Abstract

Abusive language has lately been prevalent in comments on various social media platforms. The increasing hostility observed on the internet calls for the creation of a system that can identify and flag such acerbic content, to prevent conflict and mental distress. This task becomes more challenging when low-resource languages like Tamil, as well as the often-observed Tamil-English code-mixed text, are involved. The approach used in this paper for the classification model includes different methods of feature extraction and the use of traditional classifiers. We propose a novel method of combining language-agnostic sentence embeddings with the TF-IDF vector representation that uses a curated corpus of words as vocabulary, to create a custom embedding, which is then passed to an SVM classifier. Our experimentation yielded an accuracy of 52% and a macro F1-score of 0.54.

1 Introduction

In recent times, with rapid digitisation, people are increasingly using social media and various other forums available online for interpersonal communication (Riehm et al., 2020). However, these platforms also come with their own share of drawbacks, such as the propagation of fake news (Waszak et al., 2018) and cyberbullying (Whittaker and Kowalski, 2015), to list a few.

Comments that are found to be offensive and often degrading, that may be targeted at an individual or a community as a whole, are categorised as abusive comments. These comments often have negative effects on the mental well-being of people (O’Reilly et al., 2018), with an apparent relation between the time spent on social media and increasing levels of depression (Karim et al., 2020). There is a pressing need for moderation on these websites, which motivates the creation of a system that will be able to classify abusive comments into one of many categories. It could also be useful in identifying and filtering out vitriolic content.

A major challenge faced with this task is that most of the data available contains a mixture of languages (Lin et al., 2021), with people often transliterating from their native language into English, thus posing a hurdle, as most resources available for the task of Abusive language detection are pretrained on English text.

Tamil is a Dravidian classical language used by the Tamil people of South Asia. Tamil is an official language of Tamil Nadu, Sri Lanka, Singapore, and the Union Territory of Puducherry in India. Tamil is one of the world’s longest-surviving classical languages. Malayalam is Tamil’s closest significant cousin; the two began splitting during the 9th century AD (Anita and Subalalitha, 2019b,a; Subalalitha and Poovammal, 2018; Subalalitha, 2019; Srinivasan and Subalalitha, 2019; Narasimhan et al., 2018; Sakuntharaj and Mahesan, 2021, 2017, 2016; Thavareesan and Mahesan, 2019, 2020a,b, 2021).

The Task A of Abusive Comment Detection in Tamil-ACL 2022 (Priyadharshini et al.) involves classification of purely Tamil text, whereas task B deals with the classification of code-mixed Tamil English text into 8 categories as listed in Table 1. Our approach for Task B was to create embeddings for each data record and then pass them to the various classifiers. Three types of embeddings were employed - a multilingual BERT that produces language-agnostic embeddings, TF-IDF vectorizer and a combination of both.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 is dedicated to related works obtained from the literature survey. Section 3 proceeds to describe the dataset used. Section 4 covers the details of the preprocessing steps, outlines the feature extraction process and describes the model employed for this task. Section 5 summarises the results and Section 6 concludes the paper.
| Category           | Definition                                                                 | Example                                                                 | Train | Dev |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----|
| None-of-            | Does not belong in any of the other categories                               | Bala kumar wat ur asking.? 1st olunga kealviya kealunga.              | 3715  | 917 |
| the-above          |                                                                             | Poda H cha naaye                                                       | 830   | 218 |
| Misandry           | These are comments indicating contempt against men.                         | Manickam Anbu ammauvai pathi pesurathu sari kidaiyaathu.              | 348   | 95  |
| Counter-Speech      | It is a way of undermining a harsh remark by giving alternate narratives of | kudisekiram tamilnadu china controll poidum...                        | 297   | 70  |
| Xenophobia          | These are comments that involve hatred towards people of a different culture/  |                                                                         |       |     |
|                     | country.                                                                    |                                                                        |       |     |
| Hope-Speech         | These contain sentences that include phrases indicative of hope and other    | DMKJambu Lingaa OK manaviyai mathippom. Malai pola valgaiyil uyavom.   | 213   | 53  |
| Misogyny            | These are hateful statements against women.                                 | Gh Wb u pondatti pundaila en Pola Vidasva... ungomma punda naaruthu   | 211   | 50  |
| Homophobia          | Statements with a negative connotation, targeted towards homosexuality.     | Nee Naam gay sax pannalam                                           | 172   | 43  |
| Transphobia         | Referring to those hateful comments having a prejudice against transgender  | Pitchakara Mothevinga Train la Ukkara uda maatithunga Parathesinga      | 157   | 40  |
|                     | people.                                                                    | thuu. Ithungaluku daily azha vendiyatha iruku                        |       |     |

