

---

# MODELING SUBJECTIVITY (BY MIMICKING ANNOTATOR ANNOTATION) IN TOXIC COMMENT IDENTIFICATION ACROSS DIVERSE COMMUNITIES

WARNING: THIS PAPER CONTAINS COMMENTS THAT ARE OFFENSIVE BY NATURE.

---

**Senjuti Dutta**  
University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Knoxville, TN  
sdutta6@vols.utk.edu

**Sid Mittal**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
sidmittal@google.com

**Sherol Chen**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
sherol@google.com

**Deepak Ramachandran**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
ramachandrand@google.com

**Ravi Rajakumar**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
ravirajakumar@google.com

**Ian Kivlichan**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
Ian.Kivlichan@gmail.com

**Sunny Mak**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
smak@google.com

**Alena Butryna**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
alenab@google.com

**Praveen Paritosh**  
Google LLC  
Mountain View, CA  
pkparitosh@gmail.com

November 2, 2023

## ABSTRACT

The prevalence and impact of toxic discussions online have made content moderation crucial. Automated systems can play a vital role in identifying toxicity, and reducing the reliance on human moderation. Nevertheless, identifying toxic comments for diverse communities continues to present challenges that are addressed in this paper. The two-part goal of this study is to (1) identify intuitive variances from annotator disagreement using quantitative analysis and (2) model the subjectivity of these viewpoints. To achieve our goal, we published a new dataset<sup>1</sup> with expert annotators' annotations and used two other public datasets to identify the subjectivity of toxicity. Then leveraging the Large Language Model (LLM), we evaluate the model's ability to mimic diverse viewpoints on toxicity by varying the size of the training data and utilizing the same set of annotators as the test set used during model training and a separate set of annotators as the test set. We conclude that subjectivity is evident across all annotator groups, demonstrating the shortcomings of majority-rule voting. Moving forward, subjective annotations should serve as ground truth labels for training models for domains like toxicity in diverse communities.

## 1 Introduction

Online platforms play a vital role in communication, creation, discussion, and collaboration. They allow users to discuss various topics by building communities with shared interests [1]. However, communities can also bring out negativity through their community members engaging in toxic behavior by spreading hate speech, using offensive language, fake news, expressing personal attacks, cyberbullying about a religion, person, group, or public figure, etc.[2, 3]. The

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/XXX>

prevalence and impact of toxic online discussions have led both industrial and research communities to combat toxicity beyond human moderation, through automated systems and sophisticated ML filtering.

Human-annotated labels are the primary empirical source of ground truth for training toxicity detection models. However, a key limiting factor in using datasets with toxicity annotations is the low consistency and reliability of the labels due to their intrinsic subjectivity [4, 5]. To gain a better grasp of the subjective nature of toxicity, let us examine an illustrative example:

*“Another great ‘zinger’. You’re an amusing fellow. I bet you sway all kinds of folks to your side of an issue.”*

If two different annotators are asked to annotate the toxicity of the above comment, they might express completely different but valid opinions. This comment could be interpreted as toxic to annotators assuming that it is harassment to the interlocutor or it could be not toxic to annotators assuming it is sardonic but not rude or disrespectful. This can have a negative impact on the fairness and accuracy of the models trained to classify toxicity due to its subjective nature. Thus, in this paper, we aim to understand the subjectivity of toxic datasets and explore the usage and limitations of toxicity annotations in model training. Consequently, this approach will aid in diminishing toxic harassment and restraining malicious posts by identifying and addressing toxic comments across diverse communities.

While the subjectivity of toxicity is acknowledged, the extent of subjectivity remains unclear when toxic comments are annotated by both expert and non-expert annotators, as well as across different annotator groups and timelines. Therefore in this paper, we investigate subjectivity through quantitative analysis. There have been many publicly available toxic datasets [6, 7, 8, 9, 4, 10]. However, these datasets are not annotated by annotators who have experience in annotating subjective datasets. Moreover, these datasets lack a crucial element, the inclusion of annotators’ rationales behind their judgments.

We fill the gap first by publishing a dataset by recruiting annotators who possess expertise in subjective datasets, whom we refer to as “expert annotators.” We explicitly incorporate the annotators’ rationales during the dataset creation process, thereby addressing the limitation above. We used two publicly available datasets<sup>2, 3</sup> along with our created dataset<sup>4</sup> for quantitative analysis in the context of toxicity. Then we model the subjectivity of diverse viewpoints using an LLM framework. To assess the model’s ability to capture individual annotators’ perspectives on toxicity, we employ two methods: (1) varying the size of the training data and (2) utilizing both the same set of annotators as the test set used during model training and a separate set of annotators as the test set. These methods allow us to thoroughly assess how well the model performs in understanding various viewpoints, especially when trained on different amounts of data and with input from a variety of annotators.

In the remainder of the paper, we first provide an overview of related work in Section 2. Section 3 presents the methodology employed and discusses the results derived from this quantitative analysis. In Section 4, we describe how we model subjectivity and detail the experiments conducted using an LLM framework. Next, we conclude with takeaways from the paper in Section 5. Finally Section 6 addresses the limitations and ethical considerations of our work, as well as broader implications.

## 2 Related work

To position our research we present a brief summary of the related work in two areas: metrics for subjective datasets, and previous work reflecting disagreement of toxicity annotation.

