

The Cost of Arbitrariness for Individuals: Examining the Legal and Technical Challenges of Model Multiplicity

Prakhar Ganesh^{*1,2}, Ihsan Ibrahim Daldaban^{*1}, Ignacio Cofone¹, Golnoosh Farnadi^{1,2}

¹McGill University ²Mila

prakhar.ganesh@mila.quebec, ihsan.daldaban@mail.mcgill.ca, ignacio.cofone@mcgill.ca, farnadig@mila.quebec

Abstract

Model multiplicity, the phenomenon where multiple models achieve similar performance despite different underlying learned functions, introduces arbitrariness in model selection. While this arbitrariness may seem inconsequential in expectation, its impact on individuals can be severe. This paper explores various individual concerns stemming from multiplicity, including the effects of arbitrariness beyond final predictions, disparate arbitrariness for individuals belonging to protected groups, and the challenges associated with the arbitrariness of a single algorithmic system creating a monopoly across various contexts. It provides both an empirical examination of these concerns and a comprehensive analysis from the legal standpoint, addressing how these issues are perceived in the anti-discrimination law in Canada. We conclude the discussion with technical challenges in the current landscape of model multiplicity to meet legal requirements and the legal gap between current law and the implications of arbitrariness in model selection, highlighting relevant future research directions for both disciplines.

1 Introduction

Machine learning models have gained unprecedented power and influence across diverse domains and real-world applications. As these models advance in complexity and capability, a new challenge emerges — *model multiplicity*. This phenomenon, often stemming from inherent overparameterization or underspecification, is the existence of multiple solutions for the same problem, thus introducing arbitrariness in selecting a single model.

In recent years, model multiplicity has garnered significant attention (Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; D’Amour et al. 2022), primarily focused on responsible behaviour in expectation (Ganesh 2024), e.g., group fairness (Sokol et al. 2022; Ganesh et al. 2023; Long et al. 2023; Cooper et al. 2024), out-of-distribution robustness (McCoy, Min, and Linzen 2020), overall privacy leakage (Kulynych et al. 2023), etc. Beyond the technical exploration, discussions on policy changes and moral arguments (Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; Creel and Hellman 2022; Black et al. 2024) have been pivotal in developing the discourse on multiplicity. Despite this

increasing attention, a critical aspect of multiplicity remains underexplored — its wide-ranging impact on an individual and the legal implications of this arbitrariness.

Existing studies tend to focus solely on multiplicity through model predictions, and don’t address how the final model selection can affect individuals in diverse ways. Consider, for instance, an individual from the training data who may either face a high risk of information leakage or not, depending on the arbitrary model choice under multiplicity. These effects of arbitrariness go unnoticed in existing studies, and consequently, the cost of arbitrariness for individuals is underestimated. Furthermore, the absence of a definitive correct choice exacerbates the problem, as these decisions of model selection from a set of good models usually hinge on pitting similar individuals against each other.

Recent studies have also shed light on how certain demographic groups bear the brunt of this arbitrariness more than others (Ganesh et al. 2023; Cooper et al. 2024; Gomez et al. 2024). This arbitrariness not only raises concerns about inadequate planning and recourse under multiplicity but also undermines trust and predictability in the decision-making process. Consequently, heightened arbitrariness within specific demographic groups can perpetuate structured disparities, necessitating a thorough legal examination. This becomes even more pressing when these models are directly adopted by various downstream applications or service providers, thus creating a monopoly and perpetuating structured arbitrariness against certain individuals throughout the sector (Creel and Hellman 2022). While existing legal discourse on multiplicity has centred exclusively on model behaviour in expectation (Black et al. 2024), we instead focus on the impact of arbitrariness on individuals.

In this interdisciplinary work, we examine these concerns from both technical and legal perspectives. We focus on employment, and particularly on hiring decisions, advocating for a more nuanced understanding of multiplicity and its influence on individuals. Our contributions are:

- Redefining model multiplicity to emphasize individual concerns by incorporating various causes of multiplicity beyond learning hyperparameters as well as other impacts of multiplicity beyond just predictive multiplicity.
- Arguing that increased levels of arbitrariness for a protected group can be considered an adverse impact and, accordingly, a discriminatory employment practice under the

^{*}Equal contribution

Canadian anti-discrimination law.

- Scrutinizing the adoption of the same machine learning model or dataset for hiring across diverse user contexts, followed by a discrimination analysis of the sector-wide exclusion of individuals from employment opportunities and a brief inquiry into how competition laws may be useful in ensuring algorithmic fairness.

We conclude with a call for action to reduce the gap between the technical and legal domains by (i) emphasizing the need to improve the methods of measuring and auditing multiplicity and (ii) prompting a discussion on the lack of legal arguments against the adverse impact of arbitrariness, especially in high-stakes applications. In sum, our work encompasses a multifaceted analysis of multiplicity, putting the concerns of individuals at the forefront.

2 Related Work

Prior to discussing our contributions, we provide a comprehensive review of existing literature in multiplicity to contextualize our work within the broader research landscape.

2.1 Model Multiplicity

As defined by Black, Raghavan, and Barocas (2022), model multiplicity is the phenomenon where *models with equivalent accuracy for a certain prediction task differ in terms of their internals*. Many recent works in literature have explored the implications of multiplicity in machine learning, focusing on the unpredictability of model behaviour during deployment (Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022). While D’Amour et al. (2022) underscored the connection between model multiplicity and underspecification, Ganesh (2024) showed that even additional specifications during model selection cannot counter the overparameterization of deep learning models, leaving the concerns of multiplicity unresolved. Paes et al. (2023) formalized this further, using an information-theoretic approach to show that model multiplicity is inevitable in settings with finite data. Beyond these challenges, positive opportunities also arise from multiplicity, for instance, the potential for better trade-offs and the development of responsible models (Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; Semenova, Rudin, and Parr 2022; Black et al. 2024).

The majority of literature on multiplicity focuses on predictive multiplicity (Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020), a special case of model multiplicity that evaluates variations solely in the final predictions of the model. However, other dimensions of quantifying multiplicity have also been explored. Hsu and Calmon (2022) use the output probabilities to quantify multiplicity, while Heljakka et al. (2022) extend this further, using the complete internal representation of the model to measure model disagreements. Several works have also explored the impact of multiplicity on the robustness of model explanations (Karimi et al. 2022; Hancox-Li 2020).

The exploration of multiplicity in literature also extends to various problem formulations. While most existing works define a set of good models to have similar accuracy, this has also been expanded to perform model selection under multiple metrics (Kulynych et al. 2023; Long et al. 2023; Ganesh

2024), and even with models trained on different subsets of the data (Meyer, Albarghouthi, and D’Antoni 2023). Multiplicity has also been addressed outside classification, for instance, multi-target objective (Watson-Daniels et al. 2023), object detection (Hsu et al. 2024), etc. In our paper, we consolidate these strands of research to formalize a more comprehensive definition of multiplicity. This encompasses various causes of multiplicity such as dataset choice, model hyperparameters, the stochasticity nature of learning, and various effects of multiplicity like privacy and robustness.

2.2 Multiplicity and Responsible AI

In addition to choosing better models with multiplicity (Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022), recent works have also studied the interplay between multiplicity and other trustworthy metrics. Kulynych et al. (2023) showed that improvements in privacy come at a cost of higher multiplicity and Long et al. (2023) found a similar cost to achieve group fairness. Ali, Lahoti, and Gummadi (2021) showed that addressing unfairness only in examples with high multiplicity effectively eliminates biases and Cooper et al. (2024) showed similarly that abstaining from highly uncertain predictions exhibits a noticeable improvement in fairness.

