

DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

MASTERS THESIS

Value-Sensitive Rejection of Machine Decisions for Hate Speech Detection

Author:

Philippe Lammerts

Thesis advisor:

Prof. dr. ir. G.J.P.M. Houben
Delft University of Technology

Daily supervisor:

Dr. J. Yang
Delft University of Technology

Co-daily supervisors:

Dr. Y-C. Hsu
University of Amsterdam

P. Lippmann

Delft University of Technology

*A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science*

in the

Web Information Systems Group - Crowd Computing
Software Technology

July 19, 2022

DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Abstract

Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science
Software Technology

Master of Science

Value-Sensitive Rejection of Machine Decisions for Hate Speech Detection

by Philippe Lammerts

The Thesis Abstract is written here (and usually kept to just this page). The page is kept centered vertically so can expand into the blank space above the title too...

Acknowledgements

The acknowledgments and the people to thank go here, don't forget to include your project advisor...

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
1 Introduction	1
2 Related work	3
2.1 Hate speech: definition and challenges	3
2.2 Automatic hate speech detection	4
2.3 Machine Learning models with rejection	5
2.4 Value assessment	6
2.4.1 Objective assessment	6
2.4.2 Subjective assessment	8
Likert	8
Magnitude Estimation	8
2.5 Evaluation metrics	10
3 Value-sensitive rejection	11
3.1 Metric	11
3.2 Hate speech detection models	11
3.2.1 Logistic Regression	11
3.2.2 CNN	11
3.2.3 DistilBERT	11
3.2.4 Calibration	11
4 Survey study	13
4.1 Research question and hypothesis	13
4.2 Method	13
4.2.1 Scales	13
4.2.2 Normalization	13
4.2.3 Design	13
Independent variables	13
Confounding variables	13
Control variables	13
Dependent variables	13
4.2.4 Planned sample	13
Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	13
Participant Compensation	13
Sample size	13
4.2.5 Materials	13
Survey tool	13
Data	13
4.3 Analysis	13

4.3.1	Validation	13
4.3.2	Reliability	13
5	Results	15
5.1	Survey study	15
5.1.1	Value ratios	15
5.1.2	Reliability	15
5.1.3	Validity	15
5.2	Value-sensitive rejection	15
6	Discussion	17
6.1	Survey study	17
6.2	Value-sensitive rejection	17
6.3	Implications	17
6.4	Limitations	17
6.5	Recommendations	17
7	Conclusion	19
	Bibliography	21

List of Abbreviations

BERT	bidirectional e ncoder representations from t ransformers
BOW	b ag- o f- w ords
CNN	c onvolutional n eural n etwork
DL	d eep l earning
FN	false n egative
FP	false p ositive
LDA	latent d irichlet a llocation
LR	logistic regression
LSTM	long short-term m emory
ML	m achine learning
POS	p art- o f-speech
SVM	support vector m achine
TF-IDF	term frequency-inverse d ocument frequency
TN	true n egative
TP	true p ositive
VSD	value-sensitive d esign

List of Symbols

Add symbols

Chapter 1

Introduction

The amount of hateful content spread online on social media platforms remains a significant problem. Ignoring its presence can harm people and even result in actual violence and other conflicts (Balayn et al., 2021; Council of Europe, n.d.). There are many news articles about events where hate spread on online platforms lead to acts of violence (Ingram, 2018; Mashal et al., 2022; Mozur, 2018; Müller & Schwarz, 2021). One research paper found a connection between hateful content on Facebook containing anti-refugee sentiment and hate crimes against refugees by analyzing social media usage in multiple municipalities in Germany (Müller & Schwarz, 2021). Governmental institutions and social media companies are becoming more aware of these risks and are trying to combat hate speech. For example, the European Union developed a Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech in cooperation with large social media companies such as Facebook and Twitter (European Commission, 2016). This Code of Conduct requests companies to prohibit hate speech and report their progress every year (European Commission, 2016). The most recent report from 2021 stated that Twitter only removed 49.5% of all hateful content on their platform. Facebook is most successful in removing hate speech as they claim to have removed 70.2% of all hateful content in 2021 (European Commission, 2016). However, one article found in internal communication from Facebook that this percentage is much lower, around 3-5% (Giansiracusa, 2021). Therefore, hate speech detection remains a hard problem that even large institutions have not solved yet.

Currently, people rely on reactive and proactive content moderation methods to detect hate speech (Klonick, 2018). Reactive moderation is when social media users are flagging (also known as reporting) hateful content (Klonick, 2018). Proactive moderation is either done automatically using detection algorithms or manually by a group of human moderators (Klonick, 2018). There exist different methods for automatically detecting hateful content. Most use Machine Learning (ML) algorithms since these tend to be the most promising for their detection performance at a large scale (Balayn et al., 2021; Fortuna & Nunes, 2018). These algorithms can range from traditional ML methods such as Support Vector Machine or Decision Tree to Deep Learning algorithms (Fortuna & Nunes, 2018).

