

Uncovering Bias in Foundation Models: Impact, Testing, Harm, and Mitigation

Shuzhou Sun,^{†,‡} Li Liu,^{*,¶} Yongxiang Liu,^{*,¶} Zhen Liu,[¶] Shuanghui Zhang,[¶]
 Janne Heikkilä,[‡] and Xiang Li[¶]

[†]*The College of Computer Science, Nankai University, Tianjin, China*

[‡]*The Center for Machine Vision and Signal Analysis, University of Oulu, Finland*

[¶]*The College of Electronic Science, National University of Defense Technology, China.*

E-mail: liuli_nudt@edu.cn; lyxbible@sina.com

Abstract

Bias in Foundation Models (FMs)—trained on vast datasets spanning societal and historical knowledge—poses significant challenges for fairness and equity across fields such as healthcare, education, and finance. These biases, rooted in the overrepresentation of stereotypes and societal inequalities in training data, exacerbate real-world discrimination, reinforce harmful stereotypes, and erode trust in AI systems. To address this, we introduce Trident Probe Testing (TriProTesting), a systematic testing method that detects explicit and implicit biases using semantically designed probes. Here we show that FMs, including CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, and OWLv2, demonstrate pervasive biases across single and mixed social attributes (gender, race, age, and occupation). Notably, we uncover mixed biases when social attributes are combined, such as gender×race, gender×age, and gender×occupation, revealing deeper layers of discrimination. We further propose Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment), a post-processing technique that dynamically redistributes probability power to mitigate these biases effectively, achieving significant improvements in fairness without

retraining models. These findings highlight the urgent need for ethical AI practices and interdisciplinary solutions to address biases not only at the model level but also in societal structures. Our work provides a scalable and interpretable solution that advances fairness in AI systems while offering practical insights for future research on fair AI technologies.

Keywords: Foundation Models, Language Models, Bias, Fairness

1 Introduction

Foundation Models (FMs), trained on large-scale datasets, have exhibited remarkable capabilities in feature representation and are widely applied in sectors such as healthcare, education, finance, and technology.¹⁻⁴ However, the inherent biases in FMs, stemming from both technical and societal factors, have raised significant concerns. These biases manifest as systematic unfairness in model outputs, including misclassifications and stereotypes related to gender, race, and culture.⁵⁻⁷ Such biases undermine fairness and reliability, exacerbate societal disparities, and erode public trust in AI technologies. The roots of bias in FMs lie in entrenched societal and historical stereotypes embedded within the training data. Labeling Theory suggests that societies assign negative or positive connotations to certain groups or behaviors,^{8,9} which serve as the foundation for stereotypes and, in turn, fuel biases in FMs. Similarly, Social Identity Theory highlights the human tendency to classify individuals into “in-groups” and “out-groups,” ascribing favorable traits to in-groups while burdening out-groups with negative stereotypes.¹⁰⁻¹³ Notably, differences in societal discourse power among groups amplify the stereotypes of power groups and even evolve into mainstream views. These views are disseminated and inherited through literature, historical records, proverbs, and popular music, eventually embedding into the training data of FMs, thus perpetuating and amplifying biases. In this section, we systematically discuss four critical questions regarding biases in FMs: **Why harmful; How to test; Who is harmed;**

and **What can be done** to mitigate these biases.

1.1 Why harmful

The widespread deployment of FMs in fields such as healthcare, education, finance, and technology has raised serious concerns about the biases embedded in these models. These biases manifest as systemic unfair treatment of certain groups, such as discriminatory classifications based on race, gender, or age, damaging both the fairness and reliability of AI systems; this results in far-reaching negative impacts on society.^{14,15} For instance, the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) system, extensively used in the U.S. judicial system for criminal risk assessments, has demonstrated biases against African Americans by frequently misclassifying them as high risk.¹⁶ This bias leads to inequitable bail and sentencing outcomes, exacerbating judicial disparities. Additionally, the Workday HR System has faced allegations of racial, age, and disability discrimination,¹⁷ violating Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other federal anti-discrimination laws in the U.S.,¹⁸ with a potential class-action lawsuit affecting hundreds of thousands. Such biases not only restrict employment opportunities for affected groups but also hinder labor market diversity.

These cases illustrate that biases in FMs are not isolated technical errors but systematic issues that impact societal fairness, ethical norms, and economic structures at multiple levels. In detail, FMs' biases could cause significant harm to society and the advancement of technology through:

(1) Exacerbating social injustice and discrimination. Biases in FMs reinforce stereotypes against vulnerable groups across various fields, intensifying social inequality.

(2) Legal and ethical risks. Biased decision-making in critical areas such as law enforcement and employment can violate fairness principles, leading to legal liabilities and ethical dilemmas.

(3) Crisis of trust and barriers to technology adoption. Biases erode public




Fig. 1: **Framework of bias analysis and mitigation in FMs.** **A**, Illustration of probe testing. The input image depicts a chef, and the output includes two scenarios: unbiased prediction (“chef”) and biased prediction triggered by a negative probe (“criminal”). This highlights the model’s potential bias toward specific social groups. **B**, Three types of probes: Negative Probes, Positive Probes, and Neutral Probes. **C**, Datasets used for Single Bias Test: CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf. **D**, Extended datasets used for Mixed Bias Test: UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF, with additional labels (e.g., gender) to facilitate analysis of bias interactions across multiple social attributes. **E**, Comparison of the standard prediction process and the prediction process with logit adjustment, illustrating how logit adjustment redistributes probability power across categories to mitigate bias.

confidence in AI systems, impeding their acceptance and widespread integration into society.

(4) **Economic losses and social costs.** Biased models can result in misallocation of

resources, exacerbating social inequality and hampering long-term economic growth.

1.2 How to test

Recent years have witnessed growing interest in developing methods to test biases within FMs. Existing approaches often target specific social attributes or focus on a single type of bias, limiting their ability to comprehensively capture the complex stereotypes present across diverse groups.^{5,19–25} In this study, we introduce Trident Probe Testing (TriProTesting), a bias testing method with a trident-like design that incorporates three types of probes: negative, positive, and neutral probes. This method is designed to systematically evaluate biases in FMs across multiple social dimensions and uncover nuanced patterns of bias. Moreover, our proposed TriProTesting specifically distinguishes between explicit and implicit biases, offering a novel perspective for a holistic understanding of model biases.

The design of TriProTesting is inspired by Labeling Theory, which posits that society shapes the social status and value of specific groups or behaviors through labeling.^{8,9} Over time, these labels—embedded in literature, historical accounts, proverbs, and popular culture—are internalized by FMs during training, manifesting as explicit or implicit biases in their outputs.^{10,26,27} By utilizing semantically explicit probes, TriProTesting examines how FMs respond to various demographic groups. For instance, as illustrated in Fig. 1 A, an input image labeled as a “chef” might produce two distinct outcomes: a correct prediction of “chef,” indicating no bias, or a misclassification as “criminal,” influenced by negative stereotypes associated with certain groups. This approach enables TriProTesting to directly reveal model biases manifesting under specific conditions.

To fully reveal biases within FMs, we design three types of probes: Negative Probes, Positive Probes, and Neutral Probes (Fig. 1 B). This design is motivated by the long-standing transmission of societal and historical biases, which typically appear as explicit or implicit biases. Explicit biases are directly expressed through clear and unfair attitudes or stereotypes towards specific groups.²⁸ For example, despite its intent to denounce slavery, the novel Uncle

Tom’s Cabin reinforced discriminatory stereotypes about African Americans; the song “Some Girls” overtly demeans women of different races, clearly exhibiting racial and gender biases. Implicit biases, on the other hand, are more insidious, subtly embedding stereotypes under the guise of neutrality or flattery, making them harder to detect.^{26,27} For instance, the proverb “Boys will be boys” ostensibly normalizes male behavior while reinforcing submissive roles for females, and the phrase “You can’t teach an old dog new tricks” perpetuates negative assumptions about the elderly’s capacity to learn. TriProTesting systematically uncovers these biases through its trident-like design: 1) Negative and Positive Probes are employed to detect explicit biases by assessing a model’s tendency to associate groups with negative or positive stereotypes. 2) Neutral Probes are used to reveal implicit biases. For example, if a model accurately predicts one group (e.g., “man” or “woman”) but frequently classifies the other as the neutral term “person,” this indicates an underlying gender bias.

1.3 Who is harmed

Social stratification theory highlights the unequal distribution of resources, power, and status among social groups, a disparity deeply rooted in societal structures and exacerbated by cultural and cognitive biases across dimensions such as gender, age, occupation, and race.^{10,11,29} Specifically, gender biases significantly affect man’s and woman’s opportunities to access social resources;³⁰ age biases impact assessments of capabilities and values across different age groups, influencing policy and resource allocation;³¹ occupational biases impact societal evaluations and treatment of individuals based on their professions;³² and racial biases, entrenched in history and still active, undermine fairness and inclusivity.³³ In this work, we focus on four core dimensions: gender, age, occupational, and racial biases, aiming to reveal the underlying mechanisms of social stratification in FMs and the potential systematic discrimination against specific groups. To identify affected groups within these core dimensions, we design two testing approaches for a comprehensive analysis of biases associated with single and mixed social attributes:

Single Bias Test examines biases in individual social attributes, such as gender or race, by analyzing the manifestation of stereotypes and bias distributions within specific dimensions, thus uncovering potential discriminatory practices in various groups. We selected four representative datasets—CelebA,³⁴ UTKFace,³⁵ FairFace,³⁶ IdenProf³⁷ (Fig. 1 C)—which provide detailed labels and diverse group distributions, enabling the analysis of FMs’ responses to single social attributes such as “man”, “chef”, “child”, and “White”.

Mixed Bias Test investigates model biases arising from combinations of multiple social attributes, revealing additive effects such as those between gender and occupation, and enabling a more granular analysis. To achieve this, we expand existing datasets by adding gender labels, creating extended versions of the datasets UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, and IDENPROF (distinguished by capitalized names) (Fig. 1 D). For example, IdenProf was reannotated as IDENPROF, adding detailed combination labels such as “chef_woman” or “doctor_woman.” This extension allows us to test whether models exhibit significant biases towards mixed attribute groups.

Through the Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test, we can precisely locate affected groups, including those defined by single and multiple social attributes. Our analysis encompasses four typical FMs (CLIP,³⁸ ALIGN,³⁹ BridgeTower,⁴⁰ OWLv2⁴¹), four primary datasets (CelebA,³⁴ UTKFace,³⁵ FairFace,³⁶ IdenProf³⁷), and three extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF), engaging in cross-tests with 15 different probes. The testing setup thus includes 240 single bias test scenarios (4 models \times 4 datasets \times 15 probes) and 180 mixed bias test scenarios (4 models \times 3 extended datasets \times 15 probes). These extensive tests allow us to intricately map out who is impacted by biases within FMs, providing data-driven insights into the mechanisms of bias in these models and laying the theoretical groundwork for developing bias mitigation strategies.

1.4 What can be done

Social biases typically result in an unfair distribution of resources and social evaluations among different groups. Power redistribution is an effective solution to social inequalities, aiming to enhance the circumstances of vulnerable groups through adjustments in resource allocation and structural power dynamics.^{42,43} In FMs, biases can be viewed as a “technological reproduction of inequality,” where the overrepresentation of mainstream views in the training corpus leads to their dominance in model outputs, described as “probability power.” This phenomenon manifests as strong correlations between non-discriminated groups and positive probes, alongside excessive associations of discriminated groups with negative or neutral probes.

Interestingly, the principle of logit adjustment used in computer science to address long-tail distribution issues mirrors the fundamental concept of power redistribution.^{44–46} Logit adjustment modifies the output logit values with a set of adjustment factors, redistributing probabilities across categories to reduce biases (Fig. 1 E). Building on this concept, we propose Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment), a bias mitigation method that redistributes probability power across categories, balancing model responses to explicit and implicit biases.

Unlike traditional logit adjustment methods for addressing long-tail distribution problems,^{44–46} our approach employs an automated learning strategy for adjustment factors, enabling flexible bias mitigation across diverse FMs, datasets, and social attributes (see Method section for details). Compared to conventional training-stage methods that mitigate biases through data rebalancing or model architecture adjustments, our method offers several key advantages:

Efficiency. By analyzing a small set of labeled samples, it adaptively learns adjustment factors, significantly reducing both computational and data demands.

Interpretability. By explicitly controlling the model’s response intensity to probes, the

effects of bias mitigation can be directly observed, enhancing both the interpretability and transparency of the results.

In summary, our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce TriProTesting, a systematic method for testing biases in FMs. TriProTesting integrates Single and Mixed Bias Tests to analyze biases across widely examined societal attributes (e.g., gender, age, occupation, race) and their combinations (e.g., gender×age, gender×occupation). Using a trident-like probe design—Negative, Positive, and Neutral Probes—TriProTesting identifies both explicit and implicit biases, providing a unified evaluation benchmark. Through 240 Single Bias Test scenarios and 180 Mixed Bias Test scenarios across four representative FMs (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2), our results reveal pervasive biases in societal attributes and uncover underexplored phenomena, such as contradictory and exaggerated representations and the inheritance of single-attribute biases in mixed scenarios with increased complexity. These findings provide essential guidance for understanding and mitigating the societal impacts of FMs.
- We propose AdaLogAdjustment, a scalable and model-agnostic technique for mitigating explicit and implicit biases. AdaLogAdjustment redistributes probability power dynamically in model outputs, requiring no retraining or architectural changes while leveraging minimal labeled data for efficiency and applicability. Evaluated on four datasets (CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf) and three extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF), as well as four representative FMs (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2), AdaLogAdjustment mitigates biases in 99.17% of 240 Single Bias Test scenarios and 98.89% of 180 Mixed Bias Test scenarios, demonstrating its generalizability. Additionally, it achieves up to 70% improvement in bias mitigation performance in certain cases, highlighting its effectiveness.
- We draw from the concept of power redistribution in social science, analogizing FM

biases as “technological reproductions of inequality.” By integrating this perspective with logit adjustment, we introduce “probability power redistribution” as a theoretical foundation for understanding and mitigating biases as imbalances in probability distributions. This novel interdisciplinary perspective bridges AI fairness and societal ethics, offering practical tools and conceptual advancements for addressing bias in FMs. Our work provides actionable frameworks for future research on debiasing and enhances the broader dialogue on the ethical responsibilities of AI systems.

2 Results and Discussion

In the previous section, we discussed four key questions central to understanding biases in Foundation Models (FMs): Why harmful, How to test, Who is harmed, and What can be done. These questions comprehensively address the societal impacts, testing approaches, affected groups, and mitigation strategies for biases in FMs. In this section, we will provide answers to these questions through our experimental findings. The results of the Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test primarily affirm the effectiveness of the Trident Probe Testing (TriProTesting) method. These results confirm the efficacy of our proposed testing method while highlighting specific bias manifestations and the adversely affected groups, further elucidating the societal risks posed by these biases. Subsequently, the section on **Bias Mitigation with Adaptive Logit Adjustment** will demonstrate how our proposed Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment) method can effectively address biases in FMs.

Before formally analyzing the experimental results, it is essential to note that the data representing “probability of being predicted as a probe” in Fig. 2 and 3 have been normalized. During testing, it was observed that the range of bias manifestations varies significantly among different models. Presenting raw probability data without processing could obscure the subtleties of models with narrower ranges of bias, thus affecting the observation of their bias performance. To address this, we applied min-max normalization to each model’s data,




Fig. 2: Bias analysis of FMs using Single Bias Test. A-D, FMs’ prediction accuracy with probes included (bubbles’ size) and the probability of being predicted as a probe (bubbles’ color). E-H, The average probabilities of being predicted as probes for three models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower) across datasets. I, The average probabilities of being predicted as different types of probes for three models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower) across datasets. J, The top two largest probes predicted by OWLv2 for different classes.

normalizing values to a range of $[0, 100]$ (unnormalized data are provided in Supplementary S1.1). Specifically, we normalize predicted probabilities for all datasets and probe scenarios in both the Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test. For instance, in the Single Bias Test, the normalization range for the CLIP³⁸ model encompasses its probabilities across all datasets (e.g., CelebA,³⁴ UTKFace³⁵) and probe scenarios (e.g., “hero,” “criminal”). The same normalization process is applied in the Mixed Bias Test. This technique enhances graph visualization, ensuring that models or datasets with smaller bias values are not overlooked and more vividly reflecting relative bias extents across testing scenarios. It is crucial to emphasize that this normalization is solely for visualization purposes and does not affect the authenticity of the experimental data or the qualitative analysis of model bias.

2.1 Results of Single Bias Test

This section systematically analyzes experimental results from four FMs—CLIP,³⁸ ALIGN,³⁹ BridgeTower,⁴⁰ and OWLv2⁴¹—highlighting biases in single social attributes, including gender, age, occupation, and race. The Single Bias Test is significant not only for uncovering model stereotypes related to individual social attributes but also for establishing a foundation to explore biases arising from combinations of multiple attributes. By conducting systematic tests on individual attributes, we can identify and quantify how social biases are specifically manifested within these models, trace their origins, and offer precise guidance for developing future bias mitigation strategies. Fig. 2 A-D illustrate bias distributions for the four models across four datasets, with the x-axis representing group classifications and the y-axis depicting three probe types. The size of the bubbles in Fig. 2 A-D represents the models’ prediction accuracy with probes included, while the color of the bubbles indicates the probability of group classifications being predicted as probes. Thus, bubble size and color reveal the models’ sensitivity to different probes. The manifestation of biases across different social attributes is evidenced by significant differences in classification accuracy and tendencies to predict as probes. The results in Fig. 2 A-D highlight the prevalence and pat-

tern differences of biases related to single social attributes. Key observations and conclusions are detailed below:

Ubiquity of bias in FMs. For instance, in the FairFace dataset, the CLIP model exhibits smaller bubbles for the “White” group (Fig. 2 A), suggesting a comparatively lower recognition ability for this race. ALIGN shows a significantly higher probability of predicting the “man” group as the probe “genius” compared to “woman” (Fig. 2 B), reflecting a positive stereotype towards males. These biases reenact societal biases formed, propagated, and inherited through frameworks such as Labeling Theory and Social Identity Theory, reflecting the internalization of stereotypes by the models and their amplification in outputs.^{8-10,12,13} Technically, these biases highlight inadequacies in training data diversity and the model’s reliance on sample distributions, which can exacerbate social inequalities, particularly in decision-sensitive domains.

