

Debiasing Multilingual Word Embeddings: A Case Study of Three Indian Languages

Srijan Bansal*
Dept. of ECE,
IIT Kharagpur
West Bengal, India – 721302
srijanbansal97@iitkgp.ac.in

Vishal Garimella*
Dept. of CSE,
IIT Kharagpur
West Bengal, India – 721302
vishal_g@iitkgp.ac.in

Ayush Suhane
Dept. of Mathematics,
IIT Kharagpur
West Bengal, India – 721302
ayushsuhane99@iitkgp.ac.in

Animesh Mukherjee
Dept. of CSE,
IIT Kharagpur
West Bengal, India – 721302
animeshm@cse.iitkgp.ac.in

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we advance the current state-of-the-art method for debiasing monolingual word embeddings so as to generalize well in a multilingual setting. We consider different methods to quantify bias and different debiasing approaches for monolingual as well as multilingual settings. We demonstrate the significance of our bias-mitigation approach on downstream NLP applications. Our proposed methods establish the state-of-the-art performance for debiasing multilingual embeddings for three Indian languages - Hindi, Bengali, and Telugu in addition to English. We believe that our work will open up new opportunities in building unbiased downstream NLP applications that are inherently dependent on the quality of the word embeddings used.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Machine translation.**

KEYWORDS

Debiasing multilingual embeddings, Gender debias, Debiasing Indian languages

ACM Reference Format:

Srijan Bansal, Vishal Garimella, Ayush Suhane, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2021. Debiasing Multilingual Word Embeddings: A Case Study of Three Indian Languages. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media (HT '21)*, August 30-September 2, 2021, Virtual Event, Ireland. ACM, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465336.3475118>

1 INTRODUCTION

Word embeddings are ubiquitous across many downstream NLP applications. Current approaches in NLP rely on large amounts of training data. Such data is easily available for a resource-rich language like English but poses a major challenge for other languages. Multilingual word embeddings are widely used in numerous downstream NLP applications which represent words from multiple languages in a common vector space such that similar meaning

**Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

HT '21, August 30-September 2, 2021, Virtual Event, Ireland

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-8551-0/21/08...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3465336.3475118>

words are close to each other. This allows to leverage advancement in English for improving model's performance on low resource languages using transfer learning [1, 2, 6, 13].

However, there is an unavoidable bottleneck in the aforementioned pipeline. Lately, word embeddings have been found to be 'blatantly sexist' thus introducing a bias in the applications built on top of them [4]. Using Google-News embeddings for the English language the authors showed how gender-neutral profession words (e.g., programmer, homemaker) get aligned to one of the gender directions for various analogy tasks. To mitigate this problem they introduced different flavours of debiasing algorithms that can quite successfully remove the biases in the word embeddings. Later Dev and Phillips [9] showed that using simple linear projections can be more effective in attenuating bias in word vectors than complex debiasing algorithms.

An open question: While multiple efforts have focused on understanding and mitigating the bias in English word embeddings, less attention is given to understand and mitigate the bias in multilingual embeddings. A pertinent question is how well the above debiasing algorithms work for other non-English languages in a multilingual setting. This question is worth investigating for the following reasons.

- The semantics of gender words may vary from one language to another. Hassan and Alamgir [11] point out 'তার' can refer to both 'he' or 'she' in the sentence কেউ তার ছাতা ভুলে গেছে। (Somebody forgot his/her umbrella).
- While Bolukbasi et al. [4] leverages the pronouns (e.g., she/he) to construct gendered directions this might not be possible for many languages (e.g., Bengali where the same pronoun is used to refer to both the male and female genders). Prates et al. [15] point out that a relatively high proportion of words in Bengali are gender-neutral.

The present work: In this paper, we aim to understand bias in multilingual embeddings. Gender bias in English can be very different from bias in other languages due to the innate structure and semantics of the languages. In addition to quantifying this bias, we advance the linear projection based bias mitigation approach to multilingual embeddings.

Our **key contributions** are as follows.

- We build sets of gendered words for three different Indian languages chosen from two different language families (Indo-Aryan and Dravidian) – Hindi, Bengali and Telugu. We also identify a set of gender-neutral words for these languages which include both profession words (alike Bolukbasi et al.

	Profession	Adjective	Transliterated	Gender defining pairs
en	professor, boss, poet	rich, powerful, bright	-	father-mother, king-queen, he-she
hi	माली ⁽¹⁾ , पत्रकार ⁽²⁾ , न्यायाधीश ⁽³⁾	कठिन ⁽⁴⁾ , स्वच्छ ⁽⁵⁾ , भारी ⁽⁶⁾	कंडक्टर ⁽⁷⁾ , नर्स ⁽⁸⁾ , प्रोफेसर ⁽⁹⁾	लड़का-लड़की ⁽¹⁰⁾ , आदमी-महिला ⁽¹¹⁾ , पति-पत्नी ⁽¹²⁾
be	माली ⁽¹³⁾ , सांवादि ⁽¹⁴⁾ , विचारक ⁽¹⁵⁾	नोनता ⁽¹⁶⁾ , मशलादार ⁽¹⁷⁾ , कम ⁽¹⁸⁾	कन्डाक्टर ⁽¹⁹⁾ , नार्स ⁽²⁰⁾ , अध्यापक ⁽²¹⁾	भूरुश-महिल ⁽²²⁾ , (छले-मये ⁽²³⁾ , भूत-कन्या ⁽²⁴⁾)
te	న్యాయమూర్తి ⁽²⁵⁾ , న్యాయవాది, ⁽²⁶⁾ నిర్వాహకుడు ⁽²⁷⁾	శక్తివంతమైన ⁽²⁸⁾ , శాంతిగా ⁽²⁹⁾ , నిశితం ⁽³⁰⁾	కమిషనర్ ⁽³¹⁾ , కన్సల్టెంట్ ⁽³²⁾ , ఎడిటర్ ⁽³³⁾	అంకుల్-అత్త ⁽³⁴⁾ , నోదరుడు-నోదరి ⁽³⁵⁾ , దేవుడు-దేవత ⁽³⁶⁾

