Fairness Definitions in Language Models Explained

THANG VIET DOAN, Florida International University, USA
ZHIBO CHU, Florida International University, USA
ZICHONG WANG, Florida International University, USA
WENBIN ZHANG, Florida International University, USA

Language Models (LMs) have demonstrated exceptional performance across various Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. Despite these advancements, LMs can inherit and amplify societal biases related to sensitive attributes such as gender and race, limiting their adoption in real-world applications. Therefore, fairness has been extensively explored in LMs, leading to the proposal of various fairness notions. However, the lack of clear agreement on which fairness definition to apply in specific contexts (*e.g.,* medium-sized LMs versus large-sized LMs) and the complexity of understanding the distinctions between these definitions can create confusion and impede further progress. To this end, this paper proposes a systematic survey that clarifies the definitions of fairness as they apply to LMs. Specifically, we begin with a brief introduction to LMs and fairness in LMs, followed by a comprehensive, up-to-date overview of existing fairness notions in LMs and the introduction of a novel taxonomy that categorizes these concepts based on their foundational principles and operational distinctions. We further illustrate each definition through experiments, showcasing their practical implications and outcomes. Finally, we discuss current research challenges and open questions, aiming to foster innovative ideas and advance the field. The implementation and additional resources are publicly available at https://github.com/LavinWong/Fairness-in-Large-Language-Models/tree/main/definitions.

ACM Reference Format:
Thang Viet Doan, Zhibo Chu, Zichong Wang, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Fairness Definitions in Language Models Explained. 1, 1 (July 2024), 36 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/xxxxx.xxxxxx

1 INTRODUCTION

Language Models (LMs), such as BERT [45], ELMo [113], RoBERTa [95], GPT-4 [4], LLaMA-2 [137], and BLOOM [86] have demonstrated impressive performance and potential in a wide range of Natural Language Processing (NLP) including translation [46, 59, 157], text sentiment analysis [108, 116, 173], and text summarization [107, 123, 128]. Despite their success, most of these LM algorithms lack consideration for fairness [129]. Consequently, they could yield discriminatory results towards certain populations defined by *sensitive attributes* (*e.g.,* race [9], age [48], gender [79], nationality [139], occupation [78], and religion [3]) when such algorithms are exploited in real-world applications. For example, a study [141] examining the behavior of a LM like ChatGPT revealed a concerning trend: it generated letters of recommendation that described a fictitious individual named Kelly (*i.e.,* a commonly female-associated name) as *"warm and amiable"* while describing Joseph (*i.e.,* a commonly male-associated name) as a *"natural leader and role model"*. This result indicates that LMs may inadvertently perpetuate gender stereotypes by associating higher levels of leadership with males, underscoring the need for more sophisticated mechanisms to identify and correct such biases. In addition, with the widespread usage of LMs, such potential discrimination could also perpetuate in other high-stakes applications, such as hiring [57], loan approvals [21], legal sentencing [72], and medical diagnoses [156]. These biases in LMs have

Authors' addresses: Thang Viet Doan, thang.dv509@gmail.com, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA, 33199; Zhibo Chu, zb.chu2001@gmail.com, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA, 33199; Zichong Wang, zichonglwang@gmail.com, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA, 33199; Wenbin Zhang, wenbinzhang2008@gmail.com, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA, 33199.

2024. Manuscript submitted to ACM

raised significant ethical and societal concerns, severely limiting the adoption of LMs in high-risk decision-making scenarios [184]. Therefore, addressing unfairness in LMs has naturally become a crucial problem.

Extensive efforts have thus been undertaken to quantify unfairness in these models, leading to the proposal of various fairness notions [14, 20, 52, 54, 70, 79, 105, 165, 186]. These notions can be broadly categorized into concepts for two groups of LMs: (1) *medium-sized LMs using pre-training and fine-tuning approaches*, such as BERT [45], RoBERTa [95], DeBERTa [67], GPT-1 [118], GPT-2 [119], and T5 [121], and (2) *large-sized LMs utilizing prompting paradigms*, such as GPT-3 [22], GPT-4 [4], LLaMA-1 [137], LLaMA-2 [137], and OPT [166]. Fairness notions for the former focus on understanding how biases emerge during the training and fine-tuning stages. In particular, these works often define bias as *intrinsic bias* (biases present in output representation generated by a pre-trained LM) or *extrinsic bias* (the disparity in model performance on downstream tasks) [60]. For example, May et al. [100] found that the BERT model exhibits bias since it often links professions like *"nurse"* or *"teacher"* with female pronouns and *"engineer"* or *"scientist"* with male pronouns. Conversely, fairness notions for the latter primarily concentrate on alternative methods that determine bias based on the variations in the model's responses to input prompts. This is due to the fact that the internal representations for most large-sized LMs, especially closed-source models, are inaccessible. Thus, the traditional concept of intrinsic and extrinsic bias cannot be simply applied to measure bias in these models. For instance, Brown et al. [22] identified significant biases in GPT-3's outputs related to racial associations. They observed that prompts associating the term *"Asian"* with positive sentiments yielded responses like *"intelligent"* and *"diligent"*, whereas prompts with *"Black"* were associated with less favorable words. Specifically, when prompted with phrases like *"People would describe the Asian person as"* versus *"People would describe the Black person as"*, GPT-3 consistently produced more positive descriptors for the Asian group, highlighting biases inherent in the model's outputs. These various efforts to define bias in LMs underscore the need for a comprehensive understanding of how different fair definitions operate across diverse contexts. However, the concept of fairness varies across these works, which can cause confusion and limit further advancement [17]. Without clarity on these correspondences, designing future fair LMs can become a significant challenge.

To this end, this paper offers a systematic review and categorization of fairness definitions within LMs, emphasizing clarity across various contexts. *To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to offer an extensive, structured analysis of fairness definitions within LMs, while also equipping researchers and practitioners with the tools, implementation guidelines, and additional resources needed to reproduce and apply these concepts in practice, thereby advancing future research.* **The key contributions of this paper** are: i) Introduction to LMs and the evolution of fairness: Providing an overview of LMs and their evolution concerning fairness, highlighting significant milestones, and increasing emphasis on fairness considerations. ii) Comprehensive review of fairness definitions: Offering a detailed examination of different types of bias and unfairness in LMs. Specifically, categorize fairness definitions into two groups based on the model size and training paradigm: medium-sized LMs trained using pre-training and fine-tuning, and large-sized LMs trained using prompting. iii) Intuitive explanation: Demonstrating each definition through experiments to illustrate practical implications and outcomes. iv) Discussion of challenges and future directions: Identifying current research limitations and highlighting open research areas for future advancements.

Connection to existing surveys. Despite the urgent need for a comprehensive overview of fairness definitions in LMs, most existing surveys focus on fairness in traditional relational data [26, 101, 109, 112, 140]. A few other surveys address fairness in LMs [36, 56, 92], but they are limited to large-sized LMs, without distinguishing them from medium-sized LMs, nor are they focused on complex fairness notions themselves. Consequently, there remains a gap in providing a dedicated overview of fairness notions in LMs. This gap serves as the primary motivation for this survey.

Unlike previous surveys, this paper includes: (1) a detailed and systematic review of existing fairness notions in two primary groups of LMs based on their training paradigms, including medium-sized and large-sized LMs; and (2) a well-organized introduction to commonly used techniques to assess these notions through illustrative experiments.

Survey Structure. The remainder of the survey is organized as follows. Section 2 provides essential background on LMs and the evolution of fairness within this context. Sections 3 introduce the taxonomy used in this survey, along with key notations and descriptions of the experiments conducted. Sections 4 and 5 delve into current fairness definitions in medium-sized and large-sized LMs, respectively. Subsequently, we discuss the challenges in Section 6. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section 7.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Language Models

LMs are computational models designed to understand, generate, and predict human language. These models have played a crucial role in various NLP tasks, such as text generation [87, 104], translation [8, 37], and sentiment analysis [71, 102]. The development of LMs has undergone significant changes, from statistical language models (SLMs) to neural language models (NLMs), then to pre-trained language models (PLMs), and finally to large language models (LLMs) [35]. The Transformer architecture [138], particularly its self-attention module, has been instrumental in driving this progress. This module has enabled efficient handling of sequential data, parallelization, and effective capture of long-range dependencies in text. This has led to significant advancements in NLP, enabling LMs to process large amounts of data and generate responses that are more logical and contextually relevant. A notable characteristic of contemporary LMs is their ability to engage in in-context learning [22], which involves training the model to produce text that is influenced by a specific context or prompt. This allows LMs to generate responses that are more logical and contextually relevant, making them well-suited for interactive and conversational applications. However, recent studies have highlighted that LMs frequently incorporate unintended social biases and prejudices, reflecting the biases present in their training data and amplifying them in generated content [11, 60, 130]. These biases can have harmful consequences when LMs are deployed in real-world applications, emphasizing the need for ongoing research and development of methods to identify, evaluate, and mitigate bias in LMs. Addressing these issues is essential for ensuring the ethical and equitable use of LMs in society.

2.2 Fairness in LMs

The study of fairness in LMs has garnered substantial attention, revealing that social biases within the models are the primary cause of unfairness. This finding underscores the urgent need to detect and address these biases to guarantee reliable and equitable model performance across various applications. Unchecked biases in LMs can perpetuate harmful stereotypes, marginalize minority groups, and lead to discriminatory outcomes, emphasizing the importance of developing fair and unbiased LMs as a fundamental objective in AI research.

Our survey categorizes LMs into two groups based on their training strategies: (1) *medium-sized LMs under pre-training and fine-tuning paradigms*; and (2) *large-sized LMs under prompting paradigms*. The emergence of GPT-3 marked a significant shift in the status of both paradigms with the proposal of various large-scale in-context LMs [16, 74, 77, 120, 164] thereafter. Before GPT-3, the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm was the traditional training strategy. Then, the advent of GPT-3 led to the discovery of large-sized LMs with extraordinary emergent abilities, such as few-shot learning with GPT-4 [4], LLaMA-1 [137], or LLaMA-2 [137]. The prompting paradigm replaces

the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm as a more suitable learning strategy for large-sized LMs. Furthermore, there are notable differences in both approach and definition of fairness between these two groups of models.

Medium-sized LMs under the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm. In the medium-sized LMs, biases are typically divided into two types: intrinsic bias [60] and extrinsic bias [43]. Intrinsic bias refers to the bias in the representation output by the pre-trained model, which is task-independent since it does not involve downstream tasks. It is also known as upstream bias or representational bias. In contrast, extrinsic bias refers to the bias in the model output in downstream tasks, also known as downstream bias or prediction bias. The performance of extrinsic bias depends on specific downstream tasks, such as predicted labels for classification tasks and generated text for generative tasks.

The effort to evaluate intrinsic bias in these models begins with the Word Embedding Association Test (WEAT) [24] and the methodology proposed by Tolga Bolukbasi et al. [19]. In these approaches, intrinsic evaluations refer strictly to those computed using only the internal state of a model—essentially metrics over the embedding space [60]. However, with the advancement of LMs, the notion of *"intrinsic bias"* has undergone a significant transformation. The emergence of dynamic embeddings that adapt to context has enabled a more precise and context-sensitive evaluation of prejudice. By learning within sentence contexts and being designed for use with embedding metrics for sentence-level encoders, these models can now be evaluated more effectively. Specifically, they can be used to assess differences in predicted token probabilities or distributions across various social groups, providing a more nuanced understanding of intrinsic bias. This evolution aligns with the capabilities of modern LMs, which are equipped to handle complex linguistic contexts and capture subtle biases in language.

Beyond intrinsic bias, medium-sized LMs also exhibit extrinsic biases that manifest in different ways depending on the downstream task: natural language understanding (NLU) and natural language generation (NLG). NLU tasks, such as classification [30, 42] and natural language inference [7, 44], can reveal biases in predicted labels; whereas NLG tasks, such as recommender system [69] and question-answering [111], can reveal biases in the generated content. Evaluating and mitigating these biases requires task-specific strategies, including diverse and representative training datasets.

Large-sized LMs under the prompting paradigm. The traditional concept of intrinsic and extrinsic bias cannot be simply applied to measure bias in the prompting paradigm, particularly for large-sized LMs. This is because the internal representations of most large-scale LMs, especially closed-source models, are not readily available. Therefore, evaluating fairness in these models requires analyzing the model's output in response to different input prompts. This involves examining the model's output for signs of bias based on various prompts. These tasks can be approached from different viewpoints and accomplished through various generative tasks, such as completing prompts, engaging in conversations, and reasoning through analogies. Additionally, different evaluation metrics can be employed, including demographic representation [22, 99], stereotypical association [3, 94], counterfactual fairness [93, 94], and performance disparities [142, 165]. In this survey, we will explore the concept of fairness in large-sized LMs through these evaluation strategies.

3 TAXONOMY AND TERMINOLOGY

This section introduces the taxonomy of the survey, along with important notations and the experimental setup, which are crucial for understanding the nuances of fairness in LMs and the methodologies employed in the experiments.

3.1 Taxonomy

We categorize fairness definitions in LMs into two branches based on the LMs that they are applied to, including: (1) *fairness definitions for medium-sized LMs* and (2) *fairness definitions for large-sized LMs* as presented in figure 1. These types of LMs are distinguished by their training strategies: medium-sized LMs typically follow the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm, while large-sized language models operate under the prompting paradigm.

In medium-sized LMs, biases are further categorized into two types based on their manifestation: intrinsic bias [60] and extrinsic bias [43]. There are two types of intrinsic bias that will be presented including similarity-based bias and probability-based bias [92]. Extrinsic bias, on the other hand, refers to biases that manifest in the model's outputs during downstream tasks. The extrinsic bias definitions are further summarized into two categories: natural language understanding (NLU) tasks with text classification [30, 42] and natural language inference [7, 44]; and natural language generation (NLG) tasks with recommender system [69] and question-answering [111]. In large-sized LMs, further categorizations are based on evaluation strategies designed to quantify fairness in these models, including demographic representation [22, 99], stereotypical association [3, 94], counterfactual fairness [93, 94], and performance disparities [142, 165]. Overall, this survey explores fairness definitions in LMs according to the proposed taxonomy, examining their application to various concepts, and aims to deepen the understanding of fairness in LMs by addressing the unique challenges associated with these definitions.



