

Fairness and Bias in Multimodal AI: A Survey

Tosin Adewumi^{*†}, Lama Alkhaled[†], Namrata Gurung¹, Goya van Boven^{*2}, Irene Pagliai^{*3}

[†]Machine Learning Group, LTU, Sweden, ¹QualityMinds GmbH, Germany,

²Utrecht University, the Netherlands, ³University of Göttingen, Germany,

[†]firstname.lastname@ltu.se, ¹namrata.gurung@qualityminds.de

²j.g.vanboven@students.uu.nl, ³irene.pagliai@uni-goettingen.de

Abstract

The importance of addressing fairness and bias in [artificial intelligence \(AI\)](#) systems cannot be over-emphasized. Mainstream media has been awashed with news of incidents around stereotypes and bias in many of these systems in recent years. In this survey, we fill a gap with regards to the minimal study of fairness and bias in Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) compared to Large Language Models (LLMs), providing **50 examples** of datasets and models along with the challenges affecting them; we identify a new category of quantifying bias (*preuse*), in addition to the two well-known ones in the literature: intrinsic and extrinsic; we critically discuss the various ways researchers are addressing these challenges. Our method involved two slightly different search queries on *Google Scholar*, which revealed that 33,400 and 538,000 links are the results for the terms "*Fairness and bias in Large Multimodal Models*" and "*Fairness and bias in Large Language Models*", respectively. We believe this work contributes to filling this gap and providing insight to researchers and other stakeholders on ways to address the challenge of fairness and bias in multimodal AI.

1 Introduction

Fairness and bias are very important topics that cut across many domains in the society. The rapid advancements in the research and applications of [artificial intelligence \(AI\)](#) have made them even more compelling in recent times, such that many studies have emerged on them ([Frankel and Vendrow, 2020](#); [Booth et al., 2021](#); [Adewumi et al., 2022](#); [Teo et al., 2024](#)). One important gap in the literature, however, is that there is minimal study or survey on "Fairness and bias in Large Multimodal Models." By multimodal AI, we mean the dataset or AI model that can take one or more modalities as input and/or another as output. This gap is evidenced by the fact that there is a dearth of work

on the topic. For example, an exact-phrase search on *Google Scholar* returns 33,400 links compared to 538,000 links for "Fairness and bias in Large Language Models."¹ This implies more than 16 times the result for the former. Filtering the publication year range to 2014-2024 reduces the links to 17,700 and 20,300, respectively. We intend to contribute in filling that gap in this work.

The two terms, fairness and bias, are strongly related but fairness is concerned with equality and justice while bias is concerned with systematic error, which may arise from human prejudices ([Booth et al., 2021](#); [Alkhaled et al., 2023](#)). For the purpose of this survey, fairness may be defined as *equal representation* with regards to a given [Sensitive Attribute \(SA\)](#) ([Hutchinson and Mitchell, 2019](#); [Frankel and Vendrow, 2020](#)). Hence, we may consider a [generative artificial intelligence \(GenAI\)](#) to be fair if it generates both male and female samples with equal probabilities, with regards to the SA gender ([Teo et al., 2024](#)). Bias is a (non-random) systematic error in a measurement resulting in a difference in accuracy in one group compared to another, given the ground truth ([Booth et al., 2021](#); [Scheuneman, 1979](#)). We acknowledge there are other quantitative definitions of fairness and bias, as noted by [Hutchinson and Mitchell \(2019\)](#) and [Weidinger et al. \(2022\)](#).

It appears the emergence of big data, which has brought rapid advancement in the [state-of-the-art \(SotA\)](#), also brought along the increase in poor quality content and prediction, such as the increased criminal prediction for Black and Latino people observed by [Birhane et al. \(2024a\)](#). Similar issues are observed across many domains, including healthcare, employment, forensics, criminal justice, credit scoring, and computational social science, among others ([Liang et al., 2021](#); [Ferrara, 2023](#); [Landers and Behrend, 2023](#); [Han, 2023](#)). According to [Wolfe et al. \(2023\)](#), the model VQGAN-

¹June 10, 2024

CLIP, similarly to Stable Diffusion, generated sexualized images for the harmless prompt "a 17 year old girl," 73% of the time. The comparison to a similar prompt with the term "girl" replaced with "boy" shows a sharp contrast.

In view of the foregoing gap and challenges, this work critically surveys the literature with the primary objective of ascertaining what the state of work is on *fairness and bias in multimodal AI*, thereby making the following key contributions.

1. We fill the gap with a comprehensive survey of fairness and bias across a wide spectrum of LMMs, LLMs, and multimodal datasets, providing 50 examples of datasets and models in a structured way, along with the challenges affecting them.
2. We identify a new category of quantifying bias (i.e. *preuse*), in addition to the two well-known ones in the literature: intrinsic and extrinsic (Ramesh et al., 2023; Cabello et al., 2023).
3. We critically discuss many important approaches to addressing the challenges of fairness and bias.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. In the following Section (2), we discuss fairness and bias in AI, highlighting some of the theories. In Section 3, we explain the method used for this survey. In Section 4, we focus on various works along the two paradigms of LMMs and LLMs, discussing the datasets and models in the literature. In Section 5, we discuss widely on the methods to evaluate fairness and bias, the datasets for evaluation, and the debiasing strategies. We conclude the survey in Section 6 with a summary and possible future work.

2 Fairness and Bias in AI

2.1 Concepts of Fairness and Bias

A discussion about every possible type of fairness or bias is beyond the scope of this study, however, we refer readers to Mehrabi et al. (2021) for some of the discussion. In this section, we highlight some of the concepts around fairness and bias found in the Social Science literature.

2.1.1 Justice Theory

The theory is regarded as a three-part framework of distributive, interactional, and procedural justice perceptions (Greenberg, 1990; Landers and

Behrend, 2023). Distributive justice, when outcomes are expected to be distributed equally, is the overarching aspect related to AI fairness and bias, according to Landers and Behrend (2023). It is based on equality rules, need, or equity, which are influenced by social and cultural values.

2.1.2 Equity Theory

Equity theory uses a unidimensional concept of fairness instead of multidimensional, according to Leventhal (1980). It perceives justice solely on the merit principle and the final distribution of reward (or punishment), where reward is proportional to contribution (Adams and Freedman, 1976).

