

# Algorithmic Pluralism

## A Structural Approach Towards Equal Opportunity

SHOMIK JAIN, VINITH SURIYAKUMAR, and ASHIA WILSON

The idea of equal opportunity enjoys wide acceptance because of the freedom opportunities provide us to shape our lives. Many disagree deeply, however, about the meaning of equal opportunity, especially in algorithmic decision-making. A new theory of equal opportunity adopts a structural approach, describing how decisions can operate as bottlenecks or narrow places in the structure of opportunities. This viewpoint on discrimination highlights fundamental problems with equal opportunity and its achievement through formal fairness interventions, and instead advocates for a more pluralistic approach that prioritizes opening up more opportunities for more people. We extend this theory of bottlenecks to data-driven decision-making, adapting it to center concerns about the extent to which algorithms can create severe bottlenecks in the opportunity structure. We recommend algorithmic pluralism: the prioritization of alleviating severity in systems of algorithmic decision-making. Drawing on examples from education, healthcare, and criminal justice, we show how this structural approach helps reframe debates about equal opportunity in system design and regulation, and how algorithmic pluralism could help expand opportunities in a more positive-sum way.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: algorithmic fairness, bottlenecks, equal opportunity, discrimination, structural injustice

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Many works advocate for centering *equal opportunity* in systems of decision-making. This is primarily because of the profound impact that opportunities have on our skills, talents and future endeavors. Indeed, “we do not come into the world with fixed preferences, ambitions, or capacities, but develop all these through processes of interaction with the world and with the opportunities we see before us” [28]. In this way, the principle of equal opportunity offers us a greater ability to *shape our lives*. Additionally, when opportunities are more equal and *plentiful*, more people have the *freedom* to choose among disparate life paths, as opposed to having these paths be dictated by societal constraints. This notion of freedom makes equal opportunity foundational to many democratic societies. Finally, it is worth pointing out that the idea of equal opportunity enjoys a *broad consensus*. It is a value that is singled out in several founding documents and is regularly invoked by advocates of radically different political and social agendas [29].

Despite its wide appeal, many disagree deeply about the meaning of equal opportunity. This debate unsurprisingly extends to the algorithmic fairness community, especially given the ways in which our data-driven economy can create circumstances that severely limit opportunities for swaths of the population [10, 21]. Many prior works focus on what it means for a single opportunity to be “equal.” Formal views of equal opportunity contend that these decision points should only consider features relevant to one’s future success in the opportunity being decided [65]. This perspective has inspired several algorithmic fairness metrics such as demographic parity [13, 74] and equalized odds [37]. However, a growing number of scholars have criticized the narrow scope of these interventions, advocating instead for more structural views of equal opportunity that better consider one’s life chances and pathways overall [5, 34, 42, 45, 67].

In this work, we adopt Joseph Fishkin’s structural approach towards equal opportunity [28] and extend it to algorithmic decision-making. Fishkin emphasizes the need for a more pluralistic structure of opportunities in order to achieve the outcomes that make equal opportunity so valued in the first place. His viewpoint focuses on the concept of *bottlenecks*, which are decision points in the broad structure of how opportunities in our society are created, distributed, and controlled. These bottlenecks involve some level of severity, or degree to which they constrain opportunities, that

juxtaposes with their legitimacy, or justification in relation to how they allocate opportunities. Fishkin highlights that systems of decision-making with severe bottlenecks greatly compromise the values of equal opportunity, regardless of their legitimacy. He therefore argues that alleviating severity should be an urgent priority. We extend this idea of *opportunity pluralism* [28] to systems of algorithmic decision-making – what we define as *algorithmic pluralism*. Specifically, we make the following contributions:

- We review fundamental problems with equal opportunity that complicate its formulation in systems of decision-making (Section 2).
- We present Fishkin’s theory of bottlenecks and use the framework to center several structural concerns about equal opportunity raised in the algorithmic fairness community (Section 3).
- We show why greater opportunity requires alleviating severity and discuss implications for regulation and design (Section 4).
- We validate this framework through current debates about equal opportunity in education, healthcare, and criminal justice (Section 5).
- We end our discussion by situating bottleneck theory within the context of related work (Section 6).

## 2 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND ITS PROBLEMS

Formal views of equal opportunity propose that at any particular decision point, a person should be evaluated only on features relevant to one’s future success in the opportunity at hand [65]. While this sort of normative reasoning seems compelling, several issues complicate the possibility and desire to achieve this ideal in algorithmic systems. We use Bernard Williams’ provocative thought experiment of an imaginary society consisting of a dominating warrior class [28, 73] to first, illustrate why it is surprisingly hard to specify the idea of equal opportunity; and second, argue that even if practically achievable, formal approaches offer an unsatisfactorily narrow view of the opportunity structure.

### 2.1 Equal Opportunity Cannot Be Achieved

Consider a hypothetical society with two castes: warriors and non-warriors. Warriors defend the society and are rewarded with all the valued goods that society has. Since there are a fixed number of positions in the army, an algorithm chooses who becomes a warrior at the age of sixteen based on various characteristics such as athletic ability and intelligence tests. In principle, the algorithm manifests the formal notion of equal opportunity by choosing warriors based on features relevant to their success on the battlefield. However, it turns out that the children of warrior parents have a significant advantage. They are chosen more often because they are healthier, smarter, stronger, and more confident – all traits that are reflected in the historical data for successful warriors.

#### 2.1.1 *The problem of developmental opportunities.*

The children of warrior parents have advantageous experiences and resources prior to the algorithm’s evaluation, such as family wealth and access to better education. These developmental opportunities make it impossible for warrior and non-warrior children to have a fair contest. While non-warrior children are not explicitly excluded because of their caste, the data collected on them reflects their lack of developmental opportunities. For this reason, selecting warriors based on who will perform best will rationally relegate non-warrior children because of their disadvantages. As Eidelson explains, “disadvantage, in other words, is disadvantageous. And that means that allocating opportunities to those who would in fact perform best will extend, and likely exacerbate, patterns that give rise to grave harm and injustice” [27].

