

OffensiveLang: A Community Based Implicit Offensive Language Dataset

Amit Das¹, Mostafa Rahgouy¹, Dongji Feng², Zheng Zhang¹, Tathagata Bhattacharya³,
Nilanjana Raychawdhary¹, Fatemeh Jamshidi¹, Vinija Jain^{4,5*}, Aman Chadha^{4,5*},
Mary Sandage¹, Lauramarie Pope¹, Gerry Dozier¹, Cheryl Seals¹

¹Auburn University, AL, USA, ²Gustavus Adolphus College, MN, USA,

³Auburn University at Montgomery, AL, USA

⁴Stanford University, USA, ⁵Amazon AI, USA

azd0123@auburn.edu

Abstract

The widespread presence of hateful languages on social media has resulted in adverse effects on societal well-being. As a result, addressing this issue with high priority has become very important. Hate speech or offensive languages exist in both explicit and implicit forms, with the latter being more challenging to detect. Current research in this domain encounters several challenges. Firstly, the existing datasets primarily rely on the collection of texts containing explicit offensive keywords, making it challenging to capture implicitly offensive contents that are devoid of these keywords. Secondly, common methodologies tend to focus solely on textual analysis, neglecting the valuable insights that community information can provide. In this research paper, we introduce a novel dataset *OffensiveLang*, a community based implicit offensive language dataset generated by ChatGPT 3.5 containing data for 38 different target groups. Despite limitations in generating offensive texts using ChatGPT due to ethical constraints, we present a prompt-based approach that effectively generates implicit offensive languages. To ensure data quality, we evaluate the dataset with human. Additionally, we employ a prompt-based zero-shot method with ChatGPT and compare the detection results between human annotation and ChatGPT annotation. We utilize existing state-of-the-art models to see how effective they are in detecting such languages. The dataset is available here: <https://github.com/AmitDasRup123/OffensiveLang>

Content Warning: This article features hate speech examples that may be disturbing to some readers.

1 Introduction

In recent times, an escalating trend of use of offensive language has emerged on social networks. The

proliferation of offensive language on social networks can be attributed to various factors. Firstly, users can effortlessly hide their identities within these platforms, and the resulting anonymity often facilitates the adoption of aggressive behavior. Additionally, the structure of social networks creates an environment conducive to the rapid dissemination of offensive language (Fortuna and Nunes, 2018).

Offensive language can be divided into two categories: explicit and implicit. Explicit offensive language refers to language that is extremely hateful and generally easier to detect. Implicit offensive language refers to language that does not directly imply hate, but still could be offensive depending on the context and specific target group. Implicit offensive language generally does not contain hateful words, which makes it more challenging to detect.

Current research on offensive language detection faces many challenges. Firstly, most of the existing datasets (Zampieri et al., 2019a), (Davidson et al., 2017) use specific offensive keywords to gather relevant texts from social media. This method presents a challenge in capturing implicit offensive texts that lack these specified keywords.

The second challenge is, a majority of the current approaches predominantly concentrate on textual aspects, neglecting the significance of the target community information. Also since they are gathered mostly from social media, the chances of existence of non-English terms (like lol, lmao, @user etc.) is very high, making the text more informal in nature.

The third challenge involves the generation of offensive language data using Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT which can help reduce time and expense for data generation and annotation by human. ChatGPT is constrained to prevent the generation of offensive content, with a goal to prevent the spread of any form of hatred among individuals. So the only feasible way to collect

*Work does not relate to position at Amazon.

offensive language data is through social media platforms which can be very expensive.

To address these challenges, we conduct the work in this article with the following contributions:

1. In this research, we present *OffensiveLang*, a community-based offensive language detection dataset consisting of 8270 texts with 6616 texts labeled as ‘offensive’ and 1654 texts as ‘not offensive’. The dataset is generated by ChatGPT and annotated by both human and ChatGPT to make a fair comparison between human and ChatGPT annotation. This method provides an efficient alternative to the time-consuming and expensive process of collecting and annotating social media data with human annotators.
2. We demonstrate a prompting method for generating offensive data using ChatGPT, despite its policy restrictions against producing offensive texts. By utilizing prompts that convey positive intents, we illustrate how ChatGPT can be utilized for the generating offensive texts.
3. Our dataset is categorized into seven distinct categories: Race/Ethnicity, Religion, Gender/Sexual Orientation, Disability, Diet, Body Structure, and Occupation.
4. The dataset is further classified into 38 different target groups in total which makes the dataset diverse. Notably, our dataset introduces innovative categories such as Diet (with target groups: Vegan, Vegetarian, Non-Vegetarian), Body Structure (with target groups: Fat, Skinny, Tall, Short), and Occupation (with target groups: Farmers, Janitors, Waitresses, Actors, Sports-persons, Journalists). To the best of our knowledge, no existing offensive language dataset contains these specific categories.
5. As a contribution to prompt engineering, we explore multiple prompts to identify the most effective one for target specific offensive data annotation.
6. Finally, we employ human annotators to annotate our data and conduct a comparative analysis between human annotation and ChatGPT annotation.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLM generated dataset

