

A Survey on Automatic Online Hate Speech Detection in Low-Resource Languages

Susmita Das¹ Arpita Dutta² Kingshuk Roy³ Abir Mondal⁴
 Arnab Mukhopadhyay⁵

¹Bennett University, India
 susmita.das@bennett.edu.in

²Techno Main Salt Lake, India
 adutta.7777@gmail.com

³Indian Institute of Information Technology & Management Gwalior, India
 rkingshuk2001@gmail.com

⁴Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, India
 abir22197072@gmail.com

⁵National Institute of Technology, Silchar, India
 arnabmukhopadhyay76@gmail.com

Abstract

The expanding influence of social media platforms over the past decade has impacted the way people communicate. The level of obscurity provided by social media and easy accessibility of the internet has facilitated the spread of hate speech. The terms and expressions related to hate speech gets updated with changing times which poses an obstacle to policy-makers and researchers in case of hate speech identification. With growing number of individuals using their native languages to communicate with each other, hate speech in these low-resource languages are also growing. Although, there is awareness about the English-related approaches, much attention have not been provided to these low-resource languages due to lack of datasets and online available data. This article provides a detailed survey of hate speech detection in low-resource languages around the world with details of available datasets, features utilized and techniques used. This survey further discusses the prevailing surveys, overlapping concepts related to hate speech, research challenges and opportunities. **Keywords:** article, template, simple

1 Introduction

In the age of social networking and the exponential growth of social media platforms, people have gained freedom of speech and online anonymity. This has propelled the transmission of hate speech [65] on multiple social networking platforms and has presently transformed into a global issue. Social media platforms have become a centre for online communications, discussions, opinion exchange and arguments. People's inclination to defend their opinions or ideologies often leads to online debates which occasionally transform into aggressive online behaviour and hate speech. Users often express their animosity in the form of hate speech by berating a certain individual or a group based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, gender, sex, skin colour or even sexual orientation[135]. Social media companies have implemented their own policies for prevention of hate speech in the cyber-space which often relies on multiple users reporting a certain post or the platform admins regulating the timelines. The evolving social networks depicts increase in prejudiced perceptions, increase speed of hate speech spread[95], delay in restrictions have posed a great challenge in counteracting against hate speech.

Online social networks produce huge amounts of data which makes manual monitoring for hate speech infeasible. This naturally leads to requirement for automatic online hate speech detection techniques. As Natural Language Processing(NLP), Machine Learning(ML) and Deep Learning(DL) approaches make great headway in multiple pragmatic solutions to real-life problems, researchers obtained motivation in analysing different methods for detecting online hate speech. Researchers have assembled multiple large-scale datasets for hate speech, mostly in English language(the most prevalent language worldwide).

Although several studies have been organized to deal with hate speech in multiple non-English languages, lack of resources has restricted extensive research. There are various other limitations apart from resource availability which have been acknowledged and require further research. Expanding on the previously available surveys on online hate speech, this paper provides an updated survey on automatic hate speech detection in low-resource languages. In this survey study, we have discussed the following issues associated with online hate speech detection, that collectively constitute our primary contributions:

1. Various categories of hate speech and their corresponding background information along with multiple approaches for online hate speech detection are explained elaborately from the existing literature.
2. The datasets for hate speech detection are studied well. Moreover, the available datasets for several low resource languages have received special focus.
3. The multiple cutting-edge natural language processing and deep learning-based techniques used in low-resource languages are analyzed to identify online hate speech.
4. The challenges encountered in identifying hate speech along with potential directions for further research have been addressed.




Figure 1: Survey Overview

The principal objective of this survey is to provide a comprehensive idea about the history of research on hate speech and a detailed account of its application in case of low-resource languages. This survey paper is organized as follows: Section 2 consists background study detailing the definition of hate speech as explained by different social media giants, categorizing hate speech and the overlapping concepts related to hate speech. Section 3 explains the search for related works and literature. Section 4 delves into the datasets available in English and low-resource languages. Section 5 expounds on automatic hate speech detection, primarily in low-resource languages. These low-resource languages have been presented continent-wise such as European, African, Latin American and Asian to bring clarity. Asian Languages have again been elaborated into Indic Languages and non-Indic languages as India has considerable spoken languages. Section 6 details the research challenges and other opportunities with Section 7 consisting of the Conclusion. The overview of this survey article has been depicted in Fig. 1.

2 Background Study

Although hate speech has existed in society for a prolonged time, detection of hate speech from the perspective of computer science is quite a recent development.

2.1 Hate Speech

Defining hate speech can be quite difficult as it takes into account complex relationships and viewpoints among different groups of people and the definition is not consistent. As of now, the international human rights law does not have a comprehensive definition of hate speech, but UN Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech has defined hate speech as follows:

“any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour, that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factor.”

Detecting hate speech is challenging as it relies on language variations. In case of online hate speech, multiple social media platforms have given their definition and policies, which are as follows:

1. **Meta:** Meta, the parent company of multiple social media platforms like Facebook, Instagram etc., has defined hate speech as follows: *“We define hate speech as a direct attack against people – rather than concepts or institutions – on the basis of what we call protected characteristics: race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, religious affiliation, caste, sexual orientation, sex, gender identity and serious disease.”*¹
2. **YouTube:** YouTube has established its policies to tackle hate speech and harassment. As per official pages of YouTube, hate speech is considered as follows: *“We consider content to be hate speech when it incites hatred or violence against groups based on protected attributes such as age, gender, race, caste, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status.”*²
3. **Twitter/X:** Twitter, presently known as X, has also provided their hate speech definition: *“You may not attack other people on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, caste, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, religious affiliation, age, disability, or serious disease.”*³
4. **TikTok:** TikTok, a comparatively recent social media platform, has issued their definition: *“Hate speech and hateful behaviour attack, threaten, dehumanise or degrade an individual or group based on their characteristics. These include characteristics like race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, caste, sexual orientation, sex, gender, gender identity, serious disease, disability and immigration status.”*⁴
5. **LinkedIn:** LinkedIn is a social media platform focused on employment and professional improvement. As per their policies, they have defined hate speech as: *“Hate speech, symbols, and groups are prohibited on LinkedIn. We remove content that attacks, denigrates, intimidates, dehumanizes, incites or threatens hatred, violence, prejudicial or discriminatory action against individuals or groups because of their actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, caste, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, or disability status.”*⁵

As depicted in Fig. 2, millions of people regularly use multiple social media platforms. It is imperative that these social networking giants implement their policies regarding hate speech to constrain the spread of these discriminatory posts and content.

2.2 Categorization of Hate Speech

The evolving definition of hate speech has included multiple elements under its blanket. Analysis of hate speech contains different categories based on the characteristics of a group that are being targeted. The prevalent categories of hate speech are:

2.2.1 Racism and Xenophobia:

It is one of the primary categories for hate speech and discrimination. This category includes discrimination of a cluster of people based on their race, country, ethnicity and skin colour. Refugees and immigrants are vilified based on their nationality and the region they belong to. Racial prejudice can be displayed by individuals, communities or institutions. Razavi et al.[121] show that racism presently also includes cultural aspects.

¹<https://transparency.meta.com/en-gb/policies/community-standards/hate-speech/>

²https://www.youtube.com/intl/ALL_in/howyoutubeworks/our-commitments/standing-up-to-hate/

³<https://help.twitter.com/en/rules-and-policies/x-rules>

⁴<https://www.tiktok.com/safety/en/countering-hate/>

⁵<https://www.linkedin.com/help/linkedin/answer/a1339812>




Figure 2: Monthly Active Users on Different Social Media Platforms[42]

2.2.2 Sexism and Gender Hate Speech:

Sexism refers to stereotyping and animosity against a person based on sex or gender. O'Brien[106] has commented that sexism can affect anyone, although the primary targets are females. Gender discrimination is a broader term where bias is displayed against people of different gender identities. Although women are primary targets, this includes non-binary and transgender people. Derogatory remarks against people of other sexual orientations like lesbians, gays and bisexuals are also included in this category.

2.2.3 Religious Hate Speech:

Another important category of hate speech is discriminating groups of people based on the religions they practice. Religious intolerance leads to stereotyping of certain religious beliefs which often leads to hostility, violence and riots.

2.2.4 Ableism:

Negative attitudes are often displayed against people with disabilities. Friedman et al.[49] have proposed these disabilities may include physical, sensory as well as cognitive disabilities. Sometimes this may include discrimination against people with certain diseases. This category of hate speech manifests from the belief that people with disabilities are somehow inferior.

Table 1: Analysis of Hate Speech Definitions in Different Platforms

	Race/Ethnicity	Sexism/Gender	Religion	Ableism	Others
Meta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Caste, Serious Disease
YouTube	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Age, Veteran Status
Twitter/X	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Caste, Serious Disease
Tiktok	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Caste, Serious Disease, Immigration Status
LinkedIn	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Caste

As observed in Table 1, social media platforms have defined hate speech as discrimination against specific groups. Most of these definitions have considered religion, race, gender discrimination, colour, ethnicity, disability. Some other criteria like serious disease, age, immigration status etc, have also been included in hate speech definition.

2.3 Correlation and Overlapping Concepts of Hate Speech

The categories of hate speech are correlated and have interrelationships among them. The extensive usage of social media have allowed the spread of abusive language online. People are often attacked on individually and harassed on the online social networks. Some concepts of these persecutions are:

2.3.1 Hate:

While hate speech is stereotyping and focusing on a particular group, hate is generally displaying aggressive behaviour for no particular reason.

2.3.2 Discrimination:

Discrimination is identifying a certain group or community and making unfair distinctions, prejudiced treatment. Hate speech is basically discrimination, but online or verbal in nature.

2.3.3 Cyberbullying:

Cyberbullying is targeted harassment of a certain individual on social media platforms. Dinakar et al.[40], Smith et al.[137] have explained that much like traditional bullying, cyberbullying involves repeated aggression towards the same individual or group of individuals.

Table 2: Hate Speech Categorization

	Race/ Ethnicity	Sexism/Gender	Religion	Ableism	Cyberbullying	Abusive
1. "He is a good person."	No	No	No	No	No	No
2. "May be he is a cheapskate."	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
3. "Why doesn't he realize he is a chunker. These clothes are not for him"	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
4. "This person with <insert skin colour>is so dirty"	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
5. "These two men are obnoxious. I don't want to see these homos"	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
6. "Never seen a <insert religion> who is a pansy ;) ."	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
7. "He is a moron. People call him THE DUMB."	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. "People from <insert country> are not good."	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
9. "People from <insert religion> should not be allowed inside."	No	No	No	Yes	No	No

2.3.4 Abusive Language:

Abusive language refers to offensive, rude and derogatory language. Abusive language includes profanities, demeaning, slanderous and swear words which evokes inferior sentiment in other individuals. Hate speech can be considered as a variety of abusive language.




Figure 3: Relation between Hate Speech and Extended Concepts

"Cyberbullying", "Abusive Language", "Hate Speech" have a lot of similarities among themselves and their concepts often overlap with each other. Recognizing and classifying online contents accordingly




Figure 4: Content Percentage of Languages on Various Social Media Platforms

can become challenging. Racial slurs, sexist terms etc. can be used to bully a person online. In this case, a particular post can be classified as both hate speech and cyberbullying or abusive. There are instances where, the message is a case of cyberbullying but cannot be regarded as hate speech. As shown in Table 2, a certain post or message can be designated under multiple categories of hate speech. As for example, in sentence-4 of Table 2, (*"This person with insert skin colour is so dirty"*) is categorised as abusive, cyberbullying and at the same time racist hate speech. Similarly, in sentence-6, (*"Never seen a <insert religion> who is a pansy ;)"*) contains abusive term ("*pansy*") and is categorised as both religious hate speech and cyberbullying. Sentence-2 contains abusive word "*cheapskate*", but it may not be categorised as cyberbullying, due to the fact that the writer of the post is just wondering not targeting the person. Again, sentence-9, (*"People from insert religion should not be allowed inside."*), does not contain any abusive language or cannot be categorised as cyberbullying. This sentence is definitely discriminating a group of people based on religion which is hate speech. These examples demonstrates that cyberbullying and abusive language can be potential determinants of hate speech, but presence or non-presence of these components does not determine whether a certain message is hate speech. As in Fig. 3, hate speech and the other related or adjacent concepts have intersections in their relationships with each other.

Due to complexities of language formation and semantics, annotation of dataset for hate speech can be ambiguous. Although abusive language has been used as a blanket term for many categories of hate speech. Van Hee et al.[146] has considered racist and sexist remarks as part of offensive language, while Davidson et al.[35] clearly distinguishes both. In case of annotations of online posts, while some posts are considered as hate speech by one research[154], those same posts are considered as abusive language in another study[105]. Thus, complex language norms as well as ambiguous dataset annotation, both contribute to complications in hate speech detection.

3 Related Works

Hate speech has been explored in multiple research topics. There are multiple studies regarding hate speech in politics, law, journalism, human behaviour etc. When it comes to computer science, studies on hate speech have been a comparatively recent trend. A substantial amount of resources are available in public domain encouraging researchers to study online hate speech. As English is the prevailing language for information exchange on the internet, most resources available are predominantly in English. Apart from English, account holders on various social media platforms have started to use their native languages for communication purposes. These native languages can be considered online low-resource languages, as considerably fewer resources can be obtained for these languages. As depicted in Fig. 4, it has been observed that English is the dominant language used in all social media platforms. After English, it is discerned that there is an abrupt decrease in the content percentage of other languages across all platforms. While Spanish is the second-most used language on both YouTube and Facebook as shown in Fig. 4a and Fig. 4b respectively, German is the second-most used language on Twitter/X as portrayed in Fig. 4c, while Arabic is the second-most used language by moderators on TikTok as shown in Fig. 4d.

The number of research articles and available datasets is not vast. In the case of low-resource languages, the frequency of articles is quite sparse. However, we accumulated a considerable number of scholarly articles from multiple digital libraries and websites.

