

---

# VISION-LANGUAGE MODELS REPRESENT DARKER-SKINNED BLACK INDIVIDUALS AS MORE HOMOGENEOUS THAN LIGHTER-SKINNED BLACK INDIVIDUALS

---

**Messi H.J. Lee**

Division of Computational and Data Sciences  
Washington University in St. Louis  
St. Louis, MO 63130  
hojunlee@wustl.edu

**Soyeon Jeon**

Department of Political Science  
Washington University in St. Louis  
St. Louis, MO 63130  
j.soyeon@wustl.edu

December 16, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Vision-Language Models (VLMs) combine Large Language Model (LLM) capabilities with image processing, enabling tasks like image captioning and text-to-image generation. Yet concerns persist about their potential to amplify human-like biases, including skin tone bias. Skin tone bias, where darker-skinned individuals face more negative stereotyping than lighter-skinned individuals, is well-documented in the social sciences but remains under-explored in Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly in VLMs. While well-documented in the social sciences, this bias remains under-explored in AI, particularly in VLMs. Using the GAN Face Database, we sampled computer-generated images of Black American men and women, controlling for skin tone variations while keeping other features constant. We then asked VLMs to write stories about these faces and compared the homogeneity of the generated stories. Stories generated by VLMs about darker-skinned Black individuals were more homogeneous than those about lighter-skinned individuals in three of four models, and Black women were consistently represented more homogeneously than Black men across all models. Interaction effects revealed a greater impact of skin tone on women in two VLMs, while the other two showed nonsignificant results, reflecting known stereotyping patterns. These findings underscore the propagation of biases from single-modality AI systems to multimodal models and highlight the need for further research to address intersectional biases in AI.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs), such as GPT-4, have rapidly advanced the fields of natural language understanding and generation, enabling applications in areas like automated content creation and decision support. These models are trained on extensive collections of text, providing them with remarkable capabilities in a wide array of language-related tasks. Vision-Language Models (VLMs) represent a step further in this technological advancement, integrating LLM capabilities with image processing tasks from image captioning to text-to-image generation.

With advancements of Large- and Vision-Language Models, concerns about their potential to reproduce and amplify human biases have intensified. LLMs, for instance, often generate text aligned with group-based stereotypes [e.g., Abid et al., 2021, Lucy and Bamman, 2021]. Recent studies have extended this inquiry to VLMs, revealing that these models produce stereotypical captions and answers for image inputs [Zhou et al., 2022, Zhao et al., 2021] and generating biased images, such as lighter-skinned men as software developers and darker-skinned women as housekeepers [e.g., Bianchi et al., 2023, Naik and Nushi, 2023, Sun et al., 2023, Sami et al., 2023].

## 1.1 Homogeneity Bias in AI Models

Another form of stereotyping documented in AI models is homogeneity bias—the tendency of AI systems to represent certain groups as more uniform than others. Rooted in social psychology, this phenomenon relates to the *out-group homogeneity effect*, where individuals perceive their own group (in-group) as more diverse than other groups (out-group) [Linville et al., 1989, Quattrone and Jones, 1980].

Lee et al. [2024] explored whether a state-of-the-art LLM reproduces similar biases, examining how group status affects the homogeneity of group representations. They found that ChatGPT generated more uniform texts for racial/ethnic minority groups and women compared to the racial/ethnic majority group in the US (i.e., White Americans) and men. They suggested that disproportionate representation and stereotypical portrayals of marginalized groups in training data may lead LLMs to replicate this pattern of human stereotyping. Similarly, Cheng et al. [2023] found that texts about marginalized groups often exaggerate defining characteristics, resulting in more caricature-like representations.

These findings align with broader research on stereotyping and erasure in Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems, which highlights minimal representation and stereotypical portrayals of marginalized groups, leading to erasure—the failure to adequately represent the diversity and richness of an identity [Dev et al., 2022]. For example, prior work has shown that contextualized word embeddings failed to provide meaningful representations for non-binary gender pronouns in the embedding space [Dev et al., 2021]. Biases like these can perpetuate societal inequalities by reinforcing misrepresentation and stereotypes about marginalized groups. Furthermore, as these models become pervasive in everyday life, they risk wrongly influencing user perceptions. Evidence suggests that AI biases can shape attitudes and decision-making [e.g., Fisher et al., 2024], making homogeneity bias in AI models concerning for its potential to reinforce skewed perceptions and erasure.

