

Considerations for the Interpretation of Bias Measures of Word Embeddings

Inom Mirzaev*

inom.mirzaev@workday.com

Anthony Schulte*

tony.schulte@workday.com

Michael Conover

michael.conover@workday.com

Sam Shah

shahsam@umich.edu

Abstract

Word embedding spaces are powerful tools for capturing latent semantic relationships between terms in corpora (Mikolov et al. 2013; Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014), and have become widely popular for building state-of-the-art natural language processing algorithms. However, recent studies have shown that societal biases (e.g., gender, race, age, etc.) present in text corpora may be incorporated into the word embedding spaces learned from them as well. Thus, there is an ethical concern that human-like biases contained in the corpora and their derived embedding spaces might be propagated, or even amplified with the usage of the biased embedding spaces in downstream applications. In an attempt to quantify these biases so that they may be better understood and studied, several bias metrics have been proposed. We explore the statistical properties of these proposed measures in the context of their cited applications as well as their supposed utilities. We find that there are significant caveats to the simple interpretation of these metrics as proposed, and that some applications of these metrics in well-cited works may be erroneous. Specifically, we find that the bias metric proposed by (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) is highly sensitive to embedding hyper-parameter selection, and that in many cases, the variance due to the selection of some hyper-parameters, notably the embedding space dimensionality, is greater than the variance in the metric due to corpus selection, while in fewer cases, even the relative rankings of the bias measured in the embedding spaces of various corpora varies with hyper-parameter selection. In light of these observations, it may be the case that bias estimates should not be thought to directly reflect the properties of the underlying corpus, but rather the properties of the specific embedding spaces in question, particularly in the context of hyper-parameter selections used to generate them. Hence, bias metrics of spaces generated with differing hyper-parameters should be compared only with explicit consideration of the embedding-learning algorithms' particular configurations.

While it may be possible to use embedding spaces generated with a controlled hyper-parameter configuration to rank corpora in terms of the quantity of bias contained, the numerical value of this bias metric has poor stability across model configurations and

*The two first authors contributed equally.

a somewhat unclear interpretation in the context of the hyper-parameter sensitivity, and should not be presented as a canonical measure of the corpus in question without reporting the setup of the embedding-learning algorithm used. Moreover, due to the potentially imprecise means by which the term sets used to identify the bias axes, G_1 , G_2 and W , are found, we find it difficult to defend the canonicity of these term sets, and offer that it may be helpful to include statistics related to the distribution of the bias metric under variously sampled metric-inducing term sets to defend against critiques related to the hyper-parametric selection of a particular set of terms in the formulation of the particular bias metric in question.

Introduction

Word embeddings are widely used for their ability to capture the semantic meanings of terms within a corpus. They are widely praised as useful tools for generating features for use in natural language processing systems, and recently, some researchers are attempting to study the structures of these embedding spaces to learn about the fundamental linguistic properties, or even the semantic content of a corpus. While many of the properties of embedding spaces are useful and socially benign, a subset of these properties can reveal latent relationships between terms which could be socially problematic, and may be of interest to researchers for study, or possibly lead to risks of propagating the implicit biases of a corpus if these socially problematic term relationships are used in downstream machine learning applications which would ideally be free of such implicit biases. Qualitatively, when inspecting term-analogical relationships as is done in (Garg et al. 2018), it is difficult to deny the existence of these biases, but the task of quantitatively capturing them in a canonical measure has been a topic of recent study. Initial attempts have been made to develop metrics which seek to describe the geometric properties of the embedding space with respect to various axes of interest which are empirically determined to correspond to our intuitions of the hypothetical biases under study to quantify the degrees to which various biases exist within the embedding space, and presumably, the underlying text corpus (Bolukbasi et al. 2016; Caliskan, Bryson, and Narayanan 2017; Garg et al. 2018). For instance, using such a bias measure, (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) concluded that “word embeddings trained on Google News articles exhibit female/male gender stereotypes to a disturbing extent”. To the end of quantifying these biases, (Caliskan, Bryson, and Narayanan 2017) proposed and used a bias measure to report that “text corpora contain recoverable and accurate imprints of our historic biases”. The genesis of these biases via the underlying text corpus is explored in depth in (Brunet et al. 2018). Although this family of bias metrics is fairly new, initial attempts have been made to refine and explore their validity and robustness as explored in the metric significance research in (Caliskan, Bryson, and Narayanan 2017), which seeks to determine whether a bias score is significant, given the possibility of having selected various sets of metric-inducing terms.