Fig. 1. An overview of the proposed taxonomy of fairness definitions in language models.

3.2 Notations

To establish a comprehensive understanding of fairness in LMs, we introduce a set of general notations that will be used throughout this survey, as outlined in Table 1. Specifically, we define the concept of a socially sensitive topic T, encompassing aspects such as gender, race, religion, age, nationality, and so on. This topic is represented by a set of demographic groups (aka social groups), denoted by $G = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_n)$, which includes specific groups like *(Male, female)* for the gender topic or *(Judaism, Islam, Christianity)* for the religion topic. Each group is characterized by a set of sensitive attributes: $A_i = [a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, a_{i,3}, ..., a_{i,m}]$. For instance, the demographic group "Female" might be characterized by the attributes $[woman, girl, female, mom, grandma, Kelly]$, while the group "Male" might be defined

Table 1. Notations employed for defining the problem and describing the methodology.

Notations	Descriptions
T	The socially sensitive topic
G	The set of demographic groups
A_i	The list of sensitive attributes associated with i-th demographic group
S_i	The set of sentences represented for i-th demographic group
g_i	The i-th demographic group
$a_{i,j}$	The j-th sensitive attribute of the i-th demographic group

by $[man, boy, male, dad, grandfather, Joseph]$. In the context of LMs, these demographic groups can be depicted as features within sentences.

3.3 Experimental setup

This section presents the experimental setup used in this paper, listing the models and datasets for the experiment corresponding to each definition used in the survey in Table 2. Detailed results are presented in their respective sections. Exploring these definitions and datasets helps practitioners understand the manifestations of bias in various contexts and across different training paradigms. To aid the community and encourage further development of fairness in LMs, the implementation has been made publicly available online at https://github.com/LavinWong/Fairness-in-Large-Language-Models/tree/main/definitions.

4 FAIRNESS DEFINITIONS FOR MEDIUM-SIZED LANGUAGE MODELS

Medium-sized LMs such as BERT [45], RoBERTa [95], DeBERTa [67], GPT-2 [119], and T5 [121] widely adopt the pre-training and fine-tuning approach, which involves two distinct phases. Initially, the model undergoes an unsupervised pre-training phase, leveraging a vast corpus to develop its linguistic understanding. Subsequently, the pre-trained model is fine-tuned in a supervised manner for a specific downstream task, involving adjustments to all model parameters. This paradigm enables the model to utilize the knowledge acquired during the pre-training phrase while adapting to the specific needs of the downstream task. By being fine-tuned by task-specific data, these models can achieve state-of-the-art performance across a wide range of NLP tasks. Nevertheless, this process also carries the risk of introducing biases from the dataset, which can negatively impact the model's overall performance and fairness.

4.1 Intrinsic bias definitions

Intrinsic bias, also known as upstream bias or representational bias [92], refers to the inherent biases present in the output representation generated by a medium-sized LM under the pre-training and fine-tuning approach. These biases are independent of specific downstream tasks and arise from the vast corpus of data used during the initial pre-training phase. They may manifest by favoring certain words, phrases, or concepts over others, deeply ingrained in the model's parameters as a reflection of the training data and processes.

This section provides an overview of the definitions of intrinsic bias for medium-sized LMs, which are categorized into two main types: similarity-based bias and probability-based bias. These definitions are primarily based on metrics used to evaluate intrinsic bias, which may include statistical measures of distributional similarity, co-occurrence patterns, and other quantitative assessments of the model's output.

4.1.1 Similarity-based bias.

Table 2. Summary of experimental setup.

Definitions		Metrics/ task	Model	Dataset	Bias types
Pre-training and fine-tuning paradigms	Intrinsic bias	WEAT	BERT [45]	Caliskan et al. [24]	gender race age
		CEAT			
		SEAT			
		DisCo		US Social Security name statistics [5] Zhao et al. [185]	gender
		LBPS		Employee Salary [41]	gender
		CBS		XNLI [38]	race
		PLL		CrowS-Pairs [106] StereoSet [105]	age disability gender nationality physical-appearance race-color religion sexual-orientation socioeconomic profession race
		CPS			
		CAT			
		iCAT			
		AUL			
		AULA			
	Extrinsic bias	Classification	BERT [45]	Bias-in-Bios [42]	gender
		Natural Language Inference	BERT [45] T0 [125]	Bias-NLI [44] BBNLI [7]	gender race regligion
		Question Answering	RoBERTa [95]	BBQ [111]	gender
		Recommender Systems	BERT [45]	MovieLens-1M [65]	gender age occupation
Prompting paradigms		Demographic Representation	GPT-3.5 [159] LLaMA-2 [137]	Natural Questions [82]	gender
		Stereotypical Association		Natural Questions [82]	gender religion
		Counterfactual Fairness		German Credit [85]	gender
		Performance Disparities		BBQ [111] BiasAsker [142]	gender

Similarity-based metrics refer to biases that arise from the way different words or phrases are clustered or related in the embedding space. For example, if the model consistently groups words related to one gender or ethnicity more closely than others, this indicates a similarity-based bias. *In this context, bias is defined as the differences in the associations between certain groups of words that reflect social stereotypes and prejudices. A LM is considered to satisfy this metric if there are no differences between the sets of target words in terms of their relative similarity to the sets of attribute words, indicating that the model's embedding space does not privilege one social group over another.* We illustrate an example of



Fig. 2. An example of similarity-biased bias in medium-sized LMs.

similarity-based bias in LM in Figure 2. In this example, the model is considered biased because its embedding space shows differences in the associations between European American and African American names with the attributes pleasant and unpleasant.

The experimental evaluation of similarity-based metrics is summarized in Table 3. In this table, we report the overall magnitude of bias in the BERT model [45] with the effect size (d). All the tests are derived from Caliskan et al. [24].

Table 3. Similarity-based metrics' experimental results.

Test		WEAT	SEAT	CEAT
C1	Flowers/Insects Pleasant/Unpleasant	-0.2277	0.0583	0.6465
C2	Instruments/Weapons Pleasant/Unpleasant	-0.8269	-0.1190	0.5408
C3	European American/African American names Pleasant/Unpleasant	0.2223	0.1443	0.3061
C4	European American/African American names Pleasant/Unpleasant	0.7275	0.4389	0.4929
C5	European American/African American names Pleasant/Unpleasant	-0.1800	0.3562	0.1017
C6	Male/Female names Career/Family	0.6301	0.0508	0.3981
C7	Math/Arts Male/Female terms	0.1484	-0.0002	0.2017
C8	Science/Arts Male/Female terms	0.3586	-0.0719	0.1816
C9	Mental/Physical disease Temporary/Permanent	-0.0033	0.3125	0.3807
C10	Young/Old people's names Pleasant/Unpleasant	-0.3181	0.0342	0.0990

- **Word-Embeddings Association Test (WEAT)** [24] quantifies the correlation between two demographic groups g_1 and g_2 (*e.g.*, male and female) and two groups of target terms (*e.g.*, family and career), following the Implicit Association Test [61]. Formally, the sets of attribute words are represented by A_1 and A_2, and the sets of target words are denoted by T_1 and T_2. Stereotypical associations are quantified using the following test statistic:

$$f(T_1, T_2, A_1, A_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{|A_1|} s(a_{1,\mathrm{i}}, T_1, T_2) - \sum_{j=1}^{|A_2|} s(a_{2,\mathrm{i}}, T_1, T_2) \tag{1}$$

where $s(a_{\mathrm{i,j}}, T_1, T_2)$ calculates the disparity between the average cosine similarity of the $j-th$ sensitive attribute of the $i-th$ demographic group with all the target words in T_1 and with all the target words in T_2. It is defined as follows:

$$s(a_{\mathrm{i,j}}, T_1, T_2) = \frac{1}{|T_1|} \sum_{t \in T_1} cos(a_{\mathrm{i,j}}, t) - \frac{1}{|T_2|} \sum_{t' \in T_2} cos(a_{\mathrm{i,j}}, t') \tag{2}$$

where $cos(,)$ represents the cosine similarity. The normalized effect size is as follows:

$$d = \frac{\mu(\{s(a_{1,\mathrm{i}}, T_1, T_2)\}_{a_{1,\mathrm{i}} \in A_1}) - \mu(\{s(a_{2,\mathrm{j}}, T_1, T_2)\}_{a_{2,\mathrm{j}} \in A_2})}{\sigma(\{s(a_{\mathrm{i,j}}, T_1, T_2)\}_{a_{\mathrm{i,j}} \in A_1 \cup A_2})} \tag{3}$$

The main idea behind the similarity-based bias using this metric is that no demographic group should be disproportionately associated with certain attributes or concepts within a LM's predictions. A model that shows no bias will yield an effect size value of 0, indicating minimal associational differences between specific groups and attributes. In our experiments, WEAT revealed significant biases in certain contexts. For instance, in test C2 (Instruments/Weapons with Pleasant/Unpleasant), WEAT identified a substantial effect size of -0.8269, indicating significant bias. Similarly, tests C4 (European American/African American names with Pleasant/Unpleasant) and C6 (Male/Female names with Career/Family) exhibited notable effect sizes of 0.7275 and 0.6301, respectively. These findings underscore the presence of biases in the BERT model, as detected by WEAT.

- **Sentence Embedding Association Test (SEAT)** [100] extends WEAT by using contextual embeddings, which use basic sentence templates like *"This is a <word>"* (*e.g., "This is a friend'* for pleasant and *"This is a murder"* for unpleasant) to replace attribute concepts and sentence templates like *"This is <word>"* (*e.g., "This is Katie"* for European American name and *"This is Jamel"* for African American name) to replace target concepts. Then they produce embeddings that are unaffected by context. The SEAT test statistic is computed for the two sets of embeddings, which are represented by the *[CLS]* [63] token of the last layer from BERT [45]. In BERT's architecture, the *[CLS]* token is prepended to each input sequence and processed through multiple transformer layers. During training, BERT learns to encode the semantic content of the entire input sequence into the *[CLS]* token's representation. This token serves as a summarization of the sentence's meaning, incorporating contextual information from both preceding and following tokens. This approach leverages BERT's bidirectional context modeling, allowing the *[CLS]* token to capture nuanced semantic relationships within sentences. This idea is inherited and continued to be developed by later research, such as utilizing the initial four attention layers instead of the final layer embedding [84] or taking the context embeddings that are relevant rather than relying just on the representation provided by *[CLS]* tokens [135].
  SEAT uses sentence templates to create contextual embeddings, ensuring a realistic assessment of these associations. Like WEAT, a model that shows no bias will have the SEAT value of 0, indicating no systematic bias detected. In our experiments, SEAT detected significant biases in certain tests. For instance, in tests C4 and C5 (European American/African American names with Pleasant/Unpleasant), the effect size was 0.4389 and 0.3562, respectively. Conversely, tests like C6 (Male/Female names with Career/Family), C7 (Math/Arts with

Male/Female terms), and C10 (Young/Old people's names and Pleasant/Unpleasant) showed minimal bias, as indicated by their SEAT scores close to 0, suggesting less pronounced associations between the tested attributes.

- **Contextualized Embedding Association Test (CEAT)** [62] uses a different methodology to expand the scope of WEAT to contextualized embeddings. Instead of directly computing the effect size of WEAT, the method produces phrases by combining T_1, T_2, A_1, and A_2. It then randomly selects a subset of embeddings and calculates a distribution of effect sizes. The bias magnitude is computed using a random-effects model and is expressed as:

$$CEAT(S_{T_1}, S_{T_2}, S_{A_1}, S_{A_2}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i WEAT(S_{T_{1_i}}, S_{T_{2_i}}, S_{A_{1_i}}, S_{A_{2_i}})}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i} \tag{4}$$

The main idea behind the similarity-based bias definitions using this metrics is that CEAT provides a more robust measure of bias by considering the distribution of effect sizes rather than a single measure. This method accounts for variability in the embedding space, ensuring that the computed bias is reflective of a wider range of contexts. Like the two aforementioned metrics, an ideal model will yield an effect size close to 0. In our experiments, CEAT detected significant biases in certain tests, notably in C1(Flowers/Insects with Pleasant/Unpleasant), C2 (Instruments/Weapons with Pleasant/Unpleasant), and C4 (European American/African American names with Pleasant/Unpleasant) with the CEAT score of 0.6465, 0.5408, and 0.4929, respectively. These tests exhibited substantial deviations from neutrality in their semantic associations, indicating pronounced biases captured by the embedding space.

4.1.2 Probability-based bias. Probability-based bias refers to biases that are evident in the likelihood distributions generated by the model. This can include the likelihood of generating certain words or phrases over others, which can reflect underlying prejudices present in the training data. There are two classes of metrics to quantify this bias: masked token metrics and pseudo-log-likelihood metrics [56].

Masked Token Metrics. Masked token metrics compare the distributions of predicted masked words in two sentences that involve different social groups. *Given S_1 and S_2 are two sentences presented for different demographic groups, g_1 and g_2; $P_S(w)$ is the probability distribution of the predicted word in the sentence S. These sentences differ only in the social group being referenced. An LM that satisfies these metrics should have similar probability distributions for the predicted masked word between different social groups: $D(P_{S_1}(w), P_{S_2}(w)) \leq \epsilon$ where D is a measure of the difference between two probability distributions.* An instance of probability-based bias in a medium-sized LM, as depicted in Figure 3, shows a disparity where *"programmer"* and *"doctor"* are predominantly associated with the male group, while *"homemaker"* and *"nurse"* are more frequently linked to the female group. Such outcomes reveal a gender prejudice in these LMs when forecasting the *[MASK]* token for the two groups.



Fig. 3. An example of probability-based bias with masked token metrics in medium-sized LMs.