¹gardner ²reporter ³judge ⁴tough ⁵clean ⁶heavy ⁷conductor ⁸nurse ⁹professor ¹⁰boy-girl ¹¹man-woman ¹²husband-wife ¹³gardner ¹⁴journalist ¹⁵judge ¹⁶spicy ¹⁷spicy ¹⁸low ¹⁹conductor ²⁰nurse ²¹professor ²²male-female ²³son-daughter ²⁴son-daughter ²⁵judge ²⁶lawyer ²⁷administrator ²⁸powerful ²⁹peaceful ³⁰careful ³¹commissioner ³²consultant ³³editor ³⁴uncle-aunt ³⁵brother-sister ³⁶god-goddess

Figure 1: Examples of words in our corpus.

[4]) as well as a set of adjectives which are known to be gender-biased for many Indian languages (see Pande [14]).

- We perform all our debiasing analysis on fasttext embeddings for the monolingual setting. For multilingual settings, they are aligned to common space using a bilingual dictionary. Our choice of embedding is motivated by the need for mitigating bias in Indic languages as well as in English.
- We advance monolingual debiasing algorithms to multilingual settings and evaluate them based on intrinsic and extrinsic bias measures. Our debiasing approach reduces both intrinsic and extrinsic bias in multilingual setting *achieving state-of-the-art performance* without compromising the overall quality of the debiased embeddings much.

Our methods are generic and can be easily extended to any other language. The choice of the current set of languages is motivated by the knowledge of the authors in these languages. All our code is available at <https://github.com/amsuhane/Debiasing-Multilingual-Word-Embeddings-A-Case-Study-of-Three-Indian-Languages>.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes related works on these problems and provides context on why the problem is difficult and important to solve. Next, in sections 3 and 4, we respectively quantify bias and describe the datasets which are used to measure it. Sections 5 and 6 respectively discuss our novel multilingual debiasing algorithm and the experimental setup. We present the results in section 7 and conclude our work in section 8.

2 RELATED WORK

Bolukbasi et al. [4] provides motivation as to why debiasing word embeddings is a problem of interest and introduce concepts of gender spaces and debiasing with respect to them. Dev and Phillips [9] further advance this work by proposing simpler algorithms for debiasing based on linear projections. Caliskan et al. [5] also find the gender stereotypes in the English word embeddings based on the Word Embedding Association Test (WEAT) which cannot be

adapted for other languages. Zhou et al. [21] reveal that bias exists in languages with grammatical gender and make an attempt to debias English-Spanish embeddings. Recently, Blodgett et al. [3] have raised concerns about Dev and Phillips [9] and Bolukbasi et al. [4] due to lack of downstream applications (categorized as “stereotyping”). In [8] the authors studied the advantage of word debiasing on natural language inference task. The authors showed that there is a reduction in the number of invalid inferences due to debiasing. In another recent work [17] the authors introduce the concept of iterative null space projection to reduce bias in neural representations. The last two works, which are also the most recent in this space, are again limited to the monolingual setting.

Our work is novel in various ways – we consider multiple Indic languages including samples from both the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian families, perform our analysis after the alignment of words from all the languages to a common space (unlike previous studies) and propose a single algorithm for debiasing all of them which allows for easy inclusion of many other languages. One of the earlier works on debiasing Indo-Aryan languages include [16]. Further, we address the concern of stereotyping by solving a downstream NLP task of occupation classification.

3 QUANTIFYING BIAS

In this section, we describe the notion of gender bias in word embeddings. Although in this study we consider only four languages namely English, Hindi, Bengali and Telugu the approach is general and can be easily extended to other languages. Bias in embeddings can be quantified in two major ways: *intrinsic* bias and *extrinsic* bias. While the former is used to quantify bias at the word-level the latter focuses on quantifying bias from the perspective of downstream NLP applications.

3.1 Intrinsic bias

Intrinsic bias (*InBias*) evaluation metric proposed by Zhao et al. [20] uses the gap between the distance of occupations and corresponding gender to show gender discrimination. Say, we have a pair of masculine and feminine words describing an occupation, such as the words actor and actress, the only difference lies in the gender information. As a result, they should have similar correlations to the corresponding gender seed words such as ‘he’ and ‘she’. If there is a gap, i.e., the distance between ‘actor’ and ‘he’ against the distance between ‘actress’ and ‘she’, it means such occupation shows discrimination against gender. We provide detailed descriptions of those words in section 4.

Definition of *InBias*: Given a set of masculine and feminine words, we define *InBias* as:

$$InBias = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |dis(O_{M_i}, S_M) - dis(O_{F_i}, S_F)|$$

where

$$dis(X, Y) = \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{y \in Y} 1 - \cos(X, y)$$

Here (O_{M_i}, O_{F_i}) stand for the masculine and feminine versions of the i^{th} occupation word, such as ‘actor’ and ‘actress’. This metric can also be generalized to languages without grammatical genders, such as English, by just using the same format of the occupation words. In our gender-neutral set (N_{all}), we only consider words which are same in male and female versions for all languages. S_M and S_F denote the set of male and female-oriented words respectively (i.e., S_M contains {male, him, he, ...}, and S_F contains {female, her, she, ...}).

In other words, intrinsic bias is a simple geometric method to quantify the overall “proximity” of gender-neutral words with respect to the notion of gender in a particular embedding space.

