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Abstract

With the widespread usage of social media and effortless internet access, millions of posts and comments are generated every minute. Unfortunately, with this substantial rise, the usage of abusive language has increased significantly in these mediums. This proliferation leads to many hazards such as cyber-bullying, vulgarity, online harassment and abuse. Therefore, it becomes a crucial issue to detect and mitigate the usage of abusive language. This work presents our system developed as part of the shared task to detect the abusive language in Tamil. We employed three machine learning (LR, DT, SVM), two deep learning (CNN+BiLSTM, CNN+BiLSTM with FastText) and a transformer-based model (Indic-BERT). The experimental results show that Logistic regression (LR) and CNN+BiLSTM models outperformed the others. Both Logistic Regression (LR) and CNN+BiLSTM with FastText achieved the weighted $F_1$-score of 0.39. However, LR obtained a higher recall value (0.44) than CNN+BiLSTM (0.36). This leads us to stand the 2nd rank in the shared task competition.

1 Introduction

With the rapid growth of user-generated content in social media, the emergence of abusive language also increased dramatically (Priyadharshini et al., 2021; Kumaresan et al., 2021). This insurgeance has become a reason of worry for governments, policymakers, social scientists and tech companies since it has detrimental consequences on society (Sharif et al., 2021b; Chakravarthi et al., 2020b). Currently, we are living in an information era where social media plays a vital role in shaping people’s minds, and opinions (Perse and Lambe, 2016; Chakravarthi et al., 2021). Therefore mitigating the usage of abusive language has become extremely important (Sharif and Hoque, 2021b). Companies like Facebook, YouTube, Twitter have been trying to achieve this for years (Ghanghor et al., 2021a,b; Yasaswini et al., 2021). It is impossible to monitor and moderate social media content manually because of its large volume and its messy forms (Meyer, 2016). Therefore, it is necessary to develop an intelligent system to tackle this issue. Several studies have been conducted to detect abusive language for English, and other high resource languages (Kumar et al., 2020; Sampath et al., 2022; Ravikiran et al., 2022; Chakravarthi et al., 2022; Bharathi et al., 2022; Priyadharshini et al., 2022). In contrast, a low-resource language like Tamil remained out of focus and has much room for improvement (Priyadharshini et al., 2020; Chakravarthi et al., 2020a).

Tamil is an official language of Tamil Nadu, Sri Lanka, Singapore, and the Union Territory of Puducherry in India (Anita and Subalalitha, 2019b,a; Subalalitha and Poovammal, 2018). Significant minority speak Tamil in the four other South Indian states of Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Telangana, as well as the Union Territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands (Subalalitha, 2019; Srinivasan and Subalalitha, 2019; Narasimhan et al., 2018). Tamil, as a Dravidian language, descended from Proto-Dravidian, a proto-language, according to Bhadriraju Krishnamurti. Linguistic reconstruction implies that Proto-Dravidian was spoken about the third millennium BC, likely in the peninsular Indian region surrounding the lower Godavari river basin. The material evidence implies that the speakers of Proto-Dravidian belonged to the civilization linked with South India’s Neolithic complexes. The earliest Old Tamil documents are small inscriptions in Adichanallur dating from 905 BC to 696 BC. Tamil has the most ancient non-Sanskritic Indian literature (Sakuntharaj and Mahesan, 2021, 2017, 2016; Thavareesan and Mahesan, 2019, 2020a,b, 2021).

This work aims to build a system that can classify abusive language from Tamil text concerning...
eight different categories: Hope-Speech, Homophobia, Misandry, Counter-speech, Misogyny, Xenophobia, Transphobia and None-of-the-above. Various machine learning (ML), deep learning (DL), and transformer-based models have been used to attain this goal. The key contributions of this work are illustrated in the following:

- Developed multiple ML and DL techniques to classify abusive texts in Tamil into eight classes.
- Investigated the performance of the models to find the suitable method for the classification of abusive comments and analyzed in-depth error, providing useful insight into abusive text classification.