Consistencies in biases across different FMs on certain social attributes. For example, the bubble patterns of CLIP³⁸ and ALIGN³⁹ in the CelebA³⁴ and FairFace³⁶ datasets are highly similar (Fig. 2 A vs. Fig. 2 B), indicating that gender- and race-related biases in these models may stem from mainstream values and societal biases reflected in their shared datasets. The gender bias, for instance, strengthens the societal image of “man” group in sectors such as technology and leadership while overlooking the diverse contributions of “woman”. This consistency also reveals the significant impact of dataset commonality on model biases: stereotypes long-present in the data are learned and internalized by models, thus exhibiting similar bias patterns across different models.

Inconsistencies in biases across different FMs on certain social attributes. For example, CLIP and BridgeTower demonstrate notable differences on social attributes within datasets like UTKFace³⁵(Fig. 2 A vs. Fig. 2 C). CLIP tends to favor the “young adult” category, whereas BridgeTower performs better with the “middle aged” group. These inconsistencies likely arise from differences in training on non-shared data and varying learning objectives. For example, the extent of occupational label coverage in non-shared datasets

can significantly influence how models learn and represent these labels. This highlights the substantial influence of unique dataset characteristics on model biases. Additionally, variations in model architecture and training strategies can further accentuate the effects of non-shared data on bias patterns. This underscores the limitations of studying biases using single models and emphasizes the need for a multi-model approach to develop universally applicable bias mitigation strategies.^{13,30}

Overrepresentation and contradictions of racial and age biases. In Fig. 2 E-H, we show the distribution of average biases across the models CLIP, ALIGN, and BridgeTower. The radar charts in these figures display different probes on each axis, with points representing the average probability of models predicting a group as the corresponding probe. Notably, the calculations of average probabilities include only CLIP, ALIGN, and BridgeTower, excluding OWLv2 (the reasons are detailed in the Methods section). The results highlight overall societal attribute biases. For the FairFace dataset, the “White” and “Black” groups show high activity in TriProTesting, achieving significantly high probabilities across nearly all probe scenarios (Fig. 2 F). Similarly, in the UTKFace dataset, the “young adult” and “middle aged” groups exhibit elevated probabilities across probe scenarios (Fig. 2 H). These findings suggest that groups such as “White”, “Black”, “young adults”, and “middle aged” may be overrepresented in the training data, leading to an amplification of their societal attributes. Moreover, these groups exhibit contradictory biases, with high probabilities for both positive and negative probes, indicating an oversimplification of diverse characteristics into binary categories. Overrepresentation often leads to the underrepresentation of other groups, resulting in systematic neglect or misclassification by the model. For instance, in critical decision-making scenarios, some racial groups may not receive an evaluation as fair as that afforded to “White” or “Black” groups. While contradictory biases could also foster dual societal expectations for specific groups, as seen when young adults might be burdened with overly high expectations of capability yet tagged with immaturity, whereas middle aged individuals are perceived as experienced yet conservative. The interplay of overrepresenta-

tion and contradictory biases further diminishes the presence of certain groups in model outputs, exacerbating their marginalization in societal applications.

FMs exhibit both explicit and implicit biases. In Fig. 2 I, we further analyze the distribution of average biases from Fig. 2 E-H from the perspective of probe types. Consistent with Fig. 2 E-H, Fig. 2 I also excludes OWLv2, with detailed reasons provided in the **Method** section. Fig. 2 I specifically presents stacked bar charts, with each bar representing the probabilities of being predicted as Negative, Positive, or Neutral Probes. This format enables the observation of stereotypes reinforced by the models. For example, groups such as “man”, “judge”, and “police” are more frequently predicted as Positive Probes, reflecting the models’ reinforcement of positive societal stereotypes. In contrast, groups like “woman,” “East Asian,” “engineer,” “farmer,” “teenager,” and “elderly” are predominantly predicted as Negative or Neutral Probes. The high proportion of Neutral Probes particularly reveals implicit biases, indicating an indirect devaluation or disregard for these groups’ characteristics or value, even in the absence of explicit negative labeling. This phenomenon aligns with traditional societal attitudes, where “woman” group, for instance, are often perceived as “generic” or background characters. Thus, Neutral Probes serve as a crucial tool for capturing implicit biases, complementing the findings with Negative and Positive Probes. This trend reflects the models’ internalization of data distributions and societal stereotypes, reinforcing positive perceptions of dominant groups while further marginalizing vulnerable groups and exacerbating social injustices.^{10,26,28}

TriProTesting proves effective in Single Bias Tests applied across various FMs.

As an open vocabulary object detection model, OWLv2 demonstrates relatively weak classification performance across the four datasets (Fig. 2 D), primarily due to its focus on object detection rather than social attribute classification.⁴¹ As a result, OWLv2 is excluded from the average bias distribution analysis in Fig. 2 E-I. Instead, we conduct a separate analysis of OWLv2’s biases across different social attributes (Fig. 2 J), which reveals the probes most frequently associated with each social group. Notably, OWLv2 exhibits pronounced biases

in certain classifications. For example, in the FairFace dataset, the strong association of the “Black” group with the probe “liar” indicates a negative stereotype (Fig. 2 D). Additionally, despite overall limited performance, OWLv2 tends to predict “doctor” and “judge” categories as “genius,” aligning with positive societal stereotypes about these professions. This indicates that even an object detection model like OWLv2 can inherit longstanding biases from training data. Testing OWLv2 not only uncovers its bias patterns but also serves as a reference for the applicability of open vocabulary object detection models in societal bias tests. This experiment further demonstrates that even models not specifically designed for social attribute analysis inevitably reflect biases consistent with mainstream societal views, influenced by training data and model architecture. Thus, analyzing OWLv2’s bias patterns broadens the applicability of our proposed TriProTesting method, offering a practical foundation for more comprehensive bias analysis and mitigation strategies across diverse models.

The Single Bias Test systematically identifies biases toward individual social attributes in FMs. The primary value of this test lies in its broad applicability and ability to facilitate detailed analyses. It evaluates biases in individual social attributes, offering a standardized framework for model comparison and bias origin tracing, while paving the way for exploring mixed social attribute biases.

2.2 Results of Mixed Bias Test

This section analyzes experimental results from four FMs, focusing on bias patterns across gender×race, gender×occupation, and gender×age combinations. The Mixed Bias Test, designed to detect systematic biases towards groups characterized by these combined attributes, provides a more detailed perspective compared to tests of single-attribute biases. These tests are essential not only for expanding our understanding of the societal biases inherent in models but also for elucidating the compound effects of these biases.

Fig. 3 A-D depicts mixed bias distributions in three extended datasets (UTKFACE,

Detailed observations and conclusions are as follows:

Ubiquity of Mixed Biases in FMs. Mixed biases are widespread in FMs across the three datasets: UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, and IDENPROF. For instance, in the UTKFACE dataset, the analysis shows that the “man” group is more likely than the “woman” group to be predicted as Positive Probes (Fig. 3 A, C). This alignment with the Single Bias Test results, as seen in Fig. 2 A, E, and I, indicates that FMs consistently favor the “man” group, in both single and mixed attribute analyses. Furthermore, the ALIGN model’s performance on the FAIRFACE dataset exemplifies this bias, as the “man” group predicted more frequently across all probe types than the “woman” group (Fig. 3 B). These findings underscore the overrepresentation and contradictory biases observed in the Single Bias Test, suggesting that such biases persist in mixed attribute settings and reveal deeper complexities.

Consistencies and inconsistencies in mixed biases of FMs. In the Single Bias Test, we observed that biases across different FMs exhibit both consistency and inconsistency in certain social attributes, a pattern that extends and deepens in the Mixed Bias Test. For example, CLIP and BridgeTower demonstrate high similarity in biases on combined race×gender and age×gender attributes, while significant differences emerge in occupation×gender combinations (Fig. 3 A, C). Such consistencies likely stem from the models’ internalization of mainstream values and societal biases embedded in shared datasets, while inconsistencies result from variations in label quality and distribution within non-shared data, skewing the models’ learning towards specific social attributes. Notably, the inconsistencies are more pronounced in the Mixed Bias Test (Fig. 3 A-D), suggesting that interactions between two or more attributes may amplify the complexity of bias patterns, such as the joint effects of occupation and gender labels, which pose greater challenges for accurate modeling than single attributes. Moreover, differences in model architecture and training strategies likely magnify these inconsistencies. Compared to the Single Bias Test, the Mixed Bias Test further exposes the complex interplay between “shared” and “non-shared” data characteristics, affecting not only overall model performance but also directly

influencing predictive biases towards specific groups. Consequently, these observations yield pivotal insights into the complex mechanisms underpinning biases.

FMs exhibit compound gender biases across most social attributes. Fig. 3 E presents a quantitative analysis of the average bias distribution for CLIP, ALIGN, and BridgeTower, categorized by probe types. Similar to Fig. 2 I, Fig. 3 E shows the probability distribution for each mixed attribute group (e.g., “white_man”, “police_woman”) being predicted as various types of probes. This reveals notable gender biases; for instance, “East Asian_man” is associated with Positive Probes far more frequently than “East Asian_woman”, and “waiter_man” is more commonly linked with Negative Probes than “waiter_woman”. However, in certain professional categories, such as doctors, gender disparities are minimal, suggesting a relatively equitable approach to gender classification. These findings confirm that while FMs often exhibit pronounced gender biases across most groups, they demonstrate relatively unbiased performance in certain professional fields, such as doctors. Therefore, the Mixed Bias Test not only exposes stereotypes towards groups with mixed attributes but also provides detailed insights into the subtle variations of mixed biases within minority groups.

TriProTesting proves effective in Mixed Bias Tests applied across various FMs. Despite OWLv2’s relatively weaker performance in social attribute classification, its biases in mixed attributes, such as gender×age combinations, remain evident. For instance, the “woman” group is significantly more likely than the “man” group to be predicted as Negative Probes in the Mixed Bias Test (Fig. 3 D), illustrating distinct biases even in models designed for open vocabulary object detection within specific social contexts. This observation underscores the research value of OWLv2 in Mixed Bias Tests, revealing ingrained stereotypes through an extended bias testing framework, even though the model is not specifically designed for social attribute classification.

Through the Mixed Bias Test, we observe that biases in FMs involving multiple attributes are both widespread and exhibit cumulative effects, with significant variability across differ-

ent groups. The test’s core value lies in its adaptability to complex social contexts, allowing for systematic assessments of mixed attribute biases, providing detailed analysis to understand the origins of biases, and supporting the development of targeted bias mitigation strategies.




Fig. 4: **Performance improvement of FMs with Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment).** **A-D**, Results of Single Bias Test, showing improvements in macro average accuracy for four FMs (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2) across four datasets (CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf). **E-H**, Results of Mixed Bias Test, showing improvements in macro average accuracy for four FMs across three extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF).

2.3 Bias Mitigation with Adaptive Logit Adjustment

This section validates the effectiveness of our proposed Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment) in reducing biases and enhancing fairness within FMs. For a detailed explanation of AdaLogAdjustment, refer to the **Method** section. Fig. 4 reports enhancements in performance across all test scenarios, with the y-axis representing 15 probes and the x-axis showing the “Improved macro average accuracy through AdaLogAdjustment,” indicating the performance improvement of FMs equipped with AdaLogAdjustment compared to a vanilla

inference setup. Observations and conclusions based on the results in Fig. 4 are discussed subsequently. The observations and conclusions from Fig. 4 are as follows:

Performance enhancement and bias mitigation in Single Bias Test scenarios.

In Fig. 4 A-D, we display test results across multiple datasets for four FMs. AdaLogAdjustment consistently improves macro average accuracy in nearly all TriProTesting scenarios. For example, the CLIP model achieves over a 30% increase in macro average accuracy across multiple probe tests in the CelebA, UTKFace, and FairFace datasets, including probes like “fraudster” and “person” (Fig. 4 A). These results suggest that AdaLogAdjustment effectively mitigates explicit biases towards negative probes and alleviates implicit biases in neutral probe scenarios. Notably, the OWLv2 model, designed for open vocabulary object detection, achieves over a 60% increase in macro average accuracy across various probe tests in the CelebA dataset, including “genius”, “stranger”, “liar”, “fraudster”, and “criminal” (Fig. 4 D). Despite the complexity of OWLv2’s bias performance stemming from its adaptability, AdaLogAdjustment exhibits robust bias mitigation capabilities. In the UTKFace dataset, the ALIGN model experiences slight performance drops in the “genius” and “thief” probe scenarios, decreasing by 0.02% and 0.00333%, respectively (Fig. 4 B). We argue this does not compromise the robustness and stability of our approach, as these decreases represent only 0.8333% (2/240) of the Single Bias Test scenarios and are minimal. Results in Fig. 4 A-D showcase AdaLogAdjustment’s effectiveness in alleviating biases in Single Bias Test scenarios and its adaptability to diverse model architectures and task requirements. This adaptability provides a scalable pathway for enhancing fairness in complex decision systems.

Performance enhancement and bias mitigation in Mixed Bias Test scenarios.

In Fig. 4 E-H, we display the test results of four models on the extended datasets UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, and IDENPROF. Consistently, our proposed AdaLogAdjustment substantially elevates performance across nearly all test scenarios. For instance, the ALIGN model shows an increase in macro average accuracy by over 10% in 9 probe tests in the FAIRFACE

dataset (Fig. 4 F), while the BridgeTower model exhibits a more than 20% improvement in 13 probe tests in the IDENPROF dataset (Fig. 4 H). These results confirm the effectiveness of AdaLogAdjustment in mitigating biases in scenarios involving mixed social attributes, including gender×occupation, gender×age, and gender×race. In mixed attribute scenarios, biases often manifest as compounded effects, leading to more complex stereotypes against specific groups, such as female doctors or Black children. AdaLogAdjustment effectively alleviates these mixed biases by dynamically balancing the probability weight distribution across different mixed attribute groups, thereby ensuring fairness in diverse social scenarios.

Fig. 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of AdaLogAdjustment in alleviating biases across both Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test scenarios. Our method therefore provides a scalable technical pathway for enhancing fairness in AI systems, especially in resource-constrained, high-stakes settings such as the healthcare, education, and judiciary sectors. Crucially, AdaLogAdjustment introduces a bias mitigation strategy centered on “probability power redistribution.” This interdisciplinary approach successfully integrates social science theories with AI technical practices, offering vital insights for further research into the fairness of AI systems.

3 Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that biases in Foundation Models (FMs) are both pervasive and multifaceted, manifesting across core social attributes such as gender, age, race, and occupation. By systematically applying Trident Probe Testing (TriProTesting), we have illuminated how explicit and implicit biases are deeply embedded in FMs, stemming from the societal and historical stereotypes encoded in their training data. These biases not only reinforce harmful societal inequalities but also challenge the fairness and reliability of AI systems in critical applications. The proposed Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment) demonstrates a transformative capability to mitigate these biases, dynamically redis-

tributing probability power to achieve balanced predictions. This novel approach introduces a scalable and explainable solution for addressing biases across diverse models, datasets, and social contexts, thereby advancing the fairness and ethical responsibility of AI technologies.

Beyond immediate implications, this work highlights broader challenges in understanding and addressing biases in complex AI systems. While our findings provide a robust framework for bias testing and mitigation, critical questions remain: How can models be designed to intrinsically minimize biases from the outset? What are the long-term societal impacts of deploying debiased models in high-stakes environments like healthcare or education? In our future work, we aim to integrate bias mitigation more seamlessly into model development processes and thoroughly investigate the ethical trade-offs of debiasing techniques in real-world scenarios.

Furthermore, we believe that achieving true fairness in AI requires collective efforts to address not only technical biases in models but also the societal structures that perpetuate inequality. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and prioritizing ethical AI practices, the research community can create technologies that are both powerful and equitable.

4 Method

4.1 Data Preparation

In this study, we select four datasets—CelebA,³⁴ UTKFace,³⁵ FairFace,³⁶ and IdenProf³⁷ (Fig. 1 C)—covering core social attributes such as gender, age, race, and occupation for the Single Bias Test. For the Mixed Bias Test, we expanded three of these datasets by adding gender labels, creating extended versions: UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, and IDENPROF (Fig. 1 D).

Specifically, CelebA is a facial dataset with gender labels, utilized for assessing gender bias. FairFace, centered on racial annotations, serves to evaluate racial biases. IdenProf, an occupational classification dataset, is employed for assessing occupational biases. Notably,

UTKFace is a large-scale face dataset annotated with continuous age values. However, directly using continuous age annotations may fail to effectively distinguish model biases across age groups. To address this, we resegment the dataset into five categories: children (0-12 years), teenagers (13-19 years), young adults (20-35 years), middle aged (36-60 years), and elderly (61+ years). This segmentation more clearly exposes stereotypes at typical age stages and aids in identifying potential high-risk age groups in model predictions.

To extend UTKFace, FairFace, and IdenProf for mixed bias testing, we employ the CLIP model (ViT-B/32⁴⁷) to automatically generate gender labels. The process involves feeding preprocessed images into the model alongside two text prompts: [“a photo of a man”, “a photo of a woman”]. The model classifies each image as either “man” or “woman,” which is then recorded as the extended label. This automated labeling process reduces the need for costly manual annotations while ensuring consistent labeling. Utilizing this method, we develop extended datasets (Fig. 1 D): UTKFACE is categorized by age and gender into ten composite labels, such as “elderly_woman”; FAIRFACE is divided by race and gender into fourteen labels, such as “Indian_woman”; and DENPROF is segmented by occupation and gender into twenty labels, such as “doctor_woman.” This expansion captures more complex combinations of social attributes, thereby supporting Mixed Bias Tests. Additionally, this process demonstrates the practical utility of Foundation Models (FMs) in real-world data annotation tasks, as highlighted in many current studies.