Recent works have also explored the implications of arbitrariness itself, and its integration into the broader landscape of responsible AI. Particularly relevant to our work, several studies have shown a disparity in predictive multiplicity across demographics (Ganesh et al. 2023; Cooper et al. 2024; Gomez et al. 2024), thereby disproportionately impacting individuals from various groups. Building on these insights, our study expands the empirical analysis beyond predictions, revealing similar disparities in other metrics, with a case study on privacy and robustness. Furthermore, while existing literature is limited to empirically documenting these disparities, we provide a legal examination under the anti-discrimination law in Canada.

2.3 Multiplicity and Monopolies

Recent progress in AI has enabled the introduction of a new class of large-scale models, also referred to as foundational models, capable of being adapted to a diverse set of domains. Given their impact, experts have raised concerns about the widespread deployment of these models. Creel and Hellman (2022) use the term *algorithmic leviathans* to characterize such algorithms and offer a comprehensive discussion on the moral concerns of the *standardization* of arbitrariness due to the adoption of a single algorithmic system across various applications. Similarly, Vipra and Korinek (2023) advocate for better regulations and the involvement of antitrust authorities to ensure a level playing field in these domains. They highlight the risks associated with tech giants training large-scale foundational models and the natural tendency of such setups to move toward a monopoly, concentrating power in the hands of a few companies. We contribute to this ongoing dialogue by providing a legal discussion examining the arbitrariness in these monopolies.

2.4 Multiplicity and Law

There exists a wide range of literature on the adverse impacts of algorithmic decision-making. More specifically, in the domain of employment, which is the focus of our work, several scholars have discussed the legal implications of these impacts and what legal approaches can be deployed to mitigate the discriminatory outcomes of algorithmic models (Ajunwa 2020; Bildfell 2019; Kelly-Lyth 2023; Kim 2017; Scherer, King, and Mrkonich 2019; Trindel, Kassir, and Bent 2021). However, discussion on the legal implications of arbitrariness resulting from model multiplicity has been limited. The closest work to ours are Black et al. (2024) which makes observations on the legal implications of model multiplicity in the context of credit-lending, and Kim (2022) that highlights the significance of model multiplicity in de-biasing models. We contribute to this discourse by bridging the gap between legal and technical discussions on the adverse impacts of arbitrariness for individuals. We explore the effects of multiplicity on individuals within the employment domain and analyze the legal implications of these effects under the anti-discrimination laws in Canada.

3 Redefining Model Multiplicity

Early work in multiplicity (Breiman 2001) draws inspiration from the epistemological framework of the Rashomon effect (Anderson 2016): the phenomenon of different yet equally plausible interpretations of the same event. The Rashomon effect underscores the subjectivity and complexity inherent in the interpretation of information. In machine learning, this is translated to the existence of multiple models with similar performance, despite learning different underlying functions. In this section, we dive deeper into the causes and effects of multiplicity in real-world systems, use these insights to motivate redefining multiplicity, and support our definition of multiplicity with empirical studies.

3.1 Multiplicity in Context: Causes and Effects

Causes of Multiplicity: The process of designing a machine learning model encompasses a multitude of choices. Beginning with the data, decisions are made regarding what data to gather, how to process and filter it, which features to select, etc. Even decisions on partitioning the data for training and validation have been shown to create multiplicity (Friedler et al. 2019; Meyer, Albarghouthi, and D’Antoni 2023). Similarly, the learning algorithm design further entails numerous decisions: the choice of model architecture, selection of hyperparameters, various forms of stochasticity, and even the criteria for model evaluation. Each of these decisions contributes to the cascade of choices that directly impacts the multiplicity of the trained models.

Notably, these choices are not always informed or even intentional. For instance, in some cases, choices are made by drawing upon insights from the literature that focus on the effects of algorithm design on model multiplicity (Wu et al. 2021; Ponomareva et al. 2023; Kulynych et al. 2023; Ganesh 2024). In other cases, choices are driven by popular trends, such as the prevalent use of a specific activation function instead of exploring various alternatives (Dubey, Singh,

and Chaudhuri 2022), or by the convenience of employing model architecture available in more accessible frameworks like PyTorch or TensorFlow. While even these choices may be studied in the future to better grasp their impact on multiplicity, others remain inherently arbitrary, like the selection of a random seed for training, defying attempts at informed decision-making when training a learning model.

These choices culminate together into the final model, collectively impacting its multiplicity. Thus, while specialized definitions of multiplicity can be helpful for targeted technical analysis, it’s important to encompass all these choices when discussing the real-world implications of multiplicity. For instance, characterizing multiplicity solely as training multiple models on the same dataset overlooks the significance of the dataset selection. Similarly, defining multiplicity based on just the accuracy or error of the model for a given task neglects the various considerations involved in model evaluation, like measuring fairness to ensure adherence to certain standards. Thus, it is important to cover all aspects of a learning pipeline when defining multiplicity.

Reality of Training Multiple Models: Existing literature often suggests training multiple models to mitigate arbitrariness in model training, by creating ensembles, quantifying multiplicity, or using model selection to navigate the causes of multiplicity discussed above (Kulynych et al. 2023; Long et al. 2023; Creel and Hellman 2022). However, this isn’t always feasible if the model’s size or complexity makes training multiple models computationally expensive. For instance, consider HireVue, a recruitment company catering to over a third of the Fortune 100 in the US. HireVue uses sophisticated models to assess candidates via textual responses and video interviews (Larsen 2018), which makes training enough models to capture multiplicity impractical.

Even in situations when it’s possible to train multiple models, the cost of data collection can be a significant barrier. Consequently, multiple models may be trained on the same dataset, perpetuating the arbitrariness inherent in the data. For example, spurious correlations in the data can be viewed as a manifestation of arbitrariness stemming from the dataset choice, as a different dataset might exhibit different behaviour (Zech et al. 2018; Hendrycks et al. 2021). Even when empirical methods can capture multiplicity, model selection may lead to overfitting, hindering generalization (Ganesh 2024). These trends don’t necessarily dismiss the efficacy of training multiple models. Rather, it highlights the complexities and limitations of this approach, making it far from a universally applicable solution.

Effects of Multiplicity: Multiplicity is often explored in scenarios where individuals encounter conflicting predictions. This can create brittleness and uncertainty in model decisions, undermining their reliability and hampering effective planning. This becomes particularly problematic when the underlying model is proprietary, leaving users in the dark about its inner workings. For example, in the context of hiring, individuals affected by high multiplicity won’t be able to anticipate outcomes based on observable patterns, severely hindering their ability to discern which applications merit greater attention and plan accordingly. As a result, they

are left at a distinct disadvantage compared to their peers who do not suffer from similar multiplicity and can thus prioritize their efforts based on discernible trends.

The effects of multiplicity extend to model updates over time. Each update introduces a fresh set of choices, thereby exacerbating multiplicity. Concerns of arbitrariness over time have also been studied under the umbrella of predictive churn (Milani Fard et al. 2016). Intriguingly, a recent study highlighted the relationship between multiplicity and predictive churn, indicating a common demographic vulnerable to fluctuating model outputs in both cases (Watson-Daniels et al. 2024). Thus, an individual affected by high multiplicity will also encounter higher uncertainty in recourse strategies, as their predictions are more vulnerable to the model updates, potentially rendering their recourse efforts redundant. Another line of research has explored the possibility of algorithmic recourse becoming invalidated under distribution shifts (Rawal, Kamar, and Lakkaraju 2021). We argue that these problems arise even in situations without a distribution shift, simply due to multiplicity in learning models.