## 1.2 Skin Tone Bias

Skin tone bias refers to prejudiced attitudes or discriminatory behaviors directed toward individuals within a racial group based on their skin tone [Maddox, 2004, Maddox and Gray, 2002]. Research in this area has predominantly focused on perceptions of Black individuals, showing that darker-skinned Black individuals are more likely to be associated with negative traits compared to lighter-skinned Black individuals [e.g., Berumen Martinez, 2021, Stepanova and Strube, 2018, Kahn and Davies, 2011, Lynn, 2002, Maddox and Gray, 2002].

This bias also has significant real-world consequences. For example, darker-skinned Black individuals receive lower ratings and fewer job offers in hiring scenarios [Wade et al., 2004, Harrison and Thomas, 2009], achieve lower levels of educational attainment and income [Keith and Herring, 1991], experience greater racial discrimination [Klonoff and Landrine, 2000], and report higher levels of mental distress due to discrimination [Gleiberman et al., 1995]. Overall, skin tone plays a critical role in shaping both perceptions and life outcomes for Black individuals in the United States.

## 1.3 This Work

While substantial research in the social sciences has examined the impact of skin tone on social perceptions and real-world outcomes, relatively few studies have addressed skin tone bias in Artificial Intelligence (AI) models, particularly in Vision-Language Models (VLMs). Seminal work by Buolamwini and Gebu [2018] revealed that commercial gender-classification systems perform significantly better for lighter-skinned individuals. While much subsequent research has investigated the impact of skin tone on machine learning model performance [e.g., Groh et al., 2024, Kinyanjui et al., 2019], the topic of skin tone bias in newer generative models (e.g., VLMs) remains relatively under-explored.

Skin tone bias in Vision-Language Models (VLMs) carries significant implications. As VLMs increasingly contribute to the production of social information and creative content, they may generate more stereotypical texts in response to images of darker-skinned individuals compared to lighter-skinned individuals. Research shows that repeated exposure to stereotypes in social information can reinforce societal biases [Park et al., 2007, Saleem et al., 2017], suggesting that if VLMs perpetuate skin tone bias, they could exacerbate the very inequities that led to the bias in their training data. Moreover, as VLMs and other generative models are increasingly deployed in decision-making contexts, such biases could amplify discrimination in real-world outcomes.

We explored the topic of skin tone bias in VLMs through the lens of homogeneity bias, investigating how skin tone is associated with homogeneity of group representations. Our study was informed by hypotheses and research questions grounded in the social psychology literature on skin tone bias. Based on extensive evidence of the role of skin tone in stereotyping, we hypothesized that stories about darker-skinned Black individuals would exhibit greater homogeneity than those about lighter-skinned Black individuals. To test this, we encoded VLM-generated stories into sentence embeddings and measured their pairwise cosine similarity, following the method introduced by Lee et al. [2024]. A mixed-effects model was then fitted with skin tone, derived from the images, as the only predictor. Additionally, we




Figure 1: Summary of the experimental setup. We collect 50-word stories about Black individuals differing in skin tone using four state-of-the-art Vision-Language Models. After encoding these stories into sentence embeddings, we compare the pairwise similarity of the embeddings using mixed-effects models.

investigated the interaction between skin tone and gender as a research question. Prior studies suggest that skin tone effects may differ across genders, with stronger influences on attractiveness perceptions among women [Hill, 2002] and more pronounced performance disparities found in commercial gender-classification systems within women compared to men [Buolamwini and Gebru, 2018].

## 2 Method

### 2.1 Image Stimuli

We sampled ten images of Black American men and women from the publicly available GAN Face Database (GANFD)<sup>1</sup>, which features realistic, computer-generated faces. The database includes sets of images representing the same fictional individuals, with manipulations applied to vary facial features associated with perceived race. To ensure consistency, we used cropped images with a uniform grey background that contained only the face.

From the GANFD, we focused on facial stimuli that were primarily identified as Black or multiracial.<sup>2</sup> Within each set, faces with higher perceived Blackness ratings, measured by the question, “How much does this person look Black or African American? (0-100),” were assigned to the darker-skinned condition, while those with lower perceived Blackness scores were assigned to the lighter-skinned condition. As shown in Figure 2, faces with higher perceived Blackness typically had darker skin tones, while other facial features remained largely consistent across the skin tone conditions. This approach allowed us to manipulate skin tone while controlling for other features associated with perceived Blackness, such as nose width or eyebrow thickness [Ma et al., 2018].

