Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Department-specific admissions data

Departments	Social Warfare		Machismatics	
Applicant gender	Women	Men	Women	Men
Admitted	20	1	19	100
Rejected	180	19	1	100

Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Department-specific admissions data

Departments	Social Warfare		Machismatics	
Applicant gender	Women	Men	Women	Men
Admitted	20	1	19	100
Rejected	180	19	1	100

Cumulative admissions data

Applicant gender	Women	Men
Total admissions	39	101
Total rejected	181	119
Admission odds	$39/220 \approx .18$	$101/220 \approx .46$

Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Department-specific admissions data

Departments	Social Warfare		Machismatics	
Applicant gender	Women	Men	Women	Men
Admitted	20	1	19	100
Rejected	180	19	1	100

Cumulative admissions data

Applicant gender	Women		Men
Total admissions	39		101
Total rejected	181		119
Admission odds	$39/220 \approx .18$	$<$	$101/220 \approx .46$

Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Department-specific admissions data

Departments	Social Warfare		Machismatics	
Applicant gender	Women	Men	Women	Men
Admitted	20	1	19	100
Rejected	180	19	1	100
Admission odds	20/200 = .10	1/20 = .05	19/20 = .95	100/200 = .50

Cumulative admissions data

Applicant gender	Women		Men
Total admissions	39		101
Total rejected	181		119
Admission odds	39/220 ≈ .18	<	101/220 ≈ .46

Is there gender bias in graduate admissions?

P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, W. J. O'Connell, *Science* (**187**), 1975

Department-specific admissions data

Departments	Social Warfare		Machismatics	
Applicant gender	Women	Men	Women	Men
Admitted	20	1	19	100
Rejected	180	19	1	100
Admission odds	20/200 = .10	>	1/20 = .05	19/20 = .95	>	100/200 = .50

Cumulative admissions data

Applicant gender	Women		Men
Total admissions	39		101
Total rejected	181		119
Admission odds	39/220 ≈ .18	<	101/220 ≈ .46

Gender bias? Simpson's paradox

E. H. Simpson, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (**13**), 1951

- *Sample space*: population of 440 applicants, 220 men and 220 women.
- *Combinatorial setting*: a randomly selected applicant from the population.
- *Events*:
  - A := applicant is admitted; A^c := applicant is rejected.
  - W := applicant is a woman; W^c := applicant is a man.
  - S := applicant applies to Department of Social Warfare; S^c := applicant applies to Department of Machismatics.

Gender bias? Simpson's paradox

E. H. Simpson, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (**13**), 1951

- *Sample space*: population of 440 applicants, 220 men and 220 women.
- *Combinatorial setting*: a randomly selected applicant from the population.
- *Events*:
  - A := applicant is admitted; A^c := applicant is rejected.
  - W := applicant is a woman; W^c := applicant is a man.
  - S := applicant applies to Department of Social Warfare; S^c := applicant applies to Department of Machismatics.

Department-specific admissions data:

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S^c) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S^c)$$

Gender bias? Simpson's paradox

E. H. Simpson, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (**13**), 1951

- *Sample space*: population of 440 applicants, 220 men and 220 women.
- *Combinatorial setting*: a randomly selected applicant from the population.
- *Events*:
  - A := applicant is admitted; A^c := applicant is rejected.
  - W := applicant is a woman; W^c := applicant is a man.
  - S := applicant applies to Department of Social Warfare; S^c := applicant applies to Department of Machismatics.

Department-specific admissions data:

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S^c) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S^c)$$

Cumulative admissions data:

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W) < \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c)$$

Gender bias? Simpson's paradox

E. H. Simpson, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (**13**), 1951

- *Sample space*: population of 440 applicants, 220 men and 220 women.
- *Combinatorial setting*: a randomly selected applicant from the population.
- *Events*:
  - A := applicant is admitted; A^c := applicant is rejected.
  - W := applicant is a woman; W^c := applicant is a man.
  - S := applicant applies to Department of Social Warfare; S^c := applicant applies to Department of Machismatics.

Department-specific admissions data:

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W \cap S^c) > \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c \cap S^c)$$

Cumulative admissions data:

$$\mathbf{P}(A \mid W) < \mathbf{P}(A \mid W^c)$$

Slogan: Conditioning provides information that can effect event probabilities in unexpected ways.