3.2 Extrinsic bias

The authors in Gonen and Goldberg [10] raise a valid concern that projection-based debiasing methods such as hard-debias and linear-projection reduce bias superficially. While the bias is indeed substantially reduced according to the provided bias definition, the actual effect is mostly of hiding the bias, not removing it.

We address this concern by, quantifying bias from an extrinsic perspective (*ExBias*) based on a downstream task [20] in addition to the intrinsic metric. Extrinsic bias measures the gap in performance for a standard NLP task before and after the debiasing of the word embeddings.

Definition of *ExBias*: We follow the same definition of extrinsic bias evaluation as used in Zhao et al. [20], i.e., using the average performance gap between different gender groups (male and female) aggregated across all the occupations ($|Diff|$). We used the BiosBias dataset proposed by De-Arteaga et al. [7] to evaluate the bias in predicting the occupation of people using a short biography on the bio of the person written in the third person (see section 4 for more details). We split the dataset based on the gender attribute. A gender-agnostic model should have similar performance in each group. To make predictions of the occupations, we used bidirectional LSTM units followed by attention mechanism (similar to the model used in De-Arteaga et al. [7]). The predictions are

generated by a softmax layer. We train such models using standard cross-entropy loss and keep the embeddings frozen during the training.

4 DATASET

In this section we describe the datasets used for measuring the *InBias* and *ExBias*.

4.1 *InBias* dataset

In order to evaluate intrinsic bias for embeddings, we require male-female counterparts of words or gender-neutral words and gender-oriented words¹. We considered a set of gender-neutral occupational words and adjectives (N_{all}). For the three Indian languages, it also includes the relevant transliterated-English profession words taken from [4]. N_{all} consists of neutral words for each language namely $N_{en}, N_{hi}, N_{te}, N_{bn}$.

In addition to neutral words for each language, we considered a set of gender-defining pairs (D_{all}), i.e., gender specific words that are associated with a gender by definition (e.g., {{he, she}, {him, her}, {king, queen}}). For $D_{all} = \{D_{all,1}, D_{all,2}, \dots, D_{all,m}\}$, each $D_{all,i}$ represents a tuple of male-female words ({he, she}, {king, queen} etc.) $D_{all,i} = (\delta_i^+, \delta_i^-)$ where $\delta_i^+, \delta_i^- \in \mathcal{V}$. D_{all} constitutes of D_{en}, D_{hi}, D_{be} and D_{te} which are gender-defining pairs for each language.

Lang	$ N_{prof} $	$ N_{adj} $	$ N_{tr} $	$ N_{lang} $	$ D_{lang} $
<i>en</i>	59	50	-	109	20
<i>hi</i>	28	44	14	86	20
<i>be</i>	29	43	15	87	21
<i>te</i>	18	54	18	90	15
<i>All</i>	134	191	47	372	76

Table 1: Datasets statistics: $|N_{prof}|$ - neutral profession words, $|N_{adj}|$ - neutral adjectives, $|N_{tr}|$ - neutral English transliterated words, $|N_{lang}|$ - total number of neutral words for language *lang*, $|D_{lang}|$ - total number of gender pairs for language *lang*.

Table 1 notes some basic statistics for the dataset used for further analysis. Our corpus is balanced with respect to different languages. Some examples of words in our dataset are noted in Figure 1. Henceforth, ‘neutral’ would refer to gender-neutral words.

4.2 *ExBias* dataset

For the investigation of *ExBias* we used the BiosBias dataset proposed by De-Arteaga et al. [7]. The dataset has been prepared to evaluate the bias in predicting the occupation of people using a short biography on the bio of the person written in third person. We followed the data collection procedure proposed by De-Arteaga et al. [7] for the English dataset².

To identify bio paragraphs, we use regex patterns such as “NAME is an OCCUPATION-TITLE”. In order to minimise bias due to the

¹<https://bit.ly/2TNKW3>

²For our work, we have removed all occurrences of author identity as well as co-references to the authors. We do not plan to release non-anonymized bios-data since it is already available for download from the commoncrawl portal.




Figure 2: Gender statistics of Bios-Bias dataset for different occupations where each occupation has at least 100 instances. X-axis here stands for the occupation names and y-axis is the number of instances for each occupation.

dataset, we restricted our analysis to occupations having a relatively balanced distribution of male and female bios as shown in Figure 2. We extract the binary gender based on gendered pronouns, like ‘he’ and ‘she’. To remove any effect of names and gender pronouns on the model prediction, we filtered them out from the bios.

One of the main challenges here is the absence of appropriate datasets (bios) in Indic languages on Common Crawl dumps. As a resort, we translated the English bios to the Indian languages under investigation using the Google Translate API.

5 DEBIASING ALGORITHMS

Bolukbasi et al. [4] propose a hard-debiasing (HD) method in which the vector difference of corresponding gender-defining pairs (e.g. {man,woman}) i.e., $\vec{man} - \vec{woman}$ captures the gender direction in the embedding space. They use this gender direction to project the word embeddings of gender-neutral words into a subspace orthogonal to the gender-defining words. The HD method uses a seed set of gender-defining words to train a support vector machine classifier, and use it to expand the initial set of gender-defining words. During the subsequent debiasing process, HD focuses only on gender neutral words (i.e., words not predicted as gender-defining by the classifier). Therefore, if the classifier erroneously predicts a stereotypical word as a gender-defining word, it would not get debiased.

