

Improving Hate Speech Detection with Deep Learning Ensembles

Steven Zimmerman, Chris Fox, Udo Kruschwitz

University of Essex
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, United Kingdom
{szimme, foxcj, udo}@essex.ac.uk

Abstract

Hate speech has become a major issue that is currently a hot topic in the domain of social media. Simultaneously, current proposed methods to address the issue raise concerns about censorship. Broadly speaking, our research focus is the area human rights, including the development of new methods to identify and better address discrimination while protecting freedom of expression. As neural network approaches are becoming state of the art for text classification problems, an ensemble method is adapted for usage with neural networks and is presented to better classify hate speech. Our method utilizes a publicly available embedding model, which is tested against a hate speech corpus from Twitter. To confirm robustness of our results, we additionally test against a popular sentiment dataset. Given our goal, we are pleased that our method has a nearly 5 point improvement in F-measure when compared to original work on a publicly available hate speech evaluation dataset. We also note difficulties encountered with reproducibility of deep learning methods and comparison of findings from other work. Based on our experience, more details are needed in published work reliant on deep learning methods, with additional evaluation information a consideration too. This information is provided to foster discussion within the research community for future work.

Keywords: Hate Speech, Reproducibility, Text Classification

1. Introduction and Motivation

Our research is focused on the development of better methods for protection of freedom of expression in the web domain and social media while simultaneously reducing illegal discrimination. Motivation is provided by the fundamental human rights (as outlined in articles 19 and 20 of (The United Nations, 1948) and (The United Nations General Assembly, 1966)) which simultaneously provide rights to freedom of expression and prevent censorship and illegal discrimination. Automated take down approaches potentially infringe upon rights to freedom of expression, such as when a text classifier incorrectly flags a page or post as something to be taken down. Hate speech classifiers are based on annotation methods that are very difficult to define, with questionable reliability (Ross et al., 2017). Even a manual take down approach, such as that used by Facebook, is a challenging task¹.

Censorship is a potential risk when addressing these issues with automated text classification methods, thus all options should be considered (Benesch, 2017). Actions to filter and block content (e.g. recently implemented laws in Germany and by platforms such as Twitter and Facebook) deemed to be hateful and / or threatening to the online community and society as whole have been taken, which is having negative consequences².

The goal of our work is to discover simple but effective methods to improve upon existing research in the area of hate speech classification. These methods will be useful in our broader research which tests mechanisms that provide users with feedback about their consumption of potentially

hateful material, with the intent of changing their behavior through awareness as a possible alternative to regulation.

We include an initial investigation of existing methods for classification of abusive and hateful speech in the domain of Twitter. Additionally, we look into methods from the domain of sentiment analysis, as the classification task is similarly subjective and provides a larger body of research. Our contributions are as follows.

- Experimental results for a deep learning ensemble method that improves F-measure 2% over non-ensemble approaches and a nearly 5% increase over hand crafted methods from authors of a hate speech dataset.
- We provide recommendations for future work by the research community on text classification problems such as hate speech and suggestions for researchers using deep learning approaches. The recommendations are motivated by discovery of inconsistencies in evaluation methods and a lack of detail for methods used in previous research that was reviewed for our work.

In the following sections, we provide related background work, methods of implementations, results and analysis of findings.

2. Background

While lookup of hateful terms in a dictionary is one possible approach (Tulkens et al., 2016) to filter hateful content, such methods are deemed insufficient (Saleem et al., 2016). Text classification methods demonstrate much better results.

Ensemble models have shown promising results in many areas of machine learning and other fields as well (see (Molteni et al., 1996), an example from atmospheric sciences). Ensemble methods for text classification, such as

¹See example of task: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/10/13/technology/facebook-hate-speech-quiz.html>

²as demonstrated by the recently implemented law in Germany <https://www.economist.com/news/europe/21734410-new-social-media-law-causing-disquiet-germany-silencing-hate-speech-cannot-define-it>

stacking and bagging, are commonly used approaches (Aggarwal and Zhai, 2012; Xia et al., 2011). In the area of social media, simple but effective ensemble approaches have been used for sentiment classification of Tweets (Hagen et al., 2015). Most relevant to our experiments with neural networks and Twitter data are hybrid models (Badjatiya et al., 2017; Park and Fung, 2017) which combine outputs from different neural networks.