### 2.1 Metrics for handling annotator agreement

Previous studies have presented various metrics for measuring agreement among annotators. In the context of crowdsourcing-based approaches, inter-rater reliability (IRR) is commonly utilized as a measure to assess the level of agreement when collecting annotated data. Inter-rater reliability (IRR) is commonly utilized as a measure to assess the level of agreement when collecting annotated data. The IRR metrics encompass a wide range of coefficients, accommodating different experimental scenarios such as varying numbers of raters, rating scales, agreement definitions, different types of crowdsourcing tasks, and assumptions regarding rater interchangeability. Examples of these metrics include Scott’s pi [11], Cohen’s kappa [12], Siegel and Castellan’s kappa [13], Fleiss’s kappa [14], Byrt et al.’s kappa [15], Krippendorff’s alpha [16], CrowdTruth metrics [17], Jury Learning [18], etc. Additionally, to measure the

<sup>2</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-unintended-bias-in-toxicity-classification>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/google/jigsaw-specialized-rater-pools-dataset>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/XXX>

agreement between annotators across different groups, [19] propose cross-replication reliability (xRR) and normalized xRR.

## 2.2 Disagreement of toxicity annotation

Prior studies have examined the evaluation of toxic datasets, revealing notable instances of disagreement among annotators. For instance, in the context of labeling comments as “toxic” for Wikipedia talk page comments, annotators exhibited Krippendorff’s alpha 0.5, indicating moderate disagreement among them [20]. Moreover, [21] found that researchers who were already familiar with the definition of hate speech exhibited relatively low agreement (Krippendorff’s alpha of 0.38). When annotating the Civil Comments dataset, African American and LGBTQ groups considered comments to be more toxic than a control rater pool composed of individuals who are neither African American nor LGBTQ [4]. Similarly, a study focusing on labeling tweets on a four-point toxicity scale from a corpus of 20,000 English-language tweets revealed relatively low inter-rater agreement (Fleiss’ kappa of 0.25), even among raters who had previously experienced online harassment [22]. Collectively, these previous works demonstrate significant disagreement among annotators when undertaking toxicity tasks. However, it remains unclear whether similar types and amounts of subjectivity are prevalent for the same datasets across different timelines and also among expert annotators who are specifically trained for the task of annotating subjective datasets.

## 3 Understanding subjectivity of toxicity across three dataset versions

In this section, we first describe two publicly available datasets and then discuss our published dataset as one of the main contributions of this paper, which includes annotations from expert annotators. Subsequently, we present our task design and the analysis of the collected data. Ultimately, we delve into a discussion of the results.

### 3.0.1 Datasets

Here we explain all three datasets that are used in the paper. The first two datasets are publicly available: Civil Comment Toxicity Kaggle (CCTK) Dataset<sup>5</sup>, we refer as *2017 dataset* and Rater Pool Dataset<sup>6</sup>, addressed as *2022 dataset*. Both the 2017 and 2022 datasets are described in Appendix A). The third dataset is the one that we created and published<sup>7</sup>. We address the dataset as the *2023 dataset (expert annotators)*. These three datasets are all civil comments annotated by different annotators across three timelines.

*2023 dataset (expert annotators)*: We selected a total of 50 comments from the 2017 and 2022 datasets, where 30 random comments were bucketed by the amount of disagreement between annotators from the 2017 dataset, and 20 random comments were selected from the 2022 dataset in the same manner.

The complete annotated data reflecting 500 annotations is available publicly<sup>8</sup>. With this data release, we hope to pave the way for exploring subjectivity through an examination of the annotators’ rationales as well as the expert annotator’s perspectives. This dataset is intended to be used only for research purposes<sup>9</sup>. We discuss the details of the data collection and analysis in Section 3.0.2.

### 3.0.2 Data Collection and analysis

Two different pools of expert annotators were presented with an identical full set of 50 comments. Details about annotations are provided in Appendix B. The first pool, referred to as “expert pool 1,” consists of individuals with 5 or more years of experience working with subjective datasets. The second pool, referred to as “expert pool 2,” comprises annotators who have one year of experience working with subjective data. We recruited six annotators from expert pool 1 and four annotators from expert pool 2. We asked each expert annotator to rate each comment on the basis of toxicity as well as toxicity sub-type attributes. The task follows the same definition and Likert scale for each component of toxicity and its sub-types as mentioned in this paper [4] except for the new toxicity sub-type that we added. We present the toxicity and toxicity sub-types taken from prior work for completeness in Appendix B. Besides the toxicity-related components in the 2017 and 2022 datasets, we added one new component of the toxicity sub-type, as well as an open-ended response question for rationale in the task to understand the annotators’ thinking styles and processes,

<sup>5</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-unintended-bias-in-toxicity-classification>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/google/jigsaw-specialized-rater-pools-dataset>

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/XXX>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/XXX>

<sup>9</sup>It is especially important to note that derivatives of data accessed for research purposes should remain within the confines of research contexts and should not be employed outside of those specific settings

<i>Kappa Statistic</i>	<i>Strength of Agreement</i>
<0.00	Poor
0.00–0.20	Slight
0.21–0.40	Fair
0.41–0.60	Moderate
0.61–0.80	Substantial
0.81–1.00	Almost Perfect

Figure 1: Agreement measure interpretation for categorical data [26]

Dataset	Toxicity	Profanity	Insult	Threat	Identity Attack
2017	0.136	0.222	0.208	0.124	0.142
2022-Control	0.240	0.242	0.209	0.125	0.182
2022-LGBTQ	0.268	0.290	0.234	0.142	0.238
2022-African American	0.202	0.219	0.184	0.120	0.157

Table 1: Calculated value of IRR for 2017 dataset, 2022 dataset for three different groups for toxicity and toxicity sub-types

thereby increasing transparency and data quality. In doing this, we take inspiration from prior work [23, 24, 25]. We define this new toxicity-related sub-type and rationale as the following:

1. Leaving Discussion is described as “comments which are likely to make you leave or not want to continue a discussion”. This is measured on a 3-point Likert scale from -1 to 1.
2. Explanation is an open-ended response that is defined as “the rationale behind your judgment to choose the comment as toxic or not.”

