

A Neighbourhood Framework for Resource-Lean Content Flagging

Sheikh Muhammad Sarwar^{1,2} and Dimitrina Zlatkova¹ and Momchil Hardalov^{1,3}
and Yoan Dinkov¹ and Isabelle Augenstein^{1,4} and Preslav Nakov^{1,5}

¹Checkstep Research, ²University of Massachusetts, Amherst,

³Sofia University, ⁴University of Copenhagen, ⁵Qatar Computing Research Institute, HBKU,
smsarwar@cs.umass.edu,

{didi, momchil, yoan.dinkov, isabelle, preslav.nakov}@checkstep.com

Abstract

We propose a novel framework for cross-lingual content flagging with limited target-language data, which significantly outperforms prior work in terms of predictive performance. The framework is based on a nearest-neighbour architecture. It is a modern instantiation of the vanilla k -nearest neighbour model, as we use Transformer representations in all its components. Our framework can adapt to new source language instances, without the need to be retrained from scratch. Unlike prior work on neighbourhood based approaches, we encode the neighbourhood information based on query-neighbour interactions. We propose two encoding schemes and show their effectiveness using both qualitative and quantitative analyses. Our evaluation results on eight languages from two different datasets for abusive language detection show sizable improvements of up to 9.5 (for the Italian language) in F1 over strong baselines. On average we achieve 3.6 improvements in F1 for the three languages in the Jigsaw Multilingual dataset and 2.14 improvements in F1 for the WUL dataset.

1 Introduction

Online content moderation has become an increasingly important problem – small-scale websites and large-scale corporations alike strive to remove harmful content from their platforms (Vidgen et al., 2019; Pavlopoulos et al., 2017; Wulczyn et al., 2017). This is partly in anticipation of proposed legislation, such as the *Digital Service Act* (Commission, 2020) in the EU and the *Online Harms Bill* (Government, 2020) in the UK. Even without such legislative efforts, it is clear that the lack of content moderation can have significant impact on businesses (e.g., Parler was denied server space), on governments (e.g., U.S. Capi-

tol Riots), and on individuals, e.g., because hate speech is linked to self-harm (Jürgens et al., 2019).

A key challenge when developing content moderation systems is the lack of resources for many languages (other than English). Thus, our task is to create a content flagging model for a target language with limited annotated data by transferring knowledge from another dataset in a different language, for which a large amount of training data is available.

There are existing approaches that could partially address this challenge. A popular approach is to fine-tune multilingual language models such as XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) or mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019) on the target dataset (Glavaš et al., 2020; Stappen et al., 2020). To incorporate the source dataset knowledge, a sequential adaptation technique (Garg et al., 2020) which first fine-tunes a multilingual LM on the source dataset, then on the target dataset, can be used. There are also existing approaches for mixing the source and the target datasets (Shnarch et al., 2018) in different proportions, followed by fine-tuning the multilingual LM on the resulting dataset. While sequential adaptation introduces the risk of forgetting the knowledge from the source dataset, such mixing methods are driven by heuristics that are effective, but not systematic. Crucially, as we argue in this paper, this is because they do not model the relationship between the source and the target data. Another problem arises if we consider that new data cases with novel labels can be added to the source dataset. This is a specifically pertinent issue for content moderation, as efforts to create new resources often define their own label taxonomies (Banko et al., 2020). In that case, model re-training becomes a requirement in order to map the new label space to the output layer that is used for fine-tuning.

We propose a Transformer-based k -Nearest

Is the content flagged or not?




Figure 1: Conceptual diagram of our neighbourhood framework. The query is processed using run-time compute, while the neighbour vector is pre-computed.

Neighbour ($k\text{NN}^+$) framework,¹ a one-stop solution and a significant improvement over the vanilla k -NN model. Our framework addresses the above-mentioned challenges, which are not easy to solve via simple fine-tuning of pre-trained language models. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, our framework is the first attempt to use k -NN for transfer learning for the task of abusive content detection.

Given a query, which is a training or an evaluation data point from the target dataset, $k\text{NN}^+$ retrieves its nearest neighbours using a language-agnostic sentence embedding model. Then, it constructs Transformer representations for the query and for its neighbours. After that, it computes interaction features, which are based on the interactions of the representations of the query with each of its neighbours.² At training time, the interaction features are optimised using supervised training signals computed from the label of the query and the neighbour, so that the features indicate their level of agreement. For example, if the query and its neighbour are both abusive, they agree on

¹We use + superscript to indicate that our $k\text{NN}^+$ framework is an improvement over the vanilla k -NN model.

²We borrow the terminology from information retrieval, as the interactions between a query and a document in deep matching models are computed in a similar way (Guo et al., 2016).

the labels. Thus, the interactions help the model learn a semantic similarity space in terms of labels. The framework further uses a self-attention mechanism to aggregate the interaction features from all the neighbours, and it uses the aggregated representation to classify the input query. The aggregated representation computed from the interaction features indicates the agreement of the query with the neighbourhood. As the predictions are made based on aggregated interaction features only, $k\text{NN}^+$ can easily incorporate new data cases with unseen labels without requiring re-training. The conceptual framework is shown in Figure 1. Note that our framework is robust to neighbours with incorrect labels, as it can learn to disagree with them as part of its training process.

We instantiate two variants from our framework: Cross-Encoder (CE) $k\text{NN}^+$, and Bi-Encoder (BE) $k\text{NN}^+$. The CE $k\text{NN}^+$ concatenates the query and a neighbour, and passes that sequence through a Transformer to obtain interaction features. BE $k\text{NN}^+$ computes representations of the query and a neighbour by passing them individually through a Transformer, and computes interaction features from those representations. BE $k\text{NN}^+$ is more efficient than CE $k\text{NN}^+$, but it does not yield the same performance gain. Both models outperform six strong baselines both in cross-lingual and in multilingual settings. Our contributions are summarised as follows:

- We address cross-lingual transfer learning for content flagging with limited labelled data from the target language.
- We demonstrate that neighbourhood methods, such as $k\text{NN}$ are viable candidates for approaching the content flagging task.
- We propose a novel framework, $k\text{NN}^+$, which, unlike a vanilla $k\text{NN}$, models the relationship of a data point and each of its neighbours to represent the neighbourhood, using language-agnostic Transformers.
- Our evaluation results on eight languages from two different datasets for abusive language detection show sizable improvements of up to 9.5 (for the Italian language) in F1 over strong baselines. On average we achieve improvements of 3.6 points in F1 for the three languages in the Jigsaw Multilingual dataset, and an improvement of 2.14 points in F1 for the WUL dataset.

2 Related Work

Below, we review recent work on abusive language detection as well as on neighbourhood-based approaches. A more extensive survey of abusive language detection can be found in Nakov et al. (2021).

2.1 Abusive Content Detection

Most approaches for abusive language detection use text classification models, which have also shown to be effective for related tasks such as sentiment analysis. This includes SVMs (MacAvaney et al., 2019), CNNs (Georgakopoulos et al., 2018; Badjatiya et al., 2019; Agrawal and Awekar, 2018), LSTMs (Arango et al., 2019; Agrawal and Awekar, 2018), BiLSTMs, with attention (Agrawal and Awekar, 2018), Capsule networks (Srivastava et al., 2018), and fine-tuned Transformers (Glavaš et al., 2020). Differently from what we are proposing, these approaches focus on single data points rather than on their neighbourhoods.

