
NEUTRASUM: A LANGUAGE MODEL CAN HELP A BALANCED MEDIA DIET BY NEUTRALIZING NEWS SUMMARIES*

Xi Luo^{a,b,c}, Junjie Liu^{d,†}, Sirong Wu^{a,b,c}, and Yuhui Deng^{a,b,†}

^aGuangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research and Application for Data Science, Zhuhai 519087, China

^bBNU-HKBU United International College, Zhuhai 519087, China

^cFaculty of Science, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong SAR 999077, China

^dDepartment of Political Science, Trinity College Dublin, 2 Clare Street, Dublin 2, Ireland

[†]Correspondence: liuj13@tcd.ie, ivandeng@uic.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Media bias in news articles arises from the political polarisation of media outlets, which can reinforce societal stereotypes and beliefs. Reporting on the same event often varies significantly between outlets, reflecting their political leanings through polarised language and focus. Although previous studies have attempted to generate bias-free summaries from multiperspective news articles, they have not effectively addressed the challenge of mitigating inherent media bias. To address this gap, we propose **NeutraSum**, a novel framework that integrates two neutrality losses to adjust the semantic space of generated summaries, thus minimising media bias. These losses, designed to balance the semantic distances across polarised inputs and ensure alignment with expert-written summaries, guide the generation of neutral and factually rich summaries. To evaluate media bias, we employ the political compass test, which maps political leanings based on economic and social dimensions. Experimental results on the Allsides dataset demonstrate that NeutraSum not only improves summarisation performance but also achieves significant reductions in media bias, offering a promising approach for neutral news summarisation.

1 Introduction

Media bias is inevitable in mass media, when journalists frame news stories to support their political stances [9, 34]. Even if they are reporting on the same event, they can manifest entirely disparate emphases on the salient aspects of an event based on their intended points of emphasis [16]. This selective framing encourages readers to consume news that aligns with their pre-existing political beliefs, further reinforcing political stereotypes and potentially distorting decision-making on critical political issues [38]. Therefore, how to mitigate media bias in news articles becomes an important research topic.

A feasible systemic research framework to mitigate media bias from the news is news aggregation [33, 23, 43, 6]. It provides a comprehensive perspective of an event to mitigate the exposure of the far-left or far-right slanted bias. Founded on this approach, one early study [23] proposed a new task to generate a neutral summary from a triplet of news articles reporting on the same issues. To promote the goal of news neutralisation, they utilized a hierarchical framework from title to articles to generate a bias-free summary. A further refined work [6] introduced polarity loss to minimise the polarity difference in the input articles. While these studies contribute valuable insights, they also exhibit notable limitations. Although indicative information and polarity regularisation techniques were explored to produce bias-free summaries, their effectiveness in achieving genuine neutrality remains uncertain. For instance, while title neutralisation can serve as a helpful subtask, it does not directly address the inherent bias embedded in the

*Disclaimer: This study involves the generation of synthetic news content using with language model. The generated content was created solely for the purposes of this research and does not represent actual news or the views of any individual, organization, or entity. X. Luo and J. Liu contributed equally to this work.




Figure 1: Illustration of the training process of our model NeutraSum. The main task is to summarize a neutral summary \hat{Y}^D from a Multi-document dataset D using BART pre-trained language model. This dataset incorporates triplets of left, center, and right-wing news articles $\{X_L^D, X_C^D, X_R^D\}$, as well as expert-written summaries Y^D . Each triplet is reporting on the same issue. In the encoder framework, we introduced an Auxiliary Dataset D_{aux} to propose polarised left-wing and right-wing news articles $X_L^{D_{aux}}, X_R^{D_{aux}}$. This dataset aims to join two neutrality losses (Equal-distance Loss and Contrastive Loss) by finetuning the whole semantic space. These two datasets jointly guide the neutral writing of a summary.

summarisation process. Moreover, minimising polarity differences poses significant challenges, as even news articles covering the same event often present different factual elements, making strict mappings across sources difficult to establish.

To address the challenge of reducing media bias, we propose a new **Neutrality Loss** in Multi-News Summarisation for Media Bias Mitigation, **NeutraSum**, a novel framework designed to generate bias-neutralised summaries by aggregating polarised news articles reporting on the same event. The model leverages a multi-document dataset and an auxiliary dataset to provide two neutrality losses to adjust semantic spaces among polarised articles and summaries. These losses encourage the model to generate texts that do not have a slant toward each side of the political leaning and follow the writing pattern of expert-written summaries. Since the auxiliary dataset could provide news articles with evident media bias, the purpose of incorporating this auxiliary dataset is to ensure a semantic differentiation between same-story news articles from the multi-document dataset and those exhibiting pronounced media bias from the auxiliary dataset. This serves to facilitate semantic integration and feature extraction among these same-story news articles, contributing to the generation of more objective summaries. To measure media bias more accurately, we employ the political compass test [14], which evaluates the political responses generated by models across social (ranging from liberal to conservative) and economic (ranging from left to right) dimensions.

Our experiments were conducted on the Allsides dataset [23], which incorporates same-story news articles from different political leanings, as well as expert-written summaries. Fine-tuning the neutrality losses significantly guides the generative model toward producing more neutral outputs. The results indicate that these losses effectively reduce media bias while consistently preserving the salient information in the summaries.

