

SUBDATA: A Python Library to Collect and Combine Datasets for Evaluating LLM Alignment on Downstream Tasks

Leon Fröhling
leon.froehling@gesis.org
GESIS
Cologne, Germany

Pietro Bernardelle
p.bernardelle@uq.edu.au
The University of Queensland
Brisbane, Australia

Gianluca Demartini
g.demartini@uq.edu.au
The University of Queensland
Brisbane, Australia

Abstract

With the release of ever more capable large language models (LLMs), researchers in NLP and related disciplines have started to explore the usability of LLMs for a wide variety of different annotation tasks. Very recently, a lot of this attention has shifted to tasks that are subjective in nature. Given that the latest generations of LLMs have digested and encoded extensive knowledge about different human subpopulations and individuals, the hope is that these models can be trained, tuned or prompted to align with a wide range of different human perspectives. While researchers already evaluate the success of this alignment via surveys and tests, there is a lack of resources to evaluate the alignment on what oftentimes matters the most in NLP; the actual downstream tasks. To fill this gap we present SUBDATA, a Python library that offers researchers working on topics related to subjectivity in annotation tasks a convenient way of collecting, combining and using a range of suitable datasets.

1 Introduction

Recently, there has been an interest in using LLMs to predict the survey responses of individual participants [2] or subpopulations [19]. To evaluate whether models are well aligned to predict survey responses of individual participants or subpopulations, researchers may simply use the large number of surveys available, as they contain all the aspects necessary for evaluating the alignment: the attributes and characteristics of the alignment target (individuals or subpopulations), as well as the "correct" responses that a well-aligned LLM should generate. For the more general, task-independent alignment of LLMs with the views held by different subgroups [1, 4, 6, 8, 10], a number of ideas for evaluating the success of that alignment have been proposed. Agiza et al. [1] and Chen et al. [4] use the Political Compass Test (PCT) to evaluate whether their models aligned to either left- or right-leaning political ideologies end up in the expected positions on the PCT map, and He et al. [10] compare the models' answers to multiple-choice questions with the positions expressed in the relevant subgroups. Most related to our conceptualization of alignment, Haller et al. [8] evaluate the models' sentiment expressed in open-ended generations when prompted about different demographics, and Feng et al. [6] explicitly look at hate speech classification, evaluating the impact of the model's alignment with different political views on its performance in detecting hate speech towards different targets.

In contrast, the evaluation of the LLMs' ability to represent individuals and subgroups on subjective downstream tasks is a much more complicated endeavor, so much so that even prominent papers in the field explicitly shy away from it: "[...] teasing out the effect of personas on models' performance is hard because of the natural subjectivity of the task" [25]. With the introduction of the




Figure 1: The SUBDATA library allows to combine relevant instances from different datasets into a single resource. In our main use case, this resource serves to evaluate an LLM’s alignment with different human perspectives by testing a theory-derived (T) hypothesis (H) in an experiment (E).

SUBDATA library, we want to facilitate the collection, combination and use of datasets suitable for the evaluation of the alignment of LLMs to different human perspectives in subjective tasks.

While there has been increased focus on subjectivity and bias in LLM annotations recently [3, 7, 15], we are not aware of any proposed resources or frameworks for evaluating the success of a model’s alignment with different viewpoints. In conceptualizing our measure, we build on the downstream-task use by Feng et al. [6]. Instead of their use of (balanced) accuracy, however, we propose to compare simple (mis-)classification rates of LLMs aligned with different viewpoints instead. Figure 1 illustrates our approach. We start with formulating a hypothesis, derived either theoretically or informed empirically. For the construct of hate speech and concerning the difference between perceived hate and desired censorship of speech, for example, Solomon et al. [20] theorize that “Democrats generally strive to protect marginalized groups (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities)”. We translate this into an hypothesis involving our “alignment target” (partisan viewpoints) and hate speech as the construct of interest: “We expect the model aligned with a Democratic viewpoint to classify more instances targeted at Black people as hate speech than the model aligned with a Republican viewpoint”. Finally, this hypothesis can be evaluated by comparing the share of potential hate speech targeted towards the specified target group (here: Black people) that is detected as hate speech by Democrat- and Republican-aligned LLMs. We note that one main advantage of this simple yet theory-grounded approach is that it does not

require any (ground truth) labels, thus circumventing the problem of having to account for the subjectivity necessarily expressed in (human) annotations for subjective constructs.

