

# Fairness implications of encoding protected categorical attributes

CARLOS MOUGAN, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

JOSE M. ALVAREZ, University of Pisa, Italy

GOURAB K PATRO, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India and L3S Research Center, Hannover, Germany

SALVATORE RUGGIERI, University of Pisa, Italy

STEFFEN STAAB, University of Southampton, United Kingdom and University of Stuttgart, Germany

Protected attributes are often presented as categorical features that need to be encoded before feeding them into a machine learning algorithm. Encoding these attributes is paramount as they determine the way the algorithm will learn from the data. Categorical feature encoding has a direct impact on the model performance and fairness. In this work, we compare the accuracy and fairness implications of the two most well-known encoders: one-hot encoding and target encoding. We distinguish between two types of induced bias that can arise while using these encodings and can lead to unfair models. The first type, *irreducible bias*, is due to direct group category discrimination and a second type, *reducible bias*, is due to large variance in less statistically represented groups. We take a deeper look into how regularization methods for target encoding can improve the induced bias while encoding categorical features. Furthermore, we tackle the problem of intersectional fairness that arises when mixing two protected categorical features leading to higher cardinality. This practice is a powerful feature engineering technique used for boosting model performance. We study its implications on fairness as it can increase both types of induced bias.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Supervised learning by classification**; **Classification and regression trees**; **Anomaly detection**; **Supervised learning by regression**; • **Social and professional topics** → **Socio-technical systems**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Fairness, Algorithmic Accountability, Categorical Features, Bias

## ACM Reference Format:

Carlos Mougan, Jose M. Alvarez, Gourab K Patro, Salvatore Ruggieri, and Steffen Staab. 2022. Fairness implications of encoding protected categorical attributes. 1, 1 (January 2022), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Anti-discrimination laws [2, 13, 14] prohibit the unfair treatment of individuals based on *sensitive attributes* (also referred to as *protected attributes*). The list of sensitive attributes varies per country, though these usually include gender, ethnicity, and religion [52]. Following such legal motivations along with societal expectations, many studies have looked into discrimination in machine learning and proposed various ways to promote fairness (e.g., [15, 35]).

---

Authors' addresses: Carlos Mougan, University of Southampton, United Kingdom, c.mougan-navarro@soton.ac.uk; Jose M. Alvarez, University of Pisa, Italy, jose.alvarez@di.unipi.it; Gourab K Patro, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India and L3S Research Center, Hannover, Germany, gourab@patro.com; Salvatore Ruggieri, University of Pisa, Italy, salvatore.ruggieri@unipi.it; Steffen Staab, University of Southampton, United Kingdom and University of Stuttgart, Germany, S.R.Staab@soton.ac.uk.

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

Sensitive attributes are central to fairness and so are their handling throughout the machine learning pipeline. An early common practice was removing data on sensitive attributes altogether. This technique has been debunked and the overall practice discouraged as sensitive personal data like an individual’s gender or race may be necessary for avoiding discrimination in data-driven decision models [65]. Later works [23, 62, 63] thus have focused on how to obtain fairer models given the presence of sensitive attributes, phrasing the problem as a trade-off to be optimized between model quality (in terms of performance) and some fairness objective.

Sensitive attributes often come in the form of categorical data. For instance, roughly 75% of the famous COMPAS dataset [29] consists of categorical attributes, including most of the sensitive ones (see Section 5.1 for more details). Further, many machine learning algorithms require categorical attributes to be suitably *encoded* as numerical data before being fed to algorithms. Different ways of encoding categorical features into numerical ones [25, 36, 40] have been proposed and extensively studied in the literature along with statistical regularization methods since the mid-1950s [44]. This has resulted in various encoding methods being proposed to make categorical attributes into numerical data and more useful for exploitation by the machine learning model.

In this paper, we study the broader implications that encoding categorical sensitive attributes can have on fairness and model accuracy. Despite being a common machine learning practice, often falling within the data pre-processing step, its effects on fairness remain largely unexplored. For instance, in the fairness works previously mentioned the presence of sensitive attributes is assumed and so are their feature encoding. Given the range of available categorical encoding methods and the fact that they often must deal with sensitive attributes, we believe this first study on the subject to be of value to the fair machine learning community.

We focus on the two most widely used encodings: one-hot encoding and target encoding [40, 44, 46, 57]. *One-hot encoding*, an unsupervised technique, produces orthogonal and equidistant vectors for each category [3, 40, 42], thereby considering the categories to be equally independent of each other and other attributes. However, when dealing with high cardinality categorical variables, one-hot encoding suffers from a lack of scalability and sparsity issues (later discussed in Section 2) due to the creation of many orthogonal dimensions. *Target Encoding* [36, 40, 44], a supervised technique, on the other hand is well-equipped to deal with high cardinality of categorical variables. In target encoding, categorical features are replaced with the mean target value of each respective category.<sup>1</sup>

Interestingly, many datasets contain imbalanced distributions of data over different values of categorical attributes, often leading to performance degradation of the learning models (known as the *classes imbalance problem* [28]). The use of target encoding in such datasets would naturally introduce disparity as per the imbalance seen in a dataset. Therefore, beyond the primary problem of unfairness possibly acquired from the use of protected attributes, which we call *induced irreducible bias*, the secondary problem of *induced reducible bias* may imply unfairness because of large variance found in sampling small groups. The effects of encodings on model quality and fairness under the interplay of irreducible and reducible bias have not been studied in the literature, although they concern a machine learning practice that is ubiquitous, especially when personal data is involved. Moreover, when a dataset contains several sensitive categorical attributes, and these are merged into one (a strategy often followed to improve model quality substantially [21]), encodings create an intersectionality problem [30, 31] by simultaneously racing the chance of introducing both types of induced biases.

<sup>1</sup>Target encoding methods have become an industry standard for high-cardinality categorical data [21, 40, 44, 50] with algorithmic procedures being implemented in many open source packages [8, 57]. One of the most common is *category encoders* ([https://pepy.tech/project/category\\_encoders](https://pepy.tech/project/category_encoders), a Python package). It achieves up to 1 million downloads per month. Category encoders is the default encoding method in some high-performance open-source software implementations such as *catboost* [11, 22, 46] that has reached a total download of 33 millions.

To illustrate the two types of biases, consider the example of COMPAS where the goal is to predict the risk that a defendant will re-offend. Studies [16, 29] reveal that a criminal’s ethnicity was paramount when determining recidivism score; the numerical encoding of large ethnicity groups such as *African-American* or *Caucasian* may lead to discrimination, which is an unfair effect coming from the irreducible bias. Similarly, reducible bias can be found and introduced when encoding the ethnicity category *Arabic*, which is rarely represented in the data, provoking a large sampling variance that ends in an almost random and unrealistic encoding. It is in this regard why we also explore statistical regularization techniques for target encoding as unregularized target encoding does not perform well on categories with little statistical mass, tending to overfit the training data [40].

For target encoding, we study two popular statistical regularizations methods called *smoothing* and *Gaussian noise regularization*, which provides a new avenue for the analysis of implications of categorical encodings on fairness. Through both a simple theoretical analysis as well as an empirical analysis using two real-world datasets (COMPAS [29] and Law School Admission [33]), we find that with suitable regularization the target encoding can substantially improve fairness (concerning the default option of one-hot encoding) with only marginal losses in accuracy.<sup>2</sup> In summary, we make the following contributions:

- We identify two types of induced biases, irreducible and reducible, that arise while encoding categorical protected attributes.
- We compare the two best-known categorical feature encoding methods, one-hot encoding, and target encoding, in terms of model performance and the two types of induced biases.
- We study the relation between regularizing target encoding and fairness by comparing the two most used regularization techniques: smoothing and Gaussian noise.
- Our paper provides evidence that intersectional fairness can boost the model performance but at the same time increase the risk of discrimination. Though, similarly, we show that a regularized target encoder can account for this opening the possibility of implementing intersectional fairness within machine learning models.

