# The Mismeasure of Man and Models:
# Evaluating Allocational Harms in Large Language Models

**Hannah Chen, Yangfeng Ji, David Evans**
Department of Computer Science
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904
{yc4dx,yangfeng,evans}@virginia.edu

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are now being considered and even deployed for applications that support high-stakes decision-making, such as recruitment and clinical decisions. While several methods have been proposed for measuring bias, there remains a gap between *predictions*, which are what the proposed methods consider, and how they are used to make *decisions*. In this work, we introduce *Rank-Allocational-Based Bias Index* (RABBI), a model-agnostic bias measure that assesses potential *allocational harms* arising from biases in LLM predictions. We compare RABBI and current bias metrics on two allocation decision tasks. We evaluate their predictive validity across ten LLMs and utility for model selection. Our results reveal that commonly-used bias metrics based on average performance gap and distribution distance fail to reliably capture group disparities in allocation outcomes, whereas RABBI exhibits a strong correlation with allocation disparities. Our work highlights the need to account for how models are used in contexts with limited resource constraints.

## 1 Introduction

The growing popularity of large language models (LLMs) has raised concerns regarding the potential for discrimination and harm if they are used in high-stake decision-making contexts, such as lending decisions in financial sectors (Fu et al., 2021), hiring (Bogen and Rieke, 2018), and healthcare triage (Rajkomar et al., 2018). Recent orders in both Europe (European Parliament, 2024) and the United States (Biden, 2023) have mandated audits to address AI risks including bias, but left it unclear how to conduct effective audits.

Several methods have been proposed to audit LLMs for bias when used in critical decision-making (Tamkin et al., 2023; Veldanda et al., 2023;

Haim et al., 2024; Armstrong et al., 2024). However, these methods focus on the *predictions* the models make, without considering how those predictions would be used to make decisions. Even when predictions appear to be unbiased, actual harms can arise from how they are used to make decisions (Corbett-Davies et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2018; Kleinberg et al., 2018). As shown by Dwork and Ilvento (2018), evaluating models in isolation is insufficient to assert fairness without considering the context in which they will be deployed.

This work is motivated by the observation that in settings where resources are limited and a model is used to prioritize options, there is a gap between *predictions* and *decisions*. Prediction-based evaluation methods, which measure bias as the *average performance gap* in prediction outcomes (Czarnowska et al., 2021), may not be sufficient to measure bias risks in applications where predictions are used for resource allocation.

Consider a resume-screening model that evaluates candidates' suitability for a job. The prediction outcome is the *fitness* of each candidate, i.e., the probability of the candidate being a good match for the job position. The company may use the predictions to select the candidates but only has a few available slots for interviews. Figure 1 depicts two simulated candidate selection results for a resume screening task (Section 4.1 provides details). The average performance gap ($\delta$) differs notably from the demographic parity gap ($\Delta$DP), which captures the group selection rate difference in decision outcomes. While the model (Llama2-7B-Chat) exhibits a positive bias towards Hispanic and Black males with $\delta$, $\Delta$DP shows White males are selected 7% more often than Black males and 3% more often than Hispanic males.

Most work on debiasing NLP models targets the goal of minimizing the average performance gap

Figure 1: Bias scores per group for the resume screening task. Each score is computed with respect to White Male. $\delta$ indicates the average performance gap, measured as the average score difference. The demographic parity gap ($\Delta$DP) represents the selection rate difference over multiple candidate selection rounds, with selection quota $k = 2$ for each round.

in group prediction outcomes (Shen et al., 2022; Han et al., 2022; Chi et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2023; Agarwal et al., 2023). As illustrated by Figure 1, however, what is important about models used in critical decision-making is how the outputs of those models impact the resulting decisions. In allocational settings, this impact may not be measured well by average predictions.

**Contributions.** To better assess potential harms from LLM-based decision-making, we propose *Rank-Allocational-Based Bias Index* (RABBI), a model-agnostic bias measure to assess potential allocation gaps in decision outcomes (Section 3.1). Our metric measures allocational bias using scores derived from model outputs, which we implement with scoring methods for pointwise and pairwise ranking with LLMs (Section 3.2). We compare RABBI against existing bias metrics on two allocation decision tasks, resume screening for hiring and essay grading (Section 4). We conduct extensive predictive validity evaluation across ten LLMs (Section 5.1) and evaluate the utility of RABBI for model selection (Section 5.2). Our results demonstrate how current bias measures and evaluation methods are insufficient to assess allocational harms. We show that prevailing bias metrics, which rely on average performance and distribution differences, do not reliably reflect disparities in allocation outcomes (Section 5), but that RABBI exhibits strong correlations with allocation disparities.

## 2 Background: Bias in NLP

Algorithmic bias is commonly described as "skew that produces a type of harm" towards certain groups of people (Crawford, 2017). This can be further categorized into (i) *harms of allocation*, which arise when models perpetuate an unfair distribution of resources (e.g., healthcare) or opportunities (e.g., jobs), and (ii) *harms of representation*, which include stereotyping and misrepresentation.

### 2.1 Measuring Bias

Proposed bias metrics are often formulated as the average group disparities in prediction outcomes based on established fairness definitions (Czarnowska et al., 2021). The *demographic parity gap* measures the difference in positive prediction rates between groups (Agarwal et al., 2018). Since demographic parity can be achieved independently of ground truths, a predictor with perfect accuracy would be considered unfair when the ground truth is correlated with the protected attribute. Conversely, *equalized odds* demands equal group performance in true positive rates (TPRs) and false positive rates (FPRs). *Equal opportunity* (EO), a relaxed notion of equalized odds, requires equal positive outcomes for qualified individuals. The EO gap is thus the TPR differences between groups. For continuous predictions, group bias can be measured by the *average score gap* (Sicilia and Alikhani, 2023). Several works adopt distribution-based metrics, which compare the group distribution difference in prediction outcomes using metrics such as Jensen–Shannon divergence (Guo et al., 2022), Earth Mover's distance (Huang et al., 2020), and total variance distance (Liang et al., 2022).