2 Related Work

2.1 Media Bias Detection

News journalists would frame their news stories to omit or exaggerate some parts of the facts to support their political leaning, which could be referred to as media bias [17]. There is a series of computational approaches to identify media bias by extracting the polarity features [29, 5, 13, 18, 40]. A line of work employed the additional mechanism or information to detect media bias on the document level. For example, some auxiliary losses were added to demand the semantic space clustering news articles with the same political direction [29, 5], which assists in predicting the political leaning. It has also been found that headlines could act as additional cues to classify media bias [15]. Besides

identifying the polarity of the news articles, some more refined datasets [37, 13] annotated at the sentence and lexicon level are leveraged by recent research. However, such media annotation datasets are too small to learn the pattern of the political stances for the media bias detection task.

2.2 Media Bias Mitigation

Despite the current absence of large-scale media annotation datasets including bias span and expert-written summaries, along with standardized measurements for media bias mitigation, numerous studies have still endeavored to reduce media bias in news coverage. [32, 33, 39, 22, 23]. A GAN framework [26] was designed to reverse or neutralize the political polarity of the news articles. However, the definition of neutrality adopted is limited to the “center” media rating. It is insufficient to assert a reduction in media bias, as a center stance does not inherently equal bias-free [1]. They further deployed a depolarisation algorithm [28] to mitigate bias in polarised texts, while the measurement of media bias was conducted using both manual and model-based methods, which could not be considered as a universe of media bias metrics since no consistently reliable predicted results could be produced. Another emerging mitigation task generates a neutral summary based on the same-story polarity news articles [22, 23, 6]. However, they did not provide a clear neutralisation guidance or mechanism to reduce media bias. Therefore, we followed this task and introduced the new neutrality losses. These losses prompt the generated tokens to exhibit neutrality traits within the semantic space.

3 Methodology

In this section, we introduce the details of our **NeutraSum** model. To achieve good summarisation performance while minimising a lower media bias, our model is governed by a multi-document summarisation loss to generate high-quality summaries. Additionally, two neutrality losses (contrastive loss and equal-distance loss) are employed to mitigate media bias in summaries. The whole architecture is shown in Fig. 1.

3.1 Multi-document Summarisation Loss

To align with the neutral summarisation task, multi-document summarisation loss is the main loss to ensure coherent and content-focused writing by conditional generation. To ensure the comprehensiveness and accuracy of the news, multi-document summarisation would be utilized to aggregate left, center, and right-wing media coverage to generate a relatively bias-free summary. In the training phase, the generation process would learn the neutral writing features by following the texts of the expert-written summary Y^D . The multi-document summarisation loss could be illustrated as follows:

$$X^D = \text{Concat}(X_L^D, X_C^D, X_R^D) = \{x_i^D\}_{i=1}^{|T|} \quad (1)$$

$$Y^D = \{y_i^D\}_{i=1}^{|Y|} \quad (2)$$

$$H_{Summ}^D = \text{Enc}_{Summ}(X^D) \quad (3)$$

$$O_{Summ}^D = \text{Dec}_{Summ}(H_{Summ}^D) \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{Y}^D = W_H O_{Summ}^D + b_H \quad (5)$$

$$L_{MDS} = CE(\hat{Y}^D, Y^D) = - \sum_{i=1}^{|Y|} y_i^D \log \hat{y}_i^D \quad (6)$$

Where X_L^D , X_C^D , X_R^D represents the left-wing, center-wing, and right-wing news articles relevant to the same event. D denotes the multi-document dataset crawled from Allsides that is used for the summarisation task. X^D is the input that concatenates three different political leanings news articles X_L^D , X_C^D , X_R^D into a sequence of $|T|$ tokens, denoted as $\{x_i^D\}_{i=1}^{|T|}$. Y^D represents the expert-written summary towards the same event of input articles consisting of $|Y|$ tokens, denoted as $\{y_i^D\}_{i=1}^{|Y|}$.

Enc_{Summ} and Dec_{Summ} demonstrate the encoder and decoder part of the summarisation BART architecture. Input articles X^D would go through the encoder framework Enc_{Summ} to obtain the hidden state $H_{Summ}^D \in R^{|T| \times d}$ in a d -dimensional semantic embedding, which is default to 1024. Then H_{Summ}^D would feed into the decoder framework Dec_{Summ} to get the hidden state $O_{Summ}^D \in R^{|Y| \times d}$. Finally, to obtain the probabilities of each generated token, the decoder hidden state O_{Summ}^D would be projected to a w -dimensional semantic embedding $\hat{Y}^D \in R^{|Y| \times w}$ through the

weight W_H and bias b_H , it could also be considered as a predicted probability distribution for the predicted tokens. Since the predicted output should follow the expert-written summary Y^D , the multi-document summarisation loss L_{MDS} would be calculated by the cross-entropy loss CE between expert-written summary Y^D and projected output \hat{Y}^D to optimize the model.

