mapped to (subject matter: personal, severity: moderate to high). In this way, separate research efforts are expected to produce more compatible and more applicable outputs. Still, listing different types of abuse with their coarse-grained definitions and examples can be extremely helpful in guiding data collection and annotation.

Data Collection and Sampling Bias: To ensure adequate representation for different identity groups, data can be collected for each group using abusive and benign query terms that refer to members of that group or to entities associated with the

group. The sets of terms can be acquired manually or semi-automatically using unsupervised techniques, such as topic modeling, clustering, etc. Textual messages collected in this way would include abusive as well as neutral and friendly utterances about an identity group or closely related concepts, cover a variety of topics, and contain explicit and implicit language. However, this method of data collection does not specifically target the ‘personal’ category. It can also result in low proportions of abusive texts and introduce unintended biases, such as topic bias (Wiegand et al., 2019). Therefore, the data collection should be spread out over a period of time (to diversify the set of covered topics) and supplemented with other techniques, such as sampling based on lexicons of common abusive words and expressions, sampling of messages written by users known for abusive behavior, and random sampling. Further, data from existing abusive language datasets as well as abusive examples reported by users on dedicated websites, such as HeartMob³ and Microaggressions⁴, are valuable data sources. Collecting data with a specific focus on identity groups allows to account for fairness in representation at the beginning of the development cycle.

The set of identity groups represented in a dataset is decided apriori based on a research focus, a data source, and available resources. A preliminary round of exploratory annotations can be beneficial to expand the list of commonly addressed groups (e.g., women, African-Americans, immigrants) to other identities. Further exploratory rounds can be run periodically to include new, previously non-existent or missed, categories.

Annotation Bias: Manually annotating for sever-

³<https://iheartmob.org>

⁴<https://www.microaggressions.com>

ity of abuse is a particularly subjective task, and often requires specific expertise obtained through training or life experiences. We recommend having data annotated for subject matter first, and then the severity annotations can be done independently for different identity groups and involve corresponding annotator pools. Most often, online abuse is directed towards minorities and marginalized communities, therefore it is vital to involve and consult the members of these communities to adequately represent their values and to reduce data annotation bias (Blackwell et al., 2017). In cases where community involvement in annotation is infeasible, professionals specializing in related issues or trained annotators can be employed.

Quantifying Bias: Although the new framework does not guarantee the fairness of trained models, it allows measuring and mitigating bias through comparability of the overall automatic detection error or the False Positive and False Negative error rates for different identity groups.

Generalizability: The conceptions of target groups based on specific identities are expected to be applicable across online platforms and domains. The generalizability of trained models will be improved by increasing the proportion of texts with implicit meaning and texts that provide acceptable criticism of entities and concepts. Further, the proposed framework will improve the generalizability by allowing data annotators to use the full spectrum of the severity dimension without forcing them to decide where the boundary between abusive and benign languages lies. That decision is application and domain specific and can be left to human moderators, making trained systems suitable to a greater variety of applications.

Explainability: Within the framework, the systems are trained to predict and output the detailed information on the target of abuse and the level of severity that can serve as basic explanations for human and machine decisions. More comprehensive explanations can sometimes be derived when the targeted group is coupled with the words and expressions in the message that are considered particularly insulting for that group. Similarly, knowing the target of abuse is imperative in recognizing and explaining implicit abuse and stereotypical references. Further, these explanations can serve educational purposes when employed in a system that assists users at the time of message creation.

Transparency: The framework provides a means

to measure the class imbalances in a dataset across target groups. Reporting the limitations of a dataset is essential for transparency and helps practitioners to better identify the scope of use of trained models.

Safety and Security: The vulnerability of classification systems due to their high sensitivity to specific words suggests that those words are over-represented in the training datasets. The proposed framework can improve the safety of such systems by including more training examples with implicit meaning and training systems to learn fine-grained information which is not directly correlated with explicitly abusive words.

6 Limitations and Ethical Considerations

Delineating target categories based on identity groups, selecting search terms associated with the groups, and annotating for fine-grained target categories can propagate harmful stereotypes and reinforce social iniquity (Beukeboom and Burgers, 2019). NLP researchers should ground their work in the relevant literature from other disciplines, such as sociology, sociolinguistics, and social psychology, and engage with the lived experiences of members of affected communities in order to minimize such adverse effects (Blodgett et al., 2020).