It is exactly with the described use case in mind - measuring the alignment of LLMs with different political viewpoints for the subjective task of hate speech detection - that we set out to develop the presented SUBDATA library. This use case informs our selection of datasets made available through the library as well as the mapping and taxonomy presented for the homogenization and combination of these datasets. However, we note that the resources we provide are already applicable to different alignment targets, asking, e.g., whether LLMs aligned with male and female viewpoints differ in their classification of hate speech targeted at women. In addition, thanks to the universality of our approach of evaluating the success of the alignment, the presented resources can (and will be) extended to cover additional classification tasks with subjective constructs such as the detection of misinformation, asking, e.g., whether LLMs aligned with conservative and liberal ideologies differ in their assessment of news article credibility from different outlets.

2 Datasets

As laid out above, our approach requires datasets that have been collected for a subjective construct and that carry some piece of additional information. We illustrate the choice of additional information using the example of our use case: Since we are interested in aligning LLMs with different ideological viewpoints and work on the downstream task of hate speech detection, and since we have theory implying that individuals from different ideological viewpoints differ in their treatment of hate speech targets, the additional information we require is the target of the hate speech. Only with this additional information can we evaluate whether the differently aligned LLMs differ in their annotations of hate speech for different targets. We therefore require included datasets to fulfill two conditions: first, they have to be collected for the construct of hate speech (or a related construct such as toxicity, offensive or abusive language), and second, they have to include information on the target of hate speech. Importantly, we require datasets to specifically name the group that is targeted, excluding such datasets that only carry information on, e.g., whether individuals or groups are targeted, from our scope.

For the lack of a single repository that stores and documents the properties of datasets, identifying the set of relevant datasets is an inherently difficult challenge. We started our survey of the literature from our extensive domain expertise in the area of hate speech detection, considered existing repositories of hate speech datasets such as `hatespeechdata.com` [21] and `toxic-comment-collection` [16], and tested a number of different search queries combining different variants of “target[ed]” and “hate speech” on scholarly search engines to identify related literature that might present or point to additional datasets. We searched through many publications and manually accessed a large number of published datasets until we came up with the set of ten datasets that we are now presenting here.

While we have strived to make our initial dataset collection comprehensive, we recognize that some relevant sources may have been

overlooked. Rather than seeing this as a limitation, we consider it an opportunity to build a collaborative research community focused on annotation subjectivity. We actively encourage researchers to contact us with suggestions for additional datasets that satisfy our outlined criteria to be included in the SUBDATA library.

3 SUBDATA Library

While Figure 1 gives an abstracted overview of the SUBDATA library’s basic workflow, the user-facing functionality is documented in the following subsections. Apart from the targeted hate speech datasets which we identified as relevant for our approach, there are two other important elements that we deliberately designed: the mapping from the target terminology found in the original dataset to a standardized set of targets, and the taxonomy that assigns each target into a category. In the following, we briefly reflect upon the general process we followed and some of the decisions we had to take in creating these two components. In addition, we transparently document both resources and have implemented functionality in the SUBDATA library that allows users to easily and freely modify and thus tailor them better to their individual research objectives. All code is available open source on GitHub¹ and the library can conveniently be installed directly from PyPi². Detailed documentation of the library’s functionality as well as the full mapping and taxonomy may also be found in the GitHub repository.