However, both proactive and reactive moderation methods have their limitations. Proactive manual moderation of hateful content is still the most reliable solution but is simply infeasible due to the large amount of content generated by the many users (Balayn et al., 2021). Reactive moderation solves this problem since the users can report hate speech themselves. Although, the problem stays that hateful content is exposed to the users for some time. Proactive automatic moderation using automated detection algorithms allow for large amounts of data to be checked quickly without the involvement of humans. However, these algorithms have shown to be unreliable as they often perform poor on deployment data (Balayn et al., 2021; Gröndahl et al., 2018). One study found that the F1 scores reduce

significantly (69% F1 score drop in the worst case) when training a hate speech detection model on one dataset and evaluating it using another dataset (Gröndahl et al., 2018). Furthermore, one paper found that most research in hate speech detection overestimates the performance of the automated detection methods (Arango et al., 2019). The authors found that the performance drops significantly when the detection algorithms are trained on one dataset and evaluated on another (Arango et al., 2019).

This thesis research will tackle the problems of proactive moderation by focusing on the concept of *human-machine co-creation* (Woo, 2020) where the advantages of both humans (cognitive abilities and ability to make judgements) and machines (automation and performance) are combined. So humans and machines should work together to detect hate speech. ML models should detect hateful content automatically and humans should make the final decisions (*human-in-the-loop*) when the model is not confident enough (Woo, 2020). Here come ML models with a reject option in place. The goal of the reject option is to reject an ML prediction when the risk of making an incorrect prediction is too high and to defer the prediction task to a human (Hendrickx et al., 2021). There are several advantages. First, the utility of the ML model increases as only the most confident (and possibly the most correct) predictions are accepted. Second, less human effort is necessary as the machine is handling all prediction tasks, and only a fraction needs to be checked by a human. To the best of our knowledge, ML with rejection has not been used in hate speech detection before.

In this work, we focus on *value-sensitive* rejection. There are gains of accepting correct predictions (positive value) and costs of accepting incorrect or rejecting predictions (negative value). We should weigh these values according to the task of hate speech detection and incorporate them in the design of the hybrid human-AI system (Sayin et al., 2021). We will mainly focus on the user-centred value since the social media users are the most affected by the consequences of hate speech.

The idea of most ML models with rejection is that we reject predictions when the model's confidence is too low. Therefore, we need a metric that measures the total value of ML models with a reject option. We can use the resulting metric to determine when to reject/accept predictions by maximizing the total value. Second, we need to find out how we can define the user-centred values in the context of hate speech detection. We will attempt to retrieve the value ratios since it is hard to come up with the absolute cost values in the hate speech domain. By value ratios, we mean to figure out, for example, the ratio between an FP and an FN prediction. Therefore, our first sub-research question is as follows:

This leads to the following research questions:

RQ How can we reject predictions of Machine Learning models in hate speech detection in a value-sensitive manner?

- **SRQ1** How can we measure the value of Machine Learning models with a reject option?
- **SRQ1** How can we determine the value ratios between rejections and True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Positive (FP), and False Negative (FN) predictions?

Here comes a list of contributions

Here comes a short description of the structure of the thesis report

Chapter 2

Related work

In this chapter, we first define hate speech in section 2.1 and explain why it is such a challenging topic to tackle, especially from a computer science perspective. Then, we give an overview of the state-of-the-art solutions for the automatic detection of hate speech in section 2.2. In section 2.3, we discuss the different types of ML models with a reject option. Section 2.4 discusses the main challenges of assessing the values of (in)correct and rejected predictions in the hate speech domain. Finally, we discuss the shortcomings of standard machine metrics, such as accuracy, to evaluate detection systems and why human-centred metrics are promising.

2.1 Hate speech: definition and challenges

Different types of online conflictual languages exist, such as cyberbullying, offensive language, toxic language, or hate speech, and come with varying definitions from domains such as psychology, political science, or computer science (Balayn et al., 2021). We can broadly define *hate speech* as “*language that is used to express hatred towards a targeted group or is intended to be derogatory, to humiliate, or to insult the members of the group*” (Balayn et al., 2021; Davidson et al., 2017). It differs from other conflictual languages since it focuses on specific target groups or individuals (Balayn et al., 2021).

Balayn et al. (2021) identified the mismatch between the formalisation of hate speech and how people perceive it. Many factors influence how people perceive hate speech, such as the content itself and the characteristics of the target group and the observing individual, such as gender, cultural background, or age (Balayn et al., 2021). We can identify this mismatch in other related work from which there appears to be low agreement among humans regarding annotating hate speech (Fortuna & Nunes, 2018; Ross et al., 2017; Waseem, 2016). Ross et al. (2017) found low inter-rater reliability scores (Krippendorff’s alpha values of around 0.2 – 0.3) in a study where they asked humans about the hatefulness and offensiveness of a selection of tweets. They also found that the inter-rater reliability value does not increase when showing a definition of hate speech to the human annotators beforehand. Waseem (2016) found a slight increase in the inter-rater reliability when considering annotations of human experts only, but it remained low overall.