### 2.1.2 *The problem of isolating merit.*

Despite differences in developmental opportunities, views rooted in the principle of formal equal opportunity still contend that decisions can be based solely on merit, such as talent and effort [65]. But it is practically impossible to isolate merit from circumstances of birth and advantageous life experiences: “everything we are and everything we do is the product of layer upon layer of interaction between person and environment – between our selves, our efforts, and our opportunities – that in a sedimentary way, over time, build each of us into the person we become” [28]. Moreover, real-world data and features will inherently combine aspects of merit with developmental opportunities. Warrior children may score higher on any test of athletic ability, for example, because of special coaching that actually improves their scores more than it actually improves their battlefield performance.

## 2.2 Formal Equal Opportunity Artificially Narrows the Solution Space

The warrior society thought experiment also illustrates how formal approaches take an overly narrow view of the opportunity structure. As Dewey astutely points out, “the way in which [a] problem is conceived decides what specific suggestions are entertained and which are dismissed” [25]. Formal fairness methods often reduce considerations to relative advantages or disadvantages at a particular decision point. This type of single-axis thinking comes at the expense of attention to what produces the systematic benefits or privileges in the first place [42]. In doing so, formal approaches do not account for the fact that having a plurality of opportunities (and not just equal opportunities) is a prerequisite for the accompanying virtues of “freedom” and “the ability to shape our lives.”

### 2.2.1 *The problem of a starting gate.*

Many formal notions of equal opportunity assert that if we could somehow obtain a fair representation of data before some set point (a starting gate), then algorithmic decision-making after that point would be fair as well [65]. Some scholars have even attempted to solve this starting gate issue through statistical methods [36]. While there are epistemological and practical challenges with these approaches, the warrior society reveals additional reasons for why they may be insufficient for maintaining the virtues associated with equal opportunity. Suppose we could equalize developmental opportunities by placing all children into warrior skill academies from the moment of birth. While those not selected to become warriors may no longer dispute the fairness of the algorithm, they still might object at the severity of the decisions. Such a severe narrowing of their entire life paths seems arbitrary, and compromises the value of equal opportunity as offering the freedom to shape their lives.

### 2.2.2 *The problem of zero-sum thinking.*

Focusing on specific decision points further reduces considerations of equal opportunity to zero-sum thinking. For example, if we choose to give compensatory bonus points to non-warrior children, some warrior children may object at no longer being selected. This distributive view forces zero-sum trade-offs between mathematically incompatible notions of fairness, magnifying the stakes of choosing between these definitions [47]. As Green argues, restricting analysis to specific decision points also cannot fully “account for the inequalities that often surround those decision points [and] is therefore prone to reproducing existing patterns of injustice” [34]. By expanding our view to the broader structure of opportunities, we can better account for the important contexts in which decisions are made and consider interventions that diminish or even eliminate the zero-sum framing.




Fig. 1. (Fig. 6 in [28]) Fishkin’s framework for assessing the impact of bottlenecks along the axes of severity and legitimacy.

### 3 BOTTLENECK THEORY: A STRUCTURAL VIEW OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

A growing number of works in the algorithmic fairness community have called for interventions beyond formal approaches in order to better account for the broader structure of opportunities [5, 17, 34, 45, 67]. Fishkin’s bottleneck theory offers a novel framework for understanding these more substantive views on equal opportunity [28]. As algorithms are increasingly used to inform or make decisions about our lives, they create bottlenecks for many real-world opportunities. Bottlenecks involve some level of *severity*, or amplified degree of competition and scarcity for the opportunities at hand. This juxtaposes with the values and reasons for the bottleneck that constitute its *legitimacy*. We show how this framework of severity and legitimacy maps to structural concerns about equal opportunity in systems of algorithmic decision-making. In particular, situating algorithms in these terms allows us to assess their impact on the opportunity structure, and shifts our focus away from the decisions of any one model in isolation.

#### 3.1 Severity

The severity of a bottleneck is the degree to which it constrains opportunities. This is a combination of two factors: pervasiveness and strictness [28]. A bottleneck’s *pervasiveness* is the range of affected people and opportunities. For example, the algorithm in the warrior society has maximum pervasiveness because it controls everyone’s access to all the valued goods in the society. *Strictness* examines how directly a bottleneck controls opportunities, or in other words, whether it is an absolute bar, strong preference, or weak preference. The warrior society also has maximum strictness because it is an absolute bar in determining who becomes a warrior. While this represents an extreme case, many severe bottlenecks can naturally arise in systems of data-driven decision-making, as illustrated by the concerns expressed in the ideas of *patterned inequality* and *algorithmic monoculture*.

##### 3.1.1 The concern about patterned inequality is a concern about severe bottlenecks.

Patterned inequality [27] refers to two observations: (1) real-world inequalities in status, resources, and opportunities are often patterned in terms of certain discernible, socially salient features; (2) allocating future outcomes based on an individual’s likelihood of success will predictably reproduce and aggravate patterns of this kind. The problem of developmental opportunities makes it inevitable that some patterns of inequality will exist. Once an observable trait, perhaps implicit or arbitrary in itself, is correlated with less visible attributes relevant for deciding opportunities, decision-makers will rationally tend to use that trait as a proxy for allocating future outcomes (c.f. the problem of

isolating merit). For example, consider the strong correlation between credit score and job performance, which led to its controversial use as a proxy for hiring decisions [7]. Given algorithms are developed to identify these patterns in a more explicit way, the concern is that allocating opportunities using them “will tend to reproduce existing patterns in inequality and cement the matrix of stereotypes and social meanings that both cause and result from those patterns” [27]. This stronger tendency towards the comparatively privileged creates the possibility of stricter bottlenecks, while the denial of even more opportunities to members of worse-off groups represents more pervasive bottlenecks.