Moreover, as hinted earlier, the effects of multiplicity extend beyond final model predictions. For instance, model explanations and suggested recourse decisions can vary noticeably due to multiplicity, and an individual’s recourse feasibility hinges on the arbitrariness in model selection. Similarly, multiplicity can impact robustness, leading to divergent outcomes for similar cases, thus compromising system reliability and trust. Multiplicity can even impact individuals whose data was used for training. For example, multiplicity can affect the privacy risks of individuals, necessitating perpetual vigilance, as arbitrary choices in model selection could have potentially exposed individuals to privacy breaches, even if they aren’t currently at risk. The effects of multiplicity are multifaceted, and we should not narrow our scope to predictions on a given task, which can underestimate the true risks of multiplicity. We will provide several empirical studies in Section 3.3 for more practical examples of the various effects of multiplicity discussed here.

3.2 Rashomon Sets and Model Multiplicity

With the causes and effects of multiplicity better understood, we now formally define model multiplicity. We saw that the concept of multiplicity is deeply rooted in the Rashomon effect, which highlights the diverse interpretations that can arise from the same data. The models illustrating this Rashomon effect are together known as a Rashomon set, or a set of competing models, a set of good models, ϵ -Rashomon set, ϵ -Level set, etc. We’ll stick to the term Rashomon set for consistency in our discussion. In principle, a Rashomon set defines a set of models which are practically indistinguishable for those deploying the model, underscoring the arbitrariness in selecting one model over another. Thus, to define multiplicity, we need to first define a Rashomon set. And to define a Rashomon set, we need to define what it means for two models to be indistinguishable.

We introduce a set of metric delta functions, Δ^P , and corresponding thresholds \mathcal{E}^P . A metric delta function takes as input two models and measures the difference between them under the given metric. These metric deltas serve as

benchmarks for determining whether two models are indistinguishable: if the difference in performance for every $\delta_i^P \in \Delta^P$ falls within the corresponding threshold $\epsilon_i^P \in \mathcal{E}^P$. For example, one might define the metric delta for accuracy as $\delta_{Acc,D}(h_1, h_2) = |Acc(h_1, D) - Acc(h_2, D)|$. Formally,

Definition 1 (Rashomon Set) *Two models h_1, h_2 belong to the same Rashomon set under performance constraints $(\Delta^P, \mathcal{E}^P)$ if they exhibit similar performance for every metric in the given performance constraints, i.e.:*

$$\delta_i^P(h_1, h_2) \leq \epsilon_i^P \quad \forall (\delta_i^P, \epsilon_i^P) \in (\Delta^P, \mathcal{E}^P) \quad (1)$$

The Rashomon set effectively captures the phenomenon of various learned models being practically indistinguishable. However, the study of multiplicity is crucial only in the context of these models also exhibiting diverse behaviour when deployed, i.e., our interest lies in discerning meaningful differences, rather than merely the existence of Rashomon sets. Given the various effects of multiplicity discussed above, we generalize model multiplicity by binding it to a metric delta δ^M and corresponding threshold ϵ^M , on models belonging to the same Rashomon set. Formally,

Definition 2 (Model Multiplicity) *Two models h_1, h_2 exhibit multiplicity under performance constraints $(\Delta^P, \mathcal{E}^P)$ and multiplicity constraint (δ^M, ϵ^M) , if they have similar performance for every metric in the performance constraints yet differ on the metric in the multiplicity constraint, i.e.:*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i^P(h_1, h_2) \leq \epsilon_i^P \quad \forall (\delta_i^P, \epsilon_i^P) \in (\Delta^P, \mathcal{E}^P) \\ \text{and} \quad \delta^M(h_1, h_2) > \epsilon^M \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Note that the definitions here are quite similar to those already present in the literature. However, we have made deliberate choices distinct from previous approaches. Unlike several existing works (Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022), we do not restrict the models h_1, h_2 to a hypothesis class or limit them to being trained on data from the same distribution. Similarly, unlike much of the prior work, we avoid relying on a single metric of model similarity or only model predictions as a measure of multiplicity. While these are not radical changes, we emphasize these lack of restrictions to highlight the complete scope of the impact of multiplicity as discussed above. Next, we briefly present empirical evidence to support our choices.

3.3 Empirical Insights into Multiplicity

We now present a series of empirical studies to support our decision to expand the definition of multiplicity.

Dataset: We conduct our study on a Job Applicants dataset (Tankha 2023), which surveys individuals on the website *StackOverflow*, collecting various attributes and the success of their job applications. We filter the dataset to focus specifically on applications to Canadian companies, resulting in 2779 data points for our analysis. This data is split into 80% for training and 20% for testing. We also explore other datasets spanning different modalities in Appendix B.




Figure 1: **(a)** Distribution of self-consistency scores for individuals in the *StackOverflow* dataset (Tankha 2023), under Rashomon sets trained by changing only the feature subsets, changing only the model hyperparameters, changing only the random seeds, and changing all three simultaneously. **(b)** The same distribution of self-consistency scores across various settings, but with performance constraints including both accuracy and fairness (instead of just accuracy in (a)). The impact of multiplicity is more pronounced in this case, which underscores the significance of the model selection criteria. **(c,d,e)** Distribution of self-consistency scores for predictions, robustness, defined as the consistency of prediction under input noise, and privacy, defined as membership inference. We find multiplicity concerns for metrics beyond predictions as well as a disparate impact of multiplicity across various groups (Ganesh 2024; Cooper et al. 2024; Gomez et al. 2024).

Models and Metrics: Our learning model is a multi-layer perceptron with a single hidden layer of 64 neurons. To create the Rashomon set, we train multiple models while (i) changing the subset of features to mimic multiplicity caused by the data, (ii) changing batch size, learning rate, and the optimizer to account for the multiplicity in the learning algorithm, and (iii) changing the random seeds to replicate the stochasticity of learning. Each model is then evaluated using the performance constraints, before being admitted into the Rashomon set. Subsequently, we quantify multiplicity through a measure known as self-consistency (Long et al. 2023). Self-consistency is defined as the likelihood of obtaining the same output from two randomly selected models in the Rashomon set. Details on model training and evaluation setup are delegated to Appendix A.

Why do we need better Rashomon sets? To emphasize the broader definition of Rashomon sets, we experiment with various ways of training multiple models as well as different performance constraints. Our results reveal that neglecting the diverse causes of multiplicity can lead to an underestimation of the true risks associated with arbitrariness in machine learning. To illustrate this, we begin by examining the self-consistency scores for predictive multiplicity of individuals within different Rashomon sets (each containing 20 mod-

els), under performance constraint accuracy, constructed by varying feature subsets, hyperparameters, random seeds, and a combination of all three, as depicted in Figure 1(a). Notably, we find that altering only the random seeds, a common practice in literature, underestimates the multiplicity risks.

Furthermore, the problem becomes severe when we change our performance constraints. Instead of solely relying on accuracy, we introduce fairness, defined as accuracy parity, and collect the results for the new Rashomon sets in Figure 1(b). Despite being a more exclusive selection criterion, the Rashomon sets created under these constraints—still comprising 20 models each—demonstrate even higher multiplicity. By combining our insights from the previous two sets of results, it becomes apparent that both dataset variability and the incorporation of multiple performance constraints play an important role in assessing the true risks of multiplicity. Strikingly, these critical facets are often overlooked in existing literature, which focuses instead on changing random seeds or only accuracy and loss as the performance constraint, thus highlighting the need for a broader definition of Rashomon sets.

Are multiplicity risks limited to model predictions? We discussed how predictive multiplicity risks are often underestimated when not all potential causes are taken into

account. However, predictive multiplicity is not the only consequence of arbitrariness in model selection. We now delve into the broader implications of multiplicity, examining its impact specifically on robustness and privacy within the Rashomon set. We use the Rashomon set with all three model training variations outlined above and with performance constraints of both accuracy and fairness. Robustness is defined as the consistency of predictions under input noise and privacy as the output of a membership inference attack. Additional details on these definitions can be found in Appendix A. The results are collected in Figure 1(d,e).