2 Related Work

Recently, researchers are trying to develop methods and tools to analyze social media sites like Twitter, Facebook, and Snapchat since these mediums has become integral part of our life (Anand and Eswari, 2019). Studies have already been conducted to detect abusive or offensive comments on social media (Sharif et al., 2021a; Aurpa et al., 2022; Sharif et al., 2020). Few researches has focused on other overlapping domains such as hate speech (Founta et al., 2018; Waseem et al., 2017), cyberbullying (Fosler-Lussier et al., 2012), racism/sexism (Talat et al., 2018), aggression & trolling (Zampieri et al., 2019) and so on. All of these researches primarily conducted for high-resource languages. Very few researches have been carried out to detect abusive language for low-resources languages like Tamil. Eshan and Hasan (2017) evaluated the effectiveness of RF, NB, and SVM classifiers to detect abusive language. Their system achieved the maximum accuracy (∼ 95%) for SVM with linear kernel and tri-gram features. Ishmam and Sharmin (2019) collected roughly 5000 Bengali abusive comments from Facebook and categorized them into six different classes: hate speech, communal attack, inciteful comments, religious hatred, political hatred etc. They obtained the highest accuracy of 70.10% utilizing the GRU-based model. Salmi and Sharmin (2020) collected 197,566 comments from Twitter, Wikipedia, Reedit and YouTube, where 20% of the data was hateful. They applied logistic regression, naïve bayes, support vector machines, XGBoost techniques on this dataset and obtained 0.92 $F_1$-score using XGBoost classifier. Sharif and Hoque (2021a) developed a gold standard dataset on Bengali aggressive comments from social media called ‘ATxtC’, which contains 7591 annotated data. In the subsequent work they presented a novel Bengali aggressive text dataset (called ‘BAD’) with two-level of annotation (Sharif and Hoque, 2021b). They proposed a weighted ensemble technique that uses m-BERT, distil-BERT, Bangla-BERT, and XLM-R as base classifiers to identify and categorize aggressive texts in Bengal. The model achieved the highest weighted-score of 93.43% in the identification task and 93.11% in the categorization task.

3 Task and Dataset Description

Task organizers created a gold standard dataset to detect abusive comments from Tamil social networking sites. This task aims to develop a system that can correctly identify abusive texts from a given set of texts in Tamil. We used the corpus provided by the organizers of the workshop\(^1\) (Chakravarthi, 2020; Chakravarthi and Muralidaran, 2021; Hande et al., 2021; Priyadharshini et al., 2022). The shared task required classifying a text into eight predefined classes (i.e., Misogyny, Misandry, Homophobia, Transphobia, Xenophobia, Counter-speech, Hope-speech and None-of-the-above). Table 1 reports the number of samples in the train, validation, and test sets for each class. Dataset is quite imbalanced where Transphobia and Homophobia classes have only 10 and 51 text samples, respectively. Before model development, we preprocessed the dataset to exclude irrelevant characters, numbers, symbols, punctuation marks, and emojis.

| Class            | Train | Validation | Test |
|------------------|-------|------------|------|
| Misogyny         | 125   | 24         | 48   |
| Misandry         | 447   | 104        | 127  |
| Homophobia       | 35    | 8          | 8    |
| Transphobia      | 6     | 2          | 2    |
| Xenophobia       | 95    | 29         | 25   |
| Counter-speech   | 149   | 36         | 47   |
| Hope-speech      | 87    | 11         | 26   |
| None-of-the-above| 1296  | 346        | 416  |
| **Total**        | 2240  | 560        | 699  |

Table 1: Class wise dataset distribution in train, validation and test set

\(^1\)https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/36403
4 Methodology

The techniques and methods used to detect abusive categories for given YouTube comments are briefly explained in this section. We cleaned the raw data first by stripping away noisy elements and then extracted features (Lewis, 1992) using various feature extraction techniques, including TF-IDF, Word2Vec, and FastText. We used ML and DL based techniques for the baseline evaluation. The schematic process of our approach is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Schematic process of abusive comments classification

4.1 Feature Extraction

Feature extraction is conducted prior to training the models. The TF-IDF (Nayel, 2020) values of the unigram features are calculated and used for training ML models. On the other hand, Word2Vec (Jurgens, 2021) and FastText (Joulin et al., 2017) embeddings are used as feature for the DL models. Keras embedding layer generates the embedding vectors of the dimension of 100. In contrast, a pre-trained embedding matrix is in the case of FastText embedding.