### 2.2 Selection of Vision-Language Models and Writing Prompts

We collected data using a collection of Vision-Language Models including two proprietary VLMs—GPT-4o mini, GPT-4 Turbo—and two open-source VLMs—Llama-3.2-11B-Vision-Instruct (“Llama-3.2”) [Grattafiori et al., 2024]

<sup>1</sup><https://osf.io/7auyw>

<sup>2</sup>Multiracial faces were included due to an insufficient number of faces rated as Black.




Figure 2: Two face stimulus pairs representing (A) Black men and (B) Black women. In each pair, the left image depicts a lighter-skinned individual, while the right shows a darker-skinned individual, generated from the same set.

and BLIP-3 (*xgen-mm-phi3-mini-instruct-r-v1*) [Xue et al., 2024]. We accessed the proprietary models using the OpenAI API and the open-source models by downloading the model weights and running inferences on them locally.

The models were given the following writing prompt, “Write a 50-word story about the individual inside the image.” and the following system prompt, “You are a helpful chat assistant. You are going to generate texts in response to images depicting fictional individuals.”<sup>3</sup> The maximum number of generated tokens was set to 150, and 50 stories were generated for each image, totaling 1,000 completions from each VLM. All data collection involving open-source models was conducted using an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU.

### 2.3 Measure of Homogeneity

To quantify homogeneity of stories generated for each group, we adopted the measure introduced by Lee et al. [2024]. We first represented the generated stories into sentence embedding representations using a pre-trained Sentence-BERT model [Reimers and Gurevych, 2019]—specifically *all-mpnet-base-v2*—and then calculated the cosine similarity between all possible combinations of sentence embeddings of stories generated for each image. Larger cosine similarity between sentence embeddings indicates that the stories are more similar to each other and, hence, more homogeneous.

### 2.4 Comparison of Cosine Similarity Measures

We fitted mixed-effects models [Bates et al., 2014, Pinheiro and Bates, 2000] to compare cosine similarity measurements between groups. These models account for random variations in measurements, such as those arising from repeated cosine similarity values for texts generated from images within the same condition (i.e., skin tone and gender), as well as variations in baseline similarity across conditions. To account for the resemblance between facial stimuli generated from the same set thereby possibly affecting the similarity of the generated stories, the sets of facial stimuli (i.e. Pair ID) were used as random intercepts in all our mixed-effects models.

First, we fitted a *Skin Tone Model* with skin tone as the sole fixed effect to test the hypothesis that stories about darker-skinned Black individuals are more homogeneous than those about lighter-skinned Black individuals. Next, we fitted a *Gender Model* with gender as the sole fixed effect to test the hypothesis that stories about women are more homogeneous than those about men. Finally, we fitted a *Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Model* with skin tone, gender, and their interactions to examine the interaction between skin tone and gender.

In all models, lighter skin tone was set as the reference level, with a significantly positive effect of skin tone indicating larger cosine similarity values for darker-skinned Black individuals than for lighter-skinned Black individuals. For gender, men were set as the reference level, with a significantly positive effect indicating higher cosine similarity values for Black women compared to Black men. Mixed-effects models were fitted using the *lme4* package [Lenth et al., 2024], and skin tone effects within gender groups were evaluated using the *emmeans* package [Lenth et al., 2024]. Likelihood-ratio tests, conducted with the *aftex* package, assessed whether adding individual terms improved model fit. All analyses were performed in R version 4.4.0.

<sup>3</sup>The system prompt was not supplied to Llama-3.2 as it did not support system-level instructions.

## 2.5 Power Analysis

We used 10 facial stimuli per group to assess homogeneity bias. Power analysis with the *simr* package in R [Green et al., 2023], employing Monte Carlo simulations, determined that 1,245 cosine similarity measurements per pair of stimuli (i.e., Pair ID) were required to achieve 90% power for detecting an interaction effect (skin tone  $\times$  gender) with an effect size of 0.30 (from Lee et al. [2024]) at  $\alpha = .05$ . With 2,500 cosine similarity measurements collected, our study exceeded this requirement. This analysis accounted for the increased power requirements of detecting interaction effects, ensuring that our study was adequately powered to test all effects with statistical confidence.