In recent years, efficient algorithms were produced (Mikolov et al., 2013b; Mikolov et al., 2013a; Pennington et al., 2014) that have allowed the use of word embeddings as features for neural networks and other algorithms (e.g. Logistic Regression). There are multiple pre-trained word embedding models available, trained in domains such as news articles (Mikolov et al., 2013b) and Twitter (Godin et al., 2015; Pennington et al., 2014). These unsupervised methods and models have produced significant improvements in downstream supervised NLP and text classification tasks.

These new approaches have allowed for significant improvements against previous SemEval³ message level Twitter sentiment analysis test sets (Severyn and Moschitti, 2015; Stojanovski et al., 2015; Vosoughi et al., 2016; Yang and Eisenstein, 2017). Similar improvements have been shown (Badjatiya et al., 2017; Gambäck and Sikdar, 2017; Park and Fung, 2017) using the recently published hate speech datasets (Waseem and Hovy, 2016; Waseem, 2016)⁴ and note two of the three methods mentioned fail to provide a direct comparison to original findings as test sets were split in a different manner. For all methods reviewed, limited information (if any) was provided regarding network weight initialization schemes, which our experiments demonstrate as important information for reproducibility purposes. Similar concerns regarding details of neural network configurations have recently been raised in the information retrieval community as well (Fuhr, 2017). Nonetheless, use of neural networks and embedding methods is worth exploration by NLP and text mining researchers, as the work of (Badjatiya et al., 2017; Gambäck and Sikdar, 2017; Park and Fung, 2017; Severyn and Moschitti, 2015; Stojanovski et al., 2015; Vosoughi et al., 2016; Yang and Eisenstein, 2017) are just some examples demonstrating strong improvements on previous work that made use of traditional features (e.g. n-grams, part of speech tags, etc.).

3. Methods

Due to challenges encountered with our own work when tuning and replicating previous work using neural networks, such as inconsistencies with weight initialization of networks, we decided to take a different approach. Knowing that neural networks are not guaranteed to find a global

³SemEval is an annual shared task event where researchers compare methods on various semantic tasks, such as sentiment analysis, sarcasm detection and word sense disambiguation

⁴These are two frequently cited hate speech datasets, but only provide limited coverage in the domain of racism and sexism. We note the limited number of test sets currently available for this important task, and note that non-English datasets are further under-resourced

minimum (Goodfellow et al., 2016), coupled with difficulties of parameter tuning of networks and having limited computational resources to perform an extensive set of configurations, we recalled research in 2015 which produced robust results for Twitter sentiment classification utilizing a simple ensemble method (Hagen et al., 2015). In their work, logistic regression was used to produce 3 models based upon a diverse set of features. The probabilistic output for each sentiment classification (positive, negative or neutral) was summed and averaged, with the highest average chosen as the winning classification, which resulted in the best performing solution for the SemEval sentiment classification task in 2015. Similar success with these methods was found with different Twitter sentiment classification tasks by (Balikas and Amini, 2016; Sygkounas et al., 2016) and (Zimmerman and Kruschwitz, 2017). Based on previous successes with this method for classification tasks in Twitter, we hypothesize that similar ensemble methods with neural networks using different weight initializations could also produce improvements for the tasks of hate speech detection in Twitter.

The ensemble model is created in the following manner. First we take soft-max results from each underlying model and sum them together. Then we average the sum of soft-max results, by dividing by the number of models (10 total in our case). With the average soft-max score of all models, the class with highest average is chosen as winning class similar to methods in previous work (Hagen et al., 2015).

