
Assessing Multilingual Fairness in Pre-trained Multimodal Representations

Jialu Wang, Yang Liu, Xin Eric Wang

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA
{faldict,yangliu,xwang366}@ucsc.edu

Abstract

Recently pre-trained multimodal models, such as CLIP [1], have received a surge of attention for their exceptional capabilities towards connecting images and natural language. The textual representations in English can be desirably transferred to multilingualism and support promising downstream multimodal tasks for different languages. Nevertheless, previous fairness discourse in vision-and-language learning mainly focuses on monolingual representational biases, and rarely scrutinizes the principles of multilingual fairness in this multimodal setting, where one language is equated to a group of individuals and images provide the universal grounding for bridging different languages.

In this paper, we provide a nuanced understanding of individual fairness and group fairness by viewing language as the recipient of fairness notions. We define new fairness notions within multilingual context and analytically articulate that, pre-trained vision-and-language representations are individually fair across languages but not guaranteed to group fairness. Furthermore, we conduct extensive experiments to explore the prevalent group disparity across languages and protected groups including race, gender and age.

1 Introduction

Recently pre-trained vision-and-language representations [1–11] have received a surge of attraction. Such pre-trained multimodal representations have shown great capabilities of bridging images and natural language on the downstream tasks including image captioning [12], image retrieval [13], visual QA [14], text-to-image generation [15], etc. While it is commonly recognized that the multimodal representations trained on English corpora can be generalized to multilingualism by cross-lingual alignment [16, 17], recent works critique that the multilingual textual representations *does not* learn equally high-quality representations for all the languages [18]. Even though Hu *et al.* [19] urge the general-purpose representations seek equal performance across all languages, there still lacks of a nuanced understanding on how multilingual representations fare on multimodality.

This paper provides a novel perspective for analyzing the principles of multilingual fairness in multimodal representations from two aspects. First, existing frameworks for measuring multilingual biases usually emulate text sources in different languages, which may have ambiguous meanings in varied contexts [20]. In contrast, we leverage visual grounding as the anchors to bridge text in different languages—text snippets in different languages but with the same semantics should be equitably relevant to the same images. Second, we equate a language as a group of individuals in the terminology of fairness. As Choudhury *et al.* [21] has pointed out, “*each language has a distinct identity, defined by its vocabulary, syntactic structure, its typological features, amount of available resources, and so on.*”, the notions of fairness, such as individual fairness [22] and group

fairness [23–25], can be naturally adapted to multilingual representations by viewing language as the recipient.

Therefore, we formally contextualize and develop two fairness notions: *multilingual individual fairness* presumes that text snippets with similar semantics in different languages should yield similar outcomes regarding the same images; *multilingual group fairness* postulates that multimodal models should be evaluated approximately equivalent in different languages.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We formally develop the individual fairness and group fairness notions in the multilingual and multimodal setting.
- We theoretically investigate the conditions that pre-trained multimodal representations are individually fair across different languages. However, our negative result demonstrates that individual fairness doesn’t suffice to prevent accuracy disparity among groups.
- Extensive experimental results unveil the accuracy disparity across different languages. Our results also imply the choice of visual representations affect the group fairness metrics.
- We further demonstrate the prevalence of group disparity when language is coupled with multidimensional group membership, such as race, gender, and age. We display the uneven gender gap by race and age groups. Our empirical exploration provides new directions for mitigating biases under multilingual setting.

2 Background

Multilingual CLIP Our work establishes upon the multimodal setting. The universal framework for matching images and text [26] is to encode them into representation vectors in a shared representation space, such that the distance between visual and textual vectors can measure the similarity between images and text. Throughout this paper, our analysis mainly focuses on CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pre-training) [1], a representative pre-trained multimodal representation model that achieves state-of-the-art performances on zero-shot transfer tasks.

CLIP is a multimodal model trained on large-scale images with natural language supervision collected from the internet. It comprises an image encoder and a text encoder that can embed images and text into visual and textual representation vectors. One desirable property is that the CLIP model takes the cosine similarity between image and text features to measure the log-odds of the corresponding image-text pairs, and is trained to maximize their similarity by a contrastive learning objective. In light of this capability, CLIP can predict the similarity, denoted by $S(I, T)$, between arbitrary images I and natural language text snippets T .