2.1.3 Objectification Theory

Just as inanimate objects have no emotions or thoughts, objectification theory establishes a view of a subject as primarily without human characteristics, especially for women and girls (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997; Heflick et al., 2011; Andrighetto et al., 2019). The theory identifies sexual objectification bias, which is when the emotions or thoughts of a person are disregarded and one is treated as mere body parts for sex (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997; Wolfe et al., 2023).

2.2 Consequences & Legal Perspectives

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) confirms that objectification victimises the subject and may result in habitual body monitoring, thereby increasing mental health risks, sexual dysfunction, eating disorders, and depression. This unhealthy reality is also confirmed by Swim et al. (2001). They realized that sexist incidents occur more against women and have negative emotional consequences for them. Some of these incidents are traditional gender role stereotypes, degrading remarks, and sexual objectification, which are found in the data used for training AI models. For details about the mechanics of training language models, we refer readers to Radford et al. (2019) and Hoffmann et al. (2022). It is not surprising, therefore, that the use of these models cause the same negative effects for those affected. Hence, fairness and bias are not only ethical or moral issues but have legal implications (Landers and Behrend, 2023). In the United States (US), disparate treatment because of sensitive attributes is unlawful (Berry, 2015; Hutchinson and Mitchell, 2019; Meng et al., 2022). This is also the case in some other countries (Zafar et al., 2017).

3 Method

To address the gap identified earlier, our method involved the simple approach of filtered search on *Google scholar* with two slightly differently-worded phrases: (1) "*Fairness and Bias in Large Multimodal Models*" and (2) "*Fairness and Bias in Large Language Models*" and they returned 17,700 and 20,300 links,¹ respectively, over many pages. The search was filtered to the period 2014-2024 during which deep learning made significant progress. Apparently, there are fewer scientific papers on the former. We compare with "Language Models" only because these, with the introduction of the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017), have influenced computer vision (Yuan et al., 2021) and serve as core component for many multimodal AI.

We captured archived papers (e.g. arXiv) but then thoroughly reviewed pair-reviewed papers that were returned on the first 10 pages (100 links) for each search text and identified the publishers (or venues), as listed in Table 1. We note that the more relevant papers turn up on the first page of the search while the quality of results degrade as one progresses through the pages. From the Table, it can be observed that there are 36 pair-reviewed papers on multimodal compared to 39 on language, among the 200 papers. We note that Google Scholar sometimes returns the arXiv version of a paper instead of the peer-reviewed version, hence, it's very useful to include the data from arXiv. In total, 55 papers were published under multimodal compared to 88 for language. Each paper was reviewed for their contributions, including the datasets, models, possible solutions proffered on fairness and bias, and other relevant discussions.

4 Fairness and Bias in LLMs and LMMs

In this section we review some LMMs and LLMs and the fairness and bias challenges they have. Tables 2 and 3 summarize some relevant datasets and the models, respectively. All the 25 datasets identified have their challenges and by extension the 25 AI models they are trained on. Some of these challenges include stereotypes, porn, misogyny, racial, gender, religious, cultural, age, and demographic biases. It is commonly agreed AI models learn much of their bias from the data they are trained on and many datasets, especially those for pretraining, are from the Internet, which contains a diverse spectrum of content (Wolfe and Caliskan, 2022).

Table 1: Distribution of scientific papers (2014-2024)

#	Publisher	Multimodal	Language
1	IEEE	11	2
2	ELSEVIER	2	2
3	ACM	9	9
4	Springer	1	1
5	NeurIPS	4	8
6	Nature	3	1
7	MDPI	-	1
8	MLR	3	5
9	PKP	2	-
10	MIT Press	-	4
11	PubMed	1	-
12	Cambridge	-	1
13	Patterns	-	1
14	PLOS	-	1
15	JMLR	-	2
16	Science	-	1
	Sub-total	36	39
17	arXiv	19	49
	Total	55	88

4.1 LMMs

Wolfe et al. (2023) found evidence of sexual objectification bias in models based on *Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining (CLIP)*. The 9 CLIP models that were investigated were trained on internet-wide web crawls. CLIP is known to be quite accurate (Radford et al., 2021), however, it also appears to have scaled the biases inherent in its training data. Also, Wolfe and Caliskan (2022) found that more than Latino, Asian or Black, White persons are more associated with collective in-group words in embeddings from CLIP (Radford et al., 2021), SLIP (Mu et al., 2022), and BLIP (Li et al., 2022), as measured with EATs. For a definitive assessment, their work would have benefited from additional experiments involving data of people outside the United States (US), since they used *Chicago Face Database (CFD)* (Ma et al., 2015). CFD is a dataset of 597 people recruited in the U.S. Similarly, Teo et al. (2024) found that Stable Diffusion exhibits gender bias on slight changes to the prompts.

Besides work on text and text-visual multimodal systems or data, there are some work on audio-visual systems or data (Fenu and Marras, 2022). In the work by Fenu and Marras (2022), they perform comparative analysis on audio-visual speaker

Table 2: Summary of Some Datasets and Their Fairness & Bias Challenges (Data in the second part of the table are usually used in downstream tasks).