We evaluate our method on two Twitter classification datasets, abusive speech (Waseem and Hovy, 2016) and SemEval 2013 sentiment analysis (Nakov et al., 2013) dataset (Table 1). For the abusive speech dataset, we initially perform experiments on an 85/15 fixed random split on dataset to determine best parameters, then run final experiments in the same manner as (Waseem and Hovy, 2016) which evaluated results with 10-fold cross validation. This choice was made to allow for consistent comparison between evaluation scores for each run of our experiments. Additionally, we build ensemble models on the SemEval training and development sentiment test sets and evaluate against the SemEval 2013 test set. We performed this additional experiment to determine if ensemble methods were robust enough to improve results for a different classification task.

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total
SemEval Train	3632	1453	4564	9649
SemEval Test	572	338	729	1539
SemEval 2013	1568	599	1630	3797

	None	Sexism	Racism	Total
Abuse / Hate	11535	3378	1970	16883

Table 1: Summary of datasets, totals for each class

3.1. Experimental Setup

For our experiments we utilize Python neural network and machine learning libraries. Specifically, Scikit-Learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011) is used to create feature representations for input to machine learning algorithms. For the neural network model training, the Keras library (Chollet, 2015) with Tensorflow (Abadi et al., 2015) back-end was initially used, but switched to Theano (Theano Development Team, 2016) back-end due to a discovery that weight initialization cannot be reproduced, as functionality is currently not available with TensorFlow and Keras. We note that many authors do not publish libraries used in their work, however the lack of reproducibility of results with a Theano and Tensorflow back-end are one important example demonstrating why this information should be included.

Preprocessing Tweets - Prior to the embedding lookup, all Tweets were preprocessed in the same manner (i.e. tokenization and normalization of text) to the original texts used to create the embedding model. The raw Tweets are passed through a Tweet tokenizer⁵ assumed to produce output similar to tokenizers used by (Godin et al., 2015) to create an embedding model. Additionally, all URLs, mentions and numbers were normalized to `_URL_`, `_MENTION_` and `_NUMBER_` respectively with the case of the Tweets left unchanged per original methods used for the embedding model (Godin et al., 2015).

Feature Extraction - A benefit of convolutional neural network (CNN) classifiers and word embeddings is the ability to consume sequential tokens through concatenation of token embeddings into a matrix (Goldberg, 2016), in contrast to n-gram features which lose the notion of position in a text (aside from immediate neighboring terms for bi/tri-grams). CNN classifiers, in theory, can consume variable length documents. In practice, the choice of software library may make the task of variable length document ingestion impossible. As Python Keras was used for experiments, we found it necessary to set the number of tokens into the CNN to a fixed length. It is noted that the mean number of tokens in our datasets was 17 and 22 for hate speech and sentiment respectively. A pre-experimental comparison of 30, 50 and 70 tokens as the window length showed 50 tokens having better performance. With this setting, only 5 Tweets for all datasets had tokens cutoff. Investigation of the best window length is a consideration for future work. Each Tweet is represented as a matrix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where m = length of embedding vector and n = maximum tokens taken from Tweet. In cases where tokens in Tweets are $<$ than n , dummy embedding vectors with zeros are used. For the embedding model used, a 50 token by length 400 embedding matrix is the output.

Machine Learning Classifier - For the CNN, we consider a very minimal network inspired by previous work (Kim, 2014). The convolution layer has a single 3 token window and 150 filters. Padding is set to 'same', thus the input and output of convolution layer match in length. The output of the convolution layer is fed into a global max-pooling layer for feature reduction. The max pooling layer feeds into a single hidden layer with 250 units. Glorot uniform distri-

bution is used for weight initialization, which is the default for Keras, with fixed seed settings for reproducibility⁶. No regularization is used for the abusive speech dataset, however a dropout rate of 0.2 is applied after the max pooling layer for the SemEval dataset. Beyond pooling and dropout layer are the hidden (250 nodes with ReLu activation) and output (3 nodes with sigmoid activation). The weights are learned with a binary cross-entropy loss function and the adam optimizer.