Recent works on fair machine learning [23, 60, 62, 63] propose various in-processing methods where the objectives or constraints of the machine learning model itself need to be changed which may or may not be possible in real-world systems of scale. In this regard, we quote the following from Rodolfa et al. [48]: “*A common underpinning of much of this work is the assumption that trade-offs between equity and accuracy may necessitate complex methods or difficult policy choices [18, 26, 30, 48].*” Since target encoding with regularization is not only easy to perform but also does not require significant changes to the machine learning models, it can be explored in the future as suitable complementary for in-processing methods in fair machine learning.

In the rest of the paper, we discuss background knowledge and notation in Sections 2 and 3. We provide the theoretical and empirical analysis in Sections 4 and 5. Finally, considering that we are the first to analyse the impacts of target encoding on the accuracy and fairness of learning models, we provide an outline of possible future work in Section 6

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Categorical feature encoding

Handling categorical features is a common problem in machine learning, given that many algorithms need to be fed with numerical data [54]. There are many well-known methods for approaching this problem [43]. The aim of this

<sup>2</sup>In this work we use the term “accuracy” in a non-literally sense to refer to the model performance, rather than the statistical evaluation metric of the same name. In Section 5.2, we discuss the adequate evaluation metric for our scenarios.

section is to provide an introduction to the encoding methods considered in this paper. It is not an attempt to provide an exhaustive or even systematic literature review: indeed the literature is far too extensive for that.

The most established encoding for categorical features with low cardinality is *one-hot encoding* [3] (also known as dummy variables in the social sciences [58]). This encoding method constructs orthogonal and equidistant vectors for each category. However, in high cardinality categorical features scenarios, one-hot encoding suffers from several shortcomings: the dimension of the input space increases with the cardinality of the encoded variable; the created features are sparse—in many cases, most of the encoded vectors hardly appear in the data; and one-hot encoding does not handle new and unseen categories [40, 53].

A popular alternative encoding technique for one-hot encoding is *label/ordinal encoding* [4], which uses a range of integers to represent the different categorical values. These are assumed to have no true order and integers are assigned in the order of appearance of the categories. Label encoding handles the problem of high cardinality found in one-hot encoding, but imposes an artificial order to the categories that in many cases is random. This in turn obstructs the model to extract meaningful information from the categorical data.

(a) Unregularized Mean Target Encoding

Ethnic	Encoding
African-American	1
Caucasian	1/3
Caucasian	1/3
Caucasian	1/3
Hispanic	0

(b) One Hot Encoding

Ethnic	African-American	Caucasian	Hispanic
African-American	1	0	0
Caucasian	0	1	0
Caucasian	0	1	0
Caucasian	0	1	0
Hispanic	0	0	1

Table 1. An illustrative example of one-hot and target encoding methods over the same data sample.

Alternatively, *target encoding* [36] works as an effective solution to overcome the issue of high cardinality. In target encoding, categorical features are replaced with the mean target value of each respective category. With this technique, the high cardinality problem is handled and categories are ordered. The main drawback of target encoding appears when categories with few samples are replaced by values close to the desired target. This introduces bias to the model as it over-trusts the target encoded feature and makes the model prone to over-fitting. To overcome this problem several strategies introduce regularization terms in the target estimation [36, 40, 44].

In Table 1, we can see the encoding results of the categories of a toy example from the COMPAS dataset [29]. Categories are encoded in table 1 with the one-hot encoding and target encoding methods. The problem of unregularization is evident for the cases of *African-American* and *Hispanic* where their encoding is replaced directly with the target, creating a data leakage that causes reducible induced bias (cf. Section 5).

## 2.2 Group Fairness

Various definitions of fairness in machine learning have been proposed (see, e.g., [1, 15, 35] for recent overviews). They can be categorized into individual and group notions of fairness. While the individual notions of fairness emphasize on *treating similar individuals similarly* [12], group fairness notions aim to establish some form of parity between groups of individuals based on shared sensitive attributes like gender and race. Here, we limit our discussion to group fairness notions since the focus of the work is on the practice of encoding sensitive attributes. Various forms of parity between groups have been proposed in the literature: statistical parity [7], equal opportunity [24], and equal misclassification

rates [61]. Following Hardt et al. [24]’s emphasis on ensuring fair opportunity instead of raw outcomes (it also remains a guiding principle in domains like credit scoring [41, 45]), we choose *equal opportunity* (EO) as the fairness notion and use the metric *disparate treatment* (difference between the true positive rates) to measure unfairness.

In this work, we can distinguish and define two types of induced bias or discrimination that the encoding of categorical attributes introduces. For the nomenclature, we use a similar terminology as in the uncertainty field [9, 20, 32]. *Irreducible* bias refers to (direct) group discrimination arising from the categorization of groups into labels: more data about the compared groups do not reduce this type of bias. *Reducible* bias arises due to the variance when encoding groups that have a small statistical representation, sometimes even only very few instances of the group.

### 2.3 Intersectional fairness

Most of the previous work on group fairness has focused on single sensitive attributes. For example, a common interest in studying fairness will be across the features of Ethnicity and Marital status, comparing separately, say, *African American* vs. *Caucasian* and *Married* vs. *Single* outcomes. However, inspired in particular by feminist studies (e.g., [6, 10]), recent work has focused on studying intersectional fairness (e.g., [17, 59]) where we consider the intersection across different sensitive attributes. Going back to our example, under intersectionality we would be interested also in *African-American Single* outcomes, which could be a more marginalized group.

Intersectional fairness is important as it is possible to be fair on single attributes while being unfair on the intersection of these attributes [59]. Further, it aligns with existing legal notions of multi-dimensional discrimination where multiple grounds operate simultaneously [52, 55]. A distinction is made between *additive discrimination* where two or more protected attributes are considered individually (“African-American” and “Single”), and *intersectional discrimination* where these protected attributes are considered together (“African-American Single”). Within fair machine learning, intersectional fairness remains largely unexplored. We believe that this is partly due to the inherent dimensionality problem that comes with operationalizing it. Already, under the standard one-hot encoding going from an additive to an intersectional approach increases exponentially the number of categorical sensitive attributes.

From a feature engineering perspective, a common trick to boost the performance of a machine learning model is to concatenate several categorical variables and later encode them [21]. This feature engineering technique parallels implementing intersectional fairness in the case where we concatenated two sensitive attributes. We note that although this technique can boost model performance, it can also lead to higher discrimination. Therefore, in our work we analyze the capability of target encoding regularization as a method that can allow us to implement intersectional fairness through target encoding while also enabling us to mitigate the potential induced biases from the encoding of the concatenated variable via the regularization.

## 3 REGULARIZATION OF TARGET ENCODING

In this section, we introduce the notation that we will use throughout the paper, formalize the problem and methods of target encoding regularization, and give grounds for the choices of metrics and models used for the experiments. Consider a categorical attribute  $X$  with domain  $dom(X) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , a binary class attribute  $Y$  with  $dom(Y) = \{+, -\}$ , and the joint probability of  $P(X, Y)$  over the population of interest. Target encoding replaces  $X$  with a continuous attribute  $X^*$  with  $dom(X^*) \in [0, 1]$ . Values  $x_i \in dom(X)$ , for  $i \in [1, n]$  are encoded to values  $x_i^*$  in a supervised way, as follows:

$$x_i^* = p_i \quad \text{where } p_i = P(Y = + | X = x_i) \quad (1)$$

Since  $P(\cdot)$  is typically unknown, an estimate of the posterior probability  $p_i$  is adopted, derived from a dataset of observations  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  (training set).