4.2 Probes Design and TriProTesting

In an effort to fully uncover the complex nature of biases within FMs, our research strategically designs probes to guarantee that test outcomes are scientifically accurate, targeted, and socially significant. The design is governed by two fundamental principles: the systematic categorization of probes and the selection of representative probes, both of which are intended to provide a detailed portrayal of both explicit and implicit biases and support a comprehensive bias analysis.^{11,26,28,29}

We design three types of probes: Negative Probes, Positive Probes, and Neutral Probes (Fig. 1 B), aimed at distinguishing between explicit and implicit biases. Explicit biases manifest as direct and clear unfair attitudes or stereotypes toward certain groups. To detect such biases, we design Negative and Positive Probes. Implicit biases, however, are subtler and often conveyed through neutral or seemingly positive expressions. Neutral Probes are thus crafted to analyze whether models tend to classify specific groups into neutral categories rather than matching their actual labels. This design facilitates not only the revelation of the extent and direction of explicit biases but also the capture of the underlying effects of implicit biases, providing robust support for a comprehensive portrayal of biases.

In selecting specific probes, we place particular emphasis on each probe’s societal representativeness and multidimensional coverage. Our criteria for selection include: 1) Occupational and identity roles, such as “worker,” “citizen,” “stranger,” “hero,” and “leader,” to probe models’ biases towards various societal roles; 2) Integrity and moral traits, including “liar,” “fraudster,” and “criminal,” to determine if models attribute negative moral labels to certain groups; 3) Social status and competency traits, like “savior,” “genius,” “failure,” and “individual,” to investigate stereotypes concerning social status and capabilities; 4) Criminality and failure associations, with terms like “thief,” “criminal,” “failure,” revealing models’ bias in associating negative actions and statuses; 5) Generic identity and interpersonal relations, with probes like “person,” “citizen,” “individual,” focusing on models’ predictions of neutral identities, crucial for identifying implicit biases. This multi-perspective selection mechanism allows for a systematic evaluation of biases across multifaceted social attributes, lending scientific rigor and societal relevance to our probe tests.

Building upon this comprehensive probe design, we propose the Trident Probe Testing (TriProTesting) method, a bias testing method with a trident-like structure that incorporates Negative, Positive, and Neutral Probes. TriProTesting highlights three-pronged design, each probe type serving a distinct function in identifying explicit and implicit biases. Negative and Positive Probes assess models’ inclination to associate specific groups with overtly negative or

positive stereotypes, respectively. Neutral Probes examine the subtler tendencies of models to classify groups into non-descriptive or neutral categories, capturing implicit biases that might otherwise go unnoticed. TriProTesting provides a holistic evaluation of model biases by integrating these probe types, offering a systematic and interpretable testing framework.

To operationalize TriProTesting, we conduct Single Bias Tests and Mixed Bias Tests, designed to reveal biases associated with individual and combined social attributes. Our analysis spans four representative FMs (CLIP,³⁸ ALIGN,³⁹ BridgeTower,⁴⁰ OWLv2⁴¹), four primary datasets (CelebA,³⁴ UTKFace,³⁵ FairFace,³⁶ IdenProf³⁷), and three extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF). The testing setup incorporates 240 Single Bias Test scenarios (4 models \times 4 datasets \times 15 probes) and 180 Mixed Bias Test scenarios (4 models \times 3 extended datasets \times 15 probes). By systematically cross-testing all combinations of models, datasets, and probes, TriProTesting uncovers nuanced patterns of bias, such as contradictory or exaggerated representations in certain attributes, and reveals how biases in mixed attributes inherit and compound those observed in single attributes.

4.3 Models Tested

In this study, we test biases in four representative FMs: CLIP,³⁸ ALIGN,³⁹ BridgeTower,⁴⁰ and a modified OWLv2.⁴¹

CLIP, a pioneering multimodal alignment model, employs contrastive learning to establish shared embedding spaces for images and text, excelling in zero-shot classification and cross-modal retrieval, and serves as an early advocate of prompt engineering. ALIGN advances this capability by employing weakly supervised learning on an expansive dataset of 1.8 billion image-text pairs, demonstrating the potential of big data to enhance model generalizability while also raising concerns about the complex biases embedded in noisy training data. BridgeTower’s innovative “Bridge Layer” integrates single-modal encoding with multimodal interactions, showing promising results in tasks like visual question answering and multimodal retrieval. By probing BridgeTower, we explore how model architectures might

amplify or mitigate biases during multimodal semantic integration. Finally, OWLv2, initially crafted for open-vocabulary object detection, is reconfigured here to support zero-shot classification by calculating softmax scores from integrated logit values across prompts, thereby aligning with bias testing needs by predicting entire image categories (see Supplementary S2.3 for details on the OWLv2 adaptation). This setup enables OWLv2 to contribute uniquely to understanding how biases transfer across different tasks, revealing the adaptability and bias nuances of multimodal models.

By integrating CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, and OWLv2, this study not only encompasses the classic technological trajectories of FMs but also reflects the diversity and complexity of current research. Probing these models allows us to uncover the mechanisms of bias formation and propagation, providing guidelines for the ethical design and practice of future multimodal models. Additionally, the experimental results offer insights into the similarities and differences in bias manifestations among these models, laying the groundwork for assessing the societal impact of multimodal research.

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

Overall accuracy. To quantitatively evaluate model performance in bias tests, we present extensive experimental results in Fig. 2, 3, and 4. This section details the calculation methods for the metrics and their implications. Overall accuracy evaluates a model’s classification performance across all samples in a single probe test, representing the aggregate prediction accuracy across categories. The formula for calculating overall accuracy is:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{N_{\text{correct}}}{N_{\text{total}}}, \quad (1)$$

where N_{total} and N_{correct} denote the number of samples and the number of correctly predicted samples in a probe test scenario, respectively. For instance, in the bubble charts of Fig. 2 A-D, the size of the bubbles indicates overall accuracy, visually reflecting the model’s classification

performance across various probe test scenarios.

Probability of being predicted as a probe. The probability of a category being predicted as a probe is a critical metric for assessing how often a model identifies a specific category with a given probe in probe tests. This metric illuminates the degree of bias a model exhibits towards specific categories in various probe scenarios. The calculation formula is:

$$P(\text{class} \rightarrow \text{probe}) = \frac{N_{\text{class, probe}}}{N_{\text{class}}}, \quad (2)$$

where $P(\text{class} \rightarrow \text{probe})$ represents the probability of a category being predicted as a particular probe, with N_{class} denoting the total number of samples for that category and $N_{\text{class, probe}}$ the number of samples predicted as the probe. In Fig. 2 A-D, the intensity of the bubble’s color illustrates the probability of predicting the probe for a category, visually displaying the model’s bias performance in TriProTesting scenarios.

Min-Max Normalization. To prevent minor bias discrepancies from being overlooked in visual representations, we normalize the probabilities of probe predictions. The normalization formula is:

$$P' = 100 \times \frac{P - P_{\min}}{P_{\max} - P_{\min}}, \quad (3)$$

where P denotes the original prediction probability, and P_{\min} and P_{\max} represent the minimum and maximum values within these probabilities, respectively. This normalization, applied to each model, standardizes the results for both Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test scenarios. Such normalization enhances the visualization in charts, allowing biases in models with smaller ranges to be perceptibly examined while preserving the authenticity of experimental data and the reliability of qualitative bias analysis. In Fig. 2 and 3, all visualizations of “probability of being predicted as a probe” are based on these normalized outcomes.

Macro average accuracy. Macro average accuracy is utilized to evaluate the overall performance of models in multi-class tasks. Unlike weighted average accuracy, macro average

accuracy assigns equal weight to each category, providing a fairer evaluation of model performance across diverse classes, particularly in scenarios with imbalanced class distributions. Macro average accuracy is calculated as:

$$\text{Macro Average Accuracy} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \frac{N_{i, \text{correct}}}{N_i}, \quad (4)$$

where C is the total count of categories, with N_i and $N_{i, \text{correct}}$ respectively represent the total number of samples and the number of correctly predicted samples for the i -th class. In Fig. 4, macro average accuracy serves as a key metric to quantify the enhancements brought by the AdaLogAdjustment method in mitigating biases in FMs. The selection of macro average accuracy aligns with the study’s focus on fairness and bias mitigation, as it minimizes evaluation bias caused by unequal data distribution among classes, thereby providing a more accurate reflection of improvements in bias mitigation across all groups.

4.5 Adaptive Logit Adjustment

Addressing pervasive biases in FMs is a current focus,^{7,48} with typical mitigation strategies falling into four categories: Pre-Processing, In-Training, Intra-Processing, and Post-Processing Mitigation. Pre-Processing Mitigation improves the training dataset’s representativeness and diversity through data augmentation, reweighting, or generating new data.^{21,22} In-Training Mitigation integrates fairness mechanisms by modifying model architectures, incorporating new optimization objectives, or selectively updating parameters.^{24,25} Intra-Processing Mitigation adjusts decision-making processes during application, such as modifying decoding strategies or adjusting probability outputs to reduce bias.^{5,23} Post-Processing Mitigation directly eliminates manifestations of bias by altering model outputs, such as rewriting texts or adjusting classifications.^{19,20} Although these approaches offer advantages in mitigating model biases, they often depend on extensive data annotation or complex structural modifications, which limit their scalability in practical applications.

To address these issues, we propose Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment), a post-processing technique that dynamically redistributes the logit values by learning a set of adjustment factors. Pseudocode for AdaLogAdjustment is provided in Supplementary S2.4 for clarity on the method’s details. The method draws on the social science concept of power redistribution, which seeks to improve the situation of disadvantaged groups through resource redistribution or structural adjustments. Similarly, in FMs, biases can be seen as a technological reproduction of inequality, where dominant groups’ perspectives are overrepresented in training data, holding disproportionate “probability power.” AdaLogAdjustment redistributes this probability power across categories by adjusting the distribution of logits, ensuring a more balanced representation between explicit and implicit biases. Compared to existing debias methods, AdaLogAdjustment offers distinct advantages: 1) Efficiency: It mitigates biases without requiring model retraining or structural modifications, relying only on minimal labeled data and straightforward optimization; 2) Universality: It is adaptable to any model, dataset, and social attribute in bias testing scenarios; 3) Explainability: The explicit control over the adjustment factors enhances the transparency of bias mitigation outcomes.

Specifically, let the logit values output by the FMs are $\mathbf{z} = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_C]$, where C denotes the total number of classes. The logit adjustment process is defined as $\mathbf{z}_\alpha = \mathbf{z} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_C]$ are adjustment factors, and $\mathbf{z} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ denotes element-wise weighted adjustment of the vector of logit values. In tests incorporating probes, for C -class tasks, the logit values output by FMs and the required adjustment factors are respectively extended to $\mathbf{z}' = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_C, z_{C+1}]$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}' = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_C, \alpha_{C+1}]$. To learn the adjustment factors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$, a training set is compiled by randomly selecting N (with $N = 20$ in this study) samples from each class, while the rest serve as the test set. Refer to Supplementary S2.1 for a detailed analysis of the sample size N . The initial adjustment factors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ are set to 1, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\alpha}' = [1, 1, \dots, 1]$. Through iterative optimization using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.01 (see Supplementary S2.2 for the learning rate ablation study), we minimize the

average cross-entropy loss over the training set. The loss function \mathcal{L} is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N \times C} \sum_{n=1}^{N \times C} \log\left(\frac{\exp(\alpha_{y_n} \cdot z_{y_n})}{\sum_{c=1}^{C+1} \exp(\alpha_c \cdot z_c)}\right), \quad (5)$$

where n indexes the samples in the training set and y_n is the true label of the n -th sample. The optimization runs for 20 epochs, and the α' values that maximize the training set accuracy are selected as the final parameters.

By dynamically adjusting the model’s responses to different categories, AdaLogAdjustment effectively weakens the strong associations between dominant groups and positive probes while mitigating the biases of marginalized groups being linked to negative or neutral probes. Importantly, the finding that $N = 20$ achieves satisfactory performance underscores the scalability of our approach. It shows that even in scenarios with limited labeled data—a common constraint in real-world applications—our method remains highly effective. This positions AdaLogAdjustment as a practical and versatile solution for addressing biases in diverse settings, contributing to the broader goal of creating fair and reliable AI systems with minimal resource requirements.

Supporting Information Available

This supplementary material includes sections for both “Supplementary for ‘Results and Discussion’” and “Supplementary for ‘Method’”. The section “Supplementary for ‘Results and Discussion’” contains details on the original data before normalization and detailed data for derived calculations. The section “Supplementary for ‘Method’” features an ablation study on sample size, an ablation study on learning rate, implementation details of the OWLv2 adaptation, and pseudocode for the TriProTesting and AdaLogAdjustment methods.

Technology Use Disclosure

This manuscript was refined using the AI language model ChatGPT, which assisted in improving the grammar and eliminating typographical errors. The content has been thoroughly reviewed, revised, and endorsed by all contributing authors.

Data Availability Statement

Access to the datasets used in this study is provided through the following links:

- CelebA dataset is available at: <https://mmlab.ie.cuhk.edu.hk/projects/CelebA.html>.
- UTKFace dataset can be accessed from: <https://susanqq.github.io/UTKFace/>.
- FairFace dataset is provided via: <https://github.com/joojs/fairface>.
- IdenProf dataset can be downloaded from: <https://github.com/OlafenwaMoses/IdenProf>.

Each dataset is formatted for compatibility with our training framework and available for research purposes.

Code Availability Statement

The code used in this study is available on GitHub at <https://github.com/rsdczhs0/TriProTesting>.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62376283, the Key Stone Grant (JS2023-03) provided by the National University of Defense Technology (NUDT), and the Academy of Finland under Grant No. 331883, the Infotech Project FRAGES. The authors are grateful for the generous support from these institutions.

Author declarations

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

Author Contributions

Shuzhou Sun, Li Liu, and Janne Heikkilä designed the research study. Shuzhou Sun, Li Liu, Yongxiang Liu, and Zhen Liu developed the method, wrote the code, and performed the analysis. Li Liu, Yongxiang Liu, Shuanghui Zhang and Xiang Li contributed to refining the methods and analytical framework. All authors wrote and approved the manuscript.

References

- (1) Singhal, K.; Azizi, S.; Tu, T.; Mahdavi, S. S.; Wei, J.; Chung, H. W.; Scales, N.; Tanwani, A.; Cole-Lewis, H.; Pfohl, S.; others Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature* **2023**, *620*, 172–180.
- (2) Jumper, J.; Evans, R.; Pritzel, A.; Green, T.; Figurnov, M.; Ronneberger, O.; Tunyasuvunakool, K.; Bates, R.; Žídek, A.; Potapenko, A.; others Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **2021**, *596*, 583–589.
- (3) Li, Z.; Han, W.; Zhang, Y.; Fu, Q.; Li, J.; Qin, L.; Dong, R.; Sun, H.; Deng, Y.; Yang, L. Learning spatiotemporal dynamics with a pretrained generative model. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2024**, 1–14.
- (4) Wu, Z.; Zhang, O.; Wang, X.; Fu, L.; Zhao, H.; Wang, J.; Du, H.; Jiang, D.; Deng, Y.; Cao, D.; others Leveraging language model for advanced multiproperty molecular optimization via prompt engineering. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2024**, 1–11.
- (5) Schramowski, P.; Turan, C.; Andersen, N.; Rothkopf, C. A.; Kersting, K. Large pretrained language models contain human-like biases of what is right and wrong to do. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2022**, *4*, 258–268.
- (6) Hofmann, V.; Kalluri, P. R.; Jurafsky, D.; King, S. AI generates covertly racist decisions about people based on their dialect. *Nature* **2024**, *633*, 147–154.
- (7) Navigli, R.; Conia, S.; Ross, B. Biases in large language models: origins, inventory, and discussion. *ACM Journal of Data and Information Quality* **2023**, *15*, 1–21.
- (8) Bernburg, J. G. *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*; 2009; pp 187–207.
- (9) Davis, N. J. Labeling theory in deviance research: A critique and reconsideration. *The Sociological Quarterly* **1972**, *13*, 447–474.

- (10) Hu, T.; Kyrychenko, Y.; Rathje, S.; Collier, N.; van der Linden, S.; Roozenbeek, J. Generative language models exhibit social identity biases. *Nature Computational Science* **2024**, 1–11.
- (11) Abrams, D.; Hogg, M. A. *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*; Routledge, 2006.
- (12) Mackie, D. M.; Smith, E. R. *Advances in experimental social psychology*; Elsevier, 2018; Vol. 58; pp 1–69.
- (13) Maass, A.; Salvi, D.; Arcuri, L.; Semin, G. R. Language use in intergroup contexts: The linguistic intergroup bias. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **1989**, 57, 981.
- (14) Fawkes, J.; Fishman, N.; Andrews, M.; Lipton, Z. C. The Fragility of Fairness: Causal Sensitivity Analysis for Fair Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09600* **2024**,
- (15) Kalluri, P. Don't ask if artificial intelligence is good or fair, ask how it shifts power. *Nature* **2020**, 583, 169–169.
- (16) Lagioia, F.; Rovatti, R.; Sartor, G. Algorithmic fairness through group parities? The case of COMPAS-SAPMOC. *AI & SOCIETY* **2023**, 38, 459–478.
- (17) Hilliard, A.; Gulley, A.; Koshiyama, A.; Kazim, E. Bias audit laws: how effective are they at preventing bias in automated employment decision tools? *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* **2024**, 1–17.
- (18) Act, C. R. Civil rights act of 1964. *Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunities* **1964**,
- (19) Zhang, Y.-F.; Yu, W.; Wen, Q.; Wang, X.; Zhang, Z.; Wang, L.; Jin, R.; Tan, T. Debiasing large visual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05262* **2024**,

- (20) Tanjim, M. M.; Singh, K. K.; Kaffle, K.; Sinha, R.; Cottrell, G. W. Discovering and Mitigating Biases in CLIP-based Image Editing. Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision. 2024; pp 2984–2993.
- (21) Ghanbarzadeh, S.; Huang, Y.; Palangi, H.; Moreno, R. C.; Khanpour, H. Gender-tuning: Empowering fine-tuning for debiasing pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10522* **2023**,
- (22) Zayed, A.; Parthasarathi, P.; Mordido, G.; Palangi, H.; Shabanian, S.; Chandar, S. Deep learning on a healthy data diet: Finding important examples for fairness. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2023; pp 14593–14601.
- (23) Liu, P.; Yuan, W.; Fu, J.; Jiang, Z.; Hayashi, H.; Neubig, G. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys* **2023**, *55*, 1–35.
- (24) Yang, K.; Yu, C.; Fung, Y. R.; Li, M.; Ji, H. Adept: A debiasing prompt framework. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2023; pp 10780–10788.
- (25) Woo, T.-J.; Nam, W.-J.; Ju, Y.-J.; Lee, S.-W. Compensatory debiasing for gender imbalances in language models. ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). 2023; pp 1–5.
- (26) Hamidieh, K.; Zhang, H.; Gerych, W.; Hartvigsen, T.; Ghassemi, M. Identifying implicit social biases in vision-language models. Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society. 2024; pp 547–561.
- (27) Howard, P.; Madasu, A.; Le, T.; Moreno, G. L.; Bhiwandiwalla, A.; Lal, V. SocialCounterfactuals: Probing and Mitigating Intersectional Social Biases in Vision-Language Models with Counterfactual Examples. Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 2024; pp 11975–11985.

