

Deep Prompt Multi-task Network for Abuse Language Detection

Jian Zhu, Yuping Ruan, Jingfei Chang, Wenhui Sun, Hui Wan, Jian Long, and Cheng Luo*

Zhejiang Lab

{qijian.zhu, ypruan, cjf_chang, sunwh, wanhui, longjian, luo_cheng}@zhejianglab.com

Abstract. The detection of abuse language remains a long-standing challenge with the extensive use of social networks. The detection task of abuse language suffers from limited accuracy. We argue that the existing detection methods utilize the fine-tuning technique of the pre-trained language models (PLMs) to handle downstream tasks. Hence, these methods fail to stimulate the general knowledge of the PLMs. To address the problem, we propose a novel Deep Prompt Multi-task Network (DPMN) for abuse language detection. Specifically, DPMN first attempts to design two forms of deep prompt tuning and light prompt tuning for the PLMs. The effects of different prompt lengths, tuning strategies, and prompt initialization methods on detecting abuse language are studied. In addition, we propose a Task Head based on Bi-LSTM and FFN, which can be used as a short text classifier. Eventually, DPMN utilizes multi-task learning to improve detection metrics further. The multi-task network has the function of transferring effective knowledge. The proposed DPMN is evaluated against eight typical methods on three public datasets: OLID, SOLID, and AbuseAnalyzer. The experimental results show that our DPMN outperforms the state-of-the-art methods.

Keywords: Abuse Language Detection · Prompt-based Learning · Deep Prompt Tuning · Multi-task Network

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The abuse language has spread throughout social media and become a significant issue. On social network sites like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, some groups become targets of online bullying activities. Any expression that denigrates or offends a person or group of people is referred to as abuse, and examples include sexism, harassment, cyberbullying, personal insults, racism, etc. Abuse language can be directed at particular people or groups. Abuse language can have serious psychological consequences for the victim and hinder freedom of

* Corresponding author.

expression. Intelligent detection algorithms can identify abuse content in a significant volume of social media. It is essential to minimize the psychological toll on victims to stop hate crimes. As a result, it is important to intelligently detect and govern abuse language before it spreads on social networks. Past research has examined various abuse language issues, including abuse and hate speech.

Abuse language detection can be seen as short text classification. As natural language processing evolves, detecting abuse language can be roughly divided into three periods. Early detection algorithms adopt conventional machine learning methods, and the performance of model detection results largely depends on the features of manual design. These hand-designed features mainly include character features, word features, n-gram features, syntactic features, and linguistic features. The second phase of the detection algorithm uses the deep learning method. Typical deep networks are CNN [1], and RNN [2]. The advantage of the deep learning method is that it does not need to design features manually. It can automatically generate context features of short text through the deep neural network. Third, the large PLMs, such as BERT [3] and GPT [4], improve the metric of detecting abuse language. Because these models are trained on a large-scale corpus, general knowledge of natural language can be obtained.

Due to the complicated of natural language laws, automatically identifying abuse language is still exceedingly challenging. For example, abuse language generally occurs in two cases, explicit and indirect linguistic phenomena. The earlier type of abuse language is more overt, perhaps taking the form of specific harsh phrases. However, the latter type could contain metaphors or analogies, which might cause certain algorithmic identification mistakes. In addition, the existing methods focus on fine-tuning the PLMs to adapt to the downstream tasks so that the training and application of the PLMs are not under a unified paradigm, and the knowledge contained in the PLMs cannot be better utilized. Therefore, the primary goal of our work is to do this research: whether prompt-based learning helps detect abuse language. To this end, we propose a new end-to-end multi-task detection network for abuse language, which combines prompt tuning and multi-task learning.

1.2 Motivations and Contributions

The task of abuse language detection suffers from limited accuracy. Current detection methods [5,6,7,8,9] fine-tune the PLMs to adapt to downstream tasks. NULI [5] adapts and fine-tunes the BERT-base model to detect abuse language. AbuseAnalyzer [6] uses a two-layer feed-forward network with BERT for detecting abuse language. Kungfupanda [7] develops a method for detecting abuse language that blends multi-task learning with BERT-based models. With regard to their effectiveness in detecting abuse language, UHH-LT [8] uses the MLM method to compare the performance of different PLMs. An architecture called CTF [9] combines various textual elements to find abuse or hostile tweets on Twitter, which generates contextual 768-dimensional word vectors for each input character using a pre-trained BERT model. Therefore, these methods fail to stimulate the general knowledge of the PLMs, leading to limited accuracy. To

address the mentioned problem, we introduce prompt-based learning and explore how prompt-based learning can be correctly used in detecting abuse language.