Our analysis reveals multiplicity in both robustness and privacy across the Rashomon set, illustrating that concerns of arbitrariness in model selection transcend final predictions. Note that higher multiplicity in robustness (and likewise, in privacy) does not necessarily equate to heightened concerns about robustness (or privacy). Rather, they imply significant variability in these concerns. For instance, individuals with consistently high concerns of robustness (or privacy) will exhibit lower levels of multiplicity.

Who suffers the brunt of multiplicity? Several recent works have shown a disparity in the risk of arbitrary decisions across different demographics (Ganesh et al. 2023; Cooper et al. 2024; Gomez et al. 2024). Building on these findings, we expand the analysis to our broader definition of multiplicity. We examine per-group multiplicity for predictions, robustness, and privacy, as detailed in Figure 1(c,d,e).

We find a noticeable disparity in multiplicity for the two groups based on perceived gender. While we see a higher multiplicity in predictions and robustness for the perceived gender group *Female*, we find the same group has remarkably low multiplicity in privacy. These results align with observations of disparity in multiplicity in the existing literature but extend to our broader setting showing that individuals from various demographic groups may face distinct forms of arbitrariness risk based on their group membership. Equipped with these results, we will now perform a legal analysis of arbitrariness under the anti-discrimination law in Canada and argue that disparate arbitrariness across various groups should be recognized as a form of discrimination.

4 Arbitrariness and Group Membership: The Legal Challenges

We perform our legal analysis of multiplicity in light of Canadian anti-discrimination law, with a focus on the context of hiring. Hiring has recently witnessed a dramatic increase in the delegation of decisions to machine learning models (Capuano 2023; Green 2021). While these models are promising in increasing efficiency and speed in hiring processes, they also risk discriminating against job applicants based on their protected characteristics (Ajunwa 2020; Cofone 2019). Note that, although our focus is on hiring, our analysis here may shed light on the broader legal implications of arbitrariness in algorithmic decisions.

We first briefly introduce employment discrimination law in Canada. We then argue that under these laws, the disparity in arbitrariness constitutes a form of discrimination.

4.1 Anti-Discrimination Laws: The Moore Test

Discrimination in hiring and recruitment is directly prohibited under the provincial and territorial human rights legislation in Canada. For example, the *Human Rights Code* of Ontario (noa 1990) ensures that “every person has a right to equal treatment with respect to employment without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, record of offences, marital status, family status or disability”. Similarly, the *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms* of Quebec states that “Every person has a right to full and equal recognition and exercise of his human rights and freedoms, without distinction, exclusion or preference based on race, colour, sex, gender identity or expression, pregnancy, sexual orientation, civil status, age” (noa 1976). While the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* does not directly apply to the disputes between private individuals (noa 1989, 2010), the Supreme Court’s interpretation of the equality rights under the *Charter* has greatly influenced and continues to guide the provincial courts and tribunals’ interpretation and application of anti-discrimination provisions under the applicable law, such as provincial human rights provisions (England 2006; Bildfell 2019). The *Canadian Human Rights Act* provides similar protection to those employed by the federal government and several types of companies that are regulated by the federal government, such as banks. Additionally, the *Employment Equity Act* requires employers to achieve employment equity by taking proactive measures targeting the detection and elimination of the hindrances negatively affecting “women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities” in employment (noa 1995).

In Canadian anti-discrimination doctrine, courts analyze whether a given practice or treatment is discriminatory by applying a three-part test developed in the Supreme Court case *Moore v. British Columbia (Ministry of Education)* (noa 2012) and later confirmed in *Stewart v. Elk Valley Coal Corp* (noa 2017). Under this test, commonly referred to as the *Moore* test, “complainants are required to show that they have a characteristic protected from discrimination under the *Code* [provincial/territorial human rights legislation]; that they experienced an adverse impact with respect to the service; and that the protected characteristic was a factor in the adverse impact” (noa 2012). In the next subsection, we use the *Moore* test to determine when there is a pattern of discrimination due to the disparity in arbitrariness across various protected groups.

4.2 Arbitrariness as a Form of (Prima Facie) Discrimination

To determine whether model multiplicity would violate extant anti-discrimination law in Canada, we have to scrutinize it under the *Moore* test. The test establishes what situation is a *prima facie* case of discrimination, meaning that there is a discriminatory impact that the employer will have to justify for it not to constitute illegal discrimination.

Consider the following hypothetical scenario: A non-

federally regulated employer, located in Ontario, wants to automate its hiring and tasks a team of developers with designing a machine learning model that will predict which job candidates have a high potential for success at the employer's company. Developers build two different models that have the same performance and group fairness but generate discrepant predictions on an individual level (i.e., they show model multiplicity). The employer settles on one of these models, knowing that their options have higher multiplicity for a particular ethnic minority. A candidate from the minority group who has been rejected then challenges this algorithm in court on the grounds of it being discriminatory. For simplicity, let us assume that the candidate was informed by the employer about the use of the algorithm and the multiplicity of models encountered after the development period.

The court, applying the *Moore* test to the case at hand, will first question whether the complainant has a personal characteristic enumerated under the *Human Rights Code* of the province (noa 2012). As we mentioned above, race is one of the characteristics protected by the *Human Rights Code* of Ontario (noa 1990), and this complainant claims to have been discriminated against on the basis of race. After clarifying this first step, the court will move to the second step to question whether the claimant was subjected to an adverse impact (noa 2012). This step is likely to be the most intricate one, as we need to answer whether the disparity of arbitrariness in model selection gives rise to an adverse impact. In this scenario, both models available to the employer were recommending candidates from the minority group the claimant belongs to while maintaining other measures of fairness. The problem that gave rise to the said claim in court is that while the same individuals from the majority group are being recommended by both models, the recommended individuals from the minority group differ based on the model deployed. The question to address in this second step is: Does this variation constitute discrimination?

Under the Canadian anti-discrimination doctrine, courts often refer to the definition of discrimination provided in *Andrews v. Law Society (British Columbia)* in their analyses of discrimination claims. In *Andrews*, discrimination is defined as "a distinction, whether intentional or not but based on grounds relating to personal characteristics of the individual or group, which has the effect of imposing burdens, obligations or disadvantages on such individual or group not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits and advantages available to other members of society" (noa 1989)(emphasis added). Based on our analysis of model multiplicity, higher arbitrariness for minority groups can be viewed as a burden disproportionately imposed upon job candidates from these groups because, as discussed briefly in Section 3.1, such higher arbitrariness renders algorithmic decisions less predictable for them (for further discussion on the morality of unpredictability, see Creel and Hellman (2022)). Because there is less arbitrariness for majority groups, candidates from these groups have a better opportunity to foresee whether they will be recommended by the hiring algorithm despite the potential multiplicity of models. In other words, the expected value of the decision may be the same for both groups, but the variance

is different, and the burden imposed on job candidates is not limited only to the expected probability of being hired but also extends to the arbitrary variability. This predictability, for example, gives candidates from majority groups a possibility of recourse to adjust their behaviours and get a more favourable decision from the algorithm (the predictability of algorithmic decisions through explainable AI is considered an important benefit that allows individuals to obtain the outcomes they want; see Wachter, Mittelstadt, and Russell (2018); Verma et al. (2022)).

Likewise, better predictability (lower randomness) allows candidates from majority groups to better project which jobs they should apply for, and lower the number of jobs they will need to apply for to obtain one of them. On the other hand, due to higher arbitrariness, candidates from minority groups do not have this opportunity. Regardless of adjustments made to get a more favourable outcome, their chances of getting selected by the hiring algorithm will more significantly depend on an arbitrary choice of the model made by the developers and employers.