### 3.1.2 *The concern about algorithmic monoculture is a concern about severe bottlenecks.*

Algorithmic monoculture [10] occurs when multiple decision-makers controlling access to a large quantity of valued goods rely on similar datasets and/or models. This is increasingly common in high-stakes screening decisions across many domains, including in employment, healthcare, lending, and criminal justice [61]. One reason why monoculture occurs is that few decision-makers have the resources to build their own automated systems. For example, over 30% of Fortune 100 companies use the same resume-screening service for hiring [64]. Recent works have also demonstrated the performance gains of using pre-trained foundation models instead of training new models from scratch and illustrated how this can lead to homogenized outcomes [10, 11]. In other domains, the data collection itself may be expensive or unfeasible, such as in healthcare algorithms which disproportionately use data from only three states: California, Massachusetts, and New York [21].

The standardization of decision-making processes could create stricter bottlenecks because certain features will be stronger preferences for the opportunities at hand. In certain ranking problems like comparing job candidates, sharing an algorithm across multiple decision-makers can also reduce the overall quality of decisions, even if the algorithm is more accurate for any one decision-maker in isolation [48]. Moreover, if similar algorithms are uniformly applied across wide swathes of a single domain, outcomes could become homogenized resulting the systematic exclusion of groups and individuals from opportunities of great consequence [10, 21]. This type of outcome homogenization constitutes a more pervasive bottleneck for those that repeatedly receive undesirable decisions because they may find themselves locked out of many paths in the opportunity structure.

## 3.2 Legitimacy

Many other structural concerns about equal opportunity center on a model’s legitimacy, or its justification in relation to how opportunities are allocated [28]. The justification for an algorithm is often argued on two grounds: mathematical legitimacy and social legitimacy. *Mathematical legitimacy* is simply the algorithm’s accuracy with respect to a particular problem formulation. As we saw in the warrior society, however, a high accuracy alone does not fully justify the use of an algorithm to control real-world outcomes. The other necessary aspect to consider is an algorithm’s *social legitimacy*: what is the rationale for using a particular problem formulation (e.g. choosing a specific model, features, or training objective) to constrain the specific opportunity at hand? As we will see in Section 5, the COMPAS algorithm for predicting recidivism illustrates a canonical debate about social legitimacy from the perspective of two formal fairness approaches: calibration and error rate parity. While many scholars have raised substantive concerns about legitimacy [35, 42, 45], we highlight two in particular that direct their critique at the way opportunities are structured.

### 3.2.1 *The concern about compounding injustice is a concern about illegitimate bottlenecks.*

Compounding injustice [41] refers to decisions that take a prior wrong that a person has suffered, or its effects, as a reason for allocating future opportunities in a way that makes them still worse off. In many cases, adverse predictions by algorithms may involve the use of features that relate to prior victimization. For example, a prominent healthcare

algorithm selecting patients for high-risk care programs used prior health costs as a proxy for future health needs [57]. This ignored the well-documented injustices of the U.S. healthcare system that cause less money to be spent on black patients who have the same level of need as equally sick white patients. By denying future care on the basis of prior health costs, the algorithm “compounded the initial injustice” of unequal access to care. From the perspective of bottleneck theory, Hellman’s formulation of compounding injustice and Eidelson’s patterned inequality both surface similar concerns about the structure of opportunities; however, Hellman’s argument raises the illegitimacy of the initial condition as central to the moral consideration, whereas Eidelson centers the severity of unequal patterns of opportunity as sufficient to warrant concern.

### 3.2.2 *The concern about relational harms is a concern about illegitimate bottlenecks.*

Relational harms refer to when algorithms fail to account for the power relations, social dynamics, and structural contexts that surround systems of decision-making in the real-world [34, 35]. In particular, this involves scrutinizing what institutions, values, and norms cause social and material disparities in opportunities [3, 55]. Explicitly considering the potential for relational harms can help justify algorithmic design choices and problem formulations. Whether or not certain input features and output predictions are legitimate, for instance, can depend on if they reduce dignitary and material disparities that reflect social hierarchies [34]. For example, arguments against the legitimacy of COMPAS highlight that predictions of recidivism fail to account for the racial biases in policing that make re-arrest rates higher for minority populations [18]. In addition, how much a decision-maker values mitigating various relational harms can also inform the choice of a training objective [22]. Companies making hiring decisions may have different values such as hiring from the local community, creating more diverse teams, or addressing past discrimination. Training an algorithm based on who has been hired in the past may undervalue the contributions that underrepresented applicants bring to a company. Ultimately, considerations of these broader contexts and how they affect an algorithm’s social legitimacy will depend on one’s choice of worldview [30]. This may differ from the perspective of various stakeholders, such as those making decisions versus those seeking opportunities.

## 4 ALGORITHMIC PLURALISM: WHY GREATER OPPORTUNITY REQUIRES ALLEVIATING SEVERITY

The previous section showed how substantive notions of equal opportunity relate to ameliorating bottlenecks in the direction of less severity and more legitimacy. But as many including Fishkin have argued, severity alone is sufficient to warrant intervention even if a bottleneck is legitimate. Moreover, while concerns about legitimacy matter immensely, severity is often necessary to find consensus and compel intervention. This motivates Fishkin to center severity as the prioritized axis for intervention in his proposal of opportunity pluralism. By making bottlenecks less severe, it becomes “more possible, both in ideal theory and the real world, to achieve the goals that lead us to value equal opportunity in the first place” [28]. In this section, we advocate for alleviating severity in systems of algorithmic decision-making – what we define as *algorithmic pluralism* – and discuss implications for regulation and design.

### 4.1 Severity Necessitates Intervention On Its Own

When a bottleneck becomes so severe that it significantly constrains a person’s range of opportunities, it magnifies each of the problems with achieving formal equal opportunity. Developmental opportunities will orient themselves to the severe bottleneck; zero-sum debates will intensify over what aspects of merit are legitimate; and the problem of determining a starting gate will matter more because there are fewer paths to the opportunity of consequence. For

these reasons, Fishkin centers severity as the axis for intervention in his proposal of *opportunity pluralism* [28], which has four principles:

- (1) There should be plurality of values and goals.
- (2) As many as possible of the valued goods should be less positional and the valued roles less competitive.
- (3) As far as possible, there should be a plurality of paths leading to these different valued goods and roles, without bottlenecks constraining people’s ability to pursue those paths.
- (4) There should be a plurality of sources of authority regarding the elements described in the other principles.