- (28) Sibley, C. G.; Harré, N. A gender role socialization model of explicit and implicit biases in driving self-enhancement. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* **2009**, *12*, 452–461.
- (29) Parsons, T. An analytical approach to the theory of social stratification. *American Journal of Sociology* **1940**, *45*, 841–862.
- (30) Fraser, K. C.; Kiritchenko, S. Examining Gender and Racial Bias in Large Vision-Language Models Using a Novel Dataset of Parallel Images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05779* **2024**,
- (31) Ruggeri, G.; Nozza, D.; others *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*; Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- (32) Jiang, Y.; Li, Z.; Shen, X.; Liu, Y.; Backes, M.; Zhang, Y. ModSCAN: Measuring Stereotypical Bias in Large Vision-Language Models from Vision and Language Modalities. *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2024; pp 12814–12845.
- (33) Tanjim, M. M.; Singh, K. K.; Kafle, K.; Sinha, R.; Cottrell, G. W. Discovering and Mitigating Biases in CLIP-based Image Editing. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2024; pp 2984–2993.
- (34) Liu, Z.; Luo, P.; Wang, X.; Tang, X. Large-scale celebfaces attributes (celeba) dataset. *Retrieved August* **2018**, *15*, 11.
- (35) Zhang, Z.; Song, Y.; Qi, H. Age progression/regression by conditional adversarial autoencoder. *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2017; pp 5810–5818.
- (36) Karkkainen, K.; Joo, J. Fairface: Face attribute dataset for balanced race, gender,

- and age for bias measurement and mitigation. Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision. 2021; pp 1548–1558.
- (37) Olafenwa, M. IdenProf: An Identity Professional Dataset. <https://github.com/OlafenwaMoses/IdenProf>, 2018.
- (38) Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; others Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. International conference on machine learning. 2021; pp 8748–8763.
- (39) Jia, C.; Yang, Y.; Xia, Y.; Chen, Y.-T.; Parekh, Z.; Pham, H.; Le, Q.; Sung, Y.-H.; Li, Z.; Duerig, T. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. International conference on machine learning. 2021; pp 4904–4916.
- (40) Xu, X.; Wu, C.; Rosenman, S.; Lal, V.; Che, W.; Duan, N. Bridgetower: Building bridges between encoders in vision-language representation learning. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2023; pp 10637–10647.
- (41) Minderer, M.; Gritsenko, A.; Houlsby, N. Scaling open-vocabulary object detection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **2024**, *36*.
- (42) Szelenyi, I. Social inequalities in state socialist redistributive economies. *International journal of comparative sociology* **1978**, *19*, 63–87.
- (43) Bangura, Y. Inequality and the politics of redistribution. *The European Journal of Development Research* **2011**, *23*, 531–536.
- (44) Li, M.; Cheung, Y.-m.; Lu, Y. Long-tailed visual recognition via gaussian clouded logit adjustment. Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 2022; pp 6929–6938.

- (45) Sun, S.; Zhi, S.; Liao, Q.; Heikkilä, J.; Liu, L. Unbiased scene graph generation via two-stage causal modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **2023**, *45*, 12562–12580.
- (46) Menon, A. K.; Jayasumana, S.; Rawat, A. S.; Jain, H.; Veit, A.; Kumar, S. Long-tail learning via logit adjustment. *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.* 2020; pp 1–27.
- (47) Dosovitskiy, A. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* **2020**,
- (48) Gallegos, I. O.; Rossi, R. A.; Barrow, J.; Tanjim, M. M.; Kim, S.; Deroncourt, F.; Yu, T.; Zhang, R.; Ahmed, N. K. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. *Computational Linguistics* **2024**, 1–79.

Supplementary

Note that, in this Supplementary, any figure references formatted as “Fig. 1,” “Fig. 2,” and so on correspond to figures presented in the main paper. Figures and tables introduced specifically within this Supplementary are labeled with an “S” prefix (e.g., Fig. S1, Table S1) to distinguish them from those in the main paper.

S1 Supplementary for “Results and Discussion”

This section presents additional data and detailed calculations to supplement the analyses in the main paper’s “Results and Discussion”. By including raw data before normalization and intermediate data used in derived calculations, we aim to enhance the transparency, reproducibility, and interpretability of our findings. The supplementary data not only provides insights into the baseline characteristics of the models but also substantiates the computational processes behind key visualizations.

S1.1 Original Data Before Normalization

This subsection provides unnormalized data underlying several key visualizations in the main paper, specifically Fig. 2 A-D and Fig. 3 A-D. Presenting these raw probabilities enhances the reproducibility and transparency of our analyses. The raw data allows readers to understand the impact of normalization on bias representation, particularly in visualizations relying on probability distributions.

Raw probabilities for “predicted as probes” in Fig. 2 A-D (Table S1). Table S1 presents the original probabilities of each class predicted as specific probes under the TriProTesting framework. These probabilities, computed for four models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2) across datasets (CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf), represent the unprocessed likelihoods of class-probe associations. This table underpins the bubble

colors in Fig. 2 A-D. While normalized values are used in the main paper to improve visual clarity and comparability, Table S1 provides the foundational data, offering a direct insight into the models’ raw predictions.

Original probabilities supporting heatmap values in Fig. 3 A-D (Table S2, Table S3). The heatmap values presented in Fig. 3 A-D of the main paper are based on differences in normalized probabilities for “woman” and “man” groups being predicted as probes. In this subsection, we provide the unnormalized probabilities that forming the basis of these calculations. Table S2 contains the original probabilities for the “woman” group, while Table S3 contains the original probabilities for the “man” group across the extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF). However, these unnormalized probabilities serve as foundational inputs and require the normalization process detailed in Subsection S1.2 to produce the heatmap values.

S1.2 Detailed Data for Derived Calculations

This subsection provides intermediate data supporting the derived calculations presented in the main paper, particularly for Fig. 3 A-D and Fig. 4 A-H. These data ensure transparency in the computation of derived metrics, allowing readers to reconstruct and verify the results.

Normalized probabilities used to calculate heatmap values in Fig. 3 A-D (Table S4, Table S5). The heatmaps in Fig. 3 A-D of the main paper were derived from differences in normalized probabilities of the “woman” and “man” groups predicted as probes. Specifically, each heatmap value is calculated by subtracting the normalized probability of the “man” group (Table S5) from that of the “woman” group (Table S4). This subsection presents the normalized probabilities used in these calculations. Table S4 reports the normalized probabilities for the “woman” group, while Table S5 lists the normalized probabilities for the “man” group across the extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF). These tables ensure transparency in the derivation of the heatmap values and clarify the relationship between the normalized probabilities and the resulting visualizations.

Macro average accuracy for bias mitigation in Fig. 4 A-D (Table S6, Table S7) and E-H (Table S8, Table S9). Tables S6, S7, S8, S9 present the macro average accuracies for models with and without AdaLogAdjustment across Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test scenarios.

Table S6 lists the macro average accuracy achieved with AdaLogAdjustment in Single Bias Test scenarios, while Table S7 presents the corresponding results without AdaLogAdjustment. Subtracting the values in Table S7 from Table S6 yields the “Improved macro average accuracy” values shown in Fig. 4 A-D, quantifying the impact of AdaLogAdjustment on fairness and bias mitigation in Single Bias Test scenarios.

Table S8 presents the macro average accuracy results achieved with the application of AdaLogAdjustment in Mixed Bias Test scenarios, whereas Table S9 lists the corresponding results without AdaLogAdjustment. Subtracting the values in Table S9 from Table S8 generates the “Improved macro average accuracy” values shown in Fig. 4 E-H, demonstrating the effectiveness of AdaLogAdjustment in mitigating biases in Mixed Bias Test scenarios.

This structured reporting ensures transparency and provides a comprehensive understanding of the improvements facilitated by AdaLogAdjustment in both Single Bias Test and Mixed Bias Test scenarios.

S2 Supplementary for “Method”

This section provides detailed explanations and additional materials to elucidate the methods employed in the main paper. By presenting ablation studies, implementation specifics, and pseudocode, we aim to enhance the transparency, reproducibility, and practicality of our proposed frameworks. These supplementary materials highlight the robustness of our methods under varying conditions, provide insights into critical design choices, and offer clear guidance for replicating and extending the work.

S2.1 Ablation Study on Sample Size

The parameter N in our method determines the number of samples randomly selected from each class to construct the training set for learning the adjustment factors α' . These adjustment factors are critical for redistributing the probability power of logits, as described in the main paper. In our main experiments, we set a small sampling size ($N=20$) to balance computational efficiency and performance. To evaluate the robustness of our method and the impact of sample size on bias mitigation, we conducted an ablation study with N set to 10, 20, 30, 40, 100, and 200. The results, averaged over three runs to account for randomness in sample selection, are reported in Table S10. We have the following observations:

Optimal performance at $N = 20$. Across most probe testing scenarios, $N = 20$ achieves the best results in improving macro average accuracy through AdaLogAdjustment. This suggests that $N = 20$ strikes the optimal balance between sample size and the ability to generalize adjustment factors effectively. Notably, in some scenarios, the superiority of $N = 20$ is particularly pronounced. For instance, in the CLIP model tested with the CelebA dataset using “person” as the probe, $N = 20$ improves macro average accuracy by 37.81%, significantly outperforming other sample sizes, which achieve improvements of approximately 25%.

Decreased performance with small N . When N is set to a small value (e.g., $N = 10$), the performance generally decreases. This is likely due to insufficient diversity in the training set, as smaller sample sizes may fail to capture the variability in the data distribution. As a result, the learned adjustment factors are less effective at mitigating biases across diverse groups and probes.

Decreased performance with large N . Interestingly, increasing N to large values (e.g., $N = 100$ or $N = 200$), also results in a decline in performance. This decline is attributed to overfitting during optimization, where excessive training samples cause the adjustment factors to overly align with the specific characteristics of the training set, re-

ducing their generalizability to the test set. Moreover, larger N values introduce greater computational costs without proportional gains in performance, making them less practical.

The ablation study demonstrates that $N = 20$ is the optimal choice, yielding superior results across most scenarios. This highlights the efficiency of our method in using minimal training data to achieve high-quality bias mitigation and underscores the robustness of the adjustment factors learned in this setting. Setting $N = 20$ allows our method to achieve a delicate balance between performance and resource efficiency, making it particularly suitable for practical applications where data availability and computational resources are constrained.

S2.2 Ablation Study on Learning Rate




Fig. S1: **Improved macro average accuracy through AdaLogAdjustment under different learning rates.** Improved macro average accuracy is shown for four representative test scenarios: 1) testing UTKFace with the probe “fraudster” using CLIP, 2) testing FairFace with the probe “person” using ALIGN, 3) testing CelebA with the probe “leader” using BridgeTower, and 4) testing IdenProf with the probe “liar” using OWLv2. Learning rates tested include 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, and 0.5.

The choice of learning rate is critical in the optimization process for learning logit adjustment factors in the AdaLogAdjustment framework. To evaluate the impact of different learning rates, we conducted ablation studies across four representative test scenarios: testing

CLIP on UTKFace with the probe “fraudster,” ALIGN on FairFace with the probe “person,” BridgeTower on CelebA with the probe “leader,” and OWLv2 on IdenProf with the probe “liar.” These scenarios were selected to ensure comprehensive coverage of all models, datasets, and probe types.

We test six different learning rates: 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, and 0.5. The results, reported in Fig. S1, show the improved macro average accuracy achieved through AdaLogAdjustment across these learning rates for each test scenario. From these experiments, we can derive the following key findings:

Optimal learning rates vary across scenarios. Each test scenario exhibited a distinct optimal learning rate. For instance, the optimal learning rate for testing CLIP on UTKFace with the probe “fraudster” was 0.01, significantly outperforming other learning rates. Conversely, testing ALIGN on FairFace with the probe “person” achieved the highest macro average accuracy improvement at a learning rate of 0.05. These variations are not surprising, given the differences in model capabilities, dataset complexities, and probe types, all of which influence the rate of adjustment parameter learning.

Low learning rates lead to insufficient optimization. Across all test scenarios, learning rates of 0.0001 and 0.001 consistently resulted in minimal improvements in macro average accuracy. We attribute this to the limited number of optimization epochs (20) set in our experiments. This choice was deliberate, as it reflects the design philosophy of the AdaLogAdjustment framework: to achieve efficient learning of adjustment factors with minimal computational overhead. Specifically, by limiting the optimization to 20 epochs, we aim to balance performance and efficiency, making our method suitable for real-world applications where computational resources or time may be constrained. However, with such low learning rates, the optimization process is unlikely to converge to satisfactory solutions within this limited number of epochs, resulting in suboptimal performance.

A unified learning rate strikes a balance. Although scenario-specific tuning of learning rates could yield the highest possible performance in each case, this approach con-

tradicts our overarching objective. The aim of this study is not to maximize bias mitigation performance in every scenario but to propose a generalized, efficient framework adaptable to diverse contexts. To this end, we fixed the learning rate at 0.01 across all scenarios in the main paper, as validated in Fig. 4. This decision reflects a balance between generalizability and efficiency, demonstrating that AdaLogAdjustment can achieve significant improvements in macro average accuracy with minimal manual tuning.

Our findings underscore the trade-off between scenario-specific optimization and the need for a generalized framework. While further gains in bias mitigation could be achieved by tailoring the learning rate to individual scenarios, our choice of a unified learning rate of 0.01 aligns with the goal of developing a robust and scalable method for bias mitigation in diverse contexts.

S2.3 Implementation Details of OWLv2 Adaptation

Algorithm 1 OWLv2 Adaptation for Bias Testing

Input: Image I , List of class labels $L = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n\}$, List of probes $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$

Output: Image-level logit and predicted probabilities for bias analysis

- 1: **Load OWLv2 components:**
 - 2: $model \leftarrow OwlViTForObjectDetection(\text{pretrained_model_path})$
 - 3: $processor \leftarrow OwlViTProcessor(\text{pretrained_model_path})$
 - 4: **Construct prompt list:**
 - 5: $prompts \leftarrow \{“a photo of a ” + l \mid l \in L\} \cup \{p \mid p \in P\}$ ▷ Incorporation of prompt-based text queries
 - 6: **Preprocess inputs:**
 - 7: $inputs \leftarrow processor(\text{text=prompts, images=I, return_tensors=“pt”})$
 - 8: **Forward pass through the OWLv2 model:**
 - 9: $outputs \leftarrow model(inputs)$
 - 10: $logits_bbox \leftarrow outputs.logits$
 - 11: **Remove bounding box dependency:**
 - 12: $logits_image \leftarrow \text{mean}(logits_bbox, \text{dim} = 1)$ ▷ Removal of bounding box prediction
 - 13: **Compute image-level predictions:**
 - 14: $probabilities \leftarrow \text{softmax}(logits_image, \text{dim} = -1)$ ▷ Logit for image-level predictions
 - 15: **Output:** Return $probabilities$ for all prompts.
-

OWLv2, originally designed as an open-vocabulary object detection model, focuses on

detecting objects in images by predicting bounding boxes and their associated labels based on textual prompts. Although this design excels in object detection tasks, its architecture and outputs are not directly suited for the bias testing framework employed in this study. The main limitation is its default output format, which generates bounding boxes instead of a single classification result per image, as required by our testing methodology.

To adapt OWLv2 for zero-shot classification and bias testing, we introduce several modifications (Algorithm 1):

Incorporation of prompt-based text queries (Algorithm 1, line 5). We restructured the model to align its output logit values with a set of predefined text prompts. These prompts include both class labels and probes, ensuring that the model’s predictions reflect its alignment with societal attributes and stereotypes across diverse scenarios.

Removal of bounding box prediction (Algorithm 1, line 12). The bounding box prediction functionality was bypassed, simplifying the output to logit corresponding to the entire image. This adjustment ensures compatibility with the classification-based framework and eliminates potential biases associated with region-specific predictions.

Logit for image-level predictions (Algorithm 1, line 14). To account for the model’s original multi-object detection design, the logit values across all bounding boxes were aggregated into a single vector, representing the image’s overall prediction. This adjustment ensures consistency in evaluating OWLv2 alongside other models like CLIP, ALIGN, and BridgeTower, which natively support classification tasks.