In the hate speech domain, we need to be careful with creating biased detection systems that are trained on biased datasets. Most annotated hate speech datasets that are publicly available are likely to be biased. Datasets such as Waseem and Hovy (2016) or Basile et al. (2019) collected their data using specific keywords that can introduce *sample retrieval* bias and annotated their data using only three independent annotators that might result in *sample annotation* bias (Balayn et al., 2021). Automated classification models will likely become biased in their predictions if we train them on biased datasets (*garbage in, garbage out*). This phenomenon becomes most

notable when applying pre-trained classification models to new and unseen data in deployment. For example, Gröndahl et al. (2018) and Arango et al. (2019) report significant drops in F1 scores when training a hate speech classification model on one dataset and evaluating it on another. Gröndahl et al. (2018) found that the F1 score reduces by 69% in the worst case and that the model choice does not affect the classification performance as much as the dataset choice. Arango et al. (2019) replicated several state-of-the-art hate speech classification models and found that most studies overestimate the classification performance. These results further strengthen our stance that we should not detect hate speech solely by machines but rather by a human-in-the-loop approach.

2.2 Automatic hate speech detection

In this section, we will list the state-of-the-art Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques for automatic hate speech detection from literature. Several excellent surveys outlined the different detection methods from literature (Fortuna & Nunes, 2018; Schmidt & Wiegand, 2019). First, we will discuss the different features used in the classification models. Then, we will state the most used classification models ranging from supervised to unsupervised learning.

Commonly used features are bag-of-words (BOW) (Greevy & Smeaton, 2004), character/word N-grams (Waseem & Hovy, 2016), lexicon features (Xiang et al., 2012), term frequency-inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) (Badjatiya et al., 2017; Davidson et al., 2017; Rodriguez et al., 2019), part-of-speech (POS) (Greevy & Smeaton, 2004), sentiment analysis (Rodriguez et al., 2019), topic modelling (e.g. Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA)) (Xiang et al., 2012), meta-information (e.g. location) (Waseem & Hovy, 2016), or word embeddings (Agrawal & Awekar, 2018; Badjatiya et al., 2017). Greevy and Smeaton (2004) found that the classification performance is higher with BOW features than with POS features. Waseem and Hovy (2016) found that character N-gram achieves higher classification performance than word N-gram. They also found that using demographic information such as the location does not improve the results significantly. Xiang et al. (2012) used a lexicon feature (whether a social media post contains an offensive word or not) and the topic distributions from an LDA analysis. Rodriguez et al. (2019) used TF-IDF and sentiment analysis to detect and cluster topics on Facebook pages that are likely to promote hate speech. Badjatiya et al. (2017) experimented with different word embeddings: fast-Text¹, GloVe², and random word embeddings.

Most hate speech-related studies use supervised learning techniques that range from traditional ML to deep learning (DL) models, and a few use unsupervised learning techniques to cluster the social media posts. Support Vector Machine (SVM) (Davidson et al., 2017; Greevy & Smeaton, 2004; Xiang et al., 2012) and Logistic Regression (LR) (Davidson et al., 2017; Waseem & Hovy, 2016) are the most popular traditional ML techniques for hate speech detection. Davidson et al. (2017) found that SVM and LR perform significantly better than other traditional ML techniques such as Naive Bayes, Decision Trees, and Random Forests. Badjatiya et al. (2017) experimented with various configurations of word embeddings and two DL models: a convolutional neural network (CNN) and a long short-term memory (LSTM) model. They found that CNN performs better than LSTM and that using pre-trained word embeddings such as GloVe does not result in better classification performance than

¹<https://fasttext.cc/>

²<https://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/glove/>

using random embeddings. Given the recent popularity of Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) models (Devlin et al., 2018) in the NLP field, studies such as (Alatawi et al., 2021) found that BERT models achieve slightly better classification performance than DL models. Rodriguez et al. (2019) use the unsupervised learning method, K-means clustering, to cluster social media posts for identifying topics that potentially promote hate speech.

2.3 Machine Learning models with rejection

Several studies promoted the concept of rejecting ML predictions when the risk of producing an incorrect prediction is too high so that a human gives the final judgment instead (Hendrickx et al., 2021; Sayin et al., 2021; Woo, 2020). Hendrickx et al. (2021) identified three ways for rejecting ML predictions: the *separated*, the *integrated*, and the *dependent* way. In the separated way, the rejectors decides beforehand whether a data sample needs to be handled by the classification model or by a human (Hendrickx et al., 2021). In the integrated way, the rejector is integrated in the classification model (Hendrickx et al., 2021). In the dependent way, the rejector analyzes the output of the classification model to determine whether to reject a prediction or not (Hendrickx et al., 2021). Several studies have applied the reject option using one of the architectures mentioned above (Coenen et al., 2020; De Stefano et al., 2000; Geifman & El-Yaniv, 2017, 2019; Grandvalet et al., 2008).

Coenen et al. (2020) developed a *separated* rejector that rejects data samples before passing them to the classification model. They used different outlier detection techniques, such as the one-class Support Vector Machine (SVM), to detect data samples that are unfamiliar with the training data (Coenen et al., 2020).

Dependent rejectors are the most commonly used (De Stefano et al., 2000; Geifman & El-Yaniv, 2017; Grandvalet et al., 2008). Grandvalet et al. (2008) experimented with support vector machines (SVMs) with a reject option. Geifman and El-Yaniv (2017) developed a dependent rejector that rejects data samples based on a predefined maximum risk value and the coverage accuracy of the classification model (Geifman & El-Yaniv, 2017). De Stefano et al. (2000) were among the first to develop a dependent rejector for neural networks. The authors developed a confidence metric for determining the optimal rejection threshold (De Stefano et al., 2000). This threshold is calculated based on a set of predictions with their corresponding confidence values and a set of cost values: the cost of incorrect, correct, and rejected predictions. (De Stefano et al., 2000).