In algorithmic systems, we similarly contend that severity warrants intervention on its own, as many other works have argued [10, 21, 27]. Eidelson’s concern about patterned inequality is a concern about severe bottlenecks “not because it necessarily treats any individual unfairly, but because it cuts against the urgent project of scrambling existing patterns in societal inequalities.” The sole existence of this patterned inequality “poses grave problems for a range of widely endorsed values: it greatly undermines future equality of opportunity; it makes it less likely that people will relate to one another as equals; and, all issues of equality aside, it just means more overall misery and less overall flourishing” [27]. These concerns are independent of any claims about the bottlenecks’ legitimacy or causal history by which the patterns arose. Likewise, algorithmic monoculture constitutes a moral concern on its own because of its potential to create severe bottlenecks that homogenize outcomes [10], regardless of how legitimate these outcomes are considered to be. A society where some individuals and groups find themselves locked out of significant parts of the opportunity structure compromises the very virtue of freedom that we often associate with equal opportunity. As Creel and Hellman add, “this moral problem will plague both arbitrary and non-arbitrary algorithms” [21].

#### 4.2 Legitimacy Matters, But Severity Takes Precedent

The importance of ensuring legitimacy in algorithmic decisions cannot be overstated. The primary aim of legitimacy is to align ML models with fundamental human values such as equality and justice [19, 46]. Interventions to promote such values and make decisions more “fair” have been the central focus of the algorithmic fairness community. Moreover, recent critiques rightfully encourage the community to consider the legitimacy of the broader opportunity structure in addition to formal fairness approaches [34, 42, 45]. As Green points out, however, addressing the legitimacy of decisions and reforms that might alter them “can be a difficult and politically contested task” as it will involve “grappling with contested notions of what types of inequalities are unjust and what evidence constitutes sufficient proof of social hierarchy” [34]. Society is built on a plurality of values existing inside the boundaries of a human rights framework, and such plurality naturally extends to debates over the legitimacy of algorithmic systems. Fishkin concludes that: “all this leaves us with complex problems of prioritization. In a world of myriad bottlenecks, we need to decide which ones to devote our efforts and scarce resources to ameliorating. The question of how important it is to loosen any given bottleneck turns in significant part on how severe the bottleneck is” [28]. In other words, the severity of decisions on the structure of opportunities – especially (but not only) when illegitimate – should take precedent.

#### 4.3 Implications for Regulators and Policymakers

Regulators and policymakers are often in the best position to intervene on the basis of severity because they are explicitly tasked with considering the broader structure of opportunities and its impacts. In fact, Fishkin views all U.S. anti-discrimination laws as intervening in practices that amount to a severe bottleneck, and attempting to alter those practices so that the bottleneck is somewhat less severe [28]. For instance, many federal and state anti-discrimination

laws prioritize severity by extending protections to groups that we would not ordinarily expect the law to show solicitude, such as those with low-credit, predispositions to disease, and even prior criminal convictions. While businesses and other decision-makers may have many legitimate reasons for denying opportunities on the basis of these characteristics, each category (as an empirical matter in our society) severely constrains a person’s range of opportunities making it sufficient and necessary to warrant concern. This idea stems back to the very origins of anti-discrimination law and protected classes such as race and gender. The longstanding legal theory of *disparate impact* prohibits practices in employment, housing, and certain other areas that have an “unjustified adverse impact on members of a protected class” [15]. As Fishkin explains, “there is nothing fundamental or primordial about protecting a category like race. From the perspective of the anti-bottleneck principle, the validity of anti-discrimination statutes covering race is entirely contingent on the empirical reality that race is a bottleneck in the opportunity structure” [28]. Cases of disparate impact further prioritize severity in how they unfold: the courts first determine if there is an adverse impact (i.e. severity); and if so, they only carve out exceptions if there is some justification or business necessity (i.e. legitimacy).

#### 4.4 Implications for Designers and Decision-Makers

Many technical interventions may also have practical applications for alleviating severity in systems of algorithmic decision-making. For example, broader analyses of how humans and algorithms should collaborate [26, 39, 68], better representations of risk and uncertainty [32, 56], and learning algorithms that account for long-term impacts [54, 62, 69] can all help account for the overall structure of opportunities. However, the algorithmic fairness community tends to view these interventions from the perspective of how they can make decisions more legitimate, rather than from the perspective of how they can disrupt the severity of decisions. Algorithmic recourse [71] represents one example of a severity-oriented solution. Recourse provides a way to contest and overturn predictions, which reduces strictness by making the algorithm less of an absolute bar for the final outcome. Another intervention which could target the pervasiveness of algorithmic decisions is model multiplicity [9], which refers to the existence of multiple models with varying predictions but similar accuracy. This could counteract the risk of algorithmic monoculture, but in practice these varying models may only affect the outcomes of individuals near the decision boundary [10]. To provide a path for those who may still be locked out by all models, Creel and Hellman propose intentionally introducing randomness into the decision-making process [21]. In addition to these methods, we also encourage designers and decision-makers to develop more technical solutions that center severity as the axis for intervention.

## 5 CASE STUDIES

We illustrate severe bottlenecks in the opportunity structure of three different institutions: education, healthcare, and criminal justice. Using these case studies, we also discuss how severity amplifies debates about the legitimacy of decisions and possible interventions for its mitigation.

### 5.1 Education

The college admissions process constitutes one of the more severe bottlenecks in society today [28], and reinforces many patterns of inequality across race and socioeconomic status. With the increasing number of applications in recent years, acceptance rates dropped to new lows in 2022, with Harvard only admitting 3.2% of applicants [72]. Nearly 20% of these admissions comprise of those with legacy status, which overwhelmingly favor white and wealthier students [43]. Meanwhile, black and Hispanic students make up just 19% of enrolled students despite representing 37% of the college-aged population, a gap that has remained unchanged since 1980 [43]. College also remains a pervasive and strict



bottleneck for many career paths, with over 75% of new jobs requiring a bachelor's degree [70]. Moreover, college entrance itself depends on many upstream bottlenecks, such as the quality of high school, standardized testing, and parental wealth. All these bottlenecks severely constrain the paths of many prospective students, making a fallacy of the notion that this process satisfies anything close to equality of opportunity.