### 2.2 Allocational Harms

Blodgett et al. (2020) noted that NLP bias studies often lack clear and consistent motivations of what system behaviors are considered harmful and who is harmed and why. Out of thirty papers referencing allocational harms as motivation, they found only four actually propose measures or mitigations to address the harms (De-Arteaga et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2020; Romanov et al., 2019; Prost et al., 2019). Yet, these four papers study gender bias in occupation classification in a task setup separated from actual allocational issues in employment.

We find similar cases in subsequent works where the evaluation setups differ from allocation decision tasks in practice (Kirk et al., 2021; Lalor et al.,

2022; Shen et al., 2022; Borchers et al., 2022; Van Aken et al., 2022). Recent work has studied bias in LLMs used for hiring (Veldanda et al., 2023; Armstrong et al., 2024; Gaebler et al., 2024) and other high-stakes decision scenarios (Tamkin et al., 2023; Haim et al., 2024). Yet, the evaluation methods adopted in these works only consider the average performance gap. We only find two closely related works that attempt to assess bias in resume ranking (Yin et al., 2024; Glazko et al., 2024). Glazko et al. (2024) evaluate disability bias in GPT-4 by the model's average preference difference between paired resumes. Yin et al. (2024) inquire GPT-3.5 and 4 to rank a list of candidates and analyze the frequency of each group being ranked as top 1. We extend their work with more variations in resumes and ranking methods that are more applicable to most LLMs.

## 3 Measuring Allocational Bias

To account for potential allocational harms when LLMs are used for decision-making, we propose *Rank-Allocational-Based Bias Index* (RABBI)[1], a model-agnostic measure that measures allocational bias based on candidate scores derived from model outputs. In Section 3.2, we define two representative scoring methods for ranking with LLMs.

### 3.1 Proposed Bias Measure

Given all possible groups $\mathcal{G}$ for a task, we define *allocational bias* as the disparities in allocation decision outcomes between a group $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{G}$ and any group $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{A}$.

**Rank-Allocational-Based Bias Index.** By querying a model $\mathcal{M}$, each candidate $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is assigned a score $s_a = score(a)$ for the task. We discuss the candidate scoring method in Section 3.2; for now, it is enough to know that higher scores are better. We assess bias by comparing the scores between all possible candidate pairs in $\xi_{\mathcal{AB}} = \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$. We quantify the allocational bias of protected group $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to the reference group $\mathcal{B}$ as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{|\xi_{\mathcal{AB}}|} \sum_{(a,b) \in \xi_{\mathcal{AB}}} \mathbb{I}(s_a > s_b) - \mathbb{I}(s_a < s_b)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(s_a > s_b)$ indicates whether $a$ is more preferable than $b$ by the model. If $s_a > s_b$, $\mathbb{I} = 1$ and 0 otherwise. Model $\mathcal{M}$ exhibits no bias between groups when $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}} = 0$. Our approach is inspired by the *rank-biserial correlation* (Cureton, 1956). It measures the probability a candidate sampled from group ($a \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{A}$) is higher-ranked than a candidate from the reference group ($b \in \mathcal{B}$). If model $\mathcal{M}$ does not exhibit any statistical preference between the two groups, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 0$; if it always produces a score for candidates from $\mathcal{A}$ that is higher than any candidate of $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 1$; if it completely favors group $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = -1$. Note that, switching the order of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ will change the sign of the bias measurement, which means the conclusion remains unchanged.

**Connection to Rank-Biserial Correlation.** The *rank-biserial correlation* $r_{rb}$ was first introduced by Cureton (1956), in which they consider a ranking variable $R_y$ and a binary variable $R_x$. In our setting, $R_x$ indicates the candidate's group membership, $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{B}$. $r_{rb}$ measures if the group membership is correlated with being higher-ranked or lower-ranked. Given pairs from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, $r_{rb}$ can be computed as the difference between the ratio of pairs favorable to $\mathcal{A}$ and the ratio of pairs unfavorable to $\mathcal{A}$ (Kerby, 2014). The instances where a member of $\mathcal{A}$ has a higher rank than a member of $\mathcal{B}$ are considered favorable to $A$. Similarly, we formulate RABBI as the differences in the proportion of pairs preferring $A$ over $\mathcal{B}$ to those preferring $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathcal{A}$. The rank-biserial correlation can also be derived from the Mann-Whitney $U$ test statistic (Mann and Whitney, 1947; Wendt, 1972). We show that the formulation of RABBI is equivalent to $r_{rb}$ using the Mann-Whitney $U$ statistic in Appendix A. This offers a way to test the significance of scores produced by our metric. Since our goal is to test the metric's validity in assessing allocational gaps in decision outcomes, we do not consider the $p$-value of RABBI in our main experiment results.

### 3.2 Rank Scoring using LLMs

Recent work has shown promising performance on zero-shot ranking tasks with LLMs. Common prompting strategies include pointwise, pairwise, and listwise methods (Zhu et al., 2023b). Although the method proposed in this work can be applied to all three ranking methods, we focus on pointwise and pairwise methods since many LLMs except GPT-4 struggle to produce consistent and usable

---

[1]Although King Solomon is often cited by rabbis (1 Kings 3:16–28), we do not advocate for his split-the-baby approach to fair resource allocation here, although it does achieve well-defined fairness goals.

outputs with listwise methods (Sun et al., 2023).

cribes the qualificationsing of an ideal candidate, the candidates in each pool are ranked in descending order of their scores computed with pointwise or pairwise ranking methods.

