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Abstract

This paper examines machine bias in language technology. Machine bias can affect machine learning algorithms when language models trained on large corpora include biased human decisions or reflect historical or social inequities, e.g. regarding gender and race. The focus of the paper is on gender bias in machine translation and we discuss a study conducted on Icelandic translations in the translation systems Google Translate and Vélþýðing.is. The results show a pattern which corresponds to certain societal ideas about gender. For example it seems to depend on the meaning of adjectives referring to people whether they appear in the masculine or feminine form. Adjectives describing positive personality traits were more likely to appear in masculine gender whereas the negative ones frequently appear in feminine gender. However, the opposite appeared when applied to appearance related adjectives. These findings unequivocally demonstrate the importance of being vigilant towards technology so as not to maintain societal inequalities and outdated views — especially in today’s digital world.
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1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to examine how gender bias appears in English-Icelandic translations. A study was conducted on Icelandic translations in the translation systems Google Translate and Vélþýðing.is. It was conducted over a period of 20 months where Google Translate was tested three times providing data on how the representations of gender bias can fluctuate over time. Vélþýðing.is, a translation tool focusing on Icelandic, was tested alongside the multilingual Google Translate in the latest period to have a comparison between two different translation tools in order to see if a similar gender bias occurs. Our main research question is: How does gender-bias appear in English-Icelandic translations and how does it vary over a 20 month period as the systems evolve?

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of previous research concerning machine bias, focusing on gender bias in machine translation tools. In Section 3, we describe the methodology of the study and Section 4 gives statistical information on how gender bias is manifested in both translation tools, comparing the results. Finally, we conclude with Section 5.

2. Background

In the field of Machine Translations (MT), statistical and neural network approaches have been dominant in recent years (Zong and Hong, 2018). Statistical and neural machine translation systems are data-driven in the sense that large collections of linguistic data are used to train these models for natural language processing (NLP). Such methods rely heavily on parallel datasets to obtain the linguistic information needed to automatically translate between different languages. These parallel datasets contain large amounts of texts that have been written in one language and manually translated to the other and in order to train the translation models properly, the datasets must be very large (Barkarson and Steingrímsson, 2019).

Linguistic corpora that are used to train language models consist of texts that are written by people. Therefore these texts can contain discourse topics that reflect the views and opinions of said people. In turn, the texts also hold all sorts of societal ideas and patterns created by the culture that has molded the language in some part over time (Prates et al., 2018).

Language models trained on large, uncurated datasets from the Web have been shown to encode hegemonic views that are harmful to marginalized populations (Bender et al., 2021). Up to this point, the main focus in language technology has been on gathering as much data as possible in order to properly train language models and the large size of training data has enabled deep learning models to achieve high accuracy in NLP. However, the training data has been shown to have problematic characteristics, resulting in technology that encodes stereotypical and derogatory associations along the lines of gender, ethnicity, race, disability status and so on. Seeing as language models are so heavily influenced by their training data, it is important to know where the texts come from, e.g. who
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1The following abbreviations and acronyms are used in the paper: FEM=feminine, MASC=masculine, NLP=Natural Language Processing, STEM=Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics.
their writers are in terms of societal factors such as age, class, race, gender and cultural background.

A large amount of data does not necessarily guarantee its diversity (Bender et al., 2021; Sigurðardóttir, 2021). Seeing as the Internet is a large and diverse virtual space, one might assume that large databases of texts collected from the Web should be considered broadly representative of the different views of different people around the world. However that is not the case as there are many factors which narrow Internet participation. For example, a lot of the texts collected in this way come from social media and other open and accessible sites, such as Twitter, Reddit and Wikipedia, and studies have shown that the majority of the users of these media are white, young, Western males (Bar eru, 2020; Barthel et al., 2016). This indicates that the discourse and topics reflected in the texts are largely derived from very privileged social groups, therefore, a discourse from a hegemonic viewpoint is more likely to be retained rather than other more diverse viewpoints (Bender et al., 2021).