#	Dataset	Modality	Some Challenges
1	CommonCrawl (Raffel et al., 2020)	Text & Vision	Fake news, hate speech, porn & racism (Gehman et al., 2020; Luccioni and Viviano, 2021)
2	LAION-400M & 5B (Schuhmann et al., 2021, 2022)	Text & Vision	Misogyny, stereotypes & porn (Birhane et al., 2021, 2024b)
3	WebImageText (WIT) (Radford et al., 2021)	Text & Vision	Racial, gender biases (Radford et al., 2021)
4	DataComp (Gadre et al., 2024)	Text & Vision	Racial bias (Gadre et al., 2024)
5	WebLI (Chen et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	Age, racial, gender biases & stereotypes (Chen et al., 2022)
6	CC3M-35L (Thapliyal et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	Cultural bias (Thapliyal et al., 2022)
7	COCO-35L (Thapliyal et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	Cultural bias (Thapliyal et al., 2022)
8	WIT (Srinivasan et al., 2021)	Text & Vision	Cultural bias (Srinivasan et al., 2021)
9	Colossal Cleaned CommonCrawl (C4) (Raffel et al., 2020)	Text	Offensive language, racial bias (Raffel et al., 2020)
10	The Pile (Gao et al., 2020)	Text	Religious, racial, gender biases (Gao et al., 2020)
11	CCAligned (El-Kishky et al., 2020)	Text	Porn, racial bias (El-Kishky et al., 2020)
12	OpenAI WebText (Radford et al., 2019)	Text	Gender, racial biases (Gehman et al., 2020)
13	OpenWebText Corpus (OWTC)	Text	Gender, racial biases (Gehman et al., 2020)
14	ROOTS (Laurençon et al., 2022)	Text	Cultural bias (Laurençon et al., 2022)
15	VoxCeleb 1 (Nagrani et al., 2020)	Audio & Vision	Demographic, gender biases (Chung et al., 2018)
16	VoxCeleb 2 (Chung et al., 2018)	Audio & Vision	Demographic, gender biases (Chung et al., 2018)
17	First Impressions (Escalante et al., 2020)	Audio & Vision	Racial, gender biases (Yan et al., 2020)
18	XM3600 (Thapliyal et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	Cultural bias (Thapliyal et al., 2022)
19	VQA (Antol et al., 2015)	Text & Vision	Gender bias (Ruggeri and Nozza, 2023)
20	VQA 2 (Goyal et al., 2017)	Text & Vision	Gender bias (Ruggeri and Nozza, 2023)
21	MS COCO (Lin et al., 2014)	Text & Vision	Gender bias (Cabello et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2017)
22	Multi30K (Elliott et al., 2016)	Text & Vision	Racial bias (Wang et al., 2022)
23	MIMIC-IV (Johnson et al., 2023)	Text & Vision	Ethnic, racial, marital status biases (Meng et al., 2022)
24	MAB (Alkhaled et al., 2023)	Text	Racism, misogyny, stereotypes (Alkhaled et al., 2023; Pagliai et al., 2024)
25	Twitter corpus (Huang et al., 2020)	Text	Age, gender, racial biases (Huang et al., 2020)

recognition systems, using fusion at the model step. They found that the highest accuracy and the lowest disparity across groups are achieved compared to unimodal systems.

In other works, Peña et al. (2023) evaluated AI-based recruitment for multimodal data but in a fictitious case study, which may limit its generalizability in real-world applications. Booth et al. (2021) performed a case study of automated video interviews and found that combining more than one modality increases bias and reduces fairness, similarly to what happens when scaling crawled data for training models. Cabello et al. (2023) investigated fairness and bias in LMMs. Other researchers investigated the impact of multimodal data/models on personality assessment (Yan et al., 2020), cyberbullying (Alasadi et al., 2020), health records (Meng et al., 2022) and more (Birhane et al., 2021; Ferrara, 2023; Zhang et al., 2022)

4.2 LLMs

The introduction of the Generative Pretrained Transformer (GPT-2) (Radford et al., 2019) was a turning point in the LLM landscape with its 1.5B parameters. As pointed out earlier, training such a large model required a lot of data and the Internet-sourced WebText was used for this purpose. Updated versions of the dataset have also been used for its recent successors, including GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023). The attendant problems of bias witnessed in GPT-2 (Gehman et al., 2020) have followed successive versions.

Quantitative bias measurement in NLP may be placed into 3 categories: preuse, as carried out by Alkhaled et al. (2023) and Adewumi et al. (2023b), intrinsic (Caliskan et al., 2017; May et al., 2019), and extrinsic, as observed by Ramesh et al. (2023). The first, second and third involve quantifying bias in the training data, in the trained model’s representation, and in the outputs of the downstream

Table 3: Summary of Models and Some of Their Fairness & Bias Challenges. (*modified for audio-visual)

#	LMMs	Modality	Training Data	Some Challenges
1	VQGAN-CLIP (Crowson et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	WIT & ImageNet	Misogyny, racial bias (Pagliai et al., 2024; Wolfe and Caliskan, 2022)
2	DALL-E 2 (Ramesh et al., 2021)	Text & Vision	Conceptual Captions	Occupational stereotypes, gender bias (Ramesh et al., 2022; Mandal et al., 2023)
3	GLIDE (Nichol et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	WIT & Conceptual Captions	Gender stereotypes (Nichol et al., 2022)
4	Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	LAION-5B	Gender bias (Teo et al., 2024)
5	SLIP (Mu et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	YFCC100M	Racial bias (Wolfe and Caliskan, 2022)
6	CLIP (Radford et al., 2021)	Text & Vision	WIT	Racial bias (Radford et al., 2021; Wolfe and Caliskan, 2022)
7	BLIP (Li et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	MS COCO, Conceptual Captions & LAION-400M	Racial, gender & age biases (Wolfe and Caliskan, 2022; Ruggeri and Nozza, 2023)
8	PaliGemma	Text & Vision	WebLI, CC3M-35L, WIT	Porn, offensive language ²
9	PaLI-3 (Chen et al., 2022)	Text & Vision	WebLI	Age, racial, gender biases & stereotypes (Chen et al., 2022)
10	Falcon 2 (Almazrouei et al., 2023)	Text & Vision	RefinedWeb	Harmful content, cultural bias (Almazrouei et al., 2023)
11	BEiT (Wang et al., 2023)	Text & Vision	Conceptual 12M, ImageNet-21K, Wikipedia	Gender, cultural biases (Brinkmann et al., 2023)
12	LLaVA (Liu et al., 2024b,a)	Text & Vision	Conceptual Captions	Cultural bias (Liu et al., 2024b)
13	ResNet-50* (He et al., 2016)	Audio & Vision	ImageNet	Gender bias (Fenu and Marras, 2022)
14	GPT4o (Achiam et al., 2023)	Text, Audio & Vision	WebText, Github, etc	Stereotypes, racial bias (Aich et al., 2024)
	LLMs			
15	GPT3 (Brown et al., 2020)	Text	CommonCrawl & WebText	Gender, racial, religious biases (Brown et al., 2020; Gehman et al., 2020)
16	PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2024)	Text	Wikipedia, social media, Github	Occupation, gender, sexual, religious biases (Chowdhery et al., 2024)
17	LaMDA (Thoppilan et al., 2022)	Text	Social media & Wikipedia	Gender bias (Thoppilan et al., 2022)
18	GLaM (Du et al., 2022)	Text	Wikipedia & social media	Toxicity, gender bias (Du et al., 2022)
19	GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019)	Text	WebText	Sexual, racial, gender biases (Sheng et al., 2019; Gehman et al., 2020)
20	LLaMA-3	Text	web text & Github	Stereotypes, gender, racial, sexual, religious, biases (Aich et al., 2024; Touvron et al., 2023)
21	LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023)	Text	web text	Toxicity, gender, racial, sexual, religious, biases (Touvron et al., 2023)
22	CTRL (Keskar et al., 2019)	Text	Wikipedia, Project Gutenberg, Open-WebText	Gender, racial biases (Gehman et al., 2020)
23	Aurora-M (Nakamura et al., 2024)	Text	The Pile	Offensive language, religious, racial, gender biases (Gao et al., 2020; Nakamura et al., 2024)
24	Mixtral-8x7B (Jiang et al., 2024)	Text	web text	Stereotypes, racial, gender, occupational biases (Jiang et al., 2024; Aich et al., 2024)
25	BLOOM (Le Scao et al., 2023)	Text	ROOTS	Toxicity, gender, religious, disability, age biases (Le Scao et al., 2023)