Viewing and annotating abusive content for prolonged periods of time can cause significant distress to human annotators (Roberts, 2016; Vidgen et al., 2019). This concern is even more critical for members of marginalized groups annotating abusive texts directed towards their community. To reduce the possible harmful effects on mental health of the annotators, special procedures can be put in place, including the right consent process, comprehensive instructions, limited exposure time, fair compensation, and mental health support. Annotators should be made aware of why they are labeling such contents and how their work contributes to the safety of online platforms for their communities.

7 Conclusion and Future Directions

A new framework structured around the dimensions of *subject matter* and *severity of abuse* is proposed as a step towards building less biased, more accurate and generally more trustable automatic abuse detection systems. Comprehensive data collection and annotation proposed within the framework allow for better control and transparency on data characteristics and model performance with regard to unintended biases, generalizability, ex-

plainability, and safety. As the next step, the usability and efficacy of the proposed framework need to be tested. Thus, future work will include building an extensive list of identity groups subjected to online abuse, assembling lexicons of terms associated with the groups for targeted sampling, and writing detailed annotation guidelines for both annotation steps. Then, empirical datasets in multiple languages can be collected, annotated, and released to the research community for experimenting and building trustable machine learning models.

References

- Betty van Aken, Julian Risch, Ralf Krestel, and Alexander Löser. 2018. Challenges for toxic comment classification: An in-depth error analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online*.
- Lora Aroyo, Lucas Dixon, Nithum Thain, Olivia Redfield, and Rachel Rosen. 2019. Crowdsourcing subjective tasks: the case study of understanding toxicity in online discussions. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Subjectivity, Ambiguity and Disagreement in Crowdsourcing*, pages 1100–1105.
- Stavros Assimakopoulos, Rebecca Vella Muskat, Lonneke van der Plas, and Albert Gatt. 2020. [Annotating for hate speech: The MaNeCo corpus and some input from critical discourse analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 5088–5097, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Hans Baumgartner and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp. 2001. Response styles in marketing research: A cross-national investigation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2):143–156.
- Emily M Bender. 2019. A typology of ethical risks in language technology with an eye towards where transparent documentation can help. In *Future of Artificial Intelligence: Language, Ethics, Technology Workshop*.
- Emily M Bender and Batya Friedman. 2018. Data statements for natural language processing: Toward mitigating system bias and enabling better science. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:587–604.
- Camiel J. Beukeboom and Christian Burgers. 2019. How stereotypes are shared through language: a review and introduction of the social categories and stereotypes communication (SCSC) framework. *Review of Communication Research*, 7:1–37.
- Lindsay Blackwell, Jill Dimond, Sarita Schoenebeck, and Cliff Lampe. 2017. Classification and its consequences for online harassment: Design insights from HeartMob. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 1(2):1–19.
- Su Lin Blodgett, Solon Barocas, Hal Daumé III, and Hanna Wallach. 2020. Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of “bias” in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5454–5476.
- Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T Kalai. 2016. Man is to computer programmer as woman is to homemaker? debiasing word embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4349–4357.
- Daniel Borkan, Lucas Dixon, Jeffrey Sorensen, Nithum Thain, and Lucy Vasserman. 2019. Nuanced metrics for measuring unintended bias with real data for text classification. In *Companion Proceedings of The 2019 World Wide Web Conference*, pages 491–500.
- Luke Breittfeller, Emily Ahn, David Jurgens, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. [Finding microaggressions in the wild: A case for locating elusive phenomena in social media posts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 1664–1674, Hong Kong, China.
- Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186.
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Kilol Gupta, and Smaranda Muresan. 2019. Pay “attention” to your context when classifying abusive language. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 70–79, Florence, Italy.
- Eshwar Chandrasekharan, Mattia Samory, Shagun Jhaver, Hunter Charvat, Amy Bruckman, Cliff Lampe, Jacob Eisenstein, and Eric Gilbert. 2018. The Internet’s hidden rules: An empirical study of Reddit norm violations at micro, meso, and macro scales. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 2(CSCW):1–25.
- Despoina Chatzakou, Nicolas Kourtellis, Jeremy Blackburn, Emiliano De Cristofaro, Gianluca Stringhini, and Athena Vakali. 2017. Mean birds: Detecting aggression and bullying on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Web Science*, pages 13–22.
- Maral Dadvar, Dolf Trieschnigg, Roeland Ordelman, and Franciska de Jong. 2013. Improving cyberbullying detection with user context. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Information Retrieval*, pages 693–696.
- Thomas Davidson, Debasmita Bhattacharya, and Ingmar Weber. 2019. Racial bias in hate speech and abusive language detection datasets. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 25–35, Florence, Italy.

- Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. 2017. Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Emily Dinan, Angela Fan, Ledell Wu, Jason Weston, Douwe Kiela, and Adina Williams. 2020. Multi-dimensional gender bias classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00614*.
- Lucas Dixon, John Li, Jeffrey Sorensen, Nithum Thain, and Lucy Vasserman. 2018. Measuring and mitigating unintended bias in text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 67–73.
- Nemanja Djuric, Jing Zhou, Robin Morris, Mihajlo Grbovic, Vladan Radosavljevic, and Narayan Bhamidipati. 2015. Hate speech detection with comment embeddings. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 29–30.
- Maeve Duggan. 2017. *Online Harassment 2017*. Pew Research Center.
- Darja Fišer, Tomaž Erjavec, and Nikola Ljubešić. 2017. Legal framework, dataset and annotation schema for socially unacceptable online discourse practices in Slovene. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 46–51.
- T. N. Flynn and A. A. J. Marley. 2014. Best-worst scaling: theory and methods. In Stephane Hess and Andrew Daly, editors, *Handbook of Choice Modelling*, pages 178–201. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Paula Fortuna and Sérgio Nunes. 2018. A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(4):1–30.
- Paula Fortuna, Juan Soler, and Leo Wanner. 2020. Toxic, hateful, offensive or abusive? what are we really classifying? an empirical analysis of hate speech datasets. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6786–6794, Marseille, France.
- Antigoni Maria Founta, Despoina Chatzakou, Nicolas Kourtellis, Jeremy Blackburn, Athena Vakali, and Ilias Leontiadis. 2019. A unified deep learning architecture for abuse detection. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Web Science*, pages 105–114.
- Antigoni Maria Founta, Constantinos Djouvas, Despoina Chatzakou, Ilias Leontiadis, Jeremy Blackburn, Gianluca Stringhini, Athena Vakali, Michael Sirivianos, and Nicolas Kourtellis. 2018. Large scale crowdsourcing and characterization of Twitter abusive behavior. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Lei Gao and Ruihong Huang. 2017. Detecting online hate speech using context aware models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing, RANLP 2017*, pages 260–266, Varna, Bulgaria.
- Sahaj Garg, Vincent Perot, Nicole Limtiaco, Ankur Taly, Ed H Chi, and Alex Beutel. 2019. Counterfactual fairness in text classification through robustness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 219–226.
- Timnit Gebru, J. Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, H. Wallach, Hal Daumé, and K. Crawford. 2018. Datasheets for datasets. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning*, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sam Gehman, Suchin Gururangan, Maarten Sap, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2020. Realtocixityprompts: Evaluating neural toxic degeneration in language models. In *Findings of EMNLP*.
- Njagi Dennis Gitari, Zhang Zuping, Hanyurwimfura Damien, and Jun Long. 2015. A lexicon-based approach for hate speech detection. *International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering*, 10(4):215–230.
- Richard D. Goffin and James M. Olson. 2011. Is it all relative? Comparative judgments and the possible improvement of self-ratings and ratings of others. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1):48–60.
- Jennifer Golbeck, Zahra Ashktorab, Rashad O Banjo, Alexandra Berlinger, Siddharth Bhagwan, Cody Buntain, Paul Cheakalos, Alicia A Geller, Rajesh Kumar Gnanasekaran, Raja Rajan Gunasekaran, et al. 2017. A large labeled corpus for online harassment research. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Web Science*, pages 229–233.
- Tommi Gröndahl, Luca Pajola, Mika Juuti, Mauro Conti, and N Asokan. 2018. All you need is “love” evading hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 2–12.
- Isuru Gunasekara and Isar Nejadgholi. 2018. A review of standard text classification practices for multi-label toxicity identification of online content. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pages 21–25.
- S. Hinduja and J. W. Patchin. 2020. *Cyberbullying fact sheet: Identification, Prevention, and Response*. Cyberbullying Research Center.
- Hossein Hosseini, Sreeram Kannan, Baosen Zhang, and Radha Poovendran. 2017. Deceiving Google’s Perspective API built for detecting toxic comments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08138*.
- Homa Hosseinmardi, Sabrina Arredondo Mattson, Rahat Ibn Rafiq, Richard Han, Qin Lv, and Shivakant Mishra. 2015. Analyzing labeled cyberbullying incidents on the Instagram social network. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Informatics*, pages 49–66.