## 3 Results

In the Results section, we summarize the *Skin Tone Model* output to evaluate the effect of skin tone, presenting likelihood-ratio test results and a visualization of cosine similarity measurements for each skin tone group. We then summarize the *Gender Model* output to evaluate the effect of gender, presenting likelihood-ratio test results and a visualization of cosine similarity measurements for each gender group. Finally, we analyze the Interaction term from the *Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Model*, presenting likelihood-ratio test results, simple slopes, and a visualization of cosine similarity measurements for each intersectional group.

### 3.1 Darker Skin Tone Associated with Increased Homogeneity




Figure 3: Standardized cosine similarity values of lighter and darker skinned Black individuals generated from all four VLMs. Higher standardized cosine similarity means more homogeneity in the stories generated for that group. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.

As shown in Figure 3, stories about darker-skinned Black individuals were significantly more homogeneous than those about lighter-skinned Black individuals in GPT-4o mini, GPT-4 Turbo, and Llama-3.2 ( $bs = 0.044, 0.15, \text{ and } 0.080$ , respectively,  $ps < .001$ ). However, we found an opposite pattern in BLIP-3 ( $bs = -0.095, ps < .001$ ). Likelihood-ratio tests revealed that including skin tone improved model fit for all four VLMs ( $\chi^2(1)s \geq 289.55, ps < .001$ ). See Table S2 for summary output of the *Skin Tone Models* and Table S5 for likelihood-ratio test results.

### 3.2 VLMs Represent Women as More Homogeneous than Men

As shown in Figure 4, stories about Black women were significantly more homogeneous than those about Black men across all four models ( $bs = 0.63, 0.15, 0.40, \text{ and } 0.24$ , respectively,  $ps < .001$ ). Likelihood-ratio tests revealed that including gender improved model fit for all four VLMs ( $\chi^2(1)s \geq 7.34, ps < .01$ ). See Table S3 for summary output of the *Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Models* and Table S5 for likelihood-ratio test results.

### 3.3 Interaction between Skin Tone and Gender

As shown in Figure 5, we found mixed evidence for the interaction between skin tone and gender. In GPT-4o Mini and Llama-3.2, a positive interaction effect indicated that the impact of skin tone on homogeneity was significantly




Figure 4: Standardized cosine similarity values of Black men and women generated from all four VLMs. Higher standardized cosine similarity means more homogeneity in the stories generated for that group. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.




Figure 5: Standardized cosine similarity values of lighter and darker skinned men and women generated from all four VLMs. Higher standardized cosine similarity means more homogeneity in the stories generated for that group. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.

greater for women than for men ( $bs = 0.10$  and  $0.21$ ,  $ps < .001$ ). However, in GPT-4 Turbo and BLIP-3, the interaction effect was not significant ( $bs = -0.0048$  and  $-0.0072$ ,  $ps = .038$  and  $.028$ ). Likelihood-ratio tests showed that including the interaction effect improved model fit for VLMs with significant positive interactions ( $\chi^2(1)s = 389.86$  and  $838.42$ ,  $ps < .001$ ) but not for those with non-significant interactions ( $\chi^2(1)s = 0.76$  and  $1.17$ ,  $ps = .38$  and  $.28$ ). See Table S4 for summary output of the *Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Models*, Table S5 for likelihood-ratio test results, and Table S6 for simple slopes analysis results.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Skin Tone Bias Persists in Vision-Language Models

With the vision modality of AI models, the question of whether skin tone of individuals given as input to these AI models influences their output poses a significant threat to both stereotyping and erasure. Despite past evidence that skin tone can affect performances of gender classification systems, such questions had not been explored with respect to the more recent AI models such as VLMs. In this work, we find evidence that skin tone affects homogeneity bias, a form of stereotyping found in LLMs, suggesting that VLMs process skin tone of individuals and associated semantic attributes based solely on skin tone.

Such biases related to skin tone may partly stem from the under-representation of darker-skinned individuals in training data, a documented source of performance disparities in other AI models [e.g., Buolamwini and Gebru, 2018]. Given that VLMs are primarily trained on web-scraped data, which also suffers from similar under-representation issues (see Bender et al. [2021] for a detailed review), this attribution likely applies to homogeneity bias of VLMs as well.

### 4.2 Convergent Evidence of Gender Homogeneity Bias

Consistent with past evidence finding that women were represented as more homogeneous relative to men in an LLM [Lee et al., 2024], we found evidence of gender homogeneity bias in VLMs. This raises the possibility that bias found in AI models that have been trained on single modalities may be passed onto multimodal models, especially when the bias remains unattended. Future work would benefit from a systematic analysis of how different modalities interact to affect homogeneity bias, thereby clarifying if added modalities on top of text amplify biases and what parts of the model architecture would be most effective for targeting bias mitigation efforts in VLMs.