In order to adapt the flexible CLIP model to multilingualism, Multilingual CLIP [27] uses a pre-trained multilingual language model, such as M-BERT [28], to take over the original text encoder in English, and fine-tune the textual representation vectors by cross-lingual alignment [16, 17]. In this setting, we use $S(I, T^{(L)})$ to represent the similarity between image I and text $T^{(L)}$ in language L . Though the empirical evaluations in this paper mainly focus on Multilingual CLIP, the experimental approaches we adopt to arrive at the observations can be generalized to other pre-trained multilingual vision-and-language representations.

Fairness notions The multilingual fairness notions developed in this work is inspired by multiple fairness definitions [22, 29] in the algorithmic fairness literature, and below we provide a brief introduction to individual fairness and group fairness that are most relevant to our work.

Individual fairness, initiated by Dwork et al. [22], requires that individuals who are similar with respect to a task-specific similarity metric have similar decision outcomes.

Definition 1 (Individual Fairness [22]). Given a universe of individuals U and a model $M : U \rightarrow \Delta(O)$ maps each individual to a distribution of outcomes $\Delta(O)$ with outcome set O , model M is individually fair if and only if for all $x, y \in U$, $D(M(x), M(y)) \leq d(x, y)$, where D is the distance measure defined on the outcome space and d measures the task-specific similarity between individuals.

Group fairness definitions seek to provide fairness guarantees based on group-level statistical constraints, in the sense that they are evaluated and enforced without reference to similarity measures. Group fairness is often framed in terms of *protected groups* G , such as race, gender, and age. For instance, demographic parity [30] requires that the outcomes are independent of the group membership, and equalized odds [25] essentially requires equal true positive and false positive rates between different groups. Let $\text{Acc}_a(M)$ represent the accuracy evaluated on the subgroup a . Accuracy parity [30] requires that different protected groups should receive equal misclassification rates, i.e.,

Definition 2 (Accuracy Parity [30]). Given two protected groups a and b , a model M satisfies *accuracy parity* if $\text{Acc}_a(M) = \text{Acc}_b(M)$.

The above fairness notions are defined for classification tasks, but we will contextualize them in the multilingual and multimodal setting later for further study.

Fairness in multilingual NLP Many recent works [19–21, 31–34] scrutinize the ethical issues raised in multilingual settings, albeit with varying degrees of success. For instance, Zhao et al. [31] quantifies the presence of representational biases in multilingual word embeddings by calculating the distance between targets corresponding to different sensitive attributes. Huang et al. [32] evaluate group fairness violations among demographic groups on the task of hate speech detection, but do not explicitly regard language as unique group membership. Our work complements the fairness discourse in NLP to the extent that we provide a novel perspective of studying multilingual fairness by viewing language as the recipient of fairness notions and visual grounding as the bridge across different languages.

3 Multilingual fairness

We consider two potential families of multilingual fairness in the multimodal setting:

- *Individual fairness*: the model makes an equalized prediction on the similarity scores connecting images and text in different languages. For example, the word of “cat”, no matter in which language, should be equally similar to an image of a cat.
- *Group fairness*: the metrics of the model evaluated on target data are equalized across different languages. Intuitively speaking, group fairness requires equalized accuracy rates or other group-dependent parity rates across different languages.

Notation. We use the uppercase letter I to denote images and T to denote text. We use the superscript (L) in $T^{(L)}$ to represent the text is in language L . When we are jointly using $T^{(L)}$ and $T^{(L')}$ for two languages L and L' , we often assume that they share the same semantic meanings. Lowercase letters v and t are used to denote the visual and textual representation vectors encoded by model M , respectively. To simplify the presentation, we use $S(\cdot, \cdot)$ to generally represent the similarity between images and text. Specifically, $S(I, T)$ refers to the similarity scores predicted by the model M , while $S(v, t)$ refers to the cosine similarity between vectors v and t .

3.1 Individual fairness

The individual fairness in Definition 1 requires that similar people should be treated similarly. In our multilingual setting, we require that the text snippets in different languages with similar semantics should induce equalized similarity scores. Taking the Euclidean distance function to measure the distance between text features, we can define α -multilingual individual fairness by:

Definition 3 (Multilingual Individual Fairness). Given a set of image-text pairs $\{(I, T)\}$, a multimodal model M satisfies α -multilingual individual fairness if for all (I, T) , for all languages L and L' :

$$|S(I, T^{(L)}) - S(I, T^{(L')})| \leq \alpha \|t^{(L)} - t^{(L')}\|$$

where $t^{(L)}$ is the textual representation vector yielded by M in language L .