Let  $n$  be the total number of observations,  $n_i$  the number of observations where  $X = x_i$ , and  $n_Y$  the number of observations where  $Y = +$ , and  $n_{i,Y}$  the number of observations where  $X = x_i$  and  $Y = +$ . A candidate estimator is to consider the observed fraction of positives among those with  $X = x_i$ , hence encoding:

$$x_i^* = \hat{p}_i \quad \text{where } \hat{p}_i = \frac{n_{i,Y}}{n_i} \quad (2)$$

Such an estimator is unbiased, namely  $E[\hat{p}_i] = p_i = P(Y = +|X = x_i)$ . More precisely, by Hoeffding bounds [27]  $P(|\hat{p}_i - p_i| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2e^{-2n_i\epsilon^2}$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . However, the variance  $Var[\hat{p}_i] = p_i(1 - p_i)/n_i$  is relatively large when  $n_i$  is small (and assuming that observations are i.i.d.).

Unregularized target encoding does not perform well on categories with little statistical mass [46] as it tends to overfit the training data, failing to generalize to new data. In the extreme cases of almost unique values, it will replace the categorical value with the target. This encoding will be unrepresentative of the category and introduces a sampling, or data collection, bias at the pre-processing stage. This type of bias is what we defined as reducible bias (Section 2) and can be left unnoticed because extremely small categories do not impact significantly the overall loss of the problem, but can still have an impact on fairness metrics across the category.

To avoid overfitting issues, practitioners regularize using two main techniques (i) smoothing, which shrinks those effects towards the global mean, and (ii) Gaussian noise, that adds normal (Gaussian) distribution noise into training data in order to decrease overfitting. Even though there can be found more on the literature [57], these two regularization techniques are the most common ones and the rest are either minimal variations of these two techniques or not as popular [57].

### 3.1 Smoothing regularization

To account for variability, a form of smoothing is considered, giving rise to encoding:

$$x_i^* = \hat{p}_i \quad \text{where } \hat{p}_i = \lambda(n_i) \frac{n_{i,Y}}{n_i} + (1 - \lambda(n_i)) \frac{n_Y}{n} \quad (3)$$

Here, the proportion of positives among those with  $X = x_i$  is interpolated with the proportion of positives among all observations, namely with an estimate  $\hat{p} = n_Y/n$  of the prior probability  $p = P(Y = +)$ . The choice of the prior probability is natural because, lacking any sufficient observations for  $X = x_i$ , one resorts to the proportion of positives over the whole dataset of observations. The convex combination of the two estimators depend on  $\lambda(n_i) \in [0, 1]$ . The function  $\lambda(\cdot)$  is assumed to be increasing with  $n_i$ . Intuitively, the larger the number of observations with  $X = x_i$ , the more weight we give to the first estimator. Thus, the smoothed estimator is asymptotically unbiased. Conversely, the smaller the number of observations, the more weight we give to the prior probability estimator. Thus, the smoothed estimator has a small variance for small values of  $n_i$ —yet, it is biased towards the prior probability.

### 3.2 Gaussian noise regularization

Gaussian noise regularization adds normal (Gaussian) distribution noise into training data after encoding the categorical attribute as in (2). The intuition is to perturb the data to prevent overfitting the target encoded attribute values. During the prediction stage, testing data are encoded as in (2) with no perturbation. Formally, the  $j^{th}$  occurrence of  $x_i$

in the training set is replaced by:

$$x_{i,j}^* = \hat{p}_{i,j} \quad \text{where } \hat{p}_{i,j} = \frac{n_{i,Y}}{n_i} + \epsilon_{i,j} \quad \epsilon_{i,j} \sim N(0, \lambda^2) \quad (4)$$

where  $\epsilon_{i,j}$ 's are i.i.d. with mean 0 and standard deviation  $\lambda$ . Typical values for  $\lambda$  are set in the range between 0.05 and 0.6 [57].

#### 4 THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Assume that  $X$  is the only predictive attribute, and consider a classification problem intended to maximize the accuracy of predictions given the encoded attribute  $X^*$ , namely:

$$\hat{Y}(x_i^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{v \in \{+, -\}} P(Y = v | X^* = x_i^*)$$

When  $X$  is a sensitive attribute, this simple case is compelling. It models situations in which  $X$  is the only observed attribute or all other observed attributes are not informative. How the problem above is solved? Let us distinguish several cases: perfect target encoding, target encoding, and regularization methods.

*The case of perfect target encoding.* Assuming to know the true values  $p_i$ , the perfect encoding would set  $\hat{p}_i = p_i$  as in (1). The classifier that maximizes accuracy *over the population* is:

$$\hat{Y}(x_i^*) = + \text{ if } x_i^* > 0.5 \text{ and } \hat{Y}(x_i^*) = - \text{ otherwise.}$$

Its classification error on the population is:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n P(X = x_i) \cdot \min\{p_i, 1 - p_i\} \quad (5)$$

If instead of accuracy, the interest is in AUC, then the best strategy is to score  $\hat{S}(x_i^*) = x_i^*$ , i.e.,  $\hat{S}(x_i^*) = p_i$ . Assume now that  $X$  is a sensitive attribute, and consider the equal opportunity fairness metric, namely:

$$P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = +, X = x_i) - P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = +, X = x_r) \quad (6)$$

where  $x_i$  is a protected group and  $x_r$  is the reference group. When both  $p_i > 0.5$  and  $p_r > 0.5$ , we have:

$$P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = +, X = x_i) = P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = +, X = x_r) = 1$$

and then the difference is 0. A similar conclusion is obtained when both  $p_i < 0.5$  and  $p_r < 0.5$ . However, when the probabilities  $p_i$  and  $p_r$  lie on different sides of the threshold (i.e.,  $p_i \leq 0.5$  and  $p_r > 0.5$ , or when  $p_i > 0.5$  and  $p_r \leq 0.5$ ), the equal opportunity metrics is large (respectively,  $-1$  and  $1$ ). In other words, the classifier is fair only if the prediction for the reference group is the same as for the protected group, i.e., if membership to the sensitive group is *not* used. But this will impact on accuracy. In fact, assuming a constant prediction  $Y(\hat{p}_i) = +$ , the classification error on the population would be:  $\sum_{i=1}^n P(X = x_i) \cdot (1 - p_i)$ , clearly larger than (5). In summary, even in the case of perfect target encoding, there is a neat tension between accuracy and fairness metrics optimization, and the amount of unfairness is *irreducible* as we assume to know the poster probabilities  $p_i$ 's.

*The case of target encoding.* Let us consider now the encoding using the (un-regularized) estimator  $\hat{p}_i = n_{i,Y}/n_i$ , i.e., (2). The classifier and scorer that maximize empirical accuracy on the training set is:

$$\hat{Y}(\hat{p}_i) = + \text{ if } \hat{p}_i > 0.5 \text{ and } \hat{Y}(\hat{p}_i) = - \text{ otherwise.} \quad \hat{S}(\hat{p}_i) = \hat{p}_i \quad (7)$$

When  $n_i$  is large,  $\hat{p}_i \approx p_i$  (since variance of the estimator is low), and then  $\hat{Y}(\hat{p}_i) \approx \hat{Y}(p_i)$  and  $\hat{S}(\hat{p}_i) \approx \hat{S}(p_i)$ . Thus, the contribution to the classification error (5) and to the AUC are approximately the same as in the case of perfect target encoding. Regarding the fairness metric, we can reasonably assume that  $n_r$  is large for the reference group. Therefore, the equal opportunity metric is unchanged w.r.t. the case of perfect target encoding.

