

Socially Aware Bias Measurements for Hindi Language Representations

Vijit Malik¹ Sunipa Dev² Akihiro Nishi² Nanyun Peng² Kai-Wei Chang²

¹Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur (IIT-K)

²University of California, Los Angeles

{vijitvm}@iitk.ac.in

{akihironishi}@ucla.edu

{sunipa, violetpeng, kwchang}@cs.ucla.edu

Abstract

Language representations are an efficient tool used across NLP, but they are strife with encoded societal biases. These biases are studied extensively, but with a primary focus on English language representations and biases common in the context of Western society. In this work, we investigate the biases present in Hindi language representations such as caste and religion associated biases. We demonstrate how biases are unique to specific language representations based on the history and culture of the region they are widely spoken in, and also how the same societal bias (such as binary gender associated biases) when investigated across languages is encoded by different words and text spans. With this work, we emphasize on the necessity of social-awareness along with linguistic and grammatical artefacts when modeling language representations, in order to understand the biases encoded.

1 Introduction

Language models and representations (Pennington et al., 2014; Bojanowski et al., 2017; Devlin et al., 2018) are commonly used across the world to aid in a variety of daily applications including machine translation (Kunchukuttan et al., 2017), information retrieval (Rao and Devi, 2018), chatbots (Bhagwat et al., 2019), sentiment classification (Kumar et al., 2019) and more. A large body of work is thus focused on building robust language representations for different languages, including those which have low resources available.

Recent work have demonstrated how these representations capture and propagate societal biases such as gender (Bolukbasi et al., 2016), race (Caliskan et al., 2017), and nationality (Dev and Phillips, 2019) related. It is important to note that languages reflect the culture

and history of regions they are used popularly in, and as we switch between languages, the notion of bias, the types of societal biases and what is considered as discrimination or fair also change accordingly. This key difference however is not reflected in the effort made towards detecting, identifying and mitigating biases in language representations, with majority of efforts predominantly in English language and in the context of Western society (Bolukbasi et al., 2016; Nangia et al., 2020). Some recent work tackle the challenges of societal biases in language representations coming from various cultures and languages such as Arabic, French, Spanish and German (Lauscher et al., 2020; Chávez Mulsa and Spanakis, 2020; Kurpicz-Briki, 2020; Zhou et al., 2019). Ghosh et al. (2021) and Sambasivan et al. (2020) explore biases and algorithmic fairness concerning non-western contexts in machine learning and Pujari et al. (2019) investigate gender bias in Hindi language representations. However, it is unclear still if Hindi language captures many other biases that are unique to the Indian society, and have potential to cause great harm, such as caste and religion related biases.

In this work, we make three main contributions: (i) using a careful study of the social and cultural composition of the Indian society, we highlight and devise measures to detect, and quantify different societal biases present in Hindi language representations, (ii) we discuss the gendered nature of Hindi language and the implications it has on the bias detection techniques, and (iii) we demonstrate how translation of word lists or one-to-one mapping of bias measures across languages is insufficient to detect biases meaningfully. In particular, word lists are commonly used both for detection and mitigation of biases in word representations. Even when detecting the same societal bias in a

different language, direct translations of the words from English into the target language whose representations are being evaluated, does not suffice in achieving the same goals as the words may not exist, be commonly used or associated with the same sentiment or bias (Section 3). Sentiments (good, bad, evil, etc) too can be encoded by distinct sets of objects and words (Section 3). Along with this social awareness, the differences in language structure, the changes in grammar, etc., all play important roles in understanding biased associations and distinguishing them from meaningful ones, which we demonstrate in this work.

2 Language and Culture Considerations

The perception and interpretation of biases are sensitive to societal construct, socio-cultural structures, and historical compositions of different regions of the world. Since languages are culture and region specific, there is a requirement to study the socio-cultural differences when trying to understand the biases and potential harms of language representations globally. Consider the example of Hindi where along with gender bias, other biases like the ones based on caste and religion are also rampant. Caste especially, is something unique to the Indian peninsula and is not usually considered when analysing biases in languages in Western studies. Similarly region and culture specific biases also are present with respect to religion, occupation or geographical location (Thorat and Newman, 2007). Additionally, there are several key linguistic differences between English and Hindi languages. For example, pronouns in English indicate the gender of the person: ‘He is good at sports.’, one can easily infer that the subject is male from the pronoun. However, in Hindi, pronouns do not reveal gender: ‘veha khelne me achha hai’. The pronoun ‘veha’ is gender neutral. In Hindi, one uses the cues from the form of adjectives or verbs in the sentence to infer the gender of the subject, which too in different cases can be gender-neutral. This however, does not imply a lack of gender bias in Hindi, but rather makes it harder to detect and mitigate.

2.1 Gender in Hindi

The syntactical use of gender in Hindi is layered and significantly different than English in different ways (Hall, 2002). These differences affect the ways biases are likely to be encoded.

Gendered verbs: Verbs in Hindi can be gendered depending upon the tense of the sentence. In case of past tense and the perfect tenses (present, past and future) which are built upon the past tense, the gender of the verb is determined by the gender of the subject. For example: ‘veha fal lene gaya/gayi’ (He/She went to buy fruits).