Table 3: Keywords used for Relevant Document Search

Hate Speech related Keywords	Dataset Related Keywords	Language Related Keywords
Hate Speech Detection, Hate Speech Survey, Hate Speech Detection Systematic Review, Cyberbullying, Cyberbullying Detection, Cyberbullying Survey, Trolling	Hate Speech Dataset	Spanish, Dutch, Danish, Italian, French, German, Portuguese, Greek
Racism, Racism on social media, Racist speech, Ableism, Disability	Offensive Language Dataset, Abusive Language Dataset	Turkish, Indonesian, Korean, Mandarin, Chinese, Japanese
Sexism, Sexism on Social Media, Sexist Speech, Misogyny, Gender Discrimination, Homophobia, Transgender	Multilingual Dataset	Arabic, Swahili, Nepali, Vietnamese, Bengali, Urdu
Religious Hate Speech, Religious Discrimination	Low-Resource Dataset, Multimodal Hate Speech Dataset	Hindi, Marathi, Assamese, Telugu, Kannada, Telugu
Abusive Language, Offensive Language, Swear Words, Toxic Comments, Insults	Benchmark Dataset	Hinglish, Bengali code-mixed, Hindi code-mixed
	Code-Mixed Dataset	Indic Language, Dravidian Language, Asian Language

3.1 Method of collecting related papers

While surveying hate speech detection in online platforms, we studied the previous reviews and implementation papers. The process for collection of relevant documents have been depicted in Fig. 5.

3.1.1 Keywords Determination:

For retrieval of relevant research articles, we accumulated information from online literature databases and digital libraries like Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Science Direct etc. The concept of hate speech also encompasses cyberbullying, abusive and offensive language. During keyword selection along with 'Hate Speech', we included 'Racism', 'Sexism', 'Religious Discrimination', 'Homophobia', 'Cyberbullying', 'Abusive', 'Offensive', 'Toxic' etc. We paid particular attention to hate speech in low-resource languages. We included multiple search terms regarding the low-resource languages to retrieve a significant amount of documents to explore. An extensive list of keywords used for fetching documents have been depicted in Table 3.

3.1.2 Related Document Search:

During collection of literary documents, the research based on computer science has been kept in focus. The title of the paper, author details, research details from the abstract, datasets used, methodology implemented, the results obtained and full link of the research article are extracted and summarised. Initially, we were attentive towards accumulating papers on hate speech detection and no language restrictions were imposed. In the primary stage, the papers gathered were mostly research on the English language. We assembled the surveys and review papers on hate speech in computer science domain. These reviews and survey papers summarise the datasets, corpora and methodologies used

for hate speech detection. In later stages, our focus shifted to assembling information on low-resource languages. Our search became more specific on gathering low-resource datasets, and automatic hate speech detection articles on multiple low-resource languages around the world as well as in India. We have gathered documents from 2005 but our concentration has been primarily on research articles between 2017 to current time.

3.2 Filtering of Unrelated Documents

As hate speech has been an interdisciplinary research area, we had to be particular about the scholarly articles that were considered relevant to our survey. A lot of information obtained were either unrelated to hate speech, different hate speech categories or immaterial to computer science. Duplication of documents during the collection was managed. In case of review or survey papers, articles were carefully scrutinised. While some survey papers are based on the methods used for automatic hate speech detection, some are based on hate speech datasets and corpus. Research papers with indeterminate information were excluded.




Figure 5: Collection of Relevant Documents

3.3 Literature Review of Survey/Review Articles

Surveys and review articles are eminent means of gaining knowledge and resources regarding a particular research field. We collected review articles regarding hate speech and abusive language datasets and hate speech detection techniques. Fortuna and Nunes[47] presented a systematic review on the evolution of automatic hate speech detection in the textual field. This review has provided a critical overview of the theoretical concepts and the available practical datasets. Alkomah and Ma[10] have introduced a systematic approach of providing different available hate speech dataset details and summarisation of multiple textual hate speech detection techniques. Mansur et al.[93] proposed a systematic review of hate speech detection techniques specifically based on Twitter datasets and resources.

Review articles on low-resource languages are not easy to come across, as the amount of research regarding these languages is not abundant. Al-Hassan and Al-Dossari[4] have provided a summary on the multilingual facet of hate speech identification. Their survey has included English hate speech as well as Arabic anti-social behaviours. Jahan and Oussalah[65] have presented a systematic review of the multilingual datasets available in hate speech and an overview of the deep learning models being used. Del et al.[36] used datasets HatEval2, PAN (CLEF2021), ParlSpeech dataset, media news, and college media. The systematic review discusses lexicon-based and machine-learning techniques, including BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) and its Spanish-trained model BETO, NLTK, Stanford NLP, Word2Vec, and Freeling for various NLP tasks. It discusses the state of the art, identifies gaps, and highlights challenges in sentiment analysis for Spanish language content related to politics and hate speech. Dhanya and Balakrishnan[39] have organised a hate speech detection survey in different Asian languages. This survey includes research on low-resource Asian languages such as Indonesian, Arabic, Roman-Urdu, Sinhala, Nepali, Hindi, Bengali, Dravidian languages etc. Mahmud

et al.[90] provides an extensive review of cyberbullying detection methods being used in the case of low-resource languages. Chhabra et al.[28] presented a survey of hate speech detection techniques in multiple languages as well as multiple modalities. Pamungkas et al.[110] introduces a survey of abusive language detection methods across multiple domains in multiple languages.

Recently, an increasing number of people are using their native languages to communicate on social media platforms. Accordingly, the number of surveys on hate speech, cyberbullying and abusive words in low-resource languages has increased in the past few years. Our motivation has been to provide an up-to-date literature review highlighting the methods used for hate speech detection in low-resource languages along with the resources and datasets available in these languages.

4 Available Datasets

Several valuable resources have been identified during the course of this review. While most of the resources and datasets are open source projects, there are few resources for which permission is needed from the authors and creators of the datasets. Most of the publicly accessible datasets are present in GitHub, while a few of them are obtainable from different other repositories. Majority of the datasets have been compiled from public resources available on multiple social media platforms. The prevalent social media platform for data collection is observed to be Twitter/X, while Facebook and Reddit are dataset sources. A substantial number of studies have also considered YouTube, Gab etc. English is dominant language in which a major part of the studies have been conducted. Research have been carried out on other European languages like Spanish, French, German etc. Recently, studies on Asian languages like Arabic, Korean and multiple Indic languages are gaining attention.

4.1 English Language Datasets:

Regarding datasets, there are abundant public resources available in English. Depending on the requirements of the research, authors have collected posts from social media platforms, annotated them for binary classification or multi-label classification. Details of a few widely used English datasets have been provided below.

4.1.1 Waseem Dataset:

⁶ Waseem et al.[154] have gathered this dataset from Twitter consisting of 16k tweets. In this 3383 tweets were sexist in nature and posted by 613 users, 1972 had racist content conveyed by 9 users, and 11,559 had neither sent by 614 users. After annotating the data themselves, it was verified by third-party annotators.

4.1.2 Davidson Dataset:

⁷ Davidson et al.[35] constructed this Twitter dataset using lexicon from Hatebase.org, consisting of words and phrases with hate speech. It consists of approximately 25k English tweets which were annotated using crowd-sourcing. Each tweet was annotated into three categories: hate speech, only offensive but not hate speech and neither. In this dataset 5.77% tweets were labelled as Hate speech, 77.43% labelled as Offensive and 16.80% as neither.

4.1.3 Qian Dataset:

⁸ Qian et al.[117] accumulated their English language dataset from both Reddit and Gab which were conversational threads to preserve the context of hate speech. They crowd-sourced the intervention responses from workers at Mechanical Turk. The Reddit dataset consists of 5020 conversations incorporating 22324 comments annotated as hate speech or non-hate. Major part of the dataset with 76.6% conversations consisted of hate speech, while the others were non-hate. 7641 unique intervention responses were collected. The Gab dataset consists of 11,825 conversations and total of 33776 posts. Almost the whole dataset with 94.5% conversations consists of hate speech. 21747 distinctive intervention responses were accumulated in Gab dataset.

⁶<https://github.com/ZeerakW/hatespeech>

⁷<https://github.com/t-davidson/hate-speech-and-offensive-language>

⁸<https://github.com/jing-qian/A-Benchmark-Dataset-for-Learning-to-Intervene-in-Online-Hate-Speech>

4.1.4 Zhang Dataset:

⁹ Zhang et al.[160] collected their dataset from Twitter consisting of 2435 tweets. These accumulated tweets are specific to refugees, immigrants and muslims. In this dataset, 414 has been annotated as hate while 2021 has been labelled as non-hate.

4.1.5 ETHOS Dataset:

¹⁰ Mollas et al.[99] assembled this dataset based on Reddit and YouTube comments and validated the annotations from Figure-Eight crowd-sourcing platform. There are two-variants of this dataset: binary variation with 998 samples and multi-label variation with 433 samples. The binary variation consists of label 'isHate' and not, while the multi-label variation consists of 8 labels: 'violence', 'directed_vs_generalised', 'gender', 'sexual_orientation', 'disability', 'race', 'national_origin', 'religion'. For binary, 44.39% comments consists hate speech and in 55.61% comments there is absence of hate speech. For multi-label, 19.41% comments are for gender, 16.48% are related to sexual orientation, 11.96% for disability, 17.16% for race, 16.70% connected to national origin and lastly 18.28% for religion.

4.1.6 HateXplain Dataset:

¹¹ Mathhew et al.[96] have compiled this dataset with posts in English from Twitter and Gab which annotates hate speech based on both word and phrase level. This dataset has been annotated by Amazon Mechanical Turk workers in three labels: 'hate', 'offensive' and 'normal'. The annotators determined the targeted communities and the parts of text in these comments which explain their classification. There are a total of 20148 samples in this dataset with 9055 from Twitter and 11093 from Gab. In the dataset, 29.457% of total samples are labelled as hate (7.81% of total Twitter samples and 57.72% of total Gab samples), 27.19% as offensive (25.71% of total Twitter samples and 34.81% of total Gab samples), 38.78% as normal (63.72% of total Twitter samples and 22.57% of total Gab samples). 4.56% are labelled as undecided where each annotator chose different labels.

4.2 Low-Resource Languages Datasets:

Compilation of datasets in low-resource languages is quite challenging. The publicly available data on different social media platforms is sparse. Regarding openly accessible resources for data selection, researchers also have to consider transliteration and code-mixed languages. Several low-resource datasets are purely in a single language, other low-resource datasets are multilingual. Details of both monolingual and multilingual datasets containing dataset size, dataset link, annotation classes have been provided below.

4.2.1 Monolingual Datasets:

Monolingual datasets have been collected in multiple low-resource languages across the world such as Greek, Italian Twitter Corpus, Portuguese dataset, Indic languages. Details of these datasets have been provided below, while summary of multiple other datasets have been depicted in Table 4.

1. Coltekin Dataset:²⁴ Coltekin[30] have compiled this monolingual dataset consisting of 36232 tweets in Turkish language from the Twitter which have been sampled randomly. A major portion, 92.1% of the tweets are from unique users. A hierarchical annotation process has been followed during labelling of tweets. In the top level, the tweets are annotated as offensive or non-offensive. The offensive tweets are further identified with targeted communities and whether these are targeting individuals, groups or others. In this dataset, 80.6% are non-offensive tweets, while 19.4% are offensive tweets. From these offensive tweets, 21.18% are not targeted to any community, 25.45% are targeted to groups, 48.02% are targeted towards individuals and 5.33% towards others.

2. Beyhan Dataset:²⁵ Beyhan et al.[19] accumulated the monolingual dataset on hate speech in

⁹<https://github.com/ziqizhang/data#hate>

¹⁰<https://github.com/intelligence-csd-auth-gr/Ethos-Hate-Speech-Dataset>

¹¹<https://github.com/punyaajoy/HateXplain>

²⁴<https://coltekin.github.io/offensive-turkish/>

²⁵<https://github.com/verimsu/Turkish-HS-Dataset>

Table 4: Monolingual Datasets in Low-resource Languages

Name	Platform	Language	Size	Labels	Reference
Offensive Greek Tweet Dataset (OGTD) - 2020 ¹²	Twitter	Greek	5000	Offensive, Not Offensive, Spam	Pitenis et al.[113]
Portuguese Hate Speech Dataset - 2019 ¹³	Twitter	Portuguese	5668	Binary(HS, Not-HS), Hierarchical(Sexism, Racism etc.)	Fortuna et al.[48]
Italian Twitter Corpus - 2017	Twitter	Italian	1828	Hate, Non-Hate	Poletto et al.[115]
Italian Twitter Corpus -2018 ¹⁴	Twitter	Italian	1827	Immigrants, Not	Sanguinetti et al. [130]
PolycorpusXL 2021	Twitter	Italian	7000	Hate, Normal	Celli et al.[25]
Anti-Social Behaviour in Online Communication -2018 ¹⁵	YouTube	Arabic	15050	Offensive, Not Offensive	Alakrot et al.[5]
Arabic Religious Hate Speech -2018 ¹⁶	Twitter	Arabic	16914	Hate, Not Hate	Albadi et al.[6]
European Refugee Crisis-2017 ¹⁷	Twitter	German	469	Hate Speech, Toxicity, Threat	Ross et al.[124]
DeTox ¹⁸	Twitter	German	10278	Anti-Refugee Hate, Not Hate	Demus et al.[37]
Indonesian Hate Speech Dataset-2017 ¹⁹	Twitter	Indonesian	520	Hate, Not Hate	Alfina et al.[8]
SOLD 2024 ²⁰	Twitter	Sinhala	10000	Hate, Abusive	Ranasinghe et al.[118]
Hinglish Offensive Tweet(HOT) Dataset-2018 ²¹	Twitter	Hindi	3189	Hate, Abusive	Mathur et al.[97]
Bengali Hate Speech Dataset-2020 ²²	YouTube, Facebook, News articles	Bengali	10000	Hate(different categories), Abusive	Karim et al.[74]
L3Cube-MahaHate Dataset-2022 ²³	Twitter	Marathi	25000	Hate, Offensive, Profane, Not	Velankar et al.[152]

Turkish language from Twitter. There are 1033 hate speech tweets related to gender and sexual orientation in Istanbul Convention dataset, while 1278 hate speech tweets are connected to refugees in Turkey in Refugee dataset. The tweets have been annotated into 5 labels: 'insult', 'exclusion', 'wishing harm', 'threats' and lastly 'not hate'. For Istanbul Convention dataset, the chosen keywords and filtering process were adjusted accordingly to capture hate speech. For Refugee dataset, random sampling was performed to reduce bias during tweets collection. In Istanbul Convention dataset, 36.78% tweets are related to 'insult', 11.42% tweets are categorised in 'exclusion', 3.38% in 'wishing harm', 0.09% in 'threat' and 48.30% as 'not hate'. In Refugee dataset, 14.16% tweets are affiliated to 'insult', 21.67% to 'exclusion', 3% to 'wishing harm', 0.5% to 'threat' and 60.56% to 'not hate'.

