

Uplifting Lower-Income Data: Strategies for Socioeconomic Perspective Shifts in Vision-Language Models

Joan Nwatu Oana Ignat Rada Mihalcea
University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, USA
{jnwatu, oignat, mihalcea}@umich.edu

Abstract

Unequal representation across cultures and socioeconomic groups in AI is a significant and challenging problem, often leading to uneven model performance. As a step toward addressing this issue, we formulate translated non-English, geographic, and socioeconomic integrated prompts and evaluate their impact on VL model performance for data from different countries and income groups. Our findings show that geographic and socioeconomic integrated prompts improve VL performance on lower-income data and favor the retrieval of topic appearances commonly found in data from low-income households. From our analyses, we identify and highlight contexts where these strategies yield the most improvements. Our model analysis code is publicly available at [Analysis for Uplifting lower-income data](#).

1 Introduction

The overrepresentation of Western data and lack of diversity are common issues in many popular datasets (Shankar et al., 2017). Even though the size and quality of pre-training datasets greatly impact the performance of today’s AI models, there is insufficient research attention given to this area. Furthermore, there is even less attention given to data curation methods that can improve representation in AI datasets (Sambasivan et al., 2021).

Today, vision-language (VL) models are leveraged to filter uncurated data repositories into training datasets by assessing the association strength between images and text (Fang et al., 2023). For example, Open AI’s ViT-B/32 (Radford et al., 2021) was used to filter web-scraped images to create the LAION-5B dataset (Schuhmann et al., 2022). However, many VL models like CLIP have been shown to perform unequally for data from different cultures and socioeconomic classes (Nwatu et al., 2023).




Figure 1: Low-income Image Retrieval from Dollar Street dataset (Rojas et al., 2022) using different prompt formulations. The addition of *country* and *income* information to prompts leads to the retrieval of less standard images previously left out by the English and translated prompts.

Since datasets filtered using this technique reflect the VL model used for filtering (Fang et al., 2023), this practice can exacerbate the lack of diversity in AI models and datasets. This is evident in Ignat et al. (2024), which shows that data from the LAION-5B dataset is most similar to data from Western countries, like the United States and Canada, while it is dissimilar to data from many non-Western countries.

To mitigate the lack of representation in AI, we address the issue of performance inequality in VL models (Radford et al., 2021; Visheratin, 2023) through prompting that leverages the cultural knowledge embedded in language (Ventura et al., 2023; Buettner et al., 2024; Nguyen et al., 2024). Our goal is to improve the performance of VL models on the diverse representations of topic labels especially found in data from households with non-Western and lower socioeconomic status. Specifically, we pose several research questions to evaluate the effects of non-English languages and geographic and socioeconomic attribute-integrated prompts on retrieving diverse images. We focus on identifying which strategies improve performance on lower-income data, while also noting their effects on higher-income data.

Our contributions are summarized as follows.

First, we show that prompts translated to the native language (referred to as the non-English major language) of a country currently *do not* yield improved Recall performance on images from that country compared to English prompts. Second, by conducting an in-depth analysis of vision-language models’ understanding of these attributes and their effects on Recall across data from different countries, we establish that geographic attribute and socioeconomic attribute integrated prompts improve VL performance on lower-income data, and identify contexts where these prompts work best. Third, we share insights from our analysis demonstrating how these attributes drive a perspective shift that benefits the retrieval of lower-income data.

2 Related Work

Addressing AI Performance Inequality. Class imbalances in training data contribute greatly to bias propagation in AI models (Ferrara, 2024; Shankar et al., 2017; He and Garcia, 2009; Pouget et al., 2024). This bias manifests in the disparate impact of these models on users in applications such as facial recognition (Buolamwini and Gebru, 2018), healthcare (Obermeyer et al., 2019), and hiring (Raghavan et al., 2020). Since creating balanced diverse datasets is difficult and expensive (Ignat et al., 2024; Ramaswamy et al., 2023), the research community has explored alternative methods of dealing with bias. Some of these methods involve pre-processing and in-processing techniques such as data augmentation, feature importance tuning, regularization, and adversarial training (Yan et al., 2020; Zafar et al., 2017; Ignat et al., 2024; Maudslay et al., 2019; Sharma et al., 2020; Navarro et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2018). However, our work is most similar to post-processing techniques such as Ferrara (2023); Hardt et al. (2016); Kamiran et al. (2012); Pleiss et al. (2017) that adjust model outcomes using a set of criteria to fit diversity standards across race, gender, and culture for the benefit of disadvantaged groups. Pouget et al. (2024); Nwatu et al. (2023) show that vision-language models consistently perform badly on data from lower socioeconomic status. Our analysis seeks to identify and analyze the effects of non-invasive post-processing techniques that mitigate this issue.

Multilingual AI Models. Language is often referred to as a vehicle for propagating cultural knowledge and norms (Callies, 2024; Sharifian,

2014; Karsdorp and Fonteyn, 2019; Norton, 1997). This is exemplified in AI research, where models often pick up on biases contained in the language of their training data (Stanczak and Augenstein, 2021; Rogers et al., 2021), and model outputs can be controlled by specifying a cultural shift in perspective (Ventura et al., 2023) to improve diversity.

Furthermore, Arora et al. (2023); Cao et al. (2023); AlKhamissi et al. (2024); Liu et al. (2021) have shown that while LLMs and vision-language models contain a decent amount of cultural information regarding cultures present in English data (predominantly Western), for cultures contained in non-English language data, not as much cultural information can be extracted. Major reasons for this disparity include differences in the quantity and quality of training data available for these languages compared to English, information loss due to language translation, and model design decisions (Arora et al., 2023; Hershcovich et al., 2022; Nasif et al., 1991).

Similar to De Vries et al. (2019) and Nguyen et al. (2024) that demonstrate how language can improve data diversity by retrieving images using translated captions, our work seeks to identify how current multilingual VL models and non-English languages can improve representation in vision-language models and datasets across regions and income groups.

Prompting AI Models. Prompting techniques for large language models have been extensively studied in recent years. Both hard prompting (Petroni et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2023) and soft prompting (Huang et al., 2023; Goswami et al., 2023) are useful in adapting models for downstream tasks, instruction tuning, and value alignment. Prompts have also been used in vision-language models for similar purposes (Lu et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2022). Most similar to our work, Buettner et al. (2024) incorporates geographic and physical attributes of objects into prompts to improve retrieval of diverse images. However, we extend the investigation to non-English language prompts and socioeconomic attributes and then perform further analysis to highlight insights into how VL models encode representations of different topics across not only regions but also socioeconomic status.

3 Methodology

We apply three types of text prompting techniques to a geographically and socio-economically diverse dataset and analyze how these changes affect the performance of a multilingual VL model on data across different socio-economic groups, especially focusing on lower-income data.

3.1 Dollar Street Dataset

We use the Dollar Street (Rojas et al., 2022), which contains 38,479 images of household items (e.g., “stoves”, “cutlery”, “toothbrush”) spanning a large number of countries and several income levels. The dataset images were sourced from households in 63 countries on four continents (Africa, America, Asia, and Europe). The number of images ranges from 45 in Canada to 4,704 in India, with a median of 407 images per country. Size and image resolutions vary slightly across data from different regions; however, the mean and median image properties per region are relatively similar.

Income Classes. We categorize the images and countries on Dollar Street based on their income information as described below.

Image Income Classes. Each image is accompanied by the monthly household income value in U.S. dollars, calculated to reflect monthly consumption and adjusted for purchasing power parity to match the variance in cost of living across the different regions. The monthly income values range from 26.9\$ to 19,671.0\$.