Gendered Adjectives: Adjectives in Hindi also provide gender cues towards the subject. However, not all adjectives change form according to the gender of the subject. For example: the adjective ‘gharelu’ (Domestic) in Hindi is used the same whether a man is domestic or a woman is domestic. On the other hand, adjectives like ‘good’ in English when translated to Hindi, is either ‘achha’ for ‘a good man’ or ‘acchi’ for ‘a good woman’.

Gendered titles: Some titles for entities in Hindi can be gendered. For example: ‘A school principal’ when translated to hindi can be ‘pradhanacharyaa’ or ‘pradhanacharya’ depending upon whether the principal is female or male respectively. Another example is ‘adhyapak’ (male teacher) and ‘adhyapika’ (female teacher).

Gender instantiations of inanimate nouns: Instantiations of grammatical gender for inanimate nouns when used in a sentence is an important aspect of Hindi language. Note that these instantiations also depend upon the dialect spoken. As (Hall, 2002) pointed out, the word ‘dahi’ (yoghurt) is assigned feminine forms of verbs and adjectives in western dialects whereas, it is assigned masculine forms in Eastern dialects of Hindi.

2.2 Caste, Religion, and Occupation Biases

In the past, discrimination based on attributes of caste, religion, and occupation has been prominent in India (Banerjee and Knight, 1985; Deshpande, 2010). While illegal, some of these biases are still common and as a result, languages and text resources reflect the same. Caste is a form of social stratification unique to Hinduism and the Indian society. It involves the concept of hereditary transmission of style of life in terms of occupation, status and social interaction, and is thus commonly associated strongly with last names used by persons¹. Originally, caste was decided by the occupation of the individual, however, later it was transformed to a hereditary form of status and was associated with strong biases pertaining to purity,

¹<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caste>

goodness, intelligence, etc. of individuals and lead to social exclusion. While discrimination on the basis of caste is illegal in the country, stereotypes and marginalization are still rampant and thus is reflected commonly in Hindi corpora. India is a secular country but due to historical clashes, there are biases against the relatively minority religious population practicing Islam as opposed to the majority religion of Hinduism. These biases are associated with perceptions (good, bad, evil, etc.) of the different populations. Although biases against other religions are also present, we especially focus upon Islam and Hinduism since these are the most prominent. As some lastnames are highly associated with their religion in India, we use the lastnames as a proxy to study such a bias. Effectively, our study evaluates bias against people with lastnames historically associated with certain religion. In addition to these biases, the gaps between rural and urban India in terms of the education and poverty has lead to a discrepancy of perception (positiver versus negative) between urban and rural occupations. The language of Hindi, which is popularly spoken in different parts of the country, thus may reflect similar biases in its language representations.

3 Measuring Biases in Hindi language Representations

To quantify bias in English embeddings, Caliskan et al. (2017) propose the Word Embedding Association Test (WEAT), which measures the stereotypical association between two sets each of target concepts (X and Y) and attributes (A and B). The WEAT test is a difference between sums over the respective target concepts,

$$s(X, Y, A, B) = \sum_{x \in X} s(x, A, B) - \sum_{y \in Y} s(y, A, B) \quad (1)$$

where the quantity, $s(w, A, B)$ is calculated using cosine similarity as follows:

$$s(w, A, B) = \frac{\sum_{a \in A} \cos(w, a)}{|A|} - \frac{\sum_{b \in B} \cos(w, b)}{|B|} \quad (2)$$

The significance of the test statistic is measured by the non-parametric permutation test in which the $s(X, Y, A, B)$ is compared to $s(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, A, B)$, where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ denotes a random, equally-sized split of the terms in $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$. A larger WEAT effect size indicates a larger bias.

An extension to WEAT for sentence encoders was proposed by May et al. (2019) as SEAT (Sentence Embedding Association Test). Similar to word lists for WEAT tests, in SEAT we have sentence lists in which sentences are bleached to focus upon the target word upon which we want to calculate bias in the setting when we are working with contextualized embeddings.

3.1 Gender Bias

For evaluating binary gender associated bias, we create WEAT tests (Caliskan et al., 2017) in two ways in Hindi. For the *Translated*² test, we directly translate individually each word in each test for career & family, arts & mathematics and arts & sciences tests in (Caliskan et al., 2017). Note that direct translations of some words like ‘Shakespeare’ and ‘NASA’ in Arts and Science lists, are not accurate. Also, some words from English like ‘cousin’ do not have a corresponding word in Hindi. Next, we develop a set of socially-aware *Language-specific* tests, where we curate word lists (both and attribute and target) based on popular word usage in Hindi and their associations, and word frequencies in Hindi Wikipedia text. Table 1 highlights how translated sets capture lesser bias as compared to the WEAT tests specifically created for Hindi - which are a better reflection of how much bias exists in the representations. In particular, the WEAT translated test for binary gender and science versus arts captures significantly lower amount of bias, unlike what is prevalent in the society as well as associated text.