Table 1: Description of the dataset
2 Related Works

Identification and classification of offensive tasks in a fast and effective manner is very important in the moderation of online platforms (Priyadharshini et al., 2021; Kumaresan et al., 2021; Chakravarthi, 2020; Chakravarthi and Muralidaran, 2021; Sampath et al., 2022; Ravikiran et al., 2022; Chakravarthi et al., 2022; Bharathi et al., 2022).

We explored various models to achieve the same.

Ravishankar et al. (Ravishankar and Raghu Nathan, 2017) proposed three different approaches to classify Tamil tweets based on syntactic patterns. These include Tweet weight model, TF-IDF and Domain-Specific Tags (DST), and used Tamil Dictionary (Agarathi). The authors collected tweets from 100 movies which amounted up to 7000 tweets. They proposed three other feature extraction models which include TF-IDF, adjective rules, negation rules, and adjective rules which could be passed into classifiers.

Alison P. Ribeiro et al. (Ribeiro and Silva, 2019) presented their model to identify hate speech against women and immigrants. They used pre-trained word embeddings using FastText and GloVe which they passed through a CNN network.

Younes Samih et al. (Modha et al., 2021) modelled an architecture with Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) for the task of identifying Hate Speech and offensive content. They experimented with four different approaches and combined them into an ensemble. They used FastText for the first one, FFNN architecture with four hidden layers for the second one and for the third one they created pretrained word embeddings using Mazajak method which was then passed into a CNN layer and a BiLSTM layer. Their next approach was using BERT. They combined these to create an ensemble which performed well for the given dataset.

Anna Glazkova et al. (Glazkova et al., 2021) for the HASOC 2021 task which focused on detecting offensive, profane and hate content in tweets in six languages. They proposed various models which include pretrained BERT, RoBERTa and LaBSE. Though the performance of the models were similar for the English datasets, LaBSE outperformed the others for Hindi and Marathi datasets.

Shervin et al. (Malmasi and Zampieri, 2017) used a corpus of 14.5k English tweets and modelled an approach to classify them as hate speech and non-hate speech. Their model uses character n-grams, word n-grams and word skip-grams for feature extraction which was passed onto a linear SVM classifier.

Burnap et al. in their paper (Burnap and Williams, 2014) wrote about their model - they used unigram, bigram feature extraction techniques and POS (Parts of Speech tagging), they also used the Stanford Lexical Parser, along with a context-free lexical parsing model, to extract typed dependencies within the tweet text. This was further passed to classifiers like Bayesian Logistic Regression, Random Forest Decision Trees and Support Vector Machines.

Aswathi Saravanaraj et al. proposed an approach for the automatic identification of cyberbullying words and rumours. They modelled a Naive Bayes and a Random Forest approach which obtained a greater accuracy then pre-existing models.

From the literature survey performed, it is inferred that an approach involving feature extraction using TF-IDF delivers good results and that transformer models like LaBSE work the best for Indian language datasets, with a particularly high accuracy for the Tamil language. The SVM classifier works...
well for Hate/Abusive language recognition. Although various innovative models have been experimented on in the studies discussed above, a model involving TF-IDF feature extraction, LaBSE and SVM, will be a novel approach to this task.