The goal of affirmative action policies, which allow the consideration of race in admissions decisions, is to offer one way to loosen the bottleneck for minority students. However, the current debate almost entirely focuses on how it affects the legitimacy of the college admissions process. In oral arguments from cases pending before the Supreme Court, Justice Sotomayor emphasized the problems of isolating merit and developmental opportunities: "Sometimes race does correlate to some experiences and not others. If you're black, you're more likely to be in an underresourced school. You're more likely to be taught by teachers who are not as qualified as others. You're more likely to be viewed [as] having less academic potential...how do you want an admissions officer to say, I'm not going to look at the race of the child to see if they had all of those socioeconomic barriers present?" [59]. Justice Kagan added how colleges justify the use of race for more downstream legitimacy: "a lot of the argument here is about a [university's] compelling interest in collecting a diverse class, including along racial dimensions and maybe especially along racial dimensions given the kinds of challenges that our society faces" [58].

These debates over how to make the college admissions process more legitimate overshadow the fact that the vast majority of students face difficult or almost no paths to enrollment at elite institutions. Such severe constraints pose grave challenges for the urgent priority of breaking existing patterns of racial and socioeconomic inequalities [27]. For these reasons, some proposals call for more randomness in the admissions process, such as a lottery among students that meet some academic criteria that could depend on their high school [6, 16, 72]. Given that there are many more qualified applicants than spots at elite institutions, "an element of chance is already built into the system. The difference is that a lottery [would make] that element transparent to all, while eliminating many of the subjective biases that can creep into the admissions process" [72]. Another proposed reform aimed at decreasing severity of the admissions process involves increasing the range of paths to entry-level jobs that do not require a bachelor's degree. Many European countries, for instance, have a well-developed system of apprenticeships and training programs to prepare people for a substantial range of career paths [28]. These structural reforms would lessen the stakes of zero-sum debates about legitimate aspects of merit, such as those in the ongoing affirmative action cases: "In a zero-sum game like college admissions, if race is going to be counted, that means some people are going to get in and some people are going to be excluded based on race" [59]. More interventions that target the severity of the college admissions process will not just benefit those that are currently disadvantaged; a more pluralistic system of college education in relation to prior and future opportunities would help all prospective students.

## 5.2 Healthcare

The management of chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a global health problem associated with high levels of morbidity and mortality. More than 37 million people in the US are estimated to have CKD, but only 10% of these individuals are aware they have it [1]. Many of the individuals who are underdiagnosed and undertreated are racial minorities and the socioeconomically disadvantaged, who already face many other inequalities in the U.S. healthcare system [12]. For example, black Americans are almost four times more likely to suffer from kidney failure than whites. Moreover, they are often not diagnosed until later stages of the condition and spend months longer waiting for kidney transplants than white patients. Another study found that 70% of individuals on Medicare are widely underdiagnosed even when they have a lab test that indicated early CKD [24].

To help manage the CKD population, researchers developed an algorithm called the estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) [49, 50] to gauge how fast a person’s kidneys filter blood, with lower filtration rates suggesting worse kidney function. The use of eGFR is pervasive, with doctors using it to make several decisions about patients’ overall care and access to medical resources, including (but not limited to): (1) early detection of kidney decline, (2) the level of antibiotic dosing, (3) risk assessments for stroke and other conditions, and (4) placement on dialysis or transplant lists. All of these algorithmically-supported decisions constitute severe bottlenecks for care and treatment with varying levels of pervasiveness and strictness. For (1) and (4), most patients are only considered for further screening or placed on dialysis and transplant lists if their eGFR is below a certain threshold [23] resulting in maximum strictness. For (2) and (3), eGFR is used for dosing a large number of commonly used antibiotics such as Amoxicillin, Azithromycin, and Doxycycline [20] and impacts risk assessment across a large number of comorbidities [23], resulting in its high pervasiveness across medical decisions.

The severity of these bottlenecks in CKD management amplifies debates about the eGFR algorithm and its legitimacy. Several equations for eGFR have noted that using race improves overall accuracy and removes a systemic bias towards underestimation in black patients. Specifically, algorithms using race result in higher eGFR values (which suggest better kidney function) for anyone identified as black. Some researchers claim that the systematically higher eGFR scores from incorporating race leads to disadvantages for black patients, such as late referral for kidney transplants [2]. Meanwhile, others note that underestimation without incorporating race could lead to unintended consequences such as early dialysis initiation, inadequate dosing of drugs, and limited access to treatments [51]. Ultimately, the National Kidney Foundation and the American Society of Nephrology decided on a new algorithm without a race correction, even though it had lower overall accuracy. They reached this decision with considerable input from hundreds of stakeholders “to achieve consensus for an unbiased and most reasonably accurate estimation of GFR so that laboratories, clinicians, patients and public health officials can make informed decisions to ensure equity and personalized care for patients with kidney diseases” [23].

While these steps to improve the legitimacy of eGFR are imperative, further steps could have been taken to reduce the severity of harms in CKD management, especially for black patients. Instead of recommending one less accurate but “race-free” algorithm, several different algorithms could have been recommended for different decision points in the care process with mechanisms for transparency regarding their potential biases and what impact this could have on various patients. For example, the original equation with race correction prevented underdosing and qualified more black patients as organ donors, while the new equation results in much earlier transplant referrals for black patients than before [23]. In addition to multiple algorithms, having formal processes for patient recourse would also reduce the severity of CKD management decisions. Power differentials between the patient and the doctor make it imperative to create an equitable process for contesting medical decisions [33]. While these goals would require systemic changes in CKD management, prioritizing ways to reduce the severity of harms would go a long way in addressing the structural injustices of the healthcare system that even the most legitimate algorithms cannot solve alone.