**Pointwise Ranking.** Suppose $Y$ is a set of relevance labels, where each $y \in Y$ corresponds to a relevance value $\gamma_y$. Given the instruction $q$ and candidate $a$, the model $\mathcal{M}$ predicts the probability of each label in $Y$. The ranking score of candidate $a$ is defined as (Zhuang et al., 2024):

$$score_{q,\mathcal{M}}(a) = \sum_{y \in Y} P_n(\mathcal{M}_q(a), y) \cdot \gamma_y$$

where $P_n$ is the normalized output probability of $y$ over $Y$. The score is assumed to encode the relevance or fitness of candidate $a$.

**Pairwise Ranking.** Given instruction $q$ and candidate pair $(a, b)$, the model selects the more relevant candidate to the instruction $q$. We define $\mathcal{M}_q(x, y)$ as a function that extracts model $\mathcal{M}$'s preference where the output is either $x$ or $y$. As LLMs are sensitive to the pair order (Lu et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024), we prompt the model with $(a, b)$ and $(b, a)$ for all possible candidate pairs in the pool $\mathcal{P}$. Following Qin et al. (2024), we compute the score for candidate $a$ as:

$$score_{q,\mathcal{M}}(a) = \sum_{a \neq b, (a,b) \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbb{I}(a \succ b) + 0.5 \cdot \mathbb{I}(a \approx b))$$

where $a \succ b \coloneqq \mathcal{M}_q(a, b) = \mathcal{M}_q(b, a) = a$, indicating a consistent preference for $a$ over $b$ regardless of the candidate order. $x_i \approx x_j$ represents inconsistent predictions when the order is flipped ($\mathcal{M}_q(a, b) \neq \mathcal{M}_q(b, a)$), which are given a score of 0.5. Although the model is prompted with a request to identify the one best candidate, it sometimes outputs a response that states both are equally good. If the model responds in a way that indicates both candidates as equally good, the candidates get 0.25 for each prompt.

## 4  Evaluating Bias Metrics

In this section, we describe experiments conducted to compare bias metrics. Section 5 presents results from those experiments.

### 4.1  Evaluation Tasks

We consider applications that distribute limited resources or opportunities to individuals based on LLM predictions. We frame the task as a top-$k$ (or subset) ranking problem (Cossock and Zhang, 2006; Clémençon and Vayatis, 2007), where a fixed quota of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ resources are distributed among a pool of $n \gg k$ candidates. The goal is to determine a set of "best" candidates, with no particular emphasis on the relative order. We construct two allocation decision tasks with candidate selection over multiple rounds: (i) resume screening for hiring decisions and (ii) essay grading for potential use in educational settings.

**Resume Screening.** We construct a dataset that includes instructions and resume templates based on descriptions of four real job positions (software engineer, HR specialist, financial analyst, and retail) used in Bloomberg's bias audit (Yin et al., 2024). We find Bloomberg's templates are mostly rephrased versions of the same profile. We prompted GPT-3.5 (OpenAI, 2024) to generate six resume templates for each job description, varying in hiring chances (high, medium, low). Qualified candidates are represented by high-chance templates. Each template includes sections for work experience, education, and skills, with real company and university names manually verified. We consider eight groups, $\mathcal{G} = \{\text{Female}, \text{Male}\} \times \{\text{White}, \text{Black}, \text{Asian}, \text{Hispanic}\}$, as labelled in the data set. Each group is represented by 100 first and last names based on data from the Social Security Administration and voter files in US (Rosenman et al., 2023). In each round of resume screening, the candidate pool consists of one candidate sampled from each of the eight groups in $\mathcal{G}$.

**Essay Grading.** We use the written essay module from the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE) (Ishikawa, 2013), consisting of 5.6K essays written by second language (L2) English learners and first language (L1) English speakers on two topics. 140 essays include ratings (0~100) from L1 English speakers. Due to the small size of rated essays, we use ones with a rating at or above the 50$^{\text{th}}$ percentile as qualified essays (Ishikawa, 2024). The dataset has been shown to present differences in word usage between native and non-native speakers, and learners with different L1 backgrounds (Ishikawa, 2013; Nagata et al.,

2023). Given these differences, LLMs may produce varied scores for essays written by individuals from different countries. Since the essay grading dataset has varied group sizes, we randomly sample 10 candidates for each round. We provide details on the essay topics and groups in Appendix B.

## 4.2 Measuring Allocation Gaps

The scores produced by bias metrics can be viewed as predictions of the allocation gaps that would result from following decision outcomes made using the model. Given a model $\mathcal{M}$, an effective bias metric should yield a higher score in magnitude between group $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ when there is a larger disparity in the allocation outcomes between them. We measure the allocation gaps using demographic parity and equal opportunity fairness criteria.

**Demographic Parity.** Suppose each candidate $a$ is ranked $r_a \in [1, n]$ based on their scores in descending order within their candidate pool, and those with a rank $r \leq k$ will be selected. Given the decision outcomes of model $\mathcal{M}$, the *demographic parity gap* between group $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is defined as:

$$\Delta\text{DP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, k) - \phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B}, k)$$

where $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}, k)$ is the ratio of group $\mathcal{X}$'s candidates selected given quota $k$:

$$\phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}, k) = |\{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid r_x \leq k\}| \, / \, |\mathcal{X}|$$

**Equal Opportunity Gap.** Suppose a candidate is either qualified or not for the position and the actual qualification of candidate $a$ is $d_a \in \{0, 1\}$. The *equal opportunity gap* between group $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ can be formulated as:

$$\Delta\text{EO}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \psi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, k) - \psi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B}, k)$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}, k)$ is the proportion of qualified candidates in group $\mathcal{X}$ being selected, given model $\mathcal{M}$ and allocation quota $k$:

$$\psi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}, k) = \frac{|\{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid r_x \leq k \wedge d_x = 1\}|}{|\{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid d_x = 1\}|}.$$

## 4.3 Bias Metric Baselines

For comparison baselines, we use the average performance gap and two distribution-based metrics.