Prompt tuning has been a great success for most natural language processing tasks. By including new texts in the input, prompt-based learning is a method for better using the knowledge from the PLMs. As shown in Fig. 1, a prompt with a mask token is added to the tweet text, and we predict that the mask would point to the corresponding word in the vocabulary through PLMs. Then, based on the corresponding label of the word, it can determine whether the tweet is abuse language.

We propose a novel *Deep Prompt Multi-task Network* termed DPMN. First, it uses prompt-based learning to acquire knowledge of the PLMs. Second, to use the supervisory signals from other related tasks, we employ multi-task learning. Eventually, we design a task head based on the synthesis of Bi-LSTM [10], and feed-forward network (FFN) [11] to aggregate all the shared representations of the final output layer of the BERT model.

Experimental results indicate that deep prompt tuning is a very effective method. Specifically, the Macro F1 scores of DPMN are 0.8384, 0.9218, and 0.8165 on the OLID, SOLID, and AbuseAnalyzer datasets. We prove that the proposed DPMN achieves excellent results in detecting abuse language.




Fig. 1. An example of applying prompt-based learning to identify whether a tweet is an abuse language. The mask character is a word to be predicted. It can have two-word choices in the verbalizer, abuse and non-abuse.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We propose a novel *Deep Prompt Multi-task Network*, which achieves state-of-the-art results in detecting abuse language.
- Deep prompt tuning is first applied to abuse language detection. To improve the metric of detecting abuse language, we compare the forms of deep prompt tuning and light prompt tuning. Then the effects of different prompt lengths, tuning strategies, and prompt initialization methods are studied.

- We present a task head based on Bi-LSTM and FFN, and we prove that the effect of the task head is very significant through experiments.

2 Related Works

2.1 Abuse Language Detection

Much past work has explored the problem of detecting different types of abuse language. On the whole, the detection of abuse language mainly includes the following types, aggression detection [12], bullying recognition [13], hate speech recognition [14], abuse language, and toxic comments.

- Aggression detection: The developer can access a dataset of 15,000 tagged Facebook short texts as part of the shared challenge on aggression identification [12] in TRAC-2018. It is applied to the model training and validation. In the performance test portion of the model, there are two distinct datasets used, one from Twitter and the other from Facebook. The detection task aims to distinguish three categories: non-aggressive, covertly aggressive, and overtly aggressive.
- Bullying recognition: There are currently several works on cyberbullying detection methods. For example, Jun-Ming Xu [15] uses text classification, role labeling, sentiment recognition, and LDA to recognize related topics.
- Hate speech recognition: Hate speech detection tasks have a long history of research [16,17,18]. Davidson [19] proposes a dataset for detecting hate speech that includes more than 24,000 tweets in English.
- offensive language: LSF [20] applies concepts from the theory of natural language processing to exploit the linguistic syntactic representations of sentences to detect offensive language. Zampieri [21] introduces an offensive language recognition dataset OLID, which seeks to identify the class and the objective of offensive content in social networks. Rosenthal [22] extend the OLID into the multilingual edition SOLID, which promotes multilingual research in detecting abuse language. MTL [7] uses multi-task learning and the BERT-base model to detect offensive language.
- Toxic comments: On Kaggle, there is a free contest called the Toxic Comment Classification Challenge. It provides the developer with short comments from Wikipedia. The dataset is divided into six groups: insult, obscene, threat, toxic, severe toxic, and identity hate. Through thorough trials on prompt engineering, Generative CIs [23] investigates the generative variation of zero-shot prompt-based toxicity detection.

Although each task involves specific types of abuse or offense, many things are in common. For instance, insults against individuals are often called cyberbullying, and insults against groups are called hate speech.

MTL is the baseline model of our network. Compared with the MTL model, we first add prompt-based learning. Secondly, the task head is optimized. Our structure is Bi-LSTM + FFN, which is simpler and more effective than the LSTM + FFN + Softmax of MTL.