For fair comparison across bins, we group the images using the quartile binning method which splits the data into an approximately equal number of images per bin as shown in Rojas et al. (2022). We group the images into four income classes (“poor”, “low-mid”, “up-mid”, and “rich”) using quartiles as shown in Table 1. We further categorize the lowest two image income classes as *lower-income images* and the highest two income groups as *higher-income images*.

Quartile name	Income range
poor	26.9 - 95.0
low-mid	195.4 - 685.0
up-mid	694.0 - 1,998.0
rich	2,001.0 - 19,671.0

Table 1: Income quartiles and their ranges for all the images in Dollar Street.

Country Income Classes. We group all the 63 countries from Dollar Street into country income classes based on their World Bank income classification.¹ All the countries and their income classes are shown in Appendix A.2. We further categorize the lowest two country income classes as *lower-income countries* and the highest two income groups as *higher-income countries*.

Topic Representations. There are 291 unique topics that reflect common household objects and human actions (e.g., “toilet paper”, “get water”), some of which are subjective (e.g., “next big thing I plan to buy”, “favorite sports clubs”, “most loved item”). Following De Vries et al. (2019) and Nwatu et al. (2023), we remove nineteen subjective topics from the dataset.

3.2 Prompt Design

Default English Topic Prompt. Using the topics, we formulate an English prompt without any modifications (e.g., “This is a photo of *cutlery*”), as described in Radford et al. (2021), to which we refer to as the *default English prompt*. The performance obtained using these prompts is set as our baseline.

Translated Topic Prompt. For our multilingual experiments, we investigate the impact of non-English language prompts on the Dollar Street dataset. We use the term *non-English major language* to refer to the non-English language that is most widely spoken or most commonly used in a particular country or region.

Specifically, we pair each country with their non-English major language (e.g., *Spanish* for *Brazil*, *French* for *Cameroon*) following the country and language information provided by official sources.²

We identify 59/63 countries in Dollar Street where one or more non-English major languages are spoken. We also select languages covered by state-of-the-art machine translation and multilingual vision-language models. There are 40 such non-English major languages, and they are listed in Appendix A.2.

Finally, we translate the *default English prompts* to these 40 languages using the NLLB-200-

¹<https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/>

²<https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/languages/>, https://www.ncsc.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0024/17862/languagesbycountries.pdf, https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/foi_disclosure_log/12-12-13/language-list.pdf

distilled-600M (Costa-jussà et al., 2022), a state-of-the-art neural machine translation model. If an image prompt is translated into the non-English major language of the image’s country of origin, it is referred to as a *native translated prompt*.

Country Suffix Topic Prompt. For our second prompting technique, we include country names as suffixes to the default English prompt (e.g., “This is a photo of *cutlery* from *Cameroon*”). We create 63 new prompt templates by adding the country names of each of the 63 countries in Dollar Street. We refer to these prompts as *country-suffix prompts*.

Income Suffix Topic Prompt. We also create prompts by integrating socio-economic attributes (e.g., “poor country”, “rich region”) as suffixes to the *default English prompt*. For instance, a sample prompt is “This is a photo of *cutlery* from a *rich country*”. For more robust results, we use multiple synonyms each for the *poor* and *rich* attributes (e.g., “an impoverished country”, “a wealthy region”). We also create prompts using neutral suffixes (e.g., “a country”, “a home”). We refer to these prompts as *income-suffix prompts*.

3.3 State-of-the-art Vision-Language Model

For our evaluation, we chose NLLB-CLIP-SigLIP (Visheratin, 2023), a state-of-the-art multilingual vision-language model, due to its wide reach across many low-resource languages and superior performance among other models.³ The model consists of an image encoder from the SigLIP model (Beyer et al., 2022; Zhai et al., 2023) and a text encoder from the NLLB model (Costa-jussà et al., 2022). The model supports the 201 languages of the Flores-200 (Costa-jussà et al., 2022) and has recorded groundbreaking results on the Crossmodal-3600 dataset (Thapliyal et al., 2022), especially on low-resource languages.

4 Research Questions

We perform several analyses to answer three research questions that uncover and mitigate limitations in the performance of VL models across different countries and socioeconomic groups.

RQ1. Do translated prompts improve performance for lower-income images? We calculate the cosine similarities between the NLLB-CLIP-SigLIP image embeddings and the text embeddings

³<https://huggingface.co/visheratin/nllb-clip-large-siglip>

of the translated prompts for each image and topic pair and the 40 non-English languages. This process yields 40 image-topic alignment scores for each image across all non-English languages.

As a baseline, we compute the alignment scores between the images and the *default English prompts*. We use the alignment scores to compute the Recall scores for each topic. Specifically, we select the top N images with the highest alignment scores for the given topic, where N represents the number of ground truth images corresponding to that topic. We group and analyze the Recall scores across different countries and image income classes and present our findings below.

Native translated prompts perform consistently worse than English prompts on lower-income images from their respective countries. We focus our analysis on images from the two lowest image income groups, i.e., *poor* and *low-middle*. We filter out countries with no data for these income groups (e.g., *Russia*, *Turkey*) and obtain 39/59 countries and 28/40 non-English languages. We pair up each of the remaining countries with the results from their respective non-English native languages and compare the Recall scores obtained using the *native translated prompts* with those obtained using the *default English prompts*.

We find that *native translated prompts* consistently perform worse than *default English prompts*. This is shown in Figure 2, where we compute the average Recall across all countries for English and the native translated prompts. We also show examples from four countries, one from each of the four continents: Africa, America, Asia, and Europe.




Figure 2: NLLB SigLIP Recall over poor and lower-middle income images from four countries from Asia, Africa, America, and Europe for English and native translated prompts. *Best viewed in color.*

For 36/39 countries, the *native translated prompts* yield worse performance compared to *default English prompts*. The exceptions are *Indonesia*, where Recall for the *Indonesian* native translated prompt is 1.0 higher than Recall for the English prompt, and *Pakistan*, where Recall for the *Urdu* native translated prompt is 0.7 higher than Recall for the English prompt.




Figure 3: Recall scores for *lower* income data from 39 countries and 28 languages. The cyan highlight shows Recall for a country’s native translated language, the yellow highlight shows the best-performing language recall, and the red shows the Recall for the language that is both the native and highest performing for that country. *Best viewed in color.*

The best-performing non-English language is often not the country’s language. We analyze the Recall scores for lower-income images from each of the 28 language prompts used in different countries. We observe that the best-performing language prompts for these countries are often not their own non-English major language. Specifically, for 24/39 countries, the best-performing non-English languages have better results than the default English prompts. However, surprisingly, in most cases, these languages are not spoken in these countries. The results are shown in Figure 3, where for 37/39 countries the language with the highest Recall (highlighted in yellow) is different from the non-English major language of the country (high-

lighted in cyan). The only exceptions are *Indonesia* and *Pakistan*, where the highest-performing languages and the non-English major languages are the same (highlighted in bold red).

Translated prompts decrease performance for all image income classes across all countries. We analyze the effect of the 40 non-English languages on all images from Dollar Street, regardless of which country the data was collected from. We include all 59 countries and results from all 40 translated prompts for this analysis. We aggregate Recall across all topics and countries for each set of non-English language prompts and group the scores according to image income classes. We measure the difference between Recall scores with *default English prompts* and the scores with translated prompts to determine the effect of each language on the four different image income classes.

<i>Non-English languages (Average)</i>	Image Income Class			
	Poor Δ	Low-mid Δ	Up-mid Δ	Rich Δ
	20.2 (-2.2)	31.0 (-4.9)	37.8 (-7.8)	36.1 (-7.5)

Table 2: Average differences between Recall scores for non-English language prompts and Recall scores for default English prompts for all data, grouped by image income classes. We find that non-English prompts lead to a decrease in Recall scores across all income classes.