Several papers studied the problem of bias in hate speech detection datasets, and have criticised the within-dataset evaluation process (Arango et al., 2019; Davidson et al., 2019; Badjatiya et al., 2019), as this is not a realistic setting, and findings about generalisability based on such experimental settings are questionable. A more realistic and robust evaluation setting was investigated by Glavaš et al. (2020), who show the performance of online abuse detectors in a zero-shot cross-lingual setting. They fine-tuned several multilingual language models (Devlin et al., 2019; Conneau and Lample, 2019; Conneau et al., 2020; Sanh et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020) such as XLM-RoBERTa and mBERT on English datasets and observed how those models transfer to datasets in five other languages. Other cross-lingual abuse detection efforts include using Twitter user features for detecting hate speech in English, German, and Portuguese (Fehn Unsvåg and Gambäck, 2018), cross-lingual embeddings (Ranasinghe and Zampieri, 2020), and using multilingual lexicon with deep learning (Pamungkas and Patti, 2019).

While understanding the performance of zero-shot cross-lingual models is interesting from a natural language understanding point of view, in reality, a platform willing to deploy an abusive language detection system is almost always able to provide some examples of malicious content to be

used for training. Thus, a few-shot or a low-shot scenario is more realistic, and we approach cross-lingual transfer learning from that perspective. We hypothesise that a nearest-neighbour model is a reasonable choice in such a scenario and we propose several improvements over such a model.

2.2 Neighbourhood Models

k NN models have been used for a number of NLP tasks such as part of speech tagging (Daelemans et al., 1996) and morphological analysis (Bosch et al., 2007), among many others. Their effectiveness is rooted in the underlying similarity function, and thus non-linear models such as neural networks can bring additional boost to their performance. More recently, Kaiser et al. (2017) used a similarly differentiable memory which is learned and updated during training, and is applied to one-shot learning tasks. Khandelwal et al. (2020) introduced k -NN retrieval for improving language modelling, which Kassner and Schütze (2020) extended to question-answering (QA). Guu et al. (2020) proposed a framework for retrieval-augmented language modelling (REALM), showing its effectiveness on three Open-QA datasets. Lewis et al. (2020) explored a retrieval-augmented generation for a variety of tasks, including fact-checking and QA, among others. Fan et al. (2021) introduced a k -NN framework for dialogue generation using pre-trained embeddings enhanced by learning an alignment function for retrieval from a set of external multi-modal evidence sources. Finally, Wallace et al. (2018) proposed a deep k -NN approach for interpreting the predictions from a neural network for the task of natural language inference.


All the above approaches use neighbours as additional information sources, but do not investigate interactions between neighbours as we do. Moreover, there is no existing work on deep k NN models for cross-lingual abusive content detection.

3 k NN⁺ Framework

3.1 Problem Setting

Our goal is to learn a content flagging model from source and target datasets in different languages with different label spaces – see Figure 1 for an illustration of our framework.

Formally, we assume access to a source dataset for content flagging, $D^s = \{(x_i^s, y_i^s)\}_{i=1}^{n_s}$, where x_i^s is a textual content and $y_i^s \in \mathcal{Y}$. Further, a tar-



(a) Bi-Encoder k NN (BE k NN⁺) Variant.

(b) Cross-Encoder k NN (CE k NN⁺) Variant.

Figure 2: Two variants based on two encoding schemes used in our proposed k NN⁺, where $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ is the interaction feature computation model, q is the query, and c_i is a candidate neighbour. In the Bi-Encoder setup (Figure 2a) the query and each candidate are encoded separately using the same $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ model. Afterwards in order to obtain a joint vector representation for each query-candidate tuple, the query’s representation (rep_q) is concatenated with each candidate’s representation (rep_i) along with the absolute element-wise difference between the two. In the Cross-Encoder setting (Figure 2b) the query and each candidate are passed through the $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ model which produces the joint vector representation (rep_i) for the query-candidate tuple. Finally, we pass each joint representation through: (i) a linear layer to predict the label agreement between the query and the candidate (ii) a self-attention layer followed by a linear projection layer to predict the label of the content.

get dataset is given, $D^t = \{(x_j^t, y_j^t)\}_{j=1}^{n_t}$, where $y_j^t \in \{flagged, neutral\}$. D^s is resource-rich, i.e., $n_s \gg n_t$, and label-rich, i.e., $|\mathcal{Y}| > 2$. The label space, $\mathcal{Y} = \{hate, insult, \dots, neutral\}$, of D^s contains fine-grained labels for different levels of abusiveness along with the *neutral* label. We convert the label space of D^s as, $\mathcal{Y}' = \{flagged | x \in \mathcal{Y}, x \neq neutral\}$, to align with the label space of D^t . Note that this conversion is needed at training time to compute label agreement in our proposed neighbourhood framework. However, at inference time, a conversion of the label space of D^s is not needed, as the label of an item from D^t is predicted using the latent representations of the neighbours, rather than their labels. This is described in more detail in Section 3.3.

3.2 Why a Neighbourhood Framework?

A vanilla k NN predicts a content label by aggregating the labels of k similar training instances. To this end, it uses the content as a query to retrieve neighbours from the training instances. We hypothesise that this retrieval step can be performed in a cross-lingual transfer learning scenario. In our setting, the queries are target dataset instances and we index the source dataset for retrieval. Note that target instances could also be considered as neighbours for retrieval, but we exclude them, as the target dataset is small.

For a vanilla k NN, queries and documents

are represented with lexical features, and thus it suffers from the curse of dimensionality (Radovanović et al., 2009). Furthermore, the prediction pipeline becomes inefficient if the source dataset is considerably larger than the target dataset, as we are considering here (Lu et al., 2012). Lastly, for a vanilla k NN, there is no straight-forward way to map between languages for cross-lingual transfer.

We address these problems by using a Transformer-based multilingual representation space (Feng et al., 2020) that computes the similarity of a pair of sentences that are in different languages. We assume that the efficiency issue is less critical because (i) retrieval using dense vector sentence embeddings has become significantly faster (Johnson et al., 2021), and (ii) the number of labelled source data samples is not expected to go beyond millions, because obtaining annotations for multilingual abusive content detection is costly and the annotation process is harmful for the annotators as well (Schmidt and Wiegand, 2017; Waseem, 2016; Malmasi and Zampieri, 2018; Mathur et al., 2018).

Even though multilingual models make the vanilla k NN a viable solution for our problem, there exists a problem in making predictions with the model. Once a neighbourhood is retrieved, a vanilla k NN uses a majority voting scheme for prediction. We provide an example in Fig-

ure 1. Given a flagged Turkish query, our framework retrieves two *neutral* and one *flagged* English neighbours. Here, the majority voting prediction based on the neighbourhood is incorrect. *A non-parametric vanilla kNN cannot make a correct prediction with an incorrectly retrieved neighbourhood.* We propose a learned voting strategy to alleviate this problem.