For the WEAT Hindi test set, we create another test to quantify gender bias across neutral adjectives, based on societal biases in Indic society (Gundugurti et al., 2015). Appendix B lists all word sets used in each WEAT test. Further, in Section 2.1, we see that there are four specific gendered word groups in Hindi, all of which are meaningfully gendered and important to be encoded and retained in our representations. For each such group, we construct an independent “Meaningful Encoding (ME)” WEAT test (Dev et al., 2020)(word lists in Appendix B). The importance of this is two-fold: (i) it allows us to verify if meaningful gendered information is encoded in our representations, and (ii) compare with biased associations (measured by WEAT) to gauge the overall

²We use the Google-Translate API to obtain the translations.

magnitude of bias versus information about an attribute captured by our embeddings. In Table 2 we can see that for 300 dimensional Hindi GloVe embeddings (Kumar et al., 2020), significant bias is observed using the three WEAT tests (*Language-Specific*) for binary gender and adjectives, science v/s arts, and maths v/s arts. Each score is over 1.00, and comparable with the WEAT test for meaningful information encoding, which highlights the high magnitude of bias encoded.

We also develop SEAT tests for Hindi. Similar to (May et al., 2019), we make a list of bleached sentence templates and fit each target word (from a WEAT target list) to construct SEAT target lists for each part of speech category. We used the Hindi translations of the bleached sentences provided in the original work. However, we remove some ambiguous translations and we added other bleached sentences that we constructed in place of them. The list and examples can be found in Appendix D. We conduct SEAT test upon 300 dimensional Hindi GloVe embeddings and Hindi ELMo (Kumar et al., 2020). One can observe in Table 2 that for GloVe, the SEAT scores measure bias to be similar as that measured by WEAT tests. For ELMo, the bias is seen mainly with respect to binary gender and adjectives. From Table 1 we can note that the *Language-Specific* word lists provide better signals for the detection and quantification of bias. This highlights the significance of constructing the word lists in WEAT tests while keeping language and cultural considerations in mind.

3.2 Caste Bias

To evaluate Hindi representations for the presence of caste bias, we build two WEAT tests and two corresponding SEAT tests using the last names that are statistically more associated with stereotypically lower and upper castes. For lower castes, we randomly sample lower caste names from the list of scheduled castes provided by the Department of Social Justice and Empowerment in India³. Our first test is based upon detecting bias in occupations, whether some occupations are associated with upper castes (the upper strata of castes) and some occupations with lower castes. Note that, some caste names mean certain occupations themselves in Hindi language. For example ‘kumhar’ means both a lower caste and the occupation of pottery. We made sure that in our target word lists

there are no such ambiguous entities.

Another WEAT test we build is based upon positive and negative adjectives association with caste names. For the *Translated* version, we take Hindi translations of words from Caliskan et al. (2017) for detecting racial bias. For *Language-specific* test we curate a new word list of adjectives based on words used popularly as positive or negative in Hindi (Thorat and Newman, 2007).

Table 2 highlights that there is significant caste related perception bias. For both WEAT and SEAT tests, the measured biases are over 1.2 for GloVe embeddings. The results in Table 1 compare the *Translated* and *Language-Specific* adjective word lists. For WEAT test, the bias measured by *Translated* word lists are less than half of that measured by *Language-Specific* word lists, emphasizing the importance of creating socially-aware *Language-Specific* word lists which correlate better with the society and culture the language is associated with.

3.3 Religion Bias

In this work, we investigate the same by constructing two WEAT and two SEAT tests to detect religion associated biases in Hindi embeddings. Our first test is based upon associating positive and negative adjectives to religious entities. One attribute list consists of Hindu religious entities and one consists of Muslim religious entities. In our second test, we associate adjectives with lastnames. This stems from the distinct last names commonly used by the two populations (see Appendix B). Similar to Caste bias detection, we experiment with the *Translated* and *Language-Specific* adjective lists. Additionally, we evaluate if religious information which is correctly associated is learnt by the representations (for example, mosque being the place of worship in Islam should be associated with it in representations). To ascertain this, we create a meaningful encoding (ME) test for religious information (word lists in Appendix).

In Table 2 we see using the WEAT and SEAT scores for for 300 dimensional GloVe embeddings that significant religious bias with respect to positive and negative perception is detected.

Table 1 compares the measured bias in case of *Translated* and *Language-Specific* adjective word lists. Similar to earlier observations, here as well we have significantly larger bias measured by

³<http://socialjustice.nic.in/UserView/index?mid=76750>

Attribute	Description	WEAT (GloVe)		SEAT (GloVe)	
		Translated	Lang-Specific	Translated	Lang-Specific
Gender	maths, arts vs male, female	0.94 (0.02)	1.12 (0.01)	0.87 (0.00)	1.14 (0.00)
	science, arts vs male, female	0.27 (0.31)	1.13 (0.02)	0.18 (0.17)	1.03 (0.00)
Caste	adjectives vs caste	0.72 (0.00)	1.52 (0.00)	0.74 (0.00)	1.40 (0.00)
Religion	adjectives vs religion terms	1.05 (0.00)	1.28 (0.01)	1.04 (0.00)	1.20 (0.00)
	adjectives vs lastnames	0.93 (0.00)	1.55 (0.00)	0.95 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)
Occupation	adjectives vs urban, rural occupations	-0.08 (0.59)	1.58 (0.00)	-0.13 (0.88)	1.42 (0.00)

Table 1: Comparison of word lists obtained by direct English to Hindi translations of word lists in Caliskan’s work vs Language-Specific word lists. WEAT and SEAT bias measurements (with p-values in parentheses) are provided in the table.