3.2 Equal-Distance Loss

A neutral news summary is considered to deliver news content factually and does not have a slant towards each side of the political leaning. From the NLP (Natural Language Processing) perspective, the news article of each side of political leaning would be expressed as an embedding in the semantic space through a pre-trained language model. To preserve the no-slant trait in political polarity, the expected neutral embedding will have an equal distance towards the left-side and right-side embeddings. This expected neutral embedding is the encoder hidden state trained on the aggregated left, center, and right-wing news articles. It is noted that we introduce another dataset D_{aux} to provide additional samples of left-side and right-side news articles $X_L^{D_{aux}}$, $X_R^{D_{aux}}$ to accomplish the equal-distance loss. This design is to preserve the internal alignment of the same-event news articles to do the summarisation task. Then equal-distance loss could be described as follows:

$$H_L^{D_{aux}}, H_R^{D_{aux}} = Enc_{aux}(X_L^{D_{aux}}), Enc_{aux}(X_R^{D_{aux}}) \quad (7)$$

$$[\bar{H}_L^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_R^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_{Summ}^D] = Avg([H_L^{D_{aux}}, H_R^{D_{aux}}, H_{Summ}^D]) \quad (8)$$

$$L_{ED} = |sim(\bar{H}_L^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_{Summ}^D) - sim(\bar{H}_R^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_{Summ}^D)| \quad (9)$$

Where Enc_{aux} is the auxiliary encoder model, which adopts the Roberta pre-trained language model. A batch of left-side and right-side news articles denoted as $X_L^{D_{aux}}$ and $X_R^{D_{aux}}$, would be fed into the auxiliary encoder model Enc_{aux} to obtain their embedded hidden states $H_L^{D_{aux}}$ and $H_R^{D_{aux}}$. To capture the general semantic meaning and implement equal-distance loss, we take an average of their embedded hidden states in the batch size dimension as the articles' semantic representations, which is represented as $\bar{H}_L^{D_{aux}}$, $\bar{H}_R^{D_{aux}}$. The hidden state for the summarisation task is also averaged, denoted as \bar{H}_{Summ}^D . Finally, since we expect \bar{H}_{Summ}^D represented as neutral summarized embedding, it requires maintaining equal distance with left-side and right-side averaged semantic embedding, which is shown in Eq. (9). $sim(\cdot)$ represents the similarity function. $|\cdot|$ remains the equal-distance loss L_{ED} to be positive.

3.3 Contrastive Loss

Besides the characteristic of equal distance with different political directions, a neutral summary should also learn the bias-free lexicons and writing styles from expert-written summaries, since expert-written summaries are considered relatively bias-free compared to the news coverage written by mass media. To achieve this goal, it is expected to distinguish the writing manner between polarised news articles and expert-written ones. In the semantic space, the latent semantic space of the architecture should still be further optimized towards the semantic representation of the human-written summary and get away from the embeddings of polarised news coverages.

Inspired by contrastive learning [8, 41, 20], we utilized normalized temperature-scaled cross-entropy loss (NT-Xent) [8] as the contrastive loss and considered generated summaries as anchors. Expert-written summaries act as positive samples, pulling closer to anchors. While those news articles in the auxiliary dataset with strong political polarisation act as negative samples, moving away from the anchors. The contrastive loss could be described as follows:

$$\bar{H}_Y^D = Avg(Enc_{Summ}(Y^D)) \quad (10)$$

$$L_{Con} = -\log \frac{\exp(sim(\bar{H}_{Summ}^D, \bar{H}_Y^D)/\tau)}{\sum_{H \in \{\bar{H}_L^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_R^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_Y^D\}} \exp[sim(\bar{H}_{Summ}^D, H)/\tau]} \quad (11)$$

Where \bar{H}_Y^D is the averaged encoded hidden state for the expert-written summary. $sim(\cdot)$ denotes the similarity function and τ denotes the temperature. In the contrastive loss, the encoded embedding of summarized input \bar{H}_{Summ}^D and expert-written summary \bar{H}_Y^D should be pulled closer to the semantic space. In contrast, the encoded summarized embedding should maintain a greater distance from the left and right political-leaning embeddings in the auxiliary dataset $\{\bar{H}_L^{D_{aux}}, \bar{H}_R^{D_{aux}}\}$.

	Left	Right	Center	Total
Train	3160	3160	3160	9480
Val	395	395	395	1185
Test	396	396	396	1188
Total	3951	3951	3951	11853

Table 1: Allsides data statistics. Each triplet consists of a set of left, center, and right news article on the same event.

3.4 Overall Model

Generally, we employ the BART pre-trained language model as our main architecture to fine-tune toward an expert-written summary. Besides the traditional pre-trained language modeling, two additional neutrality losses are proposed to provide bias-free writing. All three losses would join the optimisation process during training. The loss function of the model in the training stage would be formulated as:

$$L_{Overall} = \lambda_1 L_{MDS} + \lambda_2 L_{ED} + \lambda_3 L_{Con} \quad (12)$$

Where λ should be the balanced weight for each loss, and the sum should be 1. Normally, we will take each λ as 1/3. The overall loss $L_{Overall}$ consists of L_{MDS} , L_{ED} , and L_{Con} representing multi-document summarisation loss, equal-distance loss, and contrastive loss.