3 Dataset

The dataset used for the study is made up of comments made by subscribers in Tamil language, in relation to a video available on the streaming platform YouTube. The text contents were retrieved and stored following manual annotation. The text statements were organized into 8 different classes: transphobia, counter-speech, misandry, homophobia, hope-speech, xenophobia, misogyny and none-of-the-above, depending on the sentiment reflected through them. The dataset has a highly disproportionate share of expressions being brought under 'none-of-the-above' - 62% from the train dataset and 61% from the development dataset. The data distribution of the train and development datasets is depicted in Table 1. The average number of sentences in a comment is 1.42 with the maximum number being 20 and the minimum number of sentences per data point being 1. The average word count for each row is 12.092.

4 Methodology

The proposed methodology for this task involves extracting lexical and sentence features from the data and applying classifier models, such as SVM, MLP and K neighbours classifier, to them. This is illustrated in Figure 1.

4.1 Preprocessing

Tamil, a Dravidian Language predominantly spoken in the South Asian region, consists of an intricate script consisting of 12 vowels and 18 consonants that can be combined in various ways to give 216 compound characters. The sentences are arranged in the order of Subject Object Verb, and use postpositions. The main difficulty during preprocessing of the code mixed data is the use of different spellings for the same word while typing Tamil sentences in English.

Before mining the text for valuable information, the raw unstructured textual data is stripped of the noise it contains, in the form of punctuations and stop words, to produce meaningful features that might prove instrumental in classifying the samples into the eleven classes available.

1. Text normalisation: Words with different capitalisation may be considered to be different words and, to prevent that from happening, the dataset was standardised by the conversion of the text to lowercase.

2. Removal of punctuations: Since the model involves creating a corpus of the most frequently occurring words in every category, punctuations are removed. The list of punctuations from the string library was used in this process.

3. Removal of extra unwanted characters: The dataset contained a significant number of lines containing noise including emojis and iOS flags which have been filtered out, using RegEx.

4. Removal of stop words: Stop words are words in a language that are used in abundance as a part of the grammatical structure but do not necessarily add to the meaning of the sentence as a whole. These involve propositions, pronouns and articles among others. To achieve this, a curated list of Tamil-English stop words has been created and used. It includes words such as “r” (are), “ur” (your), “nee” (translates to you in Tamil) and “inha” (translates to this in Tamil).

5. Encoding: In the dataset, the data is classified into categories with textual labels. To ensure that the machine learning model is able to understand the data it is being fed, a label encoder is used on the target variable.

4.2 Feature extraction

The training dataset was first preprocessed as described in the above sub-section. Following this, embeddings of the textual data were created as outlined below.

4.2.1 Statistical feature extraction utilising TF-IDF

TF-IDF, standing for term frequency-inverse document frequency, is a method of quantifying a sentence, based on the words it contains. Each row is vectorized using a technique in which every word is essentially given a score that is indicative of its importance in the overall document.

In our implementation, a vocabulary list was first created by extracting the top 100 of the most frequently used words of each category. To ensure
Table 2: Macro-averaged Performance scores of the models deployed.

| Feature       | Classifier      | Accuracy | Precision | Recall | F1-score |
|---------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|--------|----------|
| TF-IDF+LaBSE  | SVM             | 0.74     | 0.44      | 0.49   | 0.70     |
|               | MLP             | 0.67     | 0.44      | 0.45   | 0.49     |
|               | Random Forest   | 0.68     | 0.34      | 0.39   | 0.5      |
|               | Gradient Boosting Classifier | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.53 |
| TF-IDF        | SVM             | 0.71     | 0.28      | 0.31   | 0.75     |
|               | MLP             | 0.70     | 0.41      | 0.45   | 0.52     |
|               | K Neighbours Classifier | 0.66 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.44 |
| LaBSE         | SVM             | 0.71     | 0.32      | 0.38   | 0.67     |
|               | MLP             | 0.66     | 0.38      | 0.40   | 0.43     |

4.2.2 LaBSE feature extraction

Language-Agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding, also known as LaBSE, is the state-of-the-art model in sentence embedding, and works by encoding sentences into a shared embedding space, where similar sentences lie closer to each other (Feng et al., 2020).