- **Discovery of Correlations (DisCo)** [153] utilizes the average score of a model's predictions as the metric. The template used is a two-slot structure, specifically designed (*e.g., "[X] is [MASK]"*; *"[X] likes to [MASK]"*). The first slot, labeled as X, is manually filled with a bias trigger linked to a demographic group (initially designed for gendered names and nouns, but applicable to other groups with well-defined word lists). The LM generates the second slot. The DisCo score is calculated by measuring the average of uncommon predictions between demographic groups across a set of templates:

$$DisCo = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} |PW_{t,1} \cap PW_{t,2}| \tag{5}$$

where T is the list of templates used, $PW_{t,1}$ and $PW_{t,2}$ is the list of predicted words of template t for demographic group g_1 and g_2 respectively.
The main idea behind the probability-based bias using this metric is that a fair LM should give similar distributions of predicted words across different demographic groups. In the ideal case, the model would yield a *DisCo* score of 0. This means the overlap between $PW_{t,1}$ and $PW_{t,2}$ should be maximized, indicating that the model's predictions are not biased towards any specific group. Conversely, a significant disparity in the predicted words' distributions would suggest that the model exhibits bias, as it associates certain words or concepts more strongly with specific demographic groups. In our case study, we analyzed gender bias in the BERT model. The first slot is filled by gender names from the US Social Security name statistics [5] or the list of gendered nouns released by Zhao et al. [185]. We found that in both cases, the BERT model exhibits gender bias. An experiment using gender names yielded a higher *DisCo* score than that of gendered nouns, with scores of 0.8036 and 0.6174, respectively, showing a pronounced bias when gender-specific terms were used.
- **Log-Probability Bias Score (LPBS)** [80] uses a similar template and measurement as *DisCo* to measure bias in neutral attribute words (*e.g.,* occupations). The key difference between them is that *LPBS* normalizes a token's predicted probability p_a (based on a template "*[MASK] is a [NEUTRAL ATTRIBUTE]*") with the model's prior probability p_{prior} (based on a template "*[MASK] is a [MASK]*"). This normalization helps to account for the model's inherent bias towards specific social groups, allowing for the evaluation of bias specifically associated with the *[NEUTRAL-ATTRIBUTE]* token. Bias is measured by determining the difference in normalized probability scores assigned to two demographic groups g_1 and g_2 as:

$$LPBS = log\frac{p_{a_{1,\text{i}}}}{p_{\text{prior}_i}} - log\frac{p_{a_{2,\text{j}}}}{p_{\text{prior}_j}} \tag{6}$$

where $a_{1,\text{i}}$ and $a_{2,\text{j}}$ are certain sensitive attributes corresponding to demographic groups g_1 and g_2, respectively. The main concept behind the probability-based bias measured by *LPBS* is that no demographic group should have different normalized probability scores for neutral attribute words compared to others. In other words, a model satisfying this definition should give uniform probabilities for all neutral attribute words, resulting in an *LPBS* score of 0. In our experiment, we analyzed gender-occupation bias using the BERT model with the Employee Salary dataset [41]. We found that the BERT model exhibited significant bias towards the male group, with an average *LPBS* score of 0.4847 across 228 job titles in the dataset.
- **Categorical Bias Score (CBS)** [6] expands the use of *LPBS* to include the measurement of multi-class targets, utilizing a collection of sentence templates to precisely measure racial bias. The *CBS* is calculated by measuring the difference in probability between target and attribute terms after normalization. The equation to calculate

CBS is defined as:

$$CBS(S) = \frac{1}{|T|}\frac{1}{|A|}\sum_{t\in T}\sum_{a\in A} Var_{n\in N} log\frac{p_n}{p_{\text{prior}}} \tag{7}$$

where $T = t_1, t_2, ...t_i$ is a set of templates, $N = n_1, n_2, ..., n_j$ is the set of ethnicity words, $A = a_1, a_2, .., A_k$ is the set of attribute words, and $\frac{p_n}{p_{\text{prior}}}$ is the normalized probability for the ethnicity word n in N.

The main concept behind this definition is that no ethnic term should have a significantly different normalized probability compared to others. In other words, a model that predicts uniform probabilities for all target groups would yield a *CBS* of 0. Conversely, a model with high ethnic bias would assign disproportionately higher probabilities to a particular ethnicity term, resulting in a high *CBS*. In our case study, we analyzed racial bias in two monolingual BERT models [114], English and Chinese, and found that the Chinese models exhibited significantly higher bias, with scores of 2.4328 and 256.6190, respectively, indicating that racial bias is more pronounced in the Chinese BERT models.

Pseudo-Log-Likelihood Metrics. Pseudo-log-likelihood metrics assess the likelihood of a sentence being a stereotype or anti-stereotype by estimating the conditional probability of the sentence given each word in the sentence. According to Gallegos et al. [56], *given a stereotyping sentence S_1 and an anti-stereotyping sentence S_2, pseudo-log-likelihood metric f. An LM that satisfies these metrics should select stereotype and anti-stereotype sentences with the same likelihood given a set of sentence pairs. With the bias score $bias(S) = \mathbb{I}(f(S_1) > f(S_2))$ where $\mathbb{I}$ is the indicator function, an ideal model should achieve a score of 0.5 averaging over all sentences.* An example of probability-based bias in a medium-sized LM, as shown in Figure 4, is evident when the stereotypical sentence *"He is a programmer"* is deemed more probable than the anti-stereotypical sentence *"She is a programmer"*.

Our experimental evaluation of pseudo-log-likelihood metrics is presented in Table 4. The table provides insights into the percentage of examples where the BERT model [45] assigns a higher likelihood (pseudo-likelihood) according to each metric to stereotypical sentences compared to less stereotypical sentences. This analysis utilizes two widely used datasets: the CrowS-Pairs dataset [106] and the StereoSet dataset [105].



Fig. 4. An example of probability-based bias with pseudo-log-likelihood metrics in medium-sized LMs.

- **Pseudo-log-likelihood (PLL)** [124, 143] is the fundamental metric for this methods. Consider a sentence $S = [w_1, w_2, w_3, ..., w_{|S|}]$, containing |S| sequence of tokens w_i, where part of S is modified to create a stereotypical (or lack thereof) example for a particular social bias. For example, consider the sentence-pair "*John* completed *his* PhD in machine learning" and "*Mary* completed *her* PhD in machine learning". The modified tokens M for the first sentence are *"John"* and *"his"*, while for the second sentence they are *"Mary"* and *"he"*. The unmodified tokens U for both sentences are *"completed"*, *"PhD"*, *"in"*, *"machine"*, and *"learning"*. For a sentence S, PLL is given by:

Table 4. Pseudo-Log-Likelihood metrics' experimental results.

Dataset	Bias type	PLL	CAT	CPS	AUL	AULA
CrowS-Pairs	age	51.72	52.87	58.62	47.13	45.98
	disability	28.33	46.67	68.33	73.33	75.00
	gender	51.91	66.79	57.63	53.05	53.82
	nationality	46.54	40.25	59.75	54.72	56.60
	physical-appearance	42.86	47.62	63.49	57.14	50.79
	race-color	45.74	49.22	54.26	52.13	53.33
	religion	39.05	51.43	66.67	57.14	57.14
	sexual-orientation	52.38	71.43	66.67	58.33	45.35
	socioeconomic	53.49	54.65	58.72	41.86	82.76
StereoSet	gender	54.12	63.14	68.63	49.80	48,63
	profession	48.64	60.00	62.10	49.26	48.40
	race	46.88	53.33	55.30	51.56	54.57
	religion	50.63	58.23	63.29	46.84	51.90

$$PPL(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} log(P(w_i|S_{\setminus w_i}; \theta)) \tag{8}$$

where $theta$ is the pre-trained parameters of LM, $P(w_i|S_{\setminus w_i}; \theta)$ is the probability assigned by the LM to a token w_i conditioned on the remainder tokens of sentence S.

The main idea behind the probability-based bias using *PLL* is that a LM should not favor stereotyping or anti-stereotyping sentences. Instead of directly calculating the joint probability of an entire sentence, *PLL* decomposes it into a series of conditional probabilities for each word in the sentence. A fair LM should give the same *PPL* values to both stereotyping and anti-stereotyping sentences. Conversely, if an LM assigns significantly different *PPL* values to these types of sentences, it indicates the presence of bias. This bias can manifest as either stereotyping, where certain biased associations are deemed more likely, or anti-stereotyping, where the model inappropriately counteracts biases. In our experiment results for *PLL* in CrowS-Pairs, biases like disability (83.33) and sexual orientation (76.19) show high bias scores, indicating stronger biases. For StereoSet, bias was most clearly observed in gender (67.84) and profession (61.36).

- **Context Association Test (CAT)** introduced with the StereoSet dataset [105], is also a method that compares sentences. Each sentence is associated with a stereotype, anti-stereotype, and meaningless option, which can be either fill-in-the-blank tokens or continuation sentences, similar to *PLL*. The metric of *CAT* can be defined as:

$$CAT(S) = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{m \in M} log(P(m|U, \theta)) \tag{9}$$

where $P(m|U, \theta)$ is the probability of generating the modified tokens M given the unmodified tokens U in S. However, this approach has a limitation: when computing $log(P(m|U, \theta))$ for modified tokens such as common age-specific terms like *"teenager"* or *"elderly"*, the resulting high probabilities may not solely indicate learned social biases by a LM. These scores can be disproportionately influenced by how frequently these terms appear in the training corpus, rather than indicating genuine bias learned by the model [76]. In our experiment for *CAT* in CrowS-Pairs, sexual-orientation (71.43) and gender (66.79) biases show higher scores compared to others,

indicating a stronger bias toward stereotypical sentences. For StereoSet, all bias types have CAT scores over 50, showing favor towards stereotypical sentences, with the highest score belonging to gender bias (63.14).

Idealized CAT (iCAT) can be derived by evaluating the available options of stereotype, anti-stereotype, and nonsensical sentences. The metric of *iCAT* can be defined as:

$$iCAT(S) = lms \cdot \frac{min(ss, 100 - ss)}{50} \tag{10}$$

where *lms* is the average percentage of instances in which a language model prefers meaningful over meaningless associations, and *ss* is the average percentage of examples in which a model prefers a stereotypical association over an anti-stereotypical association over target terms in the model.

The main idea behind the probability-based bias using *iCAT* metrics is that a fair LM should meet two specific conditions. First, given a target term context and two possible associations—one meaningful and the other meaningless—the model should rank the meaningful association higher. Second, for every target term in a dataset, the model should show no preference between stereotypes and anti-stereotypes, preferring an equal number of each. An ideal model would achieve an *iCAT* score of 100, indicating that its *lms* is 100, meaning it consistently selects meaningful options, and its stereotype score *ss* is 50, showing an equal distribution between stereotype and anti-stereotype possibilities. Conversely, a fully biased model would score 0 on the *iCAT* scale, which would happen if its *ss* is either 100, always preferring stereotypes, or 0, always preferring anti-stereotypes. In our case study, BERT is used to evaluate its performance on the Stereoset dataset. This model achieved an *iCAT* score of 69.38, with *lms* and *ss* scores of 85.77 and 59.56, respectively. The result indicates that while BERT is quite effective at selecting meaningful associations, it still displays a moderate bias toward stereotypes.

- **CrowS-Pairs Score (CPS)** [106] leverages PLL to evaluate the model's preference for stereotypical sentences using the CrowS-Pairs dataset. The metric calculates the likelihood of shared, unmodified tokens U given changed tokens M (which usually represent protected attributes) and a parameter θ. This is done by masking and predicting each unmodified token. The metric for a sentence S is defined as:

$$CPS = \sum_{u \in U} log(P(u|U_{\backslash u}, M; \theta)) \tag{11}$$

Instead of calculating the joint probability of the entire sentence or modified token in S, the *CPS* ignores the conditional probabilities the LM assigned for changed tokens to address the frequency-bias in *CAT*. The focus is on evaluating the probability of unmodified tokens within the context of both the unchanged part of the sentence and the modified tokens representing protected attributes. However, this metric has two drawbacks [105]. Firstly, the removal of an unmodified token u from the sentence results in a loss of information that the LM can use for predicting u. Therefore, the prediction accuracy of u can decrease, rendering the biased evaluations unreliable. Second, even if we remove one token u at a time from U, the remainder of the tokens $(U_{\backslash u}, M)$ can still be biased. Moreover, the context in which we condition the probabilities continuously varies across predictions. To resolve the problems mentioned above, we will introduce *AUL* in the next part. In our experiment results for *CPS* in CrowS-Pairs, disability (68.33) and religion (66.67) show the highest scores, indicating stronger biases. For StereoSet, the most biased scores are seen in gender (68.63) and religion (63.29), reflecting notable biases. Besides, all *CPS* scores for bias types in CrowS-PairS and StereoSet are over 50, showing a significant bias toward stereotyping sentences.

- **All Unmasked Likelihood (AUL)** [76] expands the *CPS* by considering multiple accurate candidate predictions. While *PLL* only examines a single correct answer for a masked test example, AUL gives the model with an unmasked sentence and predicts all the tokens in the sentence. By providing the model with unmasked input, all the necessary information is available for predicting a token. This improves the accuracy of the model's predictions and eliminates any bias in selecting which words to mask.

$$AUL(S) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} logP(s|S, \theta) \tag{12}$$

  The main idea behind this metric is to predict all tokens in S that appear between the beginning and the end of sentence tokens, thereby overcoming the drawbacks presented in *CPS*. By not masking any tokens, AUL ensures that the full context of the sentence is utilized, preserving the semantic integrity and reducing information loss. This approach addresses the first drawback of *CPS*, where the removal of unmodified tokens led to a loss of information and reduced prediction accuracy. Additionally, by predicting all tokens in the sentence, AUL avoids the issue of varying contexts across predictions, as the model consistently uses the entire sentence context for each token prediction. In our experiment results for AUL in CrowS-Pairs, disability (73.33) and physical-appearance (57.14) show the most biased scores, indicating stronger biases toward stereotyping sentences. For StereoSet, bias was most clearly observed in race (51.56) and profession (49.26).
- **AUL with Attention Weights (AULA)** is also introduced by Kaneko et al. [76]. This metric applies attention weights to handle variations in token significance. The formula for $AULA$, where α_i represents the attention linked with s_i, is as follows:

$$AULA(S) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} \alpha_i logP(w_i|S, \theta) \tag{13}$$

  where α_i is the average of all multi-head attentions associated with w_i.
  The main idea behind $AULA$ is to account for the varying significance of different tokens within a sentence. By using attention weights, $AULA$ ensures that tokens that are more critical to the sentence's meaning have a greater influence on the overall score. This is particularly useful in LMs where certain words contribute more to the context and meaning of a sentence than others. In our experiments, the $AULA$ metric highlights areas of significant bias. For the CrowS-Pairs dataset, socioeconomic status (82.76) and disability (75.00) recorded the highest bias scores, indicating a pronounced bias in these areas. In the StereoSet dataset, bias was most clearly observed in race (54.57) and religion (51.90).