- Sarthak Jain and Byron C. Wallace. 2019. Attention is not Explanation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 3543–3556, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Jigsaw, Perspective API. 2017. <https://www.perspectiveapi.com/#/home>.
- David Jurgens, Libby Hemphill, and Eshwar Chandrasekharan. 2019. A just and comprehensive strategy for using NLP to address online abuse. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3658–3666, Florence, Italy.
- Josh Kalin, David Noever, and Gerry Dozier. 2020. Systematic attack surface reduction for deployed sentiment analysis models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11130*.
- Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif M. Mohammad. 2016. Capturing reliable fine-grained sentiment associations by crowdsourcing and best–worst scaling. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL)*, San Diego, California.
- Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif M. Mohammad. 2017. Best-worst scaling more reliable than rating scales: A case study on sentiment intensity annotation. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, Vancouver, Canada.
- Ritesh Kumar, Atul Kr Ojha, Shervin Malmasi, and Marcos Zampieri. 2018. Benchmarking aggression identification in social media. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Trolling, Aggression and Cyberbullying (TRAC-2018)*, pages 1–11.
- Keita Kurita, Paul Michel, and Graham Neubig. 2020. Weight poisoning attacks on pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Keita Kurita, Nidhi Vyas, Ayush Pareek, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. Measuring bias in contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pages 166–172.
- Jordan J. Louviere, Terry N. Flynn, and A. A. J. Marley. 2015. *Best-Worst Scaling: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan J. Louviere and George G. Woodworth. 1990. Best-worst analysis. Working Paper. Department of Marketing and Economic Analysis, University of Alberta.
- Aditya Mahajan, Divyank Shah, and Gibraan Jafar. 2020. Explainable AI approach towards toxic comment classification. Technical report.
- Thomas Manzini, Lim Yao Chong, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. Black is to criminal as caucasian is to police: Detecting and removing multi-class bias in word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 615–621.
- Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. 2019. On measuring social biases in sentence encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 622–628.
- Pushkar Mishra, Helen Yannakoudakis, and Ekaterina Shutova. 2019. Tackling online abuse: A survey of automated abuse detection methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.06024*.
- Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. 2019. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 220–229.
- Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. 2020. Stereoset: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09456*.
- Nikita Nangia, Clara Vania, Rasika Bhalerao, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. Crows-pairs: A challenge dataset for measuring social biases in masked language models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Isar Nejadgholi and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2020. On cross-dataset generalization in automatic detection of online abuse. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms*.
- Marco Niemann, Dennis M Riehle, Jens Brunk, and Jörg Becker. 2019. What is abusive language? In *Proceedings of the Multidisciplinary International Symposium on Disinformation in Open Online Media*, pages 59–73.
- Chikashi Nobata, Joel Tetreault, Achint Thomas, Yashar Mehdad, and Yi Chang. 2016. Abusive language detection in online user content. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 145–153.
- Ji Ho Park, Jamin Shin, and Pascale Fung. 2018. Reducing gender bias in abusive language detection. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2799–2804, Brussels, Belgium.