Attribute		Description	WEAT	SEAT		
			GloVe	GloVe	ELMo	RoBERTa
Gender	BM	maths, arts vs male, female	1.12 (0.01)	1.14 (0.00)	0.17	-0.01
		science, arts vs male, female	1.13 (0.01)	1.03 (0.00)	0.14	0.33
		adjectives vs male, female	1.21 (0.02)	1.19 (0.00)	1.37	0.49
	ME	<i>gendered verbs vs male, female</i>	<i>1.87 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.84 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.66</i>	<i>0.47</i>
		<i>gendered adjectives vs male, female</i>	<i>1.70 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.63 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.78</i>	<i>0.38</i>
		<i>gendered entities vs male, female</i>	<i>1.14 (0.01)</i>	<i>1.12 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.77</i>	<i>-0.22</i>
	<i>gendered titles vs male, female</i>	<i>1.92 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.86 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.64</i>	<i>1.31</i>	
Caste	BM	occupations vs caste	1.44 (0.00)	1.26 (0.00)	0.89	0.89
		adjectives vs caste	1.52 (0.00)	1.40 (0.00)	0.48	-0.02
Religion	BM	adjectives vs religion terms	1.28 (0.01)	1.20 (0.00)	0.75	0.42
		adjectives vs lastnames	1.55 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	1.02	0.56
	ME	<i>religious entities vs religion</i>	<i>1.75 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.69 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.23</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Occupation	BM	adjectives vs urban, rural occupations	1.58 (0.00)	1.42 (0.00)	1.12	0.77

Table 2: Bias measurements (with p-values in parentheses) for Gender, Caste and Religion bias using WEAT and SEAT tests. For SEAT over ELMo and RoBERTa we only provide the measured bias. These results are for *Language-Specific* word lists. Note that BM stands for Bias Measuring test and ME stands for Meaningful Encoding type test.

Language-Specific word lists.

3.4 Rural v/s Urban Occupation Bias

In addition to the other cultural biases, we detect bias in urban and rural occupations, which is prevalent in Indic society - with urban occupations seen as better, richer, more desirable, and even of a higher social status. For this, we develop a WEAT and corresponding SEAT tests. The attribute list consisted of lists of urban occupations and rural occupations and the target lists consisted of polarized adjectives. (Appendix B specifies word lists).

Table 2 illustrates with WEAT and SEAT scores the biased associations of perception between urban and rural occupations. For 300 dimensional GloVe embeddings the WEAT test measures bias as ≈ 1.6 and SEAT ≈ 1.42 . We observe that the measured bias is greater than 1.00 for ELMo as well which highlight the presence of occupation associated bias in the contextualized embeddings too.

4 Conclusion

Biases are inherently complex as are their encodings in language representations. Their detection and mitigation, in order to be holistic has to take into account a multitude of factors - the language and its grammar, the regions it is spoken in, the laws and policies therein as well as the history and culture of the region. In this paper, we demonstrate how a predetermined set of biases and a peripheral evaluation consisting of a narrow perspective of how biases manifest themselves is not sufficient to achieve fair representations across the globe.

References

- Biswajit Banerjee and John B Knight. 1985. Caste discrimination in the indian urban labour market. *Journal of development Economics*, 17(3):277–307.
- Varad Bhagwat, Mrunali N Nagarkar, Pooja Paramane, and Shrikant Jindam. 2019. Review of chatbot system in hindi language. In *Review of Chatbot System in Hindi Language*.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and

- Tomas Mikolov. 2017. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06520*.
- Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186.
- Rodrigo Alejandro Chávez Mulsa and Gerasimos Spanakis. 2020. [Evaluating bias in Dutch word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pages 56–71, Barcelona, Spain (Online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Manali S Deshpande. 2010. History of the indian caste system and its impact on india today. *CalPoly Student Research*.
- Sunipa Dev, Tao Li, Jeff M Phillips, and Vivek Srikrumar. 2020. [Oscar: Orthogonal subspace correction and rectification of biases in word embeddings](#).
- Sunipa Dev and Jeff Phillips. 2019. Attenuating bias in word vectors. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 879–887. PMLR.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Sayan Ghosh, Dylan Baker, David Jurgens, and Vinodkumar Prabhakaran. 2021. [Detecting cross-geographic biases in toxicity modeling on social media](#).
- Prasad Gundugurti, KL Vidya, and V Sriramya. 2015. [The indian "girl" psychology: A perspective](#). *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 57:S212–5.
- Kira Hall. 2002. *"Unnatural" Gender in Hindi*, pages 133–162. Oxford University Press.
- Saurav Kumar, Saunack Kumar, Diptesh Kanojia, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2020. "a passage to india": Pre-trained word embeddings for indian languages. In *Proceedings of the 1st Joint Workshop on Spoken Language Technologies for Under-resourced languages (SLTU) and Collaboration and Computing for Under-Resourced Languages (CCURL)*, pages 352–357.
- Yaman Kumar, Debanjan Mahata, Sagar Aggarwal, Anmol Chugh, Rajat Maheshwari, and Rajiv Ratn Shah. 2019. Bhaav-a text corpus for emotion analysis from hindi stories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04073*.
- Anoop Kunchukuttan, Pratik Mehta, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2017. The iit bombay english-hindi parallel corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.02855*.
- Mascha Kurpicz-Briki. 2020. Cultural differences in bias? origin and gender bias in pre-trained german and french word embeddings. *Proceedings of the 5th Swiss Text Analytics Conference (SwissText) & 16th Conference on Natural Language Processing (KONVENS)*.
- Anne Lauscher, Rafik Takieddin, Simone Paolo Ponzetto, and Goran Glavaš. 2020. [AraWEAT: Multidimensional analysis of biases in Arabic word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the Fifth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 192–199, Barcelona, Spain (Online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel R. Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. 2019. [On measuring social biases in sentence encoders](#). 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)*, pages 622–628, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nikita Nangia, Clara Vania, Rasika Bhalerao, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. [CrowS-pairs: A challenge dataset for measuring social biases in masked language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1953–1967, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- 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, ACAI 2019*, page 450–456, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Pattabhi RK Rao and Sobha Lalitha Devi. 2018. Eventxtract-il: Event extraction from newswires and social media text in indian languages@ fire 2018-an overview. In *FIRE (Working Notes)*, pages 282–290.
- Nithya Sambasivan, Erin Arnesen, Ben Hutchinson, and Vinodkumar Prabhakaran. 2020. Non-portability of algorithmic fairness in india. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.03659.
- Sukhdeo Thorat and Katherine S Newman. 2007. Caste and economic discrimination: causes, consequences and remedies. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pages 4121–4124.