4.2 Extrinsic bias definitions

Extrinsic bias refers to the disparity in a LM's performance across different downstream tasks, also known as downstream bias or prediction bias [92]. This type of bias occurs when a model's effectiveness varies for different types of tasks or different demographic groups, potentially leading to unequal outcomes in real-world applications. This section provides an overview of the definitions of extrinsic bias for medium-sized LMs. In these models, extrinsic bias is typically evaluated using benchmark datasets and task-specific metrics [92]. According to the downstream tasks for pre-training and fine-tuning paradigms, we summarize the extrinsic bias definitions into two categories: natural language understanding (NLU) tasks and natural language generation (NLG) tasks. For NLU tasks, such as text classification or natural language inference, extrinsic bias refers to the influence of biased data on model performance. On the other

hand, for NLG tasks like question-answering and recommender systems, extrinsic bias can manifest in the generation of biased language or stereotypes in text generation tasks.

4.2.1 *Definitions on NLU tasks.*

NLU represents a wide spectrum of tasks that aim to improve comprehension of input sequences [28]. We provide an overview of fairness definitions in LMs across various NLU tasks, highlighting the distinct nuances and perspectives.

Text Classification is an important task commonly used to assess bias in LMs [30, 56, 161]. Numerous studies investigate the disparities in text generation accuracy between different racial or gender groups in text classifiers [18, 23, 68, 73]. Although the evaluation metrics used in these works are largely identical to those applied in traditional ML classification, the consistency in metrics allows for a direct comparison of bias and fairness issues between LMs and traditional ML models in the classification tasks. This highlights that while the methodologies may differ, the underlying challenges of achieving fairness remain similar. *In this context, bias can be defined as the difference in classification outcomes for texts involving different values of sensitive attributes (e.g., gender), as demonstrated in Figure 5. An unbiased LM should have similar classification outcomes between different social groups.*



Fig. 5. An example of the extrinsic bias of medium-sized LMs in classification downstream task.

For instance, Chhikara et al. [30] evaluate bias in LMs by adopting seven prominent fairness definitions from ML classification tasks. These notions include Statistical Parity [39, 51, 75, 163], Equal Opportunity [64, 115], Equalized Odds [12], Overall Accuracy Equality [12], Treatment Equality [12], Causal Discrimination [55], and Fairness through Unawareness [81]. From the experiment result, it is crucial to acknowledge that although LMs guarantee accuracy among different demographic groups, specific measurements such as Disparate Impact, True Positive Rate, and False Positive Rate still reveal a bias towards the female group.

The Bias-in-Bios dataset [42] is another significant resource in this field. It consists of third-person biographies that assess the correlation between gender and occupation. The goal of this dataset is to study gender bias in occupation classification. Each biography in the dataset includes explicit gender indicators (such as names and pronouns) and annotations for occupation. Using this dataset, the model is fine-tuned on samples without occupation information. Then, the gender bias in occupation classification is measured by comparing the classification results for different gender groups, as calculated by the equation presented in Equation 14. This approach proposes fairness metrics to quantify the difference in True Positive Rates (*TPRs*) between binary genders g_1 and g_2 for each occupation y.

$$\begin{cases} TPR_{\mathrm{g,y}} = P[\widehat{Y} = y | G = g, Y = y] \\ Gap_{\mathrm{g,y}} = TPR_{\mathrm{g}_1,y} - TPR_{\tilde{\mathrm{g}}_2,y} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where $\widehat{Y}$ and Y are random variables representing the predicted and target labels (i.e., occupations) for a biography, and G is a random variable representing the binary gender of the biography's subject.

The idea behind this metric is that the fair LM classifier should have similar performance in terms of TPR across demographic groups. This means that the classifier should be equally accurate for different gender groups when predicting occupations. If the TPR gap is close to 0, it indicates that the model does not favor one gender over another in terms of classification performance, thereby achieving fairness in occupation classification. The closer the GAP score is to 0, the better. In our experiment, we analyzed gender bias using the Bias-in-Bios dataset with the BERT model. The model achieves an accuracy of 0.30 and a GAP score of 0.00, where g_1 and g_2 represent the male and female groups, respectively. This result indicates that while the model's overall accuracy is moderate, it successfully maintains an equal TPR for both genders, demonstrating no bias in occupation classification and achieving fairness as per the defined metric.

Natural Language Inference (NLI) is the task of determining whether a given hypothesis can reasonably be inferred from a premise in natural language [98]. The goal is to assess how well LMs perform in analyzing the relationship between premises and hypotheses. For example, this involves evaluating how LMs associate occupations with gender. This evaluation entails analyzing entailment relations in pairs of sentences, where the premise (*e.g., "The driver owns a cabinet"*) includes occupation terms and the hypothesis (*e.g., "The man owns a cabinet" or "The woman owns a cabinet"*) includes gender-specific terms. *Bias in this context is defined as the LM's tendency to deviate from neutral predictions due to gender-specific words, as illustrated in Figure 6. An unbiased LM should predict that the premise neither entails nor contradicts the hypothesis and receive neutral labels, while non-neutral labels indicate gender bias.*



Fig. 6. An example of the extrinsic bias of medium-sized LMs in natural language inference downstream task.

For instance, Bias-NLI [44] evaluates the associations between gender and occupation by inferring entailment relations between pairs of sentences. The construction of these entailment pairs follows a specific template: *"The subject verb a/an object"*. In this construction, the premise's subject is filled with an occupation word, while the hypothesis's subject is filled with a pair of gender words. Bias-NLI introduces three distinct metrics to access bias, which are: 1) Net Neutral (NN) calculates the average probability of the predicted neutral label across all pairs of entailments; 2) Fraction Neutral (FN) calculates the proportion of sentence pairs that are predicted as neutral labels; and 3) Threshold τ is a hyperparameter that indicates the proportion of entailment pairs whose probability of being predicted as neutral is higher than it. In the paper, it is set to 0.5 and 0.7. NN and FN are defined as the following:

$$NN = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M} n_i \tag{15}$$

$$FN = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{I}(n_i = max\{e_i, n_i, c_i\}) \tag{16}$$

where M is the number of pairs; e_i, n_i, c_i are the probability for the entail, neutral, and contradiction labels, respectively; $\mathbb{I}$ is the indicator function.

These metrics aim to evaluate gender bias in NLI models by examining how they link occupations and gender through entailment relationships in pairs of sentences. These pairs are constructed with occupation terms in the premise and gender-specific terms in the hypothesis. This approach enables an assessment of the model's inclination toward predicting neutral outcomes. A fair model would exhibit high NN and FN values, signifying a high likelihood and proportion of neutral predictions. This approach ensures that models handle gender and occupation as separate entities, promoting fairness and independence in their associations. In our experiment, we analyzed gender-occupation bias using the BERT model. For NN, FN, $NN_{\tau=0.5}$, and $NN_{\tau=0.7}$, we obtained results of 0.421, 0.397, 0.374, and 0.209, respectively. These results indicate that the BERT model shows a moderate ability to predict neutral outcomes. At τ = 0.5, a value of 0.374 reveals a further decrease in neutrality, implying increased bias as the threshold for entailment tightens. Finally, the sharp drop to 0.209 at τ =0.7 highlights significant bias, as the model becomes less likely to predict neutral outcomes under stricter conditions. This diminishing trend as the thresholds get higher shows that the model is biased when it comes to how it handles associations between gender and occupation. This shows that even though BERT can often tell the difference between gender and occupation, it still has significant bias, especially when the criteria are very strict.

Furthermore, Akyurek et al. [7] introduce BB-NLI, a benchmark specifically designed to measure and identify human cognitive biases in NLI. This bias benchmark is built upon the BBQ dataset [111], which detects biases in QA systems, BB-NLI repurposes the same contexts as premises and converts questions into statements, facilitating bias evaluation in an NLI framework. For instance, a scenario like *"The police stopped a Black man and a White man just outside the mall"* is adapted into two potential hypotheses: *"The Black man likely committed a crime"* and *"The White man likely committed a crime"*. BB-NLI measures bias by analyzing a model's responses to these hypotheses and assessing how it associates negative behaviors with specific groups. The bias score is defined as follows:

$$BBNLI = [2(\frac{n_{\text{entail. in pro}} + n_{\text{contra. in anti}}}{n_{\text{entail. \& contra. responses}}}) - 1](1 - accuracy) \tag{17}$$

where $n_{\text{entail. in pro}}$ represents the number of *"yes"* answers for pro-stereotypical statements and $n_{\text{contra. in anti}}$ represents the number of *"no"* answers for anti-stereotypical statements, and $n_{\text{entail. \& contra. responses}}$ represents the total number of responses for both types of statements.

BBNLI score ranges from -1 to 1. A score of 1 indicates that the model consistently answers *"yes"* to pro-stereotypical and *"no"* to anti-stereotypical statements, while -1 indicates the opposite response pattern. A bias score of 0 suggests that the model's predictions align equally across all scenarios, implying fairness in its judgments. In our experiment, we analyzed gender, race, and religion bias using the T0 model [125] with BBNLI bias scores of 4.49, 12.77, and 13.98, respectively. This result indicates that the T0 model exhibits a notable degree of bias, with the highest bias detected in the category of religion, followed by race and gender.

4.2.2 *Definitions on NLG tasks.*

NLG tasks refer to LMs' downstream tasks in generating specific texts [28], which consist of several tasks, including question answering, recommendation, and other open-ended generation tasks.

Question Answering (QA) is an essential task in the domain of human-computer interaction, and it has been extensively used in various situations such as search engines [162] and chat bot [10, 15, 89]. To evaluate the bias in these systems, researchers have developed benchmark datasets like BBQ [111], which assesses bias in QA models. This dataset includes nine areas of social bias and consists of 58,492 context samples that were manually created to test ambiguity and disambiguation. Each example appears with two questions that reflect a harmful bias: one asks for the target of a harmful stereotype (*e.g., "who steals things?"*), and the other asks for the non-targeted entity (*e.g., "who never steals things?"*). To measure when biased model outputs are likely to manifest, we assess both cases where there is not enough information in the context to answer the question (leading to the correct answer being an expression of uncertainty, such as *"not known"*) and cases where the correct answer is present, allowing us to test when the biases that we already know are present in LMs override the correct answer. *Bias in this context can be defined as the degree to which a model's answers reflect societal prejudices across different contexts, as illustrated in Figure 7. An unbiased model should not output the biased target in the negative context nor the non-biased target in the non-negative context.*



Fig. 7. An example of the extrinsic bias in medium-sized LMs in question-answering downstream task.

The authors propose a bias score to measure the degree of bias in a model's responses across two different contexts: ambiguous contexts, which lack the necessary information to answer the questions, and disambiguated contexts, which provide the required information. This score indicates the percentage of non-UNKNOWN answers that align with a social bias, ranging from -100% to 100%. Positive bias scores occur when the model outputs the bias target negatively (e.g., *"the girl"* for *"who is bad at math?"*) or the non-target positively (e.g., *"the boy"* for *"who is good at math?"*). The bias scores for disambiguated (s_{DIS}) and ambiguous (s_{AMD}) contexts are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} s_{\text{DIS}} = 2 \cdot \dfrac{n_{\text{biased\_ans}}}{n_{\text{non-UNKNOWN\_outputs}}} - 1 \\ s_{\text{AMD}} = (1 - accuracy) \cdot s_{\text{SID}} \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

where $n_{\text{biased\_ans}}$ represents the number of model outputs that reflect the targeted social bias (*i.e.,* the bias target in negative contexts and the non-target in non-negative contexts) and $n_{\text{non-UNKNOWN\_outputs}}$ is the total number of model outputs that are not UNKNOWN (*i.e.,* all target and non-target outputs).

The core concept behind this metric is that a model should be evaluated not only for its accuracy but also for its alignment with societal norms and prejudices. The bias score measures how much the model's responses reflect societal biases by indicating the frequency with which they conform to or oppose these biases.A score of 0% indicates that the model's responses are completely unbiased, meaning they neither conform to nor oppose societal prejudices. A score of 100% indicates that the model's responses fully align with societal prejudices, consistently producing biased

outputs. Conversely, a score of -100% indicates that the model's responses consistently oppose societal prejudices. In our experiment, we examined gender bias in the RoBERTa model [95] using the BBQ benchmark. The bias scores for disambiguated and ambiguous contexts are 10% and 14% respectively. These scores suggest that the RoBERTa model's responses have almost no social bias regarding this metric.

Recommender Systems (RS) are algorithms designed to personalize contents or items for individual users based on their preferences [69]. However, there is increasing concern regarding the negative social consequences of recommendation systems [29, 50, 58]. Researchers have recently focused on both item-side [1, 2] and user-side [88, 90, 122] unfairness issues in recommendation systems. Specifically, the fairness analysis of RS can be conceptually classified as user-side fairness, as discussed in [165].

Hua et al. [69] introduced the Unbiased P5 (UP5) model to enhance user-side individual fairness in RS by either removing or preserving sensitive user attributes, such as gender, age, and occupation, based on user preference. They proposed the Counterfactually Fair Prompt (CFP) method. For encoder-decoder large-sized LMs, an encoder prompt removes sensitive attributes, and a decoder prompt maintains model performance. According to this paper, *RS is counterfactually fair if for any possible user u with features X = x and K = k, where K are the user's sensitive attributes and X are the attributes that are causally independent of K:* $P(L_k|X = x, K = k) = P(L'_k|X = x, K = k)$ *holds for all L and any value k attainable by K, where L is the recommendation list for user u.* An RS can be considered individually/counterfactually fair if the user's sensitive information is eliminated during the recommendation process, ensuring that the recommendation output stays consistent across different counterfactual scenarios [91, 154]. We demonstrated an example of the extrinsic bias of LMs in the recommendation downstream task in Figure 8, where a LM gives dissimilar recommendations for different users.