The arbitrariness resulting from model multiplicity may have further impacts on minority groups when models are updated. The updates of these models may erratically alter their individual-level predictions (Watson-Daniels et al. 2024). These updates may hinder minority candidates' access to employment opportunities by further rendering the decisions less predictable. As minority candidates are subjected to a higher level of arbitrariness, they may face higher variability in the preferences of models following updates. For example, the explanation of why a minority candidate was not selected by a hiring model may include the notification that having more experience would lead to a more favourable decision for the candidate. However, by the time the said candidate applied again, the model might have been updated; and this time, it might require the candidate to get another college degree to receive a more favorable decision. This variability is likely to be less strong in the case of majority candidates, as there is lower arbitrariness for them in the decisions of the models.

The disparate situation depicted above constrains minority groups' access to equal employment opportunities. Therefore, it should be viewed as an adverse impact under the second step of the *Moore* test.

In the third and last part of the *Moore* test, the court will question whether the protected characteristic highlighted in the first step has indeed influenced the occurrence of the adverse impact (noa 2012). This is the step in which our empirical results are directly applicable. As we showed in our empirical study in Section 3.3, the determining factor for whether a job candidate will be subjected to a higher level of arbitrariness due to multiplicity is their group membership. Being a member of a racial minority translates into increased arbitrariness, which gives rise to reduced predictability of algorithmic decisions in a disproportionate manner. Race, the protected characteristic in this hypothetical case, thus plays a major role in the emergence of this adverse impact. This conclusion, paired with the conclusions in steps one and two of the *Moore* test, would render arbitrariness in this hypothetical case a discriminatory practice.

The heightened levels of arbitrariness for minority groups, for these reasons, should be viewed as a *prima facie* case of discrimination by courts. It should be noted that this finding does not conclude a court's analysis of the issue: employers will still be able to justify this arbitrariness based on the contextual facts of a case under the *Meiorin* test developed by the Supreme Court in *British Columbia (Public Service Employee Relations Commission) v. B.C.G.E.U.* (no 1999). In other words, after *prima facie* discrimination is shown, employers have the opportunity to show that the disparity is justified for some reason. Proving *prima facie* discrimination, however, while not conclusive, is a fundamental step in guaranteeing the rights of individuals.

5 The Potential Monopoly of A Machine Learning Model

After examining the multiplicity disparity across groups, we shift our focus to a special case of arbitrariness in machine learning: the challenges of an arbitrary decision made by an algorithm that is widely adopted across various applications or user contexts, known as an algorithmic leviathan (Creel and Hellman 2022). Algorithmic leviathans, as proposed by Creel and Hellman (2022), are “*automated decision-making systems that make uniform judgments across broad swathes of a sector*”. Such systems become problematic when these uniform judgements are arbitrary, leading to a systematic response against particular groups of individuals. Simply discouraging such a monopoly is impractical in scenarios where training multiple models can be cost-prohibitive, where there is a deliberate absence of multiple decision-makers (e.g., immigration decisions in a country), or where arbitrariness originates not from the model but from the underlying dataset (e.g., shared arbitrariness due to everyone using the same dataset). We direct readers to Creel and Hellman (2022) for a more in-depth discussion of the moral concerns associated with deploying algorithmic leviathans.

In this paper, we extend the arguments to legal concerns on the existence of such leviathans. We start by examining the compounded impact of a monopoly on the existing disparity in arbitrariness across different protected groups from the lens of anti-discrimination law. Following this, we draw attention to the far-reaching discriminatory impacts of algorithmic leviathans which result from the blanket rejection of individuals. We then ask: “*What if an algorithmic leviathan, while not discriminating against protected groups, still creates a structured adversity for certain individuals?*”

5.1 Monopoly, Anti-Discrimination Law and Competition Law

The adverse impact arising from the increased levels of arbitrariness for minority groups will be compounded when a single algorithmic model is deployed widely in a sector. Where the majority of employers within a sector use the same model to make hiring decisions, minority groups will be systematically subjected to lower levels of predictability. This will harm minority groups' access to employment opportunities as they will not be able to increase the likelihood of getting recommended by the hiring model by adjusting

their behaviours and they will be subjected to generalized welfare-decreasing uncertainty.

The compounded reduction in reduced predictability is not the only threat posed by algorithmic leviathans. These models, irrespective of whether they have higher arbitrariness for minority groups, may still be giving rise to discriminatory impacts. A hiring model that is deployed sector-wide risks excluding certain job candidates from employment opportunities (Creel and Hellman 2022). If a blanket rejection arises in connection with individuals' characteristics protected by anti-discrimination law, the disparate impact of arbitrariness on protected groups will be severe. In such a case, the members of the group rejected by the model may have significantly reduced opportunities to find employment within a specific sector. Such an exclusion would exacerbate the historical and ongoing under-representation of marginalized groups in the workforce.

Detecting the severity and extent of discrimination in such a case, however, may not be an easy task. The fact that a certain implementation of an algorithmic leviathan has an adverse impact on a minority group does not automatically mean that all other implementations of the same model have the same adverse impact too. Employers, after obtaining the hiring model from developers, might have fine-tuned it in accordance with their own business necessities. This means that different implementations of the same model may have different tendencies in selecting and rejecting job candidates. Accordingly, the discriminatory impact detected within a single instance of the model may not be found in other instances (Wang and Russakovsky 2023).

The same situation applies to the absence of discrimination in a certain implementation of an algorithmic leviathan as well. The fact that no discriminatory outcome is detected within the predictions of an algorithmic leviathan does not guarantee that all other implementations of the same model, too, do not give rise to discrimination. As fine-tuning can render a model unbiased, it can also turn an unbiased model into a biased one. Employers, in their attempts to align their hiring model with the needs of their businesses, might render them biased against certain minorities.

In some cases, the monopoly of a single hiring model within a sector may give rise to unfairness in access to employment opportunities despite not being discriminatory against any group. This happens when an unbiased, non-discriminatory, hiring model dominates a certain sector. While attaining a completely unbiased algorithmic model is highly difficult due to the intricate connections between neutral variables and protected characteristics (Cofone 2019), for the sake of our analysis and to be able to study these algorithmic leviathans separate from the discrimination against protected groups we saw in the previous section, let us assume that the model in question has achieved this fairness. Also, assume that no fine-tuning has been made by employers, and accordingly, this model, in each instance, is generating the same predictions. That is, it is recommending the same set of candidates while rejecting another set of candidates in all instances. This means that some candidates will be excluded from job opportunities as they will be consistently rejected by the same model. This situation is cer-

tainly unfair for these candidates given that they could receive more favorable outcomes had this model not attained monopoly within the given sector. But it does not constitute a case of discrimination because the said impediment does not occur in connection with a protected characteristic and it does not adversely impact any group.

Where this sector-wide uniformity in decisions has an adverse impact on minority groups, there exists discrimination. It should also be noted that where an algorithmic model has adverse impacts on the basis of protected characteristics, it will be discriminatory regardless of whether it is deployed widely in a sector. The adverse impacts of an algorithmic leviathan simply aggravate the disadvantageous situations of minority groups and give rise to compounded discrimination against them. But where this uniformity does not disadvantage any group in connection with their protected characteristics, then it is not discriminatory.

Rejecting some candidates while accepting others is an inherent part of hiring. As there are limited employment opportunities, some candidates will inevitably be rejected by employers. In our hypothetical example, the model is making rejection and acceptance decisions with no bias and discrimination. But as the model is deployed widely within a single sector, it is consistently rejecting the same candidates; making the monopoly of a single model ethically disturbing.

This problem goes beyond the reach of anti-discrimination law. However, the situation these consistently rejected candidates are put into is deeply unfair in that their access to job opportunities is severely restricted due to a hiring model's dominance within a sector (Creel and Hellman 2022). It requires a legal and policy reflection that considers the consequences of the dominance of a single hiring product within a sector. In this regard, competition law may be useful for regulators to prevent such unfair outcomes from occurring (Creel and Hellman 2022).