### 5.3 Criminal Justice

The cycle of mass incarceration in the U.S. criminal justice system constitutes a severe bottleneck for many defendants and their families. When compared to other nations, defendants in the U.S. are more likely to end up in prison, serve longer sentences, and commit future crimes. In particular, almost 80% of those released from state prisons are re-arrested within five years [52]. This pervasive cycle has led to the current state of mass incarceration, with over 1 million people locked up in prison and over 500,000 in jail. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of those in jail

are not convicted and simply awaiting trial [66]. This severe state of pretrial detention is directly influenced by risk assessment algorithms, which increasingly inform bail and sentencing decisions. In fact, over 60% of the U.S. population lives in a jurisdiction using these algorithms [63].

The severe consequences of ending up in the criminal justice system make it imperative to ensure the legitimacy of risk assessment algorithms. The canonical debate around the COMPAS algorithm centers on the social legitimacy of different formal fairness approaches [18]. On one side, COMPAS argued for their tool’s legitimacy on the basis of calibration: the algorithm predicted a risk score between 1 and 10, and at each level, black and white defendants were roughly equally likely to reoffend. On the other side, ProPublica argued that this problem formulation ignored the social context that black defendants have a higher overall recidivism rate than white defendants, in part due to biases in the criminal justice system and over-policing of minority neighborhoods [4]. This causes black defendants who don’t reoffend to be predicted as riskier by the algorithm than white defendants who don’t reoffend. The courts grappled with this dilemma when considering COMPAS’s legality in *Wisconsin v. Loomis*: “[We] caution circuit courts that because COMPAS risk assessment scores are based on group data, they are able to identify groups of high-risk offenders—not a particular high-risk individual. Accordingly, a circuit court is expected to consider this caution as it weighs all the factors that are relevant to sentencing an individual defendant” [60].

While the courts left it open to individual cases to determine the legitimacy of COMPAS, they placed clear bounds on its severity: “Although we ultimately conclude that a COMPAS risk assessment can be used at sentencing, we do so by circumscribing its use...we set forth the corollary limitation that risk scores may not be used as the determinative factor in deciding whether the offender can be supervised safely and effectively in the community” [60]. This severity-oriented view should further extend to other aspects of pretrial detention. Many less severe options could be adopted for defendants awaiting trial, such as community service, rehabilitation programs, house arrest, and electronic-monitoring devices [52]. Moreover, high-risk predictions could be used as an indicator that an individual needs additional support and resources to mitigate the chances of recidivism [53]. Reducing the severity of the pretrial detention process would lessen the stakes of risk assessment algorithms and debates about its legitimacy.

## 6 RELATED WORK

A formal approach to fairness has been the primary philosophical lens of the algorithmic fairness community. Central aspects of this approach consist of formulating mathematical definitions of fairness and developing methods that satisfy or check for violations of these definitions [38, 44]. Many of these methods adopt the perspective of formal equal opportunity to introduce fairness metrics [37, 38, 44], map these metrics to various principles [5, 40], and present theories of justice for artificial intelligence [31].

Our work joins the many in the algorithmic fairness community that have criticized the narrow scope of distributive fairness interventions and their reliance on formal equal opportunity principles, which offer an incomplete normative palette for thinking about discrimination. As pointed out by Green [34] and Kasirzadeh [45], formal approaches often suffer from the same methodological limitations as formal equal opportunity principles and are subsequently susceptible to “ethics washing”. These limitations include zero-sum thinking as well as the tendency to ignore the power relations, social dynamics, and the structural contexts that surround systems of algorithmic decision-making in the real world [42, 45, 67]. A fundamentally equitable path must adopt a wider frame, considering all “unquestioned or intuitive assumptions in datasets, current and historical injustices, and power asymmetries,” [8] as well as the larger opportunity structure itself. Although many mathematical evaluations reflexively nod at these challenges, there remains a significant gap between mathematical evaluations of fairness and an algorithm’s real world impacts. Thus,

algorithms satisfying fairness standards run the risk of exacerbating oppression and legitimizing institutional injustices. These notable deficiencies have inspired many other approaches and perspectives, such as a structural injustice view from feminist political philosophy [45], relational approaches to substantive fairness [34, 35], and consequentialist approaches to fairness [14, 17].

The work of Ben Green [34] is the most similar to our work, offering a similar critique of formal equal opportunity through a subtly different analysis and intervention. Green [34] proposes an approach termed “substantive algorithmic fairness,” which promotes a justice-oriented agenda for developing and deploying algorithms. His approach is two-pronged, consisting of (1) reducing the upstream social disparities that feed into the decision-making process, and (2) reducing the downstream harms that result for those judged unfavorably within decision-making processes. The first intervention is meant to target the relational harms of “social and material disparities grounded in social hierarchy,” and therefore address the legitimacy concerns raised by Anderson [3] and Minow [55]. The second intervention is meant to target the structural aim of “reducing the scope and stakes of decisions that act on social disparities,” and thus address the severity concerns highlighted by Fishkin [28].

While Green’s approach is undoubtedly useful, our outlooks differ in two ways. First, our framework makes clear that legitimacy and severity concerns don’t just lie either upstream or downstream of a decision-point, but rather are both structural concerns implicating the entire decision-making process. Take the example of college education, where regardless of any upstream relational differences or harms that have occurred between groups, colleges might still adopt a consequentialist approach and consider the diversity that occurs downstream of the decision to be a legitimate value to prioritize. Accounting for severity, as well, requires understanding bottlenecks that exist both upstream and downstream of the decision point. Second, while substantive algorithmic fairness calls for both legitimacy- and severity-targeted interventions equally, our framework of algorithmic pluralism argues that severity-targeted interventions should often be prioritized (c.f. Section 4 – legitimacy matters, but severity takes precedent).