3. Wich Covid2021 Dataset:²⁶ Wich et al.[155] constructed the monolingual dataset from Twitter compiled of 4960 tweets in German. Emphasis has been given on hate speech related to COVID-19 and 65 keywords have been used to collect the data. The dataset has been annotated into two classes: 'Abusive' and 'Neutral'. A major portion of the dataset with 3855 tweets(78%) has been labelled as 'Neutral', while 1105 tweets(22%) has been labelled as 'Abusive'.

4. Tulkens Dataset:²⁷ Tulkens et al.[144] collected a Dutch hate speech monolingual dataset with 6375 social media comments retrieved from two Facebook sites of Belgian organizations. The dataset has been annotated with 'racist', 'non-racist' and 'invalid' labels. 'Non-racist' label consists of 4943(77.5%) comments, 'racist' label is comprised of 1088(17.06%) comments, while 'invalid' label constitutes 344(0.05%)

²⁶<https://github.com/mawic/german-abusive-language-covid-19>

²⁷<https://github.com/clips/hades>

comments.

5. Sigurbergsson Dataset: Sigurbergsson et al.[136] have gathered the Danish hate speech monolingual dataset from Facebook and Reddit. It constitutes of 3600 comments with 800(22.2%) comments from Facebook page of Ekstra Bladet, 1400(38.8%) comments from Danish subreddit r/Denmark and 1400(38.8%) comments from subreddit r/DANMAG. Hierarchical annotation process has been followed where 3159(87.75%) are 'not offensive', while 441(12.25%) comments are 'offensive'. A total of 252 offensive comments are targeted where 95 are towards individuals, 121 towards groups and 36 towards others.

6. K-MHaS Dataset:²⁸ Lee et al.[86] collected a multilabel monolingual dataset from Korean news comments. It consists of 109692 utterances which have been annotated into multiple labels. The labels consists of 'Politics', 'Race', 'Origin', 'Religion', 'Physical', 'Age', 'Gender', 'Profanity' and 'Not Hate Speech'. While 59615(54.3%) utterances are 'Not Hate Speech', 50000(45%) are 'Hate Speech' under different labels.

7. Bohra Dataset:²⁹ Bohra et al.[21] collected this dataset from Twitter consisting of 4575 tweets in Hindi English code-mixed language. The data has been fetched in json format, which consists of multiple information such as userid, text, user, replies, re-tweets etc. The samples have been annotated as either 'Hate Speech' or 'Normal'. In total 1529(33.4%) comments have been annotated as hate speech and 3046(66.57%) comments have been annotated as non-hate.

8. BD-SHS Dataset:³⁰ Romim et al.[123] compiled this Bengali dataset with 50281 comments from multiple social networking sites like YouTube, Twitter, Facebook etc. A hierarchical approach has been obtained for annotation of the samples, where the samples are first identified as hate speech. Prior to that, the target and the type of hate speech is identified. In total, 26125(51.9%) comments are non-hate while 24156 (48.04%) comments are hate speech.

4.2.2 Multilingual Datasets:

Multiple international series of language research workshops have considered hate speech as a growing area of research. Along with English, these workshops have also paid attention to low-resource languages for hate speech detection. Details of multilingual low-resource datasets available in these workshops is given below and depicted in Table 5.

1. HatEval-2019 Dataset:³¹ Basile et al.[16] compiled this multilingual dataset comprising of 19600 tweets, which consists of 13000 English posts and rest 6600 Spanish posts. These hate tweets mainly targets immigrants and women. While 10509 tweets are misogynistic in nature, 9091 tweets spews hate about immigrants. The data has been annotated in Offensive Language Identification Dataset (OLID)[158] format, where the posts are initially labelled with binary classification. In following level, the hate speech is again specified with annotation whether the hate speech is against an individual or a community and whether the person is displaying aggression or not.

2. GermEval-2019 Dataset:³² Wiegand et al.[156] constructed this dataset from Twitter consisting of 8541 German tweets. The tweets are mainly concerned about the refugee crisis in Germany and have been annotated using two labels: 'Offensive' and 'Neutral'. In this dataset, 2890(33.83%) tweets have been labelled as 'Offensive' and 5651(66.16%) tweets have been labelled as 'Neutral'.

3. OffenseEval-2020 Dataset:³³ Zampieri et al.[159] compiled the multilingual dataset with five languages: English, Greek, Danish, Arabic and Turkish. There are 9093037 English tweets which becomes one of the largest datasets. In case of the other low-resource languages, the dataset constitutes 10000 Arabic tweets, 3600 Danish comments from Facebook, Reddit and Ekstra Bladet newspaper site, 10287 Greek tweets and 35000 Turkish tweets.

²⁸<https://github.com/adlnlp/K-MHaS>

²⁹<https://github.com/deepanshu1995/HateSpeech-HindiEnglish-Code-Mixed-Social-Media-Text>

³⁰<https://github.com/naurosromim/hate-speech-dataset-for-Bengali-social-media>

³¹<https://github.com/msang/hateval/>

³²<https://projects.cai.fbi.h-da.de/iggsa/>

³³<https://sites.google.com/site/offensevalsharedtask/home>

Table 5: Multilingual Datasets in Low-resource Languages

Name	Platform	Language	Size	Labels	Reference
CONAN Hate Speech Dataset - 2019 ³⁴	Facebook	French, Italian	17119	Islamophobic, Non-Islamophobic	Chung et al.[29]
MLMA Hate Speech Dataset - 2019 ³⁵	Twitter	French, Arabic	4014, 3353	Gender, Sexual orientation, Religion, Disability	Ousidhoum et al. [108]
HASOC-2019 ³⁶	Twitter, Facebook	Hindi, German	5983, 4669	Hate, Offensive or Neither, Profane, Targeted or Untargeted	Mandl et al.[91]
HASOC-2021 ³⁷	Twitter, Facebook	Hindi, English, Marathi	4594, 3843, 1874	Hate, Offensive or Neither, Profane, Targeted or Untargeted	Modha et al.[98]

4.3 Multimodal Datasets:

As social media platforms have incorporated multiple mediums of communication, hate speech and offensive language is also not only limited to texts. Audio, video and images have been used to spread hate speech on different platforms. Researchers have started incorporating every modality for hate speech detection. Details of some multimodal hate speech datasets are provided below.

4.3.1 MMHS150K Dataset:

³⁸ Gomez et al.[56] compiled this dataset from Twitter consisting of 150000 tweets in both textual and visual mode. Tweets containing less than three words and retweets have been filtered out. Tweets containing screenshots of other tweets are also not considered. Tweets have been annotated by Amazon Mechanical Turk with 6 labels: 'no attacks to any community', 'religion based attacks', 'attacks to other communities', 'racist', 'homophobic' and 'sexist'. In this dataset, 112845 (75.23%) are not hate tweets, while 36978 (24.65%) are hate tweets. Among hate tweets, 163 (0.44%) are religion-based hate, 11925 (32.24%) are racist, 3870 (10.46%) are homophobic, 3495 (9.45%) are sexist and 5811 (15.71%) are other hate tweets.

4.3.2 HATEFUL MEMES Dataset:

³⁹ Kiela et al.[81] of Facebook AI have created this multimodal dataset consisting of 10k memes. A text or a meme can be harmless in itself, but when these two are combined it can become hate speech. If the text or the image in itself is non-hate, then it has been defined by the authors as benign confounder. The memes have been annotated into following classes: benign text confounder, benign image confounder, multimodal hate (benign confounders were found for both modalities), unimodal hate (one or both modalities were already hateful on their own) and random non-hateful. A Cohen's kappa score of 67.2% has been obtained for this dataset.

4.3.3 Russia-Ukraine Dataset:

⁴⁰ Thapa et al.[143] compiled the multimodal hate speech dataset from Twitter based on the Russia-Ukraine war. The dataset consists of 5680 text-image pairs of tweets and has been labelled with a binary class: 'hate' or 'no-hate'. While a majority of the dataset with 4934 samples(86.86%) have been annotated as 'no-hate', only 746(13.13%) samples have been annotated as 'hate'.

4.3.4 Perifanos Dataset:

Perifanos et al.[112] collected this multimodal dataset from Twitter which consists of approximately 4004 annotated tweets in total. This dataset has been accumulated based on Greek tweets targeting undocumented immigrants and people who have been deported. Here, 1040(25.97%) have been annotated as toxic and 2964(74.02%) have been labelled as non-toxic tweets.

³⁸<https://gombu.github.io/2019/10/09/MMHS/>

³⁹<https://hatefulmemeschallenge.com/>

⁴⁰<https://github.com/Farhan-jafri/Russia-Ukraine>

4.3.5 MUTE Dataset:

⁴¹ Hossain et al.[61] accumulated a multimodal hateful memes dataset with captions in Bengali or code-mixed(Bengali+English) language. This dataset consists of 4158 memes which has been labelled as either Hate or Not-Hate. Memes have been collected manually from multiple social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and Instagram. Keywords such as Bengali Memes, Bangla Funny Memes etc have been used during the manual search. While, 2572 (61.85%) samples have been annotated as Not-Hate, 1586 (38.14%) samples have been annotated as Hate.

5 Automatic Hate Speech Detection for Different Languages






Figure 6: Action Taken Against Hate Posts on Meta Platforms[38][41]

The rampant utilisation of hate speech has become a bother in various online communities. Social media platforms encourage users to inform and reveal any hate speech encountered online and action is taken against the posts according to company policy. As depicted in Fig. 6, Meta has released the count of hate speech content deletion on both Facebook and Instagram in different quarters. In a global survey across 16 countries conducted by IPSOS and UNESCO, it has been observed that most hate speech is experienced on Facebook. At the same time, LGBT community is the most targeted community in hate speech. The details of hate speech encountered on various social media platforms has been depicted in Fig. 7a. The frequently attacked communities on social media are shown in Fig. 7b.

⁴¹<https://github.com/eftekhar-hossain/MUTE-AAACL22>



(a) Average Percentage of Hate Speech Encountered on Social Media



(b) Average Percentage of Targeted Communities

Figure 7: Hate Speech on Social Media across 16 countries[63]

5.1 English

English is the most spoken language globally, which makes it a dominant language for communication. When it comes to social media platforms, websites, most people utilise English while conveying their opinions. In case of research related to hate speech and abusive words, English is majorly studied because of multiple reasons. The data available from public sites are majorly in English, which leads to considerable number of benchmark datasets. The NLP techniques and parsers developed for English motivated researchers to investigate hate speech detection and conducting comparable studies focusing on the dominant language. Few of them have been explored in this survey.

Ghosh et al.[55] introduced a English tweets based multi-domain hate speech corpus (MHC) which is compiled using tweets related to diverse domains such as natural disasters, terrorism, technology, and human/drugs trafficking. The dataset contains 10242 samples collected from Twitter having balanced distribution with hate and non hate classes. Using multiple deep learning methods, the authors developed their own classifier named SEHC for binary classification of hate speech. Caselli et al.[22] proposes HateBERT which has been re-trained for detection of offensive language in English. A large scale English Reddit comments dataset RAL-E has been used to provide the comparative results with general BERT model, where abusive language inclined HateBERT performed better. Saleh et al.[128] proposed employing domain-specific word embedding and BiLSTM for hate speech detection in English. The hate speech corpus consists of 1048563 sentences depending on which the word embedding is built. Roy et al.[126] proposes DCNN model which employs GloVe embedding vector to represent semantics of the posts and eventually hate speech detection. It achieved a precision of 0.97, recall of 0.88 and F1-score of 0.92 for the best case and outperformed the existing models. Rottger et al.[125]proposes HATECHECK which covers model functionalities and compare them with transformer models. Ahluwalia et al.[2] focuses on misogyny detection with hate tweets directed towards women in tweets that are written in English. Authors have used binary classification using ML techniques for Automatic Misogyny Identification (AMI) at EVALITA2018.

5.2 Low-Resource Languages

While there are more than 7000 spoken languages worldwide, English is considered the standard language internationally. As a result, most research and applications are based on the English language. Supporting toolkits for language preprocessing and cleaning are developed with English as a model language. Research in all the other languages has been initially sparse with researchers providing insignificant attention to these languages. Therefore, except for English, we have considered all the other languages as low-resource languages. This includes European, Asian, African as well as Latin-American languages.

5.2.1 European Low-Resource Languages:

Among the different European languages, apart from English, substantial research has been conducted on Western and South-western European languages like Spanish, German, French, etc. as well as Scandinavian languages which include Swedish, Norwegian etc.

Spanish: Deep learning techniques have been used to detect hate speech in Spanish. Manolescu et al.[92] introduce an LSTM model with an embedding layer and character-based representations for Spanish hate speech detection. The Spanish Twitter dataset contains 5000 posts, manually labelled as hate or not, aggressive and targeted. The model achieved an F1-Score of 0.617 for Subtask A and 0.612 for Subtask B. Castillo et al.[23] used several datasets MisoCorpus-2020, DetMis, IberEval2018, including new Twitter dataset named HaSCoSVA-2022 to cover different variants of Spanish. For their transfer learning architecture, the study utilized mBERT and a monolingual Spanish Bert-based language model named BETO. Performance of these models on different variants of Spanish has been compared. The results indicated that models trained for a specific Spanish variant were impacted when multiple variations of the language were ignored. Plaza et al.[114] uses the HaterNet dataset to evaluate Deep Learning methods and LR, and Transformer mechanism-based pre-trained Language Models that include BERT, BETO, and XLM. The pre-trained Transformer-based language models, provide the finest results.

French: Automated racist speech detection is implemented using supervised machine learning models. Vanetik et al.[147] proposes dataset named FTR(French Twitter Racist speech dataset) and performs cross-lingual experiments to test the effectiveness of transfer learning. It confirms that cross-lingual transfer learning is inefficient for detecting racism in French. Battistelli et al.[17] developed a formal model based on cognitive foundations of appraisal theory, linguistic models of modalities in textual data,

and various definitions of hate speech. The model identifies hate targets and actions for online communities, emphasizing the significance of context in online hate detection.