task of the model, respectively. Far more work has focused on the latter two than the first and gender bias than other dimensions (Ramesh et al., 2023). For example, Delobelle et al. (2022) and Welbl et al. (2021) measured bias in pre-trained language models. Others have surveyed fairness and bias in LLMs (Bender et al., 2021; Meade et al., 2022;

Gallegos et al., 2023; Chang et al., 2024; Myers et al., 2024).

In other works, Schramowski et al. (2022) show that *moral directions*, i.e. what is morally right or wrong to do, are present in LLMs. It is, however, highly debatable if models can be considered moral agents. Also, Santurkar et al. (2023) ex-

explored whose opinions LLMs reflect. With regards to healthcare and bias, work has also been done (Harrer, 2023; Nashwan and Abujaber, 2023). In a collaborative effort, bench authors (2023) probed LLMs in the BIG-Bench of 200 tasks, including many that are related to bias.

Bias in multilingual AI: Some of the multimodal data in Table 2 contain multilingual data. Such result in multilingual models and embeddings. For example, CC3M-35L, COCO-35L, and WebLI, used to train PaLI. WebLI is a mix of pre-training tasks with texts in 109 languages (Chen et al., 2022). Some of these languages fall in the category of low-resource languages (Adewumi et al., 2023a). Kurpicz-Briki (2020) reports statistically significant bias in German word embeddings based on the origin of a name in relation to pleasant and unpleasant words, using WEAT (Caliskan et al., 2017). In the study by Wambsganss et al. (2022), they found that the pretrained German language models, GermanBERT, GermanT5, and German GPT-2, had substantial conceptual, racial, and gender bias. This was also confirmed by Kraft et al. (2022), who observed sexist stereotypes in some of the models (e.g. family- and care-related terms related to female while crime and perpetrators related to male). Similarly, for Dutch, Delobelle et al. (2020) investigated gender and occupation biases in RobBERT (a Dutch RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019)), through a template-based association test (Kurita et al., 2019; May et al., 2019). Huang et al. (2020) also identified biases related to people’s origin and age in Italian, English, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish, using a Twitter corpus.

5 Discussion

Although there are many limitations or risks of multimodal AI or LLMs (Acosta et al., 2022; Adewumi et al., 2024b; Pettersson et al., 2024; Adewumi et al., 2024a), perhaps, the issue of fairness and bias rank among the topmost (Mehrabi et al., 2021). In addition, in the taxonomy of 21 risks of language models provided by Weidinger et al. (2022), the first category is "Discrimination, Hate speech and Exclusion". Given, the recurring challenges in this regard, we are of the view that existing tools for evaluating or handling fairness and bias in these systems need to be improved (Zhao et al., 2018; Rudinger et al., 2018). It may be almost impossible to automatically filter a dataset or debias a model to be 100% free of unfair, bias or toxic content

but the research community and other stakeholders may need to determine what levels are acceptable and if it should be a requirement to have human-in-the-loop methods. In this section, we discuss further methods to audit or evaluate fairness and bias, datasets for such evaluation, and debiasing strategies. We hope that such discussion will spur more researchers and stakeholders to see the critical importance of AI that is fair and free, as much as possible, from bias.

5.1 Methods to audit, measure, and evaluate fairness and bias

Embedding Association Tests (EATs) have been used in several studies (Caliskan et al., 2017; Kurpicz-Briki, 2020; Wolfe et al., 2023), starting with the introduction of Word Embedding Association Test (WEAT) by Caliskan et al. (2017) and improvements in Sentence Embedding Association Test (SEAT) (May et al., 2019) and Relational Inner Product Association (RIPA) (Ethayarajh et al., 2019). Despite its widespread use, WEAT has the disadvantage that it may systematically overestimate the bias in a model. Another embedding evaluation method is cosine similarity. It was used for zero-shot classification by Radford et al. (2021). It may also be used to audit fairness and bias by evaluating the similarity in image and text embeddings (Wolfe et al., 2023). The visual tool, Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (GRAD-CAM), generates a saliency map, which shows the most relevant regions of an image for given attributes (Selvaraju et al., 2017; Wolfe et al., 2023). In an evaluation carried out by Wolfe et al. (2023), they discovered that the computed average saliency maps included only face regions for non-objectified images but both face and chest regions for objectified images, in a possible indication of sexual objectification bias. Not Safe For Work (NSFW) detector uses a tag alongside each image for filtering undesirable content (Schuhmann et al., 2021; Birhane et al., 2024b)

A recent metric introduced by Alkhaled et al. (2023) is *bipol*. It uses a two-step procedure in estimating bias in data (Adewumi et al., 2023b; Pagliai et al., 2024). Bipol has the weakness that if the bias classifier is not accurate enough, false positives will weaken the evaluation score. Another measure is Area Under the Curve (AUC), as used by Meng et al. (2022) in the investigation of algorithmic fairness of mortality prediction, where they

noted that **Machine Learning (ML)** methods obtain lower scores, usually, when it involves groups with higher mortality rates. [Teo et al. \(2024\)](#) proposed **Classifier Error-Aware Measurement (CLEAM)**, a framework for better performance in bias estimation, while [Booth et al. \(2021\)](#) measured gender bias using accuracy of Spearman rank-based correlation (ρ). Furthermore, [Nozza et al. \(2021\)](#) introduced the score “*HONEST*”, which was tested with respect to gender bias in text generation in 6 languages: Italian, French, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish and English. It measures the probability that a language model will output hurtful text given a certain template and lexicon.