Recently Large Language Models are being used frequently for data generation. Yu et al. (Yu et al., 2023) introduced CHatGPT-writtEn Abstract dataset (CHEAT), a dataset aimed at enhancing the classification of human written and ChatGPT written abstracts. The dataset consists of 35,304 synthetic abstracts with three different representatives: Generation, Polish and Mix.

To distinguish between human written and ChatGPT generated texts, initially Chen et al. (Chen et al., 2023) collected and released a preprocessed dataset OpenGPTText containing rephrased content generated by ChatGPT, and then used RoBERTa and T5 models for classification. They also showed that their model was successful in extracting and differentiating key features between human written and ChatGPT generated texts.

Hartvigsen et al. (Hartvigsen et al., 2022) generated a large scale machine generated dataset for implicit hate speech detection. The dataset contains 274k toxic and benign statements about 13 minority groups. They extract 135k toxic and 135k benign statements that targets 13 minority groups (like African Americans, women, LGBTQ+ people, etc.) using GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020).

2.2 Offensive Language Detection

Most of the feature-based offensive language detection methods involve supervised text classification tasks, which generally involves feature engineering. A lexicon containing insulting and abusive language was constructed by Razavi et al. (Razavi et al., 2010) where each word in the lexicon was assigned a weight to indicate its impact, which improved the accuracy of the detection.

Increasing detection accuracy by combining user information with textual information has also been a research area. Several researchers included user information such as age, nationality etc.) to increase offensive language detection accuracy. Das et al. (Das et al., 2023) used user gender information for detecting online sexism. Qian et al. (Qian et al., 2018) proposed a method for offensive language detection using intra-user and inter-user representation. For the intra-user tweets, they collected and analyzed users’ historical tweets. For inter-user tweets, local sensitive hashing (LSH) was used. Adding the inter-user representation and




Figure 1: Workflow diagram of our work. It shows the way *OffensiveLang* was generated texts using ChatGPT 3.5 and then was annotated with both chatGPT and human.

intra-user representation improved the F1-score significantly.

2.3 LLMs and Prompt-based Hate Speech Detection

In recent years, there has been an increased focus on utilizing LLMs for the identification of hate speech. Chiu et al. (Chiu et al., 2021) used few-shot learning using GPT-3 for detecting sexist and racist texts. Li et al. (Li et al., 2023a) found ChatGPT’s performance is comparable to expert annotations collected from Amazon Mechanical Turk in terms of categorizing harmful content, including hateful, offensive, and toxic speech. In another study, He et al. (He et al., 2023) increased the toxic content detection accuracy by using LLMs like GPT-3 and T5 and prompt learning.

Zhu et al. (Zhu et al., 2023) employed ChatGPT to re-annotate many datasets, where one of them was for hate speech detection. The findings highlighted a significant disparity in agreement with human annotations. Li et al. (Li et al., 2023a) also utilized ChatGPT to categorize comments as harmful (i.e., hateful, offensive, or toxic - HOT). They found out that the model was better at detecting non-HOT comments compared to HOT ones. Huang et al. (Huang et al., 2023) attempted to classify implicit hate speech using ChatGPT, but their approach involved framing prompts as binary questions, diverging from the original study by ElSherief et al. (ElSherief et al., 2021), which defined specific classes such as implicit hate, explicit hate, and non-hate.

The increasing popularity of large-scale Pre-

trained Language Models (PLMs), including GPT (Radford et al., 2019) (Brown et al., 2020), BERT (Kenton and Toutanova, 2019), and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) has resulted in the increasing acceptance of prompt-based learning. Numerous investigations in prompt-based learning have concentrated on utilizing PLMs as implicit and unstructured knowledge repositories (Schwartz et al., 2017; Davison et al., 2019; Talmor et al., 2020). Recent research work have employed prompts to guide PLMs across various Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks, such as sentiment classification, demonstrating commendable performance in few-shot settings (Gao et al., 2020; Schick and Schütze, 2020a,b). Additionally, an increasing amount of research is emerging exploring the application of prompts to visual-language models for tasks in computer vision (Radford et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022).