3.3 Architecture of $k\text{NN}^+$

We describe our $k\text{NN}^+$ framework (shown in Figure 2) including the training and inference procedures. The framework description includes neighbourhood retrieval, interaction feature computation and aggregation, and the multi-task learning objective function for optimisation.

Neighbourhood Retrieval We construct a retrieval index R from the source dataset, $D^s = \{(x_i^s, y_i^s)\}_{i=1}^{n_s}$. For each example $x_i^s \in D^s$, we compute its dense vector representation, $\mathbf{x}_i^s = \mathcal{M}_{\text{retriever}}(x_i^s)$. Here, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{retriever}}$ is a multilingual sentence embedding model that we use for retrieval. There are a few multilingual sentence embedding models such as that we could use as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{retriever}}$ (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019; Reimers and Gurevych, 2020; Chidambaram et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2020). In this work, we use LaBSE (Feng et al., 2020), a strong multilingual sentence matching model that has been trained with parallel sentence pairs from 109 languages. The model is trained on 17 billion monolingual sentences and 6 billion bilingual sentence pairs and it achieves state-of-the-art performance for the parallel text retrieval task proposed by Zweigenbaum et al. (2017).

We use \mathbf{x}_i^s as a key, and we assign (x_i^s, y_i^s) as its corresponding value. Our retrieval index R stores all the key-value pairs computed from the source dataset.

Assume we have a training data point, $(x_j^t, y_j^t) \in D^t$, from the target dataset. We consider the content x_j^t as our query q , i.e., $q = x_j^t$. We compute a vector representation of the query, $\mathbf{q} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{retriever}}(q)$. We use \mathbf{q} to score each key, \mathbf{x}_i^s of R using cosine similarity, i.e., $\cos(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}_i^s)$. We sort the items in R in descending order of the scores of the keys, and we take the values of the top- k items to construct the neighbourhood of q , $N_q = \{(c_1, l_1), (c_2, l_2), \dots, (c_k, l_k)\}$. Thus, each neighbour is a tuple of a content and its label from the source dataset. We convert fine-grained neigh-

bour labels to binary labels (*flagged, neutral*) as described in Section 3.1, to align the label space with the target dataset. Nevertheless, the original fine-grained labels of the neighbours can be used for obtaining an explanation at inference time as this is one of the core features of $k\text{NN}$ -based models. However, our focus is on the combination of these models with Transformer-based ones. We leave the investigation of the explainability characteristics of $k\text{NN}^+$ for future work.

Interaction Feature Modelling As discussed in Section 3.2, the neighbourhood retrieval process might lead to prediction errors. We propose a learned voting strategy to mitigate it. This strategy depends on how q relates to its neighbourhood N_q . To model this relationship, we compute the interaction features of q and the content of its j -th neighbour, $c_j \in N_q$. We obtain a set of k interaction features from k neighbours, and we optimise them using query and neighbour labels.

Similarly to Reimers and Gurevych (2019), we apply two encoding schemes to compute the interaction features: a **Cross-Encoder (CE)** and **Bi-Encoder (BE)**. Under our $k\text{NN}^+$ framework, we refer to the schemes as CE $k\text{NN}^+$ for CE, and BE $k\text{NN}^+$ for BE. The BE $k\text{NN}^+$ is computationally inexpensive, while the CE $k\text{NN}^+$ is more effective. We provide a justification for this as we describe the schemes in the following paragraphs.

For the CE $k\text{NN}^+$ implementation (see Figure 2b), we first form a set of query-neighbour pairs, $S_{ce} = \{(q, c_1), (q, c_2), \dots, (q, c_k)\}$ by concatenating q with the content of each of its neighbours. Then, we obtain the output representation, $rep_j = \mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}(q, c_j)$ of each $(q, c_j) \in S_{ce}$, from a pre-trained multilingual language model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}$. In this way, we create a set of interaction features, $I_{ce} = \{rep_1, rep_2, \dots, rep_j\}$ from q and its neighbourhood. Throughout this paper, the [CLS] token representation of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}$ is taken as its final output. We use varieties of implementations of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}$ in the experimentation. Figure 2b shows how the interaction features are computed and optimised with a CE $k\text{NN}^+$. Note that the feature interaction model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}$ is different from the neighbourhood retrieval model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{retriever}}$, and we optimise interaction features from $\mathcal{M}_{\text{feature}}$. We leave the optimisation of the retrieval model as a future work.

For the BE $k\text{NN}^+$ scheme (see Figure 2a), we obtain the output representations of q and each

of the neighbours individually from $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$. Given the representation of the query, $rep_q = \mathcal{M}_{feature}(q)$, and the representation of its j^{th} neighbour, $rep_j = \mathcal{M}_{feature}(c_j)$, we model their interaction features by concatenating them along with their vector difference. The interaction features obtained for the j -th neighbour are $(rep_q, rep_j, |rep_q - rep_j|)$, and we construct a set of interaction features I_{be} from all the neighbours of q . We use the vector difference, $|rep_q - rep_j|$ along with the content vectors rep_q and rep_j following the work of Reimers and Gurevych (2019). They trained a sentence embedding model using a Siamese neural network architecture with Natural Language Inference (NLI) data. They tried the following approaches to obtain features between the representations u, v of two sentences: $(u, v), (|u - v|), (u * v), (|u - v|, u * v), (u, v, u * v), (u, v, |u - v|), (u, v, |u - v|), (u * v)$. Their empirical analysis shows that $(u, v, |u - v|)$ works the best for NLI data and we apply this in our framework. We plan to explore other options in future work.

Both the cross-encoder and the bi-encoder architectures were shown to be effective in a wide variety of tasks including Semantic Textual Similarity and Natural Language Inference. Reimers and Gurevych (2019) showed that a bi-encoder is much more efficient than a cross-encoder, and that bi-encoder representations can be stored as sentence vectors. Thus, once $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ is trained, the vector representations $\mathcal{M}_{feature}(x_i^s)$ of each $x_i^s \in D^s$ can be saved along with its textual contents and label. Then, at inference time, only the representation of the query needs to be computed, which reduces the computation time from $k \times \mathcal{M}_{feature}$ to a constant time. Moreover, the model can easily adapt to new neighbours without the need for retraining. However, from an effectiveness perspective, the cross-encoder is usually a better option as it encodes the query and its neighbour jointly, thus enabling multi-head attention-based interactions among the tokens of the query and of the neighbour.

Choice of $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ We explore two $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ models for both the CE and the BE schemes: a pre-trained XLM-R model, which we will refer to as $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$, as well as an XLM-R model augmented with *paraphrase* knowledge, which we will refer to as $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020). Sentence representations from XLM-R are

not aligned across languages (Ethayarajh, 2019) and $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ overcomes this problem. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ is trained to learn sentence semantics with parallel data from 50 languages. Moreover, the training process includes knowledge distillation from a Sentence BERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) model trained with 50 million English paraphrases. As such, we expect $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ to outperform $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$, as it more accurately captures the semantics of the query and its neighbour sentences. Note that there is work on better alignment of multilingual vector spaces, e.g., Zhao et al. (2021), which would allow us to consider a variety of pre-trained sentence representation models, but exploring this is outside the scope of this paper.