Dutch: Markov et al.[94] evaluates models using two Dutch social media datasets: LiLaH (Facebook comments) and DALC (tweets). Ensemble method is introduced by combining gradient boosting with transformer-based language models (BERTje and RobBERT) and SVM, along with additional features like hateful words, personal pronouns, and message length. The ensemble approach significantly surpasses independent models in both in-domain and cross-domain hate speech detection settings, providing insights into challenges in Dutch hate speech detection.

Polish: Ptaszynski et al.[116] introduced a dataset for research on cyberbullying in Polish. This dataset has been segregated into binary classification and multi-class classification. This dataset has been collected from Twitter with more than 11k tweets. Korzeniowski et al.[83] discusses the challenges faced in hate speech detection using supervised learning due to the scarcity of annotated data. Authors have used unsupervised techniques like fine-tuning of pre-trained BERT and ULMFiT model and have proposed a Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for finding the optimal solution.

Austrian German: Pachinger et al.[109] introduced a dataset named *Austrotox* which has been collected from an Austrian newspaper named 'DerStandard'. This newspaper reports on multiple topics, both national and international. The authors have filtered out 123108 comments with Austrian dialect on the website of this newspaper. Toxicity score has been assigned to the comments where 873 posts have been categorized as severely toxic, while other posts have lower level of toxicity.

German: Different NLP techniques have been used for hate speech detection in German. Eder et al.[44] proposed an approach that includes a workflow for data-driven acquisition and semantic scaling of a lexicon covering rough, vulgar, or obscene terms. They applied best-worst scaling for rating obscenity and used distributional semantics for automatic lexical enlargement. They have used German slice of Wiktionary, OpenThesaurus, and corpora like CODE ALLTAGS+d email corpus, DORTMUNDER CHAT KORPUS, and FASTTEXT word embeddings based on COMMON CRAWL and WIKIPEDIA. They performed manual editing and utilized distributional semantics methods for lexical expansion. Jaki et al.[68] have analyzed more than 50k German hate tweets during the 2017 German federal elections. The authors collected right-wing German Twitter users with subversive profiles. They conduct a comprehensive analysis of characteristics typical of right-wing hate speech, such as the use of derogatory language, dissemination of misinformation, and incitement to violence.

Norwegian: Hashmi et al.[60] categorized the dataset into five distinct classes based on the intensity of hate speech, compiled from Facebook, Twitter, and Rreset. The paper presents a deep learning approach with GRU and BiLSTM using FastText word embeddings, forming the FAST-RNN model. It also discusses the implementation of multilingual transformer-based models with hyperparameter tuning and generative configuration for Norwegian hate speech detection. The FAST-RNN model outperformed other deep learning models and achieved a high Macro F1-Score.

Finnish: Jahan et al.[67] have used a Finnish annotated hate speech dataset collected from the Suomi24 forum. It contains 10.7k sentences with 16.7% identified as hate speech. The approach includes experiments with the FinBERT pre-trained model and Convolution Neural Network (CNN). They compared FinBERT's performance with multilingual-BERT (mBERT) and other models using fastText embeddings. Feature engineering strategies like TF-IDF and n-grams were also applied. FinBERT achieved 91.7% accuracy and 90.8% F1 score, outperforming all other models including mBERT and CNN with fastText embeddings.

Swedish: Fernquist et al.[46] proposed automatic hate detection techniques from digital media. Specifically, the language models for Swedish hate speech are fine-tuned and the results are examined based on the pre-trained models. The authors collected labelled data from Swedish online forums like Avpixlat, Flashback, Familjeliv etc and curated 17330 posts. Authors chose comments with entities as hateful comments are often directed towards communities or persons.

5.2.2 Latin-American Low Resource Languages:

In the Latin American region, substantial work has been organized in Portuguese language used in Brazil. Considerable research on hate speech has been conducted in Latin American Spanish spoken across multiple Latin-American countries.

Brazilian Portuguese: Multiple datasets like HateBR corpus[148] and ToLD-Br[88] have been collected from Brazilian politicians' Instagram accounts, manually annotated by specialists. HateBR discusses a multi-layer annotation schema for detecting hate speech and offensive language, including classification of offensive and non-offensive, level of offensiveness classification such as high, moderate, and slight

offensive, and nine hate speech categories. The baseline experiments on the HateBR corpus achieved an F1-score of 85%, surpassing the current state-of-the-art for the Portuguese language. ToLD-Br is manually annotated into seven categories and discusses the use of state-of-the-art BERT models for binary classification of toxic comments. Monolingual BERT models trained on Brazilian Portuguese and Multilingual BERT models were used. The paper also explores transfer learning and zero-shot learning using the OLID dataset. The monolingual BERT models achieved a macro-F1 score of up to 76% using monolingual data in the binary case.

Latin-American Spanish: Aldana et al.[7] presents a method for detecting misogynistic content in texts written in Latin-American Spanish. The approach integrates multiple sources of features to enhance the accuracy of misogyny detection with transformer-based models. Aguirre et al.[1] have accumulated 235251 Spanish comments from 200 YouTube videos based on discrimination against Venezuelan refugees in Peru and Ecuador. The comments are mainly categorized as racist, xenophobic and sexist hate speech.

5.2.3 African Low Resource Languages:

Restricted studies have been conducted for hate speech detection in the case of African languages. Primarily, Amharic and Algerian Arabic have been extensively studied among all the other African languages.

Amharic: Mossie et al.[100] created a corpus of 6120 Amharic Facebook posts and comments. An Apache Spark-based model is proposed that perform feature selection using Word2Vec and TF-IDF, and classification using Naive Bayes and Random Forest. The Word2Vec model with Naïve Bayes classifier achieved the best performance with accuracy and ROC Score of 79.83% and 0.8305, respectively. Tesfaye et al.[142] prepared a labelled dataset by curating Amharic posts from certain Facebook pages of activists. The dataset was manually labelled as hate and free speech, pre-processed with data cleaning and normalization techniques. The approach involves developing RNN models using GRU and LSTM. For feature extraction, word n-grams and in case of unique word vector representation, word2vec is used. The LSTM-based RNN model achieved an accuracy of 97.9% in detecting hate posts.

Algerian Arabic: Lanasri et al.[84] created a corpus from Algerian social networks (Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter), containing over 13.5K documents in Algerian dialect written in Arabic, labelled as hateful or non-hateful. The paper evaluates deep learning architectures on the corpus. It discusses the use of Linear Support Vector Classifier (LinearSVC), Gzip + KNN, LSTM & BiLSTM with Dziri FastText, DziriBERT FT PEFT+LoRA, Multilingual-E5-base FT, sbert-distill-multilingual FT, DzaraShield, and AraT5v2-HateDetect. Results are presented in terms of accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score, with DzaraShield achieving the highest scores across these metrics.

South African Languages: Oriola et al.[107] evaluated ML techniques using word and character n-gram, syntactic-based features and negative sentiment. They applied ensemble, hyper-parameter optimization and multi-tier meta-learning models using algorithms like SVMs, Random Forest, LRs, and gradient boosting. The best hate speech detection was obtained by SVM with character n-gram having a true positive rate of 0.894. In case of word n-gram, optimized gradient boosting achieved best results in hate speech detection having true positive rate of 0.867. Multi-tier meta-learning models provided the most consistent and balanced classification performance across different classes. The dataset consists of 21,350 tweets related to prominent individuals, trending issues and 2019 South African elections. Non-English tweets, repeated tweets, and tweets with empty texts were removed. The final corpus contained 14,896 tweets after cleaning and annotation.

5.2.4 Asian Low Resource Languages:

Asian languages are the most researched low-resource languages with considerable work in hate speech. Middle Eastern languages like Arabic, Pashto, Urdu etc. were considered among the initial research of hate speech and abusive words among Asian languages. Later on, research on Southeast Asian languages like Indonesian, Vietnamese etc., East Asian languages like Japanese, Korean etc. and languages of the Indian subcontinent gained traction.

Arabic: Mubarak et al.[101] used two datasets: 175 million tweets obtained from Twitter with language filter set to Arabic for constructing an offensive word list and 1100 manually labelled tweets and 32K user comments removed from an Arabic news site due to policy violations of the site. The approach includes creation of a list of abusive words from the tweets using usual patterns in abusive communications. Based on the words from the abusive list, users are classified into obscene and clean groups. Using list-based methods and considering lexical and syntactical features for detecting abusive language. The results showed that in this case word unigrams are better performing than word bigrams.

Roman-Urdu and Urdu: Akhter et al.[3] proposed the first offensive dataset of Urdu curated from social media. Character and word-level n-grams techniques for feature extraction have been employed. The study applies 17 classifiers from 7 ML techniques where character n-grams combined with regression-based models performed better for Urdu. LogitBoost and SimpleLogistic outperformed other models, achieving F-measure of 99.2% on Roman-Urdu and 95.9% for Urdu datasets. Ali et al.[9] curated Urdu tweets for sentiment analysis-based hate speech detection. The approach uses Multinomial Naïve Bayes’ (MNB) and SVM. For class imbalance, data sparsity and dimensionality, Variable Global Feature Selection Scheme (VGFSS), dynamic stop words filtering, and Synthetic Minority Optimization Technique (SMOTE) were employed. The results showed that resolving high dimensionality and skewness provided the utmost improvement in the overall performance.

Roman-Pashto: Khan et al.[78] used a Roman Pashto dataset, created by collecting 60K comments from various social media platforms and manually annotating them. The approach includes: bag-of-words (BoW), term frequency-inverse document frequency (TF-IDF), and sequence integer encoding. The model architectures used are 4 traditional classifiers and a deep sequence model with BiLSTM. The random forest classifier achieved a testing accuracy of 94.07% using unigrams, bigrams, and trigrams, and 93.90% with TF-IDF. The highest testing accuracy of 97.21% was obtained using the BiLSTM model.

Japanese: Fuchs et al.[50] utilized a Twitter dataset collected and filtered for 19 preselected female politician names with a corpus consisting of 9449645 words. An explorative analysis applying computational corpus linguistic tools and methods, supplemented by qualitative in-depth study is proposed. It combines quantitative-statistical and qualitative-hermeneutic methods to detect and analyze misogynist or sexist hate speech and abusive language on Twitter. Abusive language was present in a significant portion of the negative tweets, with percentages ranging from 33.33% to 48.6% for the politicians studied. The analysis also highlighted the use of gendered vocabulary and references to physical appearance in the abuse. Kim et al.[82] collected Twitter data and retweet networks were used to measure adoption thresholds of racist hate speech. Tweets were collected using 15 keywords related to racism against Koreans. The detection of hate speech posts was crucial, and a SVM with TF-IDF values was used for classification.

Korean: Kang et al.[72] formed a multilabel Korean hate speech dataset with 35K comments, including 24K online comments, 1.7K sentences from Human-in-the-Loop procedure, 2.2K neutral sentences from Wikipedia, and 7.1K rule-generated neutral sentences. The dataset is designed considering Korean cultural and linguistic context to deal with Western context in English posts. It includes 7 categories of hate speech and employs Krippendorff’s Alpha for label accordance. The base model achieved an LRAP accuracy of 0.919.

Burmese: Nkemelu et al.[104] curated a dataset of 226 Burmese hate speech from Facebook using its CrowdTangle API service. It involves a community-driven process with context experts throughout the ML project pipeline, including scoping the project, assessing hate speech definitions, and working with volunteers to generate data, train, and validate models. Classical machine learning algorithms were employed, with feature combinations of n-grams and term-frequency weighting. The best-performing model was FastText, achieving good precision, recall, and F1-score.

Vietnamese: Do et al.[43] used dataset from the VLSP Shared Task 2019: Hate Speech Detection on Social Networks which includes 25431 items. The authors implemented a framework based on the ensemble of Bi-LSTM models for hate speech detection. Word embeddings used were Word2Vec and FastText, with FastText achieving better results. The Bi-LSTM model achieved the best results with a 71.43% F1-score on the public standard test set of VLSP 2019. Luu et al.[89] introduced the ViHSD dataset, which is a human-annotated dataset for automatically detecting hate speech on social networks. It contains over 30K comments annotated as Hate, Offensive or Clean. Data was collected from Vietnamese Facebook pages and YouTube videos, with preprocessing to remove name entities for anonymity. They implemented Text-CNN and GRU models with fastText pre-trained word embedding, and transformer models like BERT, XLM-R, and DistilBERT with multilingual pre-training. The BERT model with bert-base-multilingual-cased achieved the best result with 86.88% accuracy and 62.69% F1-score on the ViHSD dataset.

Indonesian: Sutejo et al.[141] develop deep learning models for Indonesian hate speech detection from speech and text. Authors created a new dataset Tram containing posts from various social media such as LineToday, Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. Both acoustic features for speech and textual features for text were utilized to compare their accuracies. Experiments result depicted that textual features are more efficient than acoustic features for hate speech detection. The best text-based model gained F1-score of 87.98% .

5.2.5 Indian sub-continent Low Resource Languages:

The Indian subcontinent region consists of multiple countries with diverse languages. A miniscule number of languages have been studied regarding hate speech detection. Languages like Bengali, Sinhala, Nepali have large speakers in the different countries of Indian subcontinent and have gained attention from researchers.

Sinhala: Sandaruwan et al.[129] proposed lexicon-based and machine learning-based models for detecting hate speech in Sinhala social media. Corpus-based lexicon generated an accuracy of 76.3% for offensive, hate, and neutral speech detection. A corpus of 3k comments were curated consisting of texts which are evenly distributed among hate, offensive and neutral speeches. Multinomial Naïve Bayes combined with character tri-gram provided an accuracy of 92.33% with the best recall value as 0.84.

Nepali: Niraula et al.[103] used a dataset consisting of over 15,000 comments and posts from diverse social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Nepali Blogs, and News Portals. The dataset was manually annotated with fine-grained labels for offensive language detection in Nepali. The approach discussed involves supervised machine learning for detecting offensive language. The authors experimented with word and character features, and employed machine learning models. They proposed novel preprocessing methods for Nepali social media text. The results showed that character-based features are extremely useful for classifying offensive languages in Nepali. The Random Forest classifier was chosen for fine-grained classification and achieved F1 scores of 0.87 for Non-Offensive, 0.71 for Other Offensive, 0.45 for Racist, and 0.01 for Sexist categories.

Bengali: While Bengali as a language is spoken in whole of Bangladesh, it is also the second most spoken language in India. As a result, Bengali has acquired adequate observation in terms of hate speech detection.