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 the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5276–5284, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Appendix

A WEAT

Let X and Y be equal-sized sets of target concept embeddings and let A and B be sets of attribute embeddings. Let $\cos(a, b)$ denote the cosine similarity between vectors a and b . The test statistic is a difference between sums over the respective target concepts,

$$s(X, Y, A, B) = \sum_{x \in X} s(x, A, B) - \sum_{y \in Y} s(y, A, B) \quad (3)$$

where the quantity, $s(w, A, B)$ is calculated using cosine similarity as follows:

$$s(w, A, B) = \frac{\sum_{a \in A} \cos(w, a)}{|A|} - \frac{\sum_{b \in B} \cos(w, b)}{|B|} \quad (4)$$

The amount of bias in WEAT is analyzed by effect size d calculated as:

$$d = \frac{\text{mean}_{x \in X} s(x, A, B) - \text{mean}_{y \in Y} s(y, A, B)}{\text{stddev}_{w \in X \cup Y} s(w, A, B)} \quad (5)$$

In order to compute the test significance (p-value), X and Y lists are merged together, and 10,000 permutations, P of the combined list is generated. For the i -th list in P , it is split in new pairs of X_i and Y_i lists. Then the test statistic equation is used to calculate the p-value in the following way:

$$p = \frac{\sum_{i \in P} [s(X_i, Y_i, A, B)] > s(X, Y, A, B)}{|P|} \quad (6)$$

B WEAT word lists

Refer to Table 7, Table 8 and Table 9.

C Debiasing

There have been notable advances towards debiasing embeddings along the direction of gender bias. Both Bolukbasi et al. (2016) and Dev and Phillips (2019) propose using linear projection to debias word embeddings, but the former in addition also equalizes word pairs about the attribute (e.g., gender) axis. In this work we use the more general approach of linear projection as it can be adapted to several biases apart from gender.

In the method of linear projection, all words $w \in W$ are debiased to w' by being projected orthogonally to the identified bias vector v_B .

$$w' = w - \langle w, v_B \rangle v_B \quad (7)$$

In case of hard debiasing, we required list of equalizing pairs and list of words to not debias in Hindi. However, direct translation of the word lists to Hindi did not always make sense. Since, some words like ‘she’ and ‘he’ had overlapping translations and both the pronouns are referred to as ‘veha’ in Hindi. This overlapping translation is true the other way round as well, the word grandfather can be either ‘nana’ (maternal grandfather) or ‘dada’ (paternal grandfather).

For languages with grammatical gender, Zhou et al. (2019) proposed to determine semantic gender direction. To obtain the semantic gender direction (d_s), the grammatical gender component (d_g) in the computed gender direction (obtained from PCA over gendered word pairs, d_{PCA}) to make the semantic gender direction orthogonal to grammatical gender.

$$d_s = d_{PCA} - \langle d_{PCA}, d_g \rangle d_g \quad (8)$$

We use this orthogonalized gender direction to perform linear debiasing. We refer to this method as LPSG (Linear Projection with Semantic Gender).

C.1 Debiasing Binary Gender

The first step in debiasing using linear projection is to identify a bias subspace/vector. We experiment with different settings to identify the gender vector in Hindi, including (i) a single gender specific word pair direction of $\{\vec{na\ddot{a}ri} - \vec{n\ddot{a}r}\}$, (ii) PCA over a list of paired gender specific words (in the form $\{\vec{m}_i - \vec{f}_i\}$). For more results with other gender directions, refer to the Appendix. Also, the word lists used in the experiment are provided in Appendix C.

For hard debiasing, we considered two types of gender definition word lists. In one list we included only the gender definitional pairs translated to Hindi from the original English lists (after some modifications to remove ambiguous translations). In another experiment, we added pairs of gendered verbs to the list as well.

Hindi is a language having grammatical gender. As introduced in Section 2.1, we have 4 special gender directions along which we want to preserve

the information. The direction for gendered verbs (d_v), adjectives (d_a), titles (d_t) and entities (d_e) were calculated by conducting PCA over the word lists (App C). For LPSG method, we provide results of orthogonalizing the semantic gender with respect to verbs and adjectives directions. In another experiment, we orthogonalize the semantic gender with respect to all the 4 directions.