In contrast to Generative Cls, DPMN does not need to design manual prompts. Making a good prompt is very time-consuming and tough. In general, artificial design is not an intelligent solution.

2.2 Prompt-based Learning for PLMs

To improve the output embedding from the PLMs, prompt-based learning entails adding instructions to the input text. With the development of GPT-3 [24], prompt-based techniques have excelled in many common natural language processing applications. Many researches [25,26,27,28,29,30] have been put forth to show how prompt-based learning has advanced by the appropriate manual prompt. Knowledgeable prompt-tuning [31] suggests calibrating the verbalizer to accommodate outside knowledge. Automatic generating for discrete prompt has been thoroughly investigated as a way to prevent time-consuming prompt design. LM-BFF [32] first explores the creation of label words and templates automatically. Additionally, Autoprompt [33] suggests using gradient-guided search to create the vocabulary template and identify terms automatically. Continuous prompts have recently been proposed [34,35,36,37], which emphasize the use of learnable continuous representations rather than label words as prompt templates. In a word, prompt-based learning is applied in natural language processing to improve the understanding and generation of PLMs.

In view of the rapid rise and development of the above prompt tuning, we first design two continuous prompt forms, namely, deep prompt tuning and light prompt tuning. Then we apply the two prompt forms to abuse language detection. Eventually, we propose a network termed DPMN, which combines prompt-based learning and multi-task learning.

3 The Proposed Methodology

Our DPMN architecture is shown in Fig. 2. The three sub-tasks share PLMs in the section at the bottom. Each sub-task has its unique module in the upper parts. A task head based on the Bi-LSTM and FFN neural network topology is present in each module. DPMN sets the number, form, and initialization strategy of continuous prompt tokens. Then it generates the learnable embedding through the prompt encoder module. The tokenizer encoder module encodes the short text to generate input embedding. Splicing it with the input embedding generated by the PLMs. DPMN inputs them into the PLMs. The task head obtains the shared representations produced by the PLMs and generates a predicted category for short text. We calculate the multi-task loss function and train the entire architecture.

3.1 Continuous Prompt Tuning Parameters

Prompts can be divided into Discrete Prompts and Continuous Prompts.




Fig. 2. Our DPMN Architecture. According to the number of continuous prompt tokens, initialization strategy of continuous prompt, prompt form, and tuning strategy, the prompt encoder module generates the learnable embedding. The tokenizer encoder module encodes the short text to generate input embedding. We produce a representation matrix by combining the learnable embedding and input embedding. The representation matrix is input into PLMs. It outputs the shared embedding. The shared embedding is input to the task heads. The task heads output the probability value of the prediction classification. The total loss function is calculated to train the entire DPMN architecture.

- **Discrete Prompts.** Discrete prompts are essentially a natural language. Based on fixed prompt word templates, that is, adding fixed prompt word templates and masking words after inputting statements.
- **Continuous Prompts.** Continuous prompts are no longer natural language. It replaces the fixed prompt word template with n learnable vectors.

Continuous prompt tuning parameters are made up of the number, form, initialization method, and tuning strategy of prompt tokens.

The number of prompt tokens plays a critical role in DPMN. We verify that abuse language detection usually achieves different performances with different prompt lengths. Specifically, we choose the number of prompt tokens according to the metric of detecting abuse language.




Fig. 3. We design two continuous prompt forms, namely deep prompt tuning and light prompt tuning. The deep prompt tuning is to add trainable continuous prompt embedding to each layer of the PLMs. The light prompt tuning is to add trainable continuous prompt embedding to the first layer of the PLMs.

Considering the instability of discrete prompt performance, we adopt the form of continuous prompt tuning. Because the template of a discrete prompt requires a lot of manual design work, the predicted performance of the prompt-based model is relatively volatile. As shown in Fig. 3, we use two continuous prompt forms: deep prompt tuning and light prompt tuning. We prove the effectiveness of these two prompt forms through experiments. The deep prompt tuning is to add trainable continuous prompt embedding to each layer of the PLMs. The light prompt tuning is to add trainable continuous prompt embedding to the first layer of the PLMs. For two continuous prompt forms, we study the most suitable prompt form.

In the architecture of our network, prompt initiation is a significant research challenge. It has two kinds of parameter initialization methods, which are random parameter initialization and BERT token initialization.