LaBSE proves to be a good fit for this task since it is language agnostic and is proven to work better than other previously existing sentence embeddings like Doc2Vec and SentenceBERT with regard to languages with low resources (Firmiano and Da Silva, 2021) (Zhu et al., 2021). It is trained on bilingual low-resource sentences as well and works in a way so that it maximises the compatibility between the source sentence and its translation and minimises it with the other samples.

The pre-processed training data is made ready to be classified by encoding it using LaBSE, which creates an embedding with a dimension of 700, for each sentence. The model includes 630 dense layers and 1 sigmoid layer. For this task, the laBSE model was used with the default parameters. The learning rate was set to 0.001.

4.2.3 Custom embeddings

The imbalance of data was first tackled by selecting a number of random data points such that the real life variance is still retained, but the disparity between the number of samples of each type was reduced. In this run, both LaBSE and TF-IDF encodings were used so that the advantages of both these embedding methods could be harnessed in one model.

Individual embeddings of each type were initially created using the methods as described in the above two runs. They were then appended to each other to obtain a custom embedding.

4.3 Classifier Models

Following this, simple ML models such as SVM, MLP, and K Neighbours Classifier were used to classify the embeddings obtained. They are explained as follows;

SVM, also known as Support Vector Machine works by choosing the best hyperplane such that the data classes are segregated better (Mathur and Foody, 2008). RBF kernel has been used in the SVM classifier to optimise the results.

Multilayer Perceptron, abbreviated to MLP, is a feedforward deep learning network consisting of an input layer and output layer that are completely connected to each other by paths. Hidden Layer size of 200 has been used for the optimisation of this particular model, along with rectified linear unit as the activation function.

K neighbours classifier uses the closest K neighbours and identifies the most common class found among them. This label is then assigned to the data point that is to be classified. Here, the classifier uses a value of 3 for the number of neighbours.

Scikit-learn library (Pedregosa et al., 2011) in Python was used to successfully deploy these models and the results are tabulated in Table 2.

5 Results and Analysis

5.1 Performance metrics

This task is evaluated on the Macro averages of Precision, Recall and F1-score, which computes the...
### Table 3: Results of the shared task

| Team                                | Accuracy |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| abusive-checker                     | 0.650    |
| GJG_TamilEnglish_deBERTa            | 0.600    |
| UMUteam                             | 0.590    |
| Pandas                              | 0.520    |
| Optimize_Prime_Tamil_English_Run2   | 0.450    |

### Results

The development dataset was used for the unbiased evaluation of the performance of the models that were fit on the training dataset. For this task, the performance metrics used for analysis were accuracy and macro averages, which include precision, recall and F1-score.

For each type of embedding used, SVM was found to be the best classifier and performs better with Radial Basis Function kernel than with Linear kernel, with accuracy scores of 0.70 and 0.71 respectively. From the table, we can also come to the conclusion that an SVM classifier with the custom embedding gives the best performance, with an accuracy of 0.74, outperforming the models employing either LaBSE or TF-IDF, each with an accuracy of only 0.71.

This run secured the 4th rank in Task B which used Tamil English data as is shown in Table 3. The model performed on the test set with a macro F1-Score of 0.34, a precision score of 0.33 and a recall score of 0.37.

### 6 Conclusion

This paper discusses our approach for the DravidianTechLang ACL 2022 shared task, which aims to identify and classify abusive content in Tamil-English code-mixed text collected from social media. This research contributes to this task by analysing a set of classification models for identifying various types of abusive comments. We have used a combination of embeddings using TF-IDF and LaBSE with the SVM classifier. Our results showed that using this pre-trained multilingual model along with the SVM classifier yielded better results for the code-mixed data.

This model gave us a macro F-1 score of 0.49 and an accuracy of 0.74 on the development dataset, and an accuracy of 0.520 and a weighted F1-score of 0.54 on the test dataset. In the future, we would like to improve our results by using better preprocessing techniques, which may be achieved by acknowledging and utilising the significance of relevant special characters and emoticons in the given text, instead of removing them altogether.
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