Interaction Features Optimisation Given q and its j -th neighbour, we obtain interaction features $rep_j \in I_{ce}$ and $(rep_q, rep_j, |rep_q - rep_j|) \in I_{be}$ from $\mathcal{M}_{feature}$ for the CE kNN^+ and BE kNN^+ schemes, respectively. For both schemes, we optimise the interaction features to indicate whether a query and its neighbour have the same or different labels. We do this to later aggregate interaction features from all the neighbours of a query to model the overall agreement of the query with the retrieved neighbourhood. Our hypothesis is that understanding individual neighbour-level agreement and aggregating it will allow us also to understand the neighbourhood.

We apply a fully connected layer with two outputs over the interaction features to optimise them. The outputs indicate the label agreement between q and its j -th neighbour, $(c_j, l_j) \in N_q$. There is a label agreement if both q and the j -th neighbour are flagged or are both neutral, i.e., $y_j^t = l_j$. We learn the label agreement using a binary cross-entropy loss, \mathcal{L}_{lal} , computed using the output of a softmax layer for each example in a batch of training data. We refer to \mathcal{L}_{lal} as label-agreement loss. In our implementation, a batch of data comprises a query and its k neighbours. We provide more details about the training procedure in Section 4.4.

Note that as our model predicts label agreement, it also indirectly predicts the label of the query and the neighbour. In this way, it learns representations that separate flagged from the non-flagged examples.

Interaction Features Aggregation The main reasons to use interaction features for label agree-

ment is to predict whether q should be flagged or not. In a vanilla k NN setup, there is no mechanism to back-propagate classification errors; it is only minimised by tuning the hyper-parameter k . We propose to optimise the interaction features – using a self-attention module – to minimise the classification error with a fixed neighbourhood size k . To this end, we propose to aggregate the k interaction features: I_{ce} for CE k NN⁺ and I_{be} for BE k NN⁺. The aggregated representation captures global information, i.e., the agreement between the query and its neighbourhood, whereas the interaction features capture them locally.

We use structured self-attention (Lin et al., 2017) for capturing the neighbourhood information. At first, we construct an interaction features matrix, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times h}$ from the set of k neighbours (I_{ce} or I_{be}), where h is the dimensionality of the interaction feature space. Then, we compute structured self-attention as follows:

$$\vec{a} = \text{softmax}(W_2 \tanh(W_1 \mathbf{H}^T)) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{rep}_i = \vec{a} \mathbf{H} \quad (2)$$

Here, $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{h_r \times h}$ is a matrix that encodes interactions between the representations and projects the interaction features into a lower-dimensional space, $h_r < h$, thus making the representation matrix $h_r \times k$ dimensional. We multiply another matrix $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times h_r}$ with the resultant representation, and we apply softmax to obtain a probability distribution over the k neighbours. This attention vector is used to linearly combine the interaction features to obtain the neighbourhood representation rep_{N_q} , which is used for classification.

Classification Loss Optimisation The aggregated interaction features, rep_{N_q} , are used as an input to a softmax layer with two outputs (*flagged* or *neutral*), which is optimised using a binary cross-entropy loss, \mathcal{L}_{cll} . We refer to \mathcal{L}_{cll} as classification loss. Optimising this loss means that the classification decision for a query is made by computing its agreement or disagreement with the neighbourhood as a whole. Our approach is a multi-task learning one, and the final loss is computed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = (1 - \lambda) \times \mathcal{L}_{lal} + \lambda \times \mathcal{L}_{cll} \quad (3)$$

As both the classification and the label-agreement tasks aid each other, we adopt a multi-task learning approach. We balance the two losses

using the hyper-parameter λ . The classification loss forces the model to predict a label for the query. As the model learns to predict a label for a query, it becomes easier for it to reduce the label agreement loss \mathcal{L}_{lal} . Moreover, as the model learns to predict label agreement, it learns to compute interaction features, which represent agreement or disagreement. This, in turn, helps to optimise \mathcal{L}_{cll} .

Note that, at inference time, our framework requires neither the labels of the neighbours for classification, nor a heuristic-based label-aggregation scheme. The classification layer makes a prediction based on the pooled representation from the interaction features, thus removing the need for any heuristic-based voting strategy based on the labels of the neighbours. Each individual interaction feature from the query and a neighbour captures the agreement between them as we optimise the features via the L_{lal} loss. The opinion of the neighbourhood is captured using an aggregation of individual interaction features – which is different from a vanilla k NN – where neighbourhood opinion is captured using an individual neighbour label. As our aggregation is performed using a self-attention mechanism, we obtain a probability distribution over the interaction features that we can use to find the neighbour that influenced the neighbourhood opinion the most. We also know both the original and the converted label of the neighbour (see Section 3.1 for further details about the label space conversion). The original label of the neighbour could help us understand the prediction behind the query better. For example, if the query is flagged and the original label of the most influential neighbour is *hate*, we could infer that the query is hate speech. However, we do not explore this in this paper and we leave it as a future work.

4 Experimental Setting

4.1 Datasets

We conduct experiments on two different multilingual datasets covering eight languages from six families: Slavic, Turkic, Romance, Germanic, Albanian, and Finno-Ugric. We use these datasets as our target datasets, and an English dataset as the source dataset, which contains a large number of training examples with fine-grained categorisation. Both the source and target datasets are from the same domain (Wikipedia), as we do not study domain adaptation techniques in this work. We

describe these three datasets in the following paragraphs. The number of examples per dataset and the corresponding label distributions are shown in Table 1.

Jigsaw English (Jigsaw, 2018) is an English dataset, containing over 159 thousand manually reviewed comments. The labels (*toxic*, *severe toxic*, *obscene*, *threat*, *insult*, and *identity hate*) are mapped into binary ones: *flagged* and *neutral*. If at least one of those six labels is present, we consider it as *flagged*, otherwise as *neutral*. As it is a resource-rich dataset, covering different aspects of abusive language, we use it as the source dataset. We use all its examples for training, as we validate our models on *target* datasets’ dev sets.

Jigsaw Multilingual (Jigsaw Multilingual, 2020) aims to improve toxicity detection by addressing the shortcomings of the monolingual setup. The dataset contains examples in Italian, Turkish, and Spanish. It has binary labels (toxic or not), and thus it aligns well with our experimental setup. The label distribution is fairly similar to Jigsaw English, as shown in Table 1. It is used for experimenting in a resource-rich environment. As this dataset does not have standard train, test and dev sets, we split the examples in each language as follows: 1,500, 500, and 500 for Italian and Spanish, and 1,800, 600, and 600 for Turkish.

WUL (Glavaš et al., 2020) aims to create a fair evaluation setup for abusive language detection in multiple languages. Although originally in English, multilinguality is achieved by translating the original comments as accurately as possible into five different languages: German (DE), Hungarian (HR), Albanian (SQ), Turkish (TR), and Russian (RU). We use this dataset partially, by using the test set originally generated from Wulczyn et al. (2017), which focuses on identifying personal attacks. In contrast to Jigsaw Multilingual, it is used for experimenting in a low-resource environment. For each language, we have 600 examples, which are split as 400, 100, and 100 for train, test, and dev, respectively. As abusive content can be very culture-specific, there will be cases even within languages where utterances will be offensive in one culture, but not another. Thus a translation-based dataset such as WUL might not be an ideal choice and we acknowledge this limitation.