When  $n_i$  is small, the estimate  $\hat{p}_i = n_Y/n$  can be arbitrarily distant from  $p_i$ . What is the impact on the accuracy and fairness metrics? The classification error depends on the actual probability  $P(X = x_i)$  of  $x_i$  in the population, and on the difference  $\hat{p}_i - p_i$ . If the former is small (i.e., the data is actually representative of rare categories), the change in classification error (and in AUC) will be in any case small. The equal opportunity metric is instead independent of  $P(X = x_i)$ . Its value is 0 if  $\hat{p}_i$  and  $\hat{p}_r$  are on the same side of the threshold, and 1 or  $-1$  otherwise. Compared to the case of perfect target encoding, the variability of the estimator  $\hat{p}_i$  propagates to the calculation of the fairness metrics. Hence, target encoding does not solve fairness issues of perfect encoding, but rather it exacerbates the problem by introducing more variability. Such an additional unfairness is, however, *reducible* by increasing the number of observations  $n_i$ .

*The case of smoothing regularization.* Let us consider now the target encoding with smoothing regularization (3). Let  $Y_s()$  and  $S_s()$  be the classifier and scorer that maximize empirical accuracy over the training set.

When  $n_i$  is large, then  $\hat{p}_i \approx n_{i,Y}/n_i \approx p_i$ , and then empirical accuracy for  $X = x_i$  is the same as in the case of target encoding, i.e.,  $\hat{Y}_s(\hat{p}_i) \approx \hat{Y}(p_i)$  and  $\hat{S}_s(\hat{p}_i) \approx \hat{S}(p_i)$ . Thus, the contribution to the classification error (5), to the AUC, and to the equal opportunity metrics are approximately the same as in the case of (perfect) target encoding.

When  $n_i$  is small, we have  $\hat{p}_i \approx n_Y/n \approx p$ , and then instances for  $X = x_i$  and for other small-sized categories are concentrated around the mean value  $X^* = p$ . As the sum of the  $n_i$ 's in those small-sized categories is sufficiently large,  $p_i$  is close to the observed  $P(Y = +|X^* = p)$ , hence  $\hat{Y}_s(\hat{p}_i) = \hat{Y}(p)$ , and  $\hat{S}_s(\hat{p}_i) \approx p$ . What is the impact on the accuracy and fairness metrics? Let us consider two cases.

In the first case, true  $p_i$  and estimated  $\hat{p}_i \approx p$  are both greater than 0.5 or both lower. This means that  $\hat{Y}_s(p_i) = \hat{Y}_s(\hat{p}_i)$ , i.e., the predictions coincide. As a consequence, the contribution to the classification error (5) is the same, while AUC may degrade because scores depart from the best possible option. The equal opportunity metric is unchanged w.r.t. the case of perfect target encoding.

In the second case,  $p_i$  and  $\hat{p}_i \approx p$  are such that one is greater than 0.5 and the other is lower or equal than 0.5. This means that  $\hat{Y}_s(p_i) \neq \hat{Y}_s(\hat{p}_i)$ , i.e., predictions differ. As a consequence, the classification error increases w.r.t. (5) and AUC may degrade. The impact on the equal opportunity metric depends on whether  $\hat{p}_i \approx p$  and the value  $\hat{p}_r \approx p_r$  for the reference group now lie on the same side of the threshold 0.5. This is typically the case e.g., when the reference group is the majority of population and the protected groups are minorities, and then the positive rate over the majority ( $p_r$ ) is close to the average positive rate ( $p$ ). If  $p$  and  $p_r$  are both greater than 0.5 or both lower, then the equal opportunity metric is 0. This would be strictly lower than the case of perfect target encoding if  $p_i$  and  $p_r$  are on different sides of the threshold. In formula, this occurs if  $p_i < 0.5 < p, p_r$  or  $p_r, p < 0.5 < p_i$ . Thus, smoothing regularization would result in an improvement of the fairness metric mainly due to correction of *irreducible* unfairness. If  $p$  and  $p_r$  are on different sides of the threshold, then the equal opportunity metric is 1 or  $-1$ . This is a less typical situation, also considering that  $p_r$  and  $p_i$  would be on the same side of the threshold, but on different side of the average positive rate over the general population. In formula, this occurs if  $p < 0.5 < p_r, p_i$  or  $p_r, p_i < 0.5 < p$ . In such a case, there is a degradation of the fairness metric w.r.t. the perfect encoding, for which the equal opportunity is instead 0. This additional unfairness is *reducible* by increasing the number of observations  $n_i$ .



*The case of Gaussian noise regularization.* Let us finally consider Gaussian noise regularization (4). Called  $\hat{p}_i = n_{i,Y}/n_i$  the target encoding estimator, we have  $\hat{p}_{i,j} = \hat{p}_i + \epsilon_{i,j}$  where  $\epsilon_{i,j} \sim N(0, \lambda^2)$ , i.e., the Gaussian noise estimator is the sum of two independent random variables. Its expectation is  $E[\hat{p}_{i,j}] = E[\hat{p}_i] + E[\epsilon_{i,j}] = p_i$ , hence the estimator is unbiased. Its variance is  $Var[\hat{p}_{i,j}] = Var[\hat{p}_i] + \lambda^2$ . From this, we have that: (1) the variance is larger than in the case of target encoding, and, a fortiori, of the smoothing regularization, (2) the larger the regularization parameter  $\lambda$ , the larger the variance. Training a classifier to optimize empirical accuracy results in degradation of accuracy and AUC over the population. However, the impact on fairness can be beneficial, yet it depends on the actual classifier learnt. To simplify the technical analysis, assume that  $\hat{p}_i$  is concentrated over  $p_i$  with probability 1, namely we have perfect target encoding with Gaussian noise. Then, Gaussian noise changes the instances in the training set with  $X = x_i$  from being centered at  $X^* = p_i$  (perfect target encoding) to span over  $X^* = \hat{p}_{i,j}$  with  $\hat{p}_{i,j} \sim N(p_i, \lambda^2)$ . The observed proportion of positives for  $X = x_i$  is then a weighted mean of the various probabilities  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$ . Weight of  $p_j$  will depend on the number of instances  $n_j$  in the category, and on the distance between  $p_i$  and  $p_j$ . The weighted mean will lead the classification algorithm to estimate  $P(Y = +|X = x_i)$  closer to the observed proportion of the majority categories. As a consequence, the difference between estimations  $P(\hat{Y} = +|Y = +, X = x_i)$  and  $P(\hat{Y} = +|Y = +, X = x_r)$  in the equal opportunity metric will be smaller than without regularization. Therefore, Gaussian noise regularization corrects *irreducible* unfairness. The increase in the number of observations  $n_i$ , will concentrate the weighted mean around the posterior probability  $p_i$ , hence correcting the *reducible* unfairness—as in the case of smoothing regularization.

In summary, for the case of a single predictive attribute, perfect target encoding optimizes for accuracy and reducible unfairness, but not for irreducible unfairness. Target encoding does not change accuracy, but it introduces variability in the fairness metrics, hence adding reducible unfairness. Smoothing regularization trades off accuracy for (irreducible) fairness in the case of minority protected groups (small  $n_i$ ) whose positive probability values  $p_i$  is on different sides of the decision threshold w.r.t. the reference group and the general population. Finally, Gaussian noise regularization degrades performances, but might favorably impact on fairness by correcting reducible unfairness.

While we assumed a fixed threshold of 0.5 for predictions, the reasoning extends to any other fixed threshold. The case of group-specific thresholds, instead, would be more complex to analyse. For a discussion of the impact on accuracy-fairness trade-off, see [49].