ToxLex_bn by Rashid et al.[120] is an exhaustive wordlist curated for detecting toxicity in social media. It consists of 1968 unique bigrams or phrases derived from 2207590 comments. The paper analyzes the Bangla toxic language dataset by developing a toxic wordlist or phrase-list as classifier material. Hossain et al.[62] presented a dataset of 114 slang words and 43 non-slang words with 6100 audio clips. Data was collected from 60 native speakers of slang words and 23 native speakers of non-abusive words. Junaid et al.[71] created their dataset using Bangla videos from YouTube. It involved machine learning classification methods and deep learning techniques. The logistic regression model achieved the best average accuracy of 96%. The fine-tuned GRU model achieved an accuracy of 98.89%, while the fine-tuned LSTM model achieved 86.67%. Jahan et al.[66] used a large-scale corpus with abusive and hateful

Author	Feature Representation	Models	Metrics
Romim et al.[122]	Word2Vec, FastText, BengFastText	SVM, LSTM, Bi-LSTM	SVM (Acc- 87.5%, F1-Score - 0.911)
Karim et al.[76]	Word Embeddings	Conv-LSTM, Bi-LSTM, m-BERT(cased & uncased), ResNet-152, DenseNet-161	Conv-LSTM (P- 0.79, R-0.78, F1 - 0.78) XLM-RoBERTa (P- 0.82, R- 0.82, F1- 0.82) DenseNet-161 (P- 0.79, R- 0.79, F1- 0.79)
Das et al.[33]	Linguistic Features	m-BERT, XLM-Roberta, IndicBERT, MuRIL	MuRIL(Acc- 0.833, F1- 0.808) XLM-RoBERTa(Acc- 0.865, F1- 0.810)
Karim et al.[75]	Linguistic Features	m-BERT(cased & uncased), XLM-Roberta, BiLSTM, Conv-LSTM, ML Baselines	XML-RoBERTa (P-0.87, R- 0.87, F1- 0.87) Conv-LSTM (P- 0.79, R- 0.78, F1- 0.78) GBT (P- 0.71, R- 0.69, F1- 0.68)

Bengali posts collected from various sources. The authors provided a manually labelled dataset with 15K Bengali hate speech. They considered the existing pre-trained BanglaBERT model and retrained it with 1.5 million offensive posts. The architecture includes Masked-Language Modeling(MLM) and Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) as part of the BERT training strategies. BanglaHateBERT outperformed

the corresponding available BERT model in all datasets. Keya et al.[77] used Bengali offensive text from the social platform (BHSSP), which includes 20,000 posts, comments, and memes from social networks and Bengali news websites. The approach combines BERT architecture and GRU to form G-BERT model. G-BERT achieved an accuracy of 95.56%, precision of 95.07%, recall of 93.63%, and F1-score of 92.15%. Das et al.[31] proposed an encoder-decoder-based ML model, followed by attention mechanism, LSTM, and GRU-based decoders. The attention-based decoder achieved the best accuracy of 77%. A dataset of 7,425 Bengali comments from various Facebook pages was used. The comments were classified into 7 categories: Hate speech, aggressive comment, religious hatred, ethnical attack, religious comment, political comment, and suicidal comment. Ishmam et al.[64] developed ML algorithms and GRU-based deep neural network model. They employed word2vec for word embeddings and compared several ML algorithms. The best performance was achieved by the GRU-based model with 70.10% accuracy, improving upon the Random Forest model’s 52.20% accuracy. Belal et al.[18] uses the dataset that consists of 16,073 instances, with 7,585 labeled as Non-toxic and 8,488 as Toxic. The toxic instances are manually labeled in one or more of six classes – vulgar, hate, religious, threat, troll, and insult. Data was accumulated from three sources: Bangla-Abusive-Comment-Dataset, Bengali Hate Speech Dataset, and Bangla Online Comments Dataset. The authors proposed a two-stage deep learning pipeline: a binary classification model (LSTM with BERT Embedding) determines if a comment is toxic and if toxic, a multi-label classifier (CNN-BiLSTM with attention mechanism) categorizes the toxicity type. The binary classifier achieved 89.42% accuracy, multi-label classifier attained 78.92% accuracy and a weighted F1-score of 0.86. Banik et al.[14] used a human-annotated dataset with labels such as toxic, threat, obscene, insult, and racism. The dataset include 10,219 total comments, with 4,255 toxic and 5,964 non-toxic comments. The CNN model included a 1D convolutional layer and global max-pooling, while the LSTM model processed one-hot encoded vectors of length 50. The deep learning-based models, CNN and LSTM, outperformed the other classifiers by a 10% margin, with CNN achieving the highest accuracy of 95.30%. Sultana et al.[140] collected a dataset of 5,000 data points from Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. The dataset is labeled as abusive or not abusive and various ML algorithms are performed for hate speech detection. Sazzed[132] compiled two Bengali review corpora consisting of 7,245 comments collected from YouTube, manually annotated into vulgar and non-vulgar categories after preprocessing to exclude English and Romanized Bengali. BiLSTM model yielded the highest recall scores in both datasets. Haque et al.[59] proposed a supervised deep learning classifier based on CNN and LSTM for multi-class sentiment analysis. It involved training RNN variants, LSTM, BiLSTM, and BiGRU models, on word embedding. Emon et al.[45] evaluate several ML and DL algorithms for identifying abusive content in the Bengali language. It introduces new stemming rules for Bengali to improve algorithm performance. The RNN with LSTM cell outperformed other models, achieving the highest accuracy of 82.20%.

5.2.5.1 Survey on Mono-Lingual Indic Languages Architecture:

Recent years have observed a rise in usage of Indic languages leading to easier accumulation of data from online sources.

Hindi: Hindi is the most widely used Indian language and a majority of the communications on social media are conducted in Hindi. Kannan et al.[73] used dataset of the HASOC 2021 workshop containing tweets in Hindi annotated as ‘NOT’ and ‘HOF’. The approach is a C-BiGRU model, combining a CNN with a bidirectional RNN. It uses fastText word embeddings and is designed to capture contextual information for binary classification of offensive text. The C-BiGRU model achieved a macro F1 score, accuracy, precision, and recall of 75.04%, 77.48%, 74.63%, and 75.60% respectively. Bashar et al.[15] pretrained word vectors on a collection of relevant tweets and training a CNN model on these vectors. The CNN model achieved an accuracy of 0.82 on the test dataset, with precision, recall, and F1-score for the HOF class being 0.85, 0.74, and 0.79 respectively, and for the NOT class being 0.8, 0.89, and 0.84 respectively. Sreelakshmi et al.[138] uses Facebook’s pre-trained word embedding library, fastText, for representing data samples. It compares fastText features with word2vec and doc2vec features using SVM-RBF classifier. The dataset consists of 10000 texts equally divided into hate and non-hate classes. Rani et al.[119] used three datasets:(1) 4575 Hindi-English code-mixed annotated tweets in Roman script only, (2) HASOC2019, with 4665 annotated posts collected from Twitter and Facebook (3) Author-created, containing 3367 tweets annotated by them, in both Roman and Devanagari script. They used a character-based CNN model, TF weighting as ML classifiers feature, and no feature engineering or preprocessing for the CNN model. The character-level CNN model outperformed other classifiers. The accuracy for the combined dataset using the CNN model was 0.86, and the micro F1 score was 0.74. Sharma et al.[134] compiled the dataset,”THAR,” consisting of 11549 YouTube comments in Hindi-English code-mixed language, annotated for religious discrimination. The paper explores the application

of deep learning and transformer-based models. It discusses the use of word embeddings and the evaluation of model performance on the curated dataset. MuRIL outperformed others, achieving macro average and weighted average F1 scores of 0.78 for binary classification and 0.65 and 0.72 for multi-class classification, respectively.

Marathi: Marathi is considered as the third most spoken language in India. Multiple HASOC datasets have been formed from online communications in Marathi for abusive language detection. Chavan et al.[27] used the HASOC 2021, HASOC 2022, and MahaHate datasets. The authors have focused on MuRIL, MahaTweetBERT, MahaTweetBERT-Hateful, and MahaBERT models. The MahaTweetBERT model, pre-trained on Marathi tweets and fine-tuned on the combined dataset (HASOC 2021 + HASOC 2022 + MahaHate), achieved an F1 score of 98.43 on the HASOC 2022 test set, providing a new state-of-the-art result on HASOC 2022 / MOLD v2 test set. Gaikwad et al.[51] introduced MOLD (Marathi Offensive Language Dataset), the first dataset for offensive language identification in Marathi. The paper discusses ML experiments including zero-shot and transfer learning experiments on cross-lingual transformers from existing data in Bengali, English, and Hindi. Models like SVMs, LSTM, and deep learning models like BERT-m and XLM-Roberta (XLM-R) were used. Transfer learning from Hindi outperformed other methods with a macro F1 score of 0.9401. Weighted F1 scores were also reported. Velankar et al.[153] have used datasets like HASOC’21 Marathi dataset, L3Cube-MahaSent etc. to present a comparative study of both monolingual BERT and multilingual BERT based models. Ghosh et al.[52] have examined the effectiveness of mono and multilingual transformer models in Indic languages.

Assamese: In north-east India, majority speaks Assamese language. Recently, researchers have started giving attention to studying hate speech in Assamese. Ghosh et al.[54] annotated Assamese dataset with 4,000 sentences. The approach involves fine-tuning two pre-trained BERT models: mBERT-cased (bert-base-multilingual-cased) and Bangla BERT (sagorsarker/bangla-bert-base), using the Assamese data for hate speech detection. Results are based on weighted F1 scores, precision, recall, and accuracy metrics. The mBERT-cased model achieved an accuracy of 0.63, and the Bangla-BERT model achieved an accuracy of 0.61. They also used the datasets for hate speech detection in Assamese, Bengali, and Bodo languages, collected from YouTube and Facebook comments[53]. Each dataset is binary classified (hate or non-hate). The paper discusses the use of supervised machine learning systems, with a focus on a variant of BERT architecture achieving the best performance. Other systems applied include deep learning and transformer models. The best classifiers for Assamese, Bengali, and Bodo achieved Macro F1 scores of 0.73, 0.77, and 0.85, respectively.

Dravidian: Dravidian contains the languages spoken in the southern region of India, which consists of Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam etc. Among all the Dravidian languages, Tamil has been researched extensively for offensive language detection. Das et al.[32] used datasets in 8 different languages from 14 publicly available sources. The datasets vary in their choice of class labels and are combined into a binary classification task of abusive versus normal posts. The datasets include languages such as Bengali, English, Hindi (Devanagari and code-mixed), Kannada (code-mixed), Malayalam (code-mixed), Marathi, Tamil (code-mixed), and Urdu (actual and code-mixed). It explores various transfer mechanisms for abusive language detection, such as zero-shot learning, few-shot learning, instance transfer, cross-lingual learning, and synthetic transfer. Models like m-BERT and MuRIL are used, which are pre-trained on multiple languages. Chakravarthi et al.[26] used the DravidianCodeMix dataset, which consists of code-mixed comments on Tamil, Malayalam, and Kannada movie trailers from YouTube. The approach discussed involves a fusion model combining MPNet (Masked and Permuted Network) and CNN for detecting offensive language in low-resource Dravidian languages. The model achieved better offensive language detection results than other baseline models with weighted average F1-scores of 0.85, 0.98, and 0.76 for Tamil, Malayalam, and Kannada respectively. It outperformed the baseline models EWDT and EWODT. Vasantharajan et al.[149] proposes an approach that includes selective translation and transliteration techniques for text conversion, and extensive experiments with BERT, DistilBERT, XLM-RoBERTa, and CNN-BiLSTM. The ULMFiT model was used with AWD-LSTM architecture and FastAI for fine-tuning. The ULMFiT model yielded the best results with a weighted average F1-score of 0.7346 on the test dataset. The dataset used is a Tamil-English code-mixed dataset from YouTube comments/posts, compared with the Dakshina dataset for out-of-vocabulary words. Subramanian et al.[139] compares traditional machine learning techniques with pre-trained multilingual transformer-based models using adapters and fine-tuners for detecting offensive texts. Transformer-based models outperformed machine learning approaches, with adapter-based techniques showing better performance in terms of time and efficiency, especially in low-resource languages like Tamil. The XLM-RoBERTa (Large) model achieved the highest accuracy of 88.5%. Anbukkarasi et al.[11] proposes a dataset of 10,000 Tamil-English code-mixed texts collected from Twitter, annotated as hate text/non-hate text. A Bi-LSTM model has

been proposed to classify hate and non-hate text in tweets. Hande et al.[58] proposed the dataset named KanCMD, a multi-task learning dataset for sentiment analysis and offensive language identification in Kannada. It contains comments from YouTube, annotated for sentiment analysis and offensive language detection. The paper presents the dataset statistics and discusses the results of experiments with several machine learning algorithms. The results are evaluated in terms of precision, recall, and F1-score. Using this model Roy et al.[127] have proposed an ensemble model for detection of hate speech and offensive language in Dravidian languages. The model has obtained a weighted F1-score of 0.802 and 0.933 for Malayalam and Tamil code-mixed datasets respectively.

5.2.5.2 Survey on Multi-Lingual Indic Languages Architecture:

Deep learning based methods like LSTM variants, mostly transformer language models such as BERT variants, XLM-RoBERTa have been widely used for detection of hate speech in Indian languages. Khanuja et al.[79] have designed Multilingual Representations for Indian Languages (MuRIL), a multilingual language model for Indic languages and it has been specifically trained large amounts of Indian texts.