In this paper, to better understand the subjectivity of annotations for each dataset we first calculate the inter-rater reliability (IRR) of the 2017 dataset, 2022 dataset (subgroups: Control, LGBTQ, and African American), and 2023 dataset (expert annotators). We choose to employ inter-rater reliability (IRR) as a metric to quantify the level of agreement among annotators’ toxicity annotations as this fits this specific problem. Among all existing IRR coefficients, [16] stands out as highly suitable for all the datasets utilized in this paper. Additionally, to measure the disagreement between annotators across different groups, we adopt cross-replication reliability(xRR) and normalized xRR which are based on Cohen’s kappa [19]. We measure the disagreement between all combinations of 2022 sub-groups (e.g. Control, LGBTQ and African American) and 2017 vs 2022 subgroups. In addition to that, we present the disagreement metrics among annotators selected from two different groups between all combinations of 2017, 2022 Control (here we have chosen 2022 Control as a baseline (as this group consists of neither LGBTQ nor African Americans) to represent results without any bias from any specific group), as well as expert pool 1 and expert pool 2. We describe more details of dataset transformation to calculate IRR and xRR in Appendix B. In terms of IRR, we analyze annotators’ agreement for all toxicity and toxicity sub-types to show a distribution of agreement among annotators. We concentrate solely on the toxicity attribute, disregarding the sub-types of toxicity for both xRR and normalized xRR analysis. This decision stems from the IRR result that toxicity is the most subjective attribute, and it unequivocally symbolizes the concept of toxicity across all three studied datasets. In this study, we adopt the Landis-Koch approach (illustrated in Figure 1) to refer to the absolute interpretation of IRR, xRR, and normalized xRR. This choice is motivated by the choice of metric and utilization of categorical data for toxicity annotations.

### 3.1 Result

Here we present our findings and analysis on the quantification of subjectivity using inter-rater reliability (IRR) and cross-replication reliability metric (xRR and normalized xRR).

#### 3.1.1 Quantitative Analysis using IRR

- *Highest Disagreement dataset among three datasets:* Our analysis reveals that the 2017 dataset exhibits the highest level of disagreement (IRR = 0.136) among its annotators in terms of not only toxicity but also across all other toxicity sub-types among all three datasets including 2017, 2022 sub-groups and 2023 (expert annotators)(see Table 1). The high level of disagreement suggests that there may be diverse interpretations or subjective judgments among the annotators of 2017 dataset when labeling toxic content within this dataset.

Dataset	Toxicity	Profanity	Insult	Threat	Identity Attack	Leaving Discussion
Expert pool 1	0.269	0.586	0.304	0.578	0.525	0.279
Expert pool 2	0.400	0.813	0.620	0.630	0.695	0.202

Table 2: Calculated value of IRR for both pools of expert annotators for toxicity and toxicity sub-types

Dataset	Normalized XRR Value	XRR Value
2022-Control vs 2022-African-American	0.836	0.184
2022-Control vs 2022-LGBTQ	0.818	0.207
2022 African-American vs 2022 LGBTQ	0.800	0.186

Table 3: Cross-replication reliability using xRR and normalized xRR of toxicity for all possible combinations of 2022 sub-groups

- *Disagreement Among Sub-Groups:* For the 2022 dataset we observe from our result that the 2022 African American group has the highest disagreement for toxicity and toxicity sub-types among all 2022 sub-groups (e.g. Control, LGBTQ, and African American; see Table 1). This finding sheds light on the distinct characteristics and complexities associated with the African American group’s perceptions and interpretations of toxic content within the dataset. The result suggests that there may be varying viewpoints or subjective judgments regarding what constitutes toxicity or its sub-types within a specific demographic.
- *Disagreement Between Expert Annotators:* In the case of the 2023 dataset (expert annotators), we observe that expert pool 1 demonstrates a higher level of disagreement among annotators compared to expert pool 2 (see Table 2). This discrepancy highlights the influence of the specific group of expert annotators on the agreement levels within the dataset. The subjectivity between the two expert pools could be attributed to differences in their expertise, individual biases, or interpretation variations.

### 3.1.2 Quantative analysis using xRR and normalized xRR

- *Least disagreement Group:* Our analysis using xRR and normalized xRR reveals that the two expert pools show the least disagreement compared to all other combinations. (see Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5). This indicates that annotations from expert annotators exhibit the highest level of similarity among the three datasets across different groups.
- *Differences Between 2017 and 2022 Datasets:* When analyzing the 2017 and 2022 datasets, we found that the 2017 dataset shows a higher disagreement with all sub-groups from the 2022 dataset compared to the disagreements observed within the various combinations of the 2022 sub-groups (Table 3 and Table 4). This disparity implies that the two datasets may differ significantly in terms of their characteristics or underlying factors influencing the subjective annotations.
- *Among Expert Pools:* In both the 2017 dataset and the 2022 control group, we observed that expert pool 1 exhibits a higher level of disagreement compared to expert pool 2 (Table 5). This discrepancy within the expert pools suggests that even among experts, individual differences and subjective perspectives can influence the annotation process, leading to varying levels of agreement.
- *Role of annotator’s background:* Notably, our results suggest that the 2023 dataset (expert annotators) is more similar to the 2017 dataset than the 2022 Control group. This implies that annotators’ background has a more significant impact on subjectivity than the timeline when considering these three datasets (2017, 2022, and 2023(expert annotators)).