Properties of the bias measurement technique

In this section, we evaluate the stability of the bias measure developed in (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) which is claimed to measure societal biases in word embeddings. For the sake of com-

pletteness, we repeat the definition of (Bolukbasi et al. 2016)’s bias metric:

Given two groups of words (e.g., gender words)

$$G_1 = \{\vec{x}_i\}_{i=1}^K \quad \text{and} \quad G_2 = \{\vec{y}_i\}_{i=1}^K ,$$

first groups’ subspace direction \vec{g} is identified as the first principal component of the vectors

$$\{\vec{x}_i - \vec{y}_i\}_{i=1}^K \cup \{\vec{y}_i - \vec{x}_i\}_{i=1}^K .$$

Consequently, given a set of words $W = \{\vec{w}_i\}$, *bias* for each word is defined as

$$\text{cosine_similarity}(\vec{w}_i, \vec{g})$$

and *direct bias* for a given set of words is calculated as

$$\frac{1}{|W|} \sum |\text{cosine_similarity}(\vec{w}_i, \vec{g})| .$$

In essence, this bias metric measures how closely a given word embedding aligns with a gender axis defined by a first principal component of vectors *man-woman*, *he-she*, *him-her*, *etc.* And, direct bias is essentially average magnitude of bias present in a list of neutral words.

Figure 1 illustrates the results of (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) bias detection algorithm for a list of profession names with word embedding vectors of dimension 256 trained using the Skip-gram algorithm (Mikolov et al. 2013) on a sample of 23k Wikipedia articles with 50k term vocabulary. As one can observe, this bias measure identifies some profession names such as commander and nurse, which historically were predominantly male and female jobs, respectively. Moreover, we trained word embeddings with differing dimension on the same sampled Wikipedia corpus using Skip-gram algorithm, and calculated Kendall tau rank correlation coefficients for the bias metrics corresponding to terms in the above list of professions. As illustrated in Figure 2, we found that though rankings for low dimensional embeddings were unstable, for larger dimensions (≥ 128) rankings of the biases of the profession terms achieve superior Kendall tau scores.

Although this bias measure nearly preserves term-bias-rankings, particularly for highly dimensional embedding configurations, we found that bias measure decays, approaching zero as the space dimensionality increases. In Figure 3a, we have depicted bias score densities for word embeddings trained for a range of dimensions using Skip-gram algorithm on the same text corpus. One can observe that bias score densities change substantially with changing embedding dimension.

Next, we evaluated the stability of the *direct bias* measure proposed in (Bolukbasi et al. 2016). The authors assert that the direct bias measure can be used as a metric to conclude how much an embedding is biased. For instance, for word embeddings trained on Google News articles, they reported that direct gender bias on 327 profession names is 0.08 and thus they concluded that this embedding is biased. However, as we have illustrated in Figure 3a, this bias score is not stable, i.e., direct bias measure decays exponentially with increasing word embedding dimension. Moreover, the change in the direct bias, the average




Figure 1: Bias scores for a list of profession names using (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) bias measure.

Kendall rank correlation coefficients




Figure 2: Kendall tau rank correlation coefficients for pairs of word embeddings trained using Skip-gram algorithm.




Figure 3: Bias score decay with increasing dimension (a) Bias score densities for word embeddings trained using Skip-gram (b) Direct bias measures for publicly available embeddings trained with GloVe¹ and our embeddings trained on sampled Wikipedia data. Note that the ranking of the twitter corpus changes with embedding dimension.




Figure 4: Average magnitude of cosine similarity between 1000 randomly sampled word pairs common to all corpora.

bias magnitude in a word embedding, varies more with model hyper-parameter configuration than with corpus selection, and in certain instances, notably Twitter vs. Wikipedia, the bias ranking of corpora may also change with altering embedding dimension. This, in turn, suggests that this bias metric magnitude corresponds less directly to the inherent bias of the text corpus than to the measurable bias resultant of the embedding training algorithm hyper-parameter selections employed.

The decrease of bias measure with increasing embedding dimension could lead to the conclusion that you can reduce direct bias from word embeddings by increasing the dimensionality. However, we believe the downward slope we see in the plots is merely an effect of the properties of the cosine similarity metric in high dimension spaces. In particular, in Figure 4 we observe that arbitrary pairs of word embeddings become less and less similar to each other as the number of dimensions increases. We feel additional research regarding whether apparently-low-bias, high dimension embedding spaces regain their measurable bias when projected into smaller dimension spaces would help further understand this phenomenon. Future work attempting to develop a better canonical bias metric for corpora should seek to be less sensitive to model training hyper-parameters, accounting for the properties of the cosine similarity at various dimensionalities.