### 4.3 The Disproportionate Effect of Skin Tone on Women

In two of four VLMs—GPT-4 Turbo and Llama-3.2—the effect of skin tone on homogeneity of group representations was significantly greater for women than for men. Upon closer inspection of the *Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Models*, including the interaction effect to the *Skin Tone models* rendered the effect of skin tone either insignificant or in the opposite direction, suggesting that the main effect of skin tone in the *Skin Tone models* were primarily driven by the effect of skin tone within Black women. This, to some extent, is consistent with human stereotyping patterns identified by Hill [2002], where skin tone disproportionately affects women. While Buolamwini and Gebru [2018] demonstrated intersectional bias in gender classification systems, our results demonstrate that similar biases persist in Vision-Language Models (VLMs), reinforcing the need to address intersectional bias across AI systems.

## 5 Limitations

A limitation of this work is the potential conflation of perceived Blackness (or racial prototypicality of Black Americans) and skin tone. Face stimuli were assigned to lighter- and darker-skinned conditions based on perceived Blackness ratings from GANFD. Although we justified this approach by emphasizing that the manipulations of face stimuli primarily reflected changes in skin tone, it remains unclear whether VLMs can detect subtle changes in facial features beyond skin tone. While darker skin tone is an important feature of perceived Blackness [Stepanova and Strube, 2012, Wilkins et al., 2010], future research may benefit from manipulations that can better isolate skin tone to enable a more controlled assessment of its impact on group representations in AI models.

Another limitation is the lack of generalizability to real, non-computer-generated faces. Although GANFD images are generally perceived as authentic, with 13.15% of raters identifying the 40 faces in this study as artificial, it is unclear if the findings apply to real-world faces. The use of GANFD images was essential for isolating skin tone effects, which is challenging with real-world faces where darker skin often correlates with other varying features, introducing confounds. GANFD images provided the necessary control by keeping other facial features consistent, allowing us to focus solely on the impact of skin tone on group representations.

Finally, a limitation of this work is that the open-source models did not consistently generate stories in response to the writing prompt, instead producing detailed descriptions of the individuals in the images. While this deviation highlights a failure to follow instructions, it also underscores the robustness of our findings. The documented biases were not confined to the intended story format but were also evident in the more objective visual descriptions generated by the open-source models. This suggests that the observed biases in group representations are pervasive and not merely artifacts of specific text formats, further highlighting the broader implications of our results.

## 6 Conclusion

We find that Vision-Language Models (VLMs) reproduce homogeneity bias, particularly in relation to skin tone. By analyzing computer-generated images of Black American men and women with controlled skin tone variations, we found that VLMs produced more homogeneous stories for darker-skinned individuals in three of four models. Black women were consistently represented more homogeneously than Black men, with skin tone having a greater impact on women in two models. These results highlight how biases, including homogeneity bias, persist in multimodal AI systems, emphasizing the urgent need for research to address intersectional biases in AI.

## References

- Abubakar Abid, Maheen Farooqi, and James Zou. Persistent Anti-Muslim Bias in Large Language Models, January 2021.
- Li Lucy and David Bamman. Gender and Representation Bias in GPT-3 Generated Stories. In Nader Akoury, Faeze Brahman, Snigdha Chaturvedi, Elizabeth Clark, Mohit Iyyer, and Lara J. Martin, editors, *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, pages 48–55, Virtual, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.nuse-1.5.
- Kankan Zhou, Eason Lai, and Jing Jiang. VLStereoSet: A Study of Stereotypical Bias in Pre-trained Vision-Language Models. In Yulan He, Heng Ji, Sujian Li, Yang Liu, and Chua-Hui Chang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 527–538, Online only, November 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dora Zhao, Angelina Wang, and Olga Russakovsky. Understanding and Evaluating Racial Biases in Image Captioning. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 14810–14820, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 2021. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-66542-812-5. doi:10.1109/ICCV48922.2021.01456.
- Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Myra Cheng, Debora Nozza, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Dan Jurafsky, James Zou, and Aylin Caliskan. Easily Accessible Text-to-Image Generation Amplifies Demographic Stereotypes at Large Scale, June 2023.
- Ranjita Naik and Besmira Nushi. Social Biases through the Text-to-Image Generation Lens. In *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 786–808, Montreal, QC Canada, August 2023. ACM. ISBN 9798400702310. doi:10.1145/3600211.3604711.
- Luhang Sun, Mian Wei, Yibing Sun, Yoo Ji Suh, Liwei Shen, and Sijia Yang. Smiling women pitching down: Auditing representational and presentational gender biases in image-generative AI. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 29(1):zmad045, November 2023. ISSN 1083-6101. doi:10.1093/jcmc/zmad045.
- Mansour Sami, Ashkan Sami, and Pete Barclay. A case study of fairness in generated images of Large Language Models for Software Engineering tasks. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*, pages 391–396, October 2023. doi:10.1109/ICSME58846.2023.00051.
- Patricia W. Linville, Gregory W. Fischer, and Peter Salovey. Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2):165–188, 1989. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.165.
- George A. Quattrone and Edward E. Jones. The perception of variability within in-groups and out-groups: Implications for the law of small numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(1):141–152, 1980. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.1.141.
- Messi H.J. Lee, Jacob M. Montgomery, and Calvin K. Lai. Large Language Models Portray Socially Subordinate Groups as More Homogeneous, Consistent with a Bias Observed in Humans. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '24*, pages 1321–1340, New York, NY, USA, June 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658975.



- Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. CoMPosT: Characterizing and Evaluating Caricature in LLM Simulations. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10853–10875, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.669.
- Sunipa Dev, Emily Sheng, Jieyu Zhao, Aubrie Amstutz, Jiao Sun, Yu Hou, Mattie Sanseverino, Jiin Kim, Akihiro Nishi, Nanyun Peng, and Kai-Wei Chang. On Measures of Biases and Harms in NLP, October 2022.
- Sunipa Dev, Masoud Monajatipoor, Anaelia Ovalle, Arjun Subramonian, Jeff M. Phillips, and Kai-Wei Chang. Harms of Gender Exclusivity and Challenges in Non-Binary Representation in Language Technologies, September 2021.
- Jillian Fisher, Shangbin Feng, Robert Aron, Thomas Richardson, Yejin Choi, Daniel W. Fisher, Jennifer Pan, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Katharina Reinecke. Biased AI can Influence Political Decision-Making, November 2024.
- Keith B. Maddox. Perspectives on racial phenotypicity bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, 8(4):383–401, 2004. ISSN 1088-8683. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0804\_4.
- Keith B. Maddox and Stephanie A. Gray. Cognitive Representations of Black Americans: Reexploring the Role of Skin Tone. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2):250–259, February 2002. ISSN 0146-1672. doi:10.1177/0146167202282010.
- Yessica Berumen Martinez. Assessing Latinx Colorism and Skin Tone Dating Preferences in Adults. *Ursidae: The Undergraduate Research Journal at the University of Northern Colorado*, 10(1), July 2021.
- Elena V. Stepanova and Michael J Strube. Attractiveness as a Function of Skin Tone and Facial Features: Evidence from Categorization Studies. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 145(1):1–20, January 2018. ISSN 0022-1309. doi:10.1080/00221309.2017.1394811.
- Kimberly Barsamian Kahn and Paul G. Davies. Differentially dangerous? Phenotypic racial stereotypicality increases implicit bias among ingroup and outgroup members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(4):569–580, 2011. ISSN 1461-7188. doi:10.1177/1368430210374609.
- Richard Lynn. Skin Color and Intelligence in African Americans. *Population and Environment*, 23(4):365–375, 2002. ISSN 0199-0039.
- T. Joel Wade, Melanie Judkins Romano, and Leslie Blue. The Effect of African American Skin Color on Hiring Preferences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(12):2550–2558, 2004. ISSN 1559-1816. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb01991.x.
- Matthew S. Harrison and Kecia M. Thomas. The Hidden Prejudice in Selection: A Research Investigation on Skin Color Bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(1):134–168, 2009. ISSN 1559-1816. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00433.x.
- Verna M. Keith and Cedric Herring. Skin Tone and Stratification in the Black Community. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(3):760–778, 1991. ISSN 0002-9602.
- E. A. Klonoff and H. Landrine. Is skin color a marker for racial discrimination? Explaining the skin color-hypertension relationship. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 23(4):329–338, August 2000. ISSN 0160-7715. doi:10.1023/a:1005580300128.
- L. Gleiberman, E. Harburg, M. R. Frone, M. Russell, and M. L. Cooper. Skin colour, measures of socioeconomic status, and blood pressure among blacks in Erie County, NY. *Annals of Human Biology*, 22(1):69–73, 1995. ISSN 0301-4460. doi:10.1080/03014469500003712.
- Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pages 77–91. PMLR, January 2018.
- Matthew Groh, Omar Badri, Roxana Daneshjou, Arash Koochek, Caleb Harris, Luis R. Soenksen, P. Murali Doraiswamy, and Rosalind Picard. Deep learning-aided decision support for diagnosis of skin disease across skin tones. *Nature Medicine*, 30(2):573–583, February 2024. ISSN 1546-170X. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02728-3.
- Newton M. Kinyanjui, Timothy Odonga, Celia Cintas, Noel C. F. Codella, Rameswar Panda, Prasanna Sattigeri, and Kush R. Varshney. Estimating Skin Tone and Effects on Classification Performance in Dermatology Datasets, October 2019.
- Jaihyun Park, Karla Felix, and Grace Lee. Implicit Attitudes Toward Arab-Muslims and the Moderating Effects of Social Information. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1):35–45, April 2007. ISSN 0197-3533. doi:10.1080/01973530701330942.