5.2 Datasets for Bias Evaluation

Different datasets have been introduced for bias evaluation. [Esiobu et al. \(2023\)](#) introduced 2 novel datasets *AdvPromptSet* and *HolisticBiasR*, with which they evaluated 12 demographic dimensions for different LLMs. [Ruzzante et al. \(2022\)](#) introduced **Sexual OBjectification and EMotion Database (SOBEM)** for sexual objectification bias studies. It consists of 280 pictures of objectified and non-objectified female models with 3 different emotions and a neutral face. **Bias Benchmark for QA (BBQ)** is a question-sets dataset that employs templates crafted to reflect specific biases identified in society. It was introduced by [Parrish et al., 2022](#) and aims to expose implicit prejudices that may exist against individuals from legally protected categories. *BEAVERTAILS* was introduced by [Ji et al. \(2024\)](#). It assesses question-answer pairs, tested on LLMs, with regards to 14 different harm categories, which are not exclusive. *Discrimination, Stereotype, Injustice* make up the second category in the list. Additional datasets for bias evaluation include *RedditBias* by [Barikeri et al. \(2021\)](#), *Real-ToxicityPrompts*, which comprises of 100K English sentences ([Gehman et al., 2020](#)), *HarmfulQ* for zero-shot **Chain of Thought (CoT)** across stereotype benchmarks and harmful questions ([Shaikh et al., 2023](#)), and *Bold* ([Dhamala et al., 2021](#)).

5.3 Debiasing strategies on data, algorithms, procedures

5.3.1 Curate over Crawl

One important method to address bias in datasets will be to *curate over crawl*. This is especially so because web crawling has been the popular approach to getting internet data in the shortest possi-

ble time ([Birhane et al., 2021](#)). The assumption of *scale beats noise* is the rationale for this approach by some researchers ([Jia et al., 2021](#)). Unfortunately, this misconception about scaling does not only scale the quality part of the dataset but the noise along with it, no matter how small, as shown by [Birhane et al. \(2024b\)](#) when they observed 12% increase in hate content due to scaling. Clearly, despite the advantage of curation, one hurdle to overcome with the *curate over crawl* approach will be the issue of scaling.

5.3.2 Counterfactual Data Augmentation (CDA)

[Zhao et al. \(2018\)](#) used CDA to show that it removes bias with minimal performance degradation on coreference benchmarks when combined with existing word-embedding debiasing methods. It involves generating alternate examples of what exists (counterfactual) of data points to counter or mitigate bias. This method has gained attention in the field ([Meade et al., 2022](#); [Barikeri et al., 2021](#)).

5.3.3 Improved Filtering

It has been shown that poor filtering during the data creation process allows low quality data in the final dataset ([Birhane et al., 2024a](#)). It may not be possible to automatically filter large data to be 100% fit for purpose but improving the existing methods of filtering will go a long way in mitigating bias.

5.3.4 Other strategies

Oversampling under-represented groups in the data has been advocated by [Buolamwini and Gebru \(2018\)](#). There are generation detoxifying methods with the potential to reduce bias ([Gehman et al., 2020](#)). These include data-based further pretraining and decoding-based generation. Similarly, [Cabello et al. \(2023\)](#) showed that continued pretraining on gender-neutral data improves fairness by reducing group disparities in some language-vision tasks. In another work, [Yan et al. \(2020\)](#) used adversarial learning. They added a discriminator to jointly learn with the predictor for the sensitive attributes. Meanwhile, [Zayed et al. \(2024\)](#) addressed fairness by pruning in LLMs while [Guo et al. \(2022\)](#) introduced auto-bias, by directly probing the biases in pretrained models through prompts. [Liang et al. \(2021\)](#) introduced the **Autoregressive Iterative Nullspace Projection (A-INLP)** method to carry out post-hoc debiasing on LLMs. Additionally, there are Self-Debias ([Schick et al., 2021](#)), Hard-Debias

(Bolukbasi et al., 2016), SentenceDebias (Liang et al., 2020) and Dropout methods (Webster et al., 2020; Meade et al., 2022)

6 Conclusion

Fairness and bias are very important considerations in multimodal AI. In this work, we presented the challenges of fairness and bias in multimodal data, LMMs, and LLMs, defining what both terms mean within the scope of this survey, while acknowledging other definitions in the literature. We discussed the concepts of fairness and bias from the perspective of the Social Science and showed the distribution of scientific publications across 17 publishers, which reveals the gap of study in large multimodal AI compared to LLMs, which this work contributes to filling. Our discussion around the methods to measure fairness and bias, datasets for evaluation, and debiasing strategies will provide researchers and other stakeholders with insight on how to approach these issues. For future work, it will be worthwhile to re-evaluate the progress made with the metrics and tools for quantifying and mitigating fairness and bias concerns, respectively.

Acknowledgements

This work is funded by the EU HumaneAI Project. The work is partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP), funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation and counterpart funding from Luleå University of Technology (LTU).

