

Selection Collider Bias in Large Language Models

Emily McMilin¹

¹Independent Researcher

Abstract

In this paper we motivate the causal mechanisms behind sample selection induced collider bias (selection collider bias) that can cause Large Language Models (LLMs) to learn unconditional dependence between entities that are unconditionally independent in the real world. We show that selection collider bias can become amplified in underspecified learning tasks, and although difficult to overcome, we describe a method to exploit the resulting spurious correlations for determination of when a model may be uncertain about its prediction. We demonstrate an uncertainty metric that matches human uncertainty in tasks with gender pronoun underspecification on an extended version of the Winogender Schemas evaluation set, and we provide an online demo where users can apply our uncertainty metric to their own texts and models.

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates models trained to estimate the conditional distribution: $P(Y|X, Z)$ from datasets composed of cause: X , effect: Y , and covariates: Z , where Z is the cause of sample selection bias in the training dataset. We argue that datasets without some form of selection bias are rare, as almost all datasets are subsampled representations of a larger population, yet few are sampled with randomization.

Sample selection bias occurs when some mechanism, observed or not, causes samples to be included or excluded from the dataset. This is distinct from both confounder and collider bias. The former can occur when two variables have a common cause, and the latter can occur when two variables have a common effect. Correcting for confounding bias requires that one condition upon the common cause variable; conversely correcting for collider bias requires that one does not condition upon the common effect Pearl




Figure 1: Proposed data generating process for a range of NLP datasets, with text-based variables: X as gender-neutral text, Y as a gender-identifying word (often pronoun), and symbolic variables: W , as gender-neutral entities (such as *time* and *location*), Z as *access to resources*, and finally G as gender. While only X and Y are the actual text in the dataset, both symbolic variables W and G can appear in text form in the dataset (such as the country name ‘Mali’ and the word ‘man’), and Z is never observed in datasets but can be partially measured with external census data.

[2009].

While sample selection bias can take many forms, the type of selection bias that interests us here is that which involves more than one variable (observed or not), whose common effect results in selection bias. Such relationships can be compactly represented in causal directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), for example illustrated in Figure 1(a), which we will motivate shortly. The absence of arrows connecting variables in causal DAGs encodes assumptions, for example that W and G in Figure 1(a) are stochastically independent of one another. The arrows from both W and G to Z encodes the assumption that Z is a common effect of W and G .

In Figure 1(b), the twice-encircled node S represents some mechanism that can cause samples to be selected for the dataset. To represent the process of dataset formation, one must condition on S , thus inducing its ancestor Z into a collider bias relationship between W and G .

We will use the term *selection collider bias* to refer to circumstances such as this one, when the selection bias mechanism induces a collider bias relationship in the dataset, that would not have been there otherwise. Beyond posing a risk to out-of-domain generalizability, selection collider bias can result in models that lack even ‘internal validity’, as the associations learned from the data represent the statistical dependences induced by the dataset formation and not the data itself Griffith et al. [2020].

2 OUTLINE

This work is a continuation of our prior work in McMilin [2022], where we demonstrated spurious correlations between gender pronouns and real-world gender-neutral entities like *time* and *location*, on BERT Devlin et al. [2018] and RoBERTa Liu et al. [2019] large pre-trained models. Here we extend the work with further exploration into the causal mechanisms behind the selection bias effect, an investigation of methods to overcome the induced selection bias, and ultimately a demonstration of how selection collider bias induced spurious correlations can be exploited for this purpose.

3 MASKED GENDER TASK

In McMilin [2022], we desired an underspecified learning task to probe spurious associations that may remain otherwise hidden in the presence of highly predictive features. We developed what we called Masked Gender Task (MGT), a special case of Masked Language Modeling (MLM) objective, that uses a heuristic to build underspecified learning tasks by masking common gender-identifying words for prediction (see Appendix B).

Although we intentionally obscure gender for the MGT, we argue that it is not an implausible occurrence that during MLM pre-training, gender-identifying words are masked for prediction in otherwise gender-neutral sequences. At inference time, the prediction of gender-identifying words or labels from gender-neutral text is common to many downstream tasks such as text classification, dialog generation, machine translation from genderless to more gendered languages, or any task requiring gendered predictions from gender-underspecified features.

We grounded our experimentation in two data source types: Wikipedia-like and Reddit-like. The DAGs in Figure 1 represent our relevant assumptions for the data generating processes for these data sources, detailed in McMilin [2022], and briefly revisited below.