Dev and Phillips [9] proposed linear projection algorithm similar to HD, which also uses a gender-direction to debias. In the rest of the paper, we shall denote the algorithm proposed by [9] as LP. Both create a vector-space $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ from the top PCA (Principal Component Analysis) component of gender-defining pairs and using this they remove the gender component of the word embeddings. Hard debias removes the component for gender-neutral words only and equalizes the distance of neutral words wrt each

gender-defining pair. LP on the other hand achieves debiasing by removing component along \mathbf{B} for all $w \in W$, thus doing away with the need of training an SVM classifier to mine neutral words. This motivates us to use LP as our baseline.

Formally, for word vector $\vec{w} \in W$ we denote its projection onto the gender subspace \mathbf{B} as $\vec{w}_B = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle \vec{w}, \vec{b}_i \rangle \vec{b}_i$ where b_j are basis for \mathbf{B} . Thus, a word vector \vec{w} can be decomposed as $\vec{w} = \vec{w}_B + \vec{w}_\perp$, where \vec{w}_\perp is the projection onto the orthogonal space [4]. Note that all the word vectors are normalized to unit normals.

LP removes \vec{w}_B from all the word vectors $\vec{w} \in W$. Thus the component of neutral word along gender subspace is zero thereby, positioning the neutral words to almost equal distance from the gendered words. For a given word vector $\vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the debiased embedding such that $\vec{w}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is $\vec{w}' = \vec{w} - \vec{w}_B$. If $\dim(\mathbf{B}) = k$ then resulting debiased embedding will have dimension $\dim(W') = d - \dim(\mathbf{B}) = d - k$ ($k = 1$ if a single direction is used to construct \mathbf{B}).

5.1 Basis vectors: PCA and PPA

Let D be any set of gender-defining pairs such that $D \subseteq D_{all}$. We can represent D as $D = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$. For each $D_i = \{\delta_i^+, \delta_i^-\}$, *difference vector* can be defined as $\vec{\delta}_i = \vec{\delta}_i^+ - \vec{\delta}_i^-$. We can stack these difference vectors to form a matrix $Q = [\vec{\delta}_1 \vec{\delta}_2 \dots \vec{\delta}_n]^T$. Now, the gender subspace \mathbf{B} can be obtained from Q using the span of the top- k directions obtained from either principal component analysis (PCA) or principal polynomial analysis (PPA – Projection Pursuit Analysis) (see supplementary information). That is $\mathbf{B} = span\{\vec{b}_1, \vec{b}_2, \dots, \vec{b}_k\}$ where $\vec{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for integer parameter $k > 1$. We denote \mathbf{B}_{lang} as the space constructed using only the set D_{lang} .

5.2 LP for multilingual embeddings

Using linear projection for debiasing multilingual word embeddings naturally raises some questions: LP takes the defining set D as an input to construct the gender-subspace \mathbf{B} and gender neutral set N is needed by the evaluation metric to estimate the effect of debiasing. When there are many languages in a common space ($N \subset N_{all}$), we can have different choices of D ($D_{en}, D_{hi} \cup D_{en}$ etc.) for a given N .

- Are the gender subspaces induced by gendered pairs for different languages l_1 and l_2 (say \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2}) semantically different?
- What is the best choice for the gender-subspace \mathbf{B} among \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2} for debiasing both l_1 and l_2 words in common a space (which may be either aligned to l_1 or l_2 in the first place).
- Could there be a better alternative for constructing \mathbf{B} as opposed to using either \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2} ? Will it be sufficient to take gender-defining pairs from all language (here both l_1 and l_2) to form gender-subspace \mathbf{B} ?
- What if the gender subspace \mathbf{B} so formed has an over-representation of vectors from one language over others.

We proceed to answer these questions in the following. Let $\mathbf{B}_{lang} = span\{\vec{b}_{lang,1}, \vec{b}_{lang,2}, \dots, \vec{b}_{lang,k}\}$ where $\vec{b}_{lang,i}$ is the i th most significant basis vector of the gender subspace \mathbf{B}_{lang} (PCA/PPA components of matrix Q_{lang} obtained from D_{lang}). We hypothesize that for two languages $l_1, l_2 \in \{en, hi, be, te\}$ s.t. $l_1 \neq l_2$, their corresponding gender subspaces \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2} are inherently different from each other. These differences may arise due to different gender semantics of each language.

To further motivate our hypothesis, we use linear projection algorithm for debiasing neutral words $N_{l_2} \subset N_{all}$ using gender direction $\vec{b}_{l_1,1}$ ($\mathbf{B}_{l_1}, k=1$) instead of $\vec{b}_{l_2,1}$ ($\mathbf{B}_{l_2}, k=1$). If \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2} are semantically similar, then the choice of the gender direction as either $\vec{b}_{l_1,1}$ or $\vec{b}_{l_2,1}$ for debiasing N_{l_2} does not matter much since debiasing on one ensures minimal to no component along another.

We score the performance using the metric S_{l_1, l_2} defined as:

$$S_{l_1, l_2} = \frac{1}{|N_{l_2}|} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ \forall w_i \in N_{l_2}}}^{|N_{l_2}|} \frac{||\langle \vec{w}'_i, \vec{b}_{l_2,1} \rangle| - |\langle \vec{w}'_i, \vec{b}_{l_1,1} \rangle||}{|\langle \vec{w}'_i, \vec{b}_{l_2,1} \rangle|}, \text{ where } \vec{w}' \text{ corresponds}$$

to the debiased embedding of word $w \in N_{l_2}$ wrt $\vec{b}_{l_1,1}$ having original word embedding $\vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This metric captures aggregate relative change in, neutral-word similarity of a language wrt gender direction in that same language before and after debiasing. Note that $\langle \vec{w}'_i, \vec{b}_{l_1,1} \rangle = 0$ since embeddings are debiased wrt $\vec{b}_{l_1,1}$. Now, if \mathbf{B}_{l_1} and \mathbf{B}_{l_2} are semantically similar $\langle \vec{w}'_i, \vec{b}_{l_2,1} \rangle \approx 0$ thus $S_{l_1, l_2} \rightarrow 1$ (ideal case: $S_{l_1, l_1} = 1$).