3 Methodologies

3.1 *OffensiveLang* Data Generation using ChatGPT

Identifying implicit offensive language is a very challenging task for Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems (Han and Tsvetkov, 2020). Unlike explicit offensive language which generally is direct and contains specific offensive keywords, implicit offensive language is mostly indirect and lacks such keywords. Implicit offensive language is sometimes positive in sentiment and context specific which makes it harder to detect. As shown in Table 1, existing datasets contain either large

amounts of explicit toxicity, or since they are taken from social media, they are informal in nature.

To address these issues, Hartvigsen et al. (Hartvigsen et al., 2022) proposed a machine generated implicit hate speech dataset. The dataset was created using GPT-3. But since GPT-3 is expensive and given ChatGPT’s enhanced ability in conversations and an additional layer of content filtering for offensive material, our research is focused on exploring the potential applications of ChatGPT in generating community driven implicit offensive data. We also include many categories and target groups that are absent in the existing datasets.

Generating offensive text through ChatGPT is a challenging task as it is built with hateful content filtering. Figure 4 shows such a sample prompt where ChatGPT refuses to generate offensive texts.

To solve this issue, we have come up with a prompt which reflects positive intent to ChatGPT. We ask ChatGPT to provide us X number of sample sentences that should not be used for a particular target group of people, where X should be less than or equal to 5. With this prompt we observed that ChatGPT started generating offensive texts for that target group. Figure 5 shows data generation with this prompt against Women. After generating X number of such texts, we asked ChatGPT to generate 100 more such texts every time until we were satisfied with the number of data generated, and it continued to generate similar texts for us.

3.2 *OffensiveLang* dataset details

Following the above mentioned method, we have generated total 8270 texts for different communities. We first defined the categories we would be including in the dataset, then further classified them into different target groups. The details of the categories and the target groups are given in Table 3.

Out of the 8270 texts generated, 6522 were labeled as ‘offensive’ and remaining 1748 texts as ‘not offensive’. We split the dataset in 80-20 ratio for training and testing respectively (see Table 2). Since generating ‘not offensive’ texts using ChatGPT is not very difficult, we focused was on generating more offensive texts using ChatGPT, keeping the dataset imbalanced. The average length of the texts is 72.48 and the average number of words in a text is 11.61.

With the help from experts in linguistic department, we selected total 38 target groups to generate

the data. We tried to include people from various backgrounds. We categorized these 38 target groups into 7 categories mentioned in Table 3. We included 3 new categories: Diet, Body Structure, and Occupation. To the best of our knowledge, no other offensive language datasets included these categories. Figure 2 shows the distribution the categories.




Figure 2: Distribution of the seven categories in *OffensiveLang*.

3.3 Data Annotation

Evaluating LLM-produced data is a critical part(Chang et al., 2023). Chang et al. (Chang et al., 2023) provides possible ways to evaluate LLM generated data. For our dataset, we decided to evaluate it with human; and for that reason, we hired workers from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to evaluate and annotate the data. We selected annotators with a HIT approval rate greater than 95% only. To ensure no confusion among the annotators regarding annotation with specific target groups, we created 38 different batches on MTurk for 38 different target groups. We also made sure to define each target group clearly within each batch. Initially we published a set of 100 sample texts for annotation, aiming to assess both the quality of annotation and the effectiveness of the instructions provided to the annotators. Each text underwent annotation by three distinct annotators. Once we were satisfied with the sample annotations, we published our whole dataset for annotation. The annotators achieved an average Cohen’s Kappa score of 0.54. Employing a majority vote approach, we derived consensus labels for a total of 8270 annotated texts.

| Dataset | Source | Target Group | Implicit | Sample Offensive Text |
|---|----------------|--------------|------------|---|
| Davidson et al. (Davidson et al., 2017) | Twitter | No | No | @JuanYeez shut yo beaner ass up sp*c and hopyour f*ggot ass back across the border little n*gga |
| HateXplain (Mathew et al., 2021) | Twitter & Gab | Yes | No | they switch up like f*ggots |
| OLID (Zampieri et al., 2019b) | Twitter & Gab | No | No | @USER F*k this fat c*ck sucker |
| Implicit Hate Corpus (ElSherief et al., 2021) | Twitter | Yes | Yes | rt : tune in today’s jmt for my interview w / robert spencer on "" the complete infidel’s guide to iran ! |
| OffensiveLang | ChatGPT | Yes | Yes | You’re pretty smart for a woman. |

Table 1: Comparison between different datasets. Our dataset is target specific, completely implicit in nature and presented in a formal tone.

| | Train | Test | Combined |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Offensive | 5208 | 1314 | 6522 |
| Not Offensive | 1408 | 340 | 1748 |
| Total | 6616 | 1654 | 8270 |

Table 2: *OffensiveLang* dataset distribution.