The results from above mentioned datasets cannot be compared because we use the test set from

Dataset	Examples	Flagged %	Neutral %
Jigsaw En	159,571	10.2	89.8
Jigsaw Multi	8,000	15.0	85.0
WUL	600	50.3	49.7

Table 1: Dataset sizes and label distributions.

these datasets to create our train-dev-test splits. The datasets we used in the paper (Jigsaw Multilingual and WUL) provide English-only training data and observe the performance of different models in zero-shot transfer learning settings. Our setting is different from theirs as we assume that there are limited training examples in the target language. Thus, we produce results only on a subset of the original testset for both the datasets. Thus, the results from the literature are not directly comparable to our results, as both training and testing datasets differ.

4.2 Baselines

We compare our proposed approach against three families of strong baselines. The first one considers training models only on the target dataset, the second one is source adaptation, where we use Jigsaw English as our source dataset, and the third one consists of traditional k NN classification method, but with dense vector retrieval using LaBSE (Feng et al., 2020). We use cosine similarity under LaBSE representation space to retrieve neighbours for both baselines and our proposed approaches.

Target Dataset Training This family of baselines uses only the target dataset for training:

Lexicon approach counts the frequency of hateful terms in a content based on the HurtLex³ lexicons. After standard text tokenization and normalization of the content, we count the number of terms in the content that are in the abusive language lexicon. Based on our validation set, we find the number of minimum matches that we use as a threshold to flag a content. Then we apply this approach to our test split to classify contents.

fastText is a baseline that uses the mean of the token vectors obtained from fastText (Joulin et al., 2017) word embeddings to represent a textual example. Then, a binary logistic regression classifier is trained for content flagging.

³<https://github.com/valeriobasile/hurtlex>

XLM-R Target is a pre-trained XLM-R model fine-tuned on the target dataset.

Source Adaptation XLM-R Mix-Adapt is a baseline model, which we train by mixing source and target data. This is possible because the label inventories of our source and target dataset are the same: $\mathcal{Y} = \{flagged, neutral\}$. The mixing is done by oversampling the target data to match the number of instances of the source dataset. As the number of instances in the target dataset is limited, this is preferable to undersampling.

XLM-R Seq-Adapt (Garg et al., 2020) is a Transformer pre-trained on source data and then fine-tuned on target data. Here, we fine-tune XLM-R on the Jigsaw English dataset, and then we perform a second round of fine-tuning on the target dataset.

Nearest Neighbour We apply two nearest neighbour baselines, using majority voting for label aggregation. We varied the number of neighbours from 3 to 20, and find that using 10 neighbours works best on average.

LaBSE-kNN is a baseline where the source dataset is indexed using representations obtained from LaBSE sentence embeddings (Feng et al., 2020), and neighbours are retrieved using cosine similarity.

Weighted LaBSE-kNN is a baseline that uses the same retrieval step as LaBSE-kNN, but uses a weighted voting strategy: each label is scored by summing the cosine similarities for the retrieved flagged and neutral neighbours respectively; then, the label with the highest score is returned.

4.3 Metrics

For our experiments, we use F1 following prior work on abusive language detection. Nonetheless, precision and recall are also an important factors for automatic abusive language detection systems. In particular, online platforms strive to remove all contents that violate their policies, thus, if an automated system were to achieve 100% recall, the contents could be further filtered by human moderators to weed out the benign contents. However, if the automated system precision were very low, it would mean that the moderators would have to read every piece of content on the platform.

4.4 Fine-tuning and Hyper-parameters

We train all the models for 10 epochs with XLM-R as a base transformer representation with a

maximum sequence length of 256 tokens. However, we make an exception for SRC (see Section 5.1): we train it for a single epoch, as training a neighbourhood-based model on a large dataset is resource-intensive. For all the approaches, we use Adam with β_1 0.9, β_2 0.999, ϵ 1e-08 as the optimiser setting. For the baseline models, we use a batch size of 64, and a learning rate of 4e-05. For k NN⁺-based models, we create a training batch from a query and its 10-nearest neighbours. For stable updates, we accumulate gradients from 50 such batches before back-propagation. The values of all of the aforementioned hyper-parameters were selected based on validation set performance. For k NN⁺-based models, the best learning rate is selected from {5e-05, 7e-05}.

5 Experimental Results

5.1 Evaluation in a Cross-lingual Setting

Table 2 shows the effectiveness of our model variants compared to seven strong baselines (rows 1-7). The first two rows represent non-contextual baselines and they perform worse compared to baseline pre-trained XLM-R models fine-tuned with labelled data (rows 3-5). Specifically, the lexicon baseline performs the worst among all, which indicates the limited coverage of hate speech lexicon and the loss in precision due to token mismatching and context obliviousness. For example, the token “monkey” is generally included in a hate speech lexicon, but the appearance of the token in a textual content does not necessarily indicate that the content is abusive.

The highlighted rows in the table indicate different variants of our proposed framework. The variants fall into two categories of representation learning: CE k NN⁺ and BE k NN⁺, indicating the cross- and the bi-encoders in our framework, respectively. For each of the encoding schemes, we instantiate three different models by using three different pre-trained representations fine-tuned in our neighbourhood framework, namely: $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$, which is pre-trained XLM-RoBERTa (XLM-R); $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$, which is XLM-R fine-tuned under a knowledge distillation setting with 50 million paraphrases and parallel data in 50 languages (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020); and $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$, which is $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ fine-tuned with source data (here, 159,571 instances from Jigsaw English) in our neighbourhood framework. To train with SRC, we use all training data in

#	Method	Jigsaw Multilingual			WUL					
		ES	IT	TR	DE	EN	HR	RU	SQ	TR
1	Lexicon	35.8	40.5	34.0	70.9	70.6	63.9	63.6	58.2	71.8
2	FastText	55.3	47.2	64.2	74.2	72.7	58.9	74.2	65.9	72.5
3	XLM-R Target	<u>63.5</u>	56.4	80.6	82.1	75.7	73.2	76.7	77.3	78.8
4	XLM-R Mix-Adapt	64.2	58.5	76.1	83.2	93.9	87.3	82.1	86.2	86.0
5	XLM-R Seq-Adapt	60.5	58.3	81.2	83.9	88.0	80.0	80.0	86.3	83.5
6	LaBSE-kNN	44.7	48.5	66.0	70.8	77.1	84.1	79.1	83.1	75.6
7	Weighted LaBSE-kNN	44.8	38.3	52.1	71.7	85.4	82.4	79.5	83.7	81.0
8	CE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$	58.9	<u>63.8</u>	78.5	80.4	83.8	86.2	77.6	83.5	85.4
9	CE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$	59.4	67.0	<u>84.4</u>	84.8	88.0	86.3	83.8	83.0	86.5
10	CE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$	61.2	61.1	85.0	89.5	<u>92.3</u>	90.6	84.9	<u>89.5</u>	<u>87.3</u>
11	BE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$	52.2	60.3	75.0	81.6	80.8	77.9	78.0	79.6	79.6
12	BE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$	58.8	56.6	80.6	83.8	86.9	82.2	86.9	84.9	83.7
13	BE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$	59.1	59.5	81.6	<u>88.7</u>	90.7	<u>87.6</u>	<u>86.3</u>	90.2	88.7

Table 2: Comparison of F1 values of the baselines and our model variants. BE kNN^+ and CE kNN^+ indicate Bi-encoder and Cross-encoder schemes, respectively. SRC indicates that the model has been further pre-trained with source Jigsaw English, having data from it as both query and neighbours.