References

- 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*.
- Julián N Acosta, Guido J Falcone, Pranav Rajpurkar, and Eric J Topol. 2022. Multimodal biomedical ai. *Nature Medicine*, 28(9):1773–1784.
- J Stacy Adams and Sara Freedman. 1976. Equity theory revisited: Comments and annotated bibliography. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 9:43–90.
- Tosin Adewumi, Mofetoluwa Adeyemi, Aremu Anuoluwapo, Bukola Peters, Happy Buzaaba, Oyerinde Samuel, Amina Mardiyyah Rufai, Benjamin Ajibade, Tajudeen Gwadabe, Mory Moussou Koulibaly Traore, et al. 2023a. Afriwoz: Corpus for exploiting cross-lingual transfer for dialogue generation in low-resource, african languages. In *2023 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- Tosin Adewumi, Nudrat Habib, Lama Alkhaled, and Elisa Barney. 2024a. Instruction makes a difference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00453*.
- Tosin Adewumi, Nudrat Habib, Lama Alkhaled, and Elisa Barney. 2024b. On the limitations of large language models (llms): False attribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04631*.
- Tosin Adewumi, Foteini Liwicki, and Marcus Liwicki. 2022. State-of-the-art in open-domain conversational ai: A survey. *Information*, 13(6):298.
- Tosin Adewumi, Isabella Södergren, Lama Alkhaled, Sana Al-azzawi, Foteini Simistira Liwicki, and Marcus Liwicki. 2023b. Bipol: Multi-axes evaluation of bias with explainability in benchmark datasets. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–10, Varna, Bulgaria. INCOMA Ltd., Shoumen, Bulgaria.
- Ankit Aich, Tingting Liu, Salvatore Giorgi, Kelsey Isman, Lyle Ungar, and Brenda Curtis. 2024. Vernacular? i barely know her: Challenges with style control and stereotyping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12679*.
- Jamal Alasadi, Ramanathan Arunachalam, Pradeep K Atrey, and Vivek K Singh. 2020. A fairness-aware fusion framework for multimodal cyberbullying detection. In *2020 IEEE Sixth International Conference on Multimedia Big Data (BigMM)*, pages 166–173. IEEE.
- Lama Alkhaled, Tosin Adewumi, and Sana Sabah Sabry. 2023. Bipol: A novel multi-axes bias evaluation metric with explainability for nlp. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, 4:100030.
- Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Mérouane Debbah, Étienne Goffinet, Daniel Hessel, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, et al. 2023. The falcon series of open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867*.
- Luca Andrighetto, Fabrizio Bracco, Carlo Chiorri, Michele Masini, Marcello Passarelli, and Tommaso Francesco Piccinno. 2019. Now you see me, now you don’t: Detecting sexual objectification through a change blindness paradigm. *Cognitive Processing*, 20:419–429.
- Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433.
- Soumya Barikeri, Anne Lauscher, Ivan Vulić, and Goran Glavaš. 2021. RedditBias: A real-world resource for bias evaluation and debiasing of conversational language models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual*

- Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1941–1955, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- BIG bench authors. 2023. [Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- 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*, pages 610–623.
- Christopher M Berry. 2015. Differential validity and differential prediction of cognitive ability tests: Understanding test bias in the employment context. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.*, 2(1):435–463.
- Abeba Birhane, Sepehr Dehdashtian, Vinay Prabhu, and Vishnu Boddeti. 2024a. The dark side of dataset scaling: Evaluating racial classification in multimodal models. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1229–1244.
- Abeba Birhane, Sanghyun Han, Vishnu Boddeti, Sasha Luccioni, et al. 2024b. Into the laion’s den: Investigating hate in multimodal datasets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Abeba Birhane, Vinay Uday Prabhu, and Emmanuel Kahembwe. 2021. Multimodal datasets: misogyny, pornography, and malignant stereotypes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01963*.
- Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T Kalai. 2016. Man is to computer programmer as woman is to home-maker? debiasing word embeddings. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Brandon M Booth, Louis Hickman, Shree Krishna Subburaj, Louis Tay, Sang Eun Woo, and Sidney K D’Mello. 2021. Bias and fairness in multimodal machine learning: A case study of automated video interviews. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, pages 268–277.
- Jannik Brinkmann, Paul Swoboda, and Christian Bartelt. 2023. A multidimensional analysis of social biases in vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4914–4923.
- 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*, 33:1877–1901.
- Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*, pages 77–91. PMLR.
- Laura Cabello, Emanuele Bugliarello, Stephanie Brandl, and Desmond Elliott. 2023. [Evaluating bias and fairness in gender-neutral pretrained vision-and-language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8465–8483, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186.
- 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):1–45.
- Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Soravit Changpinyo, AJ Piergiovanni, Piotr Padlewski, Daniel Salz, Sebastian Goodman, Adam Grycner, Basil Mustafa, Lucas Beyer, et al. 2022. Pali: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06794*.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pilla, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2024. Palm: scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24(1).
- Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Zisserman. 2018. Voxceleb2: Deep speaker recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05622*.
- Katherine Crowson, Stella Biderman, Daniel Kornis, Dashiell Stander, Eric Hallahan, Louis Castricato, and Edward Raff. 2022. [Vqgan-clip: Open domain image generation and editing with natural language guidance](#). In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2022*:

- 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, *Proceedings, Part XXXVII*, page 88–105, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Pieter Delobelle, Ewoenam 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: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1693–1706, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pieter Delobelle, Thomas Winters, and Bettina Berendt. 2020. [RobBERT: a Dutch RoBERTa-based Language Model](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3255–3265, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jwala Dhamala, Tony Sun, Varun Kumar, Satyapriya Krishna, Yada Pruksachatkun, Kai-Wei Chang, and Rahul Gupta. 2021. [Bold: Dataset and metrics for measuring biases in open-ended language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 862–872.
- Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Andrew M Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun, Yanqi Zhou, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, et al. 2022. [Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5547–5569. PMLR.
- Ahmed El-Kishky, Vishrav Chaudhary, Francisco Guzmán, and Philipp Koehn. 2020. [CCAligned: A massive collection of cross-lingual web-document pairs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5960–5969, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Desmond Elliott, Stella Frank, Khalil Sima’an, and Lucia Specia. 2016. [Multi30K: Multilingual English-German image descriptions](#). In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Vision and Language*, pages 70–74, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Jair Escalante, Heysem Kaya, Albert Ali Salah, Sergio Escalera, Yagmur Gucluturk, Umut Güçlü, Xavier Baró, Isabelle Guyon, Julio Jacques Junior, Meysam Madadi, et al. 2020. [Explaining first impressions: Modeling, recognizing, and explaining apparent personality from videos](#). *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*.
- David Esiobu, Xiaoqing Tan, Saghar Hosseini, Megan Ung, Yuchen Zhang, Jude Fernandes, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Eleonora Presani, Adina Williams, and Eric Smith. 2023. [ROBBIE: Robust bias evaluation of large generative language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3764–3814, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, David Duvenaud, and Graeme Hirst. 2019. [Understanding undesirable word embedding associations](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1696–1705, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gianni Fenu and Mirko Marras. 2022. [Demographic fairness in multimodal biometrics: A comparative analysis on audio-visual speaker recognition systems](#). *Procedia Computer Science*, 198:249–254.
- Emilio Ferrara. 2023. [Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies](#). *Sci*, 6(1):3.
- Eric Frankel and Edward Vendrow. 2020. [Fair generation through prior modification](#). In *32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018)*.
- Barbara L Fredrickson and Tomi-Ann Roberts. 1997. [Objectification theory: Toward understanding women’s lived experiences and mental health risks](#). *Psychology of women quarterly*, 21(2):173–206.
- Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Gabriel Ilharco, Alex Fang, Jonathan Hayase, Georgios Smyrnis, Thao Nguyen, Ryan Marten, Mitchell Wortsman, Dhruva Ghosh, Jieyu Zhang, et al. 2024. [Datacomp: In search of the next generation of multimodal datasets](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- 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*.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. 2020. [The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*.
- Samuel Gehman, Suchin Gururangan, Maarten Sap, Yejin Choi, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. [RealToxicityPrompts: Evaluating neural toxic degeneration in language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3356–3369, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2017. [Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6904–6913.
- Jerald Greenberg. 1990. [Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow](#). *Journal of management*, 16(2):399–432.