Tuning strategy is also an important research issue in our network design. It contains the two strategies of the Fixed LM Prompt Tuning strategy and LM + Prompt Tuning strategy.

3.2 Prompt Encoder

According to the number, form, initialization method, and tuning strategy of the prompt, the prompt encoder module generates a continuous prompt. Specifically, first define n trainable embedding vectors, and then initialize them. Secondly, the input text is generated into a word ID sequence through a word splitter, and then an embedding sequence is generated based on the BERT model vocabulary. Finally, we concatenate these two vectors as inputs to the BERT model.

The PLMs are used as the backbone for our DPMN. The continuous prompt is applied to the encoder of the PLMs. To prepend continuous prompts for the encoder, DPMN initializes a trainable prefix matrix p_e of dimension $p_n \cdot d$ for each layer of the PLMs, where p_n is the prompt length, and d is the hidden size of the PLMs. Because the prompt is located in the deep layers of the PLMs, it has the total capacity to guide the PLMs in the right direction and output a semantic shared representation for abuse language detection.

The continuous prompt stimulates the general knowledge of the PLMs. It performs better than fine-tuning in a range of natural language processing applications. The learnable embeddings are trained for abuse language detection.

3.3 Task Head

The central for prompt tuning is that the PLMs use a head to predict verbalizers. Because this requires manual design and even searches for all possible words, which is very labor-intensive. Therefore, the DPMN directly replaces the design of the verbalizer module with the classified label. The task head of the DPMN adopts the neural network architecture of Bi-LSTM + FFN. Compared to the linear classification head, its predicted performance is better. LSTM comprises an input gate, forget gate, output gate, and cell state. Bi-LSTM contained two sub-networks to model a text sequence in both directions. The outputs of short text are integrated in the following way:

$$H_{F,B} = [F_H_t, B_H_t], \quad (1)$$

where F_H_t is output value of the LSTM at the last time t in forward direction. B_H_t represents the output value of the LSTM at the last time t in the backward direction. Here $H_{F,B}$ is the output embedding of the Bi-LSTM result.

FFN is made up of two linear layers. Its activation function is ReLU.

$$y = W_{f2}ReLU(W_{f1}H_{F,B} + b_{f1}) + b_{f2}, \quad (2)$$

we let $\Theta_{FFN} = \{W_{f1}, W_{f2}, b_{f1}, b_{f2}\}$, where Θ_{FFN} is the learnable FFN parameter. The task head takes the feed-forward network as the classifier. Multi-task classification is achieved by setting different output numbers of PLMs.

3.4 Multi-task Network

The proposed DPMN is a multi-task network, which is divided into the main task and two auxiliary tasks. Our main task is to detect whether the text is

abuse language. The auxiliary tasks are to improve the feature representation ability of the output layer of the PLMs, thereby improving the detection ability of the main task and playing the role of transfer learning.

We train our DPMN on train datasets and mainly verify the model performance metrics on sub-task A. The goal of multi-task learning is to deliver useful information in tasks B and C to boost task A.

3.5 DPMN Loss

$$Loss_{sub-task} = - \sum_i y_i \log(y'_i) \quad (3)$$

y'_i is the probability predicted by the proposed DPMN. y_i is the category information of the dataset. $Loss_{sub-task}$ represents the loss of the sub-task, using the cross-entropy loss function.

$$c_{main} + c_{auxi1} + c_{auxi2} = 1 \quad (4)$$

c_{main} is the loss coefficient for the main task. c_{auxi1} is the loss coefficient for the auxiliary task. We set the sum of the coefficients of all current sub-task losses to 1.

$$Loss_{total} = c_{main}Loss_{main} + c_{auxi1}Loss_{auxi1} + c_{auxi2}Loss_{auxi2} \quad (5)$$

$Loss_{total}$ is the total loss of the DPMN. It is equal to the weighted sum of the losses of each sub-task.

4 Experiments

Table 1. Four short tweets from the OLID, their corresponding labels are hierarchical. In task A, the aim is to discriminate between offensive and non-offensive posts. In task B, the goal is to predict the type of offense: Targeted Insult (TIN) and Untargeted (UNT). Task C focuses on the target of offenses: Individual (IND), Group (GRP), and Other (OTH).