We show in Table 2 the average Recall and drops in performance for all the 40 translated prompts for each image income class. The most significant impact is on higher-income classes. Specifically, the *rich* and *up-mid* income classes experienced the highest drops in performance compared to other income classes. One potential reason is that images depicting rich and up-mid income classes are overrepresented in AI models and datasets, leading them to be seen as the “standard” representation for these topics. In a similar way, English is the most commonly used language for training AI models and is considered the “standard” language for textual data. Therefore, non-English, translated prompts may signal to the model that a representation different from the “standard” is being requested, leading to unpredictable, inferior results. We show the performance drops for each language in the Appendix Table 7.

RQ2. Does adding country information improve performance for lower-income data? We calculate cosine similarity scores between the NLLB-CLIP-SigLIP image embeddings and the text embeddings of the 63 country suffix prompts. This

results in 63 image-topic alignment scores for each image across all country suffixes. Similar to RQ1, as a baseline, we use the alignment scores between the images and the *default English prompts*.

Following the same procedure described in Section 4, we calculate the Recall scores for each topic using each of the 63 country suffix prompts. We analyze the effects of adding country suffixes to text prompts and present our findings below.

Country-suffix prompts perform consistently better than default English prompts on lower-income images. Given our focus for this analysis on low-income data, we filter out the 21 countries with no images from *poor* or *low-mid* income class households and focus on the remaining 42 countries.

In Figure 4, we show the average Recall scores across all countries using the *default English* and *country-suffix prompts*. We also show Recall scores from four sample countries from different continents. From our results, we find that for most countries (38/42), adding the country suffix to the text prompts improves Recall performance for lower-income images compared to default English prompts. Countries where this does not hold are *Bolivia, Brazil, Jordan, and the United States*.




Figure 4: Recall with NLLB SigLIP over *poor* and *lower-middle* income images from four countries from Asia, Africa, America, and Europe, for English and Country Suffix prompts. *Best viewed in color.*

The country-suffix prompt performance across different image income classes is influenced by the country’s economic status. While country suffix prompts improve the performance of vision-language models on lower-income household data (*poor*), they simultaneously reduce performance on higher-income data.

We measure the Recall of all data for each country suffix, group them into image income classes

(based on household income), and place them into categories based on the World Bank income classification of that country suffix (e.g., Recall of data from poor households using country suffixes of poor countries is 31.2) For each image income class category, we calculate and show in Table 3 the average Recall of the country suffixes across the different country income levels and the average change in Recall compared to results obtained using the default English prompts. We show an extended table with results for all 63 country suffixes in the Appendix Table 8 and Table 9.

The differences in Recall between the country suffixes and default English prompts indicate which income group’s data benefits from an increase and vice versa. We find that country suffixes from countries that belong to the *poor*, *low-mid*, and *up-mid* World Bank Income categories lead to an increase in Recall for images with *poor* household income, as shown in green in Table 3. On the other hand, adding country suffixes to prompts leads to a decrease in Recall for images from the other household income groups (*low-mid*, *up-mid*, and *rich*).

Country suffix (Avg)	Image Income Classes			
	Poor Δ	Low-mid Δ	Up-mid Δ	Rich Δ
Poor	31.2 (+9.7)	30.7 (-5.3)	25.5 (-20.6)	21.9 (-22.5)
Low-mid	29.2 (+4.2)	31.6 (-4.3)	27.6 (-15.3)	23.2 (-16.9)
Up-mid	24.1 (+2.4)	31.2 (-3.7)	32.8 (-12.9)	30.3 (-14.7)
Rich	20.8 (-2.1)	0.329 (-4.4)	41.4 (-6.6)	40.0 (-5.6)

Table 3: Average NLLB SigLIP Recall scores for each category and the average difference between default English prompt and country suffix Recall across the four different income groups, grouping country suffixes into income class categories based on their World Bank economic classification. Recall increase is shown in green while Recall drops are highlighted in red. *Best viewed in color.*

Interestingly, we observe that country suffixes tend to favor image retrieval from income groups that are the same or close to their World Bank income classification. The default English prompts favor the retrieval of *up-mid* income level data as the Recall for *up-mid* images is higher than the Recall for the other 3 income groups. We highlight in bold the average Recall that is highest among other income groups for each country suffix classification in Table 3, and show that *poor* country suffixes, *low-mid* country suffixes, and *up-mid* country suffixes produce the highest Recall scores for data from their corresponding income class. *Rich* country suffixes are the exception as they produce the highest Recall for data from the *up-mid* income level as opposed to the *rich*. We analyze the individ-

ual country suffix results and group lower-income images as images belonging to either the poor or lower-middle income group and higher-income images as images belonging to the upper-middle or rich income groups. We then find that 48/63 countries produce the highest Recall for lower-income data and are lower-income countries, or they have the highest Recall for higher-income data and are higher-income countries.

The best-performing country suffixes for lower-income data from a continent are from the same continent. We analyze Recall results for lower-income data (from poor and low-mid households) from 42 countries when prompted using each of the 42 country suffixes and group these countries according to their respective continents. We categorize the data further into data from different World Bank Income classes within a continent. Then we display the average Recall and Recall difference (with respect to Recall using default English prompts) of each data group when prompted using country suffixes from different continents. For example, we show that lower-income data from poor African countries have a Recall of 36.6 and a performance increase of 15.7 when prompted using African country suffixes.

We find that the best-performing country suffixes for images from a continent are from the same continent, as shown by the diagonal of bold values in Table 4. We also see that lower-income data from *African* countries benefit most from the addition of country suffixes to prompts, while data from *America* and *Asia* do not experience Recall improvements.

Meanwhile, for higher-income data, there are no Recall improvements even when images and country suffixes belong to the same continent (see Appendix Table 10).

RQ3. Does adding income information improve performance for lower-income groups? We create three categories of income suffixes, *poor*, *rich*, and *neutral*, as described in Section 3.2. We repeat the image retrieval experiments from previous research questions to determine the Recall for images from each topic. We group and analyze the these results across countries and income groups.

Poor income suffixes yield the best performance on most lower-income images. We find that the *poor* income suffix prompt obtains the best performance in 26/42 countries with lower-income

Image by Continent	Country by Income	Country Suffix			
		Africa Δ	America Δ	Asia Δ	Europe Δ
Africa	Poor	36.6 (+15.7)	27.2 (+6.3)	23.0 (+2.1)	19.7 (-1.2)
	Low-mid	37.3 (+10.3)	31.2 (+4.2)	25.7 (-1.4)	24.3 (-2.7)
	Up-mid	24.3 (+2.1)	21.6 (-0.6)	17.2 (-5.0)	18.1 (-4.1)
	Average	32.7 (+9.4)	26.7 (+3.3)	22.0 (-1.4)	20.7 (-2.7)
America	Low-mid	24.5 (-2.6)	26.8 (-0.4)	20.7 (-6.5)	22.4 (-4.8)
	Up-mid	23.4 (-11.0)	35.2 (+0.9)	23.4 (-10.9)	28.9 (-5.4)
	Rich	20.4 (-15.5)	30.4 (-5.5)	22.8 (-13.1)	26.3 (-9.6)
	Average	22.8 (-9.7)	30.8 (-1.7)	22.3 (-10.2)	25.9 (-6.6)
Asia	Low-mid	29.4 (-2.4)	30.7 (-1.1)	32.7 (+0.8)	27.9 (-3.9)
	Up-mid	28.1 (-5.1)	32.5 (-0.6)	34.6 (+1.5)	30.3 (-2.8)
	Rich	31.0 (-14.0)	33.3 (-11.7)	36.0 (-9.0)	39.6 (-5.4)
	Average	29.5 (-7.2)	32.2 (-4.5)	34.4 (-2.2)	32.6 (-4.0)
Europe	Low-mid	19.6 (-23.7)	29.3 (-14.0)	26.4 (-16.9)	44.3 (+1.0)
	Up-mid	20.4 (-16.0)	26.7 (-9.7)	23.1 (-13.3)	35.9 (-0.5)
	Rich	20.0 (-19.9)	28.0 (-11.9)	24.8 (-15.1)	40.1 (+0.3)
	Average	20.0 (-19.9)	28.0 (-11.9)	24.8 (-15.1)	40.1 (+0.3)