In addition to the explored sensitivity to the dimension of the embedding space, we note that there is some degree of sensitivity of the proposed metric to the sample of terms used to induce the axis onto which term vectors are projected to determine their bias. While it is not difficult to hypothesize various words which are supposed to be either ideally neutral

¹Last 4 embeddings are publicly available at <https://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/glove/>

Bootstrapped Bias Score (sampling bias terms and neutral terms)




Figure 5: Distributions of direct bias scores of various online corpora under bootstrapping of bias and neutral term sets, G_1 , G_2 , and W .

terms W , or ideally bias-axis-aligned G_1 , G_2 , or as in (Bolukbasi et al. 2016), have these term sets evaluated by a crowd, it is much more difficult to argue the canonicity of a given term set W , G_1 or G_2 . If it is not possible to defend the term set selections used to define the metric as being canonical, it is better for them to be mathematically regarded as a sample of the canonical term set. In this light, it becomes critical to understand the sensitivity of the proposed metric to the particular term set sampled, and ideally, characterize the distribution of the metric under many such samples as partially explored in (Antoniak and Mimno 2018). In examining several online corpora, we observe that although the degree of variance due to term selection at a given embedding dimensionality is small compared to that due to the choice of embedding dimension, we feel that the incorporation of a description of the variance of the bias metric would be prudent to allow for the development of a notion of statistical significance of bias comparisons between corpora. In Figure 5, we show that for several online corpora², the variance of the bias metric under bootstrap samples of G_1 , G_2 , and W is large compared to the inter-group mean differences, making statements comparing these mean bias estimates suspect if reported in absence of an account for the variance of the metric under sampled term sets.

We note that without accounting for the bias metric variance due to target term sample, one would be led to conclude that the bias of *reddit-politics.glove_d200* is greater than the bias of *reddit-pics.glove_d200*, while in fact, this difference is probably not significant ($p > 0.5$), whereas *reddit-programming.glove_d200* is probably significantly more biased than *reddit-politics.glove_d200* ($p < 0.001$) even when accounting for the variance of the bias metric due

²Raw corpora are downloaded from <https://files.pushshift.io/reddit/comments/>

to target term sample.

Concluding remarks

We conclude that while meta analyses of the bias metrics proposed by (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) indicate that the metrics capture and somewhat quantify sociologically meaningful biases present in learned embedding spaces, the metrics are highly sensitive to the hyper-parameter configurations of the algorithms used to learn them. We specifically find that the average magnitude of the quantified bias is particularly sensitive to the embedding dimension hyper-parameter selected, as well as the sample of bias-axis-inducing terms used to construct the various projections employed by the metric. While it is the case that the bias metrics in (Bolukbasi et al. 2016) may provide meaningful rankings of corpora when controlling for model hyper-parameter configuration, publishing the average absolute value of the metric without a complete account for model configuration is suspect. Moreover, we feel publications utilizing these bias metrics would benefit from including information regarding the variance or confidence intervals of the metric under bias-term sampling, if the absolute values of the metric must be published. Regarding the use of the metric as a model selection tool intended to minimize the bias of downstream models employing the embedding space in question, we feel it is important to understand how the properties of the metric employed vary with embedding dimension, and to critically consider whether increased embedding dimensionality truly reduces implicit biases captured within the space, or whether the increased dimensionality simply reduces the apparent magnitude of the bias to simplistic quantification methods per the properties of the cosine similarity in high dimension spaces.

Important steps have been taken regarding the quantification of implicit bias contained in embedding spaces, but we feel there is still effort to be made towards developing metrics which are less sensitive to model hyper-parameter selection, and which possess more robust geometric properties if these metrics are to be used for model selection. When reporting and discussing these metric values for various corpora, we feel it is necessary to include detailed information regarding the embedding learner’s hyper-parameter configuration to improve the utility and interpretability of the results.

References

- Antoniak, Maria and David Mimno (2018). “Evaluating the Stability of Embedding-Based Word Similarities”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6.0, pp. 107–119. ISSN: 2307-387X.
- Bolukbasi, Tolga et al. (2016). “Man Is to Computer Programmer as Woman Is to Home-maker? Debiasing Word Embeddings”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*. Ed. by D. D. Lee et al. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 4349–4357.
- Brunet, Marc-Etienne et al. (2018). “Understanding the Origins of Bias in Word Embeddings”. In: arXiv: 1810.03611 [cs, stat].
- Caliskan, Aylin, Joanna J. Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan (2017). “Semantics Derived Automatically from Language Corpora Contain Human-like Biases”. In: *Science* 356.6334, pp. 183–186. ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203.

- Garg, Nikhil et al. (2018). “Word Embeddings Quantify 100 Years of Gender and Ethnic Stereotypes”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115.16, E3635–E3644. ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490.
- Mikolov, Tomas et al. (2013). “Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space”. In: arXiv: 1301.3781 [cs].
- Pennington, Jeffrey, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning (2014). “Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Doha, Qatar: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 1532–1543.