Table 2 shows the cross-language debiasing performance. The results in Table 2 clearly supports our hypothesis that gender subspace \mathbf{B}_{en} , \mathbf{B}_{hi} , \mathbf{B}_{te} and \mathbf{B}_{be} are significantly different (since the off-diagonal values are far from unity) and the objective of debiasing the multilingual embedding cannot be accomplished using a single language’s gender subspace. For example, \mathbf{B}_{en} is **not** a good choice for hi words even while the embeddings are in the common space.

Lang	N_{en}	N_{hi}	N_{be}	N_{te}
b_{en}	1.0	0.143	0.137	0.038
b_{hi}	0.105	1.0	0.083	0.023
b_{be}	0.345	0.126	1.0	0.075
b_{te}	0.049	0.054	0.157	1.0

Table 2: S_{l_1, l_2} for debiasing N_{l_2} neutral words using gender direction $\vec{b}_{l_1,1}$ where $\{l_1, l_2\} \in \{en, hi, be, te\}$.

Choice of k : In the traditional setting, LP uses top-1 gender direction for experiments limited to English. However, in a multi-lingual setting $k=1$ would be a bad choice as we have just observed (the gender direction of one language may be ineffective/insufficient in capturing the gender direction of another language). Hence $k > 1$ is a natural choice.

Hence for extending LP to a multilingual setting, the gender space \mathbf{B}_{all} should be constructed using gender-defining training pairs drawn from all languages D_{all} . PCA/PPA can then used to obtain top- k basis-vectors $\vec{b}_{all,1}, \vec{b}_{all,2}, \dots, \vec{b}_{all,k}$ of \mathbf{B}_{all} such that $\mathbf{B}_{all} = span\{\vec{b}_{all,1}, \vec{b}_{all,2}, \dots, \vec{b}_{all,k}\}$.

In addition, we also use another approach which constructs bias subspace \mathbf{B}_{equal_rep} ensuring equal representation of each language in the basis vectors of \mathbf{B}_{equal_rep} . For L languages under consideration and gender subspace having k basis vectors s.t. $k \leq |D_{all}|$, we label the PCA/PPA components of \mathbf{B}_{all} according to their language orientation (see supplementary material for details) and choose top $\frac{k}{L}$ components for each language. Motivation for this choice stems from the fact that if all the basis vectors are oriented along a single $lang$ in the derived \mathbf{B}_{all} , then the gender space spanned by this subspace will behave similar to \mathbf{B}_{lang} , defeating the purpose of multilingual gender representation.

Taking top- k PCA components of the gender directions will always provide a more robust estimate of gender than using a single gender direction. We investigate that by changing the size of seed-gender directions D used to construct Q . The variance in InBias metrics is considerably small. We also investigate the same when we randomly sample any subset of D (say he-she/ man-woman) and use it as gender direction, the bias-scores indicate a very low variance. In the rest of the paper, using only \mathbf{B}_{lang} for debiasing words of a single language $lang$ is referred to as LP_{mono} . Similarly, using \mathbf{B}_{all} or \mathbf{B}_{equal_rep} for debiasing is referred to as LP_{multi} or LP_{EQR} respectively.

6 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In our experiments to gender neutralize multilingual word embeddings, we attempt to (i) try kurtosis based projection analysis (PPA) instead of variance based (PCA) and compare them for obtaining top- k components of the gender subspace (ii) compare performances of variants of linear projection algorithm for mono-lingual and multilingual embeddings for both intrinsic ($InBias$) and extrinsic ($ExBias$) bias metrics.

6.1 Train test split of gender-defining pairs

For construction of the gender subspace used by LP we use 10 gender pairs (*train gender pairs*) of each language, i.e., $D_{lang}^{train} \subset D_{lang}$ such that $|D_{lang}^{train}| = 10$ for $lang \in \{en, hi, be, te\}$. Remaining gender pairs (*test gender pairs*) are used as set $D_{lang}^{test} \subset D_{lang}$ such that $D_{lang}^{train} \cap D_{lang}^{test} = \phi$ for *InBias* computation. Note that this split is needed since our evaluation metric is based on cosine similarities with respect to gender directions, and evaluating the embeddings on the same directions as used for constructing gender spaces would typically lead to better values of metrics (train-test leakage). We resort to train-test split strategy for gender pairs because it is intuitive that if the gender subspace obtained using the training gender pairs captures the linguistic concept of gender well, we can expect to get reliable estimate of performance with test gender pairs.

6.2 Monolingual debiasing

Monolingual setup characterizes single language applications, where the focus is on debiasing a specific language. A straightforward way is to use linear projection (LP) to debias embedding using language-specific gender subspace \mathbf{B}_{lang} (say, we expect *hi* word embeddings to be best debiased when \mathbf{B}_{hi} is used). Thus, for monolingual settings we construct language gender subspace \mathbf{B}_{lang} using gender pairs D_{lang} for a particular language $lang \in \{en, hi, be, te\}$, k basis vectors of \mathbf{B}_{lang} thus obtained using PCA/PPA ($k = 4$) are used to debias monolingual embedding and its performance is evaluated based on *InBias* and *ExBias*.

6.3 Multilingual debiasing

Multilingual setup characterizes two or more language applications, where the focus is on debiasing multiple languages at once. We get multilingual embeddings by aligning monolingual embedding in a common space. This is done using bilingual dictionaries between all source-target pairs of languages by Smith et al. [19]’s alignment algorithm (also used in fasttext multilingual pipeline) with same hyper-parameter settings³. We obtain all these dictionaries from MUSE⁴. Since for Telugu this is not available, we construct Telugu bilingual dictionary wrt other languages using the Google Translate API.