3.1 EXAMPLE DATA GENERATING PROCESSES

The objective of the MGT is to predict masked out gender-identifying words, Y , based on a gender-neutral input text, X . We assume that in MLM pre-training, the MGT objective naturally occurs, such that input sequences include words about gender-neutral entities W , such as *birthplace*, *birthdate*, or gender-neutral *topics* of online forums, yet exclude G , gender-identifying words or concepts. This is represented in Figure 1(b), where G is replaced with a doubled headed arrow to indicate that it is unobserved in the gender-neutral input text, X . As mentioned above, the symbolic variable Z represents *access to resources* that may be gender unequal. Particularly in underspecified tasks like that of the MGT, we hypothesize that Z entangles the learned relationships for W and G .

Having described the variables of our assumed data generating processes, we now describe the cause-and-effect relationships. The absence of arrows connecting variables in Figure 1 encodes assumptions, for example that W and G are both independent variables and causes of Z . This relationship is instantiated in data sources like Wikipedia written *about* people as follows, Z has become increasingly less gender dependent as the *date* approaches more modern times, but not evenly in every *place*. In data sources like Reddit written *by* people, the $W \rightarrow Z \leftarrow G$ relationship captures that even in the case of gender-neutral subreddit *topics*, the style of the moderation and community may result in gender-disparate *access* to a given subreddit.

Continuing down the arrows in Figure 1(a), Z and W both have an effect on one’s life and thus X , the text written about them or by them. G is not a direct cause of X (due to our attempt to obscure gender-identifying words in the text), but is a direct cause of the pronouns, Y . Finally, X , is more likely to cause Y , rather than vice versa, for example, in a sentence about a father and daughter going to the park, the sentence context determines which pronoun will appear where.

We can now use these example data sources to show how selection collider bias can entangle the learned representations for W and G .

4 SELECTION COLLIDER BIAS

If someone were to ask you the gender of a random person born in 1801, you may toss a coin to determine your answer, as gender at birth is invariant to time. However, if instead someone were to ask about the gender of a person born in 1801 on a random Wikipedia page, you may then inform your guess with the knowledge that the level of recognition required to be recorded in Wikipedia is not invariant to time. Thus, in your answer you would have induced a conditional dependency between date and gender, that you may reaply

when asked to guess gender of a person born in 2001 on a random Wikipedia page.

As humans are exposed to both the real world and Wikipedia domains, we can observe how conditioning on Wikipedia data changes the relationship between gender and date. However, for LLMs trained exclusively on selection biased data subsampled from real world sources, the dependency between gender and date becomes unconditional.

To explain this more formally we revisit Figure 1(a). When estimating the causal effect of X on Y here, it would be sufficient to use back-door adjustment Pearl [2009], with an admissible set $\{G\}$ to calculate: $P(Y|do(X)) = \sum_G P(Y|X, G) P(G)$. The observation of G makes this a trivial problem to solve.

In Figure 1, Z is grayed out to represent that it is not recorded in the dataset. Even if Z were available to us, we would not condition on it, as this would induce collider bias between G and W in the form of Z 's structural equation Pearl [2009]: $Z := f_z(W, G, U_z)$, where U_z is the exogenous noise of the Z variable not relevant to our task. When not conditioning on Z , and assuming faithfulness (see Pearl [2009]), Figure 1(a) encodes the unconditional independence between W and G that we experience in the real world (RW): $(G \perp\!\!\!\perp W)_{RW}$

4.1 COLLIDER BIAS

Figure 1(b) represents the data generating process for a dataset, DS . Here, we have obscured G and added an arrow $Z \rightarrow S$ to encode Z as a cause of selection, S into DS , where $S = 1$ for samples in the dataset and $S = 0$, otherwise. Unlike S , conceptually Z could take on a wider range of values, including those informed by external data sources. In the formation of DS , we implicitly condition on $S = 1$. Conditioning on a descendent of a collider node, induces the collider bias mechanism of that collider node Pearl [2009], Z , thus inducing the collider bias relationship, $f_z(W, G, U_z)$ in DS .

Therefore, applying the assumptions encoded in the data generating process in Figure 1(b), we can estimate the conditional probability of a gender-identifying word, Y , given gender-neutral text, X :

$$P(Y|X) = P(G|X) \quad (1)$$

$$= P(G|X, S=1) \quad (2)$$

$$= P(G|X, Z, S=1) \quad (3)$$

$$= P(G|X, W, S=1) \quad (4)$$

Equation (1) replaces the textual form of gender in Y (as a 'gender-identifying word') with the symbolic variable for gender, G . Equation (2) shows a mapping from the target unbiased quantity to the measured selection biased data, as defined in Bareinboim and Pearl [2012]. Equation (3) is the

result of conditioning on the descendent of the collider node, Z Pearl [2009]. Equation (4) replaces Z with the variables in its structural equation, f_z , which encodes the conditional dependence $P(G|W) \neq P(G)$. Further, Equation (4) implies the following lack of conditional independence in the dataset: $(G \not\perp\!\!\!\perp W|S=1)_{DS}$.