Our overall findings from the quantitative analysis show that there is a lot of subjectivity in toxic datasets even among expert annotators. Our result shows that there are high levels of disagreement in toxicity annotations between annotators who are on the same team ranging the IRR value from 0.1 to 0.4. The disagreement is not only limited to the same team; it also affects several groups of annotators. We see a range of toxicity disagreement across different groups of annotators and time, with normalized xRR values between 0.1 and 1 (xRR values between 0.04 and 0.3). Overall the result demonstrates that not only annotators in general, but even expert annotators have a high disagreement of toxicity

Dataset	Normalized XRR Value	XRR Value
2017 vs 2022-Control	0.648	0.117
2017 vs 2022-African-American	0.664	0.110
2017 vs 2022-LGBTQ	0.570	0.109

Table 4: Cross-replication reliability using xRR and normalized xRR of toxicity for all possible combinations between 2017 and 2022 sub-groups (e.g, Control, African American and LGBTQ).

Dataset	Normalized XRR Value	XRR Value
Expert pool 1 vs Expert pool 2	1.073	0.351
2017 vs Expert pool 2	0.846	0.197
2017 vs Expert pool 1	0.728	0.139
2022-Control vs Expert pool 2	0.415	0.128
2022-Control vs Expert pool 1	0.185	0.047

Table 5: Cross-replication reliability using xRR and normalized xRR among two expert pools, among all combinations between 2017 dataset and expert pools, all combinations between 2022 Control group and expert pools

annotation ( $0.200 < IRR \leq 0.400$ ). This implies that each annotator contributes a different perspective when annotating toxicity-related comments. We then use an LLM framework to demonstrate how we model the subjectivity of toxicity. Details are shown in Section 4.

## 4 Personalizing subjectivity of toxicity annotation using LLM

In this section, we model subjectivity further by conducting experiments using an LLM to assess its ability to mimic an individual’s response to toxicity. Our experimental design is motivated by a simulation-based study that examines the structure of disagreement in toxicity-related comments, which we discuss in the following section.

### 4.1 Motivation: Simulated Toxic Dataset Experiment

Real datasets that involve both annotators and comments often contain numerous underlying attributes, such as the properties of the comment, the skill levels of the annotators, and various forms of biases. To disentangle these factors and gain insight into the data, we constructed a simulated dataset where the attributes are known in order to identify key patterns and relationships within the simulated data.

#### 4.1.1 Method

In this experiment, we first simulated a dataset using different attributes for comment and annotator (details of how we have simulated the dataset is in Appendix C). We used a total pool of 500 annotators and 5000 comments. The ratio to simulate ground truth, annotator type, and comment type in each replication is described in Appendix C. We started the experiment with the full dataset comprising 500 annotators and 5000 comments. Using WALS factorization [27] with dimension size 3, regularization of 0.1, and 5 iterations, we generated annotator and item embeddings with an associated error (refer to Appendix C). Subsequently, we conducted 200 replications for 5000 items, randomly selecting 200 annotators out of a total of 500 to annotate each of the 5000 comments, while maintaining the same error as described above. Furthermore, we examined the influence of lower replication sizes (100, 50, 20, 15, 10, and 5) under various settings (see Appendix C). Then we clustered using HDBSCAN.




Figure 2: UMAP Projection of annotator and items using full simulated data.




Figure 3: Replication 5 of items

#### 4.1.2 Result

UMAP projection of the full dataset effectively separates annotators and items (Figure 2). The replication with 200 data points replicates this distinction. However, smaller replication sizes show no significant differentiation between item and annotator space. Exploring different options (see Appendix C), we found that lower replication results in improved separation between annotators and items (Figure 3). These findings suggest that exposing the model to actual data, rather than average data per item, improves performance with small replication. Additionally, we observed from our result when using a majority vote as the ground truth, AUC decreases as replication size decreases (see Appendix C for details). However using the binary label from HDBSCAN as ground truth achieves higher AUC compared to majority voting, as shown in Figure 4. Our result shows that the model benefits from accessing raw annotations rather than relying on majority voting in order to better learn the separation between comments and annotators for small replication. Overall our findings from the simulated experiment indicate that distinguishing between expert, bad, random, and average annotators is crucial for enhancing the model’s performance.

## 4.2 LLM Experiment: Can subjectivity be personalized?

The goal of the study is to understand if an LLM can mimic annotators’ viewpoints for toxicity annotations.




Figure 4: PR Curve of Replication 5 using majority as a ground truth and using binary level as a ground truth.