Table 4: Average NLLB SigLIP Recall scores for each continent and the average difference between default English prompt Recall and country suffix Recall from the four continents, grouping lower-income images according to continents and further into groups of countries arranged by income class categories based on their World Bank economic classification. *Best viewed in color.*

images. For 12/42 countries, the default English prompts perform better than all the income suffixes. However, most countries experience Recall improvement from one of the income suffixes. We show the results in Figure 5. The average Recall score is aggregated across all 42 countries for the default English and income suffix prompts. The income suffix *poor* achieves the best recall. Recall scores for four countries is in Appendix Figure 7.




Figure 5: Average Recall with NLLB SigLIP over *poor* and *lower-middle* income images, for English and Income Suffix prompts. *Best viewed in color.*

Images from the poor income group benefit the most from income suffixes. We group the data into four income groups and further categorize them according to the World Bank income classification of the countries they were obtained. In Table 5, we show the Recall scores and performance increase with respect to the default English prompts for each data group.

We find that income suffixes benefit most data from poor households and some from lower-

income families, while data from other income groups do not see an increase in Recall. In addition, there is no clear trend between the World Bank’s income classification of the country and the effect of income suffixes on Recall for the images. Further details about the income classification by World Bank for each country can be seen in Appendix A.2.

Images by Income	Country by Income	Income Suffix		
		Poor Δ	Rich Δ	Neutral Δ
Poor	Poor	26.8 (+4.4)	21.9 (-0.5)	20.7 (-1.7)
	Low-mid	30.0 (+7.6)	26.0 (+3.6)	24.6 (+2.2)
	Up-mid	31.9 (+9.5)	28.0 (+5.6)	26.3 (+3.9)
	Average	29.6 (+7.2)	25.3 (+2.9)	23.9 (+1.5)
Low-mid	Poor	33.3 (-2.6)	33.3 (-2.6)	33.5 (-2.4)
	Low-mid	36.5 (+0.6)	35.6 (-0.3)	35.7 (-0.2)
	Up-mid	30.6 (-5.3)	30.5 (-5.4)	30.3 (-5.6)
	Rich	35.5 (-0.5)	38.1 (+2.2)	37.2 (+1.3)
	Average	34.0 (-2.0)	34.4 (-1.5)	37.2 (-1.7)
Up-mid	Poor	31.4 (-14.2)	36.4 (-9.2)	32.8 (-12.8)
	Low-mid	37.6 (-8.1)	42.4 (-3.2)	44.5 (-1.1)
	Up-mid	33.0 (-12.6)	38.0 (-7.6)	41.3 (-4.3)
	Rich	28.4 (-17.4)	33.4 (-12.2)	36.3 (-9.3)
	Average	32.6 (-13.1)	37.6 (-8.1)	38.7 (-6.9)
Rich	Poor	29.6 (-14.0)	42.6 (-1.0)	42.4 (-1.2)
	Low-mid	30.6 (-13.0)	38.0 (-5.6)	38.5 (-5.1)
	Up-mid	25.8 (-17.8)	33.8 (-9.8)	36.1 (-7.5)
	Rich	25.5 (-18.1)	33.8 (-9.8)	36.5 (-7.1)
	Average	27.9 (-15.7)	37.1 (-6.6)	38.4 (-5.2)

Table 5: Average NLLB SigLIP Recall scores for each category and the average difference between default English prompt Recall and income suffix recall, grouping images according to household income level and separating countries into income class categories based on their World Bank economic classification.

Finally, an interesting finding is that for higher-income images, i.e., *up-mid* and *rich*, all income suffixes, including *rich* and *neutral* suffixes, lead to drops in Recall. This means that the default English prompts obtain the best results for higher-income images. This could be due to the high representation of higher-income images in AI models and datasets as the “standard representation”. Therefore, including additional information, such as socioeconomic status, causes the model to favor the retrieval of lower-income images over higher-income images. This can be seen in the results that achieve Recall improvements on lower-income images while reducing Recall for higher-income images. Such effects could result from these prompts shifting the VL’s perspective away from its understanding of the default representation of a topic.

5 Lessons Learned

Current multilingual VL models do not contribute significant improvements to diversity

and representation. Our results from Section 4 demonstrate that English prompts obtain better performance on lower (and higher) income data compared to prompts translated to a non-English that is widely spoken in the region where the data was collected from. Since the quality of translations, quantity of training data available for these languages, and consequently, the performance of AI models in these languages is lower than that of English, these findings are not very surprising. We can look forward to better non-English language performance as multilingual VL models improve.

The addition of extra information to prompts shifts the focus of model inferences from higher-income images. We find that adding geographical and socioeconomic attributes (including neutral attributes) to prompts leads to an increased model preference for lower-income images over higher-income images as demonstrated in Section 4.

Images with less standard topic appearances are retrieved using income suffix and country suffix prompts. Inspection of the retrieved images reveals that images with topic appearances commonly found in lower-income households previously not retrieved by the default English prompts are being retrieved with these prompts as shown in Figure 1. For example, *pit latrines* and *forest-style toilets* previously left out by the default English prompts are retrieved using country suffixes (*Burundi* and *Cameroon*) and the *poor* income suffixes. Another example is “leaves” as “toilet paper” retrieved by *Liberia* and *Cameroon* country suffixes but excluded by the default English prompt.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed the uneven performance of VL models across different countries and different income levels. We explored three attribute-integrated prompting strategies: (1) translation of text prompts to native non-English languages, (2) addition of geographic information, and (3) addition of socioeconomic attributes. We found that integrating geographical and socioeconomic information into prompts enhances the performance on data from lower-income households and retrieves more diverse label representations. Furthermore, we identified and highlighted the contexts where the proposed prompting techniques work best and shared our insights to improve representation in vision-language models and datasets. Our code can

be used to evaluate the performance of other VL models and datasets and is publicly available at [Analysis for Uplifting lower-income data](#).

Limitations

Translation Quality We note that, while NLLB-200-distilled-600M is reputed as a SOTA machine translation model, it does not have perfect accuracy on machine translation across all the languages it supports. We acknowledge that the quality of translations obtained from NLLB-200-distilled-600M greatly impacts our results.

Data Coverage Our study is constrained by the reach of the Dollar Street dataset and the number of contributions obtained from each region. therefore we do not account for data from other regions not included in the dataset.

Choice of Attributes We acknowledge that other attributes (e.g., physical attributes like color and material) of the objects in the images could be integrated into prompts to improve performance. However, we choose to focus on geographic and socioeconomic attributes since they are broad enough to include all possible topic appearances related to that attribute and their impact on data belonging to different countries and income groups can be measured directly.

Diverse Data Availability While our methods facilitate the improvement of diversity during dataset annotation, these strategies cannot overcome the representation issues within the actual pool of images available for annotation.