Competition law aims to foster and maintain healthy competition between the participants of markets (OECD Global Forum on Competition 2003). Competition between market participants has implications for two different concepts of fairness (Gerber 2020). Firstly, competitive fairness requires fair conditions under which market participants can compete with each other (Gerber 2020). Secondly, consumer fairness requires the protection of consumers from the detrimental practices of dominant companies (Gerber 2020).

Regulators may rely on both of these principles in preventing the sector-wide exclusion of individuals from employment opportunities. Enhancing the fairness of conditions under which the developers of hiring models compete with each other can prevent the occurrence of algorithmic leviathans, which in turn, would prevent the said unfairness candidates suffer from in searching for employment. For example, in the development of algorithmic leviathans, access to unique data fortifies the dominant position of large companies in the market, thus adversely affecting the competitive power of smaller companies (Schrepel and Pentland 2023). Vipra and Korinek (2023) argue that regulators, to strengthen competition between these companies, may consider prohibiting the developers from being the sole owner of the training data. Democratizing access to data in such

a way would strengthen smaller companies' capability to compete with larger ones; hence, it would consequently decrease the possibility of a single hiring model gaining market dominance. However, regulators should also pay attention to the possibility that the training of several models with the same dataset may lead these models to reflect similar tendencies in their predictions, thus giving rise to another sector-wide exclusion of individuals from employment opportunities (Creel and Hellman 2022)

An in-depth discussion of how competition law may be deployed in preventing the unfairness engendered by dominant hiring models is beyond the scope of this paper. But, as the above discussion on potential regulatory interventions shows, competition law is a promising legal tool for solving this problem. Regulators, therefore, should explore feasible regulatory measures under competition law to maintain and enhance equal access to employment.

6 Open Research Questions

In this paper, we explored the impact of arbitrariness in model selection due to multiplicity and discussed the discriminatory practices it can foster. However, there remain significant challenges, spanning both technical and legal domains. We conclude our paper by outlining the key open research questions in model multiplicity. By explicitly outlining paths for future research, we aim to encourage collaboration between both disciplines to address these challenges.

6.1 Auditing Model Multiplicity

We start by outlining the key technical challenges to auditing model multiplicity in real-world scenarios.

Cost-effective Auditing of Multiplicity: Various metrics for measuring multiplicity can be found in the literature, either for individual data points (Cooper et al. 2024; Kulynych et al. 2023; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; Hsu and Calmon 2022) or the entire datasets (Heljakka et al. 2022; Long et al. 2023; Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020); either for measuring multiplicity of predictions (Cooper et al. 2024; Kulynych et al. 2023; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; Long et al. 2023; Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020) or capturing a wider model behaviour (Heljakka et al. 2022; Hsu and Calmon 2022); etc. Yet, despite the differences, all these metrics share a commonality—they rely on training an ensemble of models. However, this is impractical and costly, as the burden of training multiple copies of a model can be unreasonable for companies utilizing such models, posing a significant barrier to auditing model multiplicity.

Recent work by Hsu et al. (2024) broke this trend and showed the advantages of using Monte Carlo dropout as an efficient alternative to training multiple models for measuring model multiplicity. This opens up a promising avenue for future research: understanding the relationship between predictive uncertainty and multiplicity. Predictive uncertainty is a model's calibrated uncertainty concerning a specific prediction. Acknowledging that machine learning models tend to make arbitrary decisions in uncertain situations, we might be able to use predictive uncertainty to approximate model

multiplicity. Existing work on measuring predictive uncertainty by using an ensemble of models further reinforces this connection (Lakshminarayanan, Pritzel, and Blundell 2017). Thus, gaining a better understanding of the relationship between predictive uncertainty and model multiplicity can allow us to leverage cost-effective methods of uncertainty measurement, marking a crucial step toward auditing arbitrariness and multiplicity in machine learning.

It should also be noted that despite recent advancements, we have a limited understanding of how to mitigate and manage multiplicity, with existing literature primarily focused on auditing multiplicity as discussed above. Notably, the most common recommendation in literature, model selection based on appropriate constraints, has been shown to cause overfitting and does not generalize to unseen settings (Ganesh 2024). Addressing this gap thus becomes imperative to be able to tackle multiplicity in the real world.

Arbitrariness as a Fairness Metric: Defining a metric is an important initial step in any auditing process, enabling us to measure and track progress while facilitating comparisons across diverse settings. Although we’ve demonstrated significant disparity in arbitrariness across different protected groups (see Section 3.3), an essential discussion remains on translating this disparity into a fairness metric. Furthermore, there are several multiplicity metrics currently used in the literature (Cooper et al. 2024; Kulynych et al. 2023; Black, Raghavan, and Barocas 2022; Somepalli et al. 2022; Heljakka et al. 2022; Long et al. 2023; Marx, Calmon, and Ustun 2020; Hsu and Calmon 2022), yet none have been compared with each other to determine if they even have any discernible differences. Thus, it is critical to consolidate existing metrics, conduct a comprehensive study on their applicability in defining fairness under arbitrariness, and use them to quantify the biases present in a model.

Beyond Predictive Multiplicity: Throughout the majority of this paper, and in much of the literature on model multiplicity, the focus remains on the case of predictive multiplicity. However, it is worth noting that, even when multiple models in the Rashomon set produce the same prediction for an individual, the arbitrariness of model selection can still introduce adversity, as we show in Section 3.3. Thus, while predictive multiplicity is fundamental, it is important to recognize that the adverse effects of multiplicity extend beyond predictions. Consequently, further exploration and analysis of these effects would be beneficial.

6.2 Anti-discrimination and Competition Laws

We discuss, in this section, the gaps between law and the implications of model multiplicity, emphasizing the legal discussions required for future research.

Arbitrariness in a Broader Context: Our analysis in this paper has been limited to Canada and the context of hiring. We encourage further discussions from the perspective of other jurisdictions, as a comparative analysis would provide lawmakers with a more profound insight into the problem. Further research would also be beneficial to shed light

on how model multiplicity may impact equality and non-discrimination in other domains where algorithmic decision-making is increasingly deployed, such as predictive policing, credit lending, and marketing.

Competition Law for Algorithmic Leviathans: In this paper, we argued that heightened levels of arbitrariness for individuals from minority groups should be considered as an adverse impact under anti-discrimination laws. We also noted that where protected characteristics of individuals do not play a role in the occurrence of the disadvantageous outcomes of model multiplicity, there is no discrimination under the extant anti-discrimination laws. In the case of an algorithmic system gaining market dominance, we noted that competition law may be useful in combating the unfairness emerging from these models. How better competition and stronger fairness can be achieved simultaneously in a sector that relies on such algorithmic leviathans is an important policy question that requires further research and discussion.

A Closer Look on Foundational Models: The advent of foundational models, commonly defined as large-scale AI models capable of adapting to a wide range of applications, is a special case of algorithmic leviathans. These models wield exceptional influence, intensifying concerns about the arbitrariness present in their decisions. Unlike other algorithmic leviathans, foundational models transcend individual sectors and are used across a diverse array of contexts, amplifying their impact. This universality highlights the potential harm associated with the arbitrariness and the discriminatory challenges of foundational models.

These models stand out as a case study that demands special attention, given their common practice of employing closed-source datasets and models. This practice of closed systems hampers transparency, complicating efforts to audit the model for arbitrariness. The extreme costs of training, and thus the infeasibility of retraining foundational models, also underscores the imperative of addressing arbitrariness online. Moreover, the majority of foundational models are controlled by established tech monopolies, facilitating rapid integration into a range of products. This necessitates enhanced regulatory measures to prevent their unchecked dominance in various fields. Consequently, a discussion among legal and policy experts is necessary to address the concerns of fair competition and safeguard individuals against adversities resulting from multiplicity in foundational models.