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we aim to evaluate the implications of model accuracy and fairness when encoding categorical protected attributes in real datasets for one-hot encoding and target encoding. Furthermore, we study the impact of target encoding regularization and extend our experiments towards an inter-sectional fairness case.

In the first experiment, we tackle the fairness implications from the irreducible bias, by comparing two large groups. In the next experiment, we go through the reducible bias case. Finally, in the last experiment, using intersectional fairness, we improve the model performance but also make a more discriminant model for both bias scenarios. We provide empirical evidence of the implications of encoding protected categorical attributes over two datasets: COMPAS and Law School Admission Council.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Experiments on Law School Admission Council dataset are reported in the appendix (cf. Section 6).

## 5.1 COMPAS

The scenario we want to address is characterized by datasets that display categorical features with a high cardinality of sensitive attributes in a binary classification problem. We make use of the COMPAS dataset [29]. COMPAS is an acronym for Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions, which is an assistive software and support tool used to predict the risk that a criminal defendant will re-offend. The dataset provides a category-based evaluation labeled as high risk of recidivism, medium risk of recidivism, or low risk of recidivism. We convert this multi-class classification problem into binary classification combining the medium risk and high risk of recidivism vs. low risk of recidivism. The input used for the prediction of recidivism consists of 11 categorical features, including gender, custody status, legal status, assessment reason, agency, language, ethnicity, and marital status. The sensitive feature that we will be looking at is *Ethnic* for the single discrimination, whose protected group will be the most represented group: African-American (cf. Figure 1).

For intersectional fairness, we created the variable *EthnicMarital*, engineered by concatenating *Ethnic* and *Marital* status. This new feature has a high cardinality of 46 distinct values (cf. Figure 1). The most predominant category is *African-American Single*, and it will be the protected group (cf. Figure 1) for the intersectional fairness case. To compare disparate treatment between groups we will make use of *Caucasian Married* as the reference group. It is worth noting that the contribution of the features to the model performance, based on feature importance explanation mechanism [34, 37, 39, 47], is highly relevant. The available data is split into a 50/50 stratified train/test split, maintaining the ratio of each category between train and test set.




Fig. 1. Distribution of the protected attribute categories to be encoded and regularized for the COMPAS data [29].

In Figure 1, we show the distributions of the ethnic groups (a) and the intersectional groups of ethnic and marital status (b). There are two groups (*African-American* and *Caucasian*) that account for the 80% of the data, while there are less represented groups such as Asian or Arabic that have a less significant statistical weight. For the intersectional fairness case, the number of groups increases, making room for more distinct, disparate, and imbalanced groups.

## 5.2 Choice of metrics and models

**5.2.1 Equal opportunity fairness.** As a measure of unfairness, we use the notion of equal opportunity (6), which is estimated using the disparate treatment metric [60]—hence, for simplicity, we refer to the interplay of these concepts

as the *equal opportunity fairness (EOF)* metric. The value is the difference in the True Positive Rate (TPR) between the protected group and the reference group:

$$\text{TPR} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} \quad \text{Equal Opportunity Fairness} = \text{TPR}_{\text{African-American}} - \text{TPR}_{\text{Caucasian}} \quad (8)$$

A negative value in (8) is due to the worse ability of a Machine Learning model to find actual recidivists for the protected group (*African-American*) in comparison with the reference group (*Caucasian*).

**5.2.2 Model performance.** For model performance metrics, as we are in a binary classification scenario, we use the Area Under the Curve (AUC)—a metric that illustrates the diagnostic ability of a binary classifier system as its discrimination threshold is varied [25]. This metric is less susceptible to class imbalance than accuracy or precision and also accepts soft probabilities predictions. An AUC of 0.5 is equal to doing random predictions, which can be used as a baseline for interpreting the model performance results. Previous work on fair machine learning experiments on COMPAS have focused on using accuracy as a performance metric [60, 62, 63], but given the target ratio of the full dataset of COMPAS (70 : 30), we consider accuracy to be a less informative measure of model performance.

**5.2.3 Machine learning algorithms.** As classification estimators, we experiment with a linear regression model, a decision tree model, and a gradient boosting decision tree. All models are trained on the training set. These three models provide examples of a model with large bias (the linear regression model), a model with large variance (the decision tree model), and an extensively used and with state-of-the-art performance model (gradient boosting decision tree) [5, 19, 38, 51, 64].

### 5.3 Irreducible bias

The irreducible bias that is induced while encoding categorical features is due to different posterior probabilities among groups. It can be observed for large groups, where instead reducible bias due to variance is low. For this case, we will choose the two largest groups in the COMPAS dataset: *African-American* and *Caucasian*, (Figure 1). Recall that we will benchmark the trade-off between disparate treatment and AUC metrics while using two different encoding techniques (Section 2), with two different regularization techniques (Section 3) and three different estimators (Section 5.2).

The ranges of the regularization hyperparameters are:  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  for the width of the Gaussian noise regularization;  $m \in [0, 10000]$  for the additive smoothing using the  $m$ -probability estimate function  $\lambda(n_i) = n_i / (n_i + m)$  (see [36]). These hyperparameters will also be kept for the rest of the experiments for this dataset. The observed group target mean, namely  $\hat{p}_i = n_{i,Y} / n_i$ , is 0.43 for *African-American*, and 0.25 for *Caucasian*.

Figure 2 shows that the smoothing regularization effects are relevant for the logistic regression and negligible in both fairness and model performance for the other estimators. On the other hand, Gaussian regularization affects both metrics for all estimators. This is due to the adding of white noise to the data inhibiting learning. From Figure 3, we can see that there is an optimal value around 0.3, where the disparate treatment has become negligible and the model performance has only slightly decreased. It is worth noting that performances for both groups have a negative slope. For the one-hot encoding (blue dot), the performance is very similar to the best target encoding (in terms of AUC). But, when the target encoder is correctly regularized (red dots) it achieves less or equal discriminant results consistently.



Fig. 2. Comparing one-hot encoding and target encoding regularization (Gaussian noise and smoothing) for the Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, and Gradient Boosting classifiers over the test set of the COMPAS dataset. The protected group is *African-American*. Reference group is *Caucasian*. Red dots regard different regularization parameters: the darker the red the higher the regularization. Blue dot regards the one-hot encoding.




Fig. 3. Impact of the Gaussian noise regularization parameter  $\lambda$  on performance and fairness metrics over the test set of the COMPAS dataset. In the left image the AUC of the protected group, reference group, and global over the regularization hyperparameter. On the right, the equal opportunity fairness variation throughout the regularization hyperparameter.

#### 5.4 Reducible bias

This second type of bias arises due to the large variance found when sampling small groups. To replicate this biased situation, from the most common ethnic group, *African-American*, we sample a  $\approx 0.002$  fraction, being the ratio of 50 against 27,000 samples (cf. Figure 1). We treat this sampled group as it were a different category than the original *African-American* group. Both come from the same distribution so if we had enough statistical mass for both of them, the encoding should be the same. We note that due to the stochastic nature of this sampling experiment, different randomization seeds will produce different results. For this split, the mean of the sampled group is 0.63 while the reference group has a mean of 0.43. The regularization hyperparameters are the same as in the previous experiment (Section 5.3).

In Figure 4, we can see a logistic regression estimator that is fed encoded variables in the two different encoding ways. Non-regularized target encoding is more discriminant than one-hot encoding and the AUC is almost the same with negligible differences. For the smoothing regularization, it is curious to see that the model performance does not vary, but the fairness does so significantly. This is due to the regularization affecting only to categories with few samples and the global AUC being almost unaffected. For the Gaussian noise regularization, the effect is quite similar to the smoothing, but in case the  $\lambda$  hyperparameter is over-tuned, the model performance drops significantly.