Evaluation settings - For comparison of the SemEval and abusive speech datasets, we evaluate the configuration with 3 different seed weight initializations chosen arbitrarily. A pre-experiment investigation into parameters demonstrated that improvements in model accuracy generally leveled off around 10 epochs, with small gains and reductions in evaluation metrics for epochs beyond this value, thus we focused on 3 epoch settings (3, 5 and 10) not exceeding 10. Batch size had degrading effects on accuracy and time for model convergence as it was increased, notably beyond 100, with similar effects below 10. As such, we chose 4 batch size values within the range of 10 - 100 (10, 25, 50, 100). Resources were a limiting factor to perform a more detailed parameter search within these ranges.

We use the best settings (10 epochs and batch size 10) and run 10-fold cross validation on our method to allow direct comparison with the findings of (Waseem and Hovy, 2016) (see cross validation results of these settings in Tables 4 and 5). For comparison of findings on the SemEval dataset, we use the F-1 average score for positive and negative classifications as was done in the original competition.

4. Results

Results abusive speech test set - We review results for multiple ensemble models with variations in seed parameters, number of epochs and batch size. Table 2 provides a summary of results for the 85/15 split set. In all cases, the ensemble performs better when combining sub-models, with an average of 1.97% gain on F-1. Using the best epoch and batch size settings from the 85/15 split, we ran the ensemble with 10-fold cross validation to directly compare findings with (Waseem and Hovy, 2016). In Table 4 the flattened version of confusion matrices is provided for all 10 ensemble folds, which is useful for researchers that may wish to compare their work using different evaluation metrics (e.g. unweighted F-measure). Finally, Table 5 provides a direct comparison between the mean weighted macro F-1 measure for 10-fold model run with our ensemble method with the results from (Waseem and Hovy, 2016).

To confirm significance of findings, we produce 99% confidence intervals on each set of sub-models used to produce ensemble (10 sub-models for each ensemble) and find only 2 sub-models of all 100 sub-models performs above confidence. Thus, we conclude that with 99% confidence, our ensemble method will perform better than an individual model 98% of the time.

Results SemEval 2013 test set - Analysis and review of the results, in Table 3 further demonstrate the robustness

⁵Python NLTK Tweet Tokenizer was used

⁶Note to other researchers, at time of writing, fixed seed functionality is not available when using Tensorflow back-end

mean of sub-models					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	75.98%	75.71%	75.46%	75.53%	75.67%
5	75.11%	75.08%	75.00%	75.24%	75.11%
10	74.88%	74.61%	74.91%	75.01%	74.85%
Grand Total	75.32%	75.14%	75.12%	75.26%	75.21%

std deviation of sub-models					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	0.95%	1.26%	1.23%	1.19%	1.16%
5	1.16%	1.28%	0.94%	1.15%	1.13%
10	1.02%	1.31%	1.16%	0.98%	1.11%
Grand Total	1.04%	1.28%	1.11%	1.11%	1.14%

mean of ensembles					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	77.47%	77.29%	77.21%	76.85%	77.21%
5	77.61%	77.29%	76.79%	76.74%	77.11%
10	77.83%	77.39%	76.85%	76.88%	77.24%
Grand Total	77.63%	77.33%	76.95%	76.83%	77.18%

ensemble (average improvement) over sub-model mean					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	1.48%	1.58%	1.75%	1.32%	1.53%
5	2.49%	2.21%	1.79%	1.50%	2.00%
10	2.95%	2.78%	1.95%	1.87%	2.39%
Grand Total	2.31%	2.19%	1.83%	1.57%	1.97%

std deviation of ensembles					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	0.58%	0.28%	0.38%	0.27%	0.41%
5	0.40%	0.25%	0.27%	0.27%	0.46%
10	0.12%	0.65%	0.12%	0.42%	0.54%
Grand Total	0.39%	0.38%	0.31%	0.29%	0.46%