7 Discussion and Limitations

In this paper, we provided empirical results and legal arguments on model multiplicity to address the cost of arbitrariness for individuals. A limitation of our legal discussion lies in the absence of real-world case studies. We believe that the lack of awareness among the general public regarding the arbitrary nature of model selection contributes to the absence of legal studies on the arbitrariness of automated systems; our work serves as a crucial step in shedding light on the inherent problems associated with multiplicity. We also use only a single tabular dataset in our experiments that is tailored to the hiring domain, while the other datasets in our appendix are from diverse domains. This is due to the scarcity

of publicly available hiring datasets. However, we believe that our empirical results are still relevant, as they highlight the arbitrariness inherent in learning.

With this paper, we aim to initiate an interdisciplinary conversation on the impact of model multiplicity on individuals, increasing awareness and laying the groundwork for further research in this domain.

Acknowledgements

Funding support for project activities has been partially provided by Canada CIFAR AI Chair, and Google award. We also express our gratitude to Compute Canada for their support in providing facilities for our evaluations.

References

1976. Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, CQLR c C-12.
1989. *Andrews v. Law Society (British Columbia)*. *CarswellBC*, 16.
1990. Human Rights Code, RSO 1990, c. H. 19.
1995. Employment Equity Act, SC 1995, c 44.
1999. *British Columbia (Public Service Employee Relations Commission) v. B.C.G.E.U.* *CarswellBC*, 1907.
2010. *Ontario (Director of Disability Support Program) v. Tranchemontagne*. *ONCA*, 593.
2012. *Moore v. British Columbia (Ministry of Education)*. *SCC*, 61.
2017. *Stewart v. Elk Valley Coal Corp.* *SCC*, 30.
- Ajunwa, I. 2020. The Paradox of Automation as Anti-Bias Intervention. *Cardozo L Rev*, 41(5): 1671–1742.
- Ali, J.; Lahoti, P.; and Gummadi, K. P. 2021. Accounting for Model Uncertainty in Algorithmic Discrimination. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 336–345. Virtual Event USA: ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-8473-5.
- Anderson, R. 2016. The Rashomon effect and communication. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 41(2): 249–270.
- Bildfell, C. 2019. Hiring Algorithms in the Canadian Private Sector: Examining the Promise of Greater Workplace Equality. *CJLT*, 17(2): 115–143.
- Black, E.; Koepke, J. L.; Kim, P.; Barocas, S.; and Hsu, M. 2024. The Legal Duty to Search for Less Discriminatory Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*.
- Black, E.; Raghavan, M.; and Barocas, S. 2022. Model multiplicity: Opportunities, concerns, and solutions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 850–863.
- Breiman, L. 2001. Statistical modeling: The two cultures (with comments and a rejoinder by the author). *Statistical science*, 16(3): 199–231.
- Capuano, A. 2023. Automated Candidate Screening, Algorithms and Artificial Intelligence in Recruitment. In *Class and Social Background Discrimination in the Modern Workplace*, chapter Class and Social Background Discrimination in the Modern Workplace, 150–176. Bristol University Press. ISBN 978-1-5292-2297-5.
- cjadams; Sorenson, J.; Elliott, J.; Dixon, L.; McDonald, M.; McDonald; nithum; and Cukierski, W. 2017. Toxic Comment Classification Challenge.
- Cofone, I. N. 2019. Algorithmic Discrimination Is an Information Problem. *Hastings LJ*, 70(6): 1389–1444.
- Cooper, A. F.; Lee, K.; Choksi, M. Z.; Barocas, S.; De Sa, C.; Grimmelmann, J.; Kleinberg, J.; Sen, S.; and Zhang, B. 2024. Arbitrariness and Social Prediction: The Confounding Role of Variance in Fair Classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 22004–22012.
- Creel, K.; and Hellman, D. 2022. The algorithmic leviathan: Arbitrariness, fairness, and opportunity in algorithmic decision-making systems. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 52(1): 26–43.
- D’Amour, A.; Heller, K.; Moldovan, D.; Adlam, B.; Alipanahi, B.; Beutel, A.; Chen, C.; Deaton, J.; Eisenstein, J.; Hoffman, M. D.; et al. 2022. Underspecification presents challenges for credibility in modern machine learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1): 10237–10297.
- Dubey, S. R.; Singh, S. K.; and Chaudhuri, B. B. 2022. Activation Functions in Deep Learning: A Comprehensive Survey and Benchmark. *Neurocomputing*, 503: 92–108.
- England, G. 2006. The Impact of the Charter on Individual Employment Law in Canada: Rewriting an Old Story. *Canadian Lab & Emp LJ*, 13: 1–40.
- Friedler, S. A.; Scheidegger, C.; Venkatasubramanian, S.; Choudhary, S.; Hamilton, E. P.; and Roth, D. 2019. A comparative study of fairness-enhancing interventions in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, 329–338.
- Ganesh, P. 2024. An Empirical Investigation into Benchmarking Model Multiplicity for Trustworthy Machine Learning: A Case Study on Image Classification. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. Waikoloa, HI, USA: IEEE.
- Ganesh, P.; Chang, H.; Strobel, M.; and Shokri, R. 2023. On The Impact of Machine Learning Randomness on Group Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT ’23, 1789–1800. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701924.
- Gerber, D. J. 2020. *Competition Law and Antitrust: A Global Guide*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gomez, J. F.; Machado, C. V.; Paes, L. M.; and Calmon, F. P. 2024. Algorithmic Arbitrariness in Content Moderation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16979*.
- Green, A. 2021. Want a Job? The AI Will See You Now. MIT Technology Review (Podcast).