**Average Performance Gap.** For pointwise evaluation, the average performance gap between group $\mathcal{A}$ and group $\mathcal{B}$ given model $\mathcal{M}$ is computed as:

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} s_a - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} s_b$$

For pairwise setups, we measure the average performance gap as the average preference of model $\mathcal{M}$ for group $\mathcal{A}$ over group $\mathcal{B}$ as follows:

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}|} \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(a \succ b)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(a \succ b) \coloneqq \mathcal{M}_q(a, b) = \mathcal{M}_q(b, a) = a$.

**Distribution-Based Metrics.** For pointwise settings, we measure score distribution differences between groups using Jensen–Shannon Divergence (JSD) (Lin, 1991) and Earth Mover's Distance (EMD) (Rubner et al., 1998).

## 4.4 Experimental Setup

For pointwise evaluation, the task labels $Y$ of resume screening are $\{\text{No}, \text{Yes}\}$ with corresponding relevance values $\gamma_y \in \{0, 1\}$. The pointwise labels and relevance values of essay grading are on a rating scale of $[1, 5]$. For pairwise evaluation, the model is prompted to produce an output that identifies which of the two input candidates is the better fit for the position in the resume screening task, and the better-written essay for the essay grading task.

We run the tasks across ten models with varied sizes and architectures (Appendix B). We compute the bias for each group compared to a reference group, using white males for the resume screening task and L1 English speakers for essay grading. In practice, the reference group may be any subset of the candidates. We evaluate the predictive validity of bias metrics by comparing the resulting measurements to allocation gaps measured from candidate selection decision outcomes. We compare $\Delta_{EO}$ against bias scores measured between qualified group candidates; instead of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, the bias metric inputs would then be $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$ where each group $\mathcal{X}' = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid d_x = 1\}$. As JSD and EMD are non-directional, we compare them to the absolute value of allocation gaps.

## 5 Results

This section presents results from our experiments comparing our proposed bias metrics with tradi-

(a) Resume screening (pointwise)   (b) Essay grading (pointwise)

Figure 2: Measurement comparison between bias metrics and allocation gaps, with quota $k = 1$. Each point represents a score measured between group $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ and reference group $\mathcal{B}$ given a model $\mathcal{M}$ for a job position or an essay topic. RABBI shows higher correlations with $\Delta$DP and $\Delta$EO.

| | Metric | Resume screening | | Essay grading | |
| | | $\Delta$DP | $\Delta$EO | $\Delta$DP | $\Delta$EO |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Point** | JSD | −0.19 | 0.48 | 0.79 | −0.19* |
| | EMD | −0.09* | −0.06* | 0.86 | 0.48 |
| | $\delta$ | 0.13* | −0.02* | 0.89 | 0.70 |
| | RABBI | **0.86** | **0.88** | **0.94** | **0.89** |
| **Pair** | $\delta$ | 0.85 | 0.68 | 0.84 | 0.64 |
| | RABBI | **0.86** | **0.90** | **0.85** | **0.74** |

Table 1: Pearson correlation of bias metrics and allocation gaps. * indicates p-value $> 0.01$ with a 95% confidence level.

tional metrics with a focus on allocation gaps in candidate selection outcomes. We first present the overall predictive validity of bias metrics, then their utility for model selection and informing bias risks.

## 5.1 Predictive Validity Test

Figure 2 and Figure 3 show all computed bias scores of each bias metric compared to allocation gaps measured in candidate selection outcomes. RABBI shows a strong positive correlation with the allocation gaps, whereas the average performance gap shows varied correlation performance.

Each point in the figures is computed between a reference group $\mathcal{B}$ and each of the other groups $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ given a model's predictions for a subtask, a job position or an essay topic. A total of $|\mathcal{G}| - 1$ scores are produced for each subtask and model.

In Figure 2a, many scores computed with the average score gap exhibit close to zero bias, as shown by the points along the y-axis where $\delta = 0$ (e.g., White Female's score with Gemma-2B model and retail position). Yet, some of them show a larger allocation gap than ones with a larger average score gap. This shows that the average score gap does not predict potential allocational harms well. The results for JSD and EMD only apply in the pointwise setting but show similar issues.

Table 1 reports the Pearson correlation computed across these experiments. RABBI exhibits the strongest correlation across both tasks and evaluation settings with a correlation of $\geq 0.86$ for resume screening and $\geq 0.7$ for essay grading. In the pointwise setting, the $\delta$ and EMD baselines show no correlation with $\Delta$DP and $\Delta$EO for the resume screening task. Most of the metrics show a reasonable correlation (but worse than RABBI) for the essay grading task. This may be explained

(a) Resume screening (pairwise)　　(b) Essay grading (pairwise)

Figure 3: Measurement comparison between bias metrics and allocation gaps for pairwise evaluation, with quota $k = 1$. Models with $> 55\%$ of inconsistent outputs are excluded.



(a) Ideal ranking based on $\Delta$DP　　(b) Ideal ranking based on $\Delta$EO

Figure 4: Average NDCG@$N$ in ranking model fairness, comparing to ideal rankings. EMD yields the same results as the average score gap. Due to inconsistencies in pairwise outputs, we exclude two models from resume screening and all pairwise results for essay grading (7 models with $> 50\%$ inconsistencies).

by the more balanced prediction score distributions than the resume screening task (see Figure 13). When comparing pointwise and pairwise settings, $\delta$ shows a higher correlation under the pairwise setting, which could be attributed to more direct candidate comparisons with paired inputs.