Here, α is a parameter to control the ratio of similarity gap to the text feature vectors’ distance, and smaller α indicates the model is individually fairer. Note that the similarity gap is at most 2, because the range of cosine similarity is $[0., 1]$.

Theorem 1. Denote $\mathcal{O}_\rho(\mathbf{t}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{t}\| \leq \rho\}$ to be a closed ball of radius $\rho > 0$ and center \mathbf{t} . Then for any visual representation vector \mathbf{v} ,

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathbf{t}^{(L')} \in \mathcal{O}_\rho(\mathbf{t}^{(L)}) \\ 0 \leq \rho < \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}} |S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)})| \leq \sqrt{2(1 - \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\rho}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|})^2})}$$

where $S(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the cosine similarity, $\mathbf{t}^{(L)}$ and $\mathbf{t}^{(L')}$ are textual representation vectors for languages L and L' , respectively.

Proof. Given by the definition of cosine similarity, we have

$$|S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')})| = \left| \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}^{(L)}}{\|\mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|} - \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}^{(L')}}{\|\mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\|} \right| = \frac{|\mathbf{v} \cdot (\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L)} - \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L')})|}{\|\mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\|} \quad (1)$$

From the definition of dot product,

$$|\mathbf{v} \cdot (\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L)} - \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L')})| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\| \cdot \|(\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L)} - \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L')})\| \quad (2)$$

We plug Eq. (2) into Eq. (1) and eliminate the variable \mathbf{v}

$$|S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')})| \leq \frac{\|(\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L)} - \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L')})\|}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\|} \quad (3)$$

Let θ denote the angle between $\mathbf{t}^{(L)}$ and $\mathbf{t}^{(L')}$, i.e., $\cos \theta = \frac{\mathbf{t}^{(L)} \cdot \mathbf{t}^{(L')}}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\|}$, the square of numerator in Eq. (3) expands as

$$(\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L)} - \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \mathbf{t}^{(L')})^2 = 2\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|^2 \|\mathbf{t}^{(L')}\|^2 (1 - \cos \theta) \quad (4)$$

Substituting the square root of Eq. (4) into Eq. (3), we eliminate the denominator and obtain

$$|S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')})| \leq \sqrt{2(1 - \cos \theta)} \quad (5)$$

Recall that $\mathbf{t}^{(L')} \in \mathcal{O}_\rho(\mathbf{t}^{(L)})$, we can bound θ by the law of sines

$$\sup_{\theta} |\sin \theta| = \sup_{\mathbf{t}^{(L')}} \frac{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|} = \frac{\rho}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|} \quad (6)$$

Taking supremums on both sides of Eq. (5) and combining Eq. (6), we complete the proof

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathbf{t}^{(L')} \in \mathcal{O}_\rho(\mathbf{t}^{(L)}) \\ 0 \leq \rho < \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}} |S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)})| \leq \sup_{\theta} \sqrt{2(1 - \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta})} = \sqrt{2(1 - \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\rho}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|})^2})}$$

□

Theorem 1 implies that when the distance between multilingual textual representation vectors is bounded, the similarity with images can be bounded in terms of their distance. It is worth noting that the bounds are independent on the visual representation vectors. Nevertheless, the form of upper bound in Theorem 1 is a bit sophisticated, and can be simplified when $\rho \ll \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|$.

Lemma 2. When $\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \ll \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|$, $|S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)})| \lesssim \frac{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}$.

Proof. Due to Half-Angle Identities, Eq. (5) derives as

$$|S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L')}) - S(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}^{(L)})| \leq 2 \left| \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right| \quad (7)$$

For sufficiently small θ , i.e., $\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \ll \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|$, we take the first-order Taylor approximation

$$2 \left| \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right| \approx |\theta| \approx |\sin \theta| = \frac{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|} \quad (8)$$

Combining Eq. (7) and Eq. (8) we complete the proof. □

Lemma 2 is a direct application of Theorem 1 when the distance between multilingual vectors is small enough, and extends in many natural cases to approximate the multilingual individual fairness with a coefficient $\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}$. Hence, we conclude the condition when a multimodal model is individually fair:

Proposition 3. *A multimodal model M satisfies $\frac{1}{\inf \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|}$ -multilingual individual fairness when $\|\mathbf{t}^{(L')} - \mathbf{t}^{(L)}\| \ll \|\mathbf{t}^{(L)}\|$ for all T .*

Proposition 3 is saying that when the textual representation vectors $t^{(L')}$ in all the other languages L' are perfectly aligned within a “small ball” neighborhood of $t^{(L)}$ in the pivot language L like English, the model M will satisfy multilingual individual fairness as anticipated.