4 Experiment

4.1 Dataset

We leveraged data from Allsides Dataset [23] for the summarisation task. This dataset consists of a wide range of U.S political topics such as ‘Election’, ‘Immigration’, ‘Healthcare’, ‘Abortion’, etc.etc. The dataset incorporates 3464 triplets of news articles. Each triplet consists of left, center, and right-wing news articles reporting the same issue, as well as an expert-written summary. It is mentioned that the “center” still contains media bias, which does not represent bias-free [1]. The dataset details are illustrated in Table 1. We randomly split this dataset into training, validation and testing. To integrate neutrality losses for the mitigation of media bias, we obtained the auxiliary dataset [5] that incorporates left-wing and right-wing news articles, covering many topics and media sources from Allsides. It is noted that the incorporation of an auxiliary dataset aims to guide the generated summary away from polarised texts while compacting the same-story news articles from diverse political perspectives. Allsides dataset and auxiliary dataset use MIT and Apache 2.0 license respectively.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

Salient Information Preservation Metric To assess the performance of the generated summaries retrieving essential information from the input articles, we use the ROUGE [25] and BLEU [31] to calculate the information preservation between generated summaries and expert-written summaries. ROUGE is to measure how often n-grams in the machine-generated summary capture from the human-written summary, and BLEU is to measure how often n-grams in the human summary appear in the human-written summary. It is noted that higher ROUGE and BLEU represent a better information preservation performance.

Metric Bias Metric To measure the media bias, we adopted the political compass test [14]. The test is grounded on the political spectrum theories [11, 35] to provide different perspectives to measure the political ideology of media, which is based on two factors: economic factors (from liberal to conservative) and social factors (from left to right). Previous studies usually quantify media bias primarily based on the pre-trained language model [26, 27, 21] and sentiment-based annotation [23]. However, the pre-trained language model could not yield stable results and sentiment-based annotation lacks a clear association between sentiment words and polarity polarisation.

4.3 Experiment Details

The hyperparameters of the NeutraSum model during training are illustrated below: models for summarisation and neutralisation are “Bart-large” and “Roberta-large” in HuggingFace. Their corresponding datasets are Multi-document Dataset and Auxiliary Dataset. Multi-document Dataset contains a triplet of the left, center, and right-wing news articles for summarisation tasks. The auxiliary dataset consists of different left and right-wing news articles to join neutrality losses. Learning rates for them are $3e-5$ and $2e-5$. As for the batch size, a sample from a Multi-document Dataset will

Model	Salient Information Preservation (\uparrow)				Media Bias Metric (\downarrow)
	BLEU	ROUGE1-R	ROUGE2-R	ROUGEL-R	Political Compass Test (economic-axis, social-axis)
All Source input	8.23	56.68%	32.21%	54.17%	\
LEXRANK	12.21	39.08%	17.66%	34.69%	\
BARTCNN	10.49	35.63%	15.32%	32.22%	(-0.38, 3.13)
PEGASUSMULTI	6.12	44.42%	16.99%	39.45%	(-1.3, 4.36)
BARTMULTI	4.24	35.76%	12.48%	32.08%	(-1.25, 2.6)
NEUSFT	11.67	35.11%	15.74%	31.43%	(-1.25, 2.72)
NEUS-TITLE	12.05	35.11%	16.47%	32.63%	(-0.38, 3.13)
NeutraSum	11.99	52.91%	27.87%	48.08%	(-0.38, 2.41)
w/o Contrastive Loss	12.01	52.28%	28.43%	48.14%	(0.42, 2.61)
w/o Equal-distance Loss	11.71	52.87%	28.33%	48.42%	(0.38, 2.51)

Table 2: Experiment results for the baselines and our proposed models finetuned on the Allsides dataset. For Salient Information Preservation, higher BLEU and ROUGE-R (\uparrow) scores represent a better summarisation performance. Our hybrid NeutraSum and its variants (w/o Contrastive Loss and w/o Equal-distance Loss) show competitive good summarisation results. For the Media Bias Metric, its results are shown as the points in the axis: economic and social. The points are illustrated in Fig. 2. The point that is closer to zero on both axes represents a lower bias score (\downarrow), which means that the corresponding model is less influenced by media biases and is more neutral in its output. NeutraSum and its variants demonstrate lower bias scores, suggesting that their produced summaries incorporate less media bias, and contribute to more balanced and neutral reporting.

be paired with two left and two right samples originating from the auxiliary dataset. The generated summarisation length is between 100 to 250. We ran all of the experiments on the one NVIDIA 4090 GPU with 80GB for more than 17hr.

4.4 Baselines

Since we followed a summarisation task to do the neutral summary, we would conduct some experiments on some current state-of-the-art summarisation models.

LEXRANK [10]: An extractive single-document summarisation model that extracts the sentences with high similarity in documents, which is finetuned in DOC 2004 [30].

BARTCNN: An abstract single-document summarisation utilizing CNN/Dailymail [19] to finetune on the BART-large [24] model.

BARTMULTI: A multi-document abstractive summarisation model, which is finetuned on the BART-large [24] model using Multi-News dataset [12].

PEGASUSMULTI: An multi-document summarisation model finetuned on pegasus model [42] using Multi-News dataset.

NEUSFT [22]: An abstract multi-document summarisation model that proposes this task to finetune the Allsides dataset.

NEUS-TITLE [23]: An improved version of NEUSFT that adds the title summarisation.

5 Experimental Results

In this section, we illustrated the experimental results of baselines and our model NeutraSum, which is shown in Table 2. Based on the experimental performance in salient information preservation and media bias reduction, we pointed out the significant observations by quantitative analysis.