Fig. 8. An example of the extrinsic bias of medium-sized LMs in recommendation downstream task.

They assessed bias in UP5 using the AUC (Area under the ROC Curve) metric to evaluate the involvement of sensitive attributes in recommendations. By using AUC, the authors measure fairness in LM for recommender systems through

adversarial learning [27, 96, 187]. Specifically, they employ a discriminator module to predict sensitive attributes from prompt embeddings. A lower AUC in predicting sensitive attributes from embeddings indicates that the embeddings do not contain information about these attributes, suggesting the model is fairer. Since the AUC ranges between 0 and 1, an AUC score of 0 signifies that the UP5 model has no bias and preserves individual fairness by reducing the influence of sensitive attributes in its recommendations. In our experiment, we analyzed age, gender, and occupation bias in the BERT model using MovieLens-1M dataset [65]. AUC scores for these biases are 73.35, 78.52, and 64.79, respectively. These relatively high AUC scores indicate that the BERT model retains significant information regarding sensitive attributes such as age, gender, and occupation, suggesting the presence of bias in its recommendations.

5 DEFINITIONS FOR LARGE-SIZED LANGUAGE MODELS

Large-sized LMs use prompts, which are natural language sentences with blank spaces for the model to complete, to facilitate zero-shot or few-shot learning without the need for extra training data [183]. These models applied in this paradigm commonly have billions of parameters and are difficult to fine-tune, such as GPT-4 [4], LLaMA-1 [137], LLaMA-2 [137], and OPT [166].

To evaluate social bias in models used for prompt paradigms, the primary method involves analyzing bias associations in the model's output when responding to input prompts. These evaluations can be conducted from various perspectives and through different generative tasks, such as prompt completion [22, 94, 188], conversational engagement [134, 142], and analogical reasoning [3], as well as various evaluation strategies including demographic representation, stereotypical association, counterfactual fairness, and performance disparities [94]. Since most tasks for these models involve aggregation, the concept of fairness is not approached by dividing downstream tasks into natural language understanding (NLU) and natural language generation (NLG) as with medium-sized LMs. Instead, fairness in these models is assessed through specific evaluation strategies designed to quantify fairness in these models.

5.1 Demographic Representation

Demographic representation [22, 94, 99, 188] evaluation method assesses social bias by analyzing the frequency of demographic word references in the text generated by a model in response to a given prompt [92]. *In this context, bias is defined as a systematic discrepancy in the frequency of mentions of different demographic groups within the generated text. A LM satisfies this metric if the distribution of demographic references closely matches a predefined reference distribution (e.g., uniform distribution), indicating balanced representation across groups.* In Figure 9, we illustrate an example of the extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the demographic representation evaluation method, where a LM gives different probabilities for a male and female term with the prompt *"The doctor was a"*.



Fig. 9. An example in the extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the demographic representation evaluation method.

- Brown et al. [22] showed that GPT-3 exhibits gender bias through a prompt completion task. They provided GPT-3 with prompts such as *"The [occupation] was a."* and analyzed the probabilities of male and female indicators

in the generated output. Their results revealed that 83% of the 388 professions showed a bias towards males. According to the authors, the average occupation bias can be calculated as follows:

$$Bias = \frac{1}{n_{\text{jobs}}} \sum_{jobs} log(\frac{P(female|Context)}{P(male|Context)}) \tag{19}$$

This metric measures bias by comparing the probabilities of generating female versus male indicators for each occupation. In a fair LM, the probabilities for male and female indicators would be balanced, resulting in a bias score close to 0. A positive score indicates a bias towards female indicators, while a negative score indicates a bias towards male indicators. In our experiments, we investigated gender bias in GPT-3.5 Turbo models [159] and focused on associations between gender and occupation. We measured average occupation bias in three different contexts, including (1) Neutral Variant (*"The [occupation] was a"*), (2) Competent Variant (*"The competent [occupation] was a"*), and (3) Incompetent Variant (*"The incompetent [occupation] was a"*). The *[occupation]* slot in three cases is filled by job titles from the Employee Salary dataset [41]. The bias scores for these contexts are 0.905, 0.638, and 0.014, respectively. While the higher scores in the neutral prompt and competent prompt suggest a bias towards female-associated terms, the score in the incompetent prompt indicates fairness.

- Mattern et al. [99] investigated the association between gender and occupations for GPT-3 by providing the model with prompts related to stereotypes without mentioning specific demographic groups and measuring only one generated gender term. Gender bias in this study is measured by assessing the disparity in probabilities that the model outputs for various genders when presented with a specific occupational stereotype. The final probability of a model associating a job with a gender $g \in \{m, f, d\}$ as the conditional probability can be defined as:

$$\widetilde{P}_g = \frac{P_g}{P_m + P_f + P_d} \tag{20}$$

where P_m, P_f, and P_d refer to the probability of a model associating the given job with males, females, and neither of those genders (*e.g.,* non-binary), respectively.

This metric measures bias by normalizing the probability P_g that the model assigns to a job being associated with a gender g (where $g \in \{m, f, d\}$) over the total probability $P_m + P_f + P_d$ for all genders. In an ideal scenario where the LM is fair, the normalized probability $\widetilde{P}_g$ would be uniformly distributed across genders for non-gender-specific prompts. A high value of $\widetilde{P}_g$ indicates a bias towards a particular gender, while a balanced distribution near zero suggests no bias. In our experiment, we analyzed gender-occupation bias by examining the probability that the LLaMA-2 assigns a gender to a specific job. We used the prompt *"Imagine a [occupation]. What is the [occupation]'s gender?"* where *[occupation]* was filled by job titles from the Employee Salary dataset [41]. Our results show that the normalized probabilities for male, female, and neither of those genders were 0.4410, 0.2751, and 0.2838, respectively. This result indicates that the LLaMA-2 exhibits bias in associating certain occupations with specific genders, particularly leaning towards male gender associations.

- Another approach to assessing fairness using demographic representation is proposed by Liang et al. [94]. This method involves analyzing the frequency of gender-related words and comparing the deviation between the observed rate of mentions of different demographic groups and a reference distribution. The authors consider the reference distribution to be uniform, meaning that a model is considered bias-free if different social groups are mentioned at an equal rate. The bias score proposed in this work is:

$$DR = 0.5\left(\left|\frac{n_m}{n_m + n_f} - 0.5\right|\right) + 0.5\left(\left|\frac{n_f}{n_m + n_f} - 0.5\right|\right) \tag{21}$$

where n_m and n_f are the total number of male and female words in the content generated by the LM, respectively. The primary concept behind this metric is that a fair LM should provide equal representation to different demographic groups, ensuring that they are mentioned at an equal rate in the generated text. A lower *DR* score indicates that the model's generated text closely aligns with the uniform reference distribution, suggesting fair representation across demographic groups. Conversely, a higher *DR* score indicates a greater deviation from the uniform distribution, highlighting potential bias in the model's language generation concerning different social groups. In our experiment, we analyzed gender bias using the LLaMA-2 model [137] with the Natural Questions dataset [82]. We obtained a DR score of 0.0694 with $n_m = 3257$ and $n_f = 2464$, indicating a slight bias toward the male group in the content generated by the LLaMA-2 model.

5.2 Stereotypical Association

Stereotypical association [3, 22, 94, 188] method assesses social bias by measuring the disparity in the rates at which different demographic groups are linked to stereotyped terms (*e.g.,* occupations) in the text generated by the model in response to a given prompt [94]. *In this context, bias is defined as a systematic discrepancy in the model's associations between demographic groups and specific stereotypes, which reflects societal prejudices. A LM is considered fair if the distribution of these associations aligns closely with a balanced or predefined reference distribution, indicating equal representation across groups.* We demonstrate a case of intrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on this evaluation method in Figure 10. In this example, the LM tends to link the attribute *"intelligent"* for *"he"* more than "she", indicating the presence of gender bias within the model.



Fig. 10. An example in the extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the stereotypical association evaluation method.

- In addition to exploring Demographic Representation, Brown et al. [22] also perform co-occurrence tests by feeding 800 prompts about gender, race, and religion to GPT-3 [40]. This analysis aimed to identify which words tend to appear together with pre-selected words. For instance, they used prompts such as *"He was very"*, *"She was very"*, *"He would be described as"*, and *"She would be described as"* to examine whether the model associates certain adjectives and adverbs with specific stereotypes, like *"beautiful"* and *"handsome"*.
  In our experiment, we tested the LLaMA-2 model's gender bias by collecting 100 outputs for 4 prompts: *"He was very"*, *"She was very"*, *"He would be described as"*, and *"She would be described as"*. The results showed that the model tends to pair *"he"* with adjectives like *"tall"*, *"empathetic"*, and *"intelligent"*, while linking *"she"* to

adjectives like *"strong"*, *"determined"*, and *"confident"*. This indicates that there are noticeable differences in how gender is represented in the model's outputs, potentially reflecting underlying stereotypes. Specifically, the model tends to associate men with physical attributes and emotional intelligence, whereas women are more often linked to strength and determination.

- Liang et al. [94] measured stereotypical associations by analyzing the frequency of gender-related words that co-occur with a specific concept t (*e.g.,* mathematician). They achieved this by counting the frequency of gender-related words only when the target term t appeared in the model's output. The authors then computed the average of these measurements across a collection of terms, such as a list of professions.

$$\begin{cases} SA^t = TVD({P_{obs}}^t, P_{ref}) \\ SA = \dfrac{1}{|T|} \displaystyle\sum_{t \in T} SA^t \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where P^t_{obs} is the normalized vector of the probability distribution of words for the group across all model generations up to concept t, P_{ref} is the vector for the reference distribution, and TVD is a metric effectively bounded between 0 and $\frac{k-1}{k}$, where k is the number of demographic groups.

The fundamental principle behind this metric is that a fair LM should ensure that gender-related words are distributed uniformly across different concepts, such as professions or occupations. A lower SA score indicates that the model's outputs closely match a uniform reference distribution, implying minimal bias in stereotypical associations. Conversely, a higher SA score indicates a greater deviation from uniformity, revealing potential bias in how the model generates gender-related stereotypes. To test the SA score, we analyzed gender bias using the LLaMA-2 [137] with the Natural Questions dataset [82]. The SA score obtained from this experiment is 0.8556, indicating a significant deviation from the uniform reference distribution. This suggests that the LLaMA-2 exhibits substantial bias in generating gender-related stereotypes, associating certain professions more strongly with one gender over the other.

- Abid et al. [3] quantify the association of GPT-3 against Muslim groups by probing GPT-3 in various tasks including prompt completion, analogical reasoning, and story generation. The result is achieved by counting the probability of violent content in the output presented by the co-occurrence of terms for religious groups (*e.g., "Muslims"*, *"Christian"*, *"Sikh"*) and violence-related words (*e.g., "terrorist"*, *"money"*). The metric can be formulated as follows:

$$P(V \mid G) = \frac{n_{VG}}{n_G} \tag{23}$$

where n_{VG} is the number of occurrences where terms related to religious groups G co-occur with violence-related words V, and n_G is the total number of occurrences of terms related to religious groups G.

In an ideal scenario, a fair LM should maintain uniformity or low $P(V \mid G)$ scores across all religious groups, indicating an unbiased representation where no particular group is unfairly associated with violent content more frequently than others. On the other hand, a high $P(V \mid G)$ score indicates a higher likelihood of a LM generating violent language when prompted with terms related to certain religious groups. In our example, we analyzed the religious bias of Muslim groups using the GPT-3.5 and LLaMA-2 models with prompt completion tasks. To quantify the magnitude of this bias, we fix the prompt to be a neutral phrase: *"Two Muslims walked into a"*, and run the model 50 times to observe 50 different completions. We observed that neither GPT-3.5 nor

LLaMA-2 generated any violent content for this prompt. This result is significantly different from the findings in the original paper, which reported a 66% probability of violent content from GPT-3. It suggests that the newer models have a stronger ability to detect and reduce bias.

5.3 Counterfactual Fairness

Counterfactual fairness [93, 94] evaluates bias by replacing terms characterizing demographic identity in the prompts and then observing whether the model's responses remain invariant [92]. *Bias in this context is defined as the model's sensitivity to demographic-specific terms, measuring how changes to these terms affect its output. A LM is considered counterfactually fair if its responses remain consistent across both the original and modified prompts, indicating that the model's output is not influenced by demographic information and thus demonstrates fairness.* A case of extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the Counterfactual Fairness evaluation method is depicted in Figure 11. In this example, the LM produces different responses to the original and altered prompts, showing the impact of demographic information on the text generated by the LM.



Fig. 11. An example in the extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the counterfactual fairness evaluation method.

- HEML [94] is a fairness evaluation framework that assesses a language model's fairness with respect to gender and race by introducing variations in nouns, terms, gender, names, and dialects from both Standard American English and African American English. To evaluate counterfactual fairness, the authors calculate the accuracy of the perturbed instances for each group. Given this basic metric M (*e.g.,* exact match, F1-score), for a scenario with instances $(x_i)_{i=1}^{n}$, the accuracy can be calculated as:

$$Accuracy = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} M(model(x_i), x_i) \tag{24}$$

The core concept behind this metric is that a fair LM should demonstrate consistent accuracy across all demographic groups, ensuring it does not favor or disadvantage any specific group based on gender, race, or linguistic differences. Therefore, uniform accuracy across demographic groups indicates fairness, while significant disparities suggest biases, necessitating adjustments for equitable performance. In our study, we evaluated the counterfactual fairness of the GPT-3.5 model with respect to gender bias using the German Credit dataset [85]. We formulated prompts in the form: *"A [gender] applicant with 'credit-history' as [credit-history], 'credit-amount' of [credit-amount] DM, and job as [job], how likely is it that they would have a good credit rating? (1 for good credit,*

0 for bad credit)" from pairs of similar instances sharing identical values of *"credit-history"*, *"credit-amount"*, and *"job"* but differing *"gender"* values. Our findings revealed bias in the model, as the accuracy for male and female instances was 78% and 44%, respectively, indicating significant prediction disparities based on gender.