Geifman and El-Yaniv (2019) developed an *integrated* rejector by extending their work from Geifman and El-Yaniv (2017). They integrated the reject option in a DL model by including a selection function in the last layer of the DL model.

In this work, we apply the dependent way since it supports any existing classification model (Hendrickx et al., 2021). The most relevant work is from De Stefano et al. (2000) since their confidence metric takes the value of (in)correct and rejected predictions into account. While they experimented with a range of different cost values, we go further by employing a value-sensitive approach, which determines cost values based on how users feel regarding machine decisions using a survey study with crowd workers. Thus, we obtain a threshold that captures the implications of machine decisions from a human perspective.

2.4 Value assessment

Fjeld et al. (2020) outlined 8 principles of AI systems such as *fairness and discrimination* (e.g. preventing algorithmic bias), *human control of technology* (e.g. the system should request help from the human user in difficult situations), and *promotion of human values* (we should integrate human value in the system). Sayin et al. (2021) and Casati et al. (2021) suggest that we should identify context-specific *values* and incorporate them in the design of a hybrid human-AI system. We adhere to these suggestions in our project since we develop a hate speech classification model with a reject option that incorporates value. As explained in the [Introduction](#), we have costs of incorrect and rejected predictions and gains of correct predictions. We can express the costs of incorrect (FP and FN predictions) and rejected predictions as negative values and the gains of correct (TP and TN predictions) as positive values. We should weigh these values according to the task of case hate speech detection (Sayin et al., 2021). However, value is a broad term and its definition depends heavily on the context. Several works discuss the value-sensitive design (VSD) approach that describes how different types of value, such as privacy, can be integrated in the design of a socio-technical system (Umbrello & Van de Poel, 2021; Zhu et al., 2018). According to the VSD approach, it is key to understand the stakeholders of the system and we can retrieve their values either *conceptually* (e.g. from literature) or *empirically* (e.g. through survey studies) (Umbrello & Van de Poel, 2021; Zhu et al., 2018). We consider two different stakeholders: the social media platforms and the users. The goal is to retrieve value ratios between rejection, FP, FN, TP, and TN predictions from the perspective of both stakeholders. We would like to know whether an FN prediction is, for example, two times worse than an FP prediction. The main challenge is to express all values using a single unit. First, we could define the values using an objective measure, such as time or money spent/saved. Second, we could define the values subjectively, for example by analyzing people's stance towards the consequence of incorrect predictions in hate speech detection. In this section, we try to assess the values of both stakeholders empirically and conceptually and explain why we in the end decided to assess the values of the social media users empirically.

2.4.1 Objective assessment

In this section, we explain the difficulties of defining the values of TP, TN, FP, FN, and rejected predictions in hate speech detection using objective measurements. We do this by following the conceptual approach for both stakeholders by looking at some related work.

First, we look at the social media company as a stakeholder. We can retrieve the value of rejection by looking at how much time a human moderator spends on average to check whether some social media post contains hateful content or not. We can convert this into money by taking the moderator's salary into account. We could also argue that the value of a TP and a TN is equal to the negative value of rejection since we saved human effort by letting the classification model correctly predict whether something is hateful or not. The problem, however, starts to arise when we look at the FP and the FN predictions. How can we express the values of FP and FN predictions in terms of money or time saved/spent? The main problem is that most social media companies are not transparent in how they moderate hate speech (Klonick, 2018). So we do not know the exact objective values of rejected and incorrect predictions for these companies. There do exist country-specific fines. For example, Germany approved a plan where social media companies can be fined up

to 50 million euros if they do not remove hate speech in time (“Social media firms faces huge hate speech fines in Germany”, 2017). However, this is location-specific, and it is unclear how this applies to individual cases of hate speech. Defining the value of FP cases is even more difficult. It is unclear how filtering out too much content would affect the company in terms of money/time lost. Therefore, we abstain from estimating the values from the perspective of these companies as the stakeholder both empirically and conceptually.