Figure 3: Effect of re-ranking neighbours using LaBSE in the BE kNN^+ representation space.

Jigsaw English, and we retrieve neighbours from Jigsaw English using LaBSE sentence embeddings.⁴ Then, we use this training data to fine-tune $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ with our kNN^+ -based cross- (CE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$) and bi- (BE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$) encoder setups. This is analogous to sequential adaptation (Garg et al., 2020), but in our neighbourhood framework.

The SRC approach addresses one of the weaknesses of our kNN framework. The training data is created from instances in the target dataset and their neighbours from the source dataset. Thus, the neighbourhood model cannot use all source training data, as it pre-selects a subset of source data

⁴Note that we only use LaBSE for retrieval, as it has a large coverage of languages.

based on similarity. This is a disadvantage compared to the sequential adaptation model, which uses all source training instances for pre-training. To overcome this, we use the neighbourhood approach to pre-train our models with source data.

In Table 2, we report the F1 scores for eight language-specific training and evaluation sets stemming from two different data sets: Jigsaw Multilingual and WUL. Jigsaw Multilingual is an imbalanced dataset with 15% abusive content and WUL is balanced (see Table 1). Thus, it is hard to obtain high F1 score in Jigsaw Multilingual, whereas for WUL the F1 scores are relatively higher. Our CE kNN^+ variants achieve superior performance to all the baselines and our BE kNN^+ variants as well in the majority of the cases. The




Figure 4: Multi-task loss parameter sensitivity with uncertainties from two learning rates: 5e-05, 7e-05.

Model	Representations	F1
Seq-Adapt	XLM-R	64.4
CE-kNN	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$	64.2
	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$	62.8
	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$	65.1
BE-kNN	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{XLM-R}$	65.5
	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$	63.7
	$\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R} \rightarrow SRC$	67.6

Table 3: Effectiveness of our BE kNN^+ and CE kNN^+ schemes in a multilingual setting that we create from Jigsaw Multilingual.

performance of the best and of the second-best models for each language are highlighted by **bold-facing** and underlining, respectively. We attribute the higher scores achieved by CE kNN^+ variants compared to the BE kNN^+ on the late-stage interaction of the query and the neighbours.

The CE kNN^+ variants show a large performance gain compared to baseline models on the Italian and the Turkish test sets from Jigsaw Multilingual. Even though the additional SRC pre-training is not always helpful for the CE kNN^+ model, it is always helpful for the BE kNN^+ model. However, both models struggle to outperform the baseline for the Spanish test set. We analysed the training data distribution for Spanish, but we could not find any noticeable patterns. Yet, it can be observed that the XLM-R Target baseline for Spanish (2nd row, 1st column) achieves a higher F1 score compared to the Seq-Adapt baseline, which yields better performance for Italian and Turkish. We believe that the in-domain training examples are good enough to achieve a reasonable performance on Spanish.

On the WUL dataset, the BE kNN^+ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{P-XLM-R}$ variant with SRC pre-training outper-

forms the CE kNN^+ variants and all the baselines for Russian, Turkish, and Albanian. Both the BE kNN^+ variants and the CE kNN^+ variants perform worse compared to the XLM-R Mix-Adapt baseline for English. Seq-Adapt is a recently published effective baseline (Garg et al., 2020), but for the WUL dataset, it does not perform well compared to the Mix-Adapt baseline. Note that the test set for the WUL dataset is relatively small (100 examples per language) and the examples in the test set are human translations of the English test set. Yet, we chose this dataset as it results in a larger coverage of languages. We acknowledge this limitation (that the dataset is based on translations) in our experiments and that is why we further use Jigsaw Multilingual to demonstrate the generality of our results.

5.2 Effectiveness of Learned Voting Strategy

In order to show the effectiveness of our learned voting strategy, we use our baseline classification models (shown in Table 2, rows 3-7) to retrieve neighbours, and then we perform majority voting to predict the label of a test instance. The results for all the approaches are reported in Table 4. For comparison, we also add the highest performing bi- and cross-encoder versions of kNN^+ (see Table 2, rows 10 and 13).

In particular, these baseline classification models are pre-trained XLM-R models fine-tuned on different combinations of source and target language datasets (see *Fine-Tuned kNN Baselines*, Table 4). For each data case in the source dataset, we compute its representation as the [CLS] token from the classification model and we construct a list of vectors. Given a test data case from the target dataset, we also compute its representation based on the [CLS] token representation from the classification model. We then compute its cosine similarity with each of the [CLS] vectors from the source dataset. After that, we compute a ranked

list of top-10 neighbours based on the similarity scores. Then, we vary the number of neighbours from three to ten – considering them in the order they are ranked – to obtain majority vote and to classify the test data. The performance is similar to LaBSE-kNN and Weighted LaBSE-kNN approach in which the neighbours are retrieved using a representation space constructed from sentence similarity data (see *Sentence Similarity kNN Baselines*, Table 4). From the results in Table 4, we see that when fine-tuned models are directly applied into a nearest neighbours framework without additional modifications, their performance is between 25 and 60 points absolute F1 lower, compared to our proposed $k\text{NN}^+$ model. These results suggest that the interactions between the query and the retrieved neighbours captured by our model are an important prerequisite for achieving high accuracy.

Method	ES	IT	TR
<i>Fine-Tuned kNN Baselines</i>			
XLM-R Target-kNN	32.3	23.8	48.5
XLM-R Mix-Adapt-kNN	40.9	30.3	38.2
XLM-R Seq-Adapt-kNN	29.7	34.9	32.2
<i>Sentence Similarity kNN Baselines</i>			
LaBSE-kNN	44.7	48.5	66.0
Weighted LaBSE-kNN	44.8	38.3	52.1
<i>Our Model</i>			
BE $k\text{NN}^+$ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{\text{P-XLM-R}} \rightarrow \text{SRC}$	59.1	59.5	81.6
CE $k\text{NN}^+$ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{\text{P-XLM-R}} \rightarrow \text{SRC}$	61.2	61.1	85.0

Table 4: Performance comparison in terms of F1 of the baseline classification models and the sentence similarity model LaBSE under the majority voting $k\text{NN}$ setup (on Jigsaw Multilingual).