As this W, G dependence is caused by a selection bias induced collider mechanism, we describe it with the term *selection collider bias*. Finally, because the conditioning on S is intrinsic to the dataset, we can remove S from behind the conditioning bar. Therefore, models (M) trained on DS can learn this dependency unconditionally: $(G \not\perp\!\!\!\perp W)_M$, thus entangling learned representations of G with those of W .

In the next section we will provide evidence that this proposed transformation from real-world independence to statistical dependence: $(G \perp\!\!\!\perp W)_{RW} \Rightarrow (G \not\perp\!\!\!\perp W)_M$, can be measured in LLMs.

5 EXTENDING THE MGT

In this paper we extend the Masked Gender Task introduced in McMilin [2022] as follows: we increase the number of gender-neutral evaluation texts, and we run inference on both base and large versions of the LLMs to investigate the impact of scaling. However, we limit our investigation to only that of W as *date* and *place*, and not as *subreddit*, as we were unable to confidently identify gender-neutral subreddit topic names to fulfill this requirement for W .

5.1 EXPANDED EVALUATION SET

The heuristic for creating gender-neutral input texts for each W variable category is composed of two templates represented as python f-strings: 1) 'f'[MASK] {verb} {life_stage} in {w}.'" 2) 'f'"In {w}, [MASK] {verb} {life_stage}.'"', where: [MASK] obscures a likely gender pronoun masked for MGT prediction, {verb} is replaced with past, present and future tenses of the verb *to be*: ["was", "became", "is", "will be", "becomes"], and {life_stage} is replaced with both proper and colloquial terms for a range of life stages: ["a child", "a kid", "an adolescent", "a teenager", "an adult", "all grown up"].

We argue these sentences fulfill our requirement for X as gender-neutral because they only mention the existence of a person in a time or place; a concept in the real-world known to be gender invariant. We took caution to not include any life stages past adulthood, as there are not equal gender ratios of elderly men to women, in many locations.

Finally, for {w} we require a list of values that are gender-neutral in the real world, yet due to selection collider bias are hypothesized to be a spectrum of gender-inequitable values in the dataset. For W as *date*, we just use time itself,




Figure 2: Spurious correlation between *gender* and *time* from LLM predictions on gender-neutral input texts described in Section 5.1, plotted as averaged softmax probabilities for predicted gender pronouns vs a range of dates.

as over time women have become more likely to be recorded into historical documents reflected in Wikipedia, so we pick years ranging from 1801 - 2001. For W as *place*, we use the bottom and top 10 World Economic Forum Global Gender Gap ranked countries (see details in C.1).

Example sentences for $\{w\}$ as *date* and as *place* are ‘[MASK] was a teenager, in 1953.’ and ‘In Mali, [MASK] will be an adult.’ respectively. The total number of sentences evaluated per dot in Figure 2 and Figure 3 is: 2 templates \times 5 tenses of the verb *to be* \times 6 phrases for life stages = 60 input texts per dot.

5.2 PLOTTING THE G, W DEPENDENCY

Figure 2 shows pre-trained BERT and RoBERTa base and large results, as well as results for models finetuned with the MGT objective,¹ which can serve as a rough upper limit for the magnitude of expected spurious correlations. Each plotted dot is the softmax probability (averaged over 60 gender-neutral texts) for the predicted gender pronouns vs *year*, where *year* in the x-axis matches that gender-neutral W value injected into the gender-neutral text².

The shaded regions show the 95% confidence interval for a 1st degree linear fit. Unlike the finetuned model’s binary prediction, because the final layer in the pre-trained model is a softmax over the entire tokenizer’s vocabulary, the MGT sums the gendered-identified portion (as listed in Table 2) of the probability mass from the top five predicted words³.

¹See McMilin [2022] for details.

²For example, the purple and green dots at the x-axis position of $W = 1938$ are the softmax predictions for the masked word in input texts like ‘In 1938, [MASK] will became a teenager.’, for female and male pronoun, respectively.