4.2 ML Baselines

In order to design the abusive comment detection system, we developed several ML-based methods such as logistic regression (LR), decision tree (DT), and support vector machine (SVM). After constructing the three models, we also use the majority voting ensemble technique to predict the abusive category of the texts. Furthermore, in search of improved performance, an ensemble approach is applied using the classifiers mentioned earlier. In LR and DT models, the C value is settled at 2, whereas SVM is implemented with a C value of 6.

4.3 DL Baselines

In the case of DL approach (Ruiz et al., 2020), we combined CNN and LSTM (Du et al., 2020) to classify a given comment. A total of seven layers is used to construct the combined model. Initially, a sequence vector of length 260 is fed to the embedding layer. Subsequently, two convolution layers are added with the ‘relu’ activation function. Features are downsampled through a max-pooling layer before passing to the BiLSTM layer. BiLSTM has 128 units, and the overfitting problem is reduced by setting the dropout rate to 0.2. Finally, a softmax layer is used to get the predictions. We also performed experimentation with pre-trained word vectors (FastText). We use the ‘Adam’ optimizer with a learning rate of $10^{-3}$ and a loss function of ‘sparse_categorical_crossentropy’. The model has been trained for 25 epochs with a batch size of 32.

4.3.1 Transformers

Considering the recent vogue of transformers, we also employ a transformer-based model. Specifically, we chose Indic-BERT as a pre-trained model is trained on the texts of various Indian languages such as Tamil, Bangla, and Telugu. We chose Indic-BERT because it has far fewer parameters than other multilingual models (i.e., mBERT, XLM-R, etc.) while achieving comparable performance (Kakwani et al., 2020). The maximum length of the input text is settled to 150 and use Ktrain (Maiya, 2020) package to fine-tune the model. The model is compiled using the Ktrain ‘fit_onecycle’ method along with a learning rate of $2e^{-5}$. Finally, the training is performed for 4 epochs bypassing 12 instances at each iteration. The implementation details of implemented models have been open sourced for reproducibility.

5 Results and Analysis

The performance of the various methods on the test set is reported in Table 2. The macro $F_1$-score measures the supremacy of the models. However, we pay close attention to the other measures such as accuracy (A), precision (P) and recall (R) scores.

It is observed that, among the ML models, the LR model outperformed the DT and SVM models achieving the highest macro $F_1$-score (0.39). The combination of CNN and BiLSTM (C+B) achieved a very low macro $F_1$-score (0.16) when trained with

https://github.com/m1n1-coder/ML-and-DL-models-of-Tamil-Abusive-Comment-Detection
Table 2: Performance of various models on the test set. Here, C+B represents the CNN+BiLSTM model.

| Methods     | Classifier                  | P     | R     | F1-score | A     |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| ML models   | LR                          | 0.38  | 0.44  | 0.39     | 0.60  |
|             | DT                          | 0.31  | 0.34  | 0.32     | 0.57  |
|             | SVM                         | 0.54  | 0.26  | 0.29     | 0.66  |
|             | Ensemble                    | 0.26  | 0.44  | 0.28     | 0.67  |
| DL models   | C+B (Word2Vec)              | 0.19  | 0.18  | 0.16     | 0.31  |
|             | C+B (FastText)              | 0.52  | 0.36  | 0.39     | 0.63  |
| Transformer | Indic-BERT                  | 0.22  | 0.20  | 0.19     | 0.69  |

Word2Vec features. Surprisingly, the performance is improved to 0.39 when we used a pre-trained word embedding (i.e., FastText). Unfortunately, the transformer model, Indic-BERT, could not provide satisfactory performance on the test set. Moreover, we conducted a thorough investigation into all of the employed models. The outcomes of the investigation is presented in Table 3. It is revealed that the LR model predicts 6 of the 8 categories with the highest $F_1$-score. This demonstrated that the LR model performed admirably and was the best model across all evaluation metrics. However, CNN+BiLSTM with FastText embedding also achieved the same macro $F_1$-score (0.39). On the other hand, the transformer model performs poorly due to the prevalence of local words across the different abusive classes.