- Muniba Saleem, Sara Prot, Craig A. Anderson, and Anthony F. Lemieux. Exposure to Muslims in Media and Support for Public Policies Harming Muslims. *Communication Research*, 44(6):841–869, August 2017. ISSN 0093-6502. doi:10.1177/0093650215619214.
- Mark E. Hill. Skin Color and the Perception of Attractiveness among African Americans: Does Gender Make a Difference? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 65(1):77–91, 2002. ISSN 0190-2725. doi:10.2307/3090169.
- Debbie S. Ma, Kolina Koltai, Ryan M. McManus, Adrian Bernhardt, Joshua Correll, and Bernd Wittenbrink. Race signaling features: Identifying markers of racial prototypicality among Asians, Blacks, Latinos, and Whites. *Social Cognition*, 36(6):603–625, 2018. ISSN 1943-2798. doi:10.1521/soco.2018.36.6.603.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and et al. The Llama 3 Herd of Models, November 2024.
- Le Xue, Manli Shu, Anas Awadalla, Jun Wang, An Yan, Senthil Purushwalkam, Honglu Zhou, Viraj Prabhu, Yutong Dai, Michael S. Ryoo, and et al. xGen-MM (BLIP-3): A Family of Open Large Multimodal Models, August 2024.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks, August 2019.
- Douglas Bates, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4, June 2014.
- José C. Pinheiro and Douglas M. Bates. Linear Mixed-Effects Models: Basic Concepts and Examples. In *Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS*, pages 3–56. Springer, New York, NY, 2000. ISBN 978-0-387-22747-4. doi:10.1007/0-387-22747-4\_1.
- Russell V. Lenth, Balazs Banfai, Ben Bolker, Paul Buerkner, Iago Giné-Vázquez, Maxime Herve, Maarten Jung, Jonathon Love, Fernando Miguez, Julia Piaskowski, Hannes Riebl, and Henrik Singmann. Emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means, October 2024.
- Peter Green, Catriona MacLeod, and Phillip Alday. Simr: Power Analysis for Generalised Linear Mixed Models by Simulation, April 2023.
- Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, pages 610–623, New York, NY, USA, March 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-8309-7. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922.
- Elena V. Stepanova and Michael J Strube. The role of skin color and facial physiognomy in racial categorization: Moderation by implicit racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4):867–878, 2012. ISSN 1096-0465. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.019.
- Clara L. Wilkins, Cheryl R. Kaiser, and Heather Rieck. Detecting racial identification: The role of phenotypic prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6):1029–1034, November 2010. ISSN 0022-1031. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.017.

## S1 Appendix: GANFD Face Stimuli

Table S1: The identifiers of GANFD images used to represent the four groups.

Gender	Skin Tone	Image IDs
Men	Lighter	1407-752417, 2308-489, 2491-1250, 3490-822, 4239-28, 7902-1229, 14792-3566, 19187-28, 22913-28, 24490-28
Men	Darker	1407-3876, 2308-151, 2491-1407, 3490-3876, 4239-3876, 7902-38, 14792-533, 19187-533, 22913-533, 24490-533
Women	Lighter	1402-28, 2617-2947, 10571-4022, 12360-28, 13372-1119, 13571-3112, 16252-2157, 17235-4022, 19933-533, 25885-28
Women	Darker	1402-533, 2617-533, 10571-1407, 12360-533, 13372-533, 13571-3876, 16252-3876, 17235-3876, 19933-3876, 25885-115

## S2 Appendix: Output of Mixed-Effect Models

Table S2: Summary output of the Skin Tone Models across all four VLMs. A significantly positive Skin Tone term indicates that cosine similarity was notably greater for darker-skinned individuals.