As the neural networks use machine learning to learn languages, i.e. by analyzing these texts and learning their grammatical structure and other patterns of the languages, it is inevitable that they unintentionally obtain additional information from the semantic context on opinions, prejudice and biases, such as gender bias, racial bias, and some other representations of societal ideas that these texts may hold. This can lead to machine translation systems and other data driven language technology solutions reflecting and possibly magnifying certain biases and a variety of negative discourse that is derogatory towards people of certain minorities or other less privileged groups of society (Mehrabi et al., 2021; Bender et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2018). This is called machine-bias and has been the focus of many recent studies (Kirkpatrick, 2016; Danks and London, 2017; Sólmundsdóttir et al., 2021; Bender et al., 2021).

Machine translations systems such as Google Translate are a good platform for checking whether and how machine-bias such as gender bias appears. Previous studies show that gender bias has been proven to exist in Google Translate in multiple languages (Prates et al., 2018; Schiebinger, 2014b; Schiebinger, 2014a; Vanmassenhove et al., 2018). By translating sentences concerning different professions from gender neutral languages to English, Prates et al. (2019) demonstrated that Google Translate and other current translation tools can exhibit gender biases and a strong preference for male defaults. Not only did their findings show that male defaults were prominent, but they were also exaggerated in professions associated with gender stereotypes, such as STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) occupations. This is in accordance to reigning societal ideas concerning the genders.

Gender stereotypes are broad generalizations about what men and women are like, and they are usually widely accepted (Hentschel et al., 2019). An example of different stereotypes of the genders is the idea that women are valued more for their appearance than men. Women are strongly urged to be physically attractive by the society, i.e. media promotes attention to their appearance in such a way that suggests that looks are their most valued attributes. However, men seem to be valued more for their strong personal traits, such as regarding intelligence, decisiveness and leadership, while women can be criticized for the same traits (Rudman et al., 2012; Rudman and Glick, 2021). These stereotypes along with many other ideas concerning the so-called innate difference between men and women are one of the ways in which gender bias appears in the output of machine translation systems such as Google Translate. This is further amplified in translation outputs of gendered languages where the input language is gender neutral such as English-Icelandic as will be described in section 3.

Icelandic has three grammatical genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. Nouns have fixed gender whereas adjectives receive their gender from the nouns they describe or refer to. The masculine gender in Icelandic is the default gender in many situations, meaning it has the widest range of application whereas the feminine gender has the smallest range. English adjectives and nouns on the other hand do not differentiate between genders, in fact one of the only remaining forms of grammatical gender in English is found in third person pronouns he/she (Rögnvaldsson, 1990; Kvaran, 2005).

3. Methodology

Google Translate is one of the most prominent machine translation tools that are publicly available, amounting to 500 million users (Turovský, 2016). For Icelandic, Google Translate is without a doubt the most used translation tool. The most recent translation system for Icelandic is, however, Vélþýðing.is, currently being developed by the company Miðeind. The system follows tried and tested methods in neural machine translation and is a part of the government sponsored Icelandic Language Technology Programme (Nikulás-dóttir et al., 2020). The main emphasis is to build an accessible and effective translation system for Icelandic (Simonarson et al., 2021).

In this study we assume that gender bias in machine translations can be assessed by translating gender neutral sentences in English to Icelandic, where grammatical gender is necessary, by means of an automated translation tool. In this context, we used the two translation tools, Google Translate and Vélþýðing.is, to translate English sentences, containing a first person pronoun and an adjective, to Icelandic. When first person pronouns in English are used to refer to a person, there is nothing in the structure of the sentence that specifies that person’s natural gender. However, the adjectives in Icelandic always show the gender of
4. Results

Figure 1 shows results from Google Translate on sentences containing adjectives describing personality traits. It is evident that words describing positive personality traits, such as strong and clever, appear more often in the masculine form rather than feminine, whereas negative ones, such as weak and stupid are more likely to appear in the feminine form. In March 2020 the difference between genders is most exaggerated as 60% of the words which appear in masculine form are positive and 60% of those that appear in feminine are negative. Despite these numbers fluctuating somewhat over the 20 month period, the pattern is always the same. Sentences that describe different people’s personality traits in a positive way appear most often in masculine form while the majority of the negative ones appear in feminine.

Figure 2 shows the comparison of results on adjectives describing different personality traits between Vélpýðing.is and Google Translate in October 2021. Contrary to Figure 1 the results of Vélpýðing.is do not mirror the same pattern. The ratio of positive, negative and neutral words is relatively the same for words appearing in both masculine and feminine gender. This suggests that gender bias is not as prominent in the output of Vélpýðing.is as it is in Google Translate.