Effectiveness of neutrality losses in media bias mitigation and salient information preservation As illustrated in Table 2, our proposed model NeutraSum and its variants (w/o Contrastive Loss and w/o Equal-distance Loss) have a noticeable impact on reducing media bias, especially NeutraSum, moving the score closer to a neutral point (-0.38,

Weight of Loss in NeutraSum (MDS Loss : ED Loss : Con Loss)	Salient info (\uparrow)				framing bias metric (\downarrow)
	BLEU	ROUGE1-R	ROUGE2-R	ROUGE-L	Political Compass Test
0.98:0.1:0.1	12.17	53.02%	28.02%	48.32%	(-1.63, -3.95)
0.7:0.2:0.1	12.20	53.30%	28.42%	48.60%	(0.25, -4.0)
0.33:0.33:0.33	11.99	52.91%	27.87%	48.08%	(-0.38, 2.41)
0.2:0.5:0.4	12.24	53.69%	28.75%	49.24%	(-0.63, -3.74)
0.02:0.49:0.49	11.39	52%	27%	47.50%	(0.50, -2.51)

Table 3: Experimental results of adjusting different weights of losses (Multi-document Summarisation Loss:Equal-distance Loss:Contrastive Loss) in NeutraSum. The weight combination (0.2:0.5:0.4) illustrates the best summarisation performance in Salient Information Scores. However, weight combination (0.33:0.33:0.33) would be a better choice for weight configuration since it achieved the lowest bias score(-0.38, 2.41) in the political compass test and retained good summarisation results.




Figure 2: Scores of different models in political compass test. The horizontal axis represents the economic axis (ranging from left to right), and the vertical axis represents the social axis (ranging from liberal to conservative). It could be seen that the yellow points of our model NeutraSum and its variants have relatively lower bias scores in both axes. We also take the bias score of ChatGPT for reference.

2.41) on the political compass test, which is 71% and 45% the sharp reduction compared to extreme polarised baseline PEGASUSMULTI. As for the summarisation performance, our proposed NeutraSum model with the variants keeps the most salient information among all the other baselines. More specifically, NeutraSum shows high scores in BLEU (11.99), and the variant "w/o Contrastive Loss" has comparable scores with a slight increase in BLEU (12.01) and ROUGE-2 (28.43%). Another variant "w/o Equal-distance Loss" records a similar pattern of performance, with the highest ROUGE-L (48.42%). Therefore, this result indicates that NeutraSum and its variants are effective at generating high-quality summaries that not only retain the essential information but also exhibit less media bias.

Necessity of two Neutrality Losses We investigate that although the variants of NeutraSum have a similar summarisation performance in BLEU and ROUGE, their bias reduction effects are quite different. More specifically, variants with only one neutrality loss would have an unstable performance in the political compass test, since some of their responses to the test may hover between agree and disagree. This would lead their economic score to a slight positive shift in their economic axis scores to 0.38 and 0.42. While for the NeutraSum with both the neutrality losses, it could effectively and robustly reduce the media bias to (-0.38, 2.41).

Left and Authoritarian of the baselines in Polarity Among all the baselines and our proposed models, most of them are slanted to the left and authoritarian in polarity based on the results of the political compass test. A contributing factor is that many media datasets crawled lots of news coverage from left-wing media outlets, such as CNN, Guardian, BuzzFeed News, etc. Summarisation models are fine-tuned on these news datasets and learn polarised writing styles. This proficiency is useful for detecting the political orientations of media content. However, this kind of feature adoption could potentially exacerbate the skew towards more leftist and authoritarian biases in media representation.

INPUT: Left article In a moment when President Joe Biden and Democratic leaders sought to **create desperately needed momentum** to passkey part of the President's agenda, everything appeared to turn in the exact opposite direction.

Center article Congress is close to running out of time to avoid a government shutdown amid a **partisan divide** over federal funding and an extension to the debt ceiling.

Right article **President Biden canceled a trip to Chicago planned for Wednesday** and will remain in Washington, D.C., amid **stalled negotiations** over Democrats' infrastructure legislation

Expert-Written Summary President Joe Biden canceled a Wednesday trip to Chicago and is staying in Washington D.C. as negotiations on his administration's spending bills have stalled.

Generated Summary **President Joe Biden canceled a trip to Chicago planned for Wednesday** amid a **partisan divide over federal funding and an extension to the debt ceiling**.

Figure 3: Illustration of generated summary, the corresponding input, and expert-written summary [2]. **Yellow spans** illustrates the different descriptions of the attitudes and reasons for canceling the president’s agenda. The generated summary for this issue extracts the salient and objective sentences from the center and right articles, which are highlighted in **green** and **red**.

6 Analysis

6.1 Analysis of weight for losses

The configuration of weights for different losses is a critical issue to discuss. We chose different weight combinations for the three losses and did the experiments in Table 3. From the first row of weight configuration, we adjust the weight of MDS Loss (Multi-document Summarisation Loss) progressively scaled down from 0.98 to 0.02. Meanwhile, the weights for neutrality losses, namely ED Loss (Equal-distance Loss) and Con Loss (Contrastive Loss), are weighted nearly identically due to their similar efficacy and significance. The weight combination (0.2:0.5:0.4) in the NeutraSum yields relatively high summarisation results, while the (0.33:0.33:0.33) configuration effectively minimises media bias, achieving a score of (-0.38, 2.41) in the political compass test. Excessive weight for MDS Loss (0.98:0.01:0.01) might lead to more bias (-1.63, 3.96) in the summaries. In contrast, having a higher neutrality loss weight (0.02:0.49:0.49) does not necessarily ensure the best reduction in bias. It implies that there isn’t a straightforward relationship where simply increasing the weight of these losses leads to less biased summaries. By considering the final effect observed in bias reduction, the weight configuration of (0.33:0.33:0.33) has been selected as the final setting. This is because it can reduce bias more effectively while maintaining a certain level of summarisation quality.