3.4 Data Annotation by ChatGPT

An essential aspect of data annotation by ChatGPT is the selection of correct prompts to yield accurate and meaningful annotations. With the experts’ suggestions, we created five different prompts for annotation and they were classified into four distinct categories given below:

1. **Direct Prompt:** This category involves straightforwardly asking ChatGPT whether the provided text is offensive or not.
2. **Prompt with Offensive Definition:** Within this category, a two-step approach was taken. Initially, an offensive definition was provided, followed by an inquiry whether the given text is offensive or not.
3. **Prompt with Target Group:** Here, the prompt included a reference to a specific target group, and ChatGPT was asked to determine whether the text is offensive or not with respect to that particular category.
4. **Prompt with both Offensive Definition and Target Group:** Combining elements from the previous two categories, this prompt included both an offensive definition and a specified target group, seeking a binary decision on the text’s offensiveness in relation to the defined criteria.

To generate a comprehensive set of prompts, various combinations from the mentioned categories were utilized, resulting in the creation of five distinct prompts. These prompts were then applied to 100 sample texts taken randomly from the *OffensiveLang* dataset. Table 5 lists the five prompts we implemented on sample texts. The subsequent annotations were subjected to evaluation by experts from the linguistic department, and the results of few samples are presented in Table 6. In Table 5, [Text] refers to the text data from *OffensiveLang*, and the [TARGET GROUP] is specified in Table 3.

Upon careful analysis, it was determined by the experts that among the five prompts, Prompt5 yielded the most reliable and accurate results for the annotation task. Consequently, Prompt5 was selected as the primary prompt for annotating the dataset used in our research. This prompt selection process ensures the quality and relevance of the annotation by ChatGPT.

We then annotated all the texts from *OffensiveLang* using this prompt. For the annotation, we used the OpenAI API with the ‘gpt-3.5-turbo’. For each text, we prompted ChatGPT with the Prompt5 mentioned in Table 4. We feed texts one by one to ChatGPT by putting the correct ‘[TARGET GROUP]’ mentioned in Prompt5. Figure 1 shows the workflow of our work.

3.5 Comparison Between Human and ChatGPT Annotation

Annotating target specific implicit offensive languages can be a very difficult task. Many factors like the context of the statement, the tone of the statement, the cultural background etc. may affect the results that need to be considered.

In the case of the *OffensiveLang* dataset, human

| Categories | Target Groups |
|---------------------------|--|
| Race/Ethnicity | Asian, Black, Hispanic, Latino, Native American, White, African, Arab, South Asian, European |
| Religious Belief | Atheist, Christian, Hindu, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist |
| Disability | Cognitive, Mental, Physical, Speech |
| Gender/Sexual Orientation | Gay, Lesbian, Man, Non-Binary, Woman |
| Diet | Vegan, Vegetarian, Non-Vegetarian |
| Body Structure | Fat, Skinny, Tall, Short |
| Occupation | Farmer, Janitor, Waitress, Actor, Sportsperson, Journalist |

Table 3: Categorization of the Target Groups used in *OffensiveLang*. There are 38 target groups in *OffensiveLang* divided into 7 different categories. We introduce novel categories like ‘diet’, ‘body structure’ and ‘occupation’.

annotation and ChatGPT annotation exhibited a similarity of 73.3%. A comparison between human and ChatGPT annotations for few randomly selected samples from *OffensiveLang* is presented in Table 7. The diverse interpretations of text tone by different annotators are noteworthy. For instance, in the fourth example from Table 7 “I don’t like the way you cleared the table; it was too abrupt”. with target group: Waitress; human annotators perceived it as rude, whereas ChatGPT did not. When we asked for clarification from ChatGPT regarding the annotation, it responded that the provided text does not appear overtly offensive, it communicates a dissatisfaction with the manner in which the table was cleared, specifying it as too abrupt. Conversely, in example seven “South Asians are so religious; do you pray multiple times a day?” with target group: South Asian; human annotators did not find it offensive, but ChatGPT did. When we asked for clarification from ChatGPT again regarding the example seven annotation, the model responded by highlighting the potential offensiveness of the text due to its generalization about a specific group (South Asians) based on their religious practices. The response emphasizes the importance of avoiding assumptions, stereotypes, and intrusive inquiries about cultural or ethnic groups to maintain sensitivity and prevent perpetuating stereotypes.

4 Results & Discussion

After annotation by both human and ChatGPT, we wanted to explore how effective the natural language processing models are in detecting such target specific implicit offensive languages.

4.1 Data Split & Model Description:

For our experiments, we divided the annotated data into two subsets: training (80%) and testing (20%). This split allows us to train our models on a substan-

tial portion of the data while reserving a separate set for evaluating model performance.