Table 2: Summary metrics for abusive speech ensembles and sub-models - Provided here are summary metrics (evaluation was based on average F-1 measure of positive and negative classifications) based on batch size and epochs, there were 3 ensembles produced (each with different weight initializations) for each batch size (10, 25, 50 and 100) and epoch (3, 5 and 10) setting, with best highlighted. The standard deviation of ensemble models is reduced from 0.94% for individual model approach to 0.12% for ensemble approach, signaling a strong reduction in variability. We also note a nearly 2 point gain in F-1 score when comparing the mean of all ensembles to mean of sub-models.

of our ensemble method of joining soft-max results from 10 sub-models to produce final classification, with similar improvements. When considering all sentiment models ensembles compared to individual models, there is an average of 1.84% gain on F-1. We note that our best ensemble model tied the results (F-1 of 71.91) of a computationally complex social network approach produced by (Yang and Eisenstein, 2017).

Impressively, the simple method, when run on both datasets produces an increase of nearly 2% on the evaluation metric. Furthermore, in evaluation of test sets we note the standard deviation is reduced by more than half for the ensemble method, signaling a strong reduction in variability.

The following questions provided guidance for our investigation and results. These were addressed with descriptive statistics and direct comparison. Brief summaries of find-

ings are provided for each question.

- **RQ 1:** *Based on experience with weightings and inconsistent results, how much variability in evaluation metrics is found between models with different weight initializations?* Standard deviation is the chosen metric for variability, which is provided in Tables 2 and 5. Variability for individual model approach with best parameters is found to be +/- 0.94% of the median F-1 measure. For the ensemble approach, standard deviation is found to be +/- 0.12% of the median F-1 measure and also improves nearly 2% over best individual model.
- **RQ 2:** *Given a set of N models with varying weight initializations, can an ensemble of the N models produce better results by taking the average of their soft-*

mean of sub-models					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	68.44%	68.65%	68.39%	68.01%	68.37%
5	68.34%	67.90%	68.24%	68.03%	68.13%
10	66.41%	67.13%	67.16%	67.06%	66.94%
Grand Total	67.73%	67.89%	67.93%	67.70%	67.81%

std deviation of sub-models					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	2.72%	2.24%	2.17%	2.62%	2.44%
5	1.58%	1.61%	1.78%	2.05%	1.76%
10	1.87%	1.38%	1.73%	2.11%	1.77%
Grand Total	2.06%	1.74%	1.90%	2.26%	1.99%

mean of ensembles					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	70.34%	70.16%	69.34%	68.33%	69.54%
5	70.67%	69.74%	70.36%	69.46%	70.06%
10	69.17%	69.49%	69.67%	69.08%	69.35%
Grand Total	70.06%	69.79%	69.79%	68.96%	69.65%

ensemble (average improvement) over sub-model mean					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	1.90%	1.51%	0.95%	0.33%	1.17%
5	2.33%	1.84%	2.12%	1.42%	1.93%
10	2.76%	2.36%	2.51%	2.02%	2.41%
Grand Total	2.33%	1.90%	1.86%	1.26%	1.84%

std deviation of ensembles					
	10	25	50	100	Grand Total
3	0.22%	1.17%	0.15%	0.59%	1.01%
5	1.10%	0.55%	0.61%	0.62%	0.82%
10	0.50%	0.65%	0.31%	0.68%	0.54%
Grand Total	0.92%	0.78%	0.57%	0.74%	0.84%

Table 3: Summary metrics for ensembles and sub-models evaluated on the SemEval 2013 dataset - Provided here are summary metrics (evaluation was based on average F-1 measure of positive and negative classifications) based on batch size and epochs, there were 3 ensembles produced (each with different weight initializations) for each batch size (10, 25, 50 and 100) and epoch (3, 5 and 10) setting, with best and worst highlighted (best in **bold**). Overall the standard deviation of ensemble models is reduced to +/- 0.15%, a sharp reduction from standard deviation of individual models and a signal for reduction in variance. Similar to hate speech evaluations, we note a nearly 2 point gain in F-1 score when comparing the mean of all ensembles to mean of sub-models.

max predictions? We have set $N = 10$ in our experiment and are 99% confident that our ensemble approach will significantly improve F-1 scores 98% of the time compared to results from a single model.