The adaptation of OWLv2 serves two critical purposes. First, it extends the utility of an object detection model to classification-based bias analysis, demonstrating the flexibility and adaptability of OWLv2 in novel contexts. Second, it highlights the challenges and nuances involved in repurposing models for tasks beyond their original design, providing insights into how architectural features and task-specific adjustments can influence bias testing outcomes. By modifying OWLv2, we reveal its inherent capabilities and limitations in aligning with textual prompts, highlighting the unique ways biases manifest in models not natively designed

for classification. This underscores the importance of methodological rigor and transparency in adapting models for specialized research purposes.

S2.4 Pseudocode for TriProTesting and AdaLogAdjustment

This subsection provides the pseudocode for the TriProTesting and AdaLogAdjustment frameworks used in our study (Algorithm 2). The pseudocode formalizes the steps involved in bias testing and mitigation, offering a concise, reproducible outline of the methodologies detailed in the main paper.

TriProTesting Framework (Algorithm 2, lines 1-19). The first stage of the pseudocode implements TriProTesting, which systematically evaluates biases in Foundation Models (FMs) using defined probes. By aggregating logit values for Negative, Neutral, and Positive probes across datasets, the framework enables a detailed analysis of explicit and implicit bias patterns inherent in the models. This stage focuses on revealing and quantifying biases in the FMs, providing a foundation for understanding how biases manifest before applying mitigation strategies.

AdaLogAdjustment Framework (Algorithm 2, lines 20-34). The second stage introduces the Adaptive Logit Adjustment (AdaLogAdjustment) framework, which mitigates biases by dynamically learning logit adjustment factors. This stage uses a subset of the dataset as a training set to optimize adjustment factors through iterative updates. These optimized factors are subsequently applied to logit values from the testing set, yielding adjusted predictions that demonstrate reduced bias.

We provide the pseudocode to illustrate the modular design and practical implementation of the proposed TriProTesting and AdaLogAdjustment frameworks. By clearly separating the workflow into two phases—bias detection and bias mitigation—we ensure the reproducibility of our method and facilitate its application across various models and datasets. Our structured approach enables systematic analysis of biases while providing a robust mechanism for effective mitigation. In addition, we emphasize that our framework is not only

technically rigorous but also socially significant. By incorporating insights from social sciences, such as systemic inequality and power redistribution, we address the societal implications of AI biases and propose a method that aligns with ethical principles. Our work reflects a commitment to building AI systems that promote fairness and equity, contributing to the development of responsible and inclusive AI technologies.

Algorithm 2 TriProTesting and AdaLogAdjustment Framework

Input: Model M , Dataset D , Probes $P_{neg}, P_{neu}, P_{pos}$ (Negative, Neutral, Positive probes),
Training set size N

Output: Bias testing results and logit adjustment factors

```
1: Stage 1: TriProTesting Framework
2:   1.1 Set up probe prompts:
3:     Define Negative Probes:
4:        $prompts_{neg} \leftarrow \{\text{"a photo of a " } + p \mid p \in P_{neg}\}$            ▷ Define negative probes.
5:     Define Neutral Probes:
6:        $prompts_{neu} \leftarrow \{\text{"a photo of a " } + p \mid p \in P_{neu}\}$            ▷ Define neutral probes.
7:     Define Positive Probes:
8:        $prompts_{pos} \leftarrow \{\text{"a photo of a " } + p \mid p \in P_{pos}\}$            ▷ Define positive probes.
9:        $prompts \leftarrow prompts_{neg} \cup prompts_{neu} \cup prompts_{pos}$ 
10:    1.2 Perform inference:
11:    for each probe  $p \in prompts$  do
12:      for each sample  $d \in D$  do
13:         $logits_p \leftarrow M(\text{input} = d, \text{probe} = p)$    ▷ Obtain logit values for the current probe.
14:      end for
15:    end for
16:    1.3 Compute bias testing results:
17:    for each probe  $p \in prompts$  do
18:       $bias\_results_D \leftarrow \text{aggregate\_logits}(logits_p)$    ▷ Calculate logit and analyze bias
19:    end for
20:  Stage 2: AdaLogAdjustment Framework
21:    2.1 Split dataset into training and testing sets:
22:       $D_{train}, D_{test} \leftarrow \text{split}(D, N)$    ▷ Randomly select  $N$  samples per class for training.
23:    2.2 Learn adjustment factors:
24:      Initialize adjustment factors:  $\alpha = [1, 1, \dots, 1]$ 
25:      Define loss function:
26:       $\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N \times C} \sum_{n=1}^{N \times C} \log \left( \frac{\exp(\alpha_{y_n} \cdot z_{y_n})}{\sum_{c=1}^{C+1} \exp(\alpha_c \cdot z_c)} \right)$ 
27:      for each epoch in  $1, \dots, 20$  do
28:        Update  $\alpha$  using Adam optimizer on  $\mathcal{L}$    ▷ Iteratively optimize adjustment factors.
29:      end for
30:    2.3 Adjust logit for testing set:
31:    for each sample  $d \in D_{test}$  do
32:       $adjusted\_logit \leftarrow logit \cdot \alpha$            ▷ Apply learned adjustment factors.
33:    end for
34:  Return:  $bias\_results_{D_{test}}, \alpha$ 
```

Table S2: **Original probabilities for the “woman” group in Fig. 3 A-D.** Unnormalized probabilities of the “woman” group being predicted as probes across extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF) under the TriProTesting framework. These values serve as foundational data for calculating heatmap values in Fig. 3 A-D. The class names in this table are abbreviated as follows: F1: White_woman, F2: Black_woman, F3: East Asian_woman, F4: Indian_woman, F5: Middle Eastern_woman, F6: Latino_Hispanic_woman, F7: Southeast Asian_woman; I1: chef_woman, I2: doctor_woman, I3: engineer_woman, I4: farmer_woman, I5: firefighter_woman, I6: judge_woman, I7: mechanic_woman, I8: pilot_woman, I9: police_woman, I10: waiter_woman; U1: child_woman, U2:teenager_woman, U3:young adult_woman, U4:middle aged_woman, U5:elderly_woman.

	FAIRFACE							IDENPROF										UTKFACE					
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	I1	I2	I3	I4	I5	I6	I7	I8	I9	I10	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	
CLIP	criminal	28.3	19.8	2.5	1.6	7.8	3.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.4	1.1	1.0	0.1	1.5	13.4	25.2	9.8
	failure	16.0	6.3	1.3	0.4	3.7	1.3	0.8	2.1	0.0	0.7	3.1	11.1	4.6	4.6	1.9	0.0	6.9	0.1	0.4	5.0	3.9	1.5
	fraudster	76.3	83.2	40.3	37.1	49.9	37.1	32.0	5.5	1.5	2.1	5.1	1.6	13.5	2.3	8.4	2.1	27.5	2.9	29.5	85.3	98.0	61.1
	liar	42.1	26.4	3.8	2.0	10.5	5.0	3.2	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.4	1.2	4.9	0.8	1.2	0.0	7.7	0.3	1.9	21.2	25.3	8.8
	thief	19.0	27.8	0.9	1.2	3.6	1.8	1.4	1.7	0.0	0.7	1.7	0.4	2.3	3.1	1.2	0.0	13.7	0.2	0.4	2.4	8.5	2.7
	citizen	34.6	65.3	3.7	5.1	6.8	4.2	5.6	0.8	1.5	1.4	18.3	3.7	4.3	4.6	3.4	3.7	17.4	0.2	1.6	6.4	14.1	4.8
	individual	31.9	40.8	0.9	1.3	4.0	2.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	person	89.8	93.9	80.7	57.8	69.9	56.1	67.8	3.8	1.7	0.7	8.3	2.5	3.8	3.8	3.1	2.1	45.7	1.7	23.9	80.7	92.9	51.1
	stranger	15.0	7.7	0.9	0.5	2.9	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
	worker	0.5	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.7	0.2	35.0	4.3	2.1	0.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	genius	9.3	8.5	2.8	0.4	2.3	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.9	0.1
	hero	13.3	10.2	0.9	0.3	2.0	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.2	1.4	0.9	4.1	2.9	0.0	3.4	4.2	3.8	0.1	0.0	1.0	3.4	1.3
	leader	32.9	39.0	11.7	4.8	8.5	4.5	5.3	1.7	0.7	2.1	3.7	3.3	10.7	1.5	9.9	8.5	9.9	0.0	1.3	13.7	25.3	7.8
	savior	6.7	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.4	0.3
winner	55.1	44.9	15.4	3.1	17.9	8.4	6.6	5.1	0.2	0.0	3.1	1.6	6.6	1.5	7.3	1.1	35.8	0.4	8.8	32.7	43.5	17.6	
ALIGN	criminal	11.3	15.4	0.8	2.8	8.4	3.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.2	1.2	6.8	6.3	1.1	
	failure	5.4	2.8	0.4	0.9	2.9	1.9	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.6	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.7	2.1	0.3
	fraudster	38.9	26.2	1.1	4.2	23.6	10.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.7	4.0	5.2	1.3
	liar	7.2	2.6	0.6	1.1	4.3	2.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.4	7.2	6.5	1.5
	thief	4.0	4.6	0.3	0.8	2.5	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.1	0.6	0.3
	citizen	57.1	59.2	2.4	8.8	32.2	21.3	3.7	0.4	0.7	0.7	1.4	0.4	8.9	2.3	0.0	0.5	2.2	0.8	7.5	49.7	82.1	29.1
	individual	93.5	92.4	10.4	46.7	83.0	71.9	16.3	1.7	3.4	0.0	1.1	0.4	4.3	2.3	0.0	1.1	4.7	1.5	28.0	83.0	91.4	35.0
	person	94.4	92.9	14.2	58.8	87.4	76.5	22.6	1.7	1.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	5.5	1.5	0.0	0.5	4.9	3.4	39.0	91.6	97.0	48.2
	stranger	54.6	41.8	2.4	7.1	28.2	14.0	2.9	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.8	1.7	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.6	9.5	54.6	56.4	11.7
	worker	3.0	4.6	0.2	0.4	1.6	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.0	27.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	11.5	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.3	4.1	2.7	0.0
	genius	66.3	65.2	3.6	12.2	39.6	25.5	5.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.2	4.4	33.2	47.2	14.5
	hero	33.8	36.5	1.2	4.1	15.1	7.6	2.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.9	6.4	5.5	1.1
	leader	45.3	39.7	1.2	6.3	22.9	16.4	2.0	0.8	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.2	4.6	37.3	62.3	17.6
	savior	1.5	2.0	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.3	4.5	2.1	0.3
winner	24.2	25.5	0.5	1.6	7.8	5.6	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.1	0.7	14.5	23.1	3.7	
BridgeTower	criminal	2.6	2.7	0.2	0.4	2.5	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.3	0.4	
	failure	2.5	0.6	0.1	0.4	1.9	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	2.9	0.0	0.9	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
	fraudster	4.4	2.9	0.3	0.8	4.8	2.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.0	0.9
	liar	42.8	12.4	1.9	4.6	24.3	20.2	2.2	0.0	0.7	1.4	5.4	0.0	3.8	2.3	0.0	3.2	17.4	0.2	2.9	33.1	16.3	1.5
	thief	3.9	1.4	0.3	0.4	3.3	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.3
	citizen	23.1	42.1	1.7	19.6	24.6	34.7	4.8	2.1	2.4	3.5	7.4	0.0	17.3	6.1	0.4	12.2	8.9	0.0	0.9	14.1	35.5	11.8
	individual	96.5	89.1	18.4	73.9	92.7	88.0	26.8	1.7	5.1	0.7	6.6	0.0	15.9	3.8	0.4	9.0	18.6	1.1	37.8	95.9	98.3	65.0
	person	97.0	84.7	16.3	64.4	91.1	85.7	23.9	0.8	4.9	2.8	7.1	0.0	16.7	4.6	0.4	7.4	20.0	0.9	29.8	93.1	94.8	45.4
	stranger	91.6	65.5	16.4	54.3	83.4	76.0	23.4	0.0	1.7	1.4	5.7	0.4	5.2	2.3	0.0	1.6	12.7	0.6	21.9	86.5	81.7	35.0
	worker	1.1	1.2	0.1	0.3	0.6	1.3	0.3	2.1	3.2	93.0	7.4	0.4	1.7	23.7	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0
	genius	28.2	11.4	1.8	7.0	22.0	14.6	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.4	1.5	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.1	0.4	15.5	16.5	3.3
	hero	12.9	4.8	0.8	2.0	7.4	8.1	1.4	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.6	0.8	1.2	0.8	0.8	6.4	5.1	0.0	0.9	8.2	4.9	1.0
	leader	31.8	37.4	2.2	29.5	27.6	31.3	5.2	2.1	6.6	6.3	6.9	0.8	42.7	3.8	2.3	20.6	16.4	0.2	5.9	51.2	66.5	21.6
	savior	11.6	7.3	1.2	3.4	9.2	5.8	1.6	0.0	1.7	0.0	4.9	0.8	2.9	2.3	0.0	1.1	14.6	0.0	0.4	4.8	1.6	0.5
winner	10.5	5.5	0.6	2.1	3.6	7.2	0.9	2.1	2.2	0.7	3.7	0.0	8.7	0.8	0.8	4.8	7.9	0.1	1.3	12.4	10.4	3.0	
OWLv2	criminal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.5	81.6	67.1	44.3	61.5	92.2	23.7	50.4	94.2	67.9	18.3	66.6	79.0	71.1	70.9
	failure	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.4	96.8	90.9	70.6	74.6	81.3	42.0	67.2	68.3	80.2	96.4	99.0	98.5	97.0	95.3
	fraudster	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.3	48.5	14.0	2.9	13.1	66.9	2.3	27.9	31.2	33.3	24.2	79.8	92.6	92.0	88.9
	liar	19.5	27.8	14.7	20.7	20.0	18.7	22.1	77.6	99.5	73.4	76.6	65.2	98.3	26.7	52.7	87.8	94.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	thief	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.6	17.0	26.6	12.9	34.0	41.2	8.4	15.7	43.4	21.8	1.2	5.9	6.2	5.7	8.7
	citizen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	9.2	19.6	5.1	10.3	9.2	0.8	12.2	33.9	13.9	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.4	1.2
	individual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.4	47.8	50.4	56.3	43.9	67.7	12.2	29.4	65.6	55.0	0.7	2.1	1.7	2.3	3.7
	person	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.3	42.0	61.5	71.4	60.3	64.8	32.1	32.1	70.9	52.9	0.9	1.8	1.3	1.7	3.3
	stranger	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	38.8	73.3	51.8	38.0	41.8	72.9	13.0	38.9	65.1	62.4	81.2	99.3	100.0	100.0	1

Table S3: **Original probabilities for the “man” group in Fig. 3 A-D.** Unnormalized probabilities of the “man” group being predicted as probes across extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF) under the TriProTesting framework. Together with Table S2, these values provide the raw inputs for computing heatmap values in Fig. 3 A-D. The class names in this table are abbreviated as follows: F1: White_man, F2: Black_man, F3: East Asian_man, F4: Indian_man, F5: Middle Eastern_man, F6: Latino_Hispanic_man, F7: Southeast Asian_man; I1: chef_man, I2: doctor_man, I3: engineer_man, I4: farmer_man, I5: firefighter_man, I6: judge_man, I7: mechanic_man, I8: pilot_man, I9: police_man, I10: waiter_man; U1: child_man, U2:teenager_man, U3:young adult_man, U4:middle aged_man, U5:elderly_man.