Second, we look at the social media users as the stakeholder. Both FP and FN predictions have negative consequences on the users. Having too many FP predictions might violate the value of Freedom of Speech since we are filtering out non-hateful posts and, therefore, we cause suppression of free speech. One paper found through a survey that most people think that some form of hate speech moderation is needed, but they also worry about the violation of freedom of speech (Olteanu et al., 2017). Having too many FN predictions might harm individuals or even result in acts of violence (Council of Europe, n.d.). Therefore, we need to figure out how we should weigh the values of FP and FN predictions accordingly. We abstain from using time as a unit since it does not make sense to express the consequences of hate speech or the benefits of freedom of speech in time. Therefore, we want to look at the value of freedom of speech and hate speech from an economic conceptual perspective. However, we noticed a lack of research in this area. There is one paper where they tried to come up with an economic model for free political speech by looking at the First Amendment to the United States Constitution (Posner, 1986). The First Amendment restricts the government from creating laws that could, for example, violate Freedom of Speech (“The Constitution”, n.d.). The authors explained in Posner (1986) that the lack of research in this area is because most economists do not dive into the legal domain regarding free speech, and free speech legal specialists refrain from doing economic analysis (Posner, 1986). The proposed economic model from the paper, for example, includes the cost of harm and the probability that speech results in violence (Posner, 1986). However, the authors do not elaborate on how we can define the probability and the costs. Another paper did speculate on this topic by explaining why doing a cost-benefit analysis of free speech is almost impossible (Sunstein, 2019). The authors explained that there are too many uncertainties (Sunstein, 2019). We can assume that there are values of free speech, but it is too difficult to quantify them (Sunstein, 2019). For example, terrorist organizations use free speech to recruit people and call for acts of violence online (Sunstein, 2019). At the same time, most other hateful posts will not ever result in actual acts of violence (Sunstein, 2019). Therefore, cost values using objective measurements are often case-specific and cannot be defined generically. There is a nonquantifiable risk that acts of violence will happen in the unknown future (Sunstein, 2019). But suppose we do know this probability, then there are still too many uncertainties. To calculate the actual costs of hate speech (the FN predictions), we also need to know the number of lives at risk and how we should quantify the value of each life (Sunstein, 2019). The authors claim that analyzing the benefits of free speech is even more difficult (Sunstein, 2019). They conclude their work by saying that there are too many problems to conceptually and empirically evaluate the costs and benefits in the hate speech detection context (Sunstein, 2019).

Therefore, we believe that using objective measurements, such as money, is not possible for assessing the values of predictions for both stakeholders in hate speech detection.

2.4.2 Subjective assessment

From section 2.4.1, we concluded that from related work it appears that we cannot retrieve the objective values in a conceptual and empirical manner. Instead, we will focus on the subjective measurement of values: what is people's stance towards (in)correct and rejected predictions in hate speech detection? We do only consider the social media users as the stakeholder since they are the most affected by the consequences of hate speech detection and since it does not make sense to measure the subjective values of the social media platforms. It is best to measure subjective values of the social media users in an empirical manner, for example by doing a survey study. In this survey, we could ask social media users what their stance is towards TP, TN, FP, FN, and rejected predictions in hate speech detection. We could use the commonly used Likert scales as our measurement scale. However, as we will explain in the section 2.4.2, Likert scales are not suitable for retrieving ratio values. Therefore, in section 2.4.2, we will explain why the technique called Magnitude Estimation seems promising for our use-case.

Likert

Likert scales are widely used in academic research for retrieving the opinions of a group of subjects. Likert scales are a series of multiple Likert-type questions where subjects can answer questions with several response alternatives Boone and Boone, 2012. For example, we could use a bipolar scale with seven response alternatives ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree', including a 'neutral' midpoint. However, there is a lot of discussion in the literature about how we should analyze these Likert scales Allen and Seaman, 2007; Boone and Boone, 2012; Murray, 2013; Norman, 2010. The scale of the questions is ordinal, which means that we do know the ranking of the responses, but we do not have an exact measurement of the distances between the response items Allen and Seaman, 2007. For example, we know that 'strongly agree' is higher in rank than 'agree', but not the exact distance between the two responses and whether it is greater than the distance between the 'neutral' and the 'somewhat agree' responses. Therefore, we technically cannot use parametric statistics, such as calculating the mean, when analyzing the data Allen and Seaman, 2007. Other papers argue that we can treat a Likert scale that consists of multiple Likert items as interval data and, therefore, applying parametric statistics will not affect the conclusions Boone and Boone, 2012; Murray, 2013; Norman, 2010. So, we can calculate mean scores for TP, TN, FP, FN, and rejection scenarios and compare these with each other. For example, we can then verify that the mean value of FN cases is greater than the mean value of FP cases and conclude that the negative value of an FN is smaller than the negative value of an FP. Analyzing Likert scales from our surveys would at most provide us with interval data (data for which we know the order, and we can measure the distances, but there is no true zero point Allen and Seaman, 2007). However, we need to have ratio data in this project since we want to know the exact value ratios of the TP, TN, FP, FN, and rejection scenarios.

Magnitude Estimation

In section 2.4.2, we concluded that Likert scales are not suitable since they do not provide ratio data. In this research, we want to experiment with a technique called Magnitude Estimation (ME). The ME technique originates from psychophysicists where human subjects need to give a quantitative estimation of sensory magnitudes

Stevens, 1956. For example, in one experiment, human subjects are asked to assign any number that reflects their perception of the loudness of a range of sounds Stevens, 1956. If the human subjects perceive the succeeding sound as twice as loud, they should assign a number to it that is twice as large. Researchers applied the ME technique to different types of physical stimuli (line length, brightness, duration, etc.) and proved that the results are reproducible and that the data has ratio properties Moskowitz, 1977. Other works have shown that the ME technique is also useful for rating more abstract types of stimuli, such as judging the relevance of documents Maddalena et al., 2017, the linguistic acceptability of sentences Bard et al., 1996, the strength of political opinions Lodge et al., 1976; Lodge and Tursky, 1979, and the usability of system interfaces McGee, 2004. Therefore, we think that ME is a promising method for judging the value ratios of hate speech detection scenarios.