- **RQ 3:** *With all model initialization parameters fixed, how do variations in batch size and number of epochs impact ensemble results?* We answer this question with relative improvements in F-1 scores between mean of individual models and mean of ensemble models. As shown in Table 2 and discussed in Section 4., the greatest improvements are made with smaller batch sizes and larger number of epochs. Variability, as measured by standard deviation, consistently reduces for all parameters.

- **RQ 4:** *How do methods compare with different classification tasks (e.g. Abusive speech vs. Sentiment)?* As outlined in results Section 4 and Table 3, the methods produce similar results when run on a sentiment analysis test set.

5. Discussion and Conclusions: Learnings from Experiments

We have demonstrated the usefulness of ensemble methods with a neural network configuration. We have shown that weight initialization methods are an important factor to consider in any research using deep learning. We demonstrated that a simple ensemble method for neural networks has statistically significant improvement over a single model. Furthermore, we have shown that individ-

True	None	None	None	Race	Race	Race	Sex	Sex	Sex
Pred	None	Race	Sex	None	Race	Sex	None	Race	Sex
Fold 1	1053	42	59	66	129	2	113	0	225
Fold 2	1054	52	48	48	148	1	122	1	215
Fold 3	1053	40	61	50	143	4	106	1	231
Fold 4	1066	29	59	58	136	3	106	0	232
Fold 5	1040	38	76	45	152	0	94	0	244
Fold 6	1032	46	75	49	147	1	106	4	228
Fold 7	1055	40	58	57	138	2	113	2	223
Fold 8	1055	37	61	55	142	0	122	1	215
Fold 9	1046	47	60	51	143	3	100	2	235
Fold 10	1064	44	45	50	147	0	113	1	223

Table 4: Confusion scores for all 10-fold ensembles (best in grey) on the (Waseem and Hovy, 2016) dataset. Gold standard and predicted classifications for the dataset are Sex = sexism, Race = racism and None = neither racism nor sexism.

mean of sub-models	75.65%
std deviation of sub-models	1.54%
mean of ensembles	78.62%
ensemble improvement on sub-model mean	2.96%
std deviation of ensembles	1.08%
best results from original author	73.93%
improvement on original work	4.69%

Table 5: Comparison of ensemble method on (Waseem and Hovy, 2016) dataset vs. results from original best method (Waseem and Hovy, 2016). Values are based upon F-1 Measure.

ual models have high variance when compared to the variance of ensemble models. Thus, one might place lower confidence in their model when an ensemble approach is not used. Also, in all trials, we find that ensemble models perform better on test sets compared to the mean of sub-models. The ensemble approach appears to leverage the high variance as an advantage for final classification via the simple method of averaging soft-max output.

5.1. Difficulties encountered

Several difficulties were encountered in our initial experiments due to weight initializations often not being reported by other authors coupled with the issue of a deep learning library lacking reproducibility due to seed setting. In our case, we had originally used Keras with a TensorFlow back-end. Post experimentation, we investigated this matter more and found that the issue with reproducibility of weight initializations is resolved with use of a Theano back-end. Nonetheless, this painful experience not only demonstrates the need to publish more details, it also can lead to better solutions, such as a more robust ensemble approach.