- Matti Pohjonen and Sahana Udupa. 2017. Extreme speech online: An anthropological critique of hate speech debates. *International Journal of Communication*, 11:19.
- Fabio Poletto, Marco Stranisci, Manuela Sanguinetti, Viviana Patti, and Cristina Bosco. 2017. Hate speech annotation: Analysis of an Italian Twitter corpus. In *Proceedings of the Italian Conference on Computational Linguistics (CLiC-it 2017)*, pages 1–6.
- Stanley Presser and Howard Schuman. 1996. *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Amir H Razavi, Diana Inkpen, Sasha Uritsky, and Stan Matwin. 2010. Offensive language detection using multi-level classification. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 16–27.
- Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. “Why should I trust you?” Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1135–1144.
- Sarah T. Roberts. 2016. Commercial content moderation: Digital laborers’ dirty work. In *The Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex, Class and Culture Online*. Peter Lang Publishing.
- S. Salawu, Y. He, and J. Lumsden. 2020. Approaches to automated detection of cyberbullying: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 11(1):3–24.
- Maarten Sap, Dallas Card, Saadia Gabriel, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2019. The risk of racial bias in hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1668–1678.
- Maarten Sap, Saadia Gabriel, Lianhui Qin, Dan Jurafsky, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Social bias frames: Reasoning about social and power implications of language. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Anna Schmidt and Michael Wiegand. 2017. A survey on hate speech detection using natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media*, pages 1–10.
- Tamara Shepherd, Alison Harvey, Tim Jordan, Sam Srauy, and Kate Miltner. 2015. Histories of hating. *Social Media+ Society*, 1(2).
- Ellen Spertus. 1997. Smokey: Automatic recognition of hostile messages. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1058–1065.
- Saurabh Srivastava and Prerna Khurana. 2019. Detecting aggression and toxicity using a multi dimension capsule network. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 157–162.
- Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157):1124–1131.
- David Van Bruwaene, Qianjia Huang, and Diana Inkpen. 2020. A multi-platform dataset for detecting cyberbullying in social media. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1–24.
- Bertie Vidgen and Leon Derczynski. 2020. Directions in abusive language training data: Garbage in, garbage out. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01670*.
- Bertie Vidgen, Alex Harris, Dong Nguyen, Rebekah Tromble, Scott Hale, and Helen Margetts. 2019. Challenges and frontiers in abusive content detection. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 80–93, Florence, Italy.
- Zeeraq Waseem. 2016. Are you a racist or am I seeing things? Annotator influence on hate speech detection on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on NLP and Computational Social Science*, pages 138–142.
- Zeeraq Waseem, Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmsley, and Ingmar Weber. 2017. Understanding abuse: A typology of abusive language detection subtasks. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 78–84, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Zeeraq Waseem and Dirk Hovy. 2016. Hateful symbols or hateful people? Predictive features for hate speech detection on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the NAACL Student Research Workshop*, pages 88–93.
- Zeeraq Waseem, James Thorne, and Joachim Bingel. 2018. Bridging the gaps: Multi task learning for domain transfer of hate speech detection. In Golbeck J., editor, *Online harassment*, pages 29–55. Springer.
- Michael Wiegand, Josef Ruppenhofer, and Thomas Kleinbauer. 2019. Detection of abusive language: the problem of biased datasets. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 602–608.
- Michael Wiegand, Josef Ruppenhofer, Anna Schmidt, and Clayton Greenberg. 2018. Inducing a lexicon of abusive words—a feature-based approach. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1046–1056.
- Sarah Wiegrefe and Yuval Pinter. 2019. Attention is not not explanation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language*

Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pages 11–20.

Claudia Wilhelm and Sven Joeckel. 2019. Gendered morality and backlash effects in online discussions: An experimental study on how users respond to hate speech comments against women and sexual minorities. *Sex Roles*, 80(7-8):381–392.

Ellery Wulczyn, Nithum Thain, and Lucas Dixon. 2017. Ex machina: Personal attacks seen at scale. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1391–1399.

Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. 2019a. Predicting the type and target of offensive posts in social media. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1415–1420, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. 2019b. Semeval-2019 task 6: Identifying and categorizing offensive language in social media (offenseval). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 75–86.

Frederike Zufall, Huangpan Zhang, Katharina Kloppeborg, and Torsten Zesch. 2020. Operationalizing the legal concept of ‘incitement to hatred’ as an NLP task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03422*.