We use the multilingual extension of LP approach, i.e., LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR} (both $k = 4$) for debiasing. Multilingual gender space \mathbf{B}_{all} is constructed using training gender pairs drawn from all languages D_{all}^{train} . PCA/PPA are used to obtain top- k basis vectors of \mathbf{B}_{all} and its performance is evaluated using test gender pairs D_{all}^{test} . Specifically, for bilingual embedding denoted by $l_1 \rightarrow l_2$ (i.e., l_1 is aligned in l_2 space), we use both gender-defining pair sets D_{l_1} and D_{l_2} to construct vector space capturing gender in $l_1 \rightarrow l_2$. This is in turn used by debiasing algorithms to remove the bias component for all words (l_1 and l_2) in the vocabulary. We experiment with PCA and PPA methods to get basis vectors for LP_{multi} and LP_{eqr} .

We also experimented language-specific (monolingual) LP approaches (denoted as LP_{l_1} for language l_1) on bilingual embedding

$l_1 \rightarrow l_2$ to show multilingual extension of LP is always better than original LP approach. We compared the performance of original and debiased embeddings using metrics *InBias* and *ExBias*.

6.4 Additional evaluation based on NLP task

Further, as a quality evaluation of the resulting debiased embeddings we choose an NLP task as well. The usefulness/purpose of word embeddings lies in its utility for a downstream task. To evaluate the quality of word embeddings we considered two downstream tasks.

For monolingual setting, we test the original and resulting embeddings on a news classification task for all the four languages⁵. We used a bidirectional LSTM encoder followed by a softmax layer. Performance is reported in terms of model accuracy.

For multilingual setting, we used the CVIT-*Mann ki baat* dataset [18] for the cross-lingual sentence retrieval task. This corpus contains parallel English sentences with Indic languages, thus limiting us to English language pairs like ($hi \rightarrow en, en \rightarrow be$ etc). We trained a sentence encoder (bidirectional LSTM) to cross-lingual sentence embedding and used cosine distance for retrieval as suggested in Libovický et al. [12]. Performance is reported in terms of precision@10. This confirms the possibility to use such embeddings in downstream tasks.

7 RESULTS

7.1 InBias results

We compare intrinsic bias measure for both original fasttext embedding (Orig) and LP_{mono} debiased embeddings (using both PCA and PPA; $k=4$). Table 3 summarizes *InBias* results for monolingual setting (focus only on words in N_{lang}), where the training gender subspace is constructed by D_{lang}^{train} and performance is evaluated using D_{lang}^{test} . We observe that LP_{mono} (PCA) outperforms (lower is better) both LP_{mono} (PPA) and original embeddings for all the four languages considered.

<i>lang</i>	Orig	LP_{mono}^{PCA}	LP_{mono}^{PPA}
<i>en</i>	0.014	0.0	0.001
<i>hi</i>	0.015	0.008	0.019
<i>be</i>	0.016	0.011	0.023
<i>te</i>	0.040	0.018	0.029

Table 3: *InBias* measure for monolingual setting.

Table 4 summarizes the *InBias* results for the multilingual setting (N_{all}), i.e., the gender subspace is constructed using D_{all}^{train} and performance is evaluated using D_{all}^{test} . We compare the multilingual extension of LP (LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR}) with the LP_{mono} approach. LP_{mono} approach can be applied on a bilingual embedding $l_1 \rightarrow l_2$ by either debiasing it only using language l_1 or l_2 (denoted as LP_{l_1} and LP_{l_2} respectively in Table 4). The interesting observations that one can make from these results are – (i) LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR} always perform better than LP_{mono} based approaches (LP_{l_1} and

³https://github.com/babylonhealth/fastText_multilingual

⁴<https://github.com/facebookresearch/MUSE#ground-truth-bilingual-dictionaries>

⁵AG news classification (en), BBC news article classification (hi), Soham news article classification (be), iNLTK headline classification (te).

LP_{l_2}) and the original embedding, thus supporting our intuition for multilingual extension of LP, (ii) LP_{EQR} is at par or slightly better than LP_{multi} for all the bilingual embeddings (except $hi \rightarrow be$), and (iii) PCA based methods always outperform PPA based methods and hence we only show the PCA based in results Table 4 to save space (see supplementary material for the PPA based results).

$l_1 \rightarrow l_2$	Orig	LP_{l_1}	LP_{l_2}	LP_{multi}	LP_{EQR}
$en \rightarrow hi$	0.013	0.015	0.010	0.007	0.007
$en \rightarrow be$	0.013	0.015	0.012	0.008	0.008
$en \rightarrow te$	0.015	0.011	0.014	0.006	0.006
$hi \rightarrow en$	0.015	0.013	0.013	0.007	0.008
$hi \rightarrow be$	0.016	0.015	0.013	0.008	0.007
$hi \rightarrow te$	0.017	0.015	0.016	0.007	0.007
$be \rightarrow en$	0.017	0.015	0.012	0.008	0.008
$be \rightarrow hi$	0.016	0.014	0.014	0.008	0.009
$be \rightarrow te$	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.008	0.008
$te \rightarrow en$	0.040	0.042	0.017	0.013	0.014
$te \rightarrow hi$	0.024	0.019	0.018	0.007	0.009
$te \rightarrow be$	0.019	0.023	0.022	0.007	0.007

Table 4: $ExBias$ measure for multilingual setting. Debaised algorithm uses PCA with value of $k = 4$.