³We pick the number $k = 5$ for the ‘top_k’ predicted words,




Figure 3: Spurious correlation between *gender* and *place* from LLM predictions on gender-neutral input texts described in Section 5.1, plotted as averaged softmax probabilities for predicted gender pronouns vs a list of countries, ordered by their Global Gender Gap rank (see Appendix C.1).

We argue the association between W along the x-axis and predicted gender, G , along the y-axis, supports our assumptions about the data generating process in Figure 1(b). Further, Figure 2 and Figure 3 support our hypothesis that selection collider bias has resulted in these LLMs learning the conditional dependency of $P(G|W)$ when predicting gender-identifying terms from gender-neutral texts, more specifically: $P(Y|X) = P(G|X, W, S = 1)$ from Equation (4).

Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(b) show the slope and Pearson’s r correlation coefficient (following Rudinger et al. [2018]) of the y-axis value against the *index* of the x-axis (see McMilin [2022]), for all the plots in Figure 2 and Figure 3. As expected, we do see the slope and correlation coefficients highest in the finetuned models. We nonetheless see comparable coefficients for the spurious W, G dependency in the pre-trained models, and there is no obvious trend that scaling to larger models affects the extent of the measured spurious correlation.

6 ATTEMPTS OVERCOMING SELECTION COLLIDER BIAS

6.1 SELECTION BIAS RECOVERY

In Bareinboim et al. [2014] it is proven that one can recover the unbiased conditional distribution $P(Y|X)$ from a causal DAG, G_S , with selection bias: $P(Y|X, S = 1)$, if and only if the selection mechanism can become conditionally in-

because 5 is the default value for the ‘top_k’ argument in the Hugging Face ‘fillmask()’ function used for inference. We did not experiment with other values for ‘top_k’.




Figure 4: Difference between the slope and Pearson’s r coefficients from Male and Female 1st degree linear fit plots in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

dependent of the effect, given the cause: $(Y \perp\!\!\!\perp S|X)_{G_S}$. However in the selection diagram in Figure 1(b) we can see $(Y \not\perp\!\!\!\perp S|X)_{D_S}$, due to the unobserved variable connecting Z to Y . Thus, the conditional distribution learned by models trained on the dataset DS will not converge toward the unbiased distribution without additional data or assumptions Bareinboim et al. [2014].

6.2 TRANSPORTABILITY

Although in-domain recovery of Y given X is not possible without additional data, for most LLMs we desire out-of-domain generalization or transfer to new learning objectives, for which we often have access to more data. Specifically, we desire the transport of learned representations from source population Π with probability distribution $P(Y, X, Z)$, to target population Π^* with probability distribution $P^*(Y, X, Z)$ Pearl and Bareinboim [2011].

Figure 1(c) depicts the relevant causal mechanisms when desiring to transport learned representations from source Π to target Π^* domains, such as from the training domain to the inference domain. The arrow from the square variable, S^* , to Z indicates that the causal mechanism that generates Z is different for the two populations of interest. The absence of arrows from square variables to the other variables in Figure 1(c) represents the assumption that the causal mechanisms for these variables are consistent across the two populations. Thus, conditioning on S^* relates the two domains to one another: $P^*(Y|do(X), Z) := P(Y|do(X), Z, S^*)$ Pearl and Bareinboim [2011].

In the case of the MGT, Figure 1(c) encodes our assumptions that only Z , *access to resources*, is different between our training and inference domains. This assumption seems reasonable, as W , in the form of *time* or *place*, remains a cause of X , which itself remains a cause of Y , across both Π and Π^* . However, in Π , the entries in the dataset are often

limited to only those with sufficient *access to resources* as needed to achieve the level of notoriety required for a Wikipedia biography. This is not the case at inference time in Π^* , where the experimenter is free to choose any (gender-neutral) input text.

Finally, while we do not know Z in Π (although we may be able to probe its latent representation along several axes of interest in Figure 2 and Figure 3), we can obtain information about gender disparity in *access to resources* from sources such as the US census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or other external data sources relevant to the target population.

6.3 STATISTICAL TRANSPORTABILITY

The lack of recovery of $P(Y|X)$ as described in Section 6.1, does not preclude transport of the learned statistical relationship Correa and Bareinboim [2019] from Π as $P(Y|X)$ to Π^* as $P(Y|X, S^*)$.

The transport of a learned conditional probability $P(Y|X)$ to new domains requires a reweighting and recombining of $P(Y|X)$, as informed by the causal selection diagram in Figure 1(c), and the availability of external data sources for Z Correa and Bareinboim [2019]. However, any reweighting of $P(Y|X)$ learned under the selection collider bias mechanism in Figure 1(b) is unsatisfying, as we have already seen $P(Y|X) = P(G|X, W, S=1)_{MGT}$, as plotted in Figure 2 and Figure 3 for the MGT.