#### 4.2.1 Method

We discuss the model training in Appendix D.0.1. We employ two approaches in this case: varying training sizes and two sets of annotators as test sets. In the first approach, we manipulated the size of the training data to examine how it influences LLM’s ability to learn and comprehend the unique perspectives of annotators regarding toxicity. By changing the training data size, we can understand the model’s capacity to effectively capture individual annotator viewpoints. To train the LLM, we choose training example sizes of 50, 100, 250, and 400 from a pool of 10 annotators who annotated an equal proportion of toxic and non-toxic comments. In this paper, we address these types of annotators as *balanced annotators*. We conducted the training in two different ways: (1) the model when prompted using few-shot examples [28] and (2) the model when trained via soft-tuning [29]. For soft-tuning, we treat toxicity classification as a binary Yes/No token prediction problem and train with cross-entropy loss. Furthermore, we utilized two sets of annotators for the test set. The first set consists of annotators used during model training, allowing us to evaluate the model’s performance in reproducing the perspectives it was exposed to during training. The second set comprises a completely new group of annotators, enabling us to assess the model’s generalization abilities by evaluating its understanding and adaptation to previously unseen perspectives on toxicity. We first tested the trained model (trained with the 2017 train set from 10 balanced annotators) using the 2017 dataset test split and then with the 2023 dataset (expert annotators). Finally, we evaluate the model’s performance using the formula

$$\Delta IRR = IRR \text{ with soft-tuning}^{10} - IRR \text{ with few shots}^{11} \quad (1)$$


In order to gauge the agreement between annotators and the synthetic output generated by the model, we take into account IRR and employ Krippendorff’s alpha [16] as the IRR metric. The delta between the two IRR values provides the amount of increase in the ability to mimic the annotator.

#### 4.2.2 Result

**Model performance w.r.t training size:** Our result (Figure 5 (a)) shows that the model trained with toxicity annotations performs better with more training examples (e.g. model with 400 training data performs better than the model trained with 250 training data). This suggests that an increase in training examples helps the model to learn each annotator’s perspective better and improves the IRR. It also indicates that it will be challenging for the model to learn an annotator’s toxicity annotation perspective if we have fewer than  $\sim 100$  examples.

**Model performance w.r.t test set:** Figure 5 (b) indicates that for the 2023 dataset (expert annotators), the smaller the training size, the better the delta IRR which is the opposite when the 2017 test split is used as a test set. This occurs



Figure 5: Train dataset size vs mean of  $\Delta IRR$ .

because the model is trained on the 2017 dataset with 10 balanced raters. As the training size decreases, the model’s ability to comprehend each annotator’s perspective from the 2017 dataset diminishes. Conversely, as the training size increases, the model is exposed to more data from the 10 annotators in the 2017 dataset, allowing for a better understanding of those annotators’ perspectives but a poorer understanding of annotators from the 2023 dataset.

## 5 Conclusion

In this study, we have conducted a quantitative analysis of toxicity (used IRR, xRR, and normalized XRR) to understand subjectivity by using three datasets. Notably, we have created the 2023 dataset (expert annotators) which includes annotations and rationales from 10 expert annotators. Building upon our understanding of subjectivity we model subjectivity by conducting LLM experiments. This reflects the model’s ability to learn annotators’ diverse perspectives for toxicity annotations using two approaches: varying training data size and using two different sets of annotators as the test set. Our findings highlight the presence of disagreement among both non-expert and expert annotators also across different annotator groups. This indicates that subjectivity is inherent in the task of toxicity annotation. Consequently, rather than striving to reduce annotator disagreement, it is crucial to understand subjectivity. By embracing subjective annotations as ground truth labels, we can effectively capture the detection of toxicity in diverse communities, enabling models to account for the varying perspectives encountered in real-world scenarios. When it comes to modeling subjectivity, enhancing the model’s ability to learn diverse perspectives of toxicity annotations can be achieved by increasing the training data size and employing the same set of annotators as the test set used during model training rather than using a completely new set of annotators as the test set.

## 6 Limitations, Ethical Considerations, and Broader Impacts

Although our work has yielded promising results in terms of understanding subjectivity through quantitative analysis and modeling the subjectivity of toxicity using an LLM, it is important to acknowledge the limitations, ethical considerations, and broader impacts associated with our research. These are outlined below:

First, in this work, we publish a dataset of toxicity annotations which are annotated by expert annotators. However, due to the difficulty of sourcing experts, this dataset is limited to only 10 expert annotators. Future studies should involve more expert annotators to investigate if the subjectivity and sources of subjectivity hold true for larger numbers of experts. In addition, considering annotated time for annotators 2023 dataset (expert annotators) is limited to only 50 comments. The restricted dataset size prevents the utilization of the 2023 dataset (expert annotators) for training, limiting its role to that of a test set. To enhance future research, we advocate for the expansion of the toxicity dataset by incorporating additional comments. This would enable exploration of how the model can effectively learn and reflect the perspectives of expert annotators through their annotations during training. In addition to that, we only focused on the toxicity attribute from three datasets in this paper in terms of modeling and understanding subjectivity across different groups. We suggest understanding the subjectivity of toxicity sub-types and modeling that in order to better understand the complexities associated with identifying and classifying toxic content.

One of the important ethical implications is 2023 dataset (expert annotators) is obtained by sampling the existing 2017 and 2022 datasets in this paper, complying with the terms of use of each of these datasets. The dataset is anonymized, meaning that it doesn’t include any usernames, pool identifiers, or demographic information of the individuals in the

published dataset as well as in the data which we use to train our model. Along with responsible dataset use and anonymization of participants, we also consider the broader consequences of this work and acknowledge the sensitivities of subjective spaces like toxicity. For example, while combating bias is important work towards algorithmic fairness, bias is often only implicitly represented in our data. Downstream, we can observe bias in model outputs but are less able to automate the detection of bias as a result of not having explicit demographic attributes. Practitioners and professionals have identified challenges of obtaining demographic data, but also the benefits of it [30]. While objective functions aim to generalize, we hope to see this work going beyond the average of consensus towards multi-objectives that reflect a diversity of values.