Khurana et al.[80] developed a novel model called AniMOJity, which incorporates transfer learning and XLM-RoBERTa along with finetuning it with additional layers. The dataset used is the Moj Multilingual Abusive Comment Identification dataset. It includes comments in thirteen Indian regional languages. Vashistha et al.[150] analyzed six publicly available datasets in English and Hindi

Table 6: Multilingual Research on HASOC Datasets

Authors	Languages	Models	Results
Bhatia et al.[20]	HASOC 2021: English, Hindi, Marathi	XLM-RoBERTa, mBERT, DistilBERT	Macro F1 Scores: 0.7996, 0.7748, 0.8651
Velankar et al.[151]	HASOC 2021: English, Hindi, Marathi	mBERT, IndicBERT, monolingual RoBERTa, CNN, LSTM with FastText	Macro F1 Scores: Marathi- 0.869 Hindi- 0.763
Narayan et al.[102]	HASOC 2023: Bengali, Assamese, Bodo, Sinhala, Gujarati	XLM-R, LSTM models	Macro F1 Scores: Bengali- 0.67027, Assamese- 0.70525 Bodo- 0.83009 Sinhala- 0.83493 Gujarati- 0.76601
Joshi et al.[70]	HASOC 2023: Bengali, Assamese, Bodo, Sinhala, Gujarati	SBERT, Pre-trained BERT	Macro F1: Bengali- 0.7703 Gujarati- 0.7324 Assamese- 0.7065

and combined them into a single homogeneous dataset. They classified the data into three classes: abusive, hateful, or neither. The proposed multilingual model architecture includes logistic regression, CNN-LSTM, and BERT-based networks. Das et al.[34] created a benchmark dataset of 5062 abusive speech/counterspeech pairs, with 2460 pairs in Bengali and 2602 pairs in Hindi. The authors experimented with several transformer-based baseline models for counterspeech generation, including GPT2, MT5, BLOOM, and ChatGPT. They evaluated several interlingual mechanisms and observed that the monolingual setting yielded the best performance. Gupta et al.[57] introduced the MACD dataset, a large-scale, human-annotated, multilingual abuse detection dataset sourced from ShareChat. It contains 150K textual comments in 5 Indic languages, with 74K abusive and 77K non-abusive comments. The paper presents AbuseXLMR, a model pre-trained on 5M+ social media comments in 15+ Indic languages. It is based on the XLM-R model and is adapted to the social media domain to bridge the domain gap. Jhaveri et al.[69] used the dataset provided by ShareChat/Moj in IIIT-D Multilingual Abusive Comment Identification challenge, containing 665k+ training samples and 74.3k+ test samples in 13 Indic languages labeled as Abusive or Not. The approach included leveraging multilingual transformer-based pre-trained and fine-tuned models such as XLM-RoBERTa and MuRIL. Parikh et al.[111] used dataset which consists of comments in Gujarati, Hindi, English, Marathi, and Punjabi. It contains 7500 non-toxic and 7495 toxic comments. LSTM, CNN and DistilBERT Embedding are used and fine-tuned on the multilingual dataset. Various implementations on the multiple HASOC datasets is depicted in Table

6 Research Challenges and Opportunities

Automatically spotting offensive or hateful speech is challenging for plenty of factors, especially while using social media. Most of the challenges are closely associated with the shortcomings of keyword-based techniques. In this section, we highlight significant challenges derived from survey literature of hate speech recognition.

Culture and Language Constraint

Hate speech is both cultural and linguistic specific. Therefore, cultural specific responses play a very crucial role in hate speech recognition. As Spanish is a widely spoken language around multiple countries, the same words in Spanish can carry different implications based on the country in which they are spoken[23]. Moreover, several stereotypes corresponding to the historical events of their regions may apply to the same population [85]. Language shifts promptly, especially among younger generations who interact with social media on a daily basis, requiring continuous research on Hate speech datasets. As of now, hate content is being eliminated both manually and automatically from the internet based on the reports submitted by users. Nevertheless, hate speech content spreaders are continuously looking for new methods of getting around and beyond any limitations set by the system. As an illustration, some users upload hate speech as photos for purpose of getting around some automatic hate speech detection systems. Despite the possibility that image to text may address a specific issue, many complications exist due to the constraints around this type of communication and the state of automatic high-spectrum identification. Moreover, updating the linguistic structure may include additional challenges. Often hate speech spreaders use abbreviations, combine multiple languages into the same sentence, use various phonetics where a slight change can convert a simple word into an abusive word. Sometimes, hate spreaders use sarcasm to mock and bully others on social platforms, which is extremely challenging to detect.

Dataset

In the field of research, no datasets are considered to be suitable for automatic hate speech identification task. According to the task demand and the comprehension level, the annotators annotate the dataset in various techniques. Moreover, the utilization of crowd-sourcing also raises concerns about the expertise level of annotators. Hate speech has no clear boundaries of definition and multiple concepts of detrimental languages intermingle with one another. A precise label definition is essential to distinguish hate speech from other categories of harmful languages. Additionally, the information can target a wider spectrum of specific hate speech characteristics such as personal abuse, sexism, racism, cyberbullying, and trolling. This issue can be resolved in two ways: (1) Multi-labelling Method, and (2) Hierarchical Approach. In multi-labelling method, the labels of sexism and racism may indicate ambiguity. Whereas, the sub-types of Hate Speech along with aggression is described using hierarchical approach. Additionally, many utterances are not intrinsically offensive, but they may be within appropriate circumstances [145]. However, additionally in the case of abusive language, the offense can differ depending on various audience members and users.

Data Collection

Possible biases may arise from various decisions made in the course of collecting data. Primarily, style and content can be significantly effected by the data source. Crawling involves collecting texts from a particular platform which determines its length, style, and themes. These writings mainly represents what the websites offer users and therefore are not very generalized. When utilizing crowdsourcing and nichesourcing, annotators' levels of sensitivity to hate differ based on country of origin, their personal experiences, and membership in the targeted minority [87]. Furthermore, bias can also originate from other sources such as the targets of language, hate, historical, and geographical context of the collected data. Sometimes data collected from social media requires ID retrieval, which is effective when the social media posts are live. But later on receiving reports from other users, platforms often remove these posts from their sites. In such a scenario, the dataset gets reduced and hinders the training of models.

Open Platform

Indeed, there exists many open source initiatives pertaining to hate speech recognition. However, only few well known publications have made their source code publicly available. Only 53 of the 1039 projects of Github are regularly updated and forked, raising concerns about the remaining projects' source code quality and functionality. This research field can advance more rapidly if it incorporates enhanced code sharing along with comprehensive documentation, efficient algorithms, and publicly available datasets.

Multimodal and Multilingual Characteristic

As the dominant language around the world, resources and approaches in English are comparatively abundant. Presently, multiple datasets are being accumulated[13] in multiple languages and significant advances have been achieved in low-resource languages. Various datasets have been generated consisting of textual data, but the evolving social media space have incorporated different modalities for spread of hateful content. Images and texts which individually may be harmless, when combined can generate hate speech. Audio-visual mediums can also be used to perpetuate harmful language. Minimal focus has been provided to the multimodal aspect of hate speech detection. Researchers are nowadays concentrating on the multimodal properties[12] for hate speech.

There is a lot of potential for future research opportunities in the domain of hate speech detection. Following are some of the research sections which need attention and improvement.

- Improving research in the understanding of language nuances and cultural references. Cross-language detection with the incorporation of various dialects can improve hate speech detection models.
- Merging multiple modalities and promotion of interdisciplinary collaboration among language experts, sociologists, and computer researchers to strengthen detection algorithms.
- Detection of hate speech in real-time and monitoring the systems in live social media platforms. Interactions with different communities to understand their perception of hate speech and create models that are culturally and linguistically responsive.
- Establishment of transparent ethical frameworks and policies along with moderation tools for building trust among the users.
- Investigating the behaviour of users who are involved in hate speech, can assist in developing robust algorithms for targeted interventions and preventive measures.
- Analyzing emotion and sentiment to distinguish between extremely subjective language and hate speech.
- Enhancing accuracy detection and interpreting neighbouring contexts by utilizing community feedback and crowd-sourced data.

7 Conclusion

The continual presence of the internet has facilitated the integration of social media platforms in every-day life. Moreover, people display hostility for a variety of reasons. Perusing this large volume of data for automatic harmful language detection is challenging. In this survey, we have presented an extensive overview of advances obtained in online hate speech detection techniques to date. We have discussed the overlying hate speech concepts of cyberbullying, offensive and abusive language. Initially, the publicly available datasets in both English and other low-resource languages have been detailed. We have identified prevailing reviews, surveys and implementation approaches on hate speech. Particular attention has been provided to hate speech detection in low-resource languages and the techniques applied. Primarily, TF-IDF and other machine learning techniques were used which have been replaced by FastText, word2Vec, GloVe word embeddings combined with deep learning approaches like CNN, RNN and BERT. Multiple research gaps, limitations and challenges have been elaborated with prospective future studies are elaborated. This survey will definitely be useful for researchers pursuing analysis in hate speech detection in multiple low-resource languages.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

The authors declare no conflict of interest. No human or animal subjects have been studied in this article. This article surveyed social network analysis applications.

References

- [1] Luis Aguirre and Emese Domahidi. Problematic content in spanish language comments in youtube videos about venezuelan refugees and migrants. *Journal of Quantitative Description: Digital Media*, 1, 2021.
- [2] Resham Ahluwalia, Himani Soni, Edward Callow, Anderson Nascimento, and Martine De Cock. Detecting hate speech against women in english tweets. *EVALITA Evaluation of NLP and Speech Tools for Italian*, 12:194, 2018.
- [3] Muhammad Pervez Akhter, Zheng Jiangbin, Irfan Raza Naqvi, Mohammed Abdelmajeed, and Muhammad Tariq Sadiq. Automatic detection of offensive language for urdu and roman urdu. *IEEE Access*, 8:91213–91226, 2020.
- [4] Areej Al-Hassan and Hmood Al-Dossari. Detection of hate speech in social networks: a survey on multilingual corpus. In *6th international conference on computer science and information technology*, volume 10, pages 10–5121. ACM, 2019.
- [5] Azalden Alakrot, Liam Murray, and Nikola S Nikolov. Dataset construction for the detection of anti-social behaviour in online communication in arabic. *Procedia Computer Science*, 142:174–181, 2018.
- [6] Nuha Albadi, Maram Kurdi, and Shivakant Mishra. Are they our brothers? analysis and detection of religious hate speech in the arabic twittersphere. In *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, pages 69–76. IEEE, 2018.
- [7] Edwin Aldana-Bobadilla, Alejandro Molina-Villegas, Yuridia Montelongo-Padilla, Ivan Lopez-Arevalo, and Oscar S. Sordia. A language model for misogyny detection in latin american spanish driven by multisource feature extraction and transformers. *Applied Sciences*, 11(21):10467, 2021.
- [8] Ika Alfina, Rio Mulia, Mohamad Ivan Fanany, and Yudo Ekanata. Hate speech detection in the indonesian language: A dataset and preliminary study. In *2017 international conference on advanced computer science and information systems (ICACSIS)*, pages 233–238. IEEE, 2017.
- [9] Muhammad Z Ali, Sahar Rauf, Kashif Javed, Sarmad Hussain, et al. Improving hate speech detection of urdu tweets using sentiment analysis. *IEEE Access*, 9:84296–84305, 2021.
- [10] Fatimah Alkomah and Xiaogang Ma. A literature review of textual hate speech detection methods and datasets. *Information*, 13(6):273, 2022.
- [11] S Anbukkarasi and S Varadhaganapathy. Deep learning-based hate speech detection in code-mixed tamil text. *IETE Journal of Research*, 69(11):7893–7898, 2023.
- [12] Greeshma Arya, Mohammad Kamrul Hasan, Ashish Bagwari, Nurhizam Safie, Shayla Islam, Fatima Rayan Awad Ahmed, Aaishani De, Muhammad Attique Khan, and Taher M Ghazal. Multi-modal hate speech detection in memes using contrastive language-image pre-training. *IEEE Access*, 2024.
- [13] Md Rabiul Awal, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, Eshaan Tanwar, Tanmay Garg, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. Model-agnostic meta-learning for multilingual hate speech detection. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 11(1):1086–1095, 2023.
- [14] Nayan Banik and Md Hasan Hafizur Rahman. Toxicity detection on bengali social media comments using supervised models. In *2019 2nd international conference on Innovation in Engineering and Technology (ICIET)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2019.
- [15] Md Abul Bashar and Richi Nayak. Qutnocturnal@ hasoc’19: Cnn for hate speech and offensive content identification in hindi language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12448*, 2020.
- [16] Valerio Basile, Cristina Bosco, Elisabetta Fersini, Debora Nozza, Viviana Patti, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, and Manuela Sanguinetti. Semeval-2019 task 5: Multilingual detection of hate speech against immigrants and women in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 13th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, pages 54–63, 2019.

- [17] Delphine Battistelli, Cyril Bruneau, and Valentina Dragos. Building a formal model for hate detection in french corpora. *Procedia Computer Science*, 176:2358–2365, 2020.
- [18] Tanveer Ahmed Belal, GM Shahariar, and Md Hasanul Kabir. Interpretable multi labeled bengali toxic comments classification using deep learning. In *2023 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [19] Fatih Beyhan, Buse Çarık, Inanç Arın, Ayşecan Terzioğlu, Berrin Yanikoglu, and Reyhan Yeniterzi. A turkish hate speech dataset and detection system. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth language resources and evaluation conference*, pages 4177–4185, 2022.
- [20] Mehar Bhatia, Tenzin Singhay Bhotia, Akshat Agarwal, Prakash Ramesh, Shubham Gupta, Kumar Shridhar, Felix Laumann, and Ayushman Dash. One to rule them all: Towards joint indic language hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13711*, 2021.
- [21] Aditya Bohra, Deepanshu Vijay, Vinay Singh, Syed Sarfaraz Akhtar, and Manish Shrivastava. A dataset of hindi-english code-mixed social media text for hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the second workshop on computational modeling of people’s opinions, personality, and emotions in social media*, pages 36–41, 2018.
- [22] Tommaso Caselli, Valerio Basile, Jelena Mitrović, and Michael Granitzer. Hatebert: Retraining bert for abusive language detection in english. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12472*, 2020.
- [23] Galo Castillo-López, Arij Riabi, and Djamé Seddah. Analyzing zero-shot transfer scenarios across spanish variants for hate speech detection. In *Tenth Workshop on NLP for Similar Languages, Varieties and Dialects (VarDial 2023)*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- [24] Laura Ceci. Tiktok: languages covered by content moderators, 2024. URL <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1405643/tiktok-language-covered-moderators/>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [25] Fabio Celli, Mirko Lai, Armend Duzha, Cristina Bosco, Viviana Patti, et al. Polycorpus xl: An italian corpus for the detection of hate speech against politics. In *CEUR workshop proceedings*, volume 3033, pages 1–7. CEUR-WS. org, 2021.
- [26] Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi, Manoj Balaji Jagadeeshan, Vasanth Palanikumar, and Ruba Priyadarshini. Offensive language identification in dravidian languages using mpnet and cnn. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 3(1):100151, 2023.
- [27] Tanmay Chavan, Shantanu Patankar, Aditya Kane, Omkar Gokhale, and Raviraj Joshi. A twitter bert approach for offensive language detection in marathi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10039*, 2022.
- [28] Anusha Chhabra and Dinesh Kumar Vishwakarma. A literature survey on multimodal and multilingual automatic hate speech identification. *Multimedia Systems*, 29(3):1203–1230, 2023.
- [29] Yi-Ling Chung, Elizaveta Kuzmenko, Serra Sinem Tekiroglu, and Marco Guerini. Conan-counter narratives through nichesourcing: a multilingual dataset of responses to fight online hate speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03270*, 2019.
- [30] Çağrı Çöltekin. A corpus of turkish offensive language on social media. In *Proceedings of the twelfth language resources and evaluation conference*, pages 6174–6184, 2020.
- [31] Amit Kumar Das, Abdullah Al Asif, Anik Paul, and Md Nur Hossain. Bangla hate speech detection on social media using attention-based recurrent neural network. *Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 30(1):578–591, 2021.
- [32] Mithun Das, Somnath Banerjee, and Animesh Mukherjee. Data bootstrapping approaches to improve low resource abusive language detection for indic languages. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM conference on hypertext and social media*, pages 32–42, 2022.
- [33] Mithun Das, Somnath Banerjee, Punyajoy Saha, and Animesh Mukherjee. Hate speech and offensive language detection in bengali. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03479*, 2022.