#### 5.5 Intersectional Fairness

A common feature engineering technique that boosts model performance consists of concatenating two or more categorical features [21]. If the categorical features are protected attributes, the fairness problem is known as intersectional fairness [52, 55] (Section 2.3). To provide evidence of the potential effects of encodings on intersectional fairness, we concatenate *Ethnic* and *Marital* status of the COMPAS dataset. We select *African-American Single* as the protected group and *Caucasian Married* as the reference group. Both groups have enough statistical mass so the induced bias is not due to variance but rather it is irreducible bias. The group target mean is 0.46 for *African-American Single* and 0.10




Fig. 4. One-hot Encoding vs regularized target encoding (Gaussian and smoothing), comparing the reference group *African-American* over a sample of the reference group. Smoothing regularization reduces group equal opportunity fairness with a negligible loss of AUC. Red dots regard different regularization parameters: the darker the red the higher the regularization. Blue dot regards one-hot encoding. Over tuning Gaussian noise hyperparameter causes a noticeable drop in performance.




Fig. 5. Intersectional fairness case. One-hot Encoding vs regularized target encoding (Gaussian and smoothing), comparing *African American Single* and *Caucasian Married*.

for *Caucasian Married*. This is an increased difference between the two groups with respect to previous experiments when comparing single groups of *African-American* and *Caucasian*.

In Figure 5, we can see how feature concatenation can slightly boost the model performance to an AUC of 0.713 using one-hot encoding against 0.709 for the single group case (Figure 2). But we can also see how it worsen fairness: one-hot encoding achieves  $-0.21$  of equal opportunity fairness (Figure 2) under single features, and  $-0.28$  when using concatenated features. The Gaussian regularization overperforms smoothing in terms of fairness and model accuracy, not only the maximum values achieved but also at intermediate stages of regularization. This is not surprising, and,

in general, feature concatenation can worsen fairness both on the side of irreducible bias (because  $p_i$  and  $p_r$  become more distant) and on the side of reducible bias (because  $n_i$  becomes smaller).

## 6 CONCLUSION

In recent years we have seen algorithmic methods aiming to improve fairness in data-driven systems from many perspectives: data collection, pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing steps. In this work, we have focused on how the encoding of categorical attributes (a common pre-processing step) can reconcile model quality and fairness. We have provided theoretical and empirical evidence that encoding categorical features could induce two different types of bias: an *irreducible bias*, due to the learning of discriminant information between the protected and reference groups, and a *reducible bias* due to the large variance sampling found in small protected groups.

Through experiments on two real-life datasets (COMPAS and Law School Admission Council), we showed that the most used categorical encoding method in the fair machine learning literature, one-hot encoding, consistently discriminates more in terms of equal opportunity fairness than target encoding. However, we found some promising results using target encoding, which is mostly used outside academic circles. Target encoding using Gaussian regularization showed improvements under the presence of both types of biases, with the risk of a noticeable loss of model performance in the case of over-parametrization. On the other hand, target encoding under smoothing regularization, showed more modest improvements when dealing with irreducible bias, with a very low risk of over tuning the hyperparameters and downgrading the model performance. For the experiment of reducible bias, there was an improvement of fairness with a negligible loss of performance. These results support our view that (regularized) target encoding can be a useful tool for fair machine learning. Furthermore, we discussed how feature engineering can boost the performance of machine learning algorithms but can lead into intersectional fairness, with increased risks of both reducible and irreducible biases

### Reproducibility Statement

We have been meticulous to ensure that our results are reproducible: original data, data preparation routines, code repositories, and methods are all publicly available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/FairEncoding-2C4D/README.md>. Note that throughout our work, we do not perform any hyperparameter tuning (except on the regularization) instead, we use default `scikit-learn` hyperparameters. We describe the system requirements and software dependencies of our experiments. Our experiments were run on a 4 vCPU's server of 15GB of RAM.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. 2019. *Fairness and Machine Learning*. fairmlbook.org. <http://www.fairmlbook.org>.
- [2] Solon Barocas and Andrew D Selbst. 2016. Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review* 104, 3 (2016), 671–732.
- [3] J. Bruin. 2011. *newtest: command to compute new test @ONLINE*. <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stata/ado/analysis/>
- [4] Gregory Carey. 2003. *Coding Categorical Variables*. <http://psych.colorado.edu/~carey/Courses/PSYC5741/handouts/Coding%20Categorical%20Variables%202006-03-03.pdf>
- [5] Rich Caruana and Alexandru Niculescu-Mizil. 2006. An empirical comparison of supervised learning algorithms. In *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Conference (ICML 2006), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, June 25-29, 2006 (ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, Vol. 148)*, William W. Cohen and Andrew W. Moore (Eds.). ACM, 161–168. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1143844.1143865>
- [6] Patricia Hill Collins. 2002. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- [7] 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, Halifax, NS, Canada, August 13 - 17, 2017*. ACM, 797–806. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097983.3098095>
- [8] David Masip, Carlos Mougán. 2020. Sktools: tools to extend sklearn, feature engineering based transformers. <https://sktools.readthedocs.io/> [Online; accessed 20-August-2020].

- [9] Armen Der Kiureghian and Ove Ditlevsen. 2009. Aleatory or Epistemic? Does It Matter? *Structural Safety* 31 (2009), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2008.06.020>
- [10] Catherine D’ignazio and Lauren F Klein. 2020. *Data Feminism*. MIT Press.
- [11] Anna Veronika Dorogush, Vasily Ershov, and Andrey Gulin. 2018. CatBoost: gradient boosting with categorical features support. *ArXiv preprint abs/1810.11363* (2018). <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11363>
- [12] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard S. Zemel. 2012. Fairness through awareness. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science 2012, Cambridge, MA, USA, January 8-10, 2012*, Shafi Goldwasser (Ed.). ACM, 214–226. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255>
- [13] European Commission [n. d.]. 2018 Reform of EU data protection rules. [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/data-protection-factsheet-changes\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/data-protection-factsheet-changes_en.pdf)
- [14] European Commission [n. d.]. CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12012P/TXT>
- [15] Jessie Finocchiaro, Roland Maio, Faidra Monachou, Gourab K Patro, Manish Raghavan, Ana-Andreea Stoica, and Stratis Tsirtsis. 2021. Bridging Machine Learning and Mechanism Design towards Algorithmic Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 489–503.
- [16] Anthony W Flores, Kristin Bechtel, and Christopher T Lowenkamp. 2016. False positives, false negatives, and false analyses: A rejoinder to machine bias: There’s software used across the country to predict future criminals. and it’s biased against blacks. *Fed. Probation* 80 (2016), 38.
- [17] James R. Foulds, Rashidul Islam, Kamrun Naher Keya, and Shimei Pan. 2020. An Intersectional Definition of Fairness. In *36th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2020, Dallas, TX, USA, April 20-24, 2020*. IEEE, 1918–1921. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE48307.2020.00203>
- [18] Sorelle A. Friedler, Carlos Scheidegger, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, Sonam Choudhary, Evan P. Hamilton, and Derek Roth. 2018. A comparative study of fairness-enhancing interventions in machine learning. *arXiv:1802.04422 [stat.ML]*
- [19] Jerome H. Friedman. 2001. Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *The Annals of Statistics* 29, 5 (2001), 1189 – 1232.
- [20] Yarin Gal. 2016. *Uncertainty in Deep Learning*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Cambridge.
- [21] Alexander Guschin, Dmitry Ulyanov, Mikhail Trofimov, Dmitry Altukhov, and Mario Michaidilis. 2018. How to Win a Data Science Competition: Learn from Top Kagglers - National Research University Higher School of Economics. <https://www.coursera.org/lecture/competitive-data-science/categorical-and-ordinal-features-qu1TF>. Accessed 02/11/20.
- [22] John T Hancock and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. 2020. CatBoost for big data: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of big data* 7, 1 (2020), 1–45.
- [23] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of Opportunity in Supervised Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, Daniel D. Lee, Masashi Sugiyama, Ulrike von Luxburg, Isabelle Guyon, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 3315–3323. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/hash/9d2682367c3935defcb1f9e247a97c0d-Abstract.html>
- [24] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of Opportunity in Supervised Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, Daniel D. Lee, Masashi Sugiyama, Ulrike von Luxburg, Isabelle Guyon, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 3315–3323. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/hash/9d2682367c3935defcb1f9e247a97c0d-Abstract.html>
- [25] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. 2001. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. Springer New York Inc., New York, NY, USA.
- [26] Hoda Heidari, Claudio Ferrari, Krishna P. Gummadi, and Andreas Krause. 2018. Fairness Behind a Veil of Ignorance: A Welfare Analysis for Automated Decision Making. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 1273–1283. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/be3159ad04564bf90db9e32851ebf9c-Abstract.html>
- [27] Wassily Hoeffding. 1963. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 58 (1963), 13–30. Issue 301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1963.10500830>
- [28] Nathalie Japkowicz and Shaju Stephen. 2002. The class imbalance problem: A systematic study. *Intelligent data analysis* 6, 5 (2002), 429–449.
- [29] Lauren Kirchner Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu and Julia Angwin. 2016. How We Analyzed the COMPAS Recidivism Algorithm. <https://github.com/propublica/compas-analysis> [Online; accessed 21-December-2021].
- [30] Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. 2018. An Empirical Study of Rich Subgroup Fairness for Machine Learning. *arXiv:1808.08166 [cs.LG]*
- [31] Michael J. Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. 2018. Preventing Fairness Gerrymandering: Auditing and Learning for Subgroup Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018 (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 80)*, Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause (Eds.). PMLR, 2569–2577. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/kearns18a.html>
- [32] Armen Der Kiureghian and Ove Ditlevsen. 2009. Aleatory or epistemic? Does it matter? *Structural Safety* 31, 2 (2009), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2008.06.020> Risk Acceptance and Risk Communication.
- [33] Matt J. Kusner, Joshua R. Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. 2017. Counterfactual Fairness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 4066–4076. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/a486cd07e4ac3d270571622f4f316ec5-Abstract.html>