One potential risk associated with this work is there is a risk of inadvertently amplifying or perpetuating biases present in the published dataset annotations, which may lead to biased content moderation or unintended consequences in cases where the dataset is used for research purposes. It is essential to be mindful of these potential risks and carefully use the dataset.

Finally, while our work is focused only on toxicity, it offers valuable contributions to both the understanding and modeling of annotators’ perspectives in this area. Furthermore, these insights have broader implications that extend to other subjective tasks in diverse domains. These domains include sentiment analysis, irony detection, emotion detection, affect modeling, and more [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37]. Our work serves as a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners interested in studying and modeling subjective ground truth-based tasks.

## References

- [1] Shruthi Mohan, Apala Guha, Michael Harris, Fred Popowich, Ashley Schuster, and Chris Priebe. The impact of toxic language on the health of reddit communities. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 30th Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Canadian AI 2017, Edmonton, AB, Canada, May 16-19, 2017, Proceedings 30*, pages 51–56. Springer, 2017.
- [2] Ellery Wulczyn, Nithum Thain, and Lucas Dixon. Ex machina: Personal attacks seen at scale. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1391–1399, 2017.
- [3] Rui Zhao, Anna Zhou, and Kezhi Mao. Automatic detection of cyberbullying on social networks based on bullying features. In *Proceedings of the 17th international conference on distributed computing and networking*, pages 1–6, 2016.
- [4] Nitesh Goyal, Ian D Kivlichan, Rachel Rosen, and Lucy Vasserman. Is your toxicity my toxicity? exploring the impact of rater identity on toxicity annotation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2):1–28, 2022.
- [5] Kofi Arhin, Ioana Baldini, Dennis Wei, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, and Moninder Singh. Ground-truth, whose truth?—examining the challenges with annotating toxic text datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03529*, 2021.
- [6] Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmusley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 11, pages 512–515, 2017.
- [7] Hamdy Mubarak, Kareem Darwish, and Walid Magdy. Abusive language detection on arabic social media. In *Proceedings of the first workshop on abusive language online*, pages 52–56, 2017.
- [8] Michael Wiegand, Melanie Siegel, and Josef Ruppenhofer. Overview of the germeval 2018 shared task on the identification of offensive language. 2018.
- [9] Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. Predicting the type and target of offensive posts in social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09666*, 2019.
- [10] Elisa Leonardelli, Stefano Menini, Alessio Palmero Aprosio, Marco Guerini, and Sara Tonelli. Agreeing to disagree: Annotating offensive language datasets with annotators’ disagreement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13563*, 2021.
- [11] William A Scott. Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. *Public opinion quarterly*, pages 321–325, 1955.
- [12] Jacob Cohen. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 20(1):37–46, 1960.
- [13] Sidney Siegel. Nonparametric statistics. *The American Statistician*, 11(3):13–19, 1957.
- [14] Joseph L Fleiss. Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological bulletin*, 76(5):378, 1971.

- [15] Ted Byrt, Janet Bishop, and John B Carlin. Bias, prevalence and kappa. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 46(5):423–429, 1993.
- [16] Klaus Krippendorff. Computing krippendorff’s alpha-reliability. 2011.
- [17] Anca Dumitrache, Oana Inel, Lora Aroyo, Benjamin Timmermans, and Chris Welty. Crowdtruth 2.0: Quality metrics for crowdsourcing with disagreement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06080*, 2018.
- [18] Mitchell L Gordon, Michelle S Lam, Joon Sung Park, Kayur Patel, Jeff Hancock, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and Michael S Bernstein. Jury learning: Integrating dissenting voices into machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–19, 2022.
- [19] Ka Wong, Praveen Paritosh, and Lora Aroyo. Cross-replication reliability—an empirical approach to interpreting inter-rater reliability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07393*, 2021.
- [20] Reuben Binns, Michael Veale, Max Van Kleek, and Nigel Shadbolt. Like trainer, like bot? inheritance of bias in algorithmic content moderation. In *Social Informatics: 9th International Conference, SocInfo 2017, Oxford, UK, September 13-15, 2017, Proceedings, Part II 9*, pages 405–415. Springer, 2017.
- [21] Björn Ross, Michael Rist, Guillermo Carbonell, Benjamin Cabrera, Nils Kurowsky, and Michael Wojatzki. Measuring the reliability of hate speech annotations: The case of the european refugee crisis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08118*, 2017.
- [22] Mark Díaz, Ian Kivlichan, Rachel Rosen, Dylan Baker, Razvan Amironesei, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, and Emily Denton. Crowdworksheets: Accounting for individual and collective identities underlying crowdsourced dataset annotation. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 2342–2351, 2022.
- [23] Tyler McDonnell, Matthew Lease, Mucahid Kutlu, and Tamer Elsayed. Why is that relevant? collecting annotator rationales for relevance judgments. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, volume 4, pages 139–148, 2016.
- [24] Jiao Sun, Swabha Swayamdipta, Jonathan May, and Xuezhe Ma. Investigating the benefits of free-form rationales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11083*, 2022.
- [25] Keming Liu. Annotation as an index to critical writing. *Urban Education*, 41(2):192–207, 2006.
- [26] J Richard Landis and Gary G Koch. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *biometrics*, pages 159–174, 1977.
- [27] Yifan Hu, Yehuda Koren, and Chris Volinsky. Collaborative filtering for implicit feedback datasets. In *2008 Eighth IEEE international conference on data mining*, pages 263–272. Ieee, 2008.
- [28] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Nee-lakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [29] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [30] McKane Andrus, Elena Spitzer, Jeffrey Brown, and Alice Xiang. What we can’t measure, we can’t understand: challenges to demographic data procurement in the pursuit of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 249–260, 2021.
- [31] Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. A sentimental education: Sentiment analysis using subjectivity summarization based on minimum cuts. *arXiv preprint cs/0409058*, 2004.
- [32] Bing Liu et al. Sentiment analysis and subjectivity. *Handbook of natural language processing*, 2(2010):627–666, 2010.
- [33] Antonio Reyes and Paolo Rosso. Mining subjective knowledge from customer reviews: A specific case of irony detection. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on computational approaches to subjectivity and sentiment analysis (WASSA 2.011)*, pages 118–124, 2011.
- [34] Julia Hirschberg, Jackson Liscombe, and Jennifer Venditti. Experiments in emotional speech. In *ISCA & IEEE Workshop on Spontaneous Speech Processing and Recognition*, 2003.
- [35] Rada Mihalcea and Hugo Liu. A corpus-based approach to finding happiness. In *AAAI Spring Symposium: Computational Approaches to Analyzing Weblogs*, pages 139–144, 2006.
- [36] Ebba Cecilia Ovesdotter Alm. *Affect in\* text and speech*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2008.
- [37] Hugo Liu, Henry Lieberman, and Ted Selker. A model of textual affect sensing using real-world knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces*, pages 125–132, 2003.