- [34] Mithun Das, Saurabh Kumar Pandey, Shivansh Sethi, Punyajoy Saha, and Animesh Mukherjee. Low-resource counterspeech generation for indic languages: The case of bengali and hindi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07262*, 2024.
- [35] Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmley, 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.
- [36] Ernesto del Valle and Luis de la Fuente. Sentiment analysis methods for politics and hate speech contents in spanish language: a systematic review. *IEEE Latin America Transactions*, 21(3): 408–418, 2023.
- [37] Christoph Demus, Jonas Pitz, Mina Schütz, Nadine Probol, Melanie Siegel, and Dirk Labudde. Detox: A comprehensive dataset for german offensive language and conversation analysis. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH)*, pages 143–153, 2022.
- [38] Statista Research Department. Statista dataset for facebook, 2023. URL <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1013804/facebook-hate-speech-content-deletion-quarter/>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [39] LK Dhanya and Kannan Balakrishnan. Hate speech detection in asian languages: a survey. In *2021 international conference on communication, control and information sciences (ICCISc)*, volume 1, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2021.
- [40] Karthik Dinakar, Birago Jones, Catherine Havasi, Henry Lieberman, and Rosalind Picard. Common sense reasoning for detection, prevention, and mitigation of cyberbullying. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiiS)*, 2(3):1–30, 2012.
- [41] Stacy Jo Dixon. Statista dataset for instagram, 2023. URL <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1275933/global-actioned-hate-speech-content-instagram/>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [42] Stacy Jo Dixon. Statista most used social networks, 2024. URL <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [43] Hang Thi-Thuy Do, Huy Duc Huynh, Kiet Van Nguyen, Ngan Luu-Thuy Nguyen, and Anh Gia-Tuan Nguyen. Hate speech detection on vietnamese social media text using the bidirectional-1stm model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03648*, 2019.
- [44] Elisabeth Eder, Ulrike Krieg-Holz, and Udo Hahn. At the lower end of language—exploring the vulgar and obscene side of german. In *Proceedings of the third workshop on abusive language online*, pages 119–128, 2019.
- [45] Estiak Ahmed Emon, Shihab Rahman, Joti Banarjee, Amit Kumar Das, and Tanni Mittra. A deep learning approach to detect abusive bengali text. In *2019 7th International Conference on Smart Computing & Communications (ICSCC)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2019.
- [46] Johan Fernquist, Oskar Lindholm, Lisa Kaati, and Nazar Akrami. A study on the feasibility to detect hate speech in swedish. In *2019 IEEE international conference on big data (Big Data)*, pages 4724–4729. IEEE, 2019.
- [47] Paula Fortuna and Sérgio Nunes. A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(4):1–30, 2018.
- [48] Paula Fortuna, Joao Rocha da Silva, Leo Wanner, Sérgio Nunes, et al. A hierarchically-labeled portuguese hate speech dataset. In *Proceedings of the third workshop on abusive language online*, pages 94–104, 2019.
- [49] Carli Friedman and Aleksa L Owen. Defining disability: Understandings of and attitudes towards ableism and disability. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37(1), 2017.
- [50] Tamara Fuchs and Fabian Schäfer. Normalizing misogyny: hate speech and verbal abuse of female politicians on japanese twitter. In *Japan forum*, volume 33, pages 553–579. Taylor & Francis, 2021.

- [51] Saurabh Gaikwad, Tharindu Ranasinghe, Marcos Zampieri, and Christopher M Homan. Cross-lingual offensive language identification for low resource languages: The case of marathi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03552*, 2021.
- [52] Koyel Ghosh and Apurbalal Senapati. Hate speech detection: a comparison of mono and multilingual transformer model with cross-language evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 36th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, pages 853–865, 2022.
- [53] Koyel Ghosh, Apurbalal Senapati, and Aditya Shankar Pal. Annihilate hates (task 4 hasoc 2023): Hate speech detection in assamese bengali and bodo languages. In *FIRE (Working Notes)*, pages 368–382, 2023.
- [54] Koyel Ghosh, Debarshi Sonowal, Abhilash Basumatary, Bidisha Gogoi, and Apurbalal Senapati. Transformer-based hate speech detection in assamese. In *2023 IEEE Guwahati Subsection Conference (GCON)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [55] Soumitra Ghosh, Asif Ekbal, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, Tista Saha, Alka Kumar, and Shikha Srivastava. Seh: A benchmark setup to identify online hate speech in english. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 10(2):760–770, 2022.
- [56] Raul Gomez, Jaume Gibert, Lluís Gomez, and Dimosthenis Karatzas. Exploring hate speech detection in multimodal publications. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 1470–1478, 2020.
- [57] Vikram Gupta, Sumegh Roychowdhury, Mithun Das, Somnath Banerjee, Punyajoy Saha, Binny Mathew, Animesh Mukherjee, et al. Multilingual abusive comment detection at scale for indic languages. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26176–26191, 2022.
- [58] Adeep Hande, Ruba Priyadarshini, and Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi. Kancmd: Kannada codemixed dataset for sentiment analysis and offensive language detection. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Computational Modeling of People’s Opinions, Personality, and Emotion’s in Social Media*, pages 54–63, 2020.
- [59] Rezaul Haque, Naimul Islam, Mayisha Tasneem, and Amit Kumar Das. Multi-class sentiment classification on bengali social media comments using machine learning. *International journal of cognitive computing in engineering*, 4:21–35, 2023.
- [60] Ehtesham Hashmi and Sule Yildirim Yayilgan. Multi-class hate speech detection in the norwegian language using fast-rnn and multilingual fine-tuned transformers. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 10(3):4535–4556, 2024.
- [61] Eftekhar Hossain, Omar Sharif, and Mohammed Moshiul Hoque. Mute: A multimodal dataset for detecting hateful memes. In *Proceedings of the 2nd conference of the asia-pacific chapter of the association for computational linguistics and the 12th international joint conference on natural language processing: student research workshop*, pages 32–39, 2022.
- [62] Md Fahad Hossain, Md Al Abid Supto, Zannat Chowdhury, Hana Sultan Chowdhury, and Sheikh Abujar. Baad: A multipurpose dataset for automatic bangla offensive speech recognition. *Data in Brief*, 48:109067, 2023.
- [63] IPSOS. Survey on the impact of online disinformation and hate speech, 2023. URL <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2023-11/unesco-ipsos-online-disinformation-hate-speech.pdf>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [64] Alvi Md Ishmam and Sadia Sharmin. Hateful speech detection in public facebook pages for the bengali language. In *2019 18th IEEE international conference on machine learning and applications (ICMLA)*, pages 555–560. IEEE, 2019.
- [65] Md Saroar Jahan and Mourad Oussalah. A systematic review of hate speech automatic detection using natural language processing. *Neurocomputing*, page 126232, 2023.
- [66] Md Saroar Jahan, Mainul Haque, Nabil Arhab, and Mourad Oussalah. Banglahatebert: Bert for abusive language detection in bengali. In *Proceedings of the second international workshop on resources and techniques for user information in abusive language analysis*, pages 8–15, 2022.

- [67] Md Saroar Jahan, Mourad Oussalah, and Nabil Arhab. Finnish hate-speech detection on social media using cnn and finbert. In *Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, LREC 2022, 20-25 June 2022, Palais du Pharo, Marseille, France: conference proceedings*. European Language Resources Association, 2022.
- [68] Sylvia Jaki and Tom De Smedt. Right-wing german hate speech on twitter: Analysis and automatic detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07518*, 2019.
- [69] Manan Jhaveri, Devanshu Ramaiya, and Harveen Singh Chadha. Toxicity detection for indic multilingual social media content. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00598*, 2022.
- [70] Ananya Joshi and Raviraj Joshi. Harnessing pre-trained sentence transformers for offensive language detection in indian languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02249*, 2023.
- [71] Mohd Istiaq Hossain Junaid, Faisal Hossain, and Rashedur M Rahman. Bangla hate speech detection in videos using machine learning. In *2021 IEEE 12th Annual Ubiquitous Computing, Electronics & Mobile Communication Conference (UEMCON)*, pages 0347–0351. IEEE, 2021.
- [72] TaeYoung Kang, Eunrang Kwon, Junbum Lee, Youngeun Nam, Junmo Song, and JeongKyu Suh. Korean online hate speech dataset for multilabel classification: How can social science improve dataset on hate speech? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03262*, 2022.
- [73] Sudharsana Kannan and Jelena Mitrovic. Hatespeech and offensive content detection in hindi language using c-bigr. In *FIRE (Working Notes)*, pages 209–216, 2021.
- [74] Md Rezaul Karim, Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi, John P McCrae, and Michael Cochez. Classification benchmarks for under-resourced bengali language based on multichannel convolutional-lstm network. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, pages 390–399. IEEE, 2020.
- [75] Md Rezaul Karim, Sumon Kanti Dey, Tanhim Islam, Sagor Sarker, Mehadi Hasan Menon, Kabir Hossain, Md Azam Hossain, and Stefan Decker. Deep hate explainer: Explainable hate speech detection in under-resourced bengali language. In *2021 IEEE 8th international conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2021.
- [76] Md Rezaul Karim, Sumon Kanti Dey, Tanhim Islam, Md Shajalal, and Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi. Multimodal hate speech detection from bengali memes and texts. In *International Conference on Speech and Language Technologies for Low-resource Languages*, pages 293–308. Springer, 2022.
- [77] Ashfia Jannat Keya, Md Mohsin Kabir, Nusrat Jahan Shammey, MF Mridha, Md Rashedul Islam, and Yutaka Watanobe. G-bert: an efficient method for identifying hate speech in bengali texts on social media. *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [78] Anas Ali Khan, M Hammad Iqbal, Shibli Nisar, Awais Ahmad, and Waseem Iqbal. Offensive language detection for low resource language using deep sequence model. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 2023.
- [79] Simran Khanuja, Diksha Bansal, Sarvesh Mehtani, Savya Khosla, Atreyee Dey, Balaji Gopalan, Dilip Kumar Margam, Pooja Aggarwal, Rajiv Teja Nagipogu, Shachi Dave, et al. MuriL: Multilingual representations for indian languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10730*, 2021.
- [80] Rahul Khurana, Chaitanya Pandey, Priyanshi Gupta, and Preeti Nagrath. Animojity: Detecting hate comments in indic languages and analysing bias against content creators. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*, pages 172–182, 2022.
- [81] Douwe Kiela, Hamed Firooz, Aravind Mohan, Vedanuj Goswami, Amanpreet Singh, Pratik Ring-shia, and Davide Testuggine. The hateful memes challenge: Detecting hate speech in multimodal memes. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:2611–2624, 2020.
- [82] Taehee Kim and Yuki Ogawa. The impact of politicians’ behaviors on hate speech spread: hate speech adoption threshold on twitter in japan. *Journal of Computational Social Science*, pages 1–26, 2024.

- [83] Renard Korzeniowski, Rafał Rolczyński, Przemysław Sadownik, Tomasz Korbak, and Marcin Możejko. Exploiting unsupervised pre-training and automated feature engineering for low-resource hate speech detection in polish. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09325*, 2019.
- [84] Dihia Lanasri, Juan Olano, Sifal Klioui, Sin Liang Lee, and Lamia Sekkai. Hate speech detection in algerian dialect using deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11611*, 2023.
- [85] Mario Laurent. Project hatemeter: helping ngos and social science researchers to analyze and prevent anti-muslim hate speech on social media. *Procedia Computer Science*, 176:2143–2153, 2020.
- [86] Jean Lee, Taejun Lim, Heejun Lee, Bogeun Jo, Yangsok Kim, Heegeun Yoon, and Soyeon Caren Han. K-mhas: A multi-label hate speech detection dataset in korean online news comment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10684*, 2022.
- [87] Nayeon Lee, Chani Jung, Junho Myung, Jiho Jin, Juho Kim, and Alice Oh. Crehate: Cross-cultural re-annotation of english hate speech dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16705*, 2023.
- [88] Joao A Leite, Diego F Silva, Kalina Bontcheva, and Carolina Scarton. Toxic language detection in social media for brazilian portuguese: New dataset and multilingual analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04543*, 2020.
- [89] Son T Luu, Kiet Van Nguyen, and Ngan Luu-Thuy Nguyen. A large-scale dataset for hate speech detection on vietnamese social media texts. In *Advances and Trends in Artificial Intelligence. Artificial Intelligence Practices: 34th International Conference on Industrial, Engineering and Other Applications of Applied Intelligent Systems, IEA/AIE 2021, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, July 26–29, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 34*, pages 415–426. Springer, 2021.
- [90] Tanjim Mahmud, Michal Ptaszynski, Juuso Eronen, and Fumito Masui. Cyberbullying detection for low-resource languages and dialects: Review of the state of the art. *Information Processing & Management*, 60(5):103454, 2023.
- [91] Thomas Mandl, Sandip Modha, Prasenjit Majumder, Daksh Patel, Mohana Dave, Chintak Mandlia, and Aditya Patel. Overview of the hasoc track at fire 2019: Hate speech and offensive content identification in indo-european languages. In *Proceedings of the 11th annual meeting of the Forum for Information Retrieval Evaluation*, pages 14–17, 2019.
- [92] Mihai Manolescu, Denise Löfflad, Adham Nasser Mohamed Saber, and Masoumeh Moradipour Tari. Tueval at semeval-2019 task 5: Lstm approach to hate speech detection in english and spanish. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 498–502, 2019.
- [93] Zainab Mansur, Nazlia Omar, and Sabrina Tiun. Twitter hate speech detection: a systematic review of methods, taxonomy analysis, challenges, and opportunities. *IEEE Access*, 11:16226–16249, 2023.
- [94] Iliia Markov, Ine Gevers, and Walter Daelemans. An ensemble approach for dutch cross-domain hate speech detection. In *International conference on applications of natural language to information systems*, pages 3–15. Springer, 2022.
- [95] Binny Mathew, Ritam Dutt, Pawan Goyal, and Animesh Mukherjee. Spread of hate speech in online social media. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on web science*, pages 173–182, 2019.
- [96] Binny Mathew, Punyajoy Saha, Seid Muhie Yimam, Chris Biemann, Pawan Goyal, and Animesh Mukherjee. Hatexplain: A benchmark dataset for explainable hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 14867–14875, 2021.
- [97] Puneet Mathur, Ramit Sawhney, Meghna Ayyar, and Rajiv Shah. Did you offend me? classification of offensive tweets in hinglish language. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on abusive language online (ALW2)*, pages 138–148, 2018.