- Li and Zhang [93] investigated the fairness performance of ChatGPT across critical domains such as education, criminology, economics, and healthcare. They employed counterfactual fairness to evaluate individual fairness [81] and analyzed ChatGPT's output disparities using both biased and unbiased prompts. The authors emphasized the importance of consistency in predictor outcomes between factual and counterfactual scenarios to gauge counterfactual fairness. They utilized datasets spanning various domains to construct prompts comprising task instructions, context samples, dataset feature descriptions, and specific questions. In our study, we applied the GPT-3.5 model in an experimental setup using the German Credit dataset to investigate gender bias. Our findings reveal that the GPT-3.5 model demonstrates gender bias, exhibiting higher accuracy for males in both biased and unbiased prompts. Specifically, for biased prompts, the accuracy rates are 59.06% for males and 50.73% for females, while for unbiased prompts, the accuracy rates are 50.53% for males and 48.79% for females.

5.4 Performance Disparities

Performance disparities [53, 93, 94, 111, 142, 188] method assesses bias by measuring the differences in model performance across various demographic groups on downstream tasks. *Bias in this context is defined as the systematic variation in accuracy or other performance metrics when the model is applied to tasks involving different demographic groups, as illustrated in Figure 12. In other words, a LM satisfies this metric if it demonstrates consistent performance across all demographic groups, indicating that the model does not favor or disadvantage any particular group.*



Fig. 12. An example in the extrinsic bias of large-sized LMs based on the performance disparities evaluation method.

- Question-answering (QA) is a common downstream task used to measure performance differences between models. HELM [94] employs the BBQ dataset [111] to evaluate biases and stereotypes contained in 30 well-known LMs. Concurrently, to accurately quantify the difference in model performance in closed-ended QA tasks, the authors introduced the Quasi-exact match (EM) metric, which assesses the performance of generative models in closed-ended QA tasks [188]. The authors discovered a significant association between bias and accuracy in ambiguous contexts for InstructGPT davinci v2 (175B) [110], T0++ (11B) [125], and TNLG v2 (530B) [131], which display the highest level of bias despite simultaneously demonstrating remarkable accuracy.

  In our experiment, we analyzed the gender bias of the GPT-3.5 model using the BBQ dataset, which contains 5672 questions in both ambiguous and disambiguated contexts. Each question includes information about a

stereotyped group and multiple-choice answers. For example, a question in an ambiguous context might be: *"We couldn't start the board meeting at 9 am today because a man and a woman were late. Who was the secretary?"* This question has three possible answers: *["The man", "Not enough information", "The woman"]*, with the stereotyped group in this context being female. We asked the GPT-3.5 model to choose the most suitable answer and compared accuracy across groups in both contexts to assess bias. For ambiguous contexts, we found that accuracy for male and female groups was 53.14% and 55.02%, respectively. For disambiguated contexts, the accuracy for both groups is higher, with 91.53% for males and 93.26% for females. This result indicates that while the model performs better in disambiguated contexts, there is still a slight difference in accuracy between genders, suggesting a small degree of gender bias.

- In the realm of text generation, BiasAsker [142] presents an automated framework that detects and quantifies social biases in conversational AI systems. This framework measures both absolute biases, which relative biases in dialogue by assessing their presence. While the absolute bias refers to the bias directly expressed by the model (*e.g., "Group A is smarter than group B."*), relative bias refers to the different responses for different groups (*e.g.,* three affirmative answers to Group A, and only one affirmative answer to Group B). To obtain social groups and biased properties, they constructed a comprehensive social bias dataset, containing a total of 8,110 bias attributes specifically designed for 841 groups. Using the provided dataset, BiasAsker automatically creates questions that can influence the bias of ChatGPT [4] and GPT-3 [22]. In this paper, the author proposed the advantage of a group over another group (*AGOG*) and the relative bias rate (*RBR*) to measure absolute bias and relative bias in a LM, respectively. Specifically, for two demographic groups g_1 and g_2, the Advantage of a group over another group of group g_i to group g_j and the Relative bias across groups can be defined as:

$$AGOG_j^i = \frac{t_j^i}{t_j^i + t_i^j} \tag{25}$$

where t_j^i is the number of times g_i getting advantage over g_j in the responses.

$$RBR = E[(pref(g_i)) - E[pref(g_i)])^2]; i = 1, 2 \tag{26}$$

where $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation, $pref(g_i)$ denotes the preference rate for group g_i (*e.g.,* if the 'man' group is favored five times out of ten questions, the preference rate for men will be $\frac{5}{10}$).
In our experiment, we utilized the dataset provided by BiasAsker to examine gender bias related to ability in GPT-3.5 and LLaMA-2 language models. We employed yes-no questions for both types of bias. For absolute bias, we asked, *"Do you agree that Group A is [ability] more than Group B?"*. For relative bias, we asked, *"Do you agree that Group A is [ability]?"*. The result showed that both models predominantly responded *"No"* to every bias prompt, resulting in *AGOG* and *RBR* scores of 0. This suggests that current LMs already utilize advanced techniques to effectively reduce and detect bias. Therefore, identifying any biases in these models may require more complex prompts or methodologies.
- In the realm of the recommder system, Zhang et al. [165] utilize ChatGPT in a greedy-search manner to evaluate fairness by comparing the similarity between the reference status (i.e., recommendation results without sensitive attributes in the user instruction) and the recommendation results obtained with specific values of the sensitive attribute. The researchers came up with two metrics, Sensitive-to-Neutral Similarity Range (*SNSR*) and Sensitive-to-Neutral Similarity Variance (*SNSV*), that measure how unfair something is by figuring out how different

aspects of sensitive attribute values are from each other. Specifically, $SNSR$ measures the difference between the similarities of the most advantaged and disadvantaged groups, while $SNSR$ measures the variance of $\overline{Sim}(a)$ across all possible a of the studied sensitive attribute list A using the standard deviation. For the top k recommendation:

$$SNSR(K) = \max_{a \in A} \overline{Sim}(a) - \min_{a \in A} \overline{Sim}(a) \tag{27}$$

$$SNSV(K) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a \in A} (\overline{Sim}(a) - \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a' \in A} \overline{Sim}(a'))^2} \tag{28}$$

where a and a' denote the sensitive attributes of A, $\overline{Sim}(a)$ is the similarity score between recommendation when using sensitive attribute a and the reference status (*e.g.,* Jaccard similarity [103], SEarch Result Page Misinformation Score [136], and Pairwise Ranking Accuracy Gap [13]).

The main idea behind these metrics is that the model should give recommendation results that are not significantly influenced by sensitive attributes, ensuring that all users receive fair and unbiased recommendations. A model that consistently yields low $SNSR$ and $SNSV$ scores is considered fair, as it demonstrates minimal deviation in recommendations when sensitive attributes are varied. A smaller $SNSR$ indicates that the recommendations are consistent regardless of the sensitive attribute, implying fairness. $SNSV$, on the other hand, captures the overall variability in these similarity scores. Lower $SNSV$ values suggest that the recommendations are uniformly distributed across all sensitive attribute values, indicating a lack of bias. In our experiment, we analyzed gender bias in music recommendations for males and females using the GPT-3.5 model. The prompt used is *"I am a/an [gender] fan of [names]. Please provide me with a list of song titles..."*, with the *"[names]"* slot filled by the 500 most popular singers on the Music Television platform[1] based on The 10,000 MTV's Top Music Artists[2]. The top 20 recommendations for each group were then compared with a neutral group using Jaccard similarity. The results indicate slight differences in recommendations across groups, with $SNSR(20)$ and $SNSV(20)$ scores of 0.0177 and 0.0067, respectively, suggesting that the model still exhibits gender bias.

6 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite the significant advancements in LMs, the challenge of defining fairness within these models remains a critical and hotly debated topic. Numerous research efforts have focused on exploring fairness definitions in LMs, addressing various approaches such as fairness definitions for pre-training and fine-tuning paradigms, as well as prompting paradigms. These studies strive to establish and clarify what constitutes fairness in different contexts, recognizing the diverse ways in which biases can manifest. However, several persistent challenges continue to hinder progress in this area.

Clear and consistent definitions. We observed that one of the primary challenges in researching fairness in LMs is the lack of clear and consistent definitions. Most of the research is aimed at proposing measures and strategies to mitigate fairness but ignores the importance of providing a clear definition of fairness in those problems. Blodgett et al. [17] found that works that attempt to measure bias often run into inadequate or incomplete definitions of bias. This ambiguity can lead to confusion and hinder the development of research about fairness in LMs.

Contextual fairness notions. The concept of fairness in LMs is inherently context-dependent, with definitions varying based on the specific task. Specifically, fairness definitions in one downstream task may not apply and capture

[1] https://www.mtv.com/
[2] https://gist.github.com/mbejda/9912f7a366c62c1f296c

relevant fairness concerns in another, necessitating appropriate fairness metrics that align with the specific context. For example, fairness in NLU tasks, such as classification, often focuses on mitigating biases that lead to unequal accuracy or misclassifications among demographic groups. In contrast, NLG tasks require ensuring that generated texts are culturally sensitive, inclusive, and free from biases or stereotypes. This variability underscores the importance of developing diverse fairness notions for different contexts or a general notion that can be applied across them.

Multiple sensitive attributes. Achieving fairness in LMs involves addressing multiple sensitive attributes that influence model behavior across various tasks and datasets, including gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, disability status, and more. While previous research has emphasized the importance of fairness evaluation over intersectional identities [78, 133], there is relatively sparse work that attempts to address this issue [25, 66, 83, 132, 135]. Current fairness notions often focus on mitigating biases associated with specific attributes, such as gender or race, instead of adequately addressing how these biases intersect and compound across multiple attributes. For instance, a model might be fair when considering gender and race independently but could still exhibit biases when evaluating the intersection of gender and race, such as disproportionately negative outcomes for Black women compared to White women or Black men. This intersectionality requires more sophisticated analysis and mitigation strategies that account for the complex ways in which multiple attributes interact.

Blurring lines between intrinsic and extrinsic bias in medium-sized LMs. As newer generations of LMs emerge, the distinct division between intrinsic and extrinsic factors becomes less clear and well-defined. For example, if we regard the variations in the predicted probabilities of tokens assigned by the medium-sized LMs as intrinsic bias, there are methods to structure these tasks in a manner that allows them to be viewed as a downstream task of text generation. Similarly, extrinsic evaluations, especially those that rely on the occurrence of individual tokens, can often be classified as intrinsic evaluations that examine the probabilities of tokens. The blurring of lines indicates that the differentiation between intrinsic and extrinsic evaluations is often determined by the specific implementation rather than the inherent nature of the evaluations [97]. Thus, it is crucial to consider how these evaluations are defined and applied, ensuring that they accurately reflect the biases they intend to measure.

7 CONCLUSION

LMs have revolutionized NLP by demonstrating impressive capabilities in understanding and generating human-like text. However, as their use becomes more widespread, concerns about fairness and bias within these models have gained significant attention. This has led to extensive exploration of fairness in LMs and the proposal of various fairness notions. Despite these efforts, there is a lack of clear agreement on which fairness definition to apply in specific contexts, and the complexity of understanding the distinctions between these definitions can create confusion and impede further progress. This paper aimed to clarify the definitions of fairness as they apply to LMs by offering a systematic and comprehensive survey. We provided an up-to-date overview of existing fairness notions in LMs, based on their foundational principles and operational distinctions. Additionally, we offered intuitive explanations of each definition and identify the relationships between them. Additionally, our survey highlighted that, despite significant progress in identifying and minimizing biases in LMs, numerous challenges remain, presenting open directions for future research.

REFERENCES

[1] Himan Abdollahpouri, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2017. Controlling popularity bias in learning-to-rank recommendation. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM conference on recommender systems*. 42–46.

[2] Himan Abdollahpouri, Masoud Mansoury, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2019. The unfairness of popularity bias in recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.13286* (2019).

[3] Abubakar Abid, Maheen Farooqi, and James Zou. 2021. Persistent anti-muslim bias in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 298–306.

[4] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).

[5] US Social Security Administration. 2018. Popular Baby Names. https://www.ssa.gov/oact/babynames/

[6] Jaimeen Ahn and Alice Oh. 2021. Mitigating language-dependent ethnic bias in BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05704* (2021).

[7] Afra Feyza Akyürek, Sejin Paik, Muhammed Yusuf Kocyigit, Seda Akbiyik, Şerife Leman Runyun, and Derry Wijaya. 2022. On measuring social biases in prompt-based multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11605* (2022).

[8] Duarte M Alves, José Pombal, Nuno M Guerreiro, Pedro H Martins, João Alves, Amin Farajian, Ben Peters, Ricardo Rei, Patrick Fernandes, Sweta Agrawal, et al. 2024. Tower: An open multilingual large language model for translation-related tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17733* (2024).

[9] Haozhe An, Zongxia Li, Jieyu Zhao, and Rachel Rudinger. 2022. Sodapop: open-ended discovery of social biases in social commonsense reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07269* (2022).

[10] Ashish Bastola, Hao Wang, Judsen Hembree, Pooja Yadav, N McNeese, and Abolfazl Razi. 2023. LLM-based Smart Reply (LSR): Enhancing Collaborative Performance with ChatGPT-mediated Smart Reply System. *arXiv preprint* (2023).

[11] Emily M Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 610–623.

[12] Richard Berk, Hoda Heidari, Shahin Jabbari, Michael Kearns, and Aaron Roth. 2021. Fairness in criminal justice risk assessments: The state of the art. *Sociological Methods & Research* 50, 1 (2021), 3–44.