5.3 Evaluation in a Multilingual Setting

We go beyond our cross-lingual setting and we analyse the effectiveness of our proposed model in a multilingual setting. A multilingual setting has been explored in several recent works on abusive language detection (Pamungkas and Patti, 2019; Ousidhoum et al., 2019; Basile et al., 2019; Ranasinghe and Zampieri, 2020; Corazza et al., 2020; Glavaš et al., 2020; Leite et al., 2020) and is desirable because online platforms are not limited to specific languages. An effective multilingual

Text	BE $k\text{NN}^+$ Score	LaBSE Score	Label
off i do what i want	0.99	0.88	flagged
you i do what i want	1.0	0.84	flagged
i have going to do what ever i want	-0.19	0.83	neutral
u i will do as i please	1.0	0.81	flagged
off off i do what i want	1.0	0.77	flagged
nah man i do wat i want	-0.19	0.75	neutral
i shall go ahead and do it	-0.18	0.74	neutral
whaaat whateva i do what i want"	-0.2	0.72	neutral
ok i will do it	-0.17	0.69	neutral
great i will do what you are saying	-0.16	0.68	neutral

Table 5: An example showing the effectiveness of our bi-encoder representation space for computing the similarity between the query (flagged) and its neighbours. We have masked the offensive tokens in the examples for a better reading experience.

model unifies the two-stage process of language detection and prediction with a language specific classifier. Moreover, abusive language is generally code-mixed (Saumya et al., 2021), which makes language-agnostic representations spaces more desirable.

We investigate a multilingual scenario, where all target languages in our cross-lingual setting are observed both at training and at test time. To this end, we create new training, validation and testing splits in a 5:1:2 ratio from the 8,000 available data cases in the Jigsaw Multilingual dataset. Each split contains randomly sampled data in Spanish, Italian and Turkish.

We train and evaluate our BE $k\text{NN}^+$ and CE $k\text{NN}^+$ using the aforementioned splits; the results are shown in Table 3. Here, we must note that as our neighbourhood retrieval model is language-agnostic, and thus we can retrieve neighbours for queries in any language.

We find that in a multilingual scenario, our BE $k\text{NN}^+$ model with SRC pre-training performs better than the CE $k\text{NN}^+$ model. Both the BE and the CE approaches supersede the best baseline model Seq-Adapt. Compared to the cross-lingual setting, there is more data in a mix of languages available. We hypothesise that the success of the bi-encoder based model over the cross-encoder model comes from the increase in data size.

5.4 Analysis of the BE Representation

In order to understand the effectiveness of the produced representations, BE $k\text{NN}^+$ + $\mathcal{M}_{feature}^{\text{P-XLM-R}} \rightarrow \text{SRC}$, a model variant instantiated from our proposed $k\text{NN}$ framework, we computed the similar-

ity between the query and its neighbours in the representation space of the model. An example is shown in Table 5, which is the example from the introduction. Given the Turkish flagged query, we use LaBSE (Feng et al., 2020) and our representation space, BE, to retrieve ranked lists of its ten nearest neighbours. We present the ranked lists along with the scores computed by both approaches.

The illustrative example in Table 5 shows that our representation space has the capacity to discriminate between flagged and neutral contents. When we compute the cosine similarity of the query and the nearest neighbours, the BE representation space assigns negative scores to the neutral content. The LaBSE sentence embeddings are optimised for semantic similarity, and thus using them does not allow us to discriminate between flagged and neutral contents.

Inspired by our model’s capacity to discriminate flagged and neutral contents based on the illustrative example, we further verify the effectiveness of our representation space by performing classical voting based k NN on the ranked list of top-10 neighbours retrieved by LaBSE and a re-ranking of them using semantic similarities computed between the query and LaBSE retrieved neighbours in the representation space learned by BE. For both the LaBSE ranking and our re-ranking, at each ranking point we apply the majority voting k NN approach on the neighbourhood within that ranking point. We show the results for the test part of the Jigsaw Multilingual dataset (including the multilingual setup described in Section 5.3) in Figure 3. We can see that the re-ranking step improves over LaBSE for all the different numbers of neighbours.

5.5 Multi-task learning parameter sensitivity

Our approach uses multi-task learning, where we balance the weights of \mathcal{L}_{cl} and \mathcal{L}_{lal} using a hyper-parameter λ . Figure 4 shows the impact of using different values for this hyper-parameter. In the horizontal axis, we increase the importance of \mathcal{L}_{lal} loss, and we show the performance of all model variants on the validation sets of the Jigsaw Multilingual dataset. We can see that the models perform well if the weight for the label-agreement loss is set to 0.7, and degrades if it is increased.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

We proposed k NN⁺, a framework for cross-lingual content flagging, which significantly outperforms strong baselines with limited training data in the target language. We further show the effectiveness of our framework in a multilingual scenario, where a test data point can be in Turkish, Italian, or Spanish. We also provided a qualitative analysis of the representations learned by our BE k NN⁺ framework, and show that flagged and non-flagged contents stay close in that representation space.

Our framework computes a neighbourhood representation for a query using an attention mechanism, thus indicating the influence of each individual neighbour. This and the k NN-based architecture offer an opportunity to obtain an explanation for the individual model predictions, and such explanations can be based not only on the textual content of the influential neighbours but also on their original fine-grained labels.

In future work, we plan to understand the viability of such explanations in a human study. We also plan to evaluate our framework on other content flagging tasks as the framework is not limited to abusive content detection.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the whole Checkstep team for the useful discussions on the implications of this work. We would especially like to thank Jay Alammar, who further provided feedback on the model and created the conceptual diagram explaining our proposed neighbourhood framework.

References

- Sweta Agrawal and Amit Awekar. 2018. [Deep Learning for Detecting Cyberbullying Across Multiple Social Media Platforms](#). In *ECIR*, volume 10772 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 141–153. Springer.
- Aymé Arango, Jorge Pérez, and Barbara Poblete. 2019. [Hate Speech Detection is Not as Easy as You May Think: A Closer Look at Model Validation](#). In *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, SIGIR’19, page 45–54, New York, NY, USA.

- Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019. [Massively Multilingual Sentence Embeddings for Zero-Shot Cross-Lingual Transfer and Beyond](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:597–610.
- Pinkesh Badjatiya, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. 2019. [Stereotypical Bias Removal for Hate Speech Detection Task Using Knowledge-Based Generalizations](#). In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW '19*, page 49–59, New York, NY, USA.
- Michele Banko, Brendon MacKeen, and Laurie Ray. 2020. [A Unified Taxonomy of Harmful Content](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms*, pages 125–137, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Valerio Basile, Cristina Bosco, Elisabetta Fersini, Debora Nozza, Viviana Patti, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, and Manuela Sanguinetti. 2019. [SemEval-2019 Task 5: Multilingual Detection of Hate Speech Against Immigrants and Women in Twitter](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 54–63, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Antal van den Bosch, Bertjan Busser, Sander Canisius, and Walter Daelemans. 2007. An efficient memory-based morphosyntactic tagger and parser for Dutch. *LOT Occasional Series*, 7:191–206.
- Muthu Chidambaram, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Steve Yuan, Yunhsuan Sung, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2019. [Learning Cross-Lingual Sentence Representations via a Multi-task Dual-Encoder Model](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (RepL4NLP-2019)*, pages 250–259, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- European Commission. 2020. [Shaping Europe's digital future: The Digital Services Act package](#).
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL '20*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. [Cross-lingual Language Model Pretraining](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, Vancouver, Canada.
- Michele Corazza, Stefano Menini, Elena Cabrio, Sara Tonelli, and Serena Villata. 2020. [A Multilingual Evaluation for Online Hate Speech Detection](#). *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, 20(2).
- Walter Daelemans, Jakub Zavrel, Peter Berck, and Steven Gillis. 1996. [MBT: A Memory-Based Part of Speech Tagger-Generator](#). In *Fourth Workshop on Very Large Corpora*.
- 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. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT '19*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.
- Kawin Ethayarajh. 2019. [How Contextual are Contextualized Word Representations? Comparing the Geometry of BERT, ELMo, and GPT-2 Embeddings](#). 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 55–65, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angela Fan, Claire Gardent, Chloé Braud, and Antoine Bordes. 2021. [Augmenting Transformers](#)