- [34] Scott M. Lundberg, Gabriel Erion, Hugh Chen, Alex DeGrave, Jordan M. Prutkin, Bala Nair, Ronit Katz, Jonathan Himmelfarb, Nisha Bansal, and Su-In Lee. 2019. Explainable AI for Trees: From Local Explanations to Global Understanding. arXiv:1905.04610 [cs.LG]
- [35] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
- [36] Daniele Micci-Barreca. 2001. A Preprocessing Scheme for High-Cardinality Categorical Attributes in Classification and Prediction Problems. *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.* 3, 1 (2001), 27–32.
- [37] Christoph Molnar. 2019. *Interpretable Machine Learning*. <https://christophm.github.io/interpretable-ml-book/>.
- [38] Carlos Mougán, Qian Fu, Jojeena Kolath, Huan Tong, Siddharth Dixit, Laurens Geffert, Hyesop Shin, Rabuh, Ahmad Abd, Caitlin Robinson, and Ella Gale. 2020. *Data Study Group Network Final Report: Bristol City Council (Get Bristol moving: tackling air pollution in Bristol city centre)*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3775497> Turing Network Data Study Group Bristol ; Conference date: 05-08-2019 Through 09-08-2019.
- [39] Carlos Mougán, Georgios Kanellos, and Thomas Gottron. 2021. Desiderata for Explainable AI in statistical production systems of the European Central Bank. arXiv:2107.08045 [cs.CY]
- [40] Carlos Mougán, David Masip, Jordi Nin, and Oriol Pujol. 2021. Quantile Encoder: Tackling High Cardinality Categorical Features in Regression Problems. In *Modeling Decisions for Artificial Intelligence - 18th International Conference, MDAI 2021, Umeå, Sweden, September 27-30, 2021, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 12898)*, Vicenç Torra and Yasuo Narukawa (Eds.). Springer, 168–180. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85529-1\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85529-1_14)
- [41] Cecilia Munoz, Megan Smith, and DJ Patil. 2016. Big data: A report on algorithmic systems, opportunity, and civil right. *United States. Executive Office of the President* (2016). <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=792977>
- [42] Shuntaro Okada, Masayuki Ohzeki, and Shinichiro Taguchi. 2019. Efficient partition of integer optimization problems with one-hot encoding. *Scientific Reports* 9 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-49539-6>
- [43] F. Pargent, B. Bischl, and J. Thomas. 2019. *A benchmark experiment on how to encode categorical features in predictive modeling*. Master’s thesis. School of Statistics.
- [44] Florian Pargent, Florian Pfisterer, Janek Thomas, and Bernd Bischl. 2021. Regularized target encoding outperforms traditional methods in supervised machine learning with high cardinality features. arXiv:2104.00629 [stat.ML]
- [45] John Podesta, Penny Pritzker, Ernest J. Moniz, John Holden, and Jeffrey Zients. 2014. Big data: Seizing opportunities and preserving values. *United States. Executive Office of the President* (2014). <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=752636>
- [46] Liudmila Ostroumova Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. 2018. CatBoost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 6639–6649. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/14491b756b3a51daac41c24863285549-Abstract.html>
- [47] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. “Why Should I Trust You?”: Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016*, Balaji Krishnapuram, Mohak Shah, Alexander J. Smola, Charu C. Aggarwal, Dou Shen, and Rajeev Rastogi (Eds.). ACM, 1135–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939778>
- [48] Kit T. Rodolfa, Hemank Lamba, and Rayid Ghani. 2021. Empirical observation of negligible fairness–accuracy trade-offs in machine learning for public policy. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3, 10 (2021), 896–904. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00396-x>
- [49] Kit T. Rodolfa, Erika Salomon, Lauren Haynes, Iván Higuera Mendieta, Jamie Larson, and Rayid Ghani. 2020. Case study. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372863>
- [50] Pau Rodríguez, Miguel A. Bautista, Jordi González, and Sergio Escalera. 2018. Beyond one-hot encoding: Lower dimensional target embedding. *Image and Vision Computing* 75 (2018), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imavis.2018.04.004>
- [51] Byron P. Roe, Hai-Jun Yang, Ji Zhu, Yong Liu, Ion Stancu, and Gordon McGregor. 2005. Boosted decision trees as an alternative to artificial neural networks for particle identification. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 543, 2-3 (2005), 577–584.
- [52] Andrea Romei and Salvatore Ruggieri. 2014. A multidisciplinary survey on discrimination analysis. *Knowl. Eng. Rev.* 29, 5 (2014), 582–638. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269888913000039>
- [53] Austin Slakey, Daniel Salas, and Yoni Schamroth. 2019. Encoding Categorical Variables with Conjugate Bayesian Models for WeWork Lead Scoring Engine. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:1904.13001 (2019), arXiv:1904.13001 pages. arXiv:1904.13001 [cs.LG]
- [54] Gerhard Tutz. 2011. *Regression for Categorical Data*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511842061>
- [55] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. 2021. Why fairness cannot be automated: Bridging the gap between EU non-discrimination law and AI. *Computer Law & Security Review* 41 (2021), 105567.
- [56] Linda F Wightman. 1998. *LSAC national longitudinal bar passage study*. Law School Admission Council.
- [57] Will McGinnis. 2020. Category Encoders :A library of sklearn compatible categorical variable encoders. <https://contrib.scikit-learn.org/>
- [58] Jeffrey M Wooldridge. 2015. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. Cengage Learning.