5.2. A request for future research

We note that in many papers reviewed for our work, researchers failed to publish their weight initialization methods. There are many choices available for weight initialization of a neural network and it is one of many important

factors. Deep learning has many other considerations too, and the details provided in published work are frequently light in detail. When considering all of the parameters available (e.g. number of layers, embedding options, optimizers, weighting schemes, activation functions, libraries, etc.), neural networks can become very complex and therefore more details should be recorded for reproducibility. As our work demonstrates, seemingly innocuous values such as batch size, can have significant impacts on results. Filling in the missing details from published work is a time consuming task, which is best resolved through communication with original authors that may no longer be available due to various factors. As such, it may be worthwhile to make every effort to include all parameter choices, including weight initialization methods, in future work⁷.

Additionally, a set of confusion matrices was provided in previous work on the abusive dataset (Gambäck and Sikdar, 2017). We have also provided confusion matrix results in Table 4. This information is useful for reproducibility, as you can compare many more evaluation metrics than the popular single aggregate measure F-1 macro weighted score. Reporting of confusion matrices opens the door to other metrics such as F-1 micro unweighted or F measure with different beta values. This information could easily be provided online, as publications often have space limitation, therefore it is worth consideration of a better approach.

5.3. Future work

Future work would consider evaluation of ensemble methods on additional test sets (e.g. SemEval 2014 and 2015 for example). Also, a comparison of different weighting schemes is likely useful to understand variations within this parameter. Beyond that, building models with different network configurations and embedding models are all considered to be natural next steps. Different approaches, such as LSTM networks based on character representations (as opposed to word embeddings) should be considered. Reproducing the promising results using LSTM and Gradient

⁷We made our code publicly available for other researchers, which can be found at <https://github.com/stevenzim/lrec-2018>.

Boosted Decision Trees (Badjatiya et al., 2017) on additional datasets is a worthwhile exercise too. Given knowledge that neural network performance improves as datasets become larger, it would be an interesting experiment to gain insight as to what amount of data is sufficient enough where ensemble methods do not provide a boost in performance. Therefore one possible next step for our work would be to try our methods on progressively larger datasets to empirically show that ensembles provide smaller improvements as training data increases.

6. Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council grant number ES/M010236/1.

7. Bibliographical References

- Abadi, M., Agarwal, A., Barham, P., Brevdo, E., Chen, Z., Citro, C., Corrado, G. S., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Goodfellow, I., Harp, A., Irving, G., Isard, M., Jia, Y., Jozefowicz, R., Kaiser, L., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Mané, D., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D., Olah, C., Schuster, M., Shlens, J., Steiner, B., Sutskever, I., Talwar, K., Tucker, P., Vanhoucke, V., Vasudevan, V., Viégas, F., Vinyals, O., Warden, P., Wattemberg, M., Wicke, M., Yu, Y., and Zheng, X. (2015). TensorFlow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous systems. Software available from tensorflow.org.
- Aggarwal, C. C. and Zhai, C. (2012). A survey of text classification algorithms. *Mining text data*, pages 163–222.
- Badjatiya, P., Gupta, S., Gupta, M., and Varma, V. (2017). Deep learning for hate speech detection in tweets. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web Companion*, pages 759–760. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Balikas, G. and Amini, M.-R. (2016). Twise at semeval-2016 task 4: Twitter sentiment classification. *Proceedings of SemEval*, pages 85–91.
- Benesch, S. (2017). Civil society puts a hand on the wheel: Diverse responses to harmful speech. *Harmful Speech Online*, page 31.
- Chollet, F. (2015). Keras. <https://github.com/fchollet/keras>.
- Fuhr, N. (2017). Some common mistakes in ir evaluation, and how they can be avoided. In *ACM SIGIR Forum*, volume 51, pages 32–41. ACM.
- Gambäck, B. and Sikdar, U. K. (2017). Using convolutional neural networks to classify hate-speech. In *Proceedings of The First Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 85–90. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Godin, F., Vandersmissen, B., De Neve, W., and Van de Walle, R. (2015). Multimedia lab @ acl w-nut ner shared task: Named entity recognition for twitter microposts using distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the ACL 2015 Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (ACL-IJCNLP)*, volume 2015, pages 146–153.
- Goldberg, Y. (2016). A primer on neural network models for natural language processing. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research(JAIR)*, 57:345–420.
- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., and Courville, A. (2016). *Deep Learning*. MIT Press. <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- Hagen, M., Potthast, M., Büchner, M., and Stein, B. (2015). Webis: An ensemble for twitter sentiment detection. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2015)*, pages 582–589.
- Kim, Y. (2014). Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification. In *In: Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1746–1751. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., and Dean, J. (2013a). Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G. S., and Dean, J. (2013b). Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems(NIPS)*, pages 3111–3119.
- Molteni, F., Buizza, R., Palmer, T. N., and Petrolia, T. (1996). The ecmwf ensemble prediction system: Methodology and validation. *Quarterly journal of the royal meteorological society*, 122(529):73–119.
- Nakov, P., Rosenthal, S., Kozareva, Z., Stoyanov, V., Ritter, A., and Wilson, T. (2013). Semeval-2013 task 2: Sentiment analysis in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pages 312–320.
- Park, J. H. and Fung, P. (2017). One-step and two-step classification for abusive language detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of The First Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 41–45. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M., and Duchesnay, E. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Pennington, J., Socher, R., and Manning, C. D. (2014). Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *In: Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ross, B., Rist, M., Carbonell, G., Cabrera, B., Kurowsky, N., and Wojatzki, M. (2017). Measuring the reliability of hate speech annotations: The case of the european refugee crisis. *preprint arXiv:1701.08118*.
- Saleem, H. M., Dillon, K. P., Benesch, S., and Ruths, D. (2016). A web of hate: Tackling hateful speech in online social spaces. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Text Analytics for Cybersecurity and Online Safety (TA-COS 2016)*, LREC 2016, pages 1–10.
- Severyn, A. and Moschitti, A. (2015). Twitter sentiment