Short Text	Task A	Task B	Task C
@USER With his offers, he is extremely kind.	NOT	—	—
Liberated! THE WORST ACTIVITY OF MY FUCKING LIFE	OFF	UNT	—
@USER This big cocksucker is fucked	OFF	TIN	IND
@USER Figures! Why are these people such idiots? Praise God for @USER	OFF	TIN	GRP

We assess the proposed DPMN for detecting abuse language in experiments. Three public datasets are adopted: the OLID [38], SOLID [22], and AbuseAnalyzer dataset [39]. These datasets have been widely used for evaluating detection metrics of abuse language. Macro F1 score is used as the evaluation metric. DPMN achieves excellent performance in abuse language detection.

Table 2. Detecting abuse language results on three public datasets, the evaluation metric is the Macro F1 score.

Dataset	Model	Main Task	Tuning Strategy	Prompt Length	Prompt Initialization
OLID	Logistic Regression	0.7501	*	*	*
	Bagging	0.7558	*	*	*
	MTL	0.8244	LM Tuning	*	*
	NULI	0.8290	LM Tuning	*	*
	DPMN(light prompt)	0.8279	LM + Prompt Tuning	1	Random
	DPMN(deep prompt)	0.8384	LM + Prompt Tuning	1	BERT Token
SOLID	MTL	0.9139	LM Tuning	*	*
	MTL(Ensemble)	0.9151	LM Tuning	*	*
	UHH-LT	0.9204	LM Tuning	*	*
	DPMN(light prompt)	0.9208	LM + Prompt Tuning	1	Random
	DPMN(deep prompt)	0.9218	LM + Prompt Tuning	2	BERT Token
AbuseAnalyzer	SVM	0.7277	*	*	*
	XGBoost	0.7157	*	*	*
	Logistic Regression	0.7235	*	*	*
	BERT + Linear Head	0.7985	LM Tuning	*	*
	DPMN(light prompt)	0.8107	LM + Prompt Tuning	1	BERT Token
	DPMN(deep prompt)	0.8165	LM + Prompt Tuning	1	Random

4.1 Baseline

To evaluate the detection metric, the proposed network DPMN is compared with eight comparable supervised methods, containing four shallow supervised methods (e.g., Logistic Regression [40], XGBoost [41], Bagging [42], SVM [43]) and four deep supervised methods (e.g., BERT + Linear Head [39], MTL[7], NULI [5], UHH-LT [8]).

4.2 Analysis of Experimental Results

The results in Table 2 show detection metrics. The proposed DPMN is overall better than all the compared methods in three public datasets. For example, compared with the current state-of-the-art method, the Macro F1 score of our DPMN has been increased by 0.94%, 0.14%, and 1.80% on the OLID, SOLID, and AbuseAnalyzer, respectively.

The main reasons for these superior results come from three aspects:

- Deep prompt tuning can better use the general knowledge of the PLMs.
- We propose an effective task head based on Bi-LSTM and FFN, and it improves the detection of abuse language.
- DPMN utilizes multi-task learning, which can obtain more useful information from the other tasks.

In addition, it can be seen that the detection effect of the deep models is better than that of the shallow models.

4.2.1 Ablation Experiment The results in Table 3 show the ablation experiment. We design the ablation experiment for the DPMN components. *BERT Base* model adopts the BERT + Linear Head structure, where the Linear Head is a classifier of multi-layer perceptron structure. The Macro F1 score of the




Fig. 4. Through ablation experiments on the OLID dataset, the Macro F1 score contributions of different neural network modules of the DPMN algorithm are determined. A histogram of the structural lifting value is drawn in the network, which contains the Bi-LSTM + FFN module, the multi-task learning (MTL) module, and the prompt-based learning module.

Table 3. The Ablation Experiments of DPMN Components.

Model	Architecture	Macro F1
BERT Base	BERT + Linear Head	0.8037
BERT LSTM	BERT + Bi-LSTM FFN Head	0.8202
DPMN-P	BERT + Bi-LSTM FFN Head + Multi-task Learning	0.8244
DPMN-M	BERT + Bi-LSTM FFN Head + Prompt	0.8342
DPMN-B	BERT + Multi-task Learning + Prompt	0.8276
DPMN	BERT + Bi-LSTM FFN Head + Multi-task Learning + Prompt	0.8384

BERT Base model to detect abuse language is 0.8037. The *BERT LSTM* model utilizes the BERT + Bi-LSTM FFN Head structure, where the Bi-LSTM FFN Head is a classifier of the Bi-LSTM + FFN structure. The Macro F1 score of the *BERT LSTM* model to detect abuse language is 0.8202. We experimentally prove that the classification head based on Bi-LSTM + FFN is better than the classification head based on Linear Head.