3.2 Group fairness

Although multilingual multimodal representations are proven to satisfy individual fairness, it doesn’t suffice to guarantee group fairness. Distinct from individual fairness, group fairness aims to achieve the same accuracy rates for similar representations across different subgroups. From the perspective of representations, it is hard to carry out accuracy rates without well-defined tasks and metrics. Hence it is natural to ask how to properly define group fairness in this scenario? In this section, we shall answer this question by viewing language as the group membership. Then we carefully define the group fairness on the classification task with multilingual text supervision.

Problem Setup. Given a dataset \mathcal{D} consisting of ground-truth image-text pairs $\{(I_i, T_i)\}$ and each text can be in different languages. The goal of a multimodal model M is to predict the similarity $S(I_i, T_j)$ for any image I_i and text T_j . Then the model matches \hat{T}_i for images I_i by selecting the text with highest similarity scores, i.e., $\hat{T}_i = \arg \max_j S(I_i, T_j)$. The image-text pairs in \mathcal{D} often involves group memberships, e.g., race, gender, etc, which is denoted by G . We use \mathcal{D}_a to denote the subset of \mathcal{D} given $G = a$. Then the accuracy Acc on the whole dataest and the accuracy on the subgroup a is defined as

$$\text{Acc}(M) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{1}[\hat{T}_i = T_i], \quad \text{Acc}_a(M) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_a|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_a} \mathbb{1}[\hat{T}_i = T_i] \quad (9)$$

We use the superscript (L) to indicate the accuracy $\text{Acc}^{(L)}$ is evaluated in language L . Next, we take language as group membership and define multilingual accuracy parity by equalizing accuracy across languages.

Definition 4 (multilingual accuracy parity). A multimodal model M satisfies *multilingual accuracy parity* if $\text{Acc}^{(L)}(M) = \text{Acc}^{(L')}(M)$ for all languages L, L' .

In practice, it is impossible to achieve accuracy parity for all languages. Following [19], we use

$$\text{Gap}_M(L, L') = |\text{Acc}^{(L)}(M) - \text{Acc}^{(L')}(M)| \quad (10)$$

to represent the cross-lingual gap for model M .

The above discussion on group fairness considers language as the sole group membership. In real world, the dataset often involves other protected groups. For instance, the face attribute dataset [35] contains sensitive attributes, such as age and gender. When there are multi-dimensional groups, we can define accuracy disparity between group a and group b with respect to model M within language L as

$$\text{Disp}_M^{(L)}(a, b) = |\text{Acc}_a^{(L)}(M) - \text{Acc}_b^{(L)}(M)| \quad (11)$$

Definition 5 (multilingual accuracy parity across groups). A multi-modal model M satisfies *multilingual accuracy parity across groups* if $\text{Disp}_M^{(L)}(a, b) = \text{Disp}_M^{(L')}(a, b)$ with respect to protected groups a, b for all languages.

A common case is there are only two protected groups (e.g. female and male, young and old). Let $p_a = \frac{|\mathcal{D}_a|}{|\mathcal{D}|}$ and $p_b = \frac{|\mathcal{D}_b|}{|\mathcal{D}|}$ represent the population proportion of group a and group b respectively, and $p_a + p_b = 1$. Then we can decompose the cross-lingual cross-group accuracy gap as follows:

Proposition 4. When there are only two protected groups a and b , the following inequality holds for any two languages L and L'

$$|\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| \leq \text{Gap}(L, L') + p_b \cdot \text{Disp}^{(L)}(a, b) + p_a \cdot \text{Disp}^{(L')}(a, b)$$

Proof. Expanding $|\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}|$ by triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| &= |\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}^{(L)} + \text{Acc}^{(L)} - \text{Acc}^{(L')} + \text{Acc}^{(L')} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| \\ &\leq |\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}^{(L)}| + |\text{Acc}^{(L)} - \text{Acc}^{(L')}| + |\text{Acc}^{(L')} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Noticing that $\text{Acc}^{(L)} = p_a \cdot \text{Acc}_a^{(L)} + p_b \cdot \text{Acc}_b^{(L)}$ and $p_a + p_b = 1$, we have

$$|\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}^{(L)}| = p_b \cdot |\text{Acc}_a^{(L)} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L)}| = p_b \cdot \text{Disp}^{(L)}(a, b) \quad (13)$$