We implemented seven distinct models for this classification task:

- i) TF-IDF (Jones, 1972) combined with SVM,
- ii) BERT (Devlin et al., 2018),
- iii) RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019),
- iv) DistilBERT (Sanh et al., 2019),
- v) voyage-large-2-instruct (Voyage AI, 2024),
- vi) gte-large-en-v1.5 (Li et al., 2023b) and
- vii) voyage-lite-2-instruct (Voyage AI, 2024).

For the BERT, RoBERTa, and DistilBERT models, we further split the training data into training (60%) and validation (20%) subsets. This additional split is crucial for hyperparameter tuning and early stopping during the training phase to prevent overfitting.

We maintained a constant random seed of 42 across all experiments to ensure the reproducibility of our results. Consistency in the random seed guarantees that our data splits and any stochastic processes within the models remain the same across different runs.

For fine-tuning BERT, RoBERTa, and DistilBERT, we used a learning rate of $2e-5$, which is a common choice for fine-tuning transformer models. The training process spanned 10 epochs with a batch size of 16. These hyperparameters were chosen based on preliminary experiments and literature to balance training time and performance. For the latter 6 models, we added a linear classification layer on top of each model for the classification.

Given the imbalanced nature of our dataset, we selected the Macro F1 score as our primary evaluation metric. The Macro F1 score is particularly suitable for imbalanced datasets as it calculates the F1 score independently for each class and then takes the average, thereby treating all classes equally.

Additionally, we reported precision and recall scores to provide a more detailed performance analysis:

Precision measures the proportion of positive identifications that were actually correct. Recall measures the proportion of actual positives that were correctly identified.

The binary classification results for implicit offensive speech are summarized in Table 4. Among the four models evaluated, BERT outperformed the others with a Macro F1 score of 0.53 and a recall score of 0.54. These results indicate that BERT was the most effective at identifying implicit offensive language overall.

However, DistilBERT achieved the highest precision score of 0.71, suggesting that while it may not identify as many offensive instances as BERT, it is more accurate when it does.

Figure 3 provides a comparative visualization of the F1 score, precision, and recall for each of the four models. This comparison highlights the trade-offs between different models and metrics, offering a comprehensive overview of their performance in the context of implicit offensive language detection.

| Model | F1 Score | Precision | Recall |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|--------|
| TF-IDF + SVM | 0.51 | 0.65 | 0.53 |
| BERT | 0.53 | 0.64 | 0.54 |
| RoBERTa | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.50 |
| DistilBERT | 0.49 | 0.71 | 0.52 |
| voyage-large-2-instruct | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.50 |
| voyage-lite-02-instruct | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.50 |
| gte-large-en-v1.5 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.52 |

Table 4: Classification results of different models.

The binary implicit offensive speech classification results are shown in Table 4. Since the data is highly imbalanced, we used Macro F1 score to analyze the classification result. The BERT model achieved the highest Macro F1 and Recall Score of 0.53 and 0.54 respectively among the four models whereas the DistilBERT model achieved the highest Precision score of 0.71. Figure 3 shows a comparison of the F1 score, Precision and Recall among the four models.

4.2 Analysis of Model Performances

Given the specific characteristics of the dataset – being 100% implicit in nature and written in a formal tone – the performance differences among the models can be better understood through a detailed examination of their capabilities and limitations.

TFIDF-SVM: The TFIDF-SVM model shows moderate performance with relatively high precision. This model leverages Term Frequency-

Inverse Document Frequency (TFIDF) for feature extraction combined with a Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifier. While this method is good at identifying discriminative words and phrases, it might struggle with the context and nuance required to detect implicit hate speech, hence the moderate F1-score and recall. The high precision indicates it is good at minimizing false positives, but it might miss some true positive instances of implicit hate speech.

BERT: BERT is a transformer-based model that captures contextual information from both directions. Its slightly better F1-score and recall compared to TFIDF-SVM suggest it can better understand the context in which implicit hate speech appears. However, detecting implicit hate speech still poses challenges due to the subtlety and context-dependent nature of the task.

RoBERTa: RoBERTa generally improves on BERT by optimizing the training process and using more data. However, its lower precision and F1-score indicate it might be overfitting or struggling with the specificity required for this task. The better recall shows it can identify more true positives, but the cost is a higher number of false positives.