6.2 Analysis of Generated Summary

As illustrated in Fig. 3 and 4, we showed two cases of reporting of the same event, with input (left, center, right news article), expert-written summary, and the generated summary from the NeutraSum model.

In Fig. 3, all of the relevant news articles and summaries wrote about the issue of cancelation of the president’s agenda, the left-wing article speculated that President Biden “create desperately needed momentum” to his agenda, while right-wing article stated that the reason for canceling agenda is “stalled negotiations over Democrats’ infrastructure legislation”, which amplifies the negative impact of the issue. An interesting pattern is shown in the generated summary. While BART is an automatic abstract summary model that will not directly copy the sentences from the input, we could observe that the generated summary extracts some bias-free sentences from the inputs to describe the issue. This seems to demonstrate the model’s certain capacity and semantic understanding on media bias neutralisation.

Fig. 4 still illustrates subtle word choice in different polarised articles and abstractive summarisation capacity. Regarding the coverage of abortion law issues, articles from the left-wing use the verb “blow” to convey the adverse effects of the efficacy of abortion laws on proponents of abortion rights. Articles from the Center share a comparable viewpoint with the left-wing, employing “curb” to depict the challenges associated with prohibiting abortion law. Conversely, right-wing articles employ terms like “allows” and “sue”, reflecting a more positive stance in favor of abortion legislation. An interesting notion is that the generated summary, in its conclusion, presents a neutral perspective on the

INPUT: Left article Texas' controversial abortion law will remain in place for the time being. The brief ruling is a **blow** to abortion rights advocates, who had hoped to suspend the law for as long as possible while its constitutionality is debated in the courts.

Center article Texas can continue banning most abortions after a federal appeals court rejected the Biden administration's latest attempt to stop a novel law that has become the nation's biggest **curb** to abortion in nearly 50 years.

Right article The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit said Thursday it will allow Texas's heartbeat abortion law, which **allows** private citizens to **sue** providers who perform abortions after a fetal heartbeat can be detected

Expert-Written Summary Texas' new abortion law can remain in place. Known as The Heartbeat Act, the ban outlaws abortions after a fetal heartbeat has been detected and allows private citizens to sue anyone who aids in the abortion process. Coverage from **left- and center-rated sources** often framed the law as **controversial and overly restrictive** and highlighted the ways Texas women have sought abortions since the ban took effect. Reports from **right-rated outlets** often described the law as the "heartbeat abortion law" and focused on **justices' rulings** that left the law in place.

Generated Summary The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit said Thursday it will allow Texas's heartbeat abortion law, which allows private citizens to sue providers who perform abortions after a fetal heartbeat can be detected, to remain in effect while it considers an appeal of a judge's order blocking the new law. The decision comes after the Justice Department asked the court to reinstate a federal judge's earlier ruling that barred the law from being enforced, **Supporters of the heartbeat law** say that it is necessary to **protect women's health**, while **opponents** say it **does not go far enough**.

Figure 4: Illustration of generated summary, the corresponding input, and expert-written summary [3]. **Yellow span** indicates that articles from various parties employ different words to articulate their positions on abortion laws. The generated summary not only outlines the full context of the issues but also encapsulates the perspectives and comments of various parties in **red**, similar to the expert-written summary.

attitudes of both the left and right toward abortion laws. It does more than just summarize the event's overview, it also encapsulates the stances of all parties involved in the matter.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper followed the task of generating a bias-free summary from a triplet of news articles with left, center, and right-wing reporting on the same event. Such a neutral summary could provide a more comprehensive and impartial view to the readers to alleviate their ideological and political stereotypes. By considering fine-tuning the semantic space of the generated summary towards a neutral representation, we proposed the NeutraSum model, a neutral summarisation approach designed to guide summarisation models towards a more neutral stance, and added two additional neutrality losses by adjusting the semantic distance among different inputs and labels to mitigate media bias using the BART model. To ensure impartiality in the semantic space, the desired neutral summary is structured to be equidistant from both left-leaning and right-leaning news articles. It also requires following the objective writing style of the expert-written summary while keeping a distance from polarised news articles. Moreover, as for the media bias measurement, we utilized the political compass test, which evaluates political ideologies on economic and social factors to provide a more nuanced understanding of an individual's political stance.

Despite its promising results, NeutraSum has several limitations in communication theory and AI applications. The framework focuses on overt bias and semantic neutrality but overlooks nuanced rhetorical strategies, such as tone and story prioritization, which remain challenging. Its reliance on datasets like Allsides limits generalizability, as these may not capture global or cross-cultural media diversity. While the neutrality losses reduce bias in semantic space, they fail to address pragmatic neutrality—how audiences interpret content. The lack of explainability in AI-driven decisions also limits transparency and trust, while latent biases in pre-trained models like BART and RoBERTa may still influence summaries. Scalability is another concern, as the framework's computational complexity may hinder real-time applications. Finally, ethical concerns regarding the definition and measurement of neutrality, such as

oversimplification by the political compass test, risk suppressing diversity in communication. Addressing these issues is crucial to improving robustness, scalability, and ethical responsibility in media bias mitigation.

