

# Think Outside the Data: Colonial Biases and Systemic Issues in **Automated Moderation Pipelines for Low-Resource Languages**





Farhana Shahid<sup>1</sup>, Mona Elswah<sup>2</sup>, Aditya Vashistha<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cornell University, <sup>2</sup>Center for Democracy and Technology

- Methodology Contributions **Research Question Provocation**
- Content moderation failures in the Global South are cast as a "data problem" of low-resource languages.
- Would moderation really improve if these languages had lots of data?
- Why there are not enough data in these languages despite being spoken by millions in the Global South?
- Why current language-agnostic technologies perform poorly in these languages?

- RQ1. What systemic barriers impact automated moderation pipelines for low-resource languages?
- RQ2. How might we improve automated moderation for lowresource languages? researchers and practitioners



Interviews with 22 AI

- Tamil (South Asia)
- Swahili (East Africa)
- Quechua (South America)
- Maghrebi Arabic (North Africa)
- Empirical evidence of systemic issues across moderation pipeline
- Theoretical contribution surfacing coloniality behind these systemic inequity

## Key Findings ( socio-political and technical issues)

Data preprocessing **Model training Data annotation** Data sources

## Lack of financial interest to invest in moderation pipelines for low-resource languages

#### Manifestations of digital colonialism

- Data restriction by tech companies to build proprietary LLMs hinder grassroots moderation efforts
- News articles that portray Muslims as terrorists are used as Arabic data sources
- Google uses **Bible translations** as data for Indigenous languages like Quechua
- Companies spend a lot for moderation in Western contexts but expect voluntary **labor** from Global South communities

**Corporate profit vs safety** 

- Lack of financial interest to recruit annotators for diverse Global South languages
- Global South data workers mostly annotate harmful content in English
- Historic lack of resources in Global South institutions hinder sustainable annotation practices

## Western centrism

- Sentiment and toxicity analysis models misclassify non-Western contexts based on Western notions of harm
- Language detection technologies overlook code-mixing in the Global South, which complicates the annotation of harmful content

## Normative assumptions in technology design

- Colonial suppression of native languages and limited support for non-Latin scripts led to code-switching, romanization, and code-mixing among Global South users
- Preprocessing pipelines treat codemixed, romanized data which are absent in English as "low quality"
- Colonial linguists perceived morphologically complex agglutinative languages (e.g., Tamil, Swahili, Quechua) as "less evolved" than Western languages
- Preprocessing techniques optimized for data-rich languages like English underperform in complex agglutinative languages that have distinct word formations than English

## Normalizing data-intense and languageagnostic approaches

- Current design of data and resourceintensive multilingual models are ill-suited to detect harmful content in the Global South
- Tech companies overlook languageaware approaches due to corporate arms race to build language agnostic models

#### Language naïve models

- X Large multilingual models fail to infer correct linguistic properties from different language families
- Al models flatten the diversity in annotation by allowing a singular label, especially for content with rich dialectical variations

## Monolithic assumptions

- Companies often use fixed list of slurs as a patching solution for low-resource languages ignoring the regional diversity
- Machine translated data for lowresource languages often rely on outdated corpora (Sheng vs. Shembeteng) and overlook dialectical variations (Tanzanian vs Kenyan Swahili)