Similarly,

$$|\text{Acc}^{(L')} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| = p_a \cdot |\text{Acc}_a^{(L')} - \text{Acc}_b^{(L')}| = p_a \cdot \text{Disp}^{(L')}(a, b) \quad (14)$$

Substituting Eq. (10), Eq. (13), and Eq. (14) into Eq. (12) we complete the proof. \square

4 Multilingual representations satisfies individual fairness

Our theoretical analysis on multilingual individual fairness implies that the ratio of similarity difference to their text feature distance can be bounded by the reciprocal of the length of text feature vectors. To verify the implication, we conduct experiments on the Multi30K dataset [36].

Dataset. The Multi30K dataset [36] contains 31,014 Flickr30K [37] images and composes the *translation* and the *independent* portions of English-German caption pairs. The German translations were collected from professional English-German translators by translating the English captions without seeing the images, one per image. The independent portion was independently annotated by German crowdworkers after seeing the images instead of English captions, five per image. Hence, the translated captions are strongly aligned in both languages, while the independent descriptions may have distinct context. We use 1,000 test images for our evaluation¹.




Figure 1: We empirically examine the multilingual individual fairness of Multilingual CLIP on the translation and the independent portions. The positive result is that the multimodal representations are individually fair across languages, but the negative result is that individual fairness doesn’t prevent accuracy disparity among groups.

Multilingual multimodal representations are individually fair. We embed each English-German caption pair into textual representation vectors and the corresponding image into visual representation vectors. We compute the Euclidean distance between English-German text features, as well as the cosine similarity with respect to the image features. We plot their cross-lingual gap on the translation and the independent portions in Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b, respectively. Based on Theorem 2, we estimate the theoretical bound by approximately taking the reciprocal of the average length of English textual vectors as the slope. We find out that the theoretical result upper bounds all the test instances well.

¹For independent portion, we select the first English caption and the first German caption of the five to pair with the image for a fair comparison.




Figure 2: Race, gender, and age classification accuracies across different languages. Two different vision encoders for encoding image features are evaluated, including Vision Transformer (ViT) [40] and ResNet-50 (ResNet) [41]. The predictive accuracy for gender classification is consistently higher than 90% across all the languages, while the accuracy is much lower for race and age classification.

Multimodal representations exhibit accuracy disparity across languages. Although we have verified that multilingual multimodal representations satisfy individual fairness, we demonstrate that they violate group fairness by evaluating their image-text matching accuracy. As shown in Fig. 1c, English captions dominate the Top-1 image-text matching accuracy over German captions, with 4.8% higher on the translation portion and 22.9% higher on the independent portion. This observation delivers an important message for researchers who are interested in learning individually fair representations [38]: individual fairness *does not* flatly prevent accuracy disparity among groups [39].

Disparity between translation and independent portions. One intriguing but unsurprising finding is that the English-German captions are more closely aligned on the translation portion (the average textual feature distance is 1.86) than the independent portion (average distance is 5.69). The similarity gaps for the translation portion are below 0.06 and are above 0.10 for many instances in the independent portion. The reason is apparent: translated captions have more similar semantics owing to the professional text-to-text translations, while independent captions have more diverse expressions of the same images, even if they might refer to the same content.

5 Multilingual representations undergo group fairness issues

5.1 Setup

Dataset. FairFace [42] is a face attribute dataset for balanced race, gender, and age groups. It categorizes gender into 2 groups, including female and male, and race into 7 groups, including White, Black, Indian, East Asian, Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Latino. For ages, we categorize the raw labels into 5 groups: infants (0-2), children and adolescents (2-19), adults (20-49), middle age adults (50-69), and seniors (more than 70). We follow their original data split and select the validate set consisting of 10,940 face images for evaluation.

Languages. We analyze the multilingual group fairness for 8 languages: Chinese (zh), English (en), French (fr), German (de), Japanese (ja), Russian (ru), Spanish (es), and Turkish (tr). We select English as the pivot language and write natural language prompts in English. Then we translate them into other languages by Google translate.