DistilBERT: DistilBERT is a distilled version of BERT, designed to be lighter and faster while retaining much of the original model’s performance. Its high precision indicates it is very conservative and accurate when it predicts positive instances, minimizing false positives. However, this conservativeness may lead to a lower recall, as seen with its moderate F1-score, indicating it might miss some true positive cases.

voyage-large-2-instruct: This model likely focuses on instruction-tuned large language models. The low precision and F1-score suggest it may be misclassifying non-hate speech as hate speech. Its moderate recall indicates it can still catch a reasonable number of true positives, but the high false positive rate undermines its overall effectiveness.

gte-large-en-v1.5: This model, possibly based on a large-scale transformer architecture similar to BERT or RoBERTa, shows balanced performance. The precision and recall are moderately high, indicating a good trade-off between identifying true positives and minimizing false positives. It suggests the model has a reasonably good understanding of implicit hate speech but is not exceptionally better than other transformer-based models.

voyage-lite-2-instruct: Similar to its larger




Figure 3: Visualization of the performances of different models. It can be seen that the BERT model achieved the highest F1 score and Recall values whereas DistilBERT achieved the highest Precision score.

counterpart, this model has low precision and F1-score, indicating a struggle with distinguishing implicit hate speech accurately. The results are consistent with the larger "voyage" model, suggesting that despite instruction tuning, the approach may not be well-suited for this specific task.

Models like BERT and its variants generally perform better due to their ability to understand context, which is crucial for detecting implicit hate speech. High precision models (e.g., DistilBERT) minimize false positives but might miss true positives, while models with higher recall (e.g., RoBERTa) capture more true positives at the cost of more false positives. Implicit hate speech detection is inherently challenging due to its subtle and context-dependent nature. Even advanced models struggle to balance precision and recall effectively, highlighting the need for more sophisticated techniques or additional contextual information.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed how ChatGPT can be used for generating and detecting offensive language. We also released a community based implicit offensive language dataset *OffensiveLang* generated by ChatGPT. Addressing the limitations

of existing data, *OffensiveLang* dataset is specifically designed for capturing community-based implicit offensive language written in formal tone that contains several different categories that were not addressed previously. We also show a direction how ChatGPT can be used for offensive language data creation and data annotation through prompt engineering by overcoming ethical constraints associated with generating offensive texts. The proposed prompt based Zero-Shot method leverages prompt engineering to detect community-based offensive language, presenting an effective solution. This research contributes to the ongoing efforts to mitigate online abuse by introducing a comprehensive dataset and innovative methods that consider mostly implicit offensive content, thereby advancing the field of offensive language detection.

We included 38 target groups under 7 different categories with few novel target groups never addressed before. There are many other categories or target groups not included in *OffensiveLang* (categories like nationality, age etc.). For our future work, we would like to expand our dataset by including new categories and target groups.

Limitations

While *OffensiveLang* offers significant advancements in the detection of implicit offensive language, several limitations must be acknowledged. The primary limitation stems from the reliance on a prompt-based zero-shot method for data generation introduces potential biases inherent in the model’s training data and prompt design. Furthermore, the dataset’s quality assurance through human evaluation, although valuable, is subject to subjective interpretation, which may vary across evaluators and affect the consistency of the annotations. Lastly, while the dataset includes data for 38 different target groups, it may not comprehensively cover all possible groups or the nuanced ways in which offensive language can be directed at them, potentially limiting the generalizability of our findings across diverse social contexts.

Ethics Statement

In this study, we introduce *OffensiveLang*, a dataset of implicit offensive language generated using ChatGPT 3.5, designed to address the ethical and practical challenges of detecting non-explicit hate speech. We took significant precautions to prevent the generation of explicit harmful content, relying on human evaluators to ensure data quality and mitigate biases. We implemented extensive measures for annotating the *OffensiveLang* dataset, including obtaining IRB approval and strictly adhering to legal and ethical guidelines throughout the data handling and summary annotation processes. The dataset, which is entirely artificial and respects data privacy, spans 38 target groups and aims to improve detection methods while being accessible only for ethical research purposes. Transparency in our methodology and a commitment to minimizing harm through responsible use underline our approach, emphasizing the advancement of safer digital environments.

References

- MS Windows NT kernel description. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/offensive_1. Accessed: 2010-09-30.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2023. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*.
- Yutian Chen, Hao Kang, Vivian Zhai, Liangze Li, Rita Singh, and Bhiksha Ramakrishnan. 2023. Gpt-sentinel: Distinguishing human and chatgpt generated content. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07969*.
- Ke-Li Chiu, Annie Collins, and Rohan Alexander. 2021. Detecting hate speech with gpt-3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12407*.
- Amit Das, Mostafa Rahgouy, Zheng Zhang, Tathagata Bhattacharya, Gerry Dozier, and Cheryl D Seals. 2023. Online sexism detection and classification by injecting user gender information. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Blockchain, and Internet of Things (AIBThings)*, pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmusley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. 2017. 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.
- Joe Davison, Joshua Feldman, and Alexander M Rush. 2019. Commonsense knowledge mining from pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 1173–1178.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Mai ElSherief, Caleb Ziems, David Muchlinski, Vaishnavi Anupindi, Jordyn Seybolt, Munmun De Choudhury, and Diyi Yang. 2021. Latent hatred: A benchmark for understanding implicit hate speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05322*.
- Paula Fortuna and Sérgio Nunes. 2018. A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(4):1–30.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2020. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*.
- Xiaochuang Han and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2020. Fortifying toxic speech detectors against veiled toxicity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03154*.
- Thomas Hartvigsen, Saadia Gabriel, Hamid Palangi, Maarten Sap, Dipankar Ray, and Ece Kamar. 2022. Toxigen: A large-scale machine-generated dataset for