DPMN-P adds a multi-task learning architecture based on the *BERT LSTM* model. It removes the prompt tuning module compared to DPMN. The Macro F1 score of the *DPMN-P* model to detect abuse language is 0.8244. DPMN optimizes the *DPMN-P* model and designs the architecture of prompt-based learning. The Macro F1 score of the DPMN model to detect abuse language is 0.8384. Comparing the detection performance of *DPMN-P* and DPMN models, we can conclude that deep continuous prompt learning is effective.

In contrast to DPMN, *DPMN-M* gets rid of the multi-task learning module. Its Macro F1 score is 0.8342.

Compared to DPMN, *DPMN-B* does away with the Bi-LSTM + FFN Head. Its metric value is 0.8276.

To express the validity of the ablation experiment, we draw a histogram of the structural lifting value in the network. From the above Fig. 4, in the evaluation value of Macro F1, the contribution of the Bi-LSTM + FFN module is 0.0108, the contribution of the multi-task learning (MTL) module is 0.0042, and the contribution of the prompt-based learning module is 0.0140. Therefore, it can be seen that the proposed DPMN is effective.

4.2.2 The Convergence of DPMN From Fig. 5, the training loss curve shows a downward trend with the increase in the number of epochs. As the number of epochs increases, the test loss curve first decreases and then increases. With the deepening of DPMN training, the test loss shows an upward trend, indicating that the detection performance of DPMN is declining. Through the changes in the two curves, it can be concluded that the DPMN has the best performance at *epoch* = 5.




Fig. 5. The convergence of the DPMN is verified on the OLID dataset.

4.3 Implementation Details

We chose a learning rate of $3e-6$ and a batch size of 32 for our best DPMN. The loss coefficients for sub-tasks A, B, and C are 0.4, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. We use an early stop method to stop tuning the model if the validation Macro F1 does not rise in four consecutive epochs. We train the DPMN with a maximum of 30 epochs. The DPMN is implemented in PyTorch, and a single GPU-V100 is used for each experiment.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We propose an innovative *Deep Prompt Multi-task Network* termed DPMN. It introduces deep prompt tuning in abuse language detection for the first time. It can better motivate the knowledge of PLMs. We design a task head based on Bi-LSTM and FFN, which improves the performance in detecting abuse language. We attempt two prompt forms and verify the effects of different prompt lengths, tuning strategies, and prompt initialization methods. The proposed DPMN achieves state-of-the-art results in three abuse datasets. The follow-up work is to optimize and adaptively adjust the sub-task loss weight in multi-tasks and reasonably design the algorithm of the whole model loss function.

6 Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2021ZD0201501), the Youth Foundation Project of Zhejiang Province (Grant No. LQ22F020035), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 32200860).

References

1. Yann LeCun, Bernhard Boser, John S Denker, Donnie Henderson, Richard E Howard, Wayne Hubbard, and Lawrence D Jackel. Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural computation*, 1(4):541–551, 1989.
2. Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Interspeech*, volume 2, pages 1045–1048. Makuhari, 2010.
3. Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
4. Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
5. Ping Liu, Wen Li, and Liang Zou. Nuli at semeval-2019 task 6: Transfer learning for offensive language detection using bidirectional transformers. In *SemEval@NAACL-HLT*, pages 87–91, 2019.
6. Mohit Chandra, Ashwin Pathak, Eesha Dutta, Paryul Jain, Manish Gupta, Manish Shrivastava, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. AbuseAnalyzer: Abuse detection, severity and target prediction for gab posts. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6277–6283. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, December 2020.
7. Wenliang Dai, Tiezheng Yu, Zihan Liu, and Pascale Fung. Kungfupanda at semeval-2020 task 12: Bert-based multi-task learning for offensive language detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13432*, 2020.
8. Gregor Wiedemann, Seid Muhie Yimam, and Chris Biemann. Uhh-It at semeval-2020 task 12: Fine-tuning of pre-trained transformer networks for offensive language detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11493*, 2020.