## 5.2 Metric Utility for Model Selection

When a metric is used in a model audit, it could be used to determine if a candidate model is above some required absolute threshold score, or could be used to decide between a set of candidate models. We assume a simplified setting where a metric is used to compare candidate models' performance on some desired fairness property, and the models are ranked according to their score on the metric. In this setting, we evaluate the utility of a metric for model selection by comparing the model fairness ranking derived from bias metrics to an ideal ranking. The rankings are generated in ascending order of the model's overall bias score per subtask, aggregated over each group $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ by the root mean square. Likewise, we construct the ideal rankings based on the model's overall allocation gaps. Suppose a bias metric produces a fairness ranking $\tau$ and the ideal ranking is $\sigma$. Let $\tau(i)$ de-

note the model at rank $i$ and $\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{M})$ be the rank of model $\mathcal{M}$ in $\tau$. We compute the normalized discounted cumulative gain (NDCG) at rank cutoff $N$ following Järvelin and Kekäläinen (2002) as:

$$\text{NDCG@}N(\tau) = \frac{\text{DCG@}N(\tau)}{\text{DCG@}N(\sigma)}$$

$$\text{where} \quad \text{DCG@}N(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sigma_{max} \cdot \sigma^{-1}(\tau(i))}{\log_2(i+1)}$$

$\sigma_{max} \cdot \sigma^{-1}(\tau(i))$ represents the relevance score, computed by the reverse ideal rank of model $\tau(i)$ given maximum ideal rank $\sigma_{max}$. The logarithmic discount emphasizes the "best" ideal models and imposes a penalty when they are low ranked. We report the performance on each task by the average NDCG across subtasks.

Figure 4 shows the selection performance of bias metrics in ranking models for fairness based on the $\Delta$DP and $\Delta$EO fairness criterion. RABBI consistently performs better than all the baseline metrics under the same evaluation setting with an average NDCG@10 $\geq 0.95$ on both tasks. NDCG@1 indicates how close the top-1 model is to the top on the ideal ranking. In Figure 4b, JSD and RABBI

Figure 5: Fairness ranking of models for each resume screening job position with pointwise evaluation and selection quota $k = 2$. The true rank order is based on $\Delta DP$. Existing bias metrics often rank more biased models as more "fair". RABBI shows more similar rankings to the true rank order.



Figure 6: Correlation of bias metrics and allocation gaps per group, across all models with quota $k = 2$. Current bias metrics exhibit large variations in their correlation with allocation gaps for different groups.

show the largest difference in NDCG@1 on the essay grading task. The top-1 model of RABBI ranked 2 on $\Delta EO$ ranking whereas the top-1 model of JSD ranked 6. Similarly to Table 1, all pointwise baselines show better performance in essay grading, and bias metrics generally perform better under pairwise than pointwise settings.

We further compare the fairness ranking of models between different metrics, as depicted in Figure 5 for each job position in pointwise resume screening. RABBI's ranking aligns more closely with the ranking based on $\Delta DP$, whereas other metrics tend to rank more biased models higher. We find that all three bias metric baselines rank the bottom two models (based on the true rank) as the two least-biased models for financial analyst and retail positions. We show the overall fairness ranking of the resume screening task in Figure 8 (in Appendix C). Overall, our results demonstrate the efficacy of RABBI in identifying the least-biased model for downstream allocation decisions, thereby minimizing potential harm.

**Predicting bias across groups.** Figure 6 compares the correlation between bias metrics and allocation gaps measured across models for each group

pair for both tasks. We find that the average performance gap and distribution-based metrics show significant variations in their ability to predict disparities in candidate selection outcomes. In contrast, RABBI exhibits consistent performance for each group. This suggests that existing bias metrics could be "biased" in informing risks of allocational harms to different groups of people.



Figure 7: Pearson correlation between bias metrics and $\Delta DP$ with varying allocation quota $k$.

**Varying allocation quota.** For the results in all the figures so far, we used $k = 1$ (Figure 2) and $k = 2$ (Figures 4–6). Here, we consider how robust the metrics are to higher values of $k$. Figure 7 shows the Pearson correlation between the bias metrics and $\Delta DP$ as $k$ increases from 1 to 5 (out of

8 for resume screening and out of 10 for essay grading). Most bias metrics show increasing correlation with $\Delta$DP as $k$ increases and plateaus when $k \simeq 3$. The average score gap remains poorly correlated (within the range between $0.13$ to $0.19$) across all $k$ values for the resume screening task. The shape of the curves for the essay grading task are similar— all of the metrics perform better for this task, but RABBI is consistently the best predictor.

## 6 Conclusion

Our findings show that traditional bias metrics and evaluation methods for LLMs fail to predict allocational harms in potential applications. Our analysis shows average performance gap and distribution-based metrics do not reflect group disparities in allocation outcomes, particularly when model predictions deviate from normal distributions. We propose a bias metric based on rank-biserial correlation which consistently demonstrates better correlations with group allocation gaps. Furthermore, we show its effectiveness in selecting models that diminish allocation disparities.

The goal of an audit is to determine if it is safe to deploy a model. Although audits will always be imperfect since they require making predictions about how the model will behave on data that is not available, it is essential that we develop methods for auditing models that reliably measure potential harms in the way models will be used in deployment. Our results illustrate the importance of this for settings where a model may be used to allocate a limited resource, and that fairness metrics too far removed from how a model will be used may produce misleading results.

## References

Alekh Agarwal, Alina Beygelzimer, Miroslav Dudík, John Langford, and Hanna Wallach. 2018. A reductions approach to fair classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 60–69. PMLR.

Sumit Agarwal, Aditya Veerubhotla, and Srijan Bansal. 2023. PEFTDebias : Capturing debiasing information using PEFTs. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, pages 1992–2000. ACL.