This unfortunately suggests the only way to recover $W \perp\!\!\!\perp G$ for $P^*(Y|X)$ from $\gamma P(Y|X, S^*)$, is by setting reweighting term γ to 0, in cases when a gender-identifying prediction is made with gender-neutral texts. However, the apparent pervasiveness of this erroneous statistical relationship between W, G may provide an opportunity that we can exploit, as we discuss in the next section.

7 EXPLOITING SPURIOUS CORRELATIONS

Due to the seemingly unrecoverable entanglement of *gender* and gender-neutral entities like *time* and *place*, one may be inclined to resort to other solutions: exclusively predicting gender-neutral pronouns or using random chance, for gender-identifying predictions from gender-neutral features. While such an alternate solution may be satisfactorily applied for masked pronoun prediction in this first sentence: (1) ‘The doctor told the man that [MASK] would be on vacation next week.’, it would be inappropriate for this second sentence: (2) ‘The doctor told the man that [MASK] would be at risk without the vaccination.’.

In this section we investigate if we can exploit selection collider bias induced spurious associations to identify when the prediction task is underspecified, thus when any model (or

human) should be *uncertain* of the correct prediction (as was the case in sentence (1) above), and hence when alternate solutions may be preferred. We test this using the Winogender Schema evaluation set Rudinger et al. [2018], composed of 120 sentence templates, hand-written in the style of the Winograd Schemas Levesque et al. [2012]. Originally the Winogender evaluation set was developed to demonstrate that many NLP pipelines produce gender-biased outcomes often in excess of occupation-based gender inequality in the real world.

Here we use our extended version of the Winogender evaluation set to validate that our proposed metric for *uncertainty* produces small values only when there are explicit gender-identifying features in X , for a gender-identifying prediction, Y , and produces large values otherwise, including when gendered terms are co-occurring but not coreferent with X . Additionally we demonstrate LLM’s learned dependency between *gender* and *date* in an established evaluation set, as opposed to our earlier demonstrations using a dataset designed specifically for the MGT McMilin [2022].

7.1 WINOGENDER TEXTS

The ‘Sentence’ column in Table 1 shows example texts from our extended version of the Winogender evaluation set, where the occupation is ‘doctor’. Each sentence in the evaluation set contains: 1) a *professional*, referred to by their profession, such as ‘doctor’ 2) a context appropriate *participant*, referred by one of: {‘man’, ‘woman’, ‘someone’, *other*} where *other* is replaced by a context specific term like ‘patient’, and 3) a single pronoun that is either coreferent with (1) the *professional* or (2) the *participant* in the sentence Rudinger et al. [2018]. For the masked gender task, this pronoun is replaced with a [MASK] for prediction. Our extensions to the evaluation set are two-fold: 1) we add {‘man’, ‘woman’} to the list of words used to describe the *participant*, and 2) we prepend each sentence with the phrase ‘In DATE’⁴, where ‘DATE’ is replaced by a range of years from 1901 to 2016⁵, similar to the process for MGT evaluation.

In Sentence IDs 1 - 4 of Table 1, the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *professional*, who is always referred to as the ‘doctor’. Whereas in Sentence IDs 5 - 8, the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *participant*, who is referred to as {‘man’, ‘woman’, ‘someone’, and ‘patient’}, respectively.

Of the eight sentences, six remain gender-underspecified for the pronoun prediction task, with only IDs 5 & 6 becoming gender-specified.

⁴Using ‘In PLACE’ and replacing ‘PLACE’ with the range of countries in Appendix C.1 produced similar results.

⁵We picked a slightly narrower and more modern date range as compared to that of Figure 2 for contextual consistency with some of the more modern occupations in the Winogender evaluation set.




Figure 5: Averaged softmax percentages from RoBERTa large for predicted female gender pronouns (normalized over all gendered predictions) vs a range of dates (that have been injected into the text), for the extended Winogender input texts listed in Table 1 for the occupation of ‘Doctor’.

Although IDs 1 & 2 are similar to IDs 5 & 6, as all four sentences reveal the gender of the patient, in the former we are asked to predict the unspecified gender of the doctor, while only the latter asked that we predict the (specified) gender of the patient. If, for example, the erroneous W, G dependency seen in gender-underspecified texts is resolved as soon as the term ‘man’ is injected into the sentence regardless of whether the prediction is coreferent with the ‘man’, then we would conclude our model has resolved its uncertainty with a false confidence, which we would be unable to exploit for selection bias recovery.