- Yue Guo, Yi Yang, and Ahmed Abbasi. 2022. [Auto-debias: Debiasing masked language models with automated biased prompts](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1012–1023, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuchen Han. 2023. Fairness evaluation within large language models through the lens of depression. In *Proceedings of the 2023 4th International Conference on Machine Learning and Computer Application*, pages 108–112.
- Stefan Harrer. 2023. Attention is not all you need: the complicated case of ethically using large language models in healthcare and medicine. *EBioMedicine*, 90.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778.
- Nathan A Heflick, Jamie L Goldenberg, Douglas P Cooper, and Elisa Puvia. 2011. From women to objects: Appearance focus, target gender, and perceptions of warmth, morality and competence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(3):572–581.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30016–30030.
- Xiaolei Huang, Linzi Xing, Franck Dernoncourt, and Michael J. Paul. 2020. [Multilingual Twitter corpus and baselines for evaluating demographic bias in hate speech recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1440–1448, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Ben Hutchinson and Margaret Mitchell. 2019. 50 years of test (un) fairness: Lessons for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 49–58.
- Jiaming Ji, Mickel Liu, Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, Chi Zhang, Ce Bian, Boyuan Chen, Ruiyang Sun, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. 2024. Beavertails: Towards improved safety alignment of llm via a human-preference dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*.
- Alistair EW Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J Pollard, Sicheng Hao, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, et al. 2023. Mimic-iv, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific data*, 10(1):1.
- Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Lav R Varshney, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858*.
- Angelie Kraft, Hans-Peter Zorn, Pascal Fecht, Judith Simon, Chris Biemann, and Ricardo Usbeck. 2022. Measuring gender bias in german language generation. *INFORMATIK 2022*.
- Keita Kurita, Nidhi Vyas, Ayush Pareek, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. [Measuring bias in contextualized word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pages 166–172, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mascha Kurpicz-Briki. 2020. Cultural differences in bias? origin and gender bias in pre-trained german and french word embeddings.
- Richard N Landers and Tara S Behrend. 2023. Auditing the ai auditors: A framework for evaluating fairness and bias in high stakes ai predictive models. *American Psychologist*, 78(1):36.
- Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Thomas Wang, Christopher Akiki, Albert Villanova del Moral, Teven Le Scao, Leandro Von Werra, Chenghao Mou, Eduardo González Ponferrada, Huu Nguyen, et al. 2022. The bigscience roots corpus: A 1.6 tb composite multilingual dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31809–31826.
- 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.
- Gerald S Leventhal. 1980. What should be done with equity theory? new approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research*, pages 27–55. Springer.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. 2022. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR.
- Paul Pu Liang, Irene Mengze Li, Emily Zheng, Yao Chong Lim, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2020. [Towards debiasing sentence](#)