The main advantage of ME is that it provides the ratio scale properties we need. Another advantage is that the scale is unbounded compared to other commonly used response scales, such as Likert scales. For example, suppose we first show a scenario and the subject provides a 'strongly disagree' judgment. Suppose we now present an even worse scenario. The subject is now limited to the response items in the Likert scale and can only give the same 'strongly disagree' judgement. We do not have this problem when using ME because the subject always has the freedom to assign a value of disagreement that is even larger. However, there are two main drawbacks of using ME. First, we need to normalize the results. Second, it can be hard to validate if we can use ME to measure the subjects' judgements for different scenarios of hate speech detection.

The resulting data needs to be normalized since each subject can use any value they like. For example, one may judge the scenarios using values of 1, 2, and 10, while another may use 100, 200, and 1000. There are different solutions for normalizing ME data, such as modulus normalization Moskowitz, 1977. The most commonly used method for modulus normalization is geometric averaging since this preserves the ratio information McGee, 2004; Moskowitz, 1977. However, as opposed to the unipolar scales used in Bard et al., 1996; McGee, 2004, we cannot apply geometric averaging to bipolar scales (disagree-agree). By including 0 (neutral) and negative values (disagree), we cannot use geometric averaging anymore because it uses log calculations Moskowitz, 1977. Using the algorithmic mean is also not an option since it would destroy the ratio scale properties Moskowitz, 1977. Therefore, we can normalize the magnitude estimates for bipolar scales by dividing all estimates of each subject by the maximum given value. This way, all magnitudes estimates are in the range [-100, 100] while maintaining the ratio properties.

Most papers that use the ME method apply some form of validation. Cross-modality validation is a technique that is often applied to validate the ME results Bard et al., 1996. Psychophysicists compare the magnitude estimates to the physical stimuli Bard et al., 1996. They analyze the correlation between the magnitude estimates and the physical stimuli by taking the log of each value and plotting them against each other Bard et al., 1996. In the case of estimating line lengths, we can easily vary the line length, for example, by showing a line that is twice as long as the previous line. Subjects can then estimate the line length using a number twice as large. However, this becomes more difficult in the social science and psychology domains. In hate speech detection and other applications in social science and psychology, we do not have an exact measure of the stimulus Bard et al., 1996. However, related work has shown that ME is still a suitable technique for eliciting opinions about different types of non-physical stimuli Bard et al., 1996; Lodge and Tursky, 1979; Maddalena et al., 2017; McGee, 2004. We can validate the magnitude estimates

by adopting the cross-modality technique but instead compare judgements against judgements Bard et al., 1996; Lodge and Tursky, 1979. Some papers analyze the correlation between different ME scales for validation, such as handgrip measurements or drawing lines Bard et al., 1996; Lodge et al., 1976. Others compare ME with another validated scale that can be of any type. For example, in Maddalena et al., 2017 about judging the relevance of documents, the authors compared the ME scale with two validated ordinal scales for the same dataset Maddalena et al., 2017. In our work, we also validate our findings by checking the correlation between the ME scale and another scale.

2.5 Evaluation metrics

Most hate speech-related studies evaluate their classification methods using standard *machine* metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, or F1. Evaluation of classification models with a reject option is often done by analyzing the accuracy and the coverage of the classification model. Nadeem et al. (2009) proposed the use of accuracy-rejection curves to plot the trade-off between accuracy and coverage so that different classification models with a reject option can be compared. Casati et al. (2021), Olteanu et al. (2017), and Röttger et al. (2020) recognized the shortcomings of machine metrics such as accuracy and found a gap in the evaluation of hate speech detection systems. Röttger et al. (2020) found that it is hard to identify the weak points of classification models using machine metrics such as accuracy. Therefore, the authors presented a suite that consists of 29 carefully selected functional tests to help identify the model’s weaknesses (Röttger et al., 2020). Each test checks different criteria, such as the ability to cope with spelling variations or detect neutral content containing slurs (Röttger et al., 2020). Our approach is different since we focus on measuring the performance of classification models with a reject option. Olteanu et al. (2017) promote using *human-centred* metrics that measure the human-perceived value of hate speech classification models. They found that the perceived value varies for fixed machine performance measurements, such as precision, and that it depends on the user characteristics and the type of classification errors (an offensive tweet labelled as hate (low impact) and a neutral tweet labelled as hate (high impact)) (Olteanu et al., 2017). Casati et al. (2021) propose developing new metrics for evaluating ML models with a reject option that considers domain-specific values. Our work aligns with both studies since we focus on creating a human-centred metric for evaluating hate speech detection systems with a reject option that incorporates value derived from a survey study.

Chapter 3

Value-sensitive rejection

3.1 Metric

Explain and proof our modified version of the metric from De Stefano

3.2 Hate speech detection models

3.2.1 Logistic Regression

3.2.2 CNN

3.2.3 DistilBERT

3.2.4 Calibration

Explain what model calibration is and why it's necessary

Chapter 4

Survey study

4.1 Research question and hypothesis

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Scales

4.2.2 Normalization

4.2.3 Design

Independent variables

Confounding variables

Control variables

Dependent variables

4.2.4 Planned sample

Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Participant Compensation

Sample size

4.2.5 Materials

Survey tool

Data

4.3 Analysis

4.3.1 Validation

4.3.2 Reliability

Chapter 5

Results

5.1 Survey study

5.1.1 Value ratios

5.1.2 Reliability

5.1.3 Validity

5.2 Value-sensitive rejection

Chapter 6

Discussion

Answer research questions

Discuss future work

6.1 Survey study

6.2 Value-sensitive rejection

6.3 Implications

Explain that Olteanu et al., 2017 claims that we need more human-centred metrics instead of abstract metrics such as precision and we agree with that by introducing our own human-centred metric

6.4 Limitations

Hate speech is difficult domain as there tend to be a lot of disagreement between people about what is considered hate speech and what not. Ross et al. (2017) found low Krippendorff alpha values in a hate speech survey. So our findings are in line with theirs.