7.2 $ExBias$ results

As discussed earlier for measuring $ExBias$ we make use of the BiosBias dataset, whereby, we classify the occupation from a gender-details-scrubbed-bio of a person. The premise for choosing this task is that the performance (accuracy) of any classification model on the BiosBias dataset must be similar across the male and female applicants, i.e., the accuracy of the classification model on the male applicant bios (denoted by **M**) must be equivalent to that of female applicant (denoted by **F**) as the bios are indistinguishable in all other ways. But if occupations themselves have inherent gender connotations, then an asymmetry in the performance is expected. Recall that the absolute difference of accuracy between male and female bios, averaged across all occupations quantifies $ExBias$ (i.e., $|Diff|$). The lesser the value of $|Diff|$ the better it is. Also, for a more occupation-wise analysis, we use f_i to denote the fraction of total occupations for which the performance gap ($|Diff|$) decreases after debiasing.

l	Emb	Male	Female	$ Diff $	f_i	Acc_{task}
en	orig	66.92	70.12	7.47		89.14
	LP_{mono}	69.69	73.63	7.45	0.411	89.60
hi	orig	60.95	62.78	6.76		45.58
	LP_{mono}	63.13	65.76	7.76	0.647	41.01
be	orig	59.31	60.68	7.56		84.86
	LP_{mono}	63.53	65.58	7.52	0.764	83.70
te	orig	57.97	59.39	7.50		53.29
	LP_{mono}	63.31	64.76	7.28	0.353	52.11

Table 5: $ExBias$ results in the monolingual settings.

We compare extrinsic bias ($ExBias$) measure for the original embeddings (orig) and LP_{mono} debaised embeddings⁶. Table 5 summarizes the $ExBias$ results for the monolingual setting. We observe that (i) LP_{mono} always reduces extrinsic bias ($|Diff|$) without affecting the embedding quality (i.e., the accuracy (Acc_{task}) of the news category classification task) much, with the only exception of Hindi, (ii) For all the languages, more than 35% of total professions saw a reduction in performance gap (f_i) rising up to almost 76% for Bengali after debiasing, (iii) We also observe that for all the languages, individual male and female accuracy (**M** and **F**) increase after debiasing.

$l_1 \rightarrow l_2$	Emb	M	F	$ Diff $	f_i	P@10
$en \rightarrow hi$	orig	67.23	71.06	7.60		24.24
	LP_{multi}	69.14	73.57	7.56	0.60	19.44
	LP_{EQR}	69.78	73.54	7.28	0.60	21.95
$en \rightarrow be$	orig	66.96	70.68	8.16		14.28
	LP_{multi}	69.75	74.37	7.83	0.35	18.18
	LP_{EQR}	69.74	73.33	7.65	0.65	20.59
$en \rightarrow te$	orig	67.30	70.55	7.58		21.21
	LP_{multi}	70.31	74.20	8.06	0.35	22.22
	LP_{EQR}	70.59	74.68	7.30	0.60	14.29
$hi \rightarrow en$	orig	61.74	64.08	7.79		20.59
	LP_{multi}	62.86	64.83	7.16	0.47	16.67
	LP_{EQR}	62.31	64.59	7.22	0.41	15.63
$hi \rightarrow be$	orig	61.14	63.16	7.65		-
	LP_{multi}	62.94	65.00	7.24	0.53	-
	LP_{EQR}	63.15	65.07	7.19	0.35	-
$hi \rightarrow te$	orig	61.22	63.49	7.31		-
	LP_{multi}	63.19	65.14	7.13	0.60	-
	LP_{EQR}	61.98	63.86	6.89	0.53	-
$be \rightarrow en$	orig	59.64	61.03	7.75		21.87
	LP_{multi}	61.87	63.58	6.96	0.60	12.5
	LP_{EQR}	61.15	63.39	7.51	0.53	13.89
$be \rightarrow hi$	orig	58.63	59.63	7.69		-
	LP_{multi}	61.47	63.46	6.65	0.53	-
	LP_{EQR}	61.67	63.81	7.36	0.53	-
$be \rightarrow te$	orig	59.42	61.22	6.91		-
	LP_{multi}	61.34	63.79	7.01	0.35	-
	LP_{EQR}	61.52	63.43	6.88	0.53	-
$te \rightarrow en$	orig	57.76	59.77	7.46		15.79
	LP_{multi}	60.67	62.74	7.20	0.65	16.28
	LP_{EQR}	61.38	62.46	8.08	0.47	33.33
$te \rightarrow hi$	orig	58.22	58.99	7.76		-
	LP_{multi}	60.48	62.72	7.52	0.30	-
	LP_{EQR}	61.15	63.10	6.98	0.35	-
$te \rightarrow be$	orig	58.63	60.47	8.07		-
	LP_{multi}	61.74	63.42	7.76	0.53	-
	LP_{EQR}	60.96	62.03	7.72	0.60	-

Table 6: $ExBias$ results in the multilingual setting. LP algorithm for PCA ($k = 4$) is used for this table.

Table 6 summarizes the $ExBias$ results for the multilingual setting where we compare the multilingual extension of LP (LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR}) with the original bilingual embedding (orig). For a bilingual embedding $l_1 \rightarrow l_2$, it is evaluated on the bios of language l_1 .

⁶We always report results for the PCA approach since they outperform the PPA approach.