Lena Armstrong, Abbey Liu, Stephen MacNeil, and Danaë Metaxa. 2024. The silicon ceiling: Auditing GPT's race and gender biases in hiring. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2405.04412.

Marco Bellagente, Jonathan Tow, Dakota Mahan, Duy Phung, Maksym Zhuravinskyi, Reshinth Adithyan, James Baicoianu, Ben Brooks, Nathan Cooper, Ashish Datta, et al. 2024. Stable LM 2 1.6b technical report. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.17834.

Joseph R Biden. 2023. Executive order on the safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence.

Su Lin Blodgett, Solon Barocas, Hal Daumé III, and Hanna Wallach. 2020. Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of "bias" in NLP. In *Proc. of ACL*, pages 5454–5476. ACL.

Miranda Bogen and Aaron Rieke. 2018. Help wanted: An examination of hiring algorithms, equity, and bias.

Conrad Borchers, Dalia Gala, Benjamin Gilburt, Eduard Oravkin, Wilfried Bounsi, Yuki M Asano, and Hannah Kirk. 2022. Looking for a handsome carpenter! debiasing GPT-3 job advertisements. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing (GeBNLP)*, pages 212–224. ACL.

Jianfeng Chi, William Shand, Yaodong Yu, Kai-Wei Chang, Han Zhao, and Yuan Tian. 2022. Conditional supervised contrastive learning for fair text classification. In *Findings of EMNLP*, pages 2736–2756. ACL.

Stéphan Clémençon and Nicolas Vayatis. 2007. Ranking the best instances. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8:2671–2699.

Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. 2017. Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 797–806. ACM.

David Cossock and Tong Zhang. 2006. Subset ranking using regression. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, COLT'06, pages 605–619. Springer-Verlag.

Kate Crawford. 2017. The trouble with bias. Keynote at NeurIPS.

Edward E Cureton. 1956. Rank-biserial correlation. *Psychometrika*, 21(3):287–290.

Paula Czarnowska, Yogarshi Vyas, and Kashif Shah. 2021. Quantifying social biases in NLP: A generalization and empirical comparison of extrinsic fairness metrics. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1249–1267.

Maria De-Arteaga, Alexey Romanov, Hanna Wallach, Jennifer Chayes, Christian Borgs, Alexandra Chouldechova, Sahin Geyik, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2019. Bias in bios: A case study of semantic representation bias in a high-stakes setting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* '19, page 120–128. ACM.

Xiangjue Dong, Ziwei Zhu, Zhuoer Wang, Maria Teleki, and James Caverlee. 2023. Co$^2$PT: Mitigating bias in pre-trained language models through counterfactual contrastive prompt tuning. In *Findings of EMNLP*, pages 5859–5871. ACL.

Cynthia Dwork and Christina Ilvento. 2018. Fairness under composition. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/1806.06122.

European Parliament. 2024. Regulation (eu) 2024/1689 of the european parliament and of the council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (eu ai act).

Runshan Fu, Yan Huang, and Param Vir Singh. 2021. Crowds, lending, machine, and bias. *Information Systems Research*, 32(1):72–92.

Johann D Gaebler, Sharad Goel, Aziz Huq, and Prasanna Tambe. 2024. Auditing the use of language models to guide hiring decisions. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2404.03086.

Thomas Gemma Team, Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. 2024. Gemma: Open models based on Gemini research and technology. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2403.08295.

Kate Glazko, Yusuf Mohammed, Ben Kosa, Venkatesh Potluri, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2024. Identifying and improving disability bias in gai-based resume screening. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '24. ACM.

Yue Guo, Yi Yang, and Ahmed Abbasi. 2022. Auto-debias: Debiasing masked language models with automated biased prompts. In *Proc. of ACL (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1012–1023. ACL.

Amit Haim, Alejandro Salinas, and Julian Nyarko. 2024. What's in a name? auditing large language models for race and gender bias. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.14875.

Xudong Han, Timothy Baldwin, and Trevor Cohn. 2022. Balancing out bias: Achieving fairness through balanced training. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, pages 11335–11350. ACL.

Po-Sen Huang, Huan Zhang, Ray Jiang, Robert Stanforth, Johannes Welbl, Jack Rae, Vishal Maini, Dani Yogatama, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2020. Reducing sentiment bias in language models via counterfactual evaluation. In *Findings of EMNLP*, pages 65–83. ACL.

Shin'ichiro Ishikawa. 2013. The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of asian learners of english. *Learner Corpus Studies in Asia and The World*, 1:91–118.

Shin'Ichiro Ishikawa. 2024. The icnale global rating archives: A new assessment dataset for learner corpus studies. *Learner Corpus Studies in Asia and the World*, 6:13–38.

Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of ir techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 20(4):422–446.

Dave S Kerby. 2014. The simple difference formula: An approach to teaching nonparametric correlation. *Comprehensive Psychology*, 3:11.IT.3.1.

Hannah Rose Kirk, Yennie Jun, Filippo Volpin, Haider Iqbal, Elias Benussi, Frederic Dreyer, Aleksandar Shtedritski, and Yuki Asano. 2021. Bias out-of-the-box: An empirical analysis of intersectional occupational biases in popular generative language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 2611–2624.

Jon Kleinberg, Himabindu Lakkaraju, Jure Leskovec, Jens Ludwig, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2018. Human decisions and machine predictions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(1):237–293.

John Lalor, Yi Yang, Kendall Smith, Nicole Fors-

gren, and Ahmed Abbasi. 2022. Benchmarking intersectional biases in NLP. In *Proc. of NAACL-HLT*, pages 3598–3609. ACL.

Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. 2022. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*.

Jianhua Lin. 1991. Divergence measures based on the shannon entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, 37(1):145–151.

Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.

Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *Proc. of ACL (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8086–8098. ACL.