Text Prompts. Following Radford et al. [1], we construct the text prompt by the template “A photo of a {label}”. For example, we construct the text prompt “A photo of a woman” when the gender attribute is female, and construct “A photo of a man” otherwise. For age classification, we notice that the age attributes in Fairface dataset are numeric values, and use the template “A photo of a person aged {age} years” to construct text prompts.

5.2 Multilingual accuracy parity

We probe the multilingual accuracy parity for race classification, gender classification, and age classification, as shown in Fig. 2. We use 2 different pre-trained image encoders for extracting visual representation vectors, including vision transformer [40] and ResNet-50 [41]. We observe that:

Table 1: Gender classification accuracy of FairFace images by race groups across different languages. We note the maximal gender gap across races with underline and the maximal gender gap across languages in **bold**. Taking English as the pivot language, we also highlight any amplified gap compared to English in **red** and any mitigated gap in **green**.

Language	Gender	White	Black	Indian	East Asian	Southeast Asian	Middle Eastern	Latino	Average
English	Female	95.1	90.9	94.5	95.2	96.0	96.0	94.2	94.6
	Male	95.2	83.5	90.4	92.7	89.0	96.7	93.2	91.5
	Gap	0.1	<u>7.4</u>	4.1	2.5	7.0	0.7	1.0	3.0
German	Female	93.8	90.1	94.0	94.2	95.0	95.5	93.9	93.8
	Male	95.6	85.4	92.0	93.6	89.8	97.2	93.9	92.5
	Gap	1.9	4.7	1.9	0.6	<u>5.2</u>	1.7	0.1	1.3
French	Female	95.0	90.4	94.6	95.0	96.3	95.7	94.2	94.5
	Male	95.0	84.0	90.0	92.1	87.8	96.3	93.3	91.2
	Gap	0.0	<u>6.4</u>	4.6	2.8	8.6	0.6	0.9	3.2
Japanese	Female	94.5	90.6	94.4	94.7	95.7	95.7	94.1	94.2
	Male	95.3	84.0	91.5	93.4	89.1	96.6	93.4	91.9
	Gap	0.8	<u>6.6</u>	2.9	1.3	<u>6.6</u>	0.8	0.7	2.3
Turkish	Female	93.9	90.0	93.8	94.6	95.3	95.5	94.1	93.9
	Male	95.6	85.2	92.0	93.8	89.5	96.9	93.9	92.4
	Gap	1.8	4.7	1.8	0.7	<u>5.8</u>	1.5	0.1	1.4
Russian	Female	93.0	88.4	93.1	93.4	94.6	95.2	93.4	93.0
	Male	96.4	87.6	93.2	94.5	92.0	97.5	95.0	93.7
	Gap	3.4	0.8	0.2	1.1	2.6	2.3	1.6	0.7
Spanish	Female	94.1	90.5	94.4	95.1	95.6	95.5	94.2	94.2
	Male	95.5	84.4	91.2	93.2	89.4	96.8	93.7	92.0
	Gap	1.5	6.1	3.1	1.9	<u>6.2</u>	1.3	0.5	2.2
Chinese	Female	93.9	90.1	94.1	94.8	95.4	95.5	94.2	94.0
	Male	95.5	84.9	91.8	93.7	89.5	96.9	93.9	92.3
	Gap	1.7	5.2	2.3	1.1	<u>5.9</u>	1.5	0.3	1.7

Cross-lingual gap varies across different groups. The predictive accuracy for gender classification is consistently higher than 90% across all the languages. In contrast, the multimodal model has relatively poor performance and more considerable variance for race and age classification.

Visual representations affect accuracy disparity. For race classification, Vision Transformer features consistently achieve higher accuracy across all languages than ResNet-50 (38.47% vs. 31.83% on average) except for German. The standard deviation of Vision Transformer is less than ResNet-50 (6.11% vs. 7.35%). The maximal accuracy gap for Vision Transformer is 20.48% between Chinese and German, while the maximal accuracy gap for ResNet-50 is 21.53% between Spanish and French. For gender classification, Vision Transformer dominantly achieves higher accuracy and incurs less accuracy gap. For age classification, the accuracy is moderately low for all languages. However, Vision Transformer has 63.1% accuracy in Chinese while only 25.8% accuracy in German, exaggerating the accuracy gap.




Figure 3: Gender accuracy gap across different languages and race groups. Black and Southeast Asian people face significant larger gender gaps than other groups in most languages.