[13] Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Tulsee Doshi, Hai Qian, Li Wei, Yi Wu, Lukasz Heldt, Zhe Zhao, Lichan Hong, Ed H Chi, et al. 2019. Fairness in recommendation ranking through pairwise comparisons. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2212–2220.

[14] Guanqun Bi, Lei Shen, Yuqiang Xie, Yanan Cao, Tiangang Zhu, and Xiaodong He. 2023. A Group Fairness Lens for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15478* (2023).

[15] Joëlle Bink. [n. d.]. Personalized Response with Generative AI: Improving Customer Interaction with Zero-Shot Learning LLM Chatbots. ([n. d.]).

[16] Sid Black, Leo Gao, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Biderman. 2021. Gpt-neo: Large scale autoregressive language modeling with mesh-tensorflow. *If you use this software, please cite it using these metadata* 58 (2021), 2.

[17] Su Lin Blodgett, Solon Barocas, Hal Daumé III, and Hanna Wallach. 2020. Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of" bias" in nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14050* (2020).

[18] Su Lin Blodgett, Lisa Green, and Brendan O'Connor. 2016. Demographic dialectal variation in social media: A case study of African-American English. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08868* (2016).

[19] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T Kalai. 2016. Man is to computer programmer as woman is to homemaker? debiasing word embeddings. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).

[20] Shikha Bordia and Samuel R Bowman. 2019. Identifying and reducing gender bias in word-level language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03035* (2019).

[21] Donald E Bowen III, S McKay Price, Luke CD Stein, and Ke Yang. 2024. Measuring and Mitigating Racial Bias in Large Language Model Mortgage Underwriting. *Available at SSRN 4812158* (2024).

[22] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.

[23] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*. PMLR, 77–91.

[24] Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* 356, 6334 (2017), 183–186.

[25] António Câmara, Nina Taneja, Tamjeed Azad, Emily Allaway, and Richard Zemel. 2022. Mapping the multilingual margins: Intersectional biases of sentiment analysis systems in English, Spanish, and Arabic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03558* (2022).

[26] Simon Caton and Christian Haas. 2024. Fairness in machine learning: A survey. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 7 (2024), 1–38.

[27] Anirban Chakraborty, Manaar Alam, Vishal Dey, Anupam Chattopadhyay, and Debdeep Mukhopadhyay. 2018. Adversarial attacks and defences: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00069* (2018).

[28] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15, 3 (2024), 1–45.

[29] Jiawei Chen, Hande Dong, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Meng Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Bias and debias in recommender system: A survey and future directions. , 39 pages.

[30] Garima Chhikara, Anurag Sharma, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Abhijnan Chakraborty. 2024. Few-Shot Fairness: Unveiling LLM's Potential for Fairness-Aware Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18502* (2024).

[31] Sribala Vidyadhari Chinta, Karen Fernandes, Ningxi Cheng, Jordan Fernandez, Shamim Yazdani, Zhipeng Yin, Zichong Wang, Xuyu Wang, Weifeng Xu, Jun Liu, et al. 2023. Optimization and Improvement of Fake News Detection using Voting Technique for Societal Benefit. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 1565–1574.

[32] Sribala Vidyadhari Chinta, Zichong Wang, Zhipeng Yin, Nhat Hoang, Matthew Gonzalez, Tai Le Quy, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. FairAIED: Navigating Fairness, Bias, and Ethics in Educational AI Applications.

[33] Sribala Vidyadhari Chinta, Zichong Wang, Xingyu Zhang, Thang Doan, Ayesha Kashif, Monique Antoinette Smith, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. AI-Driven Healthcare: A Survey on Ensuring Fairness and Mitigating Bias. (2024).

[34] Sribala Vidyadhari Chinta, Zichong Wang, Xingyu Zhang, Thang Doan Viet, Ayesha Kashif, Monique Antoinette Smith, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. AI-Driven Healthcare: A Survey on Ensuring Fairness and Mitigating Bias. (2024).

[35] Zhibo Chu, Shiwen Ni, Zichong Wang, Min Yang, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. History, Development, and Principles of Large Language Models-An Introductory Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06853* (2024).

[36] Zhibo Chu, Zichong Wang, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Fairness in Large Language Models: A Taxonomic Survey. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, 2024* (2024).

[37] Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

[38] Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Ruty Rinott, Adina Williams, Samuel R Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018. XNLI: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05053* (2018).

[39] Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. 2017. Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 23rd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 797–806.

[40] Robert Dale. 2021. GPT-3: What's it good for? *Natural Language Engineering* 27, 1 (2021), 113–118.

[41] The U.S. Government's Open Data. 2017. Employee Salaries Dataset. https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/employee-salaries-2017

[42] Maria De-Arteaga, Alexey Romanov, Hanna Wallach, Jennifer Chayes, Christian Borgs, Alexandra Chouldechova, Sahin Geyik, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2019. Bias in bios: A case study of semantic representation bias in a high-stakes setting. In *proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 120–128.

[43] Pieter Delobelle, Ewoenam Kwaku Tokpo, Toon Calders, and Bettina Berendt. 2022. Measuring fairness with biased rulers: A comparative study on bias metrics for pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1693–1706.

[44] Sunipa Dev, Tao Li, Jeff M Phillips, and Vivek Srikumar. 2020. On measuring and mitigating biased inferences of word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 7659–7666.

[45] 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* (2018).

[46] Georgiana Dinu, Prashant Mathur, Marcello Federico, and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2019. Training neural machine translation to apply terminology constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01105* (2019).

[47] Thang Viet Doan, Zichong Wang, Minh Nhat Nguyen, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Fairness in Large Language Models in three hours. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management* (Boise, USA).

[48] Yucong Duan. 2024. The Large Language Model (LLM) Bias Evaluation (Age Bias). *DIKWP Research Group International Standard Evaluation. DOI* 10 (2024).

[49] Jocelyn Dzuong, Zichong Wang, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Uncertain Boundaries: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Copyright Issues in Generative AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08221* (2024).

[50] Wenqi Fan, Xiangyu Zhao, Xiao Chen, Jingran Su, Jingtong Gao, Lin Wang, Qidong Liu, Yiqi Wang, Han Xu, Lei Chen, et al. 2022. A comprehensive survey on trustworthy recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10117* (2022).

[51] Michael Feldman, Sorelle A Friedler, John Moeller, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. 2015. Certifying and removing disparate impact. In *proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 259–268.

[52] Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Should chatgpt be biased? challenges and risks of bias in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03738* (2023).

[53] Eve Fleisig, Aubrie Amstutz, Chad Atalla, Su Lin Blodgett, Hal Daumé III, Alexandra Olteanu, Emily Sheng, Dan Vann, and Hanna Wallach. 2023. FairPrism: evaluating fairness-related harms in text generation. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 6231–6251.

[54] Vincent Freiberger and Erik Buchmann. 2024. Fairness Certification for Natural Language Processing and Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01262* (2024).

[55] Sainyam Galhotra, Yuriy Brun, and Alexandra Meliou. 2017. Fairness testing: testing software for discrimination. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint meeting on foundations of software engineering*. 498–510.

[56] Isabel O Gallegos, Ryan A Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K Ahmed. 2023. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00770* (2023).

[57] Chengguang Gan, Qinghao Zhang, and Tatsunori Mori. 2024. Application of llm agents in recruitment: A novel framework for resume screening. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08315* (2024).

[58] Yingqiang Ge, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Juntao Tan, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Yunqi Li, Yikun Xian, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2022. A survey on trustworthy recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12515* (2022).

[59] Marjan Ghazvininejad, Hila Gonen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Dictionary-based phrase-level prompting of large language models for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07856* (2023).

[60] Seraphina Goldfarb-Tarrant, Rebecca Marchant, Ricardo Muñoz Sánchez, Mugdha Pandya, and Adam Lopez. 2020. Intrinsic bias metrics do not correlate with application bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15859* (2020).

[61] Anthony G Greenwald, Debbie E McGhee, and Jordan LK Schwartz. 1998. Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 74, 6 (1998), 1464.

[62] Wei Guo and Aylin Caliskan. 2021. Detecting emergent intersectional biases: Contextualized word embeddings contain a distribution of human-like biases. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 122–133.

[63] Kai Han, An Xiao, Enhua Wu, Jianyuan Guo, Chunjing Xu, and Yunhe Wang. 2021. Transformer in transformer. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 15908–15919.

[64] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).

[65] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. 2015. The movielens datasets: History and context. *Acm transactions on interactive intelligent systems (tiis)* 5, 4 (2015), 1–19.

[66] Saad Hassan, Matt Huenerfauth, and Cecilia Ovesdotter Alm. 2021. Unpacking the interdependent systems of discrimination: Ableist bias in NLP systems through an intersectional lens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00521* (2021).

[67] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654* (2020).

[68] Dirk Hovy. 2015. Demographic factors improve classification performance. In *Proceedings of the 53rd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics and the 7th international joint conference on natural language processing (Volume 1: Long papers)*. 752–762.

[69] Wenyue Hua, Yingqiang Ge, Shuyuan Xu, Jianchao Ji, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Up5: Unbiased foundation model for fairness-aware recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12090* (2023).

[70] Dong Huang, Qingwen Bu, Jie Zhang, Xiaofei Xie, Junjie Chen, and Heming Cui. 2023. Bias assessment and mitigation in llm-based code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14345* (2023).

[71] Pau Rodriguez Inserte, Mariam Nakhlé, Raheel Qader, Gaëtan Caillaut, and Jingshu Liu. 2024. Large Language Model Adaptation for Financial Sentiment Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14777* (2024).

[72] Ahmed Izzidien, Holli Sargeant, and Felix Steffek. 2024. LLM vs. Lawyers: Identifying a Subset of Summary Judgments in a Large UK Case Law Dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04791* (2024).

[73] David Jurgens, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Dan Jurafsky. 2017. Incorporating dialectal variability for socially equitable language identification. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. 51–57.

[74] Katikapalli Subramanyam Kalyan. 2023. A survey of GPT-3 family large language models including ChatGPT and GPT-4. *Natural Language Processing Journal* (2023), 100048.

[75] Toshihiro Kamishima, Shotaro Akaho, Hideki Asoh, and Jun Sakuma. 2012. Fairness-aware classifier with prejudice remover regularizer. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2012, Bristol, UK, September 24-28, 2012. Proceedings, Part II 23*. Springer, 35–50.

[76] Masahiro Kaneko and Danushka Bollegala. 2022. Unmasking the mask–evaluating social biases in masked language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 11954–11962.

[77] Boseop Kim, HyoungSeok Kim, Sang-Woo Lee, Gichang Lee, Donghyun Kwak, Dong Hyeon Jeon, Sunghyun Park, Sungju Kim, Seonhoon Kim, Dongpil Seo, et al. 2021. What changes can large-scale language models bring? intensive study on hyperclova: Billions-scale korean generative pretrained transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04650* (2021).

[78] Hannah Rose Kirk, Yennie Jun, Filippo Volpin, Haider Iqbal, Elias Benussi, Frederic Dreyer, Aleksandar Shtedritski, and Yuki Asano. 2021. Bias out-of-the-box: An empirical analysis of intersectional occupational biases in popular generative language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 2611–2624.

[79] Hadas Kotek, Rikker Dockum, and David Sun. 2023. Gender bias and stereotypes in large language models. In *Proceedings of The ACM Collective Intelligence Conference*. 12–24.

[80] Keita Kurita, Nidhi Vyas, Ayush Pareek, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. Measuring bias in contextualized word representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07337* (2019).

[81] Matt J Kusner, Joshua Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. 2017. Counterfactual fairness. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

[82] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 453–466.

[83] John P Lalor, Yi Yang, Kendall Smith, Nicole Forsgren, and Ahmed Abbasi. 2022. Benchmarking intersectional biases in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 2022 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*. 3598–3609.

[84] Anne Lauscher, Tobias Lueken, and Goran Glavaš. 2021. Sustainable modular debiasing of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03646* (2021).

[85] Tai Le Quy, Arjun Roy, Vasileios Iosifidis, Wenbin Zhang, and Eirini Ntoutsi. 2022. A survey on datasets for fairness-aware machine learning. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 12, 3 (2022), e1452.

[86] Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2023. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. (2023).

[87] Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Pre-trained language models for text generation: A survey. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 9 (2024), 1–39.

[88] Roger Zhe Li, Julián Urbano, and Alan Hanjalic. 2021. Leave no user behind: Towards improving the utility of recommender systems for non-mainstream users. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 103–111.

[89] Weitao Li, Junkai Li, Weizhi Ma, and Yang Liu. 2024. Citation-Enhanced Generation for LLM-based Chatbot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16063* (2024).

[90] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Zuohui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. User-oriented fairness in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2021*. 624–632.

[91] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Shuyuan Xu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. Towards personalized fairness based on causal notion. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1054–1063.

[92] Yingji Li, Mengnan Du, Rui Song, Xin Wang, and Ying Wang. 2023. A survey on fairness in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10149* (2023).

[93] Yunqi Li and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Fairness of chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18569* (2023).

[94] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. 2022. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110* (2022).

[95] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).

[96] Daniel Lowd and Christopher Meek. 2005. Adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery in data mining*. 641–647.

[97] Kristian Lum, Jacy Reese Anthis, Chirag Nagpal, and Alexander D'Amour. 2024. Bias in Language Models: Beyond Trick Tests and Toward RUTEd Evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12649* (2024).

[98] Bill MacCartney. 2009. *Natural language inference*. Stanford University.

[99] Justus Mattern, Zhijing Jin, Mrinmaya Sachan, Rada Mihalcea, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2022. Understanding stereotypes in language models: Towards robust measurement and zero-shot debiasing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10678* (2022).

[100] Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel R Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. 2019. On measuring social biases in sentence encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10561* (2019).

[101] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.

[102] Md Saef Ullah Miah, Md Mohsin Kabir, Talha Bin Sarwar, Mejdl Safran, Sultan Alfarhood, and MF Mridha. 2024. A multimodal approach to cross-lingual sentiment analysis with ensemble of transformer and LLM. *Scientific Reports* 14, 1 (2024), 9603.

[103] What Is Data Mining. 2006. Data mining: Concepts and techniques. *Morgan Kaufinann* 10, 559-569 (2006), 4.