Figure 3 and 4 show results for sentences containing adjectives which describe peoples appearance. Figure 3 demonstrates how these words appear in masculine or feminine form in Google Translate over the 20 month period. The patterns which appear are in some ways opposite to the one in Figures 1 and 2, i.e. words describing peoples appearance negatively, such as ugly and nasty, are most likely to appear in the masculine form, whereas words describing appearance in a positive way, such as pretty and gorgeous, appear most often in the feminine. The difference is most noticeable in March 2020, just as in Figure 1, however the pattern almost disappears in March 2021 meaning that the curve of the ratio between positive, negative and neutral words is mostly flattened. This might be considered as a step in the direction of erasing gender bias from the system but the fact that the pattern appears again in October 2021, although not as extreme, suggests that bias is still present.

Figure 4 demonstrates how the results of this category from Vélpýðing.is compare to those of Google Translate in October 2021. Overlooking that the majority of words in the masculine form are neutral, the pattern of positive and negative words describing appearance is relatively the same as in Google Translate, meaning there are more negative words in the masculine than there are positive, although the difference is quite small. It should be noted that in the category of appearance-related words, there does not seem to be as much of a difference as in the category of personality traits, however, this category included fewer words, which could skew the results.

These results show a pattern which corresponds to certain societal ideas about gender. For example it seems to depend on the meaning of adjectives referring to people whether they appear in the masculine or femi-
ine form. Adjectives describing positive personality traits were more likely to appear in masculine gender whereas the negative ones frequently appear in feminine gender. However the opposite applied to appearance related adjectives, as words describing what is generally thought to be desirable appearance factors appeared in the feminine gender whereas negative adjectives appeared in the masculine.

5. Conclusion
The main purpose of this paper was to examine how gender-bias appears in English-Icelandic translations. A study was conducted on Icelandic translations in the translation systems Google Translate and Vélpþýðing.is, with the following research question as an aim: How does gender-bias appear in English-Icelandic translations and how does it vary over a 20 month period as the systems evolve?

The results show that there seems to be a correspondence between the grammatical genders in which the translations appear and certain societal ideas about the genders. This can therefore be interpreted as a direct consequence of the representations of gender in the training data. Seeing as discourse on women is mostly concerned with looks and their appearance is considered their most valued feature, it is of no surprise that adjectives conveying meaning of positive appearance traits are more likely to appear in the feminine form. Likewise, the dominant discourse on men, for example their good skills in leadership and intelligence, is reflected in the results of words describing positive personality traits appearing most often in the masculine form. This is consistent to the gender stereotypes discussed in Section 2.

The results on how gender bias appears in Google Translate over a 20 month period shows that while the numbers fluctuate somewhat, from extreme bias to a relatively small difference between genders, the patterns of gender bias still exists in the translation system. Despite the results demonstrating that gender bias exists in both translation systems, it seems that it is not as prominent in the output of Vélpþýðing.is as in Google Translate. This is interesting bearing in mind that the latter is a widely used multilingual translation tool created by a tech company which dominates its field, while Vélpþýðing.is is specifically created for the Icelandic language and its small language community.

There is by now a considerable awareness of equality in modern society and social changes are constantly moving in that direction. People have thus become increasingly critical of deep-rooted notions of gender and gender roles in history. Written sources, on the other hand, preserve the ideas of their time, so language data collected from these sources can not be considered fully descriptive of modern society. If left unmanaged, we risk that biases of the past will amplify discrimination in the future. It is important to continually monitor new technology and prevent it from perpetuating outdated societal ideas such as gender bias, because it is imperative that advances in technology must not hinder positive social change - especially in today’s digital world.
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Figure 1: Ratio of positive, negative and neutral adjectives describing personality traits in Google Translate by gender over a 20 month period.

Figure 2: Ratio of positive, negative and neutral adjectives describing personality traits in Vélþýðing.is and Google Translate by gender in October 2021.
Figure 3: Ratio of positive, negative and neutral adjectives describing appearance in Google Translate by gender over a 20 month period.