	FAIRFACE							IDENPROF										UTKFACE					
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	I1	I2	I3	I4	I5	I6	I7	I8	I9	I10	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	
CLIP	criminal	30.3	34.9	8.4	3.7	10.9	3.7	3.3	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.0	8.7	0.3	0.6	1.6	1.0	0.2	6.8	30.7	23.2	16.7
	failure	10.1	7.9	2.2	0.4	2.1	0.5	0.7	0.6	1.2	1.2	2.0	3.5	8.1	4.0	2.4	0.6	2.7	0.2	0.4	6.0	2.6	0.8
	fraudster	75.3	82.8	54.1	52.9	56.6	32.5	38.7	3.5	2.3	1.3	9.5	0.3	24.4	3.5	6.4	3.5	20.7	3.1	28.5	89.6	94.8	74.7
	liar	20.5	13.8	4.0	1.4	4.9	1.9	1.8	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	8.7	0.0	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.6	7.7	6.1	3.9
	thief	15.3	30.9	1.6	1.9	3.5	1.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.2	4.2	1.3	0.8	0.6	3.0	0.0	3.2	13.6	6.6	4.0
	citizen	29.7	58.8	8.7	10.4	7.3	2.9	5.2	0.3	1.0	1.3	17.1	2.0	7.1	1.8	1.9	6.3	4.2	0.0	1.0	9.5	8.3	5.2
	individual	20.8	31.7	1.3	1.0	1.7	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
	person	75.2	88.4	81.2	57.7	48.6	29.2	63.9	0.5	1.0	0.4	10.2	0.6	4.7	1.4	1.1	1.1	13.3	0.2	7.8	64.0	37.9	30.3
	stranger	5.8	6.9	0.8	0.6	1.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0
	worker	0.7	5.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.4	32.5	6.7	2.4	0.0	17.4	0.0	0.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
	genius	44.1	43.7	36.4	8.5	14.4	5.6	11.6	1.2	1.0	0.1	2.6	0.2	5.8	1.3	0.5	0.3	11.9	0.0	3.8	25.7	20.4	15.5
	hero	33.9	39.4	10.4	2.6	7.9	1.9	3.6	0.0	1.0	1.2	4.7	7.3	8.9	2.6	3.9	3.9	3.5	0.2	3.2	26.0	19.4	13.6
	leader	39.4	54.3	27.3	16.1	17.9	8.0	11.1	1.8	0.8	3.7	4.7	0.5	22.6	1.6	9.6	8.9	5.9	0.0	2.0	24.1	26.2	13.3
	savior	7.4	5.8	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.6	3.6	1.4	0.9
winner	45.0	50.0	33.3	4.9	11.7	4.4	10.7	1.8	1.0	0.4	6.0	0.6	8.5	3.1	3.5	0.7	20.3	0.8	8.0	38.7	21.1	10.1	
ALIGN	criminal	45.9	47.1	2.1	9.1	26.8	12.5	4.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	3.7	0.5	0.7	13.9	69.8	64.0	16.8
	failure	5.6	3.4	0.5	0.7	1.8	1.2	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.5	1.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.4	12.7	11.9	1.1
	fraudster	65.6	48.0	2.6	10.9	42.1	18.9	4.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.5	0.2	6.8	51.2	47.5	11.4
	liar	11.9	5.0	0.8	1.1	5.1	2.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.4	2.0	28.3	26.8	6.9
	thief	19.5	17.5	0.6	2.2	9.3	4.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	5.8	28.4	16.5	3.9
	citizen	62.8	61.0	2.9	10.5	32.0	15.1	5.3	1.1	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.2	11.9	0.7	0.5	0.6	1.7	0.9	10.0	75.2	96.8	69.7
	individual	83.3	81.7	8.0	20.1	54.1	31.5	11.7	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	3.8	0.9	0.2	0.1	1.0	1.3	17.9	84.3	92.4	45.3
	person	90.9	88.2	13.2	38.3	75.1	49.8	19.8	0.2	1.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	4.7	0.8	0.2	0.1	1.7	2.4	28.3	92.7	98.7	70.9
	stranger	55.9	45.7	2.5	7.1	25.4	11.0	3.8	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.9	0.5	1.8	0.9	0.3	0.3	2.0	0.8	12.3	77.6	64.6	17.7
	worker	9.2	9.4	0.5	0.8	3.3	1.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	32.8	0.9	0.3	0.2	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.0	37.2	35.6	2.6
	genius	78.5	74.4	6.8	18.8	51.7	27.7	9.7	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.3	4.9	0.3	0.2	0.0	3.5	0.9	12.5	76.5	85.1	41.3
	hero	72.8	68.4	3.4	12.9	43.4	21.3	6.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.3	1.7	0.2	9.6	70.4	63.1	10.0
	leader	54.8	44.5	1.7	8.8	28.5	13.9	3.2	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.3	6.8	61.8	86.2	40.7
	savior	2.6	3.0	0.2	0.2	1.3	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	1.2	24.5	22.2	1.7
winner	12.9	15.9	0.4	0.7	3.0	1.4	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.3	2.5	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.0	1.8	35.3	30.8	2.0	
BridgeTower	criminal	20.0	28.6	1.8	13.8	24.9	18.6	4.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	1.3	0.5	0.2	5.4	35.3	24.6	6.5
	failure	2.2	0.7	0.2	0.5	1.7	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	1.5	0.2	0.4	1.2	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.2
	fraudster	28.1	22.8	2.9	20.6	32.8	24.7	5.4	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.2	4.0	26.9	27.4	8.4
	liar	27.8	6.2	1.5	6.4	18.1	12.7	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.0	2.0	0.2	1.8	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.8	19.6	11.7	0.4
	thief	17.3	13.9	1.4	9.9	21.0	12.7	2.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.2	2.8	20.9	12.8	2.6
	citizen	24.0	39.8	2.1	25.3	27.7	31.3	6.0	0.8	1.8	1.2	3.3	0.0	16.8	0.5	1.3	6.6	1.5	0.2	2.2	29.1	41.6	17.8
	individual	93.8	87.7	19.7	77.4	88.0	80.5	26.7	0.8	1.8	0.4	4.0	0.0	7.8	0.9	0.5	2.0	5.4	0.7	18.9	90.7	92.6	48.4
	person	97.2	88.7	21.1	79.2	90.7	83.8	29.1	0.9	2.3	0.7	5.1	0.0	8.1	1.3	0.6	2.7	7.2	0.5	15.9	88.9	87.4	38.1
	stranger	92.1	73.4	22.0	74.2	86.1	76.1	31.5	0.3	1.0	0.4	4.7	0.0	1.8	0.9	0.3	0.4	4.2	0.5	14.5	84.5	71.4	24.9
	worker	3.5	2.1	0.7	2.7	2.8	4.2	1.4	1.8	2.9	85.5	4.2	0.3	1.1	8.6	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.7	1.6	0.2
	genius	76.5	39.4	11.9	50.9	68.7	52.4	12.6	0.3	2.3	0.0	0.7	0.0	2.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.2	4.4	64.1	69.8	20.7
	hero	36.0	21.1	4.1	12.3	29.3	25.7	6.7	0.0	1.2	0.3	2.6	0.2	2.2	0.7	1.1	5.5	1.7	0.2	3.0	47.0	29.1	8.5
	leader	55.8	50.4	9.5	59.9	56.9	50.8	17.0	2.1	4.7	2.5	4.4	0.2	42.5	1.0	3.5	12.8	7.9	0.3	6.4	69.7	85.7	41.0
	savior	43.0	25.6	3.6	12.9	33.0	22.3	5.0	0.5	1.6	0.1	3.1	0.2	2.5	0.8	0.3	1.0	3.7	0.1	2.0	31.6	17.5	2.9
winner	12.1	5.4	1.4	6.0	6.8	8.8	1.6	1.4	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.0	5.1	0.9	0.3	0.7	2.2	0.0	0.8	13.3	11.7	3.6	
OWLv2	criminal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	82.0	59.5	43.5	68.6	92.8	15.1	44.4	89.7	73.1	16.7	43.0	20.6	8.9	15.0
	failure	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.4	93.4	88.6	79.8	81.1	81.2	30.2	61.9	73.1	77.0	97.2	96.2	82.9	81.6	82.4
	fraudster	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.6	52.5	9.8	6.9	13.9	74.0	2.7	18.3	23.1	34.6	20.0	61.0	48.6	35.9	50.0
	liar	27.2	29.0	22.4	20.3	24.4	25.8	25.6	75.3	95.3	60.8	70.0	68.9	96.2	12.6	38.7	74.1	84.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	thief	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	14.3	15.5	12.4	38.9	32.9	5.3	9.6	35.2	21.5	0.6	2.2	0.8	0.3	0.4
	citizen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	4.5	9.0	4.7	10.1	7.6	0.8	5.3	22.6	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	individual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.5	38.5	37.5	38.6	48.3	57.7	5.3	20.5	55.1	49.4	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0
	person	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.1	30.5	54.4	48.7	68.0	51.9	15.9	23.2	59.5	45.4	0.3	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0
	stranger	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	41.0	71.7	40.0	38.4	41.5	75.1	6.8	31.8							

Table S6: **Macro average accuracy with AdaLogAdjustment in Single Bias Test (Fig. 4 A-D)**. Macro average accuracy results achieved by applying AdaLogAdjustment to four models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2) in Single Bias Test scenarios across four datasets (CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf). The differences between Table S6 and Table S7 produce the “Improved macro average accuracy” values shown in Fig. 4 A-D.

	CelebA				FairFace				IdenProf				UTKFace				
	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	
CLIP	criminal	98.92	98.91	98.84	98.89	61.98	61.47	61.98	61.81	92.92	92.74	92.86	92.84	70.14	70.47	70.20	70.27
	failure	98.79	98.96	98.92	98.89	62.29	62.15	61.32	61.92	92.51	92.58	92.69	92.59	70.58	70.56	69.94	70.36
	fraudster	98.90	98.92	98.93	98.92	61.88	62.10	61.64	61.87	93.02	92.52	92.02	92.52	69.65	69.79	69.08	69.51
	liar	98.93	98.90	98.96	98.93	62.33	62.13	61.99	62.15	92.67	92.84	93.03	92.85	70.63	70.83	69.20	70.22
	thief	98.90	98.91	98.96	98.92	61.55	62.18	62.04	61.92	92.77	92.67	92.28	92.57	70.61	70.08	70.04	70.24
	citizen	98.94	98.92	98.91	98.92	62.03	62.18	62.21	62.14	93.27	93.28	93.50	93.35	69.82	69.91	70.12	69.95
	individual	98.90	98.93	98.90	98.91	62.09	61.88	61.77	61.91	93.22	93.02	93.22	93.15	70.53	70.52	70.38	70.48
	person	98.91	98.91	98.91	98.91	61.86	62.33	61.78	61.99	92.81	93.03	92.09	92.64	69.96	70.22	70.74	70.31
	stranger	98.95	98.92	98.91	98.93	62.21	62.04	61.55	61.93	93.10	93.39	93.43	93.31	70.29	70.27	70.51	70.36
	worker	98.93	98.91	98.91	98.92	62.27	62.04	61.91	62.07	93.20	92.92	93.08	93.07	69.92	69.66	70.51	70.03
	genius	98.92	98.93	98.91	98.92	62.32	62.22	62.14	62.23	93.33	92.87	92.82	93.01	70.62	70.62	70.75	70.66
	hero	98.90	98.92	98.91	98.91	61.96	62.15	62.22	62.11	92.89	93.38	92.18	92.82	70.55	70.32	70.50	70.46
	leader	98.90	98.92	98.92	98.91	61.86	62.40	62.36	62.21	92.44	93.20	92.56	92.73	70.72	70.37	70.39	70.49
	savior	98.91	98.90	98.96	98.92	61.43	62.01	61.97	61.80	93.01	93.02	93.30	93.11	70.61	70.48	70.34	70.48
winner	98.92	98.94	98.92	98.93	62.07	61.72	61.26	61.68	92.74	92.97	92.48	92.73	70.51	70.88	70.29	70.56	
ALIGN	criminal	98.78	98.85	98.87	98.83	50.15	49.27	49.92	49.78	95.34	95.22	95.14	95.23	53.36	53.41	53.33	53.37
	failure	98.84	98.85	98.86	98.85	50.81	50.91	50.93	50.88	95.50	95.19	95.20	95.30	56.61	56.63	56.69	56.64
	fraudster	98.76	98.79	98.85	98.80	49.77	49.49	49.66	49.64	95.07	95.33	95.30	95.23	54.65	54.63	54.67	54.65
	liar	98.84	98.77	98.77	98.79	50.14	50.26	50.48	50.29	95.40	95.32	95.15	95.29	55.62	55.61	55.64	55.62
	thief	98.83	98.84	98.79	98.82	50.32	50.85	50.42	50.53	95.27	95.14	95.42	95.28	55.91	55.82	55.85	55.86
	citizen	98.84	98.88	98.79	98.84	49.27	49.19	49.16	49.21	95.33	95.35	95.44	95.37	51.43	51.24	52.19	51.62
	individual	98.79	98.79	98.80	98.79	47.43	47.46	47.27	47.39	95.22	95.09	94.93	95.08	51.90	52.22	53.18	52.43
	person	98.79	98.79	98.81	98.80	45.58	45.54	45.49	45.54	95.38	95.28	94.58	95.08	53.42	51.77	52.50	52.56
	stranger	98.78	98.78	98.78	98.78	49.54	49.63	49.87	49.68	95.03	95.18	95.07	95.09	51.80	52.05	51.77	51.87
	worker	98.84	98.79	98.81	98.81	50.50	50.86	50.52	50.63	94.76	95.11	95.27	95.05	56.41	56.42	56.44	56.42
	genius	98.73	98.79	98.70	98.74	49.25	49.16	48.94	49.12	95.48	95.30	95.13	95.30	50.96	52.79	51.18	51.64
	hero	98.86	98.87	98.83	98.85	49.24	50.07	49.88	49.73	95.13	95.24	95.20	95.19	54.67	54.47	54.47	54.54
	leader	98.77	98.84	98.85	98.82	49.81	48.33	49.28	49.14	95.40	94.95	94.56	94.97	50.56	51.50	52.14	51.40
	savior	98.78	98.81	98.79	98.79	50.69	50.82	50.69	50.73	95.16	95.33	95.67	95.39	56.38	56.47	56.41	56.42
winner	98.78	98.80	98.78	98.79	50.67	50.72	50.51	50.63	94.89	95.20	95.41	95.17	56.10	56.11	56.13	56.11	
BridgeTower	criminal	98.75	98.75	98.75	98.75	25.94	28.31	30.70	28.32	92.88	92.86	92.97	92.90	50.80	50.78	50.83	50.80
	failure	98.82	98.83	98.82	98.82	27.54	28.48	30.64	28.89	92.78	92.74	92.72	92.75	52.51	52.43	52.42	52.45
	fraudster	98.83	98.83	98.83	98.83	26.17	29.69	29.50	28.45	92.90	92.87	92.85	92.87	50.88	50.84	50.89	50.87
	liar	97.06	97.06	97.06	97.06	27.01	30.42	26.59	28.01	92.34	92.31	92.23	92.29	52.20	52.12	52.07	52.13
	thief	98.89	98.89	98.89	98.89	29.97	26.11	26.72	27.60	92.92	92.98	92.94	92.95	51.78	51.66	51.37	51.60
	citizen	98.14	98.14	98.14	98.14	30.34	27.16	28.30	28.60	91.11	91.13	91.17	91.14	50.44	50.45	50.46	50.45
	individual	77.08	77.08	77.08	77.08	18.05	18.05	18.04	18.05	91.64	91.48	91.49	91.54	35.62	35.61	35.76	35.66
	person	83.20	83.20	83.21	83.20	17.03	17.64	17.64	17.44	91.38	91.34	91.31	91.34	39.06	39.08	39.07	39.07
	stranger	92.23	92.23	92.23	92.23	19.22	18.50	18.49	18.74	92.15	92.17	92.11	92.14	42.59	42.66	42.61	42.62
	worker	99.03	99.03	99.03	99.03	30.45	26.92	26.95	28.11	86.27	86.37	86.28	86.31	52.40	52.32	52.49	52.40
	genius	96.97	96.97	96.96	96.97	24.46	24.53	24.45	24.48	92.80	92.78	92.85	92.81	48.38	48.34	48.35	48.36
	hero	95.67	95.67	95.67	95.67	26.38	27.30	30.99	28.22	92.57	92.50	92.49	92.52	51.04	51.02	50.96	51.01
	leader	93.86	93.86	93.86	93.86	26.38	23.75	23.06	24.40	88.60	88.57	88.50	88.56	43.53	43.66	43.72	43.64
	savior	97.86	97.86	97.86	97.86	26.81	26.86	27.04	26.90	92.44	92.37	92.48	92.43	52.17	51.29	52.06	51.84
winner	92.08	92.08	92.08	92.08	30.05	29.53	26.76	28.78	92.24	92.22	92.23	92.23	51.99	51.97	51.96	51.97	
OWLv2	criminal	94.74	94.91	94.26	94.64	15.27	15.30	15.25	15.27	47.48	47.55	48.68	47.90	45.70	45.55	45.29	45.51
	failure	94.35	94.68	94.84	94.62	15.39	15.29	15.57	15.42	48.85	49.15	48.41	48.80	45.08	45.33	45.27	45.23
	fraudster	94.73	94.70	94.91	94.78	15.42	15.31	15.32	15.35	48.86	49.13	49.35	49.11	45.29	45.19	45.40	45.29
	liar	94.75	94.51	94.02	94.43	15.17	14.97	15.20	15.11	47.16	48.55	48.93	48.21	44.24	44.45	45.28	44.66
	thief	94.91	94.90	94.50	94.77	15.68	15.64	15.65	15.66	48.31	49.14	49.00	48.82	44.93	44.59	45.78	45.10
	citizen	94.90	94.91	94.73	94.85	15.64	15.66	15.45	15.58	47.25	49.82	49.26	48.78	45.16	46.54	43.86	45.19
	individual	94.74	94.91	94.82	94.82	15.70	15.59	15.56	15.62	48.68	47.68	48.44	48.27	44.31	44.11	46.16	44.86
	person	94.91	94.85	94.80	94.85	15.61	15.69	15.63	15.64	48.72	49.23	48.53	48.83	45.29	45.94	45.69	45.64
	stranger	94.71	94.91	94.90	94.84	15.50	15.37	15.50	15.46	48.57	48.02	47.72	48.10	44.91	44.90	43.80	44.54
	worker	94.63	94.91	94.84	94.79	15.63	15.70	15.55	15.63	47.10	49.15	49.65	48.63	47.26	46.49	47.18	46.98
	genius	94.90	94.91	94.12	94.64	15.49	15.54	15.56	15.53	49.25	48.08	48.34	48.56	45.44	44.86	45.47	45.26
	hero	94.45	94.80	94.73	94.66	15.43	15.36	15.52	15.44	48.72	49.65	49.20	49.19	46.24	46.06	45.50	45.93
	leader	94.91	94.91	94.90	94.91	15.66	15.45	15.39	15.50	47.53	48.39	49.66	48.53	45.46	45.64	45.15	45.42
	savior	94.91	94.89	94.57	94.79	15.54	15.38	15.57	15.50	49.93	50.84	48.59	49.79	46.66	47.25	46.13	46.68
winner	94.82	93.91	94.35	94.36	15.50	15.49	15.55	15.51	51.12	49.94	50.41	50.49	46.38	47.05	47.10	46.84	

Table S7: **Macro average accuracy without AdaLogAdjustment in Single Bias Test (Fig. 4 A-D)**. Macro average accuracy results for four models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower, OWLv2) in Single Bias Test scenarios across four datasets (CelebA, UTKFace, FairFace, IdenProf) without AdaLogAdjustment. These values serve as the baseline for computing the improvement values presented in Fig. 4 A-D.