Ethics Statement

Through this work, we aim to contribute toward improving diversity in AI models and even out the disparate impact of these models on the public, especially on underrepresented groups. The strategies discussed in our work can be used to prioritize the retrieval of lower-income images for balancing skewed data representation or domain-specific applications in AI. However, we do not encourage the use of these strategies to promote over-representation or inclusion of one group over the other in contexts that affect all members of the general public.

Our decision to use the NLLB-SigLIP model exemplifies our commitment to using inclusive models that benefit as many people as possible, especially underrepresented groups. While researching

technologically advanced communities is easier and less resource-intensive, we stress the importance of making AI design decisions that do not exclude communities with limited access to technology.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Language and Information Technologies (LIT) lab members at the University of Michigan for the insightful discussions and feedback during the early stages of the project. This project was partially funded by a grant from the Department of State (#STC10023GR0014). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of State.

References

- Badr AlKhamissi, Muhammad ElNokrashy, Mai AlKhamissi, and Mona Diab. 2024. Investigating cultural alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13231*.
- Arnav Arora, Lucie-aimée Kaffee, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. [Probing pre-trained language models for cross-cultural differences in values](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Cross-Cultural Considerations in NLP (C3NLP)*, pages 114–130, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, and Alexander Kolesnikov. 2022. Big vision. https://github.com/google-research/big_vision.
- Kyle Buettner, Sina Malakouti, Xiang Lorraine Li, and Adriana Kovashka. 2024. Incorporating geo-diverse knowledge into prompting for increased geographical robustness in object recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01482*.
- Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*, pages 77–91. PMLR.
- Marcus Callies. 2024. Cultural conceptualisations in nigerian pidgin english proverbs. *World Englishes*.
- Yong Cao, Li Zhou, Seolhwa Lee, Laura Cabello, Min Chen, and Daniel Hershcovich. 2023. [Assessing cross-cultural alignment between ChatGPT and human societies: An empirical study](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Cross-Cultural Considerations in NLP (C3NLP)*, pages 53–67, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Marta R Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, et al. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- Terrance De Vries, Ishan Misra, Changan Wang, and Laurens Van der Maaten. 2019. Does object recognition work for everyone? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 52–59.
- Alex Fang, Albin Madappally Jose, Amit Jain, Ludwig Schmidt, Alexander Toshev, and Vaishaal Shankar. 2023. Data filtering networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17425*.
- Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Sci*, 6(1):3.
- Emilio Ferrara. 2024. The butterfly effect in artificial intelligence systems: Implications for ai bias and fairness. *Machine Learning with Applications*, 15:100525.
- Koustava Goswami, Srikrishna Karanam, Prateksha Udhayanan, Balaji Vasan Srinivasan, et al. 2023. Contextual prompt learning for vision-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00910*.
- Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Haibo He and Edwardo A Garcia. 2009. Learning from imbalanced data. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 21(9):1263–1284.
- Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Heather Lent, Miryam de Lhoneux, Mostafa Abdou, Stephanie Brandl, Emanuele Bugliarello, Laura Cabello Piqueras, Ilias Chalkidis, Ruixiang Cui, Constanza Fierro, Katerina Margatina, Phillip Rust, and Anders Søgaard. 2022. **Challenges and strategies in cross-cultural NLP**. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6997–7013, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qidong Huang, Xiaoyi Dong, Dongdong Chen, Weiming Zhang, Feifei Wang, Gang Hua, and Nenghai Yu. 2023. Diversity-aware meta visual prompting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10878–10887.
- Oana Ignat, Longju Bai, Joan Nwatu, and Rada Mihalcea. 2024. **Annotations on a budget: Leveraging geo-data similarity to balance model performance and annotation cost**.
- Faisal Kamiran, Asim Karim, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2012. **Decision theory for discrimination-aware classification**. In *2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 924–929.
- Folger Karsdorp and Lauren Fonteyn. 2019. Cultural entrenchment of folktales is encoded in language. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1).
- Fangyu Liu, Emanuele Bugliarello, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Siva Reddy, Nigel Collier, and Desmond Elliott. 2021. Visually grounded reasoning across languages and cultures. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10467–10485.
- Yuning Lu, Jianzhuang Liu, Yonggang Zhang, Yajing Liu, and Xinmei Tian. 2022. Prompt distribution learning. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5196–5205. IEEE Computer Society.
- Rowan Hall Maudslay, Hila Gonen, Ryan Cotterell, and Simone Teufel. 2019. It’s all in the name: Mitigating gender bias with name-based counterfactual data substitution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00871*.
- Ercan G Nasif, Hamad Al-Daeaj, Bahman Ebrahimi, and Mary S Thibodeaux. 1991. Methodological problems in cross-cultural research: An updated review. *MIR: Management International Review*, pages 79–91.
- Madeline Navarro, Camille Little, Genevera I Allen, and Santiago Segarra. 2024. Data augmentation via subgroup mixup for improving fairness. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7350–7354. IEEE.
- Thao Nguyen, Matthew Wallingford, Sebastin Santy, Wei-Chiu Ma, Sewoong Oh, Ludwig Schmidt, Pang Wei Koh, and Ranjay Krishna. 2024. Multilingual diversity improves vision-language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16915*.
- Bonny Norton. 1997. Language, identity, and the ownership of english. *TESOL quarterly*, 31(3):409–429.
- Joan Nwatu, Oana Ignat, and Rada Mihalcea. 2023. **Bridging the digital divide: Performance variation across socio-economic factors in vision-language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10686–10702, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziad Obermeyer, Brian Powers, Christine Vogeli, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2019. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464):447–453.
- Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, Patrick Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, and

- Alexander Miller. 2019. [Language models as knowledge bases?](#) 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)*, pages 2463–2473, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geoff Pleiss, Manish Raghavan, Felix Wu, Jon Kleinberg, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. On fairness and calibration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Angéline Pouget, Lucas Beyer, Emanuele Bugliarello, Xiao Wang, Andreas Peter Steiner, Xiaohua Zhai, and Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin. 2024. No filter: Cultural and socioeconomic diversity in contrastive vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13777*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Manish Raghavan, Solon Barocas, Jon Kleinberg, and Karen Levy. 2020. Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 469–481.
- Vikram V Ramaswamy, Sing Yu Lin, Dora Zhao, Aaron B Adcock, Laurens van der Maaten, Deepti Ghadiyaram, and Olga Russakovsky. 2023. Beyond web-scraping: Crowd-sourcing a geographically diverse image dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02560*.
- Anna Rogers, Olga Kovaleva, and Anna Rumshisky. 2021. A primer in bertology: What we know about how bert works. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:842–866.
- William A Gavia Rojas, Sudnya Diamos, Keertan Ranjan Kini, David Kanter, Vijay Janapa Reddi, and Cody Coleman. 2022. The dollar street dataset: Images representing the geographic and socioeconomic diversity of the world. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:12979–12990.
- Nithya Sambasivan, Shivani Kapania, Hannah Highfill, Diana Akrong, Praveen Paritosh, and Lora M Aroyo. 2021. “everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work”: Data cascades in high-stakes ai. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’21, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. 2022. [Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 25278–25294. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Shreya Shankar, Yoni Halpern, Eric Breck, James Atwood, Jimbo Wilson, and D Sculley. 2017. No classification without representation: Assessing geodiversity issues in open data sets for the developing world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.08536*.
- Farzad Sharifian. 2014. Language and culture: Overview. *The Routledge handbook of language and culture*, pages 3–17.
- Shubham Sharma, Yunfeng Zhang, Jesús M. Ríos Aliaga, Djallel Bouneffouf, Vinod Muthusamy, and Kush R. Varshney. 2020. [Data augmentation for discrimination prevention and bias disambiguation](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, AIES ’20, page 358–364, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Karolina Stanczak and Isabelle Augenstein. 2021. A survey on gender bias in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14168*.
- Ashish Thapliyal, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Xi Chen, and Radu Soricut. 2022. Crossmodal-3600: A Massively Multilingual Multimodal Evaluation Dataset. In *EMNLP*.
- Mor Ventura, Eyal Ben-David, Anna Korhonen, and Roi Reichart. 2023. Navigating cultural chasms: Exploring and unlocking the cultural pov of text-to-image models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01929*.
- Alexander Visheratin. 2023. Nllb-clip–train performant multilingual image retrieval model on a budget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01859*.
- Shen Yan, Hsien-te Kao, and Emilio Ferrara. 2020. Fair class balancing: Enhancing model fairness without observing sensitive attributes. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 1715–1724.
- Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Maosong Sun. 2024. Cpt: Colorful prompt tuning for pre-trained vision-language models. *AI Open*, 5:30–38.
- Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. 2017. Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1171–1180.
- Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. 2023. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15343*.