- analysis with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 959–962. ACM.
- Stojanovski, D., Strezoski, G., Madjarov, G., and Dimitrovski, I. (2015). Twitter sentiment analysis using deep convolutional neural network. In *International Conference on Hybrid Artificial Intelligence Systems*, pages 726–737. Springer.
- Sygekounas, E., Rizzo, G., and Troncy, R. (2016). Sentiment polarity detection from amazon reviews: an experimental study. In *Semantic Web Evaluation Challenge*, pages 108–120. Springer.
- The United Nations General Assembly. (1966). International covenant on civil and political rights. *Treaty Series*, 999:171, December.
- The United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. December.
- Theano Development Team. (2016). Theano: A Python framework for fast computation of mathematical expressions. *arXiv e-prints*, abs/1605.02688, May.
- Tulkens, S., Hilte, L., Lodewyckx, E., Verhoeven, B., and Daelemans, W. (2016). A dictionary-based approach to racism detection in dutch social media. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Text Analytics for Cybersecurity and Online Safety (TA-COS 2016)*, LREC 2016, pages 11–17.
- Vosoughi, S., Vijayaraghavan, P., and Roy, D. (2016). Tweet2vec: Learning tweet embeddings using character-level cnn-lstm encoder-decoder. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1041–1044. ACM.
- Waseem, Z. and Hovy, D. (2016). Hateful symbols or hateful people? predictive features for hate speech detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pages 88–93.
- Waseem, Z. (2016). Are you a racist or am i seeing things? annotator influence on hate speech detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science*, pages 138–142.
- Xia, R., Zong, C., and Li, S. (2011). Ensemble of feature sets and classification algorithms for sentiment classification. *Information Sciences*, 181(6):1138–1152.
- Yang, Y. and Eisenstein, J. (2017). Overcoming language variation in sentiment analysis with social attention. *Transaction of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*.
- Zimmerman, S. and Kruschwitz, U. (2017). Speaking of the weather: Detection of meteorological influences on sentiment within social media. In *Computer Science and Electronic Engineering (CEECE), 2017*, pages 1–6. IEEE.