- with KNN-Based Composite Memory for Dialog. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:82–99.
- Elise Fehn Unsvåg and Björn Gambäck. 2018. **The Effects of User Features on Twitter Hate Speech Detection**. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pages 75–85, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangxiaoyu Feng, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Naveen Arivazhagan, and Wei Wang. 2020. Language-agnostic BERT sentence embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01852*.
- Siddhant Garg, Thuy Vu, and Alessandro Moschitti. 2020. Tanda: Transfer and adapt pre-trained transformer models for answer sentence selection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7780–7788.
- Spiros V. Georgakopoulos, Sotiris K. Tasoulis, Aristidis G. Vrahatis, and Vassilis P. Plagianakos. 2018. **Convolutional Neural Networks for Toxic Comment Classification**. In *Proceedings of the 10th Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, SETN '18, New York, NY, USA.
- Goran Glavaš, Mladen Karan, and Ivan Vulić. 2020. **XHate-999: Analyzing and Detecting Abusive Language Across Domains and Languages**. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6350–6365, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- UK Government. 2020. **Online Harms White Paper**.
- Jiafeng Guo, Yixing Fan, Qingyao Ai, and W. Bruce Croft. 2016. **A Deep Relevance Matching Model for Ad-Hoc Retrieval**. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, CIKM '16, page 55–64, New York, NY, USA.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. **Retrieval Augmented Language Model Pre-Training**. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3929–3938, Online.
- Jigsaw. 2018. **Toxic Comment Classification Challenge**. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-toxic-comment-classification-challenge/>. Online; accessed 28 February 2021.
- Jigsaw Multilingual. 2020. **Jigsaw Multilingual Toxic Comment Classification**. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-multilingual-toxic-comment-classification/>. Online; accessed 28 February 2021.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2021. **Billion-Scale Similarity Search with GPUs**. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547.
- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. **Bag of Tricks for Efficient Text Classification**. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Jürgens, 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. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lukasz Kaiser, Ofir Nachum, Aurko Roy, and Samy Bengio. 2017. **Learning to Remember Rare Events**. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017*, Toulon, France.
- Nora Kassner and Hinrich Schütze. 2020. **BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pre-trained Language Models for Better QA**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 3424–3430, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2020.

- Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- João Augusto Leite, Diego Silva, Kalina Bontcheva, and Carolina Scarton. 2020. Toxic Language Detection in Social Media for Brazilian Portuguese: New Dataset and Multilingual Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 914–924, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33 of *NeurIPS '20*, pages 9459–9474, Online.
- Zhouhan Lin, Minwei Feng, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Mo Yu, Bing Xiang, Bowen Zhou, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. A Structured Self-Attentive Sentence Embedding. In *The 5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR '17, Toulon, France*.
- Wei Lu, Yanyan Shen, Su Chen, and Beng Chin Ooi. 2012. Efficient Processing of k Nearest Neighbor Joins Using MapReduce. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 5(10):1016–1027.
- Sean MacAvaney, Hao-Ren Yao, Eugene Yang, Katina Russell, Nazli Goharian, and Ophir Frieder. 2019. Hate speech detection: Challenges and solutions. *PloS one*, 14(8).
- Shervin Malmasi and Marcos Zampieri. 2018. Challenges in discriminating profanity from hate speech. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, 30(2):187–202.
- Puneet Mathur, Rajiv Ratn Shah, Ramit Sawhney, and Debanjan Mahata. 2018. Detecting Offensive Tweets in Hindi-English Code-Switched Language. In *SocialNLP@ACL*, pages 18–26. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Preslav Nakov, Vibha Nayak, Kyle Dent, Ameya Bhatawdekar, Sheikh Muhammad Sarwar, Momchil Hardalov, Yoan Dinkov, Dimitrina Zlatkova, Guillaume Bouchard, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2021. Detecting Abusive Language on Online Platforms: A Critical Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00153*.
- Nedjma Ousidhoum, Zizheng Lin, Hongming Zhang, Yangqiu Song, and Dit-Yan Yeung. 2019. Multilingual and Multi-Aspect Hate Speech Analysis. 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 4675–4684, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Endang Wahyu Pamungkas and Viviana Patti. 2019. Cross-domain and Cross-lingual Abusive Language Detection: A Hybrid Approach with Deep Learning and a Multilingual Lexicon. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 363–370, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Pavlopoulos, Prodromos Malakasiotis, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2017. Deeper Attention to Abusive User Content Moderation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1125–1135, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Miloš Radovanović, Alexandros Nanopoulos, and Mirjana Ivanović. 2009. Nearest Neighbors in High-Dimensional Data: The Emergence and Influence of Hubs. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '09*, page 865–872, New York, NY, USA.
- Tharindu Ranasinghe and Marcos Zampieri. 2020. Multilingual Offensive Language Identification with Cross-lingual Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5838–5844, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). 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 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making Monolingual Sentence Embeddings Multilingual using Knowledge Distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4512–4525, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Sunil Saumya, Abhinav Kumar, and Jyoti Prakash Singh. 2021. [Offensive language identification in Dravidian code mixed social media text](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Speech and Language Technologies for Dravidian Languages*, pages 36–45, Kyiv, Ukraine. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anna Schmidt and Michael Wiegand. 2017. [A survey on hate speech detection using natural language processing](#). In *SocialNLP@EACL*, pages 1–10. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eyal Shnarch, Carlos Alzate, Lena Dankin, Martin Gleize, Yufang Hou, Leshem Choshen, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2018. [Will it Blend? Blending Weak and Strong Labeled Data in a Neural Network for Argumentation Mining](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 599–605, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saurabh Srivastava, Prerna Khurana, and Vartika Tewari. 2018. [Identifying Aggression and Toxicity in Comments using Capsule Network](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Trolling, Aggression and Cyberbullying (TRAC-2018)*, pages 98–105, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lukas Stappen, Fabian Brunn, and Björn Schuller. 2020. [Cross-lingual zero-and few-shot hate speech detection utilising frozen transformer language models and AXEL](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13850*.
- 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. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2018. [Interpreting Neural Networks with Nearest Neighbors](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 136–144, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. [MiniLM: Deep Self-Attention Distillation for Task-Agnostic Compression of Pre-Trained Transformers](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 5776–5788.
- 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, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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, WWW '17*, page 1391–1399, Geneva, Switzerland. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Wei Zhao, Steffen Eger, Johannes Bjerva, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2021. [Inducing Language-Agnostic Multilingual Representations](#). In *Proceedings of *SEM 2021: The Tenth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 229–240, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Pierre Zweigenbaum, Serge Sharoff, and Reinhard Rapp. 2017. [Overview of the Second BUCC Shared Task: Spotting Parallel Sentences in Comparable Corpora](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th Workshop on Building and Using Comparable Corpora*, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.