Brian Hu Zhang, Blake Lemoine, and Margaret Mitchell. 2018. Mitigating unwanted biases with adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 335–340.

Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. 2022. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348.

Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, Ethan Wilcox, Ryan Cotterell, and Mrinmaya Sachan. 2023. Controlled text generation with natural language instructions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 42602–42613. PMLR.

A Example Appendix

A.1 Non-English Languages

We use the following non-English languages in our experiments. 'German', 'Spanish', 'Portuguese', 'French', 'Chinese', 'Czech', 'Danish', 'Arabic', 'Hindi', 'Indonesian', 'Farsi-Persian', 'Italian', 'Russian', 'Mongolian', 'Burmese', 'Dutch', 'Urdu', 'Romanian', 'Serbian', 'Korean', 'Swedish', 'Thai', 'Turkish', 'Ukrainian', 'Vietnamese', 'Bengali', 'Khmer', 'Oromo', 'Ewe', 'Creole', 'Swahili', 'Nepali', 'Hausa', 'Kyrgyz', 'Tagalog', 'Kinyarwanda', 'Somali', 'Zulu', 'Sinhala', 'Shona'

A.2 Lists of countries and classifications

A.3 Recall from all Prompting techniques across all countries

A.4 Non-English Languages and Effect on Recall

A.5 How do different country suffixes prompts affect the Recall of images from different income groups (expanded)?

A.6 Does adding income suffixes improve performance for lower-income images?

A.7 The best-performing country suffixes for higher income data from a continent are from the same continent

This is a section in the appendix.




Figure 6: Average Recall over lower-income images across 39 countries for English, Country Suffix, and Income Suffix prompts

Countries	Non-English Language	Image Income Classes	World Bank Country Income Classes	Continent
Austria	German	Rich, Up-mid	High	Europe
Bangladesh	Bengali	Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Bolivia	Spanish	Low-mid, poor	Low-mid	America
Brazil	Portuguese	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	Up-mid	America
Burkina Faso	French	Poor	Poor/low	Africa
Burundi	French	Poor	Poor/low	Africa
Cambodia	Khmer	Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Cameroon	French	Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Africa
Canada	French	Rich	High	America
China	Chinese	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Up-mid	Asia
Colombia	Spanish	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Up-mid	America
Cote d'Ivoire	French	Poor	Low-mid	Africa
Czech Republic	Czech	Rich	High	Europe
Denmark	Danish	Rich	High	Europe
Egypt	Arabic	Up-mid	Low-mid	Africa
Ethiopia	Oromo	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	Poor/low	Africa
France	French	Rich, Up-mid	High	Europe
Ghana	Ewe	Low-mid	Low-mid	Africa
Guatemala	Spanish	Low-mid	Up-mid	America
Haiti	Creole	Poor	Low-mid	America
India	Hindi	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Indonesia	Bahasa Indonesian	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Up-mid	Asia
Iran	Farsi (Persian)	Rich, Up-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Italy	Italian	Rich	High	Europe
Jordan	Arabic	Rich, Low-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Kazakhstan	Russian	Up-mid	Up-mid	Asia
Kenya	Swahili	Rich, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Africa
Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyz	Up-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Lebanon	Arabic	Up-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Liberia	-	Poor	Poor/low	Africa
Malawi	-	Poor	Poor/low	Africa
Mexico	Spanish	Rich, Up-mid	Up-mid	America
Mongolia	Mongolian	Low-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Myanmar	Burmese	Low-mid, poor	Low-mid	Asia
Nepal	Nepali	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Netherlands	Dutch	Rich, Up-mid	High	Europe
Nigeria	Hausa	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Africa
Pakistan	Urdu	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Palenstine	Arabic	Low-mid, poor	Low-mid	Asia
Papua New Guinea	-	Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Peru	Spanish	Low-mid, poor	Up-mid	America
Philippines	Tagalog	Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Asia
Romania	Romanian	Rich	High	Europe
Russia	Russian	Rich, Up-mid	Up-mid	Europe
Rwanda	Kinyarwanda	Low-mid, poor	Poor/low	Africa
Serbia	Serbian	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	Up-mid	Europe
Somalia	Somali	Poor	Poor/low	Africa
South Africa	Zulu	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Up-mid	Africa

Countries	Non-English Language	Image Income Classes	World Bank Country Income Classes	Continent
South Korea	Korean	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	High	Asia
Spain	Spanish	Rich	High	Europe
Sri Lanka	Sinhala	Up-mid	Low-mid	Asia
Sweden	Swedish	Rich, Up-mid	High	Europe
Switzerland	German	Rich	High	Europe
Tanzania	Swahili	Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Low-mid	Africa
Thailand	Thai	Up-mid, Low-mid, Poor	Up-mid	Asia
Togo	French	Low-mid, poor	Poor/low	Africa
Tunisia	Arabic	Low-mid, poor	Low-mid	Africa
Turkey	Turkish	Rich	Up-mid	Europe
Ukraine	Ukrainian	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	Low-mid	Europe
United Kingdom	-	Rich, Up-mid	High	Europe
United States	Spanish	Rich, Up-mid, Low-mid	High	America
Vietnam	Vietnamese	Low-mid, Rich	Low-mid	Asia
Zimbabwe	Shona	Poor	Low-mid	Africa

Table 6: Table displaying the 63 Dollar Street countries, their major non-English language, income levels of contributions for that country, World Bank income class, and their continent.




Figure 7: Average NLLB SigLIP Recall over poor and lower-middle income images for English and Income Suffix prompts