Figure 4: Ratio of positive, negative and neutral adjectives describing appearance in Vélþýðing.is and Google Translate by gender in October 2021.
Adjectives that describe personality traits: *"I am..."

| Absurd | Condemned | Envious | Impressive | Odd | Stout |
|--------|-----------|---------|------------|-----|-------|
| Accomplished | Confident | Evil | Inarticulate | Old | Strong |
| Admirable | Confused | Excited | Incapable | Oldish | Stupid |
| Adorable | Considerate | Fair | Inconsiderate | Ordinary | Superficial |
| Affable | Cool | Faithful | Inconvenient | Passionate | Sweet |
| Aggressive | Courageous | Famous | Indelicate | Patient | Talented |
| Alert | Cowardly | Fancy | Influential | Perfect | Tame |
| Amazing | Creepy | Fantastic | Insane | Pitiful | Tender |
| Ambitious | Critical | Fierce | Insignificant | Polite | Thankful |
| Angry | Crude | Filthy | Intelligent | Poor | The hottest |
| Annoyed | Cruel | Fine | Interesting | Popular | Thoughtless |
| Anxious | Dainty | Firm | Irrational | Positive | Tidy |
| Arrogant | Dangerous | Focused | Jealous | Powerful | Tough |
| Articulate | Dark | Fracturable | Jolly | Professional | Triumphant |
| Arty | Dead | Fragile | Judicious | Proud | Unclean |
| Awesome | Deceased | Frail | Kind | Psycho | Undiplomatic |
| Awful | Defiant | Friable | Layered | Psychotic | Unfaithful |
| Awkward | Delicate | Friendly | Lazy | Quiet | Unimportant |
| Bad | Delightful | Frightened | Lesbian | Rare | Unintelligent |
| Bewildered | Depressed | Fun | Lethargic | Rational | Uninteresting |
| Bisexual | Determined | Funny | Lively | Ready | Unlucky |
| Bizarre | Different | Gay | Lost | Reasonable | Unpleasing |
| Bloody | Difficult | Generous | Lovely | Repulsive | Unpopular |
| Boring | Diplomatic | Gentle | Lucky | Rich | Unprofessional |
| Brave | Dirty | Gifted | Mad | Robust | Unusual |
| Brawny | Dishonest | Glorious | Magnificent | Rude | Uptight |
| Breakable | Divine | Good | Marvelous | Rugged | Vicious |
| Bright | Doubtful | Graceful | Mellow | Sane | Victorious |
| Brittle | Dull | Great | Mighty | Scared | Vulnerable |
| Busy | Dumb | Gregarious | Mild | Scary | Wayward |
| Calm | Durable | Grotesque | Modern | Selfish | Weak |
| Careful | Dynamic | Hard-working | Modest | Sensible | Weird |
| Cautious | Eager | Healthy | Moody | Shallow | Wild |
| Charming | Educated | Helpful | Mysterious | Shatterable | Wise |
| Cheerful | Elderly | Helpless | Negative | Shril | Witty |
| Classy | Elegant | Heterosexual | Nervous | Shy | Wonderful |
| Clean | Eloquent | Honest | Neurotic | Significant | Worried |
| Clever | Embarrassing | Horrible | Nice | Silly | Young |
| Clumsy | Enchanting | Hysterical | Nonsensical | Sincere | Youngish |
| Coarse | Encouraging | Ignorant | Normal | Smart | Zealous |
| Common | Energetic | Impatient | Obedient | Soft | |
| Compelling | Enthusiastic | Imprecise | Obnoxious | Stalwart | |

Table 1: Input sentences concerning personality traits
### Adjectives that describe appearance: “I am...”

| Adjective  | adj.  | adj.  | adj.  | adj.  | adj.  | adj.  |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| attractive | curvy| handsome | neat | sexy | tall |
| bald       | cute | heavy | obese | shapely | tan |
| beautiful  | elderly | huge | overweight | short | thick |
| big        | fat | immense | painted | skinny | thin |
| black      | feminine | lanky | plain | slender | tiny |
| blonde     | fit | large | polished | slim | tough |
| blue       | gigantic | little | presentable | small | tremendous |
| broad      | gorgeous | loose | pretty | spotted | ugly |
| bumpy      | grand | masculine | redhead | stooped | well |
| chubby     | greasy | muscular | repugnant | stunning |
| colossal   | hairy | nasty | rough | symmetrical |

Table 2: Input sentences concerning appearance