	Skin Tone Model			
	GPT-4o mini	GPT-4 Turbo	Llama-3.2	BLIP-3
<b>Fixed Effects</b>				
Intercept	-0.0037 (0.041)	-0.053 (0.025)	-0.027 (0.036)	0.087 (0.045)
Skin Tone	0.044*** (0.0026)	0.15*** (0.0027)	0.080*** (0.0036)	-0.099*** (0.0033)
<b>Random Effects (<math>\sigma^2</math>)</b>				
Pair ID Intercept	0.18	0.068	0.21	0.33
Residual	0.82	0.93	0.80	0.69
Observations	499,000	499,000	499,000	499,000
Log likelihood	-657,971.70	-690,385.00	-651,912.20	-616,619.10

Table S3: Summary output of the Gender Models across all four VLMs. A significantly positive Gender term indicates that cosine similarity was notably greater for women than for men.

	Gender Model			
	GPT-4o mini	GPT-4 Turbo	Llama-3.2	BLIP-3
<b>Fixed Effects</b>				
Intercept	-0.30 (0.039)	-0.053 (0.025)	-0.18 (0.047)	-0.084 (0.063)
Gender	0.63*** (0.055)	0.15*** (0.0027)	0.40*** (0.067)	0.24*** (0.089)
<b>Random Effects (<math>\sigma^2</math>)</b>				
Pair ID Intercept	0.083	0.068	0.17	0.32
Residual	0.82	0.93	0.80	0.69
Observations	499,000	499,000	499,000	499,000
Log likelihood	-658,069.90	-690,385.00	-652,143.80	-617,052.80

Table S4: Summary output of the Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Models across all four VLMs. A significantly positive interaction effect indicates that the effect of skin tone was significantly greater for women than for men.

<b>Skin Tone and Gender Interaction Model</b>				
	GPT-4o mini	GPT-4 Turbo	Llama-3.2	BLIP-3
<b>Fixed Effects</b>				
Intercept	-0.29 (0.039)	-0.17 (0.032)	-0.17 (0.047)	-0.036 (0.063)
Skin Tone	-0.0070 (0.0036)	0.16*** (0.0039)	-0.023*** (0.0051)	-0.095*** (0.0047)
Gender	0.58*** (0.055)	0.23*** (0.045)	0.29*** (0.067)	0.24** (0.089)
Interactions	0.10*** (0.0051)	-0.0048 (0.0055)	0.21*** (0.0071)	-0.0072 (0.0067)
<b>Random Effects (<math>\sigma^2</math>)</b>				
Pair ID Intercept	0.083	0.056	0.18	0.32
Residual	0.82	0.93	0.80	0.69
Observations	499,000	499,000	499,000	499,000
Log likelihood	-657,739.80	-690,379.70	-651,482.60	-616,620.40

Table S5: Results of likelihood-ratio tests.

<b>Model</b>	<b>Term</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>p</b>
GPT-4o mini	Skin Tone	289.55***	<.001
	Gender	87.52***	<.001
	Interaction	389.86***	<.001
GPT-4 Turbo	Skin Tone	3206.77***	<.001
	gender	22.86***	<.001
	Interaction	0.76	.38
Llama-3.2	Skin Tone	502.39***	<.001
	Gender	32.36***	<.001
	Interaction	838.42***	<.001
BLIP-3	Skin Tone	881.34***	<.001
	Gender	7.34**	.007
	Interaction	1.17	.28

Table S6: The effect of skin tone within each gender group across all VLMs.

<b>Model</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Effect of Skin Tone</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
GPT-4o mini	Men	-0.0038	[-0.058, 0.050]
	Women	0.040	[-0.014, 0.094]
GPT-4 Turbo	Men	-0.053	[-0.097, -0.0085]
	Women	0.10	[0.058, 0.15]
Llama-3.2	Men	-0.027	[-0.092, 0.038]
	Women	0.053	[-0.012, 0.12]
BLIP-3	Men	0.087	[-0.00051, 0.17]
	Darker	-0.012	[-0.10, 0.075]