Languages	Income level of images			
	Poor	Low-mid	Up-mid	Rich
Arabic	21.0 (-2.4)	32.0 (-3.9)	38.5 (-7.1)	37.3 (-6.3)
Bengali	20.9 (-1.5)	33.0 (-2.9)	40.7 (-4.9)	38.9 (-4.7)
Burmese	21.5 (-0.9)	30.4 (-5.5)	36.0 (-9.6)	34.2 (-9.4)
Chinese	21.5 (-0.9)	32.5 (-3.4)	39.1 (-6.5)	37.3 (-6.3)
Creole	21.0 (-1.4)	32.6 (-3.3)	40.1 (-5.5)	38.0 (-5.6)
Czech	19.9 (-2.5)	32.3 (-3.6)	40.3 (-5.3)	38.8 (-4.8)
Danish	20.8 (-1.6)	33.7 (-2.2)	41.7 (-3.9)	40.0 (-3.6)
Dutch	21.1 (-1.3)	33.6 (-2.3)	42.5 (-3.1)	40.8 (-2.8)
Ewe	14.7 (-7.7)	19.3 (-16.6)	22.1 (-23.5)	20.6 (-23.0)
Farsi-Persian	21.9 (-0.5)	31.8 (4.1)	39.1 (-6.5)	38.1 (-5.5)
French	21.7 (-0.7)	33.7 (-2.2)	42.6 (-3.0)	41.4 (-2.2)
German	21.5 (-0.9)	33.1 (-2.8)	41 (-4.6)	39 (-4.6)
Hausa	20.6 (-1.8)	31.6 (-4.3)	38.4 (-7.2)	36.4 (-7.2)
Hindi	22.2 (-0.2)	34.5 (-1.4)	41.8 (-3.8)	40 (-3.6)
Indonesian	22.1 (-0.3)	34.8 (-1.1)	42.4 (-3.2)	40.5 (-3.1)
Italian	21.1 (-1.3)	34.3 (-1.6)	42.7 (-2.9)	41.4 (-2.2)
Khmer	16.4 (-6.0)	22.0 (-13.9)	24.8 (-20.8)	23.2 (-20.4)
Kinyarwanda	16.7 (-5.7)	23.7 (-12.2)	28.8 (-16.8)	27.2 (-16.4)
Korean	20.4 (-2.0)	32.2 (-3.7)	40.2 (-5.4)	37.9 (-5.7)
Kyrgyz	21.6 (-0.8)	30.9 (-5.0)	36.7 (-8.9)	35.7 (-7.9)
Mongolian	13.7 (-8.7)	20.9 (-1.5)	25 (-20.6)	23.4 (20.2)
Nepali	20.7 (-1.7)	32.5 (-3.4)	40.9 (-4.7)	39.7 (-3.9)
Oromo	15.8 (-6.6)	20.9 (-15.0)	24.7 (-20.9)	23.4 (20.2)
Portuguese	21.3 (-1.1)	34 (-1.9)	42.6 (-3.0)	41.2 (-2.4)
Romanian	20.3 (-2.1)	32.9 (-3.0)	41.0 (-4.6)	38.9 (-4.7)
Russian	21.1 (-1.3)	33.4 (-2.5)	41.5 (-4.1)	39.9 (-3.7)
Serbian	19.2 (-3.2)	30.8 (-5.1)	37.2 (-8.4)	35.6 (-8.0)
Shona	19.1 (-3.3)	27.2 (-8.7)	32.2 (-13.4)	30.5 (-13.1)
Sinhala	20.4 (-2.0)	32.0 (-3.9)	37.9 (-7.7)	35.7 (-7.9)
Somali	19.0 (-3.4)	28.5 (-7.4)	33.8 (-11.8)	31.4 (-12.2)
Spanish	20.7 (-1.7)	33.8 (-2.1)	42.5 (-3.1)	40.9 (-2.7)
Swahili	22.1 (-0.3)	33.6 (-2.3)	41.3 (-4.3)	38.9 (-4.7)
Swedish	20.5 (-1.9)	33.0 (-2.9)	40.5 (-5.1)	38.6 (-5.0)
Tagalog	21.4 (-1.0)	33.2 (-2.7)	39.4 (-6.2)	37.5 (-6.1)
Thai	19.7 (-2.7)	29.7 (-6.2)	34.9 (-10.7)	33.6 (-10.0)
Turkish	20.5 (-1.9)	31.6 (-4.3)	39.5 (-6.1)	38.5 (-5.1)
Ukrainian	20.7 (-1.7)	33.0 (-2.9)	40.7 (-4.9)	38.7 (-4.9)
Urdu	21.5 (-0.9)	33.0 (-2.9)	40.6 (-5.0)	39.1 (-4.5)
Vietnamese	20.6 (-1.8)	32.8 (-3.1)	41.1 (-4.5)	39.5 (-4.1)
Zulu	19.9 (-2.5)	29.9 (-6.0)	35.2 (-10.4)	33.4 (-10.2)

Table 7: Non-English prompts lead to a decrease in Recall scores across all income levels. Table of the differences (rounded to 1 d.p.) between Recall scores for non-English language prompts and Recall scores for default English prompts for all data grouped into income levels.

Country Suffix	Income levels			
	Poor Δ	Low-mid Δ	Up-mid Δ	Rich Δ
Burkina Faso	0.327 (+0.103)	0.303 (-0.056)	0.227 (-0.229)	0.185 (-0.251)
Burundi	0.331 (+0.107)	0.279 (-0.08)	0.197 (-0.259)	0.154 (-0.282)
Ethiopia	0.334 (+0.11)	0.313 (-0.046)	0.269 (-0.187)	0.227 (-0.209)
Liberia	0.327 (+0.103)	0.303 (-0.056)	0.249 (-0.207)	0.205 (-0.231)
Malawi	0.301 (+0.077)	0.32 (-0.39)	0.286 (-0.17)	0.254 (-0.182)
Rwanda	0.334 (+0.11)	0.322 (-0.037)	0.249 (-0.207)	0.204 (-0.232)
Somalia	0.318 (+0.094)	0.296 (-0.063)	0.243 (-0.213)	0.209 (-0.227)
Togo	0.297 (+0.073)	0.31 (-0.049)	0.283 (-0.173)	0.252 (-0.184)
Bangladesh	0.271 (+0.047)	0.319 (-0.04)	0.266 (-0.19)	0.221 (-0.215)
Bolivia	0.3 (+0.076)	0.318 (-0.041)	0.262 (-0.194)	0.223 (-0.213)
Cambodia	0.289 (+0.065)	0.288 (-0.071)	0.213 (-0.243)	0.172 (-0.264)
Cameroon	0.313 (+0.089)	0.289 (-0.07)	0.233 (-0.223)	0.192 (-0.244)
Cote d'Ivoire	0.23 (+0.006)	0.296 (-0.063)	0.325 (-0.131)	0.302 (-0.134)
Egypt	0.257 (+0.033)	0.334 (-0.025)	0.357 (-0.099)	0.316 (-0.12)
Ghana	0.314 (+0.09)	0.294 (-0.065)	0.267 (-0.189)	0.233 (-0.203)
Haiti	0.296 (+0.072)	0.331 (-0.028)	0.307 (-0.149)	0.269 (-0.167)
India	0.239 (+0.015)	0.31 (-0.049)	0.306 (-0.15)	0.278 (-0.158)
Iran	0.221 (-0.003)	0.343 (-0.016)	0.375 (-0.081)	0.337 (-0.099)
Jordan	0.222 (-0.002)	0.308 (-0.051)	0.376 (-0.08)	0.371 (-0.065)
Kenya	0.296 (+0.072)	0.318 (-0.041)	0.283 (-0.173)	0.236 (-0.2)
Kyrgyzstan	0.229 (+0.005)	0.338 (-0.021)	0.365 (-0.091)	0.318 (-0.118)
Lebanon	0.249 (+0.025)	0.309 (-0.05)	0.348 (-0.108)	0.33 (-0.106)
Mongolia	0.259 (+0.035)	0.326 (-0.033)	0.308 (-0.148)	0.256 (-0.18)
Myanmar	0.263 (+0.039)	0.304 (-0.055)	0.241 (-0.215)	0.195 (-0.241)
Nepal	0.274 (+0.05)	0.307 (-0.052)	0.253 (-0.203)	0.213 (-0.223)
Nigeria	0.294 (+0.07)	0.286 (-0.073)	0.256 (-0.2)	0.223 (-0.213)
Pakistan	0.197 (-0.027)	0.303 (-0.056)	0.321 (-0.135)	0.289 (-0.147)
Palestine	0.258 (+0.034)	0.349 (-0.01)	0.361 (-0.095)	0.317 (-0.119)
Papua New Guinea	0.274 (+0.05)	0.302 (-0.057)	0.266 (-0.19)	0.235 (-0.201)
Philippines	0.271 (+0.047)	0.346 (-0.013)	0.337 (-0.119)	0.295 (-0.141)
Sri Lanka	0.275 (+0.051)	0.322 (-0.037)	0.303 (-0.153)	0.277 (-0.159)
Tanzania	0.287 (+0.063)	0.292 (-0.067)	0.257 (-0.199)	0.228 (-0.208)
Tunisia	0.276 (+0.052)	0.321 (-0.038)	0.314 (-0.142)	0.284 (-0.152)
Ukraine	0.245 (+0.021)	0.355 (-0.004)	0.372 (-0.084)	0.323 (-0.113)
Vietnam	0.229 (+0.005)	0.321 (-0.038)	0.33 (-0.126)	0.294 (-0.142)
Zimbabwe	0.312 (+0.088)	0.311 (-0.048)	0.285 (-0.171)	0.242 (-0.194)