- [38] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models, 2022.
- [39] Sid Mittal, Vineet Gupta, Frederick Liu, and Mukund Sundararajan. Using foundation models to detect policy violations with minimal supervision, 2023.

## A Public Dataset Details

- 2017 dataset: The Civil Comments Dataset consists of approximately 2 million public comments from no longer active commenting platforms. Each comment has crowdsourced labels for toxicity and toxicity subtypes such as obscene, threat, insult, identity attack, and sexually explicit. To obtain toxicity labels, each comment was shown to up to 10 annotators who were asked to rate the toxicity of each comment. Some comments were annotated by more than 10 annotators. Annotators were also asked to indicate the toxicity sub-types for each comment. This dataset is publicly available and data itself is released under CC0 license.<sup>12</sup> This dataset uses the following Likert scale for toxicity and its sub-types:
  1. Toxicity is measured on a binary scale from where 0 corresponds to Not Toxic or Unsure and 1 corresponds to Toxic or Very Toxic -2 to 1 where -2 = Very Toxic, -1= Toxic, 0 = Hard to Say, and 1 = Not Toxic.
  2. Toxicity sub-type (e.g. identity attack, insult, obscene, threat) is measured again on a binary scale where 0 corresponds to Not Toxic or Unsure, and 1 corresponds to Toxic, according to the definition of that sub-type. 3-point Likert scale, where -1 = Yes, 0 = Not Sure, 1 = No.
- 2022 Dataset: The Specialized Rater Pools Dataset consists of a total of 25,500 comments from the Civil Comments dataset. The authors of the 2022 dataset worked with two groups of annotators (“specialized rater pools”) from different identity groups, one LGBTQ and one African-American, and one control group from the general US population. They then sampled 8500 comments pertaining to each of the identity groups, measured by the identity labels of each group (control group comments reference neither identity). All three rater groups received the identical entire collection of 25,500 comments, with 5 annotators from each group allowed to annotate each comment. As a result, in total the complete annotated data including all individual annotations consists of a total of 382,500 annotations. The dataset is publicly available on Kaggle in CSV and TSV formats as the Jigsaw Specialized Rater Pools Dataset<sup>13</sup>. This dataset uses a 4-point Likert scale for toxicity, where -2 = Very Toxic, -1 = Toxic, 0 = Unsure, and 1 = Not Toxic, and a 3-point Likert scale for toxicity sub-types, where -1 = Toxic (according to that sub-type), 0 = Unsure, and 1 = Not Toxic.

## B Data Collection and analysis details

### B.1 2023 dataset (expert annotators) Annotator Details

Annotators were recruited via using email, resulting in a total of 10 annotators, including 4 females and 6 males, all of them residents of the USA. Annotators were compensated by sharing the results of the study, which proved beneficial in enhancing their work. The instructions of the task include disclaimers of toxic comments which are provided to the annotators. Prior to annotation, each participant provided informed consent by signing a consent form. Participants were aware of how the data would be used. The data collection protocol underwent ethical review board approval.

### B.2 Toxicity and Toxicity Sub-type Definition

- Toxicity is defined as “a rude, disrespectful, or unreasonable comment that is likely to make people leave a discussion”. This is measured on a 4-point Likert scale with values between -2 and 1, where -2 = Very toxic, -1 = Toxic, 0 = Unsure, and 1 = Not toxic.
- Profanity or Obscenity is defined as “swear words, curse words, or other obscene or profane language”. This is measured on a 3-point Likert scale from -1 to 1.
- Insult is defined as “insulting, inflammatory, or negative comment towards a person or a group of people”. This is measured on a 3-point Likert scale from -1 to 1.