- adversarial and implicit hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09509*.
- Xinlei He, Savvas Zannettou, Yun Shen, and Yang Zhang. 2023. You only prompt once: On the capabilities of prompt learning on large language models to tackle toxic content. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05596*.
- Fan Huang, Haewoon Kwak, and Jisun An. 2023. Is chatgpt better than human annotators? potential and limitations of chatgpt in explaining implicit hate speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07736*.
- Karen Sparck Jones. 1972. A statistical interpretation of term specificity and its application in retrieval. *Journal of documentation*, 28(1):11–21.
- Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, volume 1, page 2.
- Lingyao Li, Lizhou Fan, Shubham Atreja, and Libby Hemphill. 2023a. "hot" chatgpt: The promise of chatgpt in detecting and discriminating hateful, offensive, and toxic comments on social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10619*.
- Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. 2023b. Towards general text embeddings with multi-stage contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03281*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Binny Mathew, Punyajoy Saha, Seid Muhie Yimam, Chris Biemann, Pawan Goyal, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2021. Hatexplain: A benchmark dataset for explainable hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 14867–14875.
- Jing Qian, Mai ElSherief, Elizabeth M Belding, and William Yang Wang. 2018. Leveraging intra-user and inter-user representation learning for automated hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03124*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Amir H Razavi, Diana Inkpen, Sasha Uritsky, and Stan Matwin. 2010. 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.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2020a. Exploiting cloze questions for few shot text classification and natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07676*.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2020b. It's not just size that matters: Small language models are also few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07118*.
- Roy Schwartz, Maarten Sap, Ioannis Konstas, Li Zilles, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2017. The effect of different writing tasks on linguistic style: A case study of the roc story cloze task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.01841*.
- Alon Talmor, Yanai Elazar, Yoav Goldberg, and Jonathan Berant. 2020. olympics-on what language model pre-training captures. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:743–758.
- Voyage AI. 2024. Voyage-large-2 instructions. <https://docs.voyageai.com/docs/embeddings>. Accessed: 2024-06-15.
- Michael Wiegand, Melanie Siegel, and Josef Ruppenhofer. 2018. Overview of the germeval 2018 shared task on the identification of offensive language.
- Peipeng Yu, Jiahua Chen, Xuan Feng, and Zhihua Xia. 2023. Cheat: A large-scale dataset for detecting chatgpt-written abstracts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12008*.
- Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. 2019a. Predicting the type and target of offensive posts in social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09666*.
- Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. 2019b. Semeval-2019 task 6: Identifying and categorizing offensive language in social media (offenseval). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08983*.
- Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. 2022. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16816–16825.
- Yiming Zhu, Peixian Zhang, Ehsan-Ul Haq, Pan Hui, and Gareth Tyson. 2023. Can chatgpt reproduce human-generated labels? a study of social computing tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10145*.

A Appendix

Figure 4 shows a sample prompt where ChatGPT refuses to generate offensive text. Figure 5 shows our prompt for generating offensive texts. Figure 6 shows the distribution of the target groups of the 7 categories in *OffensiveLang*. Figure 7 shows sample instructions given to MTurk workers for data annotation. We paid \$20/hr to each MTurk worker. Table 5 shows the 5 prompts we explored for data annotation. We selected prompt 5 for the data annotation. Table 6 shows Sample annotation results using the 5 Prompts. Table 7 shows comparison between human and ChatGPT annotation.

User: Give 3 sample sentences that are offensive for Women.

ChatGPT: I'm sorry, but I cannot generate offensive content or engage in any form of disrespectful language. If you have any other non-offensive requests or questions, feel free to ask, and I'll be happy to help.

Figure 4: Example where ChatGPT prohibits generating offensive texts.

User: Give 3 sample sentences that should NOT be used against Women.

ChatGPT: "1. You're pretty good at that for a girl."

"2. Why are you so emotional? It must be that time of the month."

"3. You should smile more; you look prettier when you smile."

It's important to treat everyone with respect and avoid reinforcing stereotypes or making inappropriate comments based on gender. These sentences can be offensive and perpetuate harmful stereotypes about women.