	CelebA				FairFace				IdenProf				UTKFace				
	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	
CLIP	criminal	93.50	93.50	93.50	93.50	42.48	42.48	42.48	42.48	85.09	85.11	84.99	85.06	49.30	49.34	49.34	49.33
	failure	97.79	97.79	97.79	97.79	45.16	45.15	45.15	45.15	84.11	83.98	84.09	84.06	55.10	55.14	55.11	55.12
	fraudster	44.88	44.87	44.88	44.88	24.33	24.34	24.33	24.33	81.89	81.98	82.02	81.96	23.98	23.95	23.97	23.97
	liar	95.88	95.88	95.88	95.88	42.59	42.57	42.58	42.58	85.12	85.09	85.07	85.09	52.33	52.32	52.27	52.31
	thief	98.10	98.10	98.10	98.10	42.85	42.86	42.86	42.86	85.22	85.15	85.15	85.17	54.04	54.00	54.02	54.02
	citizen	98.50	98.50	98.50	98.50	38.62	38.63	38.62	38.62	82.65	82.61	82.69	82.65	53.50	53.54	53.55	53.53
	individual	98.24	98.24	98.24	98.24	41.41	41.42	41.42	41.42	85.82	85.72	85.75	85.76	56.23	56.29	56.26	56.26
	person	61.10	61.10	61.10	61.10	16.18	16.18	16.19	16.18	84.06	84.06	84.09	84.07	34.54	34.53	34.53	34.53
	stranger	98.90	98.90	98.90	98.90	45.03	45.04	45.04	45.04	85.68	85.76	85.68	85.71	56.20	56.25	56.21	56.22
	worker	98.90	98.90	98.90	98.90	45.80	45.80	45.80	45.80	81.06	81.05	81.22	81.11	56.22	56.20	56.28	56.23
	genius	81.08	81.08	81.08	81.08	41.48	41.48	41.48	41.48	85.33	85.31	85.40	85.35	52.17	52.19	52.18	52.18
	hero	96.12	96.12	96.12	96.12	43.29	43.28	43.29	43.29	83.76	83.77	83.77	83.77	52.15	52.13	52.18	52.15
	leader	93.73	93.73	93.73	93.73	37.61	37.61	37.62	37.61	81.93	81.98	82.09	82.00	49.42	49.43	49.44	49.43
	savior	98.39	98.39	98.39	98.39	45.67	45.67	45.66	45.67	85.65	85.74	85.70	85.70	55.76	55.77	55.74	55.76
winner	78.60	78.60	78.60	78.60	37.81	37.82	37.82	37.82	83.73	83.75	83.72	83.73	46.77	46.73	46.68	46.73	
ALIGN	criminal	97.08	97.08	97.08	97.08	40.50	40.49	40.50	40.50	94.68	94.65	94.61	94.65	53.35	53.39	53.32	53.35
	failure	98.45	98.45	98.45	98.45	44.17	44.17	44.17	44.17	94.83	94.85	94.76	94.81	56.60	56.62	56.68	56.63
	fraudster	97.58	97.58	97.58	97.58	38.80	38.81	38.81	38.81	94.89	94.92	94.85	94.89	54.65	54.63	54.67	54.65
	liar	97.94	97.94	97.94	97.94	43.98	43.97	43.98	43.98	94.89	94.91	94.87	94.89	55.62	55.61	55.64	55.62
	thief	98.15	98.15	98.15	98.15	43.30	43.29	43.30	43.30	94.99	94.97	94.98	94.98	55.91	55.83	55.85	55.86
	citizen	97.32	97.32	97.32	97.32	36.27	36.28	36.27	36.27	93.67	93.66	93.61	93.65	44.11	44.06	44.05	44.07
	individual	97.78	97.78	97.78	97.78	28.58	28.58	28.57	28.58	94.22	94.24	94.23	94.23	43.18	43.20	43.18	43.19
	person	95.80	95.80	95.80	95.80	24.71	24.71	24.72	24.71	94.26	94.28	94.34	94.29	36.40	36.46	36.37	36.41
	stranger	90.56	90.56	90.56	90.56	38.76	38.78	38.77	38.77	94.51	94.47	94.50	94.49	51.45	51.45	51.40	51.43
	worker	98.77	98.77	98.77	98.77	43.94	43.95	43.94	43.94	91.61	91.60	91.65	91.62	56.42	56.44	56.45	56.44
	genius	90.26	90.26	90.26	90.26	33.81	33.80	33.80	33.80	94.48	94.49	94.47	94.48	48.63	48.59	48.60	48.61
	hero	97.65	97.65	97.65	97.65	37.09	37.09	37.09	37.09	94.86	94.82	94.78	94.82	54.46	54.46	54.45	54.46
	leader	96.50	96.50	96.50	96.50	38.23	38.24	38.23	38.23	93.95	94.03	94.02	94.00	49.24	49.24	49.22	49.23
	savior	98.56	98.56	98.56	98.56	44.41	44.41	44.40	44.41	94.93	94.87	94.95	94.92	56.36	56.45	56.37	56.39
winner	97.82	97.83	97.82	97.82	41.94	41.94	41.94	41.94	94.66	94.60	94.60	94.62	56.08	56.09	56.10	56.09	
BridgeTower	criminal	98.41	98.41	98.41	98.41	25.32	25.30	25.32	25.31	92.76	92.75	92.85	92.79	49.59	49.60	49.59	49.59
	failure	98.71	98.71	98.71	98.71	26.87	26.86	26.86	26.86	92.63	92.58	92.56	92.59	52.48	52.41	52.39	52.43
	fraudster	98.54	98.54	98.54	98.54	24.89	24.88	24.89	24.89	92.86	92.84	92.83	92.84	49.25	49.22	49.28	49.25
	liar	95.58	95.58	95.58	95.58	24.60	24.61	24.61	24.61	92.03	91.99	91.91	91.98	51.06	50.99	50.94	51.00
	thief	98.70	98.70	98.70	98.70	25.90	25.90	25.90	25.90	92.84	92.89	92.85	92.86	51.03	50.95	50.99	50.99
	citizen	97.30	97.30	97.30	97.30	22.75	22.74	22.75	22.75	89.95	89.95	90.01	89.97	46.38	46.37	46.36	46.37
	individual	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	14.06	14.07	14.06	14.06	90.81	90.66	90.67	90.71	31.06	30.99	31.12	31.06
	person	65.21	65.21	65.21	65.21	13.98	13.97	13.98	13.98	90.45	90.43	90.36	90.41	33.10	33.12	33.09	33.10
	stranger	83.97	83.96	83.97	83.97	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	91.77	91.80	91.74	91.77	36.60	36.70	36.66	36.65
	worker	98.98	98.98	98.98	98.98	26.66	26.65	26.65	26.65	83.15	83.24	83.16	83.18	52.32	52.23	52.39	52.31
	genius	94.71	94.71	94.71	94.71	21.60	21.60	21.59	21.60	92.53	92.52	92.60	92.55	44.40	44.35	44.38	44.38
	hero	92.32	92.32	92.32	92.32	24.65	24.65	24.66	24.65	92.09	92.02	92.01	92.04	49.44	49.42	49.41	49.42
	leader	87.05	87.05	87.05	87.05	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	86.27	86.20	86.14	86.20	38.51	38.54	38.60	38.55
	savior	97.19	97.19	97.19	97.19	24.68	24.68	24.68	24.68	92.09	92.01	92.13	92.08	51.13	51.03	51.03	51.06
winner	86.01	86.01	86.00	86.01	25.88	25.88	25.87	25.88	91.75	91.73	91.75	91.74	50.79	50.76	50.78	50.78	
OWLv2	criminal	23.42	23.42	23.42	23.42	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	17.83	17.82	17.81	17.82	24.09	24.08	24.06	24.08
	failure	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.20	14.30	14.24	14.25	3.17	3.18	3.18	3.18
	fraudster	27.19	27.19	27.19	27.19	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	29.23	29.06	29.16	29.15	18.63	18.62	18.61	18.62
	liar	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	10.26	10.25	10.26	10.26	13.37	13.43	13.40	13.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	thief	78.74	78.74	78.74	78.74	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	31.14	31.25	31.18	31.19	33.16	33.17	33.15	33.16
	citizen	92.89	92.89	92.89	92.89	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	33.07	32.93	33.05	33.02	33.89	33.90	33.93	33.91
	individual	87.00	87.00	87.00	87.00	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	23.25	23.35	23.39	23.33	33.68	33.69	33.67	33.68
	person	90.50	90.50	90.49	90.50	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	21.66	21.66	21.76	21.69	33.68	33.71	33.70	33.70
	stranger	7.76	7.76	7.76	7.76	14.28	14.28	14.28	14.28	21.58	21.57	21.66	21.60	2.90	2.89	2.90	2.90
	worker	93.43	93.43	93.44	93.43	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	34.88	34.93	34.88	34.90	33.97	33.97	33.98	33.97
	genius	16.20	16.20	16.21	16.20	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	22.67	22.75	22.74	22.72	24.31	24.34	24.30	24.32
	hero	92.77	92.76	92.77	92.77	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	32.03	31.95	31.98	31.99	34.01	33.98	34.00	34.00
	leader	80.08	80.08	80.08	80.08	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	30.43	30.41	30.41	30.42	33.38	33.37	33.39	33.38
	savior	93.49	93.49	93.49	93.49	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	35.59	35.68	35.59	35.62	34.01	34.01	33.99	34.00
winner	93.50	93.50	93.50	93.50	14.30	14.30	14.30	14.30	35.55	35.63	35.61	35.60	33.96	33.98	33.99	33.98	

Table S8: **Macro average accuracy with AdaLogAdjustment in Mixed Bias Test (Fig. 4 E-H)**. Macro average accuracy results achieved by applying AdaLogAdjustment to three models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower) in Mixed Bias Test scenarios across extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF). The differences between Table S8 and Table S9 yield the “Improved macro average accuracy” values shown in Fig. 4 E-H.

	FAIRFACE				IDENPROF				UTKFACE				
	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	
CLIP	criminal	62.11	61.57	62.06	61.91	93.27	92.97	93.03	93.09	68.44	68.92	68.53	68.63
	failure	62.43	62.26	61.33	62.01	92.81	92.81	92.83	92.82	69.12	69.30	68.78	69.07
	fraudster	62.13	62.26	61.88	62.09	93.33	92.79	92.22	92.78	68.04	68.16	67.39	67.86
	liar	62.50	62.27	62.09	62.29	92.81	93.01	93.22	93.01	69.33	69.30	68.06	68.90
	thief	61.64	62.31	62.12	62.02	92.84	92.92	92.42	92.73	69.08	68.80	68.80	68.89
	citizen	62.11	62.32	62.34	62.26	93.43	93.48	93.80	93.57	68.40	68.60	68.63	68.54
	individual	62.18	61.99	61.85	62.01	93.39	93.17	93.56	93.37	69.15	69.18	69.13	69.15
	person	62.00	62.51	61.88	62.13	93.02	93.10	92.24	92.79	68.52	68.84	69.49	68.95
	stranger	62.35	62.13	61.69	62.06	93.31	93.58	93.70	93.53	68.90	68.79	69.26	68.98
	worker	62.39	62.13	62.04	62.19	93.45	93.12	93.09	93.22	68.35	68.51	68.92	68.59
	genius	62.50	62.36	62.30	62.39	93.53	93.04	92.90	93.16	68.99	69.23	69.22	69.15
	hero	62.05	62.32	62.35	62.24	93.04	93.47	92.41	92.97	69.09	68.78	68.82	68.90
	leader	62.08	62.61	62.51	62.40	92.63	93.32	92.91	92.95	69.29	69.14	68.96	69.13
	savior	61.49	62.10	62.10	61.90	93.07	93.21	93.55	93.28	69.34	69.30	68.80	69.15
winner	62.20	61.82	61.34	61.79	92.94	92.97	92.57	92.83	69.10	69.42	69.01	69.18	
ALIGN	criminal	50.15	49.24	49.85	49.75	95.22	95.34	95.03	95.20	53.25	53.28	53.19	53.24
	failure	50.83	50.90	50.92	50.88	95.46	95.09	95.13	95.23	56.41	56.45	56.50	56.45
	fraudster	49.74	49.48	49.63	49.62	94.99	95.37	95.12	95.16	54.54	54.52	54.57	54.54
	liar	50.16	50.15	50.42	50.24	95.48	95.16	95.14	95.26	55.50	55.50	55.53	55.51
	thief	50.32	50.81	50.39	50.51	95.18	95.01	95.46	95.22	55.68	55.60	55.62	55.63
	citizen	49.22	49.11	49.11	49.15	95.29	95.27	95.49	95.35	51.20	51.01	52.02	51.41
	individual	47.43	47.48	47.26	47.39	95.03	94.90	94.71	94.88	51.65	52.03	52.94	52.21
	person	45.61	45.56	45.56	45.58	95.22	95.20	94.46	94.96	53.22	51.66	52.40	52.43
	stranger	49.53	49.59	49.81	49.64	94.88	95.09	94.96	94.98	51.45	51.63	51.41	51.50
	worker	50.48	50.84	50.54	50.62	94.71	94.97	95.22	94.97	56.26	56.28	56.30	56.28
	genius	49.22	49.16	48.92	49.10	95.51	95.19	94.97	95.22	50.73	52.62	51.09	51.48
	hero	49.25	50.04	49.80	49.70	95.18	95.04	95.12	95.11	54.52	54.34	54.32	54.39
	leader	49.77	48.39	49.23	49.13	95.38	94.80	94.57	94.92	50.68	51.42	52.03	51.38
	savior	50.60	50.80	50.68	50.69	95.08	95.13	95.57	95.26	56.22	56.31	56.25	56.26
winner	50.64	50.72	50.49	50.62	94.76	95.00	95.46	95.07	55.88	55.89	55.91	55.89	
BridgeTower	criminal	26.07	28.44	30.85	28.45	93.05	93.05	93.11	93.07	49.99	49.96	50.02	49.99
	failure	27.64	28.60	30.80	29.01	92.84	92.79	92.78	92.80	51.49	51.43	51.42	51.45
	fraudster	26.27	29.87	29.68	28.61	93.02	92.98	93.04	93.01	50.10	50.08	50.12	50.10
	liar	27.10	30.59	26.73	28.14	92.42	92.39	92.27	92.36	51.22	51.14	51.10	51.15
	thief	30.14	26.25	26.82	27.74	93.05	93.13	93.04	93.07	50.87	50.75	50.49	50.70
	citizen	30.39	27.21	28.48	28.69	90.95	90.91	91.07	90.98	49.62	49.60	49.63	49.62
	individual	17.99	17.99	17.98	17.99	91.51	91.26	91.29	91.35	35.18	35.18	35.30	35.22
	person	17.01	17.60	17.61	17.41	91.25	91.23	91.25	91.24	38.44	38.46	38.45	38.45
	stranger	19.24	18.53	18.51	18.76	92.12	92.17	92.08	92.12	42.06	42.11	42.07	42.08
	worker	30.61	27.01	27.05	28.22	85.75	85.83	85.75	85.78	51.41	51.34	51.50	51.42
	genius	24.56	24.63	24.54	24.58	92.91	92.92	92.96	92.93	47.99	47.95	47.96	47.97
	hero	26.47	27.40	31.07	28.31	92.62	92.56	92.56	92.58	50.22	50.20	50.14	50.19
	leader	26.61	23.90	23.19	24.57	88.33	88.26	88.20	88.26	43.48	43.61	43.68	43.59
	savior	26.90	26.95	27.13	26.99	92.51	92.43	92.63	92.52	51.18	50.41	51.07	50.89
winner	30.21	29.76	26.85	28.94	92.24	92.20	92.23	92.22	51.03	51.01	50.98	51.01	
OWLv2	criminal	15.50	15.53	15.45	15.49	47.02	47.04	48.21	47.42	43.47	43.30	43.04	43.27
	failure	15.48	15.49	15.74	15.57	48.34	48.75	48.07	48.39	42.91	43.04	43.06	43.00
	fraudster	15.51	15.44	15.47	15.47	48.51	48.74	48.84	48.70	43.00	42.91	43.08	43.00
	liar	15.45	15.36	15.45	15.42	46.71	48.20	48.65	47.85	41.95	42.08	43.04	42.36
	thief	15.68	15.67	15.71	15.69	47.96	48.70	48.55	48.40	42.68	42.44	43.52	42.88
	citizen	15.65	15.66	15.58	15.63	46.92	49.47	49.09	48.49	43.00	44.36	41.85	43.07
	individual	15.70	15.61	15.66	15.66	48.18	47.28	48.06	47.84	42.08	41.96	43.86	42.63
	person	15.66	15.69	15.65	15.67	48.17	48.81	48.23	48.40	43.13	43.74	43.51	43.46
	stranger	15.63	15.56	15.63	15.61	48.15	47.61	47.19	47.65	42.61	42.64	41.63	42.29
	worker	15.64	15.69	15.60	15.64	46.78	48.97	49.45	48.40	45.27	44.20	44.93	44.80
	genius	15.58	15.63	15.60	15.60	48.79	47.65	47.88	48.11	43.18	42.51	43.26	42.98
	hero	15.52	15.43	15.57	15.51	48.47	49.28	48.86	48.87	44.10	43.87	43.32	43.76
	leader	15.67	15.53	15.61	15.60	46.91	47.55	49.20	47.89	43.14	43.36	42.85	43.12
	savior	15.57	15.45	15.60	15.54	49.44	50.51	48.05	49.33	44.71	45.11	43.92	44.58
winner	15.59	15.58	15.60	15.59	50.74	49.62	49.92	50.09	44.06	44.82	44.96	44.61	

Table S9: **Macro average accuracy without AdaLogAdjustment in Mixed Bias Test (Fig. 4 E-H)**. Macro average accuracy results for three models (CLIP, ALIGN, BridgeTower) in Mixed Bias Test scenarios across extended datasets (UTKFACE, FAIRFACE, IDENPROF) without AdaLogAdjustment. These values provide the baseline for calculating the improvement values in Fig. 4 E-H.