3.1 Keyword-Target Mapping

For the mapping, most of the decisions taken were rather straightforward and little contested, e.g., it seems logical to map both the target “Jews” found in one dataset and the target “jewish people” found in another dataset to the single target “jews”. However, some decisions were more complicated. Whether the target “africans” should be mapped to the target “blacks” or to the target “africans”, thus interpreting it as a question of origin rather than one of race, might never be definitely determined. In such cases, we tried to consult the publication corresponding to the dataset to see whether the original creators of the resource specifically mentioned one of the potential meanings. If so, we followed their example, and if not, we tried to apply reasonable judgment and be consistent throughout the mapping.

3.2 Target-Category Taxonomy

For the taxonomy, again, most of the choices were uncontested and in line with the way that some of the original datasets assign targets to certain categories. However, there are some critical decisions we had to take. Least resolvable is probably the observation that many datasets feature an LGBTQ+ target group that is not further specified, thus mixing together both gender identities and sexual preferences. In most of those datasets, this LGBTQ+ target group ended up as part of a category called Sexuality or Sexual Orientation. We are aware that by mirroring this decision we are also replicating the confusion of gender identity and sexual preference, however, there is no real alternative for our taxonomy since we are unable to divide apart the different components of this rather unspecific target group found in the original datasets. We highlight

¹https://github.com/frohleon/subdata_library/

²<https://pypi.org/project/subdata/>

Table 1: Overview of hate speech datasets, the number of instances, and target groups across target categories.

Dataset \ Category	age	disabled	gender	migration	origin	political	race	religion	sexuality
Fanton et al. [5]	0 (0)	175 (1)	560 (1)	637 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	301 (1)	1,402 (2)	465 (1)
Hartvigsen et al. [9]	0 (0)	19,631 (1)	19,563 (1)	0 (0)	62,458 (3)	0 (0)	80,979 (4)	41,014 (2)	21,344 (1)
Jigsaw [11]	0 (0)	18,602 (3)	178,266 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	94,334 (5)	132,734 (7)	29,115 (4)
Jikeli et al. [12]	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6,439 (1)	0 (0)
Jikeli et al. [13]	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3,012 (3)	2,315 (2)	0 (0)
Mathew et al. [14]	0 (0)	153 (1)	5,584 (2)	1,701 (1)	1,855 (2)	0 (0)	7,684 (5)	6,106 (6)	2,750 (4)
Röttger et al. [17]	0 (0)	510 (1)	1,020 (2)	485 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	504 (1)	510 (1)	577 (1)
Sachdeva et al. [18]	2,355 (4)	1,801 (3)	22,535 (5)	5,473 (2)	11,637 (2)	0 (0)	21,024 (7)	12,461 (8)	14,934 (4)
Vidgen et al. [23]	23 (1)	521 (1)	3,630 (4)	1,507 (2)	862 (6)	0 (0)	3,881 (5)	2,384 (2)	1,437 (3)
Vidgen et al. [22]	41 (2)	414 (3)	689 (3)	45 (2)	164 (5)	688 (7)	397 (4)	273 (4)	472 (3)
All Datasets	2,419 (4)	41,807 (3)	231,847 (5)	9,848 (4)	76,976 (11)	688 (8)	212,116 (8)	205,638 (8)	71,094 (6)

the heterogeneity of this target group by appending *unspecified* to the name of the target group, and, wherever we can, by mapping specific gender identity and sexual preference target groups into their correct categories (i.e., gender and sexuality).

3.3 Functionality

The SUBDATA library is built around a central functionality: To create datasets of hate speech targeted towards specified target groups. The `create_target_dataset` function takes as input the name of a target group, for which it then downloads and processes all of the available datasets that include relevant instances targeted at the specified group. The function returns a dataframe object that has columns with the instance id, the text of the instance, the name of the target, as well as the source of the instance. Similarly, the `create_category_dataset` function assembles a dataset of instances targeted at all the target groups subsumed in the given category.

The functions `get_target_info` and `get_category_info` allow the user to see an overview of the available number of instances targeted at given target groups or at all groups within a given category. They show a breakdown of the number of instances available from different datasets, and also inform about the availability status of the datasets - if a dataset is not openly available, the function informs how the dataset may be accessed, asking, e.g., the user to provide a valid huggingface token with the `create_target_dataset` function call or to manually upload a dataset to a specified folder.