There are substantial opportunities for future research and improvement in addressing the limitations of media bias studies. Firstly, only limited multi-document media datasets were used to mitigate media bias in news articles. Normally the large-scale media datasets [4, 7] are limited to the annotation of political directions in news reporting. This has resulted in most research on media bias focusing on how to identify media bias, rather than progressing further in mitigating media bias. Therefore, the first future research suggestion is to build a large-scale standard media bias annotation dataset following the ALLSIDES Dataset [23]. Such media datasets require detailed annotations, such as annotations for bias spans or the inclusion of expert-written summaries. Although some prior studies have created datasets like BASIL [13] and BABE [36] with sentences numbering around 1000-2000, they are still insufficient as training sets. Secondly, there is room to explore alternative neutrality loss functions or architectural designs to more effectively reduce media bias. While this paper employs two neutrality losses to push apart polarized news articles, a promising direction for improvement lies in introducing regulations that compact same-story news articles and extract shared contextual features. This approach could provide better guidance for generating neutral summaries by promoting cohesion and alignment among input sources. What’s more, our future work could also focus on incorporating nuanced rhetorical and framing strategies, such as tone and story prioritization, to better address subtler forms of media bias. Expanding datasets to include multilingual and cross-cultural media sources would enhance the model’s generalizability and applicability to diverse media contexts. Additionally, developing explainable AI mechanisms and debiased pre-trained models could improve transparency, trust, and fairness in mitigating media bias.

Ethical Statement

Media bias can be considered abstract in the sense that it involves subjective perceptions, opinions, and preferences within a political context. In this paper, we utilize the political compass test to measure media bias based on the general political background. However, this test could not assess the political attitude towards the specific event. While early research [23] has proposed sentiment-annotation lexicons to measure media bias by calculating the sentiment scores in the summary, there is no clear relation between sentiment and political polarity. Therefore, it is essential to be mindful of media bias considerations in both the model and the generated summaries in future research.

Another noteworthy phenomenon is that not all the same-story news articles with diverse political slants would have different attitudes. As for extreme cases, media outlets commonly adopt similar stances when reporting on particular issues. A broader investigative focus is warranted on relative polarity, which means that media outlets with various political ideologies have different attitudes toward the same issue. This could also be considered as a more nuanced perspective on future media bias metric design.

The final consideration is that to do this neutral summary task, we take out some notable cases to illustrate the framing of different polarised news outlets. It is noteworthy that not all news articles employ overly emphasized or derogatory language, this is primarily utilized to showcase the effectiveness of our summary generation.

Acknowledgement

This work is partially supported by Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research and Application for Data Science, BNU-HKBU United International College, project code 2022B1212010006, UIC research grant R0400001-22; National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12231004), UIC research grant UICR0600048; National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.1272054), UIC research grant UICR0600036; Guangdong University Innovation and Enhancement Programme Funds Featured Innovation Project 2018KTSCX278, UIC Research Grants R5201910; UIC Research Grants R201809; European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101002240). The computations in this paper were performed using the Bayes Cluster (USBC) provided by the Department of Statistics and Data Science, BNU-HKBU United International College.

References

- [1] Allsides. 2019. What does a “Center” media bias rating mean? Website.
- [2] Allsides. 2021. Biden Cancels Trip, Focuses on Spending Bills as Votes Approach. Website. Last accessed 21th September 2021.
- [3] Allsides. 2021. Federal Appeals Court Keeps Texas Abortion Ban Intact; DOJ Asks Supreme Court to Halt Law. Website.