*Concluding Remarks.* Fishkin’s idea of opportunity pluralism makes the case that societies ought to move their structures of opportunity towards a more pluralistic model, where there are many gatekeepers and paths towards opportunities [28]. As our economy increasingly relies on artificial intelligence, we emphasize the importance of extending this idea to systems of data-driven decision-making through algorithmic pluralism. Towards the end of his book, Fishkin emphasizes that opportunity pluralism has vast implications for various institutions and stakeholders. He aspires to encourage gatekeepers who wish to help build a more pluralistic opportunity structure to reexamine and ameliorate the bottlenecks that result from how they make decisions. We similarly implore the data scientists responsible for designing models, gatekeepers who ultimately make decisions, and policymakers regulating algorithmic systems to isolate where they have the leverage to ameliorate bottlenecks, especially those that are most severe.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2022. Chronic Kidney Disease in the United States, 2021. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed: 2023-5-10.
- [2] Salman Ahmed, Cameron T Nutt, Nwamaka D Eneanya, Peter P Reese, Karthik Sivashanker, Michelle Morse, Thomas Sequist, and Mallika L Mendu. 2021. Examining the potential impact of race multiplier utilization in estimated glomerular filtration rate calculation on African-American care outcomes. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 36 (2021), 464–471.
- [3] Elizabeth S. Anderson. 1999. What Is the Point of Equality? *Ethics* 109, 2 (1999), 287–337. <https://doi.org/10.1086/233897>
- [4] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. 2016. Machine bias. In *Ethics of data and analytics*. Auerbach Publications, 254–264.
- [5] Falaah Arif Khan, Eleni Manis, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2022. Towards Substantive Conceptions of Algorithmic Fairness: Normative Guidance from Equal Opportunity Doctrines. In *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization* (Arlington, VA, USA) (EAAAMO ’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 18, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551624.3555303>

- [6] Dominique J Baker and Michael N Bastedo. 2022. What If We Leave It Up to Chance? Admissions Lotteries and Equitable Access at Selective Colleges. *Educational Researcher* 51, 2 (2022), 134–145.
- [7] Joshua Ballance, Robert Clifford, and Daniel Shoag. 2020. “No more credit score”: Employer credit check bans and signal substitution. *Labour Economics* 63 (2020), 101769.
- [8] Abeba Birhane. 2021. Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach. *Patterns* 2, 2 (2021), 100205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2021.100205>
- [9] Emily Black, Manish Raghavan, and Solon Barocas. 2022. Model Multiplicity: Opportunities, Concerns, and Solutions. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (FAccT ’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 850–863. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533149>
- [10] Rishi Bommasani, Kathleen A. Creel, Ananya Kumar, Dan Jurafsky, and Percy S Liang. 2022. Picking on the Same Person: Does Algorithmic Monoculture lead to Outcome Homogenization?. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.), Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 3663–3678. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/file/17a234c91f746d9625a75cf8a8731ee2-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/17a234c91f746d9625a75cf8a8731ee2-Paper-Conference.pdf)
- [11] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258* (2021).
- [12] Josephine P Briggs and Donald Wesson. 2021. Introducing a Special Series: Addressing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Kidney Disease. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology* 32, 10 (2021), 2417–2418.
- [13] Toon Calders, Faisal Kamiran, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. 2009. Building classifiers with independency constraints. In *2009 IEEE international conference on data mining workshops*. IEEE, 13–18.
- [14] Alex Chohlas-Wood, Madison Coots, Henry Zhu, Emma Brunskill, and Sharad Goel. 2021. Learning to be fair: A consequentialist approach to equitable decision-making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08792* (2021).
- [15] US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1979. Questions and Answers to Clarify and Provide a Common Interpretation of the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures.
- [16] Dalton Conley. 2018. Enough fretting over college admissions: It’s time for a lottery. *Washington Post*.
- [17] Sam Corbett-Davies and Sharad Goel. 2018. The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00023* (2018).
- [18] Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, and Sharad Goel. 2016. A computer program used for bail and sentencing decisions was labeled biased against blacks. It’s actually not that clear. *Washington Post* 17 (2016).
- [19] Sasha Costanza-Chock. 2018. Design justice, AI, and escape from the matrix of domination. *Journal of Design and Science* 3, 5 (2018).
- [20] Ryan L Crass, Keith A Rodvold, Bruce A Mueller, and Manjunath P Pai. 2019. Renal dosing of antibiotics: are we jumping the gun? *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 68, 9 (2019), 1596–1602.
- [21] Kathleen Creel and Deborah Hellman. 2022. The Algorithmic Leviathan: Arbitrariness, Fairness, and Opportunity in Algorithmic Decision-Making Systems. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 52, 1 (2022), 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1017/can.2022.3>
- [22] Jenny L Davis, Apryl Williams, and Michael W Yang. 2021. Algorithmic reparation. *Big Data & Society* 8, 2 (2021), 20539517211044808.
- [23] Cynthia Delgado, Mukta Baweja, Deidra C Crews, Nwamaka D Eneanya, Crystal A Gadegbeku, Lesley A Inker, Mallika L Mendu, W Greg Miller, Marva M Moxey-Mims, Glenda V Roberts, et al. 2022. A unifying approach for GFR estimation: recommendations of the NKF-ASN task force on reassessing the inclusion of race in diagnosing kidney disease. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases* 79, 2 (2022), 268–288.
- [24] Nisa Desai, Claudia M Lora, James P Lash, and Ana C Ricardo. 2019. CKD and ESRD in US Hispanics. *Am. J. Kidney Dis.* 73, 1 (Jan. 2019), 102–111.
- [25] John Dewey. 1938. *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. (1938).
- [26] Kate Donahue, Alexandra Chouldechova, and Krishnaram Kenthapadi. 2022. Human-Algorithm Collaboration: Achieving Complementarity and Avoiding Unfairness. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (FAccT ’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1639–1656. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533221>
- [27] Benjamin Eidelson. 2021. Patterned Inequality, Compounding Injustice, and Algorithmic Prediction. *American Journal of Law and Equality* 1 (2021), 252–276.
- [28] Joseph Fishkin. 2014. *Bottlenecks: A new theory of equal opportunity*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- [29] Joseph Fishkin and William E Forbath. 2014. The anti-oligarchy constitution. *BUL Rev.* 94 (2014), 669.
- [30] Sorelle A Friedler, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. 2021. The (im) possibility of fairness: Different value systems require different mechanisms for fair decision making. *Commun. ACM* 64, 4 (2021), 136–143.
- [31] Iason Gabriel. 2022. Toward a theory of justice for artificial intelligence. *Daedalus* 151, 2 (2022), 218–231.
- [32] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. 2021. Datasheets for datasets. *Commun. ACM* 64, 12 (2021), 86–92.
- [33] Felicity Goodyear-Smith and Stephen Buetow. 2001. Power issues in the doctor-patient relationship. *Health care analysis* 9 (2001), 449–462.
- [34] Ben Green. 2022. Escaping the Impossibility of Fairness: From Formal to Substantive Algorithmic Fairness. *Philosophy and Technology* 35 (12 2022), Issue 4.
- [35] Ben Green and Salomé Viljoen. 2020. Algorithmic Realism: Expanding the Boundaries of Algorithmic Thought. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Barcelona, Spain) (FAT\* ’20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372840>