- [59] Ke Yang, Joshua R. Loftus, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2021. Causal Intersectionality and Fair Ranking. In *2nd Symposium on Foundations of Responsible Computing, FORC 2021, June 9-11, 2021, Virtual Conference (LIPICs, Vol. 192)*, Katrina Ligett and Swati Gupta (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 7:1–7:20. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.FORC.2021.7>
- [60] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P. Gummadi. 2017. Fairness Beyond Disparate Treatment & Disparate Impact. *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web (2017)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3038912.3052660>
- [61] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez, and Krishna P. Gummadi. 2017. Fairness Beyond Disparate Treatment & Disparate Impact: Learning Classification without Disparate Mistreatment. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2017, Perth, Australia, April 3-7, 2017*, Rick Barrett, Rick Cummings, Eugene Agichtein, and Evgeniy Gabrilovich (Eds.). ACM, 1171–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3038912.3052660>
- [62] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez, and Krishna P. Gummadi. 2017. Fairness Constraints: Mechanisms for Fair Classification. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2017, 20-22 April 2017, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 54)*, Aarti Singh and Xiaojin (Jerry) Zhu (Eds.). PMLR, 962–970. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/zafar17a.html>
- [63] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez, Krishna P. Gummadi, and Adrian Weller. 2017. From Parity to Preference-based Notions of Fairness in Classification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 229–239. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/82161242827b703e6acf9c726942a1e4-Abstract.html>
- [64] Y. Zhang and A. Haghani. 2015. A gradient boosting method to improve travel time prediction. *Transportation Research Part C-emerging Technologies* 58 (2015), 308–324.
- [65] Indre Zliobaite and Bart Custers. 2016. Using sensitive personal data may be necessary for avoiding discrimination in data-driven decision models. *Artif. Intell. Law* 24, 2 (2016), 183–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-016-9182-5>

## APPENDIX

### Data: Law School Admission Council

The Law School Admission Council dataset [33], is based on a survey conducted by the Law School Admission Council across 163 law schools in the United States [56]. It covers 21,790 students and includes their race, gender, undergraduate grade-point average (UGPA), law-school entrance exam scores (LSAT), and their first-year law-school average grade normalized by region (ZFYA). The goal is to predict ZFYA for future success in law school. The protected attributes are race and sex. Race has 8 unique groups and Sex just two. In the intersectional fairness problem, derived from feature engineering *RaceSex*, the cardinality of the new categorical variable has 16 distinct values. The data is split into a 50/50 train/test split, maintaining the ratio of each category between train and test set.



Fig. 6. Distribution of the protected attribute categories to be encoded and regularized for the Law School Admission Council survey dataset [56]

**Irreducible induced bias.** The irreducible bias that is induced while encoding categorical features is due to statistical differences in large groups (Section 2). For this case, we choose the two largest groups in the dataset: *White* and *Black*. We investigate the trade-off between equal opportunity fairness and AUC metrics while using two different encoding techniques (Section 2) and with two different regularization techniques (Section 3). Figure 7 shows that the general loss of model performance in over parametrized cases is less than in the previous use case with COMPAS. In this case, for the smoothing regularization light hyperparameters show an increase of equal opportunity fairness, and after a plateau that can be seen in Figure 9, the regularization achieves equal opportunity fairness.

From Figures 8 and 9, we can see how the drop in model performance is almost negligible, but the equal opportunity fairness is disparate, ranging in its absolute maximum values  $[0, 1]$ . In Figure 7, we observe that the smoothing regularization during the first values increases the discrimination and after a plateau in fairness eventually improves and decreases discrimination. Under a stronger regularization, we reach an equal opportunity treatment between *White* and African-American groups. Further details about the changes in model performance and fairness can be seen in Figures 9 and 8, where we observe similar trends.




Fig. 7. Comparing one-hot encoding and target encoding regularization (Gaussian noise and smoothing) for the Logistic Regression over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset. Protected group is *Black*. Reference group is *White*. Red dots regard different regularization parameters: the darker the red the higher the regularization. Blue dot regards the one-hot encoding.

**Reducible induced bias.** For induced reducible bias, that arises due to the large variance found when sampling small groups. To replicate this biased situation, from the most common ethnic group, *White*, we sample a  $\approx 0.005$  fraction, being the ratio of 120 against 22,000 samples (cf. Figure 6). We treat this sampled group as the protected group and the original *White*. Both come from the same distribution so if we had enough statistical mass for both of them, the encoding should be the same. It is worth noting that due to the stochastic nature of this sampling experiment, different randomization seeds will produce different results. For this particular split, the mean of the sampled group is 0.16 while the reference group has a mean of 0.59. The regularization hyperparameters are the same as in the previous experiment (Section 5.3).



Fig. 8. Impact of the Gaussian noise regularization parameter  $\lambda$  on performance and fairness metrics over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset. In the left image the AUC of the protected group, reference group, and global over the regularization hyperparameter. On the right, the equal opportunity fairness variation throughout the regularization hyperparameter.




Fig. 9. Impact of the smoothing regularization parameter  $m$  in  $\lambda(n_i) = n_i / (n_i + m)$  on performance and fairness metrics over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset. In the left image the AUC of the protected group, reference group and global over the regularization hyperparameter. On the right, the equal opportunity fairness variation through out the regularization hyperparameter.

In Figure 10, we can see a logistic regression estimator that is fed encoded variables in the two different encoding ways. Non-regularized target encoding is more discriminant than one-hot encoding and the AUC is almost the same with negligible differences. For both regularizations, the model performance does not vary, but the fairness does so significantly. The main difference of the experiments on Law and COMPAS datasets is that model performance variations, the fairness is correctly regularized in both cases. One noticeable difference between reducible and irreducible induced bias experiment under smoothing regularization is that it needs less tuning of hyperparameter, lighter red dots in Figures (7) and (10) or directly comparing the size of the hyperparameter plateau in Figure 9 vs Figure 11.




Fig. 10. Comparing one-hot encoding and target encoding regularization (Gaussian noise and smoothing) for the Logistic Regression over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset. Reference group is *White*. Protected group is a 0.005 sample of *White*. Red dots regard different regularization parameters: the darker the red the higher the regularization. Blue dot regards the one-hot encoding.




Fig. 11. Impact of the smoothing regularization parameter  $m$  in  $\lambda(n_i) = n_i / (n_i + m)$  under reducible fairness comparison, on performance and fairness metrics over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset. In the left image the AUC of the protected group, reference group and global over the regularization hyperparameter. On the right, the equal opportunity fairness variation through out the regularization hyperparameter.

**Intersectionality on Law.** For this intersectional fairness experiment we concatenate *Race* and *Sex* status of the Law School Admission dataset. We select *Black Female* as the protected group and *White Male* as the reference group. Both groups have enough statistical mass so the induced bias is not due to variance but rather it is irreducible bias.

In Figure 12, we can see how feature concatenation boosts the model performance to an AUC of 0.661 using one-hot encoding against 0.650 for the single group case (Figure 6). In the case before, fairness already achieved the worst-case scenario, an equal opportunity difference of one. In this scenario, the best performance model is not one-hot




Fig. 12. Comparing one-hot encoding and target encoding regularization (Gaussian noise and smoothing) for the Logistic Regression over the test set of the Law School Admission Council survey dataset under intersectional sensitive categorical attributes. Protected group is *BlackFemale*. Reference group is *WhiteMale*. Red dots regard different regularization parameters: the darker the red the higher the regularization. Blue dot regards the one-hot encoding.

encoding but target encoding. The smoothing regularization presents a more a transition with less variance across the hyperparameter range.