- [4] Baly, R.; Karadzhov, G.; Alexandrov, D.; Glass, J.; and Nakov, P. 2018. Predicting Factuality of Reporting and Bias of News Media Sources. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP '18*. Brussels, Belgium.
- [5] Baly, R.; Martino, G. D. S.; Glass, J.; and Nakov, P. 2020. We can detect your bias: Predicting the political ideology of news articles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05338*.
- [6] Bang, Y.; Lee, N.; and Fung, P. 2023. Mitigating Framing Bias with Polarity Minimization Loss. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01817*.
- [7] Budak, C.; Goel, S.; and Rao, J. M. 2016. Fair and balanced? Quantifying media bias through crowdsourced content analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1): 250–271.
- [8] Chen, W.-F.; Al-Khatib, K.; Stein, B.; and Wachsmuth, H. 2020. Detecting media bias in news articles using gaussian bias distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10649*.
- [9] D’Alessio, D.; and Allen, M. 2000. Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *Journal of communication*, 50(4): 133–156.
- [10] Erkan, G.; and Radev, D. R. 2004. Lexrank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 22: 457–479.
- [11] Eysenck, H. J. 1957. Sense and nonsense in psychology. *Penguin Books*.
- [12] Fabbri, A. R.; Li, I.; She, T.; Li, S.; and Radev, D. R. 2019. Multi-news: A large-scale multi-document summarization dataset and abstractive hierarchical model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01749*.
- [13] Fan, L.; White, M.; Sharma, E.; Su, R.; Choubey, P. K.; Huang, R.; and Wang, L. 2019. In plain sight: Media bias through the lens of factual reporting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02670*.
- [14] Feng, S.; Park, C. Y.; Liu, Y.; and Tsvetkov, Y. 2023. From Pretraining Data to Language Models to Downstream Tasks: Tracking the Trails of Political Biases Leading to Unfair NLP Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08283*.
- [15] Gangula, R. R. R.; Duggenpudi, S. R.; and Mamidi, R. 2019. Detecting political bias in news articles using headline attention. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL workshop BlackboxNLP: analyzing and interpreting neural networks for NLP*, 77–84.
- [16] Gentzkow, M.; and Shapiro, J. M. 2006. Media bias and reputation. *Journal of political Economy*, 114(2): 280–316.
- [17] Hamborg, F.; Donnay, K.; and Gipp, B. 2019. Automated identification of media bias in news articles: an interdisciplinary literature review. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 20(4): 391–415.
- [18] Hamborg, F.; Meuschke, N.; and Gipp, B. 2017. Matrix-based news aggregation: exploring different news perspectives. In *2017 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, 1–10. IEEE.
- [19] Hermann, K. M.; Kocisky, T.; Grefenstette, E.; Espeholt, L.; Kay, W.; Suleyman, M.; and Blunsom, P. 2015. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- [20] Hjelm, R. D.; Fedorov, A.; Lavoie-Marchildon, S.; Grewal, K.; Bachman, P.; Trischler, A.; and Bengio, Y. 2018. Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06670*.
- [21] Jiang, H.; Beeferman, D.; Roy, B.; and Roy, D. 2022. Communitylm: Probing partisan worldviews from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07065*.
- [22] Lee, N.; Bang, Y.; Madotto, A.; and Fung, P. 2021. Mitigating media bias through neutral article generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00336*.
- [23] Lee, N.; Bang, Y.; Yu, T.; Madotto, A.; and Fung, P. 2022. NeuS: Neutral Multi-News Summarization for Mitigating Framing Bias. *Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- [24] Lewis, M.; Liu, Y.; Goyal, N.; Ghazvininejad, M.; Mohamed, A.; Levy, O.; Stoyanov, V.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- [25] Lin, C.-Y. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, 74–81.
- [26] Liu, R.; Jia, C.; and Vosoughi, S. 2021. A transformer-based framework for neutralizing and reversing the political polarity of news articles. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1): 1–26.

- [27] Liu, R.; Jia, C.; Wei, J.; Xu, G.; and Vosoughi, S. 2022. Quantifying and alleviating political bias in language models. *Artificial Intelligence*, 304: 103654.
- [28] Liu, R.; Wang, L.; Jia, C.; and Vosoughi, S. 2021. Political depolarization of news articles using attribute-aware word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 15, 385–396.
- [29] Liu, Y.; Zhang, X. F.; Wegsman, D.; Beauchamp, N.; and Wang, L. 2022. POLITICS: pretraining with same-story article comparison for ideology prediction and stance detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00619*.
- [30] Over, P.; and Yen, J. 2002. An introduction to duc 2004 intrinsic evaluation of generic new text summarization systems, 2004. *National Institute of Standards and Technology*.
- [31] Papineni, K.; Roukos, S.; Ward, T.; and Zhu, W.-J. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 311–318.
- [32] Park, S.; Kang, S.; Chung, S.; and Song, J. 2009. NewsCube: delivering multiple aspects of news to mitigate media bias. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 443–452.
- [33] Park, S.; Ko, M.; Kim, J.; Choi, H.-J.; and Song, J. 2011. NewsCube 2.0: an exploratory design of a social news website for media bias mitigation. In *Workshop on Social Recommender Systems*, 1–5.
- [34] Rodrigo-Ginés, F.-J.; Carrillo-de Albornoz, J.; and Plaza, L. 2024. A systematic review on media bias detection: What is media bias, how it is expressed, and how to detect it. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 237: 121641.
- [35] Rokeach, M. 1973. *The nature of human values*. Free press.
- [36] Spinde, T.; Plank, M.; Krieger, J.-D.; Ruas, T.; Gipp, B.; and Aizawa, A. 2022. Neural Media Bias Detection Using Distant Supervision With BABE–Bias Annotations By Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14557*.
- [37] Spinde, T.; Rudnitskaia, L.; Sinha, K.; Hamborg, F.; Gipp, B.; and Donnay, K. 2021. MBIC–A Media Bias Annotation Dataset Including Annotator Characteristics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11910*.
- [38] Sunstein, C. R. 2001. *Echo chambers: Bush v. Gore, impeachment, and beyond*. Princeton University Press Princeton, NJ.
- [39] Trampuš, M.; Fuat, F.; Pighin, D.; Štajner, T.; Berčič, J.; Novak, B.; Rusu, D.; Stopar, L.; and Grobelnik, M. 2015. DiversiNews: surfacing diversity in online news. *AI Magazine*, 36(4): 87–104.
- [40] van den Berg, E.; and Markert, K. 2020. Context in informational bias detection. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 6315–6326.
- [41] Yan, Y.; Li, R.; Wang, S.; Zhang, F.; Wu, W.; and Xu, W. 2021. Consert: A contrastive framework for self-supervised sentence representation transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11741*.
- [42] Zhang, J.; Zhao, Y.; Saleh, M.; and Liu, P. 2020. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 11328–11339. PMLR.
- [43] Zhang, Y.; Martino, G. D. S.; Barrón-Cedeno, A.; Romeo, S.; An, J.; Kwak, H.; Staykovski, T.; Jaradat, I.; Karadzhev, G.; Baly, R.; et al. 2019. Tanbih: Get to know what you are reading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02028*.