9. Sherzod Hakimov and Ralph Ewerth. Combining textual features for the detection of hateful and offensive language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04803*, 2021.
10. Shu Zhang, Dequan Zheng, Xinchun Hu, and Ming Yang. Bidirectional long short-term memory networks for relation classification. In *Proceedings of the 29th Pacific Asia conference on language, information and computation*, pages 73–78, 2015.
11. George Bebis and Michael Georgiopoulos. Feed-forward neural networks. *IEEE Potentials*, 13(4):27–31, 1994.
12. Ritesh Kumar, Atul Kr Ojha, Shervin Malmasi, and Marcos Zampieri. Benchmarking aggression identification in social media. In *Proceedings of the first workshop on trolling, aggression and cyberbullying (TRAC-2018)*, pages 1–11, 2018.
13. Qianjia Huang, Vivek Kumar Singh, and Pradeep Kumar Atrey. Cyber bullying detection using social and textual analysis. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Socially-aware Multimedia*, pages 3–6, 2014.
14. Ji Ho Park and Pascale Fung. One-step and two-step classification for abusive language detection on twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.01206*, 2017.
15. Jun-Ming Xu, Kwang-Sung Jun, Xiaojin Zhu, and Amy Bellmore. Learning from bullying traces in social media. In *Proceedings of the 2012 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pages 656–666, 2012.
16. Irene Kwok and Yuzhou Wang. Locate the hate: Detecting tweets against blacks. In *Twenty-seventh AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2013.
17. Pete Burnap and Matthew L Williams. Cyber hate speech on twitter: An application of machine classification and statistical modeling for policy and decision making. *Policy & internet*, 7(2):223–242, 2015.
18. Nemanja Djuric, Jing Zhou, Robin Morris, Mihajlo Grbovic, Vladan Radosavljevic, and Narayan Bhamidipati. Hate speech detection with comment embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pages 29–30, 2015.
19. Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmusley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 11, pages 512–515, 2017.
20. Ying Chen, Yilu Zhou, Sencun Zhu, and Heng Xu. Detecting offensive language in social media to protect adolescent online safety. In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Conference on Social Computing*, pages 71–80. IEEE, 2012.
21. 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.
22. Sara Rosenthal, Pepa Atanasova, Georgi Karadzhov, Marcos Zampieri, and Preslav Nakov. A large-scale semi-supervised dataset for offensive language identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14454*, 2020.
23. Yau-Shian Wang and Yingshan Chang. Toxicity detection with generative prompt-based inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12390*, 2022.
24. Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
25. Eyal Ben-David, Nadav Oved, and Roi Reichart. Pada: A prompt-based autoregressive approach for adaptation to unseen domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12206*, 2021.

26. Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*, 2021.
27. Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*, 2021.
28. Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08786*, 2021.
29. Laria Reynolds and Kyle McDonell. Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–7, 2021.
30. Teven Le Scao and Alexander M Rush. How many data points is a prompt worth? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08493*, 2021.
31. Shengding Hu, Ning Ding, Huadong Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, and Maosong Sun. Knowledgeable prompt-tuning: Incorporating knowledge into prompt verbalizer for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.02035*, 2021.
32. Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*, 2020.
33. Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. Autoprompt: Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15980*, 2020.
34. Karen Hambardzumyan, Hrant Khachatryan, and Jonathan May. Warp: Word-level adversarial reprogramming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00121*, 2021.
35. Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021.
36. Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
37. Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gpt understands, too. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10385*, 2021.
38. Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. Semeval-2019 task 6: Identifying and categorizing offensive language in social media (offenseval). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08983*, 2019.
39. Mohit Chandra, Ashwin Pathak, Eesha Dutta, Paryul Jain, Manish Gupta, Manish Shrivastava, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. Abuseanalyzer: Abuse detection, severity and target prediction for gab posts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00038*, 2020.
40. David G Kleinbaum, K Dietz, M Gail, Mitchel Klein, and Mitchell Klein. *Logistic regression*. Springer, 2002.
41. Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 785–794, 2016.
42. Leo Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24(2):123–140, 1996.
43. Marti A. Hearst, Susan T Dumais, Edgar Osuna, John Platt, and Bernhard Scholkopf. Support vector machines. *IEEE Intelligent Systems and their applications*, 13(4):18–28, 1998.