# Mitigating Dialect Biases in Privacy Policy Question-Answering Systems through **Collaborative Agent-based Language Models**

## **Project Goal**

This is a project to question the **performance disparities** in privacy policy question-answering systems across different English Dialects and to create a collaborative multiagent-based solution to mitigate these biases, promoting fairness in automated systems.

## Introduction

What is the impact of dialect biases in LLMs, particularly in privacy policy QA, and why is it important?

Biased systems: Increase disparities in language understanding, affecting marginalized communities, leading to **unequal access** to **critical information**.

Our motivation rises from the need to address these biases, ensuring that all users, regardless of their linguistic background, receive accurate information. **Employing Human-Centered Design (HCD)** principles to create a solution that identifies and mitigates these biases, where experts (a privacy policy LLM) work with community representatives (dialect-specific LLM in our case)

Using a subset from the **PrivacyPolicyQA dataset** with 10922 examples, from which 5549 Relevant and 5474 Irrelevant labels were evaluated with our collaboration multi-agent solution that combines a dialect agent with a privacy policy expert agent to address gaps in fairness and accuracy.

## Methods

### Step 1. Dataset Generation

We compiled a dataset of privacy policy questions (PrivacyPolicyQA) translated into 50 different dialects, including Aboriginal English, Chicano English, African American Vernacular English, etc.; using Multi-VALUE framework.

Dialect	Question
Standard American English	will you sell my information?
Aboriginal	gon y'all sell me informations?
African American Vernacular	might will y'all sell my informations?

### Table 1. Example questions in different dialects

### Step 2. Multi-Agent Collaboration

We implemented a multi-agent solution using GPT 3.5-turbo, with two agents: a **Dialect Agent** and **Privacy Policy Agent**.

Step 2a Dialect Agent. The Dialect Agent is prompted with a background about the dialect (e.g., grammar patterns) a privacy policy segment and an question in a specific dialect, tasked with translating the text to Standard American English, explaining the relevance of the policy segment to the question, and labeling the answer as "Relevant" or "Irrelevant"

Step 2b Privacy Policy Agent The expert agent is prompted with background about what privacy policies contain and what makes a good policy, the dialect agent's explanation and prediction, the original question, privacy policy **segment**. The expert must review the dialects agent's reasoning, verify the label and provide a final label and explanation.

The University of Texas at San Antonio UTSA School of Data Science

Astrid Bernaga, Dorde Klisura, Anna Karen Gárate, Rajesh Roshan and Anthony Rios Master of Applied Artificial Intelligence – Tecnológico de Monterrey, School of Data Science – The University of Texas at San Antonio,

## Methodology Overview

Agent Inputs

### Policy

You may withdraw your consent at any time, however, the withdrawal of your consent will not affect the lawfulness of processing based on consent before its withdrawal.

### Question

is my dna information used in any other way besides what is specified?

## Results

### **RQ1**: Does model performance significantly vary across different dialects of English? **YES**

		Highest F1	S
White Zimbabwean -			
White South African -			
Welsh -		0.	4
Ugandan -			
Tristan -			
Tanzanian -			
Southwest England -		0.4	-8
Southeast England -			
St Helena -			
SriLankan -			
Southeast American Enclave -			
Scottish -			
Rural African American V			
Philippine -			
Pakistani -			
Ozark -			
Orkney Shetland -			
North England -			
Nigerian -			
Newfoundland -			
New Zealand			
Manx -			
Maltese -			
Malaysian -			
Liberian Settler -			
Kenyan -			
Jamaican -			
Indian South African -			
Indian South Arrear			_
Hong Kong -			
Ghanaian -			
Fiji Basilect -			0
Fiji Acrolect -			
Falkland Islands -			
East Anglican -			
Early African American -			
Colloquial Singapore -			
Colloquial American -			
Chicano -			
Channel Islands -			
Cape Flats -			
Cameroon -			
Black South African			
Bahamian -			
Australian Vernacular -			
Australian -			
Appalachian -			
Atrican American Vernacular			
Aboriginal -		0.477	
0.	40 0.	45 0.5	0









RQ2: Can multi-agent collaboration mitigate performance disparities? YES								
	Aboriginal English	Chicano English	Standard American English	Max Difference	Average Difference			
Few-shot Prompting	0.48	0.59	0.59	0.11	0.058			
Dialect Agent Only	0.61	0.67	0.66	0.05	0.03			
Multi-Agent Collaboration	0.64	0.67	0.66	0.02	0.015			

We compare to **two baselines**: Few-shot Prompting and Dialect Agent Only

The F1 score for Aboriginal English improved from 0.48 to 0.64, and for Chicano English, from 0.59 to 0.67. Standard American English improved from 0.59 to 0.66. The maximum difference decreased from 0.11 to 0.02, and the average difference reduced from 0.058 to 0.015.

These improvements indicate the collaborative model agent incorporating the dialect and expert in privacy policies enhanced the performance across dialects.

## Conclusion

There are performance disparities across dialects. Multi-agent collaboration mitigates these disparities.

## **Future Work**

Enhance the multi-agent collaboration system by introducing a feedback loop where the **Privacy Policy** Agent and the **Dialect** Agent continually learn from each other's predictions and explanations, incorporating more Dialects and evaluate other LLMs.

Apply the developed methodology to other critical areas like healthcare to handle dialect biases and improve performance.

## References

Caleb Ziems, William Held, Jingfeng Yang, Jwala Dhamala, Rahul Gupta, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Multi-VALUE: A Framework for Cross-Dialectal English NLP. In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 744–768, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. ilasha, Alan W. Black, Shomir Wilson, Thomas Norton, and Norman Sadeh. "Question Answering for Privacy Policies: Combining Computational and Lega Perspectives." In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language

Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pp. 4947-4958. 2019.

F1 Score

F1 scores from the Baseline model (Few-shot prompting)