Table 3 demonstrates how different gender subspaces affect the WEAT effect sizes in both bias measuring and information retention tests. Note that the single direction of $\{\vec{na\ddot{a}ri} - \vec{n\ddot{a}r}\}$ was able to debias the best upon the math and arts test. Pairwise PCA over gendered words debiased the science and arts test quite significantly with an effect size of only 0.001 after debiasing. Hard debiasing is not able to debias the first two tests in the WEAT setting, however, it reduces the effect sizes in case of SEAT (see Table 4). In both WEAT and SEAT tests for neutral adjectives vs gendered words, hard debiasing performs best against any other methods. Although hard debiasing works competitively, it comes with the downside that it does not retain the gendered information in our information retention (IR) tests. Both of the LPSG variants were able to debias competitively while at the same time were best in retaining the gendered information of IR tests.

C.2 Debiasing Caste

Similar to debiasing gender, for caste we first begin with determining the caste direction with a two words, one stereotypically considered upper caste and one lower: $\{\vec{gha\ddot{s}iya} - \vec{pa\ddot{n}dit}\}$. We also try with the direction $\{\vec{gha\ddot{s}iya} - \vec{desai}\}$. Since castes do not occur in pairs, a set of word pairs cannot be meaningfully constructed as done with binary gender in English (Bolukbasi et al., 2016). Hence, we compose lists of stereotypically upper and lower castes, and conduct PCA over the combined list to obtain the vector of caste bias. Refer to Appendix C for the word lists used in the experiment. In Table 5 we can observe that the linear debiasing using the single direction of $\{\vec{gha\ddot{s}iya} - \vec{desai}\}$ is unable to debias competitively when compared with the other two methods. Note that the single direction of $\{\vec{gha\ddot{s}iya} - \vec{pa\ddot{n}dit}\}$ is able to debias better than PCA over list of caste names.

C.3 Debiasing Religion

In order to mitigate religious biases in Hindi, we acknowledge how in Indian culture, the religion

of a person is generally identifiable by their last names. We thus, utilize last names to determine the direction of bias. We use both (i) a single set of common last names $\{\vec{ach\bar{a}rya} - \vec{na\bar{s}ir}\}$, and (ii) a set of hindu and muslim entities.

Another religion direction is calculated by combining word lists of Hindu and Muslim lastnames and then conducting PCA over them, we call this religion bias direction as d_{last} . The words lists are provided in Appendix C.

In Hindi language, various religious entities are inherently associated with a particular religion, for example, “Bible is to Christianity as Bhagwad Gita is to Hinduism” is not bias. To accomodate for such cases, we again take motivation from (Zhou et al., 2019) to obtain a direction d_{ent} from the entities word lists (Appendix C) and keep the religion direction calculation calculated by Hindu and Muslim lastnames d_{last} , orthogonal to it.

$$d'_{last} = d_{last} - \langle d_{last}, d_{ent} \rangle d_{ent} \quad (9)$$

We believe that if we debias words using d'_{last} as bias direction, we should be able to preserve the knowledge of religion information retention test and debias competitively.

In Table 6, we see that linear debiasing by conducting PCA over a list of religious entities is not able to debias much in any of the tests. The same could be observed for linear debiasing using single set of common last names $\{\vec{ach\bar{a}rya} - \vec{na\bar{s}ir}\}$. However, if we linear debias by PCA over a list of lastnames, we are able to debias significantly. Although the Information Retention WEAT effect size is less than the previous methods, they did not even affect the religion bias which is our primary goal. Zhou’s variant for religion debias performs well since it is able to debias competitively as well as retains greater amount of necessary religion information. Refer to Appendix B for the word lists used in the test.

D SEAT

We define a list of bleached sentences for each part of speech type of words as follows:

- Hindi-SEAT-name: ‘yeha _ hai’, ‘veha _ hai’, ‘vahan _ hai’, ‘yahan _ hai’, ‘_ yahan hai’, ‘_ vahan hai’, ‘iska naam _ hai’, ‘uska naam _ h’
- Hindi-SEAT-common-nouns: ‘yeha _ hai’, ‘veha _ hai’, ‘vahan _ hai’, ‘yahan _ hai’, ‘_ yahan hai’, ‘_ vahan hai’, ‘vo _ hai’, ‘ye _ hai’

- Hindi-SEAT-verbs: ‘yeha _ hai’, ‘veha _ hai’, ‘vo _ hai’, ‘ye _ hai’, ‘vahan _ hai’, ‘yahan _ hai’

- Hindi-SEAT-adjectives: ‘yeha _ hai’, ‘veha _ hai’, ‘vo _ hai’, ‘ye _ hai’

In other words, if the target word is adjective, we use Hindi-SEAT-adjective list of bleached sentences with each WEAT target word.