Explain limitations of the metric and the survey study

The rejection threshold is calculated using the test set. This test set needs to be as realistic as possible. Furthermore we need to have calibrated models since we rely purely on the confidence values. This is also hard to realize. Temperature scaling can help, but it is still limited.

6.5 Recommendations

Magnitude Estimation seems promising for future research.

Personal and demographic characteristics might have a big impact. So further analysis on those aspects seem relevant.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Bibliography

- Agrawal, S., & Awekar, A. (2018). Deep learning for detecting cyberbullying across multiple social media platforms. *European conference on information retrieval*, 141–153.
- Alatawi, H. S., Alhothali, A. M., & Moria, K. M. (2021). Detecting white supremacist hate speech using domain specific word embedding with deep learning and bert. *IEEE Access*, 9, 106363–106374.
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, C. A. (2007). Likert scales and data analyses. *Quality progress*, 40(7), 64–65.
- Arango, A., Pérez, J., & Poblete, B. (2019). Hate speech detection is not as easy as you may think: A closer look at model validation. *Proceedings of the 42nd international acm sigir conference on research and development in information retrieval*, 45–54.
- Badjatiya, P., Gupta, S., Gupta, M., & Varma, V. (2017). Deep learning for hate speech detection in tweets. *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on World Wide Web companion*, 759–760.
- Balayn, A., Yang, J., Szlavik, Z., & Bozzon, A. (2021). Automatic identification of harmful, aggressive, abusive, and offensive language on the web: A survey of technical biases informed by psychology literature. *ACM Transactions on Social Computing (TSC)*, 4(3), 1–56.
- Bard, E. G., Robertson, D., & Sorace, A. (1996). Magnitude estimation of linguistic acceptability. *Language*, 72(1), 32–68.
- Basile, V., Bosco, C., Fersini, E., Nozza, D., Patti, V., Pardo, F. M. R., Rosso, P., & Sanguinetti, M. (2019). Semeval-2019 task 5: Multilingual detection of hate speech against immigrants and women in twitter. *Proceedings of the 13th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, 54–63.
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing likert data. *Journal of extension*, 50(2), 1–5.
- Casati, F., Noël, P.-A., & Yang, J. (2021). On the value of ml models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06775*.
- Coenen, L., Abdullah, A. K., & Guns, T. (2020). Probability of default estimation, with a reject option. *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, 439–448.
- The constitution [Visited on 11/04/2022]. (n.d.). *The White House*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/our-government/the-constitution/>
- Council of Europe. (n.d.). Hate speech and violence [Visited on 19/01/2022]. *European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-commission-against-racism-and-intolerance/hate-speech-and-violence>
- Davidson, T., Warmesley, D., Macy, M., & Weber, I. (2017). Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 11(1), 512–515.

- De Stefano, C., Sansone, C., & Vento, M. (2000). To reject or not to reject: That is the question-an answer in case of neural classifiers. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 30(1), 84–94.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2018). Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- European Commission. (2016). The eu code of conduct on countering illegal hate speech online [Visited on 07/03/2022]. *European Commission*. https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/eu-code-conduct-countering-illegal-hate-speech-online_en
- Fjeld, J., Achten, N., Hilligoss, H., Nagy, A., & Srikumar, M. (2020). Principled artificial intelligence: Mapping consensus in ethical and rights-based approaches to principles for ai. *Berkman Klein Center Research Publication*, (2020-1).
- Fortuna, P., & Nunes, S. (2018). A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(4), 1–30.
- Geifman, Y., & El-Yaniv, R. (2017). Selective classification for deep neural networks. *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 4885–4894.
- Geifman, Y., & El-Yaniv, R. (2019). SelectiveNet: A deep neural network with an integrated reject option. In K. Chaudhuri & R. Salakhutdinov (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th international conference on machine learning* (pp. 2151–2159). PMLR. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/geifman19a.html>
- Giansiracusa, N. (2021). Facebook uses deceptive math to hide its hate speech problem [Visited on 07/03/2022]. *Wired*. <https://www.wired.com/story/facebook-deceptive-math-when-it-comes-to-hate-speech/>
- Grandvalet, Y., Rakotomamonjy, A., Keshet, J., & Canu, S. (2008). Support vector machines with a reject option. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, & L. Bottou (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems*. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2008/file/3df1d4b96d8976ff5986393e8767f5Paper.pdf>
- Greevy, E., & Smeaton, A. F. (2004). Classifying racist texts using a support vector machine. *Proceedings of the 27th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, 468–469.
- Gröndahl, T., Pajola, L., Juuti, M., Conti, M., & Asokan, N. (2018). All you need is "love" evading hate speech detection. *Proceedings of the 11th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, 2–12.
- Hendrickx, K., Perini, L., Van der Plas, D., Meert, W., & Davis, J. (2021). Machine learning with a reject option: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.11277*.
- Ingram, M. (2018). Facebook now linked to violence in the philippines, libya, germany, myanmar, and india ["Visited on 07/03/2022"]. *Columbia Journalism Review*. https://www.cjr.org/the_media_today/facebook-linked-to-violence.php
- Klonick, K. (2018). The new governors: The people, rules, and processes governing online speech. *Harvard Law Review*, 131, 1598.
- Lodge, M., Tanenhaus, J., Cross, D., Tursky, B., Foley, M. A., & Foley, H. (1976). The calibration and cross-modal validation of ratio scales of political opinion in survey research. *Social Science Research*, 5(4), 325–347.
- Lodge, M., & Tursky, B. (1979). Comparisons between category and magnitude scaling of political opinion employing src/cps items. *American Political Science Review*, 73(1), 50–66.