- [98] Sandip Modha, Thomas Mandl, Gautam Kishore Shahi, Hiren Madhu, Shrey Satapara, Tharindu Ranasinghe, and Marcos Zampieri. Overview of the hasoc subtrack at fire 2021: Hate speech and offensive content identification in english and indo-aryan languages and conversational hate speech. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Forum for Information Retrieval Evaluation*, pages 1–3, 2021.
- [99] Ioannis Mollas, Zoe Chrysopoulou, Stamatis Karlos, and Grigorios Tsoumakas. Ethos: a multi-label hate speech detection dataset. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 8(6):4663–4678, 2022.
- [100] Zewdie Mossie, Jenq-Haur Wang, et al. Social network hate speech detection for amharic language. *Computer Science & Information Technology*, pages 41–55, 2018.
- [101] 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.
- [102] Nikhil Narayan, Mrutyunjay Biswal, Pramod Goyal, and Abhranta Panigrahi. Hate speech and offensive content detection in indo-aryan languages: A battle of lstm and transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05671*, 2023.
- [103] Nopal B Niraula, Saurab Dulal, and Diwa Koirala. Offensive language detection in nepali social media. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH 2021)*, pages 67–75, 2021.
- [104] Daniel Nkemelu, Harshil Shah, Michael Best, and Irfan Essa. Tackling hate speech in low-resource languages with context experts. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [105] Chikashi Nobata, Joel Tetreault, Achint Thomas, Yashar Mehdad, and Yi Chang. Abusive language detection in online user content. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*, pages 145–153, 2016.
- [106] Jodi O’Brien. *Encyclopedia of gender and society*, volume 2. Sage, 2009.
- [107] Oluwafemi Oriola and Eduan Kotzé. Evaluating machine learning techniques for detecting offensive and hate speech in south african tweets. *IEEE Access*, 8:21496–21509, 2020.
- [108] Nedjma Ousidhoum, Zizheng Lin, Hongming Zhang, Yangqiu Song, and Dit-Yan Yeung. Multilingual and multi-aspect hate speech analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11049*, 2019.
- [109] Pia Pachinger, Janis Goldzycher, Anna Maria Planitzer, Wojciech Kusa, Allan Hanbury, and Julia Neidhardt. Austrotox: A dataset for target-based austrian german offensive language detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08080*, 2024.
- [110] Endang Wahyu Pamungkas, Valerio Basile, and Viviana Patti. Towards multidomain and multi-lingual abusive language detection: a survey. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 27(1):17–43, 2023.
- [111] Yashkumar Parikh and Jinan Fiaidhi. Regional language toxic comment classification. *Authorea Preprints*, 2023.
- [112] Konstantinos Perifanos and Dionysis Goutsos. Multimodal hate speech detection in greek social media. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 5(7):34, 2021.
- [113] Zeses Pitenis, Marcos Zampieri, and Tharindu Ranasinghe. Offensive language identification in greek. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.07459*, 2020.
- [114] Flor Miriam Plaza-del Arco, M Dolores Molina-González, L Alfonso Urena-López, and M Teresa Martín-Valdivia. Comparing pre-trained language models for spanish hate speech detection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 166:114120, 2021.
- [115] Fabio Poletto, Marco Stranisci, Manuela Sanguinetti, Viviana Patti, Cristina Bosco, et al. Hate speech annotation: Analysis of an italian twitter corpus. In *Ceur workshop proceedings*, volume 2006, pages 1–6. CEUR-WS, 2017.

- [116] Michal Ptaszynski, Agata Pieciukiewicz, and Paweł Dybała. Results of the poleval 2019 shared task 6: First dataset and open shared task for automatic cyberbullying detection in polish twitter. 2019.
- [117] Jing Qian, Anna Bethke, Yinyin Liu, Elizabeth Belding, and William Yang Wang. A benchmark dataset for learning to intervene in online hate speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04251*, 2019.
- [118] Tharindu Ranasinghe, Isuri Anuradha, Damith Premasiri, Kanishka Silva, Hansi Hettiarachchi, Lasitha Uyangodage, and Marcos Zampieri. Sold: Sinhala offensive language dataset. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1–41, 2024.
- [119] Priya Rani, Shardul Suryawanshi, Koustava Goswami, Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi, Theodorus Fransen, and John Philip McCrae. A comparative study of different state-of-the-art hate speech detection methods in hindi-english code-mixed data. In *Proceedings of the second workshop on trolling, aggression and cyberbullying*, pages 42–48, 2020.
- [120] Mohammad Mamun Or Rashid. Toxlex.bn: A curated dataset of bangla toxic language derived from facebook comment. *Data in Brief*, 43:108416, 2022.
- [121] Amir H Razavi, Diana Inkpen, Sasha Uritsky, and Stan Matwin. Offensive language detection using multi-level classification. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 23rd Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Canadian AI 2010, Ottawa, Canada, May 31–June 2, 2010. Proceedings 23*, pages 16–27. Springer, 2010.
- [122] Nauros Romim, Mosahed Ahmed, Hriteshwar Talukder, and Md Saiful Islam. Hate speech detection in the bengali language: A dataset and its baseline evaluation. In *Proceedings of International Joint Conference on Advances in Computational Intelligence: IJCACI 2020*, pages 457–468. Springer, 2021.
- [123] Nauros Romim, Mosahed Ahmed, Md Saiful Islam, Arnab Sen Sharma, Hriteshwar Talukder, and Mohammad Ruhul Amin. Bd-shs: A benchmark dataset for learning to detect online bangla hate speech in different social contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00372*, 2022.
- [124] 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.
- [125] Paul Röttger, Bertram Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Zeerak Waseem, Helen Margetts, and Janet B Pierrehumbert. Hatecheck: Functional tests for hate speech detection models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15606*, 2020.
- [126] Pradeep Kumar Roy, Asis Kumar Tripathy, Tapan Kumar Das, and Xiao-Zhi Gao. A framework for hate speech detection using deep convolutional neural network. *IEEE Access*, 8:204951–204962, 2020.
- [127] Pradeep Kumar Roy, Snehaan Bhawal, and Chinnaudayar Navaneethakrishnan Subalalitha. Hate speech and offensive language detection in dravidian languages using deep ensemble framework. *Computer Speech & Language*, 75:101386, 2022.
- [128] Hind Saleh, Areej Alhothali, and Kawthar Moria. Detection of hate speech using bert and hate speech word embedding with deep model. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 37(1):2166719, 2023.
- [129] HMST Sandaruwan, SAS Lorensuhewa, and MAL Kalyani. Sinhala hate speech detection in social media using text mining and machine learning. In *2019 19th International Conference on Advances in ICT for Emerging Regions (ICTer)*, volume 250, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2019.
- [130] Manuela Sanguinetti, Fabio Poletto, Cristina Bosco, Viviana Patti, and Marco Stranisci. An italian twitter corpus of hate speech against immigrants. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on language resources and evaluation (LREC 2018)*, 2018.
- [131] Juan Pablo Sans. Facebook’s top ten languages, 2018. URL <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/facebook-top-ten-languages-who-using-them-juan-pablo#>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.

- [132] Salim Sazzed. Identifying vulgarity in bengali social media textual content. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 7:e665, 2021.
- [133] Semiocast. Top languages on twitter-stats, 2024. URL <https://semiocast.com/top-languages-on-twitter-stats/#>. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [134] Deepawali Sharma, Aakash Singh, and Vivek Kumar Singh. Thar-targeted hate speech against religion: A high-quality hindi-english code-mixed dataset with the application of deep learning models for automatic detection. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, 2024.
- [135] Alexander Shvets, Paula Fortuna, Juan Soler, and Leo Wanner. Targets and aspects in social media hate speech. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH 2021)*, pages 179–190, 2021.
- [136] Gudbjartur Ingi Sigurbergsson and Leon Derczynski. Offensive language and hate speech detection for danish. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04531*, 2019.
- [137] Peter K Smith, Jess Mahdavi, Manuel Carvalho, Sonja Fisher, Shanette Russell, and Neil Tippet. Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 49(4):376–385, 2008.
- [138] K Sreelakshmi, B Premjith, and KP Soman. Detection of hate speech text in hindi-english code-mixed data. *Procedia Computer Science*, 171:737–744, 2020.
- [139] Malliga Subramanian, Rahul Ponnusamy, Sean Benhur, Kogilavani Shanmugavadivel, Adhithiya Ganesan, Deepti Ravi, Gowtham Krishnan Shanmugasundaram, Ruba Priyadharshini, and Bharathi Raja Chakravarthi. Offensive language detection in tamil youtube comments by adapters and cross-domain knowledge transfer. *Computer Speech & Language*, 76:101404, 2022.
- [140] Sherin Sultana, Md Omur Faruk Redoy, Jabir Al Nahian, Abu Kaisar Mohammad Masum, and Sheikh Abujar. Detection of abusive bengali comments for mixed social media data using machine learning. 2023.
- [141] Taufic Leonardo Sutejo and Dessi Puji Lestari. Indonesia hate speech detection using deep learning. In *2018 International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP)*, pages 39–43. IEEE, 2018.
- [142] Surafel Getachew Tesfaye and Kula Kakeba. Automated amharic hate speech posts and comments detection model using recurrent neural network. 2020.
- [143] Surendrabikram Thapa, Aditya Shah, Farhan Ahmad Jafri, Usman Naseem, and Imran Razzak. A multi-modal dataset for hate speech detection on social media: Case-study of russia-ukraine conflict. In *CASE 2022-5th Workshop on Challenges and Applications of Automated Extraction of Socio-Political Events from Text, Proceedings of the Workshop*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [144] Stéphan Tulkens, Lisa Hilte, Elise Lodewyckx, Ben Verhoeven, and Walter Daelemans. A dictionary-based approach to racism detection in dutch social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08738*, 2016.
- [145] Stefanie Ullmann and Marcus Tomalin. Quarantining online hate speech: technical and ethical perspectives. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 22(1):69–80, 2020.
- [146] Cynthia Van Hee, Ben Verhoeven, Els Lefever, Guy De Pauw, Véronique Hoste, and Walter Daelemans. Guidelines for the fine-grained analysis of cyberbullying. 2015.
- [147] Natalia Vanetik and Elisheva Mimoun. Detection of racist language in french tweets. *Information*, 13(7):318, 2022.
- [148] Francielle Alves Vargas, Isabelle Carvalho, Fabiana Rodrigues de Góes, Fabrício Benevenuto, and Thiago Alexandre Salgueiro Pardo. Hatebr: A large expert annotated corpus of brazilian instagram comments for offensive language and hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14972*, 2021.
- [149] Charangan Vasantharajan and Uthayasanker Thayasivam. Towards offensive language identification for tamil code-mixed youtube comments and posts. *SN Computer Science*, 3(1):94, 2022.

- [150] Neeraj Vashistha and Arkaitz Zubiaga. Online multilingual hate speech detection: experimenting with hindi and english social media. *Information*, 12(1):5, 2020.
- [151] Abhishek Velankar, Hrushikesh Patil, Amol Gore, Shubham Salunke, and Raviraj Joshi. Hate and offensive speech detection in hindi and marathi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.12200*, 2021.
- [152] Abhishek Velankar, Hrushikesh Patil, Amol Gore, Shubham Salunke, and Raviraj Joshi. L3cube-mahahate: A tweet-based marathi hate speech detection dataset and bert models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13778*, 2022.
- [153] Abhishek Velankar, Hrushikesh Patil, and Raviraj Joshi. Mono vs multilingual bert for hate speech detection and text classification: A case study in marathi. In *IAPR Workshop on Artificial Neural Networks in Pattern Recognition*, pages 121–128. Springer, 2022.
- [154] Zeerak Waseem and Dirk Hovy. Hateful symbols or hateful people? predictive features for hate speech detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the NAACL student research workshop*, pages 88–93, 2016.
- [155] Maximilian Wich, Svenja Räther, and Georg Groh. German abusive language dataset with focus on covid-19. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference on Natural Language Processing (KONVENS 2021)*, pages 247–252, 2021.
- [156] Michael Wiegand, Melanie Siegel, and Josef Ruppenhofer. Overview of the germeval 2018 shared task on the identification of offensive language. 2018.
- [157] Wikipedia. Content languages on youtube, 2024. URL https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages_used_on_the_Internet. Accessed: 2024-08-28.
- [158] 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.
- [159] Marcos Zampieri, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Pepa Atanasova, Georgi Karadzhov, Hamdy Mubarak, Leon Derczynski, Zeses Pitenis, and Çağrı Çöltekin. Semeval-2020 task 12: Multilingual offensive language identification in social media (offenseval 2020). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07235*, 2020.
- [160] Ziqi Zhang, David Robinson, and Jonathan Tepper. Detecting hate speech on twitter using a convolution-gru based deep neural network. In *The Semantic Web: 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, 2018, Proceedings 15*, pages 745–760. Springer, 2018.