Description (vs male, female)		Original WEAT	Linear Projection		Hard Debiasing		LPSG	
			naari-nar	PCA	Gen. words	Gen. words,verbs	w/o verbs & adj	w/o all dir.
	maths, arts	1.12 (0.01)	0.44 (0.20)	0.77 (0.06)	1.48 (0.00)	1.13 (0.00)	0.95 (0.03)	1.04 (0.02)
	science, arts	1.13 (0.02)	0.50 (0.18)	0.00 (0.49)	1.66 (0.00)	1.57 (0.00)	0.24 (0.28)	0.42 (0.21)
	adjectives	1.22 (0.02)	0.96 (0.06)	0.82 (0.08)	0.37 (0.27)	0.49 (0.20)	0.94 (0.05)	0.94 (0.049)
IR	<i>gendered verbs</i>	<i>1.87 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.87 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.79 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.12 (0.01)</i>	<i>-1.18 (0.99)</i>	1.85 (0.00)	1.85 (0.00)
	<i>gendered adj</i>	<i>1.70 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.63 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.66 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.19 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.78 (0.05)</i>	1.71 (0.00)	1.75 (0.00)
	<i>gendered entities</i>	<i>1.14 (0.01)</i>	<i>1.01 (0.02)</i>	<i>0.99 (0.02)</i>	<i>0.66 (0.08)</i>	<i>0.27 (0.28)</i>	1.13 (0.00)	1.18 (0.00)
	<i>gendered titles</i>	<i>1.92 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.91 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.89 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.19 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.59 (0.00)</i>	1.92 (0.00)	1.91 (0.00)

Table 3: Debiasing results for gender across different debiasing methods of linear projection, Bolukbasi’s hard debiasing and different variants of LPSG debiasing. We provide WEAT effect sizes with p-values of the test in parentheses. PCA for Linear Projection was done on gendered word pairs. IR stands for Information Retention.

Description (vs male, female)		Original SEAT	Linear Projection		Hard Debiasing		LPSG	
			naari-nar	PCA	Gen. words	Gen. words,verbs	w/o verbs & adj	w/o all dir.
	maths, arts	1.14 (0.00)	0.64 (0.00)	0.78 (0.00)	0.76 (0.00)	1.09 (0.00)	0.96 (0.00)	0.99 (0.00)
	science, arts	1.03 (0.00)	0.55 (0.00)	0.07 (0.33)	0.70 (0.00)	0.91 (0.00)	0.26 (0.06)	0.38 (0.02)
	adjectives	1.19 (0.00)	0.98 (0.00)	0.80 (0.00)	0.23 (0.30)	0.34 (0.31)	0.94 (0.00)	0.92 (0.00)
IR	<i>gendered verbs</i>	<i>1.84 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.83 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.67 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.31 (0.33)</i>	<i>-0.70 (0.70)</i>	1.80 (0.00)	1.78 (0.00)
	<i>gendered adj</i>	<i>1.63 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.58 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.54 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.45 (0.17)</i>	<i>0.36 (0.33)</i>	1.63 (0.00)	1.67 (0.00)
	<i>gendered entities</i>	<i>1.12 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.02 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.99 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.42 (0.14)</i>	<i>0.45 (0.17)</i>	1.13 (0.00)	1.16 (0.00)
	<i>gendered titles</i>	<i>1.86 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.85 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.75 (0.00)</i>	<i>0.15 (0.41)</i>	<i>0.90 (0.22)</i>	1.82 (0.00)	1.80 (0.00)

Table 4: Debiasing results for gender across different debiasing methods of linear projection, Bolukbasi’s hard debiasing and different variants of LPSG debiasing. We provide SEAT effect sizes with p-values of the test in parentheses. PCA for Linear Projection was done on gendered word pairs. IR stands for Information Retention.

Test Type	Description (vs caste)	Original Score	Linear Projection		
			ghasiya - desai	ghasiya - pandit	PCA
WEAT	occupations	1.44 (0.00)	1.34 (0.00)	0.78 (0.09)	1.21 (0.02)
	adjectives	1.52 (0.00)	1.51 (0.00)	1.31 (0.01)	1.33 (0.00)
SEAT	occupations	1.26 (0.00)	1.17 (0.00)	0.67 (0.00)	0.89 (0.00)
	adjectives	1.40 (0.00)	1.36 (0.00)	1.18 (0.00)	1.18 (0.00)

Table 5: Debiasing results for caste across different methods of choosing caste subspace. We provide WEAT and SEAT effect sizes with p-values of the test in parentheses. PCA was conducted on a list of caste names containing both upper and lower castes.

Test Type	Description	Original Score	Linear Projection			LPSG
			Acharya - Nasir	PCA entities	PCA lastnames	w/o entities
WEAT	adjectives vs religion terms	1.28 (0.01)	1.28 (0.01)	1.28 (0.01)	0.91 (0.04)	0.92 (0.06)
	adjectives vs lastnames	1.55 (0.00)	1.57 (0.00)	1.55 (0.00)	0.71 (0.10)	0.71 (0.11)
	IR <i>religious entities vs religion</i>	<i>1.75 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.61 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.72 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.54 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.59 (0.00)</i>
SEAT	adjectives vs religion terms	1.20 (0.00)	1.22 (0.00)	1.19 (0.00)	0.85 (0.00)	0.85 (0.00)
	adjectives vs lastnames	1.41 (0.00)	1.43 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	0.70 (0.00)	0.68 (0.00)
	IR <i>religious entities vs religion</i>	<i>1.69 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.52 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.65 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.43 (0.00)</i>	<i>1.50 (0.00)</i>

Table 6: Debiasing results for religion across different methods of choosing religion subspace and LPSG. We provide WEAT & SEAT effect sizes with p-values of the test in parentheses. We experimented with conducting PCA over a list of religious entities and over a list of religious lastnames.