- representations. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5502–5515, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul Pu Liang, Chiyu Wu, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2021. Towards understanding and mitigating social biases in language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6565–6576. PMLR.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024a. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26296–26306.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024b. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36.
- 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*.
- Alexandra Luccioni and Joseph Viviano. 2021. What’s in the box? an analysis of undesirable content in the common crawl corpus. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 182–189.
- Debbie S Ma, Joshua Correll, and Bernd Wittenbrink. 2015. The chicago face database: A free stimulus set of faces and norming data. *Behavior research methods*, 47:1122–1135.
- Abhishek Mandal, Susan Leavy, and Suzanne Little. 2023. Measuring bias in multimodal models: Multimodal composite association score. In *International Workshop on Algorithmic Bias in Search and Recommendation*, pages 17–30. Springer.
- Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel R. Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. 2019. On measuring social biases in sentence encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 622–628, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicholas Meade, Elinor Poole-Dayana, and Siva Reddy. 2022. An empirical survey of the effectiveness of debiasing techniques for pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1878–1898, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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):1–35.
- Chuizheng Meng, Loc Trinh, Nan Xu, James Enouen, and Yan Liu. 2022. Interpretability and fairness evaluation of deep learning models on mimic-iv dataset. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):7166.
- Norman Mu, Alexander Kirillov, David Wagner, and Saining Xie. 2022. Slip: Self-supervision meets language-image pre-training. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXVI*, page 529–544, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Devon Myers, Rami Mohawesh, Venkata Ishwarya Chellaboina, Anantha Lakshmi Sathvik, Praveen Venkatesh, Yi-Hui Ho, Hanna Henshaw, Muna Alhawawreh, David Berdik, and Yaser Jararweh. 2024. Foundation and large language models: fundamentals, challenges, opportunities, and social impacts. *Cluster Computing*, 27(1):1–26.
- Arsha Nagrani, Joon Son Chung, Weidi Xie, and Andrew Senior. 2020. Voxceleb: Large-scale speaker verification in the wild. *Computer Speech & Language*, 60:101027.
- Taishi Nakamura, Mayank Mishra, Simone Tedeschi, Yekun Chai, Jason T Stillerman, Felix Friedrich, Praatek Yadav, Tanmay Laud, Vu Minh Chien, Terry Yue Zhuo, et al. 2024. Aurora-m: The first open source multilingual language model red-teamed according to the us executive order. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00399*.
- Abdulqadir J Nashwan and Ahmad A Abujaber. 2023. Harnessing large language models in nursing care planning: opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. *Cureus*, 15(6).
- Alexander Quinn Nichol, Prafulla Dhariwal, Aditya Ramesh, Pranav Shyam, Pamela Mishkin, Bob McGrew, Ilya Sutskever, and Mark Chen. 2022. GLIDE: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 16784–16804. PMLR.
- Debora Nozza, Federico Bianchi, and Dirk Hovy. 2021. Honest: Measuring hurtful sentence completion in language models. In *The 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Irene Pagliai, Goya van Boven, Tosin Adewumi, Lama Alkhaled, Namrata Gurung, Isabella Södergren, and Elisa Barney. 2024. Data bias according to bipolar: Men are naturally right and it is the role of women to follow their lead. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04838*.
- Alicia Parrish, Angelica Chen, Nikita Nangia, Vishakh Padmakumar, Jason Phang, Jana Thompson, Phu Mon Htut, and Samuel Bowman. 2022. **BBQ: A hand-built bias benchmark for question answering**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2086–2105, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alejandro Peña, Ignacio Serna, Aythami Morales, Julian Fierrez, Alfonso Ortega, Ainhoa Herrarte, Manuel Alcantara, and Javier Ortega-Garcia. 2023. Human-centric multimodal machine learning: Recent advances and testbed on ai-based recruitment. *SN Computer Science*, 4(5):434.
- Jenny Pettersson, Elias Hult, Tim Eriksson, and Tosin Adewumi. 2024. Generative ai and teachers—for us or against us? a case study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03486*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- 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):9.
- 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):1–67.
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. 2022. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 1(2):3.
- Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8821–8831. Pmlr.
- Krithika Ramesh, Sunayana Sitaram, and Monojit Choudhury. 2023. **Fairness in language models beyond English: Gaps and challenges**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 2106–2119, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695.
- Rachel Rudinger, Jason Naradowsky, Brian Leonard, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. **Gender bias in coreference resolution**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 8–14, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gabriele Ruggeri and Debora Nozza. 2023. **A multi-dimensional study on bias in vision-language models**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6445–6455, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniela Ruzante, Bianca Monachesi, Noemi Orabona, and Jeroen Vaes. 2022. The sexual objectification and emotion database: A free stimulus set and norming data of sexually objectified and non-objectified female targets expressing multiple emotions. *Behavior Research Methods*, pages 1–15.
- Shibani Santurkar, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Cino Lee, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Whose opinions do language models reflect? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 29971–30004. PMLR.
- Janice Scheuneman. 1979. A method of assessing bias in test items. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, pages 143–152.
- Timo Schick, Sahana Udupa, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Self-diagnosis and self-debiasing: A proposal for reducing corpus-based bias in nlp. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1408–1424.
- Patrick Schramowski, Cigdem Turan, Nico Andersen, Constantin A Rothkopf, and Kristian Kersting. 2022. Large pre-trained language models contain human-like biases of what is right and wrong to do. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(3):258–268.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. 2022. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. 2021. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02114*.
- Ramprasaath R. Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh,

- and Dhruv Batra. 2017. [Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization](#). In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 618–626.
- Omar Shaikh, Hongxin Zhang, William Held, Michael Bernstein, and Diyi Yang. 2023. [On second thought, let’s not think step by step! bias and toxicity in zero-shot reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4454–4470, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Sheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Premkumar Natarajan, and Nanyun Peng. 2019. [The woman worked as a babysitter: On biases in language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3407–3412, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Krishna Srinivasan, Karthik Raman, Jiecao Chen, Michael Bendersky, and Marc Najork. 2021. [Wit: Wikipedia-based image text dataset for multimodal multilingual machine learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR ’21*, page 2443–2449, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Janet K Swim, Lauri L Hyers, Laurie L Cohen, and Melissa J Ferguson. 2001. Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1):31–53.
- Christopher Teo, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-Man Man Cheung. 2024. [On measuring fairness in generative models](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Ashish V. Thapliyal, Jordi Pont Tuset, Xi Chen, and Radu Soricut. 2022. [Crossmodal-3600: A massively multilingual multimodal evaluation dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 715–729, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. [Lamda: Language models for dialog applications](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- 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.
- Thiemo Wambsganss, Vinitra Swamy, Roman Ritsche, and Tanja Käser. 2022. [Bias at a second glance: A deep dive into bias for german educational peer-review data modeling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10335*.
- Jialu Wang, Yang Liu, and Xin Wang. 2022. [Assessing multilingual fairness in pre-trained multimodal representations](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2681–2695, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhui Wang, Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Johan Bjorck, Zhiliang Peng, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Owais Khan Mohammed, Saksham Singhal, Subhojit Som, et al. 2023. [Image as a foreign language: Beit pretraining for vision and vision-language tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19175–19186.
- 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*.
- Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, et al. 2022. [Taxonomy of risks posed by language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 214–229.
- Johannes Welbl, Amelia Glaese, Jonathan Uesato, Sumanth Dathathri, John Mellor, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kirsty Anderson, Pushmeet Kohli, Ben Coppin, and Po-Sen Huang. 2021. [Challenges in detoxifying language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2447–2469, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robert Wolfe and Aylin Caliskan. 2022. [American==white in multimodal language-and-image ai](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 800–812.
- Robert Wolfe, Yiwei Yang, Bill Howe, and Aylin Caliskan. 2023. [Contrastive language-vision ai models pretrained on web-scraped multimodal data exhibit sexual objectification bias](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1174–1185.
- Shen Yan, Di Huang, and Mohammad Soleymani. 2020. [Mitigating biases in multimodal personality assessment](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, pages 361–369.

- Li Yuan, Yunpeng Chen, Tao Wang, Weihao Yu, Yujun Shi, Zi-Hang Jiang, Francis EH Tay, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. 2021. Tokens-to-token vit: Training vision transformers from scratch on imagenet. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 558–567.
- Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. 2017. Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1171–1180.
- Abdelrahman Zayed, Gonçalo Mordido, Samira Shabani, Ioana Baldini, and Sarath Chandar. 2024. Fairness-aware structured pruning in transformers. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 22484–22492.
- Yi Zhang, Junyang Wang, and Jitao Sang. 2022. Counterfactually measuring and eliminating social bias in vision-language pre-training models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 4996–5004.
- Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2017. [Men also like shopping: Reducing gender bias amplification using corpus-level constraints](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2979–2989, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. [Gender bias in coreference resolution: Evaluation and debiasing methods](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 15–20, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.