Figure 5 shows the predicted softmax probability for female pronouns for the masked words in the Table 1 sentences, normalized to the gendered predictions of the top five predicted words from pre-trained RoBERTa large. Similar to the findings in Rudinger et al. [2018], the softmax probabilities for female pronouns are higher for masked pronouns coreferent with the patient as opposed to the doctor (for the underspecified sentences) indicating a specific gender bias for traditionally non-female occupations.

What is new here is that in Figure 5 we can confirm the absence of selection collider bias induced spurious correlations when the words ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are **coreferent** with the masked pronoun, and the presence of these spurious correlations when the words ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are only **co-occurring** with the masked pronoun.

Table 1: Extended Winogender evaluation sentences and MGT uncertainty results for occupation as ‘Doctor’. The ‘Coref’ column shows if the masked pronoun is coreferent with the doctor or patient, and the ‘Participant’ column shows the text used to describe the *participant*. Only sentence IDs 5 & 6 are not underspecified for gender pronoun prediction, and appropriately all models show the lowest relative uncertainty for these sentences, in particular the larger and longer trained models.

ID	SENTENCE	COREF	PARTICIPANT	UNCERTAINTY			
				BERT		RoBERTA	
				BASE	LARGE	BASE	LARGE
1	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE MAN THAT [MASK] WOULD BE ON VACATION NEXT WEEK.	DOCTOR	MAN	1.7	1.8	15.0	14.0
2	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE WOMAN THAT [MASK] WOULD BE ON VACATION NEXT WEEK.	DOCTOR	WOMAN	4.3	27.3	4.0	18.8
3	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD SOMEONE THAT [MASK] WOULD BE ON VACATION NEXT WEEK.	DOCTOR	SOMEONE	10.6	8.0	13.3	20.2
4	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE PATIENT THAT [MASK] WOULD BE ON VACATION NEXT WEEK.	DOCTOR	OTHER	1.9	6.6	14.7	16.6
5	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE MAN THAT [MASK] WOULD BE AT RISK WITHOUT THE VACCINATION.	PATIENT	MAN	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
6	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE WOMAN THAT [MASK] WOULD BE AT RISK WITHOUT THE VACCINATION.	PATIENT	WOMAN	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.5
7	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD SOMEONE THAT [MASK] WOULD BE AT RISK WITHOUT THE VACCINATION.	PATIENT	SOMEONE	11.3	10.5	41.3	16.4
8	IN DATE: THE DOCTOR TOLD THE PATIENT THAT [MASK] WOULD BE AT RISK WITHOUT THE VACCINATION.	PATIENT	OTHER	6.1	12.3	19.2	9.3

7.2 UNCERTAINTY METRIC

Figure 5 supports our argument that the data generating process in Figure 1(b) leads to the spurious association between W and G (Sentence IDs 1-4, 7 & 8), which does not exist in Figure 1(a) (Sentence IDs 5 & 6). Further, identifying a spectrum of values for W (over which the hypothesized selection bias influence wanes), can aid in identifying when a model’s prediction is under the influence of selection collider bias. In this case we can see that merely prepending a *date* to a gender-underspecified sentence is sufficient to cause the model to modify its predicted softmax probabilities. We see this remains to be the case, despite the injection of gender-specified words like ‘man’ or ‘woman’ into the gender-underspecified sentence. Only when the injection of the gender-specific term is co-referent with the masked pronoun, and thus the sentence becomes no longer gender-underspecified, do we see that the model is no longer influenced by *date*.

For an easily obtainable single-value uncertainty metric, we can measure the absolute difference between the averaged softmax probabilities for the first and last several dates along the x-axis in Figure 5. For this uncertainty metric, we would expect larger values for underspecified prediction tasks, in which the spurious correlation between *gender* and *date* has a larger role in guiding the prediction. For the predictions in Figure 5, this metric is shown in the ‘Uncertainty’ columns in Table 1 for all four LLMs studied here. Here we see values closest to 0 for gender-specified sentence IDs 5 & 6⁶.

Our extended version of the Winogender Schema contains 60 occupations for the *professional* \times 4 words used to describe the *participant* \times 30 values for DATE \times 2 sentence templates (one in which the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *professional* and the other with the *participant*). This totals to 14,400 test sentences, which we provide as

⁶As can be seen further in Appendix A, this uncertainty metric appears to report results more consistent with human reasoning in RoBERTa large and generally as the model becomes increasingly over-parameterized.


input text to the 4 pre-trained models thus far investigated in this paper: BERT base and large, and RoBERTa base and large.