Figure 4: Age classification accuracy across female and male groups for different languages. The blue bars indicate that the male group has higher accuracy than the female group, while orange bars indicate that the female group has higher accuracy than the male group. The heights of bars represent the accuracy gaps between male and female groups.

5.3 Gender gap across protected groups

How do gender gaps differ across protected groups? We plot the gender gap across different languages and race groups in Fig. 3. It is clearly shown that Black and Southeast Asian in general exhibit larger gender gaps than other groups. We also observe that French has a similar performance with English. We conjecture this is because English and French share the same alphabet and similar syntactic structures. Besides, as shown in Table 1, English and French have the largest race inequality regarding gender gap—nearly zero gender gaps for White and Latino but the maximal gaps for Black and Southeast Asian.

Are gender gaps amplified for different languages when compared with English? We report the accuracy gap on gender classification of FairFace images by race groups across different languages in Table 1. We take English as the pivot language and examine whether the accuracy gaps by race groups are amplified for other languages. Compared with English, accuracy gaps for White and Middle Eastern groups are generally amplified for other languages. On the other hand, accuracy gaps are mitigated for groups including Black and Latino. The averaged cross-lingual gaps are mitigated for other languages except for French.

5.4 Age classification

Male group generally has a higher accuracy than female group. We plot the age classification accuracy by female and male groups across different languages in Fig. 4. The blue bars indicate that the male group has higher accuracy than the female group, while the orange bars indicate that the female group has higher accuracy than the male group. The heights of bars represent the accuracy gaps between male and female groups. In general, the male group has higher accuracy than the female groups. Especially, adults (20-49 years old) consistently suffer huge gender gaps across all the languages, with the largest gap 52.1% for Russian.

Same numeric digits can lead to accuracy disparity across different linguistic contexts. As we explained early in Section 5.1, the text prompts for age classification have the same numeric digits of age but different linguistic contexts. This controlled experiment helps us better understand whether the numeric digits have distinct meanings in multilingual contexts. As shown in Fig. 4, although text supervisions in different languages share the same numeric digits of ages, the yielding accuracy exhibits significant disparity across languages. One prominent example is that the predictive accuracy for infants (0-2 years old) is 5.8% for English and 2.6% for French, but 89.4% for German and 91.6% for Japanese, implying the presence of significant cross-lingual accuracy gaps.

6 Conclusion and discussion

Our work extends a growing body of fairness discourse in multilingual and multimodal learning to explore how the multilingual fairness notions, characterized by individual fairness and group fairness, are formulated on the multimodal representations. We stress that multimodal representations are individually fair, but do not prevent accuracy disparity across groups. Our extensive experimental results reveal the negative impacts caused by carelessly applying pre-trained general-purpose multimodal representations. Just one example of this, as discussed in Section 5.4, is the significant disparities between cross-lingual gender gaps occurred in age classification. We believe the findings and insights gained through this work can encourage future work to investigate how to mitigate multidimensional biases in representation learning and prevent disparities in the downstream decision-making process.

Our work also has limitations. This work does not provide a thorough explanation on whether the biases and disparities result from the multilingual model itself, or from the datasets it is pre-trained on. However, to give a convincing explanation, it requires either the access to large amounts of training data with privacy concerns (the complete datasets for training CLIP are not released yet), or ample computational resources for reproducing the training process. This research question itself is important and worth investigating further.

References

- [1] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, Chris Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, J. Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. *ArXiv*, abs/2103.00020, 2021.
- [2] Jiasen Lu, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee. Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [3] Hao Tan and Mohit Bansal. Lxmert: Learning cross-modality encoder representations from transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2019.
- [4] Weijie Su, X. Zhu, Y. Cao, B. Li, Lewei Lu, Furu Wei, and Jifeng Dai. Vi-bert: Pre-training of generic visual-linguistic representations. *ArXiv*, abs/1908.08530, 2020.
- [5] Gen Li, Nan Duan, Yuejian Fang, Daxin Jiang, and M. Zhou. Unicoder-vl: A universal encoder for vision and language by cross-modal pre-training. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [6] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- [7] Xiujun Li, Xi Yin, C. Li, X. Hu, Pengchuan Zhang, Lei Zhang, Longguang Wang, H. Hu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. Oscar: Object-semantics aligned pre-training for vision-language tasks. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- [8] Zhe Gan, Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Chen Zhu, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Large-scale adversarial training for vision-and-language representation learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [9] Fei Yu, Jiji Tang, Weichong Yin, Y. Sun, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. Ernie-vil: Knowledge enhanced vision-language representations through scene graph. *ArXiv*, abs/2006.16934, 2020.
- [10] Karan Desai and Justin Johnson. VirTex: Learning Visual Representations from Textual Annotations. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [11] Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, H. Tan, and M. Bansal. Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.02779, 2021.
- [12] Iro Laina, C. Rupprecht, and N. Navab. Towards unsupervised image captioning with shared multimodal embeddings. *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 7413–7423, 2019.
- [13] Nam S. Vo, Lu Jiang, C. Sun, K. Murphy, L. Li, Li Fei-Fei, and James Hays. Composing text and image for image retrieval - an empirical odyssey. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6432–6441, 2019.
- [14] L. Zhou, H. Palangi, Lei Zhang, H. Hu, Jason J. Corso, and Jianfeng Gao. Unified vision-language pre-training for image captioning and vqa. In *AAAI*, 2020.