- [36] Moritz Hardt and Michael P Kim. 2022. Backward baselines: Is your model predicting the past? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11673* (2022).
- [37] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [38] Tatsunori Hashimoto, Megha Srivastava, Hongseok Namkoong, and Percy Liang. 2018. Fairness without demographics in repeated loss minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1929–1938.
- [39] Brian Hedden. 2021. On statistical criteria of algorithmic fairness. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 49, 2 (2021).
- [40] Hoda Heidari, Michele Loi, Krishna P Gummadi, and Andreas Krause. 2019. A moral framework for understanding fair ml through economic models of equality of opportunity. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 181–190.
- [41] Deborah Hellman. 2018. Indirect discrimination and the duty to avoid compounding injustice. *Foundations of Indirect Discrimination Law, Hart Publishing Company* (2018), 2017–53.
- [42] Anna Lauren Hoffmann. 2019. Where fairness fails: data, algorithms, and the limits of antidiscrimination discourse. *Information, Communication & Society* 22, 7 (2019), 900–915.
- [43] Haeyoun Park Jeremy Ashkenas and Adam Pearce. 2017. Even With Affirmative Action, Blacks and Hispanics Are More Underrepresented at Top Colleges Than 35 Years Ago. *New York Times*.
- [44] Matthew Joseph, Michael Kearns, Jamie Morgenstern, Seth Neel, and Aaron Roth. 2016. Rawlsian fairness for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.09559* (2016).
- [45] Atoosa Kasirzadeh. 2022. Algorithmic Fairness and Structural Injustice: Insights from Feminist Political Philosophy. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 349–356.
- [46] Maximilian Kasy and Rediet Abebe. 2021. Fairness, equality, and power in algorithmic decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 576–586.
- [47] Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. 2016. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05807* (2016).
- [48] Jon Kleinberg and Manish Raghavan. 2021. Algorithmic monoculture and social welfare. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, 22 (2021), e2018340118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2018340118> arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.2018340118>
- [49] Andrew S Levey, Juan P Bosch, Julia Breyer Lewis, Tom Greene, Nancy Rogers, David Roth, and Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group\*. 1999. A more accurate method to estimate glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine: a new prediction equation. *Annals of internal medicine* 130, 6 (1999), 461–470.
- [50] Andrew S Levey, Lesley A Stevens, Christopher H Schmid, Yaping Zhang, Alejandro F Castro III, Harold I Feldman, John W Kusek, Paul Eggers, Frederick Van Lente, Tom Greene, et al. 2009. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Annals of internal medicine* 150, 9 (2009), 604–612.
- [51] Andrew S Levey, Silvia M Titan, Neil R Powe, Josef Coresh, and Lesley A Inker. 2020. Kidney disease, race, and GFR estimation. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology* 15, 8 (2020), 1203–1212.
- [52] Marc Mauer. 2018. Long-Term Sentences: Time to Reconsider the Scale of Punishment. <https://www.sentencingproject.org>.
- [53] Sandra G Mayson. 2019. Bias in, bias out. *The Yale Law Journal* 128, 8 (2019), 2218–2300.
- [54] Celestine Mender-Dünner, Juan Perdomo, Tijana Zrnic, and Moritz Hardt. 2020. Stochastic optimization for performative prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 4929–4939.
- [55] Martha Minow. 1990. *Making all the difference: Inclusion, exclusion, and American law*. Cornell University Press.
- [56] Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. 2019. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 220–229.
- [57] 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 (2019), 447–453. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342> arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.aax2342>
- [58] Supreme Court of the United States. 2022. Students For Fair Admission, Inc., v. President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- [59] Supreme Court of the United States. 2022. Students For Fair Admission, Inc., v. University of North Carolina, et al.
- [60] Supreme Court of Wisconsin. 2016. State of Wisconsin v. Eric L. Loomis.
- [61] Cathy O’Neil. 2017. *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- [62] Juan Perdomo, Tijana Zrnic, Celestine Mender-Dünner, and Moritz Hardt. 2020. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 7599–7609.
- [63] Movement Alliance Project. [n. d.]. Where are risk assessments being used? <https://pretrialrisk.com>.
- [64] 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* (Barcelona, Spain) (FAT\* ’20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 469–481. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372828>
- [65] John Rawls. 2004. A theory of justice. In *Ethics*. Routledge, 229–234.
- [66] Wendy Sawyer and Peter Wagner. 2023. Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie 2023. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org>.
- [67] Andrew D Selbst, Danah Boyd, Sorelle A Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 59–68.

- [68] Divya Siddarth, Daron Acemoglu, Danielle Allen, Kate Crawford, James Evans, Michael Jordan, and E Weyl. 2021. How AI fails us. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.04200* (2021).
- [69] Rohan Taori and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2022. Data Feedback Loops: Model-driven Amplification of Dataset Biases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03942* (2022).
- [70] David Trend. 2022. 75% of New Jobs Require a Degree While Only 40% of Potential Applicants Have One. <https://truthout.org>.
- [71] Suresh Venkatasubramanian and Mark Alfano. 2020. The philosophical basis of algorithmic recourse. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 284–293.
- [72] Bryan Walsh. 2023. Why we should run elite college admissions like a lottery. Vox.
- [73] Bernard Williams, Peter Laslett, and Walter G Runciman. 1962. *The idea of equality*.
- [74] Indre Zliobaite. 2015. On the relation between accuracy and fairness in binary classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05723* (2015).