We calculate the above-described uncertainty metric for all 60 occupations in the Winogender evaluation set and show the results from RoBERTa large 1) in Figure 6(a), with input sentences like IDs 1 - 4 where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *professional*, and 2) in Figure 6(b), with input sentences like IDs 5 - 8 where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *participant*. In these plots the x-axis is ordered from lower to higher female representation, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015/16 statistics provided by Rudinger et al. [2018], and the y-axis is the prediction uncertainty metric defined in the proceeding paragraphs.


In Figure 6, we again see the model reliably reporting high uncertainty for all six of the underspecified tasks and low uncertainty for the two well-specified tasks, for almost all Winogender evaluation sentences. In particular, the injection of gender-identifying text: ‘man’ and ‘woman’ into the sentence, reduces the model’s uncertainty only when these gender-identifying terms are coreferent with the masked pronoun for prediction as in Figure 6(b), and not when gender-identifying terms are merely co-occurring as in Figure 6(a). We show similar results for BERT and RoBERTa base and BERT large in Appendix A, but note that increased parameter count and hyper-parameter optimization in RoBERTa large appears to improve the uncertainty measurement.

8 DEMONSTRATION AND OPEN-SOURCE CODE

We have developed demos using the MGT where users can choose their own input text and select almost any BERT-like model hosted on Hugging Face to test for spurious correlations and model uncertainty at https://huggingface.co/spaces/emilylearning/spurious_correlation_evaluation and https://huggingface.co/spaces/emilylearning/llm_uncertainty,



(a) Masked pronoun is coreferent with the *professional* in the sentence, so all these sentences remain gender-underspecified. Matching human reasoning, we do see uncertainty results above 0 for most occupations, regardless of the word injected into evaluation text for the *participant*, including co-occurring gender-identifying terms.



(b) Masked pronoun is coreferent with the *participant*, so the sentences containing ‘man’ and ‘woman’ become gender-specified, while the rest remain gender-underspecified. Matching human uncertainty, we do see uncertainty results close to 0 for most occupations, when ‘man’ or ‘woman’ has been injected into the evaluation text for the *participant*, and generally above 0 otherwise

Figure 6: RoBERTa-large MGT uncertainty results on all Winogender Schema occupations.

respectively. We additionally will make all code available at https://github.com/2dot71mily/selection_collider_bias_uai_clr_2022.

9 DISCUSSION

In this paper we have explained the causal mechanisms behind selection collider bias and shown that it can become amplified in underspecified learning tasks, while the magnitude of the resulting spurious correlations appears scale agnostic. We have shown that selection collider bias can be pervasive and difficult to overcome. However, we also showed that we can exploit the resulting latent spurious associations to measure when a model may be uncertain about its prediction, on an extended version of the Winogender Schemas evaluation set.

We can see that LLMs, in particular increasingly over-

parameterized models like RoBERTa large, can match human reasoning about uncertainty in Winograd-like for pronoun coreference resolution. When a model has been identified as uncertain for a prediction in a specific domain, such as the prediction of gender-identifying words, a heuristic or information retrieval method specific to that problem domain may be preferred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the UAI CLR reviewers for their helpful comments, to Rosanne Liu and Jason Yosinski for their encouragement, to Hugging Face for their open source services, and to Judea Pearl, Elias Bareinboim, Brady Neal and Paul Hünermund for their fantastic online causal inference resources.

References

- Elias Bareinboim and Judea Pearl. Controlling selection bias in causal inference. In Neil D. Lawrence and Mark Girolami, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 22 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 100–108, La Palma, Canary Islands, 21–23 Apr 2012. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v22/bareinboim12.html>.
- Elias Bareinboim, Jin Tian, and Judea Pearl. Recovering from selection bias in causal and statistical inference. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 28(1), Jun. 2014. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/9074>.
- Juan D. Correa and Elias Bareinboim. From statistical transportability to estimating the effect of stochastic interventions. *IJCAI'19*, page 1661–1667. AAAI Press, 2019. ISBN 9780999241141.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>.
- Gareth J. Griffith, Tim T. Morris, Matthew J. Tudball, Annie Herbert, Giulia Mancano, Lindsey Pike, Gemma C. Sharp, Jonathan Sterne, Tom M. Palmer, George Davey Smith, Kate Tilling, Luisa Zuccolo, Neil M. Davies, and Gibran Hemani. Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), November 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-19478-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19478-2>.
- Hector J. Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. The winograd schema challenge. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR'12*, page 552–561. AAAI Press, 2012. ISBN 9781577355601.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>.
- Emily McMilin. Selection bias induced spurious correlations in large language models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.08982>.
- Judea Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2 edition, 2009. ISBN 978-0-521-89560-6. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511803161.
- Judea Pearl and Elias Bareinboim. Transportability of causal and statistical relations: A formal approach. In *2011 IEEE 11th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*. IEEE, December 2011. doi: 10.1109/icdmw.2011.169. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/icdmw.2011.169>.
- Rachel Rudinger, Jason Naradowsky, Brian Leonard, and Benjamin Van Durme. Gender bias in coreference resolution. *CoRR*, abs/1804.09301, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.09301>.