The comparative analysis illustrates that our model (i.e., COMBATANT) achieved the 2nd position in the task (Table 4). Although we investigated various ML and DL models on the corpus, the submission included the best three models (LR, SVM, and CNN+BiLSTM (with FastText)). The LR model outperformed the other models by achieving the highest $F_1$-score.

5.1 Error Analysis

The LR classifier outperformed all models in classifying Tamil abusive comments on the shared task dataset. However, it is necessary to investigate the errors of the model in order to assess how accurately the classifier performed across the different classes. The confusion matrix is used to illustrate the errors (Figure 2). We noticed that, among the classes, Misandry and Counter-Speech contained a relatively high true positive rate (TPR). Misandry class obtained a TPR of 65.35%, whereas Counter-Speech achieved 53.2%. However, Transphobia has a TPR of 0%. With a low TPR, Homophobia class also experienced a large number of miss-classification. This lower outcome could be occurred due to inadequacy and class imbalance of data. As a result, many of the test data were incorrectly classified as None-of-the-above.

6 Conclusion

This paper presents the various models developed to classify abusive comments in Tamil. This work used three ML, two DL classifiers and one transformer-based model to perform the classification task. The LR model with TF-IDF features outperformed all models by obtaining the highest macro $F_1$-score (0.39). Although the combined CNN and BiLSTM model (C+B) achieved a similar macro $F_1$-score (0.39) with FastText features, the LR model obtained a higher recall value (0.44). Surprisingly, Indic-BERT performed poorly compared to the ML and DL models. These inferior results might occur because of the prevalence of local words, which is unknown to the model. It will be interesting to investigate how the model performs if the dataset is used in more advanced transformer models (XML-R, Electra, mBERT, MuRIL).
| Classes       | LR  | DT  | SVM | Ensemble | C+B(Word2Vec) | C+B(FastText) | Indic-BERT |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| Misogyny      | 0.42| 0.31| 0.21| 0.24     | 0.08          | 0.14         | 0.15       |
| Misandry      | 0.62| 0.50| 0.54| 0.55     | 0.28          | 0.53         | 0.42       |
| Homophobia    | 0.48| 0.42| 0.46| 0.43     | 0.00          | 0.50         | 0.15       |
| Transphobic   | 0.00| 0.00| 0.00| 0.00     | 0.00          | 0.67         | 0.03       |
| Xenophobia    | 0.29| 0.14| 0.07| 0.07     | 0.10          | 0.10         | 0.07       |
| Hope-Speech   | 0.38| 0.28| 0.15| 0.00     | 0.21          | 0.26         | 0.11       |
| Counter-speech| 0.26| 0.18| 0.14| 0.20     | 0.11          | 0.14         | 0.10       |
| None-of-the-above | 0.71| 0.72| 0.78| 0.79     | 0.47          | 0.78         | 0.49       |

Table 3: Class-wise performance of models in terms of $F_1$-score

| Team_Names         | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Rank |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|----------|------|
| CEN-Tamil          | 0.380     | 0.290  | 0.320    | 1    |
| COMBATANT          | 0.290     | 0.330  | 0.300    | 2    |
| DE-ABUSE           | 0.330     | 0.290  | 0.291    | 3    |
| DLRG               | 0.340     | 0.260  | 0.270    | 4    |
| TROOOPER           | 0.400     | 0.230  | 0.250    | 5    |
| abusive-checker    | 0.140     | 0.140  | 0.140    | 6    |
| Optimize_Prime_Tamil_Run1 | 0.130 | 0.130  | 0.130    | 7    |
| GIG_Tamil          | 0.130     | 0.140  | 0.130    | 8    |
| umuteam_tamil      | 0.130     | 0.130  | 0.130    | 9    |
| MUCIC              | 0.120     | 0.130  | 0.120    | 10   |
| BpHigh_tamil(1)    | 0.180     | 0.120  | 0.060    | 11   |
| SSNCSE_NLP         | 0.130     | 0.140  | 0.090    | 12   |

Table 4: Summary of performance comparison for all participating teams in the shared task

Furthermore, we aim to tackle the data imbalance problem by adding more diverse data to the existing corpus that might improve the model’s performance.
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