- [15] A. Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.12092, 2021.
- [16] Guillaume Lample and Alexis Conneau. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [17] Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *ACL*, 2020.
- [18] Shijie Wu and Mark Dredze. Are all languages created equal in multilingual bert? In *REPLANLP*, 2020.
- [19] Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalization. *CoRR*, abs/2003.11080, 2020.
- [20] Ana Valeria González, Maria Barrett, Rasmus Hvingelby, Kellie Webster, and Anders Søgaard. Type B reflexivization as an unambiguous testbed for multilingual multi-task gender bias. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2637–2648, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [21] Monojit Choudhury and Amit Deshpande. How linguistically fair are multilingual pre-trained language models? In *AAAI-21*. AAAI, AAAI, February 2021.
- [22] C. Dwork, Moritz Hardt, T. Pitassi, O. Reingold, and R. Zemel. Fairness through awareness. *ArXiv*, abs/1104.3913, 2012.
- [23] R. Zemel, Ledell Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, T. Pitassi, and C. Dwork. Learning fair representations. In *ICML*, 2013.
- [24] A. Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big data*, 5 2:153–163, 2017.
- [25] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nathan Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’16*, page 3323–3331, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2016. Curran Associates Inc.
- [26] Aditya Mogadala, Marimuthu Kalimuthu, and D. Klakow. Trends in integration of vision and language research: A survey of tasks, datasets, and methods. *ArXiv*, abs/1907.09358, 2019.
- [27] Fredrik Carlsson and Ariel Ekgren. Pre-trained multilingual-clip encoders. <https://github.com/FreddeFrallan/Multilingual-CLIP>, 2021.
- [28] J. Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*, 2019.
- [29] Arvind Narayanan. Translation tutorial: 21 fairness definitions and their politics. In *Proc. Conf. Fairness Accountability Transp.*, 2018.
- [30] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, I. Valera, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and K. Gummadi. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *AISTATS*, 2017.
- [31] Jieyu Zhao, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Saghar Hosseini, Kai-Wei Chang, and Ahmed Hassan Awadallah. Gender bias in multilingual embeddings and cross-lingual transfer. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2896–2907, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [32] Xiaolei Huang, Linzi Xing, Franck Dernoncourt, and Michael J. Paul. Multilingual Twitter corpus and baselines for evaluating demographic bias in hate speech recognition. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1440–1448, Marseille, France, May 2020. European Language Resources Association.
- [33] Jindřich Libovický, Rudolf Rosa, and Alexander M. Fraser. How language-neutral is multilingual bert? *ArXiv*, abs/1911.03310, 2019.
- [34] Candace Ross, B. Katz, and Andrei Barbu. Measuring social biases in grounded vision and language embeddings. In *NAACL*, 2021.
- [35] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.

- [36] Desmond Elliott, Stella Frank, Khalil Sima'an, and Lucia Specia. Multi30K: Multilingual English-German image descriptions. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Vision and Language*, pages 70–74, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:67–78, 2014.
- [38] Anian Ruoss, Mislav Balunovic, M. Fischer, and Martin T. Vechev. Learning certified individually fair representations. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.10312, 2020.
- [39] Reuben Binns. On the apparent conflict between individual and group fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* '20, page 514–524, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [40] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [41] Kaiming He, X. Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [42] Kimmo Kärkkäinen and J. Joo. Fairface: Face attribute dataset for balanced race, gender, and age. *ArXiv*, abs/1908.04913, 2019.