

Imperial College: ‘Don’t Patronize Me!’ Coursework 2024

Anton Zhitomirsky
Imperial College London
az620@ic.ac.uk

1 Introduction

Most social media websites contain portals through which even unregistered users can view their content. Focusing primarily on textual posts, this leaves many vulnerable users to unfiltered content, which may be harmful if not regulated. Ng (2007) concludes that regardless of intention, if this content goes unfiltered it may “justify”, “encode”, “enact” and “routinize” discrimination amongst targeted groups.

This motivates the creation and popularization of The Don’t Patronize Me! dataset to provide a source for engineers to develop categorization algorithms to progress the protection of targeted groups. The dataset, authored by Perez Almen-dros et al. (2020), is a labelled dataset containing more than 10,000 paragraphs extracted from news stories, country of origin, and keyword which is then labelled indicating its level of Patronizing and Condescending Language (PCL).

I propose an extension to the base-line categorization model ‘RoBERTa’ which beats the initial benchmarks of 0.48 F1-score on the dev-set and 0.49 on the test-set.

Model	F1 dev-set	F1 val-set
RoBERTa (Baseline)	0.48	0.49
Mine	?	?

Table 1: F1 score of models attempted

2 Data Analysis

2.1 Feature Analysis

Labels arrive annotated by two main annotators. Their values span from $[0, 4]$ indicating the level of PCL within the text snippet. Perez Almen-dros et al. (2020) explains how both annotators individually classify each sentence with a score in the range $[0, 2]$ to indicate the strength of PCL from: no PCL, borderline PCL and blatant PCL. These scores were then summed to produce a 5-point scale of PCL, where the range $[0, 1]$ indicates a

negative example, and $[2, 4]$ indicating a positive example.

Data also arrives with labeled country information indicating the source media outlet, and a keyword field. The keyword is provided as input to the model as the search term used to retrieve texts about a target community.

2.2 Data




Figure 1: Histogram of word count by PCL (true) and non PCL (false)¹

The test data contains a disproportionate number of negative (9475) and positive (993) examples of PCL. Furthermore, the distribution of word counts between the two (See Figure 1) offers no obvious underlying pattern between the two classes. This is because natural language is about how words are said, instead of the quantity.

Indeed, Perez Almen-dros et al. (2020) mention the subjective nature of the task as it is very subjective. The word ‘lovely’ appears uniquely in PCL text examples. This word isn’t negative, but in the context of the sentence (par.id: 2404) “We think it’s lovely that so many have come forward to help out a family clearly in need!” the sentence has been labeled as blatantly PCL with a score of 3. In-fact, tweaking the sentence from “a family clearly in need” to “families in need” removes entitlement and converts it to compassion.

¹ Without loss of generality, text with more than 250 words have been clipped

3 Modelling

For the successful implementation of a classifier model (this could be a transformer or any other ML model of your choice. Do give justification for your choice.):

1. **10 marks:** Successful implementation of a model (train and produce predictions which outperform the F1 score for the RoBERTa-base baseline provided). 7 marks for outperforming the baseline model on the official dev set (0.48) and 3 marks for outperforming the baseline model on the test set (0.49).
2. **5 marks:** Choice of model hyper-parameters and description of your model setup. This should include choosing an appropriate learning rate and checking whether implementing a learning schedule improves performance. Also consider whether your model is cased or uncased. You should mention how many epochs you train the model for, whether you are using any early-stopping, and how you are using the training labels.
3. **10 marks:** Further model improvements (beyond using a bigger transformer model), for example pre-processing, data sampling, data augmentation, ensembling, etc. Two main improvements, with a third less explored improvement is sufficient. For example: try several different data sampling approaches, try several data augmentation strategies by perturbing observations in different ways, and then see if incorporating one of the categorical columns improves performance.
 - try and balance out the classes by applying synonyms to low frequency labels
 - data-sampling, research: is it common to feed in an equal proportion of each class in batches during training?
 - using country code also
4. **10 marks:** Compare your model performance to two simple baselines (e.g. a BoW model). Share some of the features that one of your baseline models used, and highlight an example misclassified with a suggestion of why the baseline may have made the misclassification.

5. **5 marks:** Description of the model results and your hyper-parameter tuning (some evidence of this is required in your report). Your results should show how the different strategies you have tried impacted the model performance. For any results presented in your paper, you should be clear if these are from your own internal dev set or the official dev set.

4 Analysis

Analysis questions to be answered (these questions can be answered without training any additional models): Your report should state the analysis questions so that this can be read as a self-contained report, rather than referring to ‘analysis question 1’ etc.

1. **5 marks:** To what extent is the model better at predicting examples with a higher level of patronising content? Justify your answer.
2. **5 marks:** How does the length of the input sequence impact the model performance? If there is any difference, speculate why.
3. **5 marks:** To what extent does model performance depend on the data categories? E.g. Observations for homeless vs poor-families, etc.

5 Conclusion

5 marks: Conclusion, with a summary of your results, and your key findings from the analysis questions. You should suggest at least one further experiment as a next step.

References

- Sik Hung Ng. 2007. [Language-based discrimination: Blatant and subtle forms](#). *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2):106–122.
- Carla Perez Almendros, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2020. [Don’t patronize me! an annotated dataset with patronizing and condescending language towards vulnerable communities](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5891–5902, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.