The following functions allow for the full customization of the mapping and taxonomy introduced above. `update_mapping_specific` allows the user to change the mapping from any target keyword found in a single original dataset to a specified target group, while `update_mapping_all` changes the mapping from a target keyword to the specified target group across all datasets. `add_target` allows the user to introduce a new target group altogether, requiring a set of target keywords that are supposed to map to the new target group as well as a category into which the target group should be subsumed. Finally, `update_taxonomy` can be used to move target groups from one category into another, or to create a new category and assign target groups from originally different categories into it.

4 Use Cases

We naturally see the main use case for the presented SUBDATA library in what we built it for, the evaluation of the alignment

of LLMs with different human perspectives on downstream tasks. However, another strain of research that would likely benefit from the provided standardized access to targeted hate speech datasets is research on hate speech itself. While there has been very notable work to create a repository of hate speech datasets by [21] and to even facilitate and standardize access to them by [16], no such resource is available for targeted hate speech specifically. The need for a stronger focus on the targets of hate speech has recently been presented by [24], and by making the specified target group and not the source dataset itself the unit of interest that is ultimately downloaded and assembled, we think that our SUBDATA library is a natural fit for this emphasis on the target groups in hate speech research.

5 Future Extensions

The most logical and easiest future extension of our SUBDATA library is the inclusion of further datasets, both those that we might have missed in our initial collection as well as those that are yet to be released. Immediately connected to this, we hope to be able to build a community of researchers interested in the alignment of LLMs with different human viewpoints around this resource, which would likely help to increase the number of available datasets. Furthermore, we would like to broaden the scope of the SUBDATA library by introducing additional subjective constructs - next in line is the construct of misinformation, for which we already have an initial collection of datasets that will be made available through the library. Ultimately, we plan to introduce an alternative approach for the proposed evaluation of the LLM alignment with different human viewpoints, focusing on annotator instead of instance characteristics. We thus aspire to build the SUBDATA library into a multi-construct benchmark suite for evaluating the level of alignment of LLMs with humans on a series of downstream tasks.

References

- [1] Ahmed Agiza, Mohamed Mostagir, and Sherief Reda. 2024. PoliTune: Analyzing the Impact of Data Selection and Fine-Tuning on Economic and Political Biases in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, Vol. 7. 2–12.
- [2] Lisa P Argyle, Ethan C Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua R Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate. 2023. Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis* 31, 3 (2023), 337–351.
- [3] Tilman Beck, Hendrik Schuff, Anne Lauscher, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. Sensitivity, performance, robustness: Deconstructing the effect of sociodemographic prompting. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2589–2615.
- [4] Kai Chen, Zihao He, Jun Yan, Taiwei Shi, and Kristina Lerman. 2024. How Susceptible are Large Language Models to Ideological Manipulation? *arXiv*