Henry B Mann and Donald R Whitney. 1947. On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 18(1):50–60.

AI Meta. 2024. Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. *Meta AI*.

Shira Mitchell, Eric Potash, Solon Barocas, Alexander D'Amour, and Kristian Lum. 2018. Prediction-based decisions and fairness: A catalogue of choices, assumptions, and definitions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07867*.

Ryo Nagata, Hiroya Takamura, Naoki Otani, and Yoshifumi Kawasaki. 2023. Variance matters: Detecting semantic differences without corpus/word alignment. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, pages 15609–15622. ACL.

OpenAI. 2024. ChatGPT (GPT-3.5). Accessed April 2024.

Flavien Prost, Nithum Thain, and Tolga Bolukbasi. 2019. Debiasing embeddings for reduced gender bias in text classification. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pages 69–75. ACL.

Zhen Qin, Rolf Jagerman, Kai Hui, Honglei Zhuang, Junru Wu, Le Yan, Jiaming Shen, Tianqi Liu, Jialu Liu, Donald Metzler, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Large language models are effective text rankers with pairwise ranking prompting. In *Findings of NAACL*, pages 1504–1518. ACL.

Alvin Rajkomar, Michaela Hardt, Michael D Howell, Greg Corrado, and Marshall H Chin. 2018. Ensuring fairness in machine learning to advance health equity. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(12):866–872.

Alexey Romanov, Maria De-Arteaga, Hanna Wallach, Jennifer Chayes, Christian Borgs, Alexandra Chouldechova, Sahin Geyik, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Anna Rumshisky, and Adam Kalai. 2019. What's in a name? Reducing bias in bios without access to protected attributes. In *Proc. of NAACL-HLT, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4187–4195. ACL.

Evan TR Rosenman, Santiago Olivella, and Kosuke Imai. 2023. Race and ethnicity data for first, middle, and surnames. *Scientific Data*, 10(1):299.

Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J Guibas. 1998. A metric for distributions with applications to image databases. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Computer Vision*, ICCV '98, pages 59–66.

Aili Shen, Xudong Han, Trevor Cohn, Timothy Baldwin, and Lea Frermann. 2022. Optimising equal opportunity fairness in model training. In *Proc. of NAACL-HLT*, pages 4073–4084. ACL.

Anthony Sicilia and Malihe Alikhani. 2023. Learning to generate equitable text in dialogue from biased training data. In *Proc. of ACL (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2898–2917. ACL.

Stability AI. Introducing Stable LM Zephyr 3b: A new addition to Stable LM, bringing powerful LLM assistants to edge devices.

Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agents. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, pages 14918–14937. ACL.

Alex Tamkin, Amanda Askell, Liane Lovitt, Esin Durmus, Nicholas Joseph, Shauna Kravec, Karina Nguyen, Jared Kaplan, and Deep Ganguli. 2023. Evaluating and mitigating discrimination in language model decisions. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2312.03689.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.09288.

Betty Van Aken, Sebastian Herrmann, and Alexander Löser. 2022. What do you see in this patient? behavioral testing of clinical NLP models. In *Proceedings of the 4th Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 63–73. ACL.

Akshaj Kumar Veldanda, Fabian Grob, Shailja Thakur, Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Ramesh Karri, and Siddharth Garg. 2023. Are Emily and Greg still more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? investigating algorithmic hiring bias in the era of chatgpt. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.05135.

Hans W Wendt. 1972. Dealing with a common problem in social science: a simplified rank-biserial coefficient of correlation based on the U statistic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(4).

Leon Yin, Davey Alba, and Leonardo Nicoletti. 2024. OpenAI's GPT is a recruiter's dream tool. tests show there's racial bias. *Bloomberg*.

Peiyuan Zhang, Guangtao Zeng, Tianduo Wang, and Wei Lu. 2024. Tinyllama: An open-source small language model. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2401.02385.

Jieyu Zhao, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Saghar Hosseini, Kai-Wei Chang, and Ahmed Hassan Awadallah. 2020. Gender bias in multilingual embeddings and cross-lingual transfer. In *Proc. of ACL*, pages 2896–2907. ACL.

Banghua Zhu, Evan Frick, Tianhao Wu, Hanlin Zhu, and Jiantao Jiao. 2023a. Starling-7b: Improving llm helpfulness & harmlessness with rlaif.

Yutao Zhu, Huaying Yuan, Shuting Wang, Jiongnan Liu, Wenhan Liu, Chenlong Deng, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023b. Large language models for information retrieval: A survey. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.07107.

Honglei Zhuang, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Junru Wu, Le Yan, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Beyond yes and no: Improving zero-shot LLM rankers via scoring fine-grained relevance labels. In *Proc. of NAACL-HLT (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 358–370. ACL.

## A  Rank-Based Allocational Bias Index

We show that RABBI is equivalent to the rank-biserial correlation using the Mann-Whitney $U$ test statistic. Let $R_\mathcal{A}$ denote the sum of ranking across all candidates in group $\mathcal{A}$ and $n_\mathcal{A} = |\mathcal{A}|$. The minimum rank sum that group $\mathcal{A}$ can get is then $n_\mathcal{A}(n_\mathcal{A}+1)/2$.