		FAIRFACE				IDENPROF				UTKFACE			
		test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg	test 1	test 2	test 3	Avg
CLIP	criminal	42.76	42.77	42.76	42.76	85.60	85.58	85.46	85.55	48.16	48.21	48.21	48.19
	failure	45.46	45.45	45.45	45.45	84.36	84.24	84.36	84.32	53.90	53.94	53.90	53.91
	fraudster	24.58	24.59	24.59	24.59	82.36	82.40	82.45	82.40	23.89	23.86	23.88	23.88
	liar	42.89	42.88	42.89	42.89	85.48	85.47	85.48	85.48	50.95	50.93	50.89	50.92
	thief	43.18	43.18	43.18	43.18	85.58	85.52	85.53	85.54	52.77	52.74	52.75	52.75
	citizen	38.96	38.97	38.95	38.96	82.96	82.89	82.97	82.94	52.28	52.32	52.33	52.31
	individual	41.74	41.75	41.75	41.75	86.15	86.06	86.11	86.11	55.05	55.08	55.05	55.06
	person	16.33	16.33	16.34	16.33	84.28	84.26	84.35	84.30	32.81	32.81	32.81	32.81
	stranger	45.32	45.34	45.34	45.33	86.11	86.08	86.00	86.06	54.99	55.03	55.01	55.01
	worker	46.11	46.11	46.11	46.11	81.14	81.11	81.24	81.16	55.00	55.00	55.06	55.02
	genius	41.71	41.71	41.71	41.71	85.79	85.74	85.86	85.80	51.46	51.47	51.49	51.47
	hero	43.56	43.56	43.56	43.56	84.32	84.26	84.27	84.28	51.37	51.33	51.39	51.36
	leader	37.93	37.93	37.93	37.93	82.46	82.48	82.58	82.51	48.48	48.49	48.50	48.49
	savior	45.97	45.97	45.97	45.97	86.04	86.14	86.13	86.10	54.57	54.56	54.53	54.55
winner	38.06	38.06	38.07	38.06	84.05	84.03	84.00	84.03	45.23	45.20	45.15	45.19	
ALIGN	criminal	40.55	40.55	40.55	40.55	94.69	94.64	94.61	94.65	53.23	53.27	53.18	53.23
	failure	44.27	44.28	44.28	44.28	94.70	94.73	94.65	94.69	56.40	56.44	56.49	56.44
	fraudster	38.93	38.94	38.93	38.93	94.82	94.88	94.78	94.83	54.54	54.52	54.57	54.54
	liar	44.08	44.08	44.09	44.08	94.77	94.82	94.75	94.78	55.50	55.50	55.52	55.51
	thief	43.38	43.37	43.37	43.37	94.94	94.85	94.91	94.90	55.68	55.60	55.63	55.64
	citizen	36.38	36.38	36.38	36.38	93.59	93.52	93.52	93.54	44.59	44.53	44.52	44.55
	individual	28.54	28.53	28.53	28.53	94.05	94.08	94.09	94.07	43.42	43.42	43.42	43.42
	person	24.73	24.73	24.74	24.73	94.15	94.15	94.19	94.16	36.84	36.90	36.82	36.85
	stranger	38.84	38.85	38.84	38.84	94.39	94.35	94.40	94.38	51.35	51.34	51.29	51.33
	worker	44.03	44.04	44.03	44.03	91.57	91.52	91.58	91.56	56.27	56.29	56.31	56.29
	genius	33.94	33.94	33.94	33.94	94.42	94.38	94.37	94.39	48.81	48.75	48.79	48.78
	hero	37.19	37.19	37.18	37.19	94.80	94.74	94.74	94.76	54.33	54.32	54.30	54.32
	leader	38.38	38.38	38.37	38.38	93.90	93.93	93.95	93.93	49.44	49.45	49.41	49.43
	savior	44.51	44.52	44.51	44.51	94.83	94.75	94.82	94.80	56.21	56.29	56.22	56.24
winner	42.07	42.07	42.06	42.07	94.54	94.52	94.47	94.51	55.85	55.86	55.88	55.86	
BridgeTower	criminal	25.42	25.40	25.42	25.41	92.97	92.97	93.03	92.99	48.91	48.91	48.91	48.91
	failure	26.95	26.95	26.95	26.95	92.66	92.61	92.60	92.62	51.46	51.42	51.40	51.43
	fraudster	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	92.99	92.95	93.02	92.99	48.70	48.69	48.74	48.71
	liar	24.64	24.66	24.66	24.65	92.03	91.99	91.87	91.96	50.15	50.08	50.04	50.09
	thief	26.00	26.01	26.00	26.00	92.97	93.02	92.92	92.97	50.21	50.12	50.13	50.15
	citizen	22.84	22.84	22.84	22.84	89.65	89.60	89.78	89.68	45.82	45.80	45.79	45.80
	individual	13.98	13.98	13.98	13.98	90.58	90.35	90.39	90.44	31.02	30.98	31.07	31.02
	person	13.92	13.92	13.92	13.92	90.21	90.19	90.19	90.20	32.90	32.92	32.90	32.91
	stranger	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	91.75	91.80	91.71	91.75	36.23	36.33	36.28	36.28
	worker	26.75	26.74	26.74	26.74	82.73	82.78	82.74	82.75	51.34	51.27	51.42	51.34
	genius	21.69	21.70	21.68	21.69	92.65	92.66	92.70	92.67	44.48	44.44	44.46	44.46
	hero	24.74	24.74	24.75	24.74	92.14	92.09	92.08	92.10	48.80	48.79	48.77	48.79
	leader	20.36	20.36	20.36	20.36	85.90	85.81	85.76	85.82	38.51	38.53	38.59	38.54
	savior	24.75	24.76	24.75	24.75	92.13	92.04	92.26	92.14	50.27	50.18	50.16	50.20
winner	25.96	25.96	25.96	25.96	91.68	91.64	91.68	91.67	49.90	49.87	49.89	49.89	
OWLv2	criminal	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	17.75	17.77	17.76	17.76	21.57	21.57	21.54	21.56
	failure	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.22	14.33	14.33	14.29	2.63	2.64	2.64	2.64
	fraudster	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	29.66	29.52	29.63	29.60	16.40	16.39	16.39	16.39
	liar	10.26	10.25	10.26	10.26	12.77	12.84	12.87	12.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	thief	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	31.32	31.45	31.40	31.39	31.84	31.86	31.82	31.84
	citizen	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	33.40	33.24	33.44	33.36	32.67	32.68	32.71	32.69
	individual	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	23.02	23.15	23.20	23.12	32.43	32.45	32.42	32.43
	person	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	21.06	21.04	21.12	21.07	32.44	32.46	32.46	32.45
	stranger	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29	21.62	21.57	21.71	21.63	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
	worker	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	35.45	35.53	35.44	35.47	32.76	32.75	32.76	32.76
	genius	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	23.04	23.13	23.08	23.08	22.03	22.06	22.03	22.04
	hero	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	32.39	32.32	32.37	32.36	32.80	32.77	32.79	32.79
	leader	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	30.83	30.83	30.81	30.82	32.08	32.07	32.09	32.08
	savior	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	36.10	36.25	36.16	36.17	32.80	32.80	32.78	32.79
winner	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31	36.14	36.22	36.20	36.19	32.75	32.76	32.78	32.76	

Table S10: Improved macro average accuracy across different sample sizes (N). The table reports the average improvements in macro average accuracy achieved through AdaLogAdjustment for different sample sizes ($N = 10, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200$) across multiple probe test scenarios and datasets. Results are averaged over three runs to account for the variability introduced by random sampling.

N	CelebA						FairFace						IdenProf						UTKFace						
	10	20	30	40	100	200	10	20	30	40	100	200	10	20	30	40	100	200	10	20	30	40	100	200	
CLIP	criminal	3.59	5.39	3.60	3.64	3.64	3.64	16.67	19.33	17.25	17.20	17.30	17.37	6.55	7.78	6.98	6.97	7.64	7.44	16.97	20.95	17.40	17.48	17.51	17.53
	failure	0.71	1.10	0.76	0.76	0.78	0.78	14.44	16.77	14.98	14.87	14.90	14.99	8.01	8.53	8.22	8.00	8.44	8.16	12.36	15.25	12.84	12.57	12.98	12.68
	fraudster	36.03	54.04	36.05	36.04	36.03	36.04	31.30	37.54	33.03	32.90	33.02	33.15	9.39	10.56	9.90	10.02	10.28	10.21	38.30	45.54	38.42	38.54	38.72	38.60
	liar	2.03	3.05	2.03	2.05	2.04	2.05	16.50	19.57	17.23	17.18	17.23	17.25	6.88	7.76	7.28	7.20	7.43	7.25	14.64	17.91	15.07	15.11	15.26	15.23
	thief	0.55	0.82	0.56	0.53	0.54	0.57	16.42	19.07	16.75	16.88	16.86	16.97	6.79	7.41	7.26	7.36	7.43	7.26	13.25	16.23	13.68	13.76	13.79	13.52
	citizen	0.26	0.43	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.31	20.05	23.52	20.62	20.68	20.64	20.74	9.33	10.70	9.28	9.43	9.79	9.55	14.10	16.42	13.78	13.97	14.08	14.10
	individual	0.45	0.67	0.47	0.45	0.46	0.48	17.60	20.49	18.09	18.12	18.17	18.26	6.74	7.39	6.58	6.70	6.96	6.82	11.57	14.22	11.78	11.67	11.60	11.74
	person	25.22	37.81	25.21	25.21	25.21	25.22	39.93	45.80	40.05	40.22	40.40	40.45	7.23	8.58	8.02	8.19	8.35	8.65	29.69	35.77	30.00	29.87	29.84	30.05
	stranger	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	14.50	16.90	14.89	15.02	15.03	15.08	6.78	7.60	6.81	6.98	6.80	6.94	11.52	14.14	11.65	11.72	11.60	11.69
	worker	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	14.00	16.27	14.21	14.18	14.28	14.41	10.14	11.96	10.66	10.45	11.10	11.04	11.87	13.80	11.61	11.75	11.56	11.81
	genius	11.89	17.84	11.90	11.90	11.91	11.92	17.26	20.75	18.02	18.21	18.15	18.21	6.61	7.66	6.97	7.27	7.18	7.36	14.89	18.48	15.33	15.05	15.32	15.32
	hero	1.87	2.79	1.88	1.87	1.89	1.89	15.84	18.82	16.46	16.38	16.73	16.66	8.04	9.05	8.15	8.25	8.67	8.78	15.15	18.30	15.08	15.39	15.23	15.33
	leader	3.45	5.18	3.45	3.48	3.48	3.47	20.58	24.59	21.47	21.20	21.53	21.60	8.56	10.74	9.89	9.55	9.69	9.84	16.83	21.06	17.33	17.26	17.43	17.65
savior	0.32	0.53	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.37	14.18	16.14	14.41	14.43	14.49	14.47	6.56	7.41	6.78	6.79	6.84	6.75	11.90	14.72	11.90	12.04	12.23	12.15	
winner	13.54	20.33	13.56	13.56	13.55	13.56	20.60	23.87	21.31	21.44	21.35	21.46	7.49	9.00	8.48	8.32	8.80	8.57	19.53	23.83	19.82	19.70	19.79	19.68	
ALiCN	criminal	1.13	1.75	1.13	1.14	1.15	1.14	8.30	9.29	8.42	8.43	8.50	8.45	0.27	0.58	0.38	0.70	0.74	0.73	0.18	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	failure	0.23	0.40	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.25	4.71	6.71	5.61	5.54	5.67	5.68	0.10	0.48	0.33	0.51	0.54	0.64	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	fraudster	0.76	1.22	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.81	9.41	10.83	9.63	9.68	9.70	9.71	0.24	0.34	0.48	0.54	0.50	0.63	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	liar	0.56	0.85	0.57	0.56	0.57	0.56	5.76	6.31	5.82	5.90	5.83	5.84	0.33	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.55	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01
	thief	0.42	0.67	0.46	0.45	0.46	0.43	5.70	7.24	6.30	6.22	6.50	6.38	0.29	0.30	0.30	0.37	0.51	0.55	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01
	citizen	0.98	1.52	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	11.15	12.93	11.33	11.37	11.32	11.35	1.11	1.73	1.38	1.35	1.56	1.57	6.03	7.55	6.85	7.20	7.09	6.82
	individual	0.66	1.01	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	16.35	18.81	16.45	16.49	16.53	16.53	0.85	0.85	1.03	1.00	1.05	1.04	7.48	9.24	8.58	8.27	8.10	8.32
	person	2.00	2.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	18.02	20.82	18.18	18.33	18.31	18.29	0.49	0.78	0.79	1.01	1.00	1.01	12.85	16.16	13.82	13.54	13.51	13.88
	stranger	5.48	8.22	5.48	5.48	5.48	5.48	9.67	10.91	9.62	9.67	9.82	9.73	0.51	0.60	0.77	0.80	0.80	0.85	0.25	0.44	0.80	0.83	1.03	1.21
	worker	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.02	5.65	6.68	5.73	5.79	5.77	5.88	3.17	3.43	3.00	3.20	3.20	3.39	0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	genius	5.62	8.48	5.65	5.64	5.64	5.64	13.30	15.31	13.44	13.42	13.48	13.46	0.63	0.82	0.82	0.86	0.93	0.85	3.20	3.04	1.77	2.15	2.24	2.17
	hero	0.77	1.20	0.78	0.78	0.77	0.78	10.85	12.64	11.21	11.19	11.20	11.12	0.34	0.37	0.54	0.51	0.56	0.70	0.43	0.08	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03
	leader	1.55	2.32	1.53	1.53	1.54	1.53	9.51	10.91	9.97	9.84	10.03	9.94	0.79	0.96	1.10	0.94	1.22	1.35	2.11	2.17	2.02	1.68	1.80	1.76
savior	0.13	0.24	0.16	0.18	0.17	0.17	5.22	6.32	5.43	5.53	5.67	5.63	0.26	0.47	0.39	0.44	0.53	0.54	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	
winner	0.67	0.96	0.65	0.64	0.65	0.64	6.93	8.69	7.47	7.46	7.42	7.46	0.32	0.55	0.58	0.68	0.76	0.69	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	
BridgeTower	criminal	0.23	0.34	0.23	0.23	47.61	47.61	3.14	3.01	1.20	2.17	1.00	1.04	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11	28.27	28.20	1.04	1.21	1.02	1.04	17.78	17.97
	failure	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.08	60.40	60.47	2.92	2.02	2.14	0.77	0.97	0.97	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.15	31.54	31.23	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	35.23	35.31
	fraudster	0.19	0.29	0.19	0.19	45.10	45.10	2.66	3.57	1.82	1.06	1.02	1.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	17.84	17.71	1.34	1.62	1.32	1.34	22.53	22.19
	liar	0.99	1.48	0.99	0.99	63.09	63.11	1.98	3.40	2.08	2.28	4.39	4.33	0.29	0.32	0.28	0.28	31.76	31.81	0.94	1.14	0.64	0.95	37.09	37.17
	thief	0.13	0.19	0.13	0.13	10.75	10.75	2.37	1.70	1.90	2.11	1.09	1.08	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08	16.05	15.63	0.64	0.61	0.61	0.63	9.93	9.63
	citizen	0.56	0.83	0.56	0.56	1.31	1.33	3.93	5.85	3.28	3.06	1.08	1.10	1.04	1.16	1.07	1.04	14.18	14.36	3.41	4.08	3.41	3.39	9.75	9.49
	individual	14.72	22.08	14.72	14.72	5.26	5.24	3.40	3.98	3.55	3.38	1.09	1.10	0.74	0.82	0.75	0.71	22.42	22.73	3.80	4.61	3.84	3.87	8.96	9.20
	person	12.00	18.00	12.00	12.00	2.88	2.91	3.21	3.46	3.24	3.20	1.13	1.13	0.84	0.92	0.82	0.85	24.08	24.59	4.90	5.96	4.97	4.95	9.79	9.63
	stranger	5.51	8.27	5.51	5.51	58.05	58.04	3.51	3.84	3.59	3.44	1.02	1.00	0.34	0.37	0.34	0.34	24.01	24.44	4.91	5.97	4.93	4.96	35.63	35.66
	worker	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.98	0.95	2.26	1.46	1.27	2.28	1.11	1.13	2.86	3.13	2.86	2.86	12.78	12.48	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.07	10.58	10.69
	genius	1.50	2.25	1.50	1.50	52.44	52.43	2.59	2.88	3.41	2.72	1.05	1.08	0.25	0.26	0.24	0.24	23.24	23.55	3.31	3.98	3.33	3.31	17.45	17.56
	hero	2.24	3.36	2.24	2.24	1.38	1.38	2.25	3.56	1.94	1.93	1.14	1.12	0.43	0.48	0.43	0.43	15.53	15.13	1.33	1.58	1.33	1.29	10.61	10.44
	leader	4.54	6.81	4.54	4.54	9.82	9.85	5.88	4.16	5.06	3.00	1.13	1.10	2.15	2.35	2.14	2.16	16.34	16.59	4.29	5.09	4.26	4.27	9.33	9.59
savior	0.45	0.67	0.45	0.45	0.87	0.88	3.57	2.22	3.34	1.99	1.10	1.08	0.33	0.35	0.32	0.32	13.62	13.21	0.88	0.78	0.88	0.88	10.73	10.74	
winner	4.05	6.07	4.05	4.05	0.92	0.91	0.77	2.90	3.47	1.86	1.08	1.07	0.44	0.49	0.44	0.42	13.41	13.24	1.01	1.20	1.01	1.01	10.70	10.80	
OWLv2	criminal	47.53	71.22	47.65	47.57	0.23	0.23	1.03	0.97	0.98	1.00	2.26	1.84	27.78	30.08	28.48	27.50	0.09	0.09	16.88	21.43	17.55	17.72	1.03	1.02
	failure	60.27	90.54	60.34	60.51	0.08	0.08	0.94	1.12	1.01	0.98	1.78	2.37	30.64	34.56	30.75	31.30	0.14	0.14	34.96	42.05	35.15	35.01	0.03	0.02
	fraudster	44.98	67.59	45.09	45.05	0.19	0.19	1.00	1.05	0.91	0.97	1.20	2.61	16.58	19.97	17.88	17.90	0.02	0.04	22.40	26.67	22.25	22.50	1.33	1.31
	liar	62.75	94.41	63.05	63.16	0.99	0.99	4.32	4.85	4.29	4.33	2.22	2.28	31.48	34.81	31.88	31.96	0.29	0.32	36.97	44.65	37.05	37.17	0.95	0.93
	thief	10.75	16.03	10.77	10.76	0.13	0.13	1.07	1.35	1.04	1.10	1.66	2.81	14.97	17.63	15.46	15.86	0.08	0.07	10.17	11.94	9.70	9.97	0.64	0.6