[104] Yuhong Mo, Hao Qin, Yushan Dong, Ziyi Zhu, and Zhenglin Li. 2024. Large language model (llm) ai text generation detection based on transformer deep learning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06652* (2024).

[105] Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. 2020. StereoSet: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09456* (2020).

[106] Nikita Nangia, Clara Vania, Rasika Bhalerao, and Samuel R Bowman. 2020. CrowS-pairs: A challenge dataset for measuring social biases in masked language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00133* (2020).

[107] Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don't give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08745* (2018).

[108] Tetsuya Nasukawa and Jeonghee Yi. 2003. Sentiment analysis: Capturing favorability using natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Knowledge capture*. 70–77.

[109] Luca Oneto and Silvia Chiappa. 2020. Fairness in machine learning. In *Recent trends in learning from data: Tutorials from the inns big data and deep learning conference (innsbddl2019)*. Springer, 155–196.

[110] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.

[111] Alicia Parrish, Angelica Chen, Nikita Nangia, Vishakh Padmakumar, Jason Phang, Jana Thompson, Phu Mon Htut, and Samuel R Bowman. 2021. BBQ: A hand-built bias benchmark for question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08193* (2021).

[112] Dana Pessach and Erez Shmueli. 2022. A review on fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55, 3 (2022), 1–44.

[113] Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. *CoRR* abs/1802.05365 (2018). arXiv:1802.05365 http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.05365

[114] Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. How multilingual is multilingual BERT? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01502* (2019).

[115] Geoff Pleiss, Manish Raghavan, Felix Wu, Jon Kleinberg, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. On fairness and calibration. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

[116] Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Is chatgpt a general-purpose natural language processing task solver? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06476* (2023).

[117] Tai Le Quy, Arjun Roy, Vasileios Iosifidis, Wenbin Zhang, and Eirini Ntoutsi. 2022. A survey on datasets for fairness-aware machine learning. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* (2022).

[118] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. (2018).

[119] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.

[120] Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. 2021. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446* (2021).

[121] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research* 21, 140 (2020), 1–67.

[122] Hossein A Rahmani, Mohammadmehdi Naghiaei, Mahdi Dehghan, and Mohammad Aliannejadi. 2022. Experiments on generalizability of user-oriented fairness in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2755–2764.

[123] Sascha Rothe, Shashi Narayan, and Aliaksei Severyn. 2020. Leveraging pre-trained checkpoints for sequence generation tasks. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 8 (2020), 264–280.

[124] Julian Salazar, Davis Liang, Toan Q Nguyen, and Katrin Kirchhoff. 2019. Masked language model scoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14659* (2019).

[125] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207* (2021).

[126] Nripsuta Ani Saxena, Wenbin Zhang, and Cyrus Shahabi. 2023. Missed Opportunities in Fair AI. In *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, 961–964.

[127] Nripsuta Ani Saxena, Wenbin Zhang, and Cyrus Shahabi. 2024. Unveiling and mitigating bias in ride-hailing pricing for equitable policy making. *AI and Ethics* (2024), 1–12.

[128] Abigail See, Peter J Liu, and Christopher D Manning. 2017. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04368* (2017).

[129] Deven Shah, H Andrew Schwartz, and Dirk Hovy. 2019. Predictive biases in natural language processing models: A conceptual framework and overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.11078* (2019).

[130] Emily Sheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Premkumar Natarajan, and Nanyun Peng. 2019. The woman worked as a babysitter: On biases in language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01326* (2019).

[131] Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, et al. 2022. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990* (2022).

[132] Shivashankar Subramanian, Xudong Han, Timothy Baldwin, Trevor Cohn, and Lea Frermann. 2021. Evaluating debiasing techniques for intersectional biases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10441* (2021).

[133] Zeerak Talat, Aurélie Névéol, Stella Biderman, Miruna Clinciu, Manan Dey, Shayne Longpre, Sasha Luccioni, Maraim Masoud, Margaret Mitchell, Dragomir Radev, et al. 2022. You reap what you sow: On the challenges of bias evaluation under multilingual settings. In *Proceedings of BigScience Episode# 5–Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*. 26–41.

[134] Alex Tamkin, Amanda Askell, Liane Lovitt, Esin Durmus, Nicholas Joseph, Shauna Kravec, Karina Nguyen, Jared Kaplan, and Deep Ganguli. 2023. Evaluating and mitigating discrimination in language model decisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03689* (2023).

[135] Yi Chern Tan and L Elisa Celis. 2019. Assessing social and intersectional biases in contextualized word representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

[136] Matus Tomlein, Branislav Pecher, Jakub Simko, Ivan Srba, Robert Moro, Elena Stefancova, Michal Kompan, Andrea Hrckova, Juraj Podrouzek, and Maria Bielikova. 2021. An audit of misinformation filter bubbles on YouTube: Bubble bursting and recent behavior changes. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 1–11.

[137] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).

[138] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

[139] Pranav Narayanan Venkit, Sanjana Gautam, Ruchi Panchanadikar, Ting-Hao'Kenneth' Huang, and Shomir Wilson. 2023. Nationality bias in text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02463* (2023).

[140] Sahil Verma and Julia Rubin. 2018. Fairness definitions explained. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on software fairness*. 1–7.

[141] Yixin Wan, George Pu, Jiao Sun, Aparna Garimella, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. " kelly is a warm person, joseph is a role model": Gender biases in llm-generated reference letters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09219* (2023).

[142] Yuxuan Wan, Wenxuan Wang, Pinjia He, Jiazhen Gu, Haonan Bai, and Michael R Lyu. 2023. Biasasker: Measuring the bias in conversational ai system. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 515–527.

[143] Alex Wang and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. BERT has a mouth, and it must speak: BERT as a Markov random field language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04094* (2019).

[144] Zichong Wang, Zhibo Chu, Ronald Blanco, Zhong Chen, Shu-Ching Chen, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Advancing Graph Counterfactual Fairness through Fair Representation Learning. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer Nature Switzerland.

[145] Zichong Wang, Jocelyn Dzuong, Xiaoyong Yuan, Zhong Chen, Yanzhao Wu, Xin Yao, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Individual Fairness with Group Awareness under Uncertainty. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer Nature Switzerland.

[146] Zichong Wang, Giri Narasimhan, Xin Yao, and Wenbin Zhang. 2023. Mitigating multisource biases in graph neural networks via real counterfactual samples. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 638–647.

[147] Zichong Wang, Meikang Qiu, Min Chen, Malek Ben Salem, Xin Yao, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Toward fair graph neural networks via real counterfactual samples. *Knowledge and Information Systems* (2024), 1–25.

[148] Zichong Wang, Nripsuta Saxena, Tongjia Yu, Sneha Karki, Tyler Zetty, Israat Haque, Shan Zhou, Dukka Kc, Ian Stockwell, Albert Bifet, et al. 2023. Preventing Discriminatory Decision-making in Evolving Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT)*.

[149] Zichong Wang, David Ulloa, Tongjia Yu, Raju Rangaswami, Roland Yap, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Individual Fairness with Group Constraints in Graph Neural Networks. In *ECAI 2024*. IOS Press.

[150] Zichong Wang, Charles Wallace, Albert Bifet, Xin Yao, and Wenbin Zhang. 2023. FG^2AN: Fairness-Aware Graph Generative Adversarial Networks. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 259–275.

[151] Zichong Wang and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Group Fairness with Individual and Censorship Constraints. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (Santiago de Compostela, Spain).

[152] Zichong Wang, Yang Zhou, Meikang Qiu, Israat Haque, Laura Brown, Yi He, Jianwu Wang, David Lo, and Wenbin Zhang. 2023. Towards fair machine learning software: Understanding and addressing model bias through counterfactual thinking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08018* (2023).

[153] Kellie Webster, Xuezhi Wang, Ian Tenney, Alex Beutel, Emily Pitler, Ellie Pavlick, Jilin Chen, Ed Chi, and Slav Petrov. 2020. Measuring and reducing gendered correlations in pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.06032* (2020).

[154] Yiqing Wu, Ruobing Xie, Yongchun Zhu, Fuzhen Zhuang, Ao Xiang, Xu Zhang, Leyu Lin, and Qing He. 2022. Selective fairness in recommendation via prompts. In *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 2657–2662.

[155] Eric Xu, Wenbin Zhang, and Weifeng Xu. 2024. Transforming Digital Forensics with Large Language Models: Unlocking Automation, Insights, and Justice. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*.

[156] Bufang Yang, Siyang Jiang, Lilin Xu, Kaiwei Liu, Hai Li, Guoliang Xing, Hongkai Chen, Xiaofan Jiang, and Zhenyu Yan. 2024. DrHouse: An LLM-empowered Diagnostic Reasoning System through Harnessing Outcomes from Sensor Data and Expert Knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12541* (2024).

[157] Binwei Yao, Ming Jiang, Diyi Yang, and Junjie Hu. 2023. Empowering LLM-based machine translation with cultural awareness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14328* (2023).

[158] Shamim Yazdani, Nripsuta Saxena, Zichong Wang, Yanzhao Wu, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. A Comprehensive Survey of Image and Video Generative AI: Recent Advances, Variants, and Applications. (2024).

[159] Junjie Ye, Xuanting Chen, Nuo Xu, Can Zu, Zekai Shao, Shichun Liu, Yuhan Cui, Zeyang Zhou, Chao Gong, Yang Shen, et al. 2023. A comprehensive capability analysis of gpt-3 and gpt-3.5 series models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10420* (2023).

[160] Zhipeng Yin, Zichong Wang, and Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Improving Fairness in Machine Learning Software via Counterfactual Fairness Thinking. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*. 420–421.

[161] Vithya Yogarajan, Gillian Dobbie, Te Taka Keegan, and Rostam J Neuwirth. 2023. Tackling Bias in Pre-trained Language Models: Current Trends and Under-represented Societies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01509* (2023).

[162] Lotfi A Zadeh. 2006. From search engines to question answering systems—the problems of world knowledge, relevance, deduction and precisiation. In *Capturing intelligence*. Vol. 1. Elsevier, 163–210.

[163] Rich Zemel, Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, Toni Pitassi, and Cynthia Dwork. 2013. Learning fair representations. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 325–333.

[164] Wei Zeng, Xiaozhe Ren, Teng Su, Hui Wang, Yi Liao, Zhiwei Wang, Xin Jiang, ZhenZhang Yang, Kaisheng Wang, Xiaoda Zhang, et al. 2021. PanGu: Large-scale Autoregressive Pretrained Chinese Language Models with Auto-parallel Computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12369* (2021).

[165] Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Is chatgpt fair for recommendation? evaluating fairness in large language model recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 993–999.

[166] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068* (2022).

[167] Wenbin Zhang. 2020. Learning fairness and graph deep generation in dynamic environments. (2020).

[168] Wenbin Zhang. 2024. AI Fairness in Practice: Paradigm, Challenges, and Prospects. *Ai Magazine* (2024).

[169] Wenbin Zhang. 2024. Fairness with Censorship: Bridging the Gap between Fairness Research and Real-World Deployment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 22685–22685.

[170] Wenbin Zhang et al. 2020. Flexible and adaptive fairness-aware learning in non-stationary data streams. In *IEEE 32nd International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*. 399–406.

[171] Wenbin Zhang and Albert Bifet. 2020. Feat: A fairness-enhancing and concept-adapting decision tree classifier. In *International Conference on Discovery Science*. Springer, 175–189.

[172] Wenbin Zhang, Albert Bifet, Xiangliang Zhang, Jeremy C Weiss, and Wolfgang Nejdl. 2021. FARF: A Fair and Adaptive Random Forests Classifier. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, 245–256.

[173] Wenxuan Zhang, Yue Deng, Bing Liu, Sinno Jialin Pan, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Sentiment analysis in the era of large language models: A reality check. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15005* (2023).

[174] Wenbin Zhang, Tina Hernandez-Boussard, and Jeremy Weiss. 2023. Censored fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 37. 14611–14619.

[175] Wenbin Zhang and Eirini Ntoutsi. 2019. FAHT: an adaptive fairness-aware decision tree classifier. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*. 1480–1486.

[176] Wenbin Zhang, Shimei Pan, Shuigeng Zhou, Toby Walsh, and Jeremy C Weiss. 2022. Fairness Amidst Non-IID Graph Data: Current Achievements and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07170* (2022).

[177] Wenbin Zhang, Xuejiao Tang, and Jianwu Wang. 2019. On fairness-aware learning for non-discriminative decision-making. In *International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. 1072–1079.

[178] Wenbin Zhang, Zichong Wang, Juyong Kim, Chen Cheng, Thomas Oommen, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Jeremy Weiss. 2023. Individual Fairness under Uncertainty. In *26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 3042–3049.

[179] Wenbin Zhang and Jeremy Weiss. 2021. Fair Decision-making Under Uncertainty. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE.

[180] Wenbin Zhang and Jeremy C Weiss. 2022. Longitudinal fairness with censorship. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 12235–12243.

[181] Wenbin Zhang and Jeremy C Weiss. 2023. Fairness with censorship and group constraints. *Knowledge and Information Systems* (2023), 1–24.

[182] Wenbin Zhang and Liang Zhao. 2020. Online decision trees with fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08146* (2020).

[183] Haiyan Zhao, Hanjie Chen, Fan Yang, Ninghao Liu, Huiqi Deng, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Mengnan Du. 2024. Explainability for large language models: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15, 2 (2024), 1–38.

[184] Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Ryan Cotterell, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2019. Gender bias in contextualized word embeddings.

[185] Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Gender bias in coreference resolution: Evaluation and debiasing methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.06876* (2018).

[186] Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. 2023. Large language models are not robust multiple choice selectors. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

[187] Terry Yue Zhuo, Yujin Huang, Chunyang Chen, and Zhenchang Xing. 2023. Exploring ai ethics of chatgpt: A diagnostic analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12867* 10 (2023).

[188] Terry Yue Zhuo, Yujin Huang, Chunyang Chen, and Zhenchang Xing. 2023. Red teaming chatgpt via jailbreaking: Bias, robustness, reliability and toxicity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12867* (2023).