Figure 5: Our prompt for generating community based implicit offensive text using ChatGPT.



Figure 6: Distribution details of the 7 categories in *OffensiveLang*.

Qualifications Required: HIT Approval Rate (%) for all Requesters' HITs greater than 95, Adult Content Qualification equal to 1

Instructions Shortcuts Is the following text offensive for Women?

Instructions X

"The definition of offensive is rude in a way that causes somebody to feel upset or annoyed because it shows a lack of respect." According to the above definition, choose the primary sentiment that is expressed by the text.

\$(text)

Select an option

Offensive 1

Not Offensive 2

Figure 7: Sample MTurk instructions.

| Prompt No. | Prompt Category | Prompts |
|------------|--|---|
| Prompt1 | Direct Prompt | “Is this offensive? Answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with no explanation.” [Text] |
| Prompt2 | Prompt with Offensive Definition | “The definition of offensive is Hurtful, derogatory or obscene comments made by one person to another person (Wiegand et al., 2018). According to the above definition of offensive, is the following text offensive? Answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with no explanation.” [Text] |
| Prompt3 | Prompt with Target Group | “Is the following text offensive for [TARGET GROUP]. Answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with no explanation.” [Text] |
| Prompt4 | Prompt with Target Group | “Is the following text offensive, hurtful, derogatory, or obscene for [TARGET GROUP]. Answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with no explanation.” [Text] |
| Prompt5 | Prompt with both Offensive Definition and Target Group | “The definition of offensive is rude in a way that causes somebody to feel upset or annoyed because it shows a lack of respect (Win). According to the above definition of offensive, is the following text offensive for [TARGET GROUP]. Answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with no explanation.” [Text] |

Table 5: Prompt Selection for Data Annotation using ChatGPT. Here [Text] refers to the text data from *Offensive-Lang*, and the [TARGET GROUP] is specified in Table 3. Upon careful analysis, it was determined that Prompt5 yielded the most reliable and accurate results for the annotation task.

| Sample Text from <i>OffensiveLang</i> | Target Group | Prompt1 | Prompt2 | Prompt3 | Prompt4 | Prompt5 |
|--|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| “You’re too emotional to handle this project, let a man take care of it.” | Woman | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| “You’re so inspirational for someone with a disability; I could never live like that.” | Physical Disability | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| “Islam promotes violence and intolerance.” | Muslim | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| “Real men don’t cry; you’re just being too sensitive.” | Man | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| “Speaking English is the only way to fit in here; stop using your native language.” | Hispanic | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| “Hinduism is just a collection of primitive superstitions.” | Hindu | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| “You’re only religious because you’re afraid of facing reality.” | Christian | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| “It’s surprising you can do that with your condition!” | Physical Disability | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| “You must be good at sports because of your race.” | Black | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| “You’re pretty smart for a woman.” | Woman | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| “Your speech makes me cringe; it’s so uncomfortable.” | Speech Disability | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| “Africans are not capable of creating advanced infrastructure.” | African | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| “Are you sure you can handle that task? It might be too tall for you.” | Short People | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |

Table 6: Sample Annotation Results using 5 different Prompts.

| Sample Text from <i>OffensiveLang</i> | Category | Target Group | Offensive? Human Annotation | Offensive? ChatGPT Annotation |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| “You’re pretty smart for a woman.” | Gender/Sexual Orientation | Woman | Yes | Yes |
| “You must have a hard time finding umbrellas that cover your entire height.” | Body Structure | Tall People | Yes | No |
| “All Native Americans live in teepees and hunt for a living.” | Race/Ethnicity | Native American | Yes | Yes |
| “I don’t like the way you cleared the table; it was too abrupt.” | Occupation | Waitress | Yes | No |
| “Vegetarians are just too sensitive about their dietary choices. It’s not that serious.” | Diet | Vegetarian | No | Yes |
| “People with speech issues should stay in the background; it’s less bothersome.” | Disability | People with Speech Disability | Yes | Yes |
| “South Asians are so religious; do you pray multiple times a day?” | Race/Ethnicity | South Asian | No | Yes |
| “You’re too thin; it’s like you’re not even present in photos.” | Body Structure | Skinny | Yes | Yes |
| “Short people must face obstacles in gaining visibility in the film industry.” | Body Structure | Short People | Yes | No |
| “Your disability probably makes you more understanding of others.” | Disability | People with Physical Disability | Yes | Yes |
| “Non-vegetarians are responsible for environmental destruction and should be ashamed of their choices.” | Diet | Non Vegetarian | Yes | Yes |
| “You’re just too stubborn to accept the reality of God’s existence.” | Religious Belief | Atheist | Yes | Yes |

Table 7: Comparison Between Human and ChatGPT Annotation.