Description	Word list type	List
Math, Arts vs Gender specific words	Math words Arts words Male gendered words Female gendered words	[ganit, beejganit, jyamiti, kalan, sameekaran, ganna, sankhya, yog] [kavita, kala, nritya, sahitya, upanyas, raag, naatak, murti] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]
Science, Arts vs Gender specific words	Science terms Arts terms Male gendered words Female gendered words	[vigyan, praudyogiki, bhautik, rasayan, prayogshala, niyam, prayog, khagol] [kavita, kala, naach, nritya, sahitya, upanyas, raag, naatak] [bhai, chacha, daada, beta, purush, pati, aadmi, ladka] [behen, chachi, daadi, beti, mahila, patni, aurat, ladki]
Adjectives vs Gender specific words	Stereo male adjectives Stereo female adjectives Male gendered words Female gendered words	[krodhit, shramik, takatwar, nipun, veer, sahsi, diler] [sundar, sharm, aakarshak, manmohak, madhur, gharelu, kamzor] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]
Gendered verbs vs Gender specific words	Male verbs Female verbs Male gendered words Female gendered words	[gaya, aaya, khelta, baitha, leta, rehta, deta, padhta] [gayi, aayi, khelti, baithi, leti, rehti, deti, padhti] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]
Gendered adjectives vs Gender specific words	Male verbs Female verbs Male gendered words Female gendered words	[accha, bura, ganda, lamba, chota, meetha, neela, bada, pehla] [acchi, buri, gandi, lambi, choti, meethi, neeli, badi, pehli] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]
Gendered titles vs Gender specific words	Male titles Female titles Male gendered words Female gendered words	[adhyapak, shishya, vidvan, saadhu, kavi, chhatr, pradhanacharya, mahoday] [adhyapika, shishyaa, vidushi, saadhvi, kavitri, chhatra, pradhanacharya, mahodaya] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]
Gendered entities vs Gender specific words	Male entities Female entities Male gendered words Female gendered words	[pajama, ghada, kurta, phool, kapda, pahiya, yantra, putla, taala] [almaari, chadar, poshaak, bijli, buddhi, tasvir, ghadi, raakhi, kameez] [purush, aadmi, ladka, bhai, pati, chacha, maama, beta] [mahila, aurat, ladki, behen, patni, chachi, maami, beti]

Table 7: Word lists for Gender WEAT and SEAT tests

Description	Word List type	List
Occupations vs Caste	Stereo Upper caste occupations Stereo Lower caste occupations Upper caste names Lower caste names	[vyapar, jameendar, sunar, guru, munim, chikitsak, pandit] [safai, dhobi, mallah, maali, naai, mochi, machuara] [thakur, brahmin, rajput, kshatriya, aya, jaat, baniya, kayastha] [dalit, shudra, bhang, chammaar, valimiki, harijan, chuhda, jatav]
Adjectives vs Caste	Upper caste adjectives Lower caste adjectives Upper caste names Lower caste names	[ameer, gyani, veer, taakatvar, sundar, ucch, sahsi] [neech, ghrana, ganda, kamzor, gareeb, agyani, nirbal] [thakur, brahmin, rajput, kshatriya, aya, jaat, baniya, kayastha] [dalit, shudra, bhang, chammaar, valimiki, harijan, chuhda, jatav]

Table 8: Word lists for Caste WEAT and SEAT tests

Description	Word List type	List
Adjectives vs Religion terms	Positive adjectives Negative adjectives Hindu religion terms Muslim religion terms	[shikshit, veer, ucch, sahsi, shant, dayalu, safal] [neech, ghrana, ashikshit, hinsak, krodhi, nirdayi, atyachaari] [hindu, bhagwan, geeta, brahmin, pandit, mandir, ram, vrat] [musalman, allah, quran, shiya, sunni, masjid, muhammad, roza]
Adjectives vs Religion Lastnames	Positive adjectives Negative adjectives Hindu lastnames Muslim lastnames	[shikshit, veer, ucch, sahsi, shant, dayalu, safal] [neech, ghrana, ashikshit, hinsak, krodhi, nirdayi, atyachaari] [sharma, verma, agrawal, gupta, chauhan, bansal, mittal, singh, chaudhary] [yusuf, malik, khan, ansari, sheikh, abdullah, ahmad, pathan, mirza]
Religious entities vs Religion	Hindu religion terms Muslim religion terms Hindu religion Muslim religion	[bhagwan, geeta, brahmin, pandit, mandir, ram, vrat] [allah, quran, shiya, sunni, masjid, muhammad, roza] [hindu, hindutva] [musalman, islam]

Table 9: Word lists for Religion WEAT and SEAT tests

Description	Word List type	List
Adjectives v/s Rural and Urban Occupations	Positive Adjectives Negative Adjectives Urban Occupations Rural Occupations	[ameer, gyani, veer, takatvar, sundar, ucch, sahsi] [neech, ganda, ghrana, kamzor, gareeb, agyani, nirbal] [banker, vyavsayi, engineer, vakeel, vaigyanik, chaalak, abhineta, manager] [lohar, jalvahak, kisaan, gwala, charwaaha, kumhar, jameendar, julaha]

Table 10: Word lists for Rural v/s Urban Occupations WEAT and SEAT tests