- Maddalena, E., Mizzaro, S., Scholer, F., & Turpin, A. (2017). On crowdsourcing relevance magnitudes for information retrieval evaluation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 35(3), 1–32.
- Mashal, M., Raj, S., & Kumar, H. (2022). As officials look away, hate speech in india nears dangerous levels [Visited on 07/03/2022]. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/08/world/asia/india-hate-speech-muslims.html>
- McGee, M. (2004). Master usability scaling: Magnitude estimation and master scaling applied to usability measurement. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, 335–342.
- Moskowitz, H. R. (1977). Magnitude estimation: Notes on what, how, when, and why to use it. *Journal of Food Quality*, 1(3), 195–227.
- Mozur, P. (2018). A genocide incited on facebook, with posts from myanmars military [Visited on 07/03/2022]. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/15/technology/myanmar-facebook-genocide.html>
- Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2021). Fanning the flames of hate: Social media and hate crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(4), 2131–2167.
- Murray, J. (2013). Likert data: What to use, parametric or non-parametric? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(11).
- Nadeem, M. S. A., Zucker, J.-D., & Hanczar, B. (2009). Accuracy-rejection curves (arcs) for comparing classification methods with a reject option. In S. Deroski, P. Guerts, & J. Rousu (Eds.), *Proceedings of the third international workshop on machine learning in systems biology* (pp. 65–81). PMLR. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v8/nadeem10a.html>
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the laws of statistics. *Advances in health sciences education*, 15(5), 625–632.
- Olteanu, A., Talamadupula, K., & Varshney, K. R. (2017). The limits of abstract evaluation metrics: The case of hate speech detection. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Web Science Conference*, 405–406.
- Posner, R. A. (1986). Free speech in an economic perspective. *Suffolk University Law Review*, 20, 1.
- Rodriguez, A., Argueta, C., & Chen, Y.-L. (2019). Automatic detection of hate speech on facebook using sentiment and emotion analysis. *2019 international conference on artificial intelligence in information and communication (ICAIIIC)*, 169–174.
- Ross, B., Rist, M., Carbonell, G., Cabrera, B., Kurowsky, N., & Wojatzki, M. (2017). Measuring the reliability of hate speech annotations: The case of the european refugee crisis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08118*.
- Röttger, P., Vidgen, B., Nguyen, D., Waseem, Z., Margetts, H., & Pierrehumbert, J. B. (2020). Hatecheck: Functional tests for hate speech detection models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15606*.
- Sayin, B., Yang, J., Passerini, A., & Casati, F. (2021). The science of rejection: A research area for human computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.06736*.
- Schmidt, A., & Wiegand, M. (2019). A survey on hate speech detection using natural language processing. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media, April 3, 2017, Valencia, Spain*, 1–10.
- Social media firms faces huge hate speech fines in germany [Visited on 11/04/2022]. (2017). *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-39506114>
- Stevens, S. S. (1956). The direct estimation of sensory magnitudes: Loudness. *The American journal of psychology*, 69(1), 1–25.

- Sunstein, C. R. (2019). Does the clear and present danger test survive cost-benefit analysis? *Cornell Law Review*, 104, 1775.
- Umbrello, S., & Van de Poel, I. (2021). Mapping value sensitive design onto ai for social good principles. *AI and Ethics*, 1(3), 283–296.
- Waseem, Z. (2016). Are you a racist or am i seeing things? annotator influence on hate speech detection on twitter. *Proceedings of the first workshop on NLP and computational social science*, 138–142.
- Waseem, Z., & Hovy, D. (2016). Hateful symbols or hateful people? predictive features for hate speech detection on twitter. *Proceedings of the NAACL student research workshop*, 88–93.
- Woo, W. L. (2020). Future trends in i&m: Human-machine co-creation in the rise of ai. *IEEE Instrumentation & Measurement Magazine*, 23(2), 71–73.
- Xiang, G., Fan, B., Wang, L., Hong, J., & Rose, C. (2012). Detecting offensive tweets via topical feature discovery over a large scale twitter corpus. *Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*, 1980–1984.
- Zhu, H., Yu, B., Halfaker, A., & Terveen, L. (2018). Value-sensitive algorithm design: Method, case study, and lessons. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction*, 2(CSCW), 1–23.