Table 2: List of explicitly gendered words that are masked out for prediction as part of the masked gender task. These words were largely selected for convenience, as each is a single token in both the BERT and RoBERTa tokenizer vocabs, for ease of downstream token to word alignment. During finetuning, it is expected that this list will not fully mask gender in every sample, reducing the underspecification of the learning task. At inference time, it is critical that all gendered words are masked, and because the inference input texts are constructed by a heuristic, this is trivial to achieve.

MALE-VARIANT	FEMALE-VARIANT
HE	SHE
HIM	HER
HIS	HER
HIMSELF	HERSELF
MALE	FEMALE
MAN	WOMAN
MEN	WOMEN
HUSBAND	WIFE
FATHER	MOTHER
BOYFRIEND	GIRLFRIEND
BROTHER	SISTER
ACTOR	ACTRESS

A EXTENDED WINOGENER UNCERTAINTY RESULTS ON MORE LLMS

Figure 7 shows MGT uncertainty results for all Winogender occupations where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *professional*. Because the injected text (one of: {‘man’, ‘woman’, ‘someone’, ‘other’}) is referring to the *participant* and not the *professional*, all these sentences remain gender-underspecified. The plots show all tested models tend to report uncertainty results above 0 for all occupations, regardless of the word injected into the evaluation text for the *participant*, thus the models do not become erroneously certain about gender when the words ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are injected into the text.

Figure 8 shows MGT uncertainty results for all Winogender occupations where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *participant*, unlike Figure 7 where the pronoun is coreferent with the *professional*. Because the injected text (again one of: {‘man’, ‘woman’, ‘someone’, ‘other’}) is referring to the *participant*, the sentences containing ‘man’ and ‘woman’ become gender-specified, while the rest remain gender-underspecified. We see uncertainty results closer to 0 for most occupations when ‘man’ or ‘woman’ has been injected into the evaluation text for the *participant*, and generally above 0 otherwise, in particular for more highly over-parameterized models like BERT large and RoBERTA base & large in Figure 6(b).

B GENDER-IDENTIFYING WORDS


See Table 2 for the list of gender-identifying words that were masked for prediction during both finetuning and at inference time for the Masked Gender Task, with the exclusion of ‘man’ & ‘woman’ that remained unmasked in the extended Winogender evaluation set.

C W VARIABLE X-AXIS VALUES


C.1 PLACE VALUES

Ordered list of bottom 10 and top 10 World Economic Forum Global Gender Gap ranked countries used for the x-axis in Figure 3, that were taken directly without modification from https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2021.pdf:


"Afghanistan", "Yemen", "Iraq", "Pakistan", "Syria", "Democratic Republic of Congo", "Iran", "Mali", "Chad", "Saudi Arabia", "Switzerland", "Ireland", "Lithuania", "Rwanda", "Namibia", "Sweden", "New Zealand", "Norway", "Finland", "Iceland"



(a) BERT base




(b) BERT large




(c) RoBERTa base


Figure 7: MGT uncertainty results for all Winogender occupations where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the gender-unidentified *professional*, thus all sentences remain gender-unspecified. The plots show that generally, the models do not become erroneously certain about gender when the words ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are injected into the text.



(a) BERT base



(b) BERT large



(c) RoBERTa base

Figure 8: MGT uncertainty results for all Winogender occupations where the masked pronoun is coreferent with the *participant*, thus the sentences containing ‘man’ and ‘woman’ become gender-specified, while the rest remain gender-unspecified. Accordingly, the plots show that the uncertainty metric for the models is closer to 0 for the well-specified sentences containing ‘man’ and ‘woman’, and higher than 0 otherwise, particularly in the case of the more highly over-parameterized models like BERT large and RoBERTa base & large in Figure 6(b).