<sup>12</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/competitions/jigsaw-unintended-bias-in-toxicity-classification/data>

<sup>13</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/google/jigsaw-specialized-rater-pools-dataset>

- Threatening describes “an intention to inflict pain, injury, or violence against an individual or group”. This is measured on a 3-point Likert scale from -1 to 1.
- Identity-based negativity is defined as “negative or hateful comments targeting someone because of their identity”. This is measured on a 3-point Likert scale from -1 to 1.

### B.3 Dataset transformation for calculating of IRR and xRR

In terms of the 2017 and 2022 datasets, we take into account 25,500 comments which are common in both these datasets. The 2017 dataset has a varying number of annotators for each comment whereas for the 2022 dataset, each group has 5 annotators. Therefore we consider random 5 annotators for each comment from the 2017 dataset. We transform the 2023 dataset (expert annotators) dataset and the 2022 dataset to binary scale since the 2017 dataset is in binary scale in order to maintain consistency and quantitatively analyze all three datasets in an effective manner.

## C Simulated Toxic Dataset Experiment Details

### C.1 Simulated dataset

To simulate a dataset, we first create an entire matrix of ratings from  $N$  annotators and  $M$  items, resulting in a fully rated dataset. We then reduce the replication to more realistic levels by randomly sampling down ratings per item. If the replication is  $P$  that refers to  $M$  items annotated by  $P$  annotators. Then we establish a set of attributes (e.g. annotator skill level and comment difficulty level). For annotators’ skill level, there are 4 attributes : (1) Expert (2) Average (3) Bad (4) Random whereas in the case of comment difficulty level, there are 3 attributes : (1) Easy (2) Normal (3) Hard. They are described as follows:

- Annotator skill level:
  - Expert: Annotators whose annotation is 90% accurate with respect to the ground truth
  - Average: Annotators whose annotation is 75% accurate with respect to the ground truth
  - Bad: Annotators whose annotation is 25% accurate with respect to ground truth
  - Random: Annotators who annotate 50% of the comments as toxic or not toxic uniformly at random
- Comment difficulty level:
  - Easy: Annotators perform at 120% of their skill
  - Normal: Annotators perform as expected
  - Hard: Annotators perform at 70% of their skill

We randomly initialize attributes to each annotator and item and use these attributes to probabilistically assign an annotation for each annotator and item interaction. We then create items and annotator embeddings using the following way We first created a sparse binary matrix of item-annotator items. Then we used WALS factorization [27] to do the dimensionality reduction to create items and annotator embeddings. Then we use HBDSCAN for clustering that.

### C.2 Ratio Details

(1) Ground truth ratio is 1:1 for toxic: not toxic (2) Annotator type ratio is 1:1:1:5 for expert:random:bad:average. (3) Item type ratio is 1:2:1 for easy:normal:hard.

### C.3 Item-Annotator Embedding

We first created a sparse binary matrix of item-annotator items. Then we used WALS factorization [27] to do the dimensionality reduction to create items and annotator embeddings. This formalizes the idea that two annotators are likely to be more similar if they both annotate the same item similarly. And analogously, two items are likely to be more similar if an annotator annotates the same item similarly.

### C.4 Annotators and Item embedding Error in experiment

Positive Train: 0.71, Negative Train: 0.72, Positive Dev: 0.75, Negative Dev: 0.76.




Figure 6: Effects of majority vote as a proxy ground truth by replication size

### C.5 Different options in the experiment to improve results with lower replication

- Scale/normalize/whiten the embedding before running UMAP: Scaling and normalizing correspond to subtracting the mean and normalizing to unit variance, while whitening means removing correlations among features.
- Reduced the dev/train error ratio: In the original run, we used 3 dimensions, reg 0.1, and 5 iterations. We tried to perturb dimensions, reg, and iterations to see the scope of improvement. We looked in the range  $\text{dim} = [2, 3, 5]$ ,  $\text{reg} = [0.01, 0.1, 1, 10]$  and iterations  $= [2, 5, 8]$  and saw that dimension 3, reg=10 and iteration = 5 work better which results in the following train/dev error: Positive Train: 0.68, Negative Train: 0.69, Positive Dev: 0.80, and Negative Dev: 0.81.
- Trying different UMAP parameters: We modified the UMAP parameter of neighbors, which was set at 15 by default. We selected 30 because lower numbers result in a more dense chain-like structure, whereas higher values (e.g., neighbors = 30) result in a less dense chain-like structure, which helps the clustering method to perform better.

### C.6 Effect of majority vote

Figure 6 shows When a majority vote is used as ground truth then the AUC decreases as the replication decreases.

## D LLM Experiment Details

### D.0.1 Model Training

We train our LLM using soft prompt tuning [29]. This allows us to efficiently tune the LLM on 10 - 500 examples. The LLM we use is the 62b FLAN-cont-PaLM [38]. We tuned a prompt consisting of 100 tokens, each with an embedding of dimension 8192 for the 62B model. We trained these tokens with a basic Adam optimizer with clipped gradients. We chose a default learning rate and schedule for all our experiments and did not tune hyperparameters further. We set the sampling temperature to 0 and fixed the prompt initialization, to reduce randomness. For each training run, we have a train, validation, and test set with balanced positive and negative classes. We train for 20-40 epochs and use a validation set to pick the final model for each run. We follow the setup described in [39] for the construction of the few shots and soft tuning. We used sklearn for accuracy metrics, whereas TensorFlow internals were used for the model training and implementation.