- preprint arXiv:2402.11725 (2024).
- [5] Margherita Fanton, Helena Bonaldi, Serra Sinem Tekiroğlu, and Marco Guerini. 2021. Human-in-the-Loop for Data Collection: a Multi-Target Counter Narrative Dataset to Fight Online Hate Speech. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 3226–3240.
 - [6] Shangbin Feng, Chan Young Park, Yuhan Liu, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. From Pretraining Data to Language Models to Downstream Tasks: Tracking the Trails of Political Biases Leading to Unfair NLP Models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 11737–11762.
 - [7] Tommaso Giorgi, Lorenzo Cima, Tiziano Fagni, Marco Avvenuti, and Stefano Cresci. 2024. Human and LLM Biases in Hate Speech Annotations: A Socio-Demographic Analysis of Annotators and Targets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07991* (2024).
 - [8] Patrick Haller, Ansar Aynedinov, and Alan Akbik. 2024. OpinionGPT: Modelling Explicit Biases in Instruction-Tuned LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*. 78–86.
 - [9] Thomas Hartvigsen, Saadia Gabriel, Hamid Palangi, Maarten Sap, Dipankar Ray, and Ece Kamar. 2022. ToxiGen: A Large-Scale Machine-Generated Dataset for Adversarial and Implicit Hate Speech Detection. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 3309–3326.
 - [10] Zihao He, Minh Duc Chu, Rebecca Dorn, Siyi Guo, and Kristina Lerman. 2024. COMMUNITY-CROSS-INSTRUCT: Unsupervised Instruction Generation for Aligning Large Language Models to Online Communities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12074* (2024).
 - [11] Jigsaw. 2019. Jigsaw Unintended Bias in Toxicity Classification. <https://kaggle.com/competitions/jigsaw-unintended-bias-in-toxicity-classification>. Accessed: 2024-11-19.
 - [12] Gunther Jikeli, Sameer Karali, Daniel Miehl, and Katharina Soemer. 2023. *Antisemitism on Twitter: A Dataset for Machine Learning and Text Analytics*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7932888>
 - [13] Gunther Jikeli, Sameer Karali, and Katharina Soemer. 2023. *Hate Speech and Bias against Asians, Blacks, Jews, Latines, and Muslims: A Dataset for Machine Learning and Text Analytics*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8147308>
 - [14] Binny Mathew, Punyajoy Saha, Seid Muhie Yimam, Chris Biemann, Pawan Goyal, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2021. Hatexplain: A benchmark dataset for explainable hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 14867–14875.
 - [15] Matthias Orlikowski, Paul Röttger, Philipp Cimiano, and Dirk Hovy. 2023. The Ecological Fallacy in Annotation: Modeling Human Label Variation goes beyond Sociodemographics. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. 1017–1029.
 - [16] Julian Risch, Philipp Schmidt, and Ralf Krestel. 2021. Data integration for toxic comment classification: Making more than 40 datasets easily accessible in one unified format. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH 2021)*. 157–163.
 - [17] Paul Röttger, Bertie Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Zeerak Waseem, Helen Margetts, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 2021. HateCheck: Functional Tests for Hate Speech Detection Models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 41–58.
 - [18] Pratik Sachdeva, Renata Barreto, Geoff Bacon, Alexander Sahn, Claudia Von Vacano, and Chris Kennedy. 2022. The measuring hate speech corpus: Leveraging rasch measurement theory for data perspectivism. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Perspectivist Approaches to NLP@ LREC2022*. 83–94.
 - [19] Shibani Santurkar, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Cinoo Lee, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Whose opinions do language models reflect?. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 29971–30004.
 - [20] Brittany C Solomon, Matthew EK Hall, Abigail Hemmen, and James N Druckman. 2024. Illusory interparty disagreement: Partisans agree on what hate speech to censor but do not know it. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121, 39 (2024), e2402428121.
 - [21] Bertie Vidgen and Leon Derczynski. 2020. Directions in abusive language training data, a systematic review: Garbage in, garbage out. *Plos one* 15, 12 (2020), e0243300.
 - [22] Bertie Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Helen Margetts, Patricia Rossini, and Rebekah Tromble. 2021. Introducing CAD: the Contextual Abuse Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 2289–2303.
 - [23] Bertie Vidgen, Tristan Thrush, Zeerak Waseem, and Douwe Kiela. 2021. Learning from the Worst: Dynamically Generated Datasets to Improve Online Hate Detection. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1667–1682.
 - [24] Zehui Yu, Indira Sen, Dennis Assenmacher, Mattia Samory, Leon Fröhling, Christina Dahn, Debora Nozza, and Claudia Wagner. 2024. The Unseen Targets of Hate: A Systematic Review of Hateful Communication Datasets. *Social Science Computer Review* (2024), 08944393241258771.
 - [25] Mingqian Zheng, Jiaxin Pei, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Moontae Lee, and David Jurgens. 2024. When “A Helpful Assistant” Is Not Really Helpful: Personas in System Prompts Do Not Improve Performances of Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. 15126–15154.