Precision@10 (P@10) for cross-lingual sentence retrieval task, on *Mann ki baat* (MKB) dataset is used as a multilingual-embedding quality evaluation. We observe that **(i)** LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR} , always outperform the original embedding in terms of $|Diff|$, showing effective bias mitigation. Further, LP_{multi} outperforms LP_{EQR} for cases where the target language is English and a specific case of $be \rightarrow hi$. In all other settings, LP_{EQR} is the winner, thus establishing the *state-of-the-art performance* **(ii)** For all the settings, male, female accuracy (**M** and **F**) increases after debiasing, **(iii)** For all the language pairs, around 35-60% professions have a reduction in performance gap (f_i), using both LP_{multi} and LP_{EQR} methods, **(iv)** Bias depends on the target languages, as it is better to align to gender-rich language like Telugu and Hindi than gender-neutral languages like Bengali and English and **(v)** The embedding quality (measured in terms of P@10) remains roughly same or sometimes gets a boost due to debiasing (P@10 scores only available for English>Indic language and Indic language>English pairs).

8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed different LP variants to debias word embeddings for three Indian languages in addition to English. We experiment in two different settings - monolingual and multilingual; for each setting we measure two types of biases - intrinsic and extrinsic. In both settings and for both types of evaluation measures we observe that debiasing helps in removing the bias from the embeddings. This comes mostly at the cost of a slight compromise of the embedding quality as is well established in the fairness literature.

In future, we would like to extend the framework to include more Indian languages. We also plan to include other downstream tasks which at this point however is difficult due to the limited availability of datasets like BiasBios.

REFERENCES

- [1] Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Zhisong Zhang, Xuezhe Ma, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2019. Cross-Lingual Dependency Parsing with Unlabeled Auxiliary Languages. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 372–382. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/K19-1035>
- [2] Waleed Ammar, George Mulcaire, Yulia Tsvetkov, Guillaume Lample, Chris Dyer, and Noah A. Smith. 2016. Massively Multilingual Word Embeddings. *ArXiv abs/1602.01925* (2016).
- [3] Su Lin Blodgett, Solon Barocas, Hal Daumé III, and Hanna Wallach. 2020. Language (Technology) is Power: A Critical Survey of “Bias” in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 5454–5476. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.485>
- [4] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam Kalai. 2016. Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [5] Aylin Caliskan, Joanna Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* 356 (04 2017), 183–186.
- [6] Xilun Chen, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Hany Hassan, Wei Wang, and Claire Cardie. 2019. Multi-Source Cross-Lingual Model Transfer: Learning What to Share. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy, 3098–3112. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1299>
- [7] Maria De-Arteaga, Alexey Romanov, Hanna Wallach, Jennifer Chayes, Christian Borgs, Alexandra Chouldechova, Sahin Geyik, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2019. Bias in Bios: A Case Study of Semantic Representation Bias in a High-Stakes Setting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (Atlanta, GA, USA) (FAT* ’19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 120–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287572>
- [8] Sunipa Dev, Tao Li, Jeff M. Phillips, and Vivek Srikumar. 2020. On Measuring and Mitigating Biased Inferences of Word Embeddings. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 05 (2020), 7659–7666.
- [9] Sunipa Dev and Jeff M. Phillips. 2019. Attenuating Bias in Word Vectors. In *Proceedings of AISTATS*.
- [10] Hila Gonen and Yoav Goldberg. 2019. Lipstick on a Pig: Debiasing Methods Cover up Systematic Gender Biases in Word Embeddings But do not Remove Them. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 609–614. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1061>
- [11] Khandoker Hassan and Mohammad Alamgir. 2013. A Comparative Study of Gender Sensitivity between English and Bengali. *Language in India* 13 (11 2013), 200–208.
- [12] Jindřich Libovický, Rudolf Rosa, and Alexander M. Fraser. 2019. How Language-Neutral is Multilingual BERT? *ArXiv abs/1911.03310* (2019).
- [13] Tao Meng, Nanyun Peng, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2019. Target Language-Aware Constrained Inference for Cross-lingual Dependency Parsing. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 1117–1128. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1103>
- [14] Anjali Pande. 2004. Undoing Gender Stereotypes in Hindi. *Linguistik online* 21 (01 2004).
- [15] Marcelo O. R. Prates, Pedro H. C. Avelar, and Luís C. Lamb. 2020. Assessing Gender Bias in Machine Translation - A Case Study with Google Translate. *Neural Computing Applications* 32 (2020), 6363–6381.
- [16] Arun K. Pujari, Ansh Mittal, Anshuman Padhi, Anshul Jain, Mukesh Jadon, and Vikas Kumar. 2019. Debiasing Gender Biased Hindi Words with Word-Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 2nd International Conference on Algorithms, Computing and Artificial Intelligence (Sanya, China) (ACAI 2019)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 450–456.
- [17] Shauli Ravfogel, Yanai Elazar, Hila Gonen, Michael Twiton, and Yoav Goldberg. 2020. Null It Out: Guarding Protected Attributes by Iterative Nullspace Projection. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 7237–7256.
- [18] Shashank Siripragada, Jerin Philip, Vinay P. Nambodiri, and C V Jawahar. 2020. A Multilingual Parallel Corpora Collection Effort for Indian Languages. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*. European Language Resources Association, Marseille, France, 3743–3751. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.lrec-1.462>
- [19] Samuel L. Smith, David H. P. Turban, Steven Hamblin, and Nils Y. Hammerla. 2017. Offline bilingual word vectors, orthogonal transformations and the inverted softmax. *CoRR*. arXiv:1702.03859 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.038>
- [20] Jieyu Zhao, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Saghar Hosseini, Kai-Wei Chang, and Ahmed Hassan Awadallah. 2020. Gender Bias in Multilingual Embeddings and Cross-Lingual Transfer. In *ACL*.
- [21] Pei Zhou, Weijia Shi, Jieyu Zhao, Kuan-Hao Huang, Muhao Chen, Ryan Cotterell, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2019. Examining Gender Bias in Languages with Grammatical Gender. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.