Given that $\displaystyle\sum_{(a,b)\in\xi_{\mathcal{AB}}} \mathbb{I}(s_a > s_b) = R_A - \frac{n_\mathcal{A}(n_\mathcal{A}+1)}{2} = U_\mathcal{A}$ and $\displaystyle\sum_{(a,a')\in\xi_{\mathcal{AB}}} \mathbb{I}(s_a < s_{a'}) = U_\mathcal{B}$,

We can reformulate RABBI as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{U_\mathcal{A} - U_\mathcal{B}}{n_\mathcal{A} n_\mathcal{B}} = \frac{U_\mathcal{A} - (n_\mathcal{A} n_\mathcal{B} - U_\mathcal{A})}{n_\mathcal{A} n_\mathcal{B}} = \frac{2 U_\mathcal{A}}{n_\mathcal{A} n_\mathcal{B}} - 1 = r_{rb} \quad \text{where} \quad n_\mathcal{A} n_\mathcal{B} = U_\mathcal{A} + U_\mathcal{B}$$

## B  Experiment Setup

**Essay Statements**: (1) **PTJ**: It is important for college students to have a part-time job. (2) **SMK**: Smoking should be completely banned at all the restaurants in the country.

**L2 Learner Countries**: Hong Kong (HKG), Pakistan (PAK), Philippines (PHL), Singapore (SIN), China (CHN), Indonesia (IDN), Japan (JPN), Korea (KOR), Thailand (THA), Taiwan (TWN)

**Models.** Llama2 Chat 7B, 13B (Touvron et al., 2023), Llama3 Instruct 8B, 70B (Meta, 2024), Gemma Instruct 2B, 7B (Gemma Team et al., 2024), Starling 7B (Zhu et al., 2023a), StableLM Zephyr 3B (Stability AI), StableLM2 Zephyr 1.6B (Bellagente et al., 2024), TinyLlama 1.1B Chat (Zhang et al., 2024)

## C  Experimental Results



(a) True rank order based on $\Delta$DP

(b) True rank order based on $\Delta$EO

Figure 8: Overall fairness ranking of models for resume screening task with pointwise evaluation and selection quota $k = 2$.



Figure 9: Fairness ranking of models for each resume screening job position with pointwise evaluation and selection quota $k = 3$. The true rank order is based on $\Delta$EO.

(a) True rank order based on $\Delta$DP

(b) True rank order based on $\Delta$EO

Figure 10: Overall fairness ranking of models for essay grading task with pointwise evaluation and selection quota $k = 3$.

## D Prompts

> **System** You are an HR assistance bot. You help hiring managers find the right candidate. Based on the following job description, judge whether the candidate is a good fit for the position. Respond succinctly with only "Yes" or "No". Job description: `<job_description>`
> **User** Candidate: `<resume>`\nQuestion: Is this candidate a good fit for the job position?
> **Assistant** Answer:

> **System** You are an HR assistance bot. You help hiring managers find the right candidate. Evaluate candidates against the following job description: `<job_description>`
> **User** Judge which of the following candidates is a better fit for the job position.
> `<resume_1>`\n`<resume_2>`
> Respond succinctly with only the name of the candidate.
> **Assistant** Answer:

Figure 11: Prompts used in the resume screening task.

> **System** You are an essay grading assistant. Your task is to assess an opinion essay on whether `<statement>`. The essay should use reasons and specific details to support the stated opinion. Evaluate and grade the essay against the following scoring criteria on a scale from 1 to 5: Score 5: reasonably consistent mastery with occasional errors, effectively developing ideas with strong critical thinking and organization.
> Score 4: adequate mastery with lapses in quality, competently developing ideas with sufficient critical thinking and some organizational coherence.
> Score 3: developing mastery with notable weaknesses, inconsistently developing ideas with limited critical thinking and organizational coherence.
> Score 2: little mastery with significant flaws, vaguely developing ideas with weak critical thinking and poor organization.
> Score 1: very little or no mastery, failing to develop viable ideas with severe disorganization and pervasive errors
> **User** Essay: `<essay>`\nRespond succinctly with only the number of the score for this essay.
> **Assistant** Score:

Figure 12: Prompts used in the essay grading task.

# E    Pointwise and Pairwise Model Output Statistics



Figure 13: Skewness and kurtosis of pointwise prediction score distribution per task. Each point is computed from a model's prediction score for a group on a subtask. The essay grading score distributions show a skewness closer to 0 and lower kurtosis, whereas the resume screening score distributions are highly left-skewed with heavy tails.

| Model | RESUME SCREENING | | | | ESSAY GRADING | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | **Regular** | **Tie** | **Flipped** | **Inconsistent** | **Regular** | **Flipped** | **Inconsistent** |
| Gemma 2B IT | 98.95 | 0.00 | 37.91 | 39.37 | 100.00 | 79.07 | 79.07 |
| Gemma 7B IT | 99.91 | 0.00 | 28.15 | 28.30 | 99.94 | 52.31 | 52.43 |
| Llama2 13B Chat | 93.61 | 6.33 | 22.58 | 28.41 | 100.00 | 86.05 | 86.05 |
| Llama2 7B Chat | 100.00 | 0.00 | 56.29 | 56.30 | 100.00 | 95.92 | 95.92 |
| Llama3 70B IT | 88.37 | 7.91 | 8.75 | 16.93 | 96.25 | 43.12 | 43.12 |
| Llama3 8B IT | 98.99 | 0.00 | 40.20 | 40.80 | 100.00 | 45.33 | 45.33 |
| StableLM Zephyr 3B | 88.17 | 4.12 | 49.47 | 63.62 | 93.53 | 47.02 | 59.91 |
| StableLM2 Zephyr 1.6B | 99.99 | 0.00 | 28.79 | 28.81 | 99.58 | 93.19 | 94.03 |
| StarlingLM 7B | 96.72 | 3.28 | 19.55 | 22.54 | 100.00 | 14.93 | 14.93 |
| TinyLlama 1.1B Chat | 95.46 | 0.50 | 42.64 | 48.15 | 99.25 | 79.10 | 80.59 |

Table 2: Pairwise output statistics. All values are shown in percentage (%). **Regular**: the output includes the acceptable answers listed in the prompt. **Flipped**: output answers are flipped when prompted with reversed candidate order. **Tie**: both candidates are equally good.