Table 8: Table of low-income/poor (in lilac) and lower-middle income (in purple) country suffixes and their effect on Recall for different income groups. For each country suffix, the highest Recall among income groups is highlighted in bold. The green and red values show how much increase or reduction that country suffix has on the Recall of data from an income group compared to default English prompts.

Country Suffix	Income levels			
	Poor Δ	Low-mid Δ	Up-mid Δ	Rich Δ
Brazil	0.254 (+0.03)	0.303 (-0.056)	0.323 (-0.133)	0.303 (-0.133)
China	0.213 (-0.011)	0.34 (-0.019)	0.369 (-0.087)	0.319 (-0.117)
Colombia	0.3 (+0.076)	0.324 (-0.035)	0.275 (-0.181)	0.232 (-0.204)
Guatemala	0.269 (+0.045)	0.314 (-0.045)	0.277 (-0.179)	0.233 (-0.203)
Indonesia	0.266 (+0.042)	0.328 (-0.031)	0.303 (-0.153)	0.266 (-0.17)
Kazakhstan	0.254 (+0.03)	0.337 (-0.022)	0.337 (-0.119)	0.292 (-0.144)
Mexico	0.251 (+0.027)	0.335 (-0.024)	0.357 (-0.099)	0.312 (-0.124)
Peru	0.261 (+0.037)	0.319 (-0.04)	0.317 (-0.139)	0.287 (-0.149)
Russia	0.212 (-0.012)	0.344 (-0.015)	0.382 (-0.074)	0.335 (-0.101)
Serbia	0.197 (-0.027)	0.313 (-0.046)	0.378 (-0.078)	0.354 (-0.082)
South Africa	0.291 (+0.067)	0.302 (-0.057)	0.302 (-0.154)	0.269 (-0.167)
Thailand	0.234 (+0.01)	0.312 (-0.047)	0.293 (-0.163)	0.256 (-0.18)
Turkey	0.228 (+0.004)	0.321 (-0.038)	0.333 (-0.123)	0.302 (-0.134)
Austria	0.166 (-0.058)	0.296 (-0.063)	0.407 (-0.049)	0.408 (-0.028)
Canada	0.266 (+0.042)	0.355 (-0.004)	0.391 (-0.065)	0.359 (-0.077)
Czech Republic	0.195 (-0.029)	0.33 (-0.029)	0.395 (-0.061)	0.379 (-0.057)
Denmark	0.184 (-0.04)	0.293 (-0.066)	0.386 (-0.07)	0.394 (-0.042)
France	0.199 (-0.025)	0.317 (-0.042)	0.415 (-0.041)	0.417 (-0.019)
Italy	0.192 (-0.032)	0.318 (-0.041)	0.379 (-0.077)	0.367 (-0.069)
Netherlands	0.219 (-0.005)	0.31 (-0.049)	0.374 (-0.082)	0.359 (-0.077)
Romania	0.255 (+0.031)	0.337 (-0.022)	0.342 (-0.114)	0.312 (-0.124)
South Korea	0.225 (+0.001)	0.313 (-0.046)	0.345 (-0.111)	0.314 (-0.122)
Spain	0.183 (-0.041)	0.308 (-0.051)	0.413 (-0.043)	0.404 (-0.032)
Sweden	0.167 (-0.057)	0.294 (-0.065)	0.405 (-0.051)	0.412 (-0.024)
Switzerland	0.135 (-0.089)	0.257 (-0.102)	0.363 (-0.093)	0.389 (-0.047)
United Kingdom	0.205 (-0.019)	0.326 (-0.033)	0.418 (-0.038)	0.409 (-0.027)
United States	0.25 (+0.026)	0.362 (-0.003)	0.421 (-0.035)	0.391 (0.045)

Table 9: Table of high-income/rich (in blue) and upper-middle-income (in sky blue) country suffixes and their effect on Recall for different income groups. For each country suffix, the highest Recall among income groups is highlighted in bold. The green and red values show how much increase or reduction that country suffix has on the Recall of data from an income group compared to default English prompts.

<i>Images by Continent</i>	<i>World Bank Income Classification</i>	<i>Country Suffixes</i>			
		<i>African Δ</i>	<i>American Δ</i>	<i>Asian Δ</i>	<i>European Δ</i>
<i>African images</i>	<i>Poor countries</i>	42.3 (-1.4)	40.3 (-3.4)	36.0 (-7.7)	40.3 (-3.4)
	<i>Low-mid countries</i>	41.8 (-8.8)	39.7 (-10.9)	37.0 (-13.6)	40.7 (-9.9)
	<i>Up-mid countries</i>	33.3 (-5.9)	32.4 (-6.8)	25.7 (-13.5)	33.4 (-5.8)
	Average	39.1 (-5.4)	37.5 (-7.0)	32.9 (-11.6)	38.1 (-6.4)
<i>American images</i>	<i>Up-mid countries</i>	24.3 (-20.8)	37.6 (-7.5)	26.9 (-18.3)	37.2 (-8.0)
	<i>Rich countries</i>	28.7 (-33.4)	45.7 (-16.4)	32.5 (-29.6)	44.7 (-17.4)
	Average	26.5 (-27.1)	41.7 (-12.0)	29.7 (-24.0)	41.0 (-12.7)
<i>Asian images</i>	<i>Low-mid countries</i>	33.8 (-17.2)	38.4 (-12.6)	40.4 (-10.5)	43.4 (-7.6)
	<i>Up-mid countries</i>	30.9 (-21.0)	40.5 (-11.4)	41.2 (-10.7)	46.5 (-5.4)
	<i>Rich countries</i>	28.2 (-19.9)	36.1 (-12.0)	36.5 (-11.6)	40.1 (-8.0)
	Average	31.0 (-19.4)	38.3 (-12.0)	39.4 (-10.9)	43.3 (-7.0)
<i>European images</i>	<i>Low-mid countries</i>	22.3 (-23.9)	33.3 (-13.1)	26.6 (-19.6)	42.2 (-0.4)
	<i>Up-mid countries</i>	18.9 (-25.0)	29.2 (-14.7)	24.5 (-19.4)	40.7 (-3.2)
	<i>Rich countries</i>	19.0 (-20.8)	27.8 (-12.0)	21.5 (-18.3)	37.6 (-2.2)
	Average	20.1 (-23.2)	30.0 (-13.3)	24.2 (-19.1)	40.2 (-3.1)

Table 10: Grouping higher income images according to continents and further into groups of countries arranged by income class categories based on their World Bank economic classification, this table shows the average NLLB SigLIP Recall scores for each continent and the average difference between default English prompt Recall and country suffix Recall from the four continents.