- Hancox-Li, L. 2020. Robustness in machine learning explanations: does it matter? In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, 640–647.
- Hardt, M.; Price, E.; and Srebro, N. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Heljakka, A.; Trapp, M.; Kannala, J.; and Solin, A. 2022. Representational multiplicity should be exposed, not eliminated. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08890*.
- Hendrycks, D.; Zhao, K.; Basart, S.; Steinhardt, J.; and Song, D. 2021. Natural adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 15262–15271.
- Hofmann, H. 1994. Statlog (German Credit Data). UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5NC77>.
- Hsu, H.; and Calmon, F. 2022. Rashomon Capacity: A Metric for Predictive Multiplicity in Classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 28988–29000.
- Hsu, H.; Li, G.; Hu, S.; et al. 2024. Dropout-Based Rashomon Set Exploration for Efficient Predictive Multiplicity Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00728*.
- Karimi, A.-H.; Barthe, G.; Schölkopf, B.; and Valera, I. 2022. A survey of algorithmic recourse: contrastive explanations and consequential recommendations. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(5): 1–29.
- Kelly-Lyth, A. 2023. Algorithmic discrimination at work. *ELLJ*, 14(2): 152–171.
- Kim, P. T. 2017. Data-Driven Discrimination at Work. *Wm & Mary L Rev*, 58(3): 857–936.
- Kim, P. T. 2022. Race-Aware Algorithms: Fairness, Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action. *Cal L Rev*, 110(5): 1539–1596.
- Kulynych, B.; Hsu, H.; Troncoso, C.; and Calmon, F. P. 2023. Arbitrary Decisions are a Hidden Cost of Differentially Private Training. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1609–1623.
- Lakshminarayanan, B.; Pritzel, A.; and Blundell, C. 2017. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Larsen, L. 2018. Train, Validate, Re-train: How We Build HireVue Assessments Models.
- Long, C. X.; Hsu, H.; Alghamdi, W.; and Calmon, F. 2023. Individual Arbitrariness and Group Fairness. In *Thirty-Seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Marx, C.; Calmon, F.; and Ustun, B. 2020. Predictive multiplicity in classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 6765–6774. PMLR.
- McCoy, R. T.; Min, J.; and Linzen, T. 2020. BERTs of a Feather Do Not Generalize Together: Large Variability in Generalization across Models with Similar Test Set Performance. [arxiv:1911.02969](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02969).
- Meyer, A. P.; Albarghouthi, A.; and D’Antoni, L. 2023. The Dataset Multiplicity Problem: How Unreliable Data Impacts Predictions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 193–204.
- Milani Fard, M.; Cormier, Q.; Canini, K.; and Gupta, M. 2016. Launch and iterate: Reducing prediction churn. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29.
- OECD Global Forum on Competition, O. G. F. o. C. 2003. The Objectives of Competition Law and Policy. *CCN-M/GF/COMP(2003)3*.
- Paes, L. M.; Cruz, R.; Calmon, F. P.; and Diaz, M. 2023. On the Inevitability of the Rashomon Effect. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 549–554. IEEE.
- Ponomareva, N.; Hazimeh, H.; Kurakin, A.; Xu, Z.; Denison, C.; McMahan, H. B.; Vassilvitskii, S.; Chien, S.; and Thakurta, A. G. 2023. How to dp-fy ml: A practical guide to machine learning with differential privacy. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 77: 1113–1201.
- Rawal, K.; Kamar, E.; and Lakkaraju, H. 2021. Algorithmic Recourse in the Wild: Understanding the Impact of Data and Model Shifts. *arxiv*.
- Scherer, M. U.; King, A. G.; and Mrkonich, M. J. 2019. Applying Old Rules to New Tools: Employment Discrimination Law in the Age of Algorithms. *S C L Rev*, 71(2): 449–522.
- Schrepel, T.; and Pentland, A. S. 2023. Competition Between AI Foundation Models: Dynamics and Policy Recommendations. *MIT Connection Science Working Paper*.
- Sellam, T.; Yadlowsky, S.; Tenney, I.; Wei, J.; Saphra, N.; D’Amour, A.; Linzen, T.; Bastings, J.; Turc, I. R.; Eisenstein, J.; et al. 2021. The MultiBERTs: BERT Reproductions for Robustness Analysis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Semenova, L.; Rudin, C.; and Parr, R. 2022. On the existence of simpler machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1827–1858.
- Sokol, K.; Kull, M.; Chan, J.; and Salim, F. D. 2022. Fairness and Ethics Under Model Multiplicity in Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07139*.
- Somepalli, G.; Fowl, L.; Bansal, A.; Yeh-Chiang, P.; Dar, Y.; Baraniuk, R.; Goldblum, M.; and Goldstein, T. 2022. Can Neural Nets Learn the Same Model Twice? Investigating Reproducibility and Double Descent From the Decision Boundary Perspective. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 13699–13708.
- Tankha, A. 2023. Employability Classification of Over 70,000 Job Applicants. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/ayushtankha/70k-job-applicants-data-human-resource>.
- Trindel, K.; Kassir, S.; and Bent, J. 2021. Fairness in Algorithmic Employment Selection: How to Comply with Title VII. *ABA J Lab & Emp L*, 35(2): 241–288.
- Verma, S.; Boonsanong, V.; Hoang, M.; Hines, K. E.; Dickerson, J. P.; and Shah, C. 2022. Counterfactual Explanations and Algorithmic Recourses for Machine Learning: A Review. [arXiv:2010.10596](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.10596).

Vipra, J.; and Korinek, A. 2023. Market Concentration Implications of Foundation Models: The Invisible Hand of ChatGPT. *Center on Regulation and Markets at Brookings*, Working Paper 9.

Wachter, S.; Mittelstadt, B.; and Russell, C. 2018. Counterfactual Explanations without Opening the Black Box: Automated Decisions and the GDPR. *Harv JL & Tech*, 31(2): 841–888.

Wang, A.; and Russakovsky, O. 2023. Overwriting pre-trained bias with finetuning data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 3957–3968.

Watson-Daniels, J.; Barocas, S.; Hofman, J. M.; and Chouldechova, A. 2023. Multi-Target Multiplicity: Flexibility and Fairness in Target Specification under Resource Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 297–311.

Watson-Daniels, J.; du Pin Calmon, F.; D’Amour, A.; Long, C.; C. Parkes, D.; and Ustun, B. 2024. Predictive Churn with the Set of Good Models. *arxiv*.

Wu, B.; Chen, J.; Cai, D.; He, X.; and Gu, Q. 2021. Do wider neural networks really help adversarial robustness? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 7054–7067.

Yeom, S.; Giacomelli, I.; Fredrikson, M.; and Jha, S. 2018. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st computer security foundations symposium (CSF)*, 268–282. IEEE.

Zech, J. R.; Badgeley, M. A.; Liu, M.; Costa, A. B.; Titano, J. J.; and Oermann, E. K. 2018. Variable generalization performance of a deep learning model to detect pneumonia in chest radiographs: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS medicine*, 15(11): e1002683.

Zhang, Z.; Song, Y.; and Qi, H. 2017. Age progression/regression by conditional adversarial autoencoder. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 5810–5818.

A Additional Details on Experiment Setup

A.1 Self Consistency

For measuring multiplicity in our paper, we use self-consistency (Cooper et al. 2024). Given b models in the Rashomon set, where the final prediction is 0 for b_0 models and 1 for the rest $b_1 = b - b_0$ models, **self-consistency** is defined as $1 - \frac{b_0 b_1}{b(b-1)}$. This metric represents the likelihood of choosing two models randomly from the Rashomon set, and getting the same output.

A.2 Creating Rashomon Sets

To create the Rashomon sets, we change the underlying dataset, the model hyperparameters and the random seeds. For simulating a change in the underlying dataset, we simply choose a random subset of 12 features out of 18 features in our dataset, and repeat this 100 times with a different subset of features each time. For simulating a change in the model hyperparameters, we change the model’s batch

size, the model’s learning rate, and the optimizer (choosing between SGD and Adam). Finally, we set a random seed to control both the stochasticity of model weight initialization and training data shuffling and change this seed 500 times. When making all three changes simultaneously, we run exponentially many training runs by randomly changing the parameters on all three axes as defined above, until we found 20 models that satisfied the performance constraints.

A.3 Defining Robustness

We define robustness as the stability of model predictions under input noise, more specifically noise of $\pm\$5000$ in the feature column PreviousSalary. To binarize this metric, so that we can measure self-consistency, we define robustness as follows. If the individual’s predictions do not change with an increase (and a decrease) of the feature PreviousSalary by \$5000 then we consider that individual robust, else we consider them not robust.

A.4 Defining Privacy

We define privacy as the prediction made by a membership inference attack algorithm. We perform membership inference using a simple threshold-based algorithm (Yeom et al. 2018). We choose the threshold for binarizing the membership inference scores by utilizing our knowledge of the train test split. This assignment thus becomes the membership inference prediction for a data point, given a specific model, and we can then measure self-consistency for privacy.

B Results on Additional Datasets

Datasets We perform additional experiments on a tabular dataset (South German Credit (Hofmann 1994)), an image dataset (UTKFace (Zhang, Song, and Qi 2017)), and a text dataset (Jigsaw (cjadams et al. 2017)), to cover a diverse set of distributions and modalities. **South German Credit** dataset (Hofmann 1994) is a tabular dataset containing personal and financial information of 1000 unique individuals, with the binary classification task of predicting whether the individual has good or bad credit. We use the protected attribute *age* for this dataset, discretizing it into two binary age groups, [19 – 59, 59 – 75]. **UTKFace** dataset (Zhang, Song, and Qi 2017) is an image dataset containing over 20,000 face images with attributes like age, race, and perceived gender of each individual in the image. We use the perceived gender label to create a binary classification task and the race label as the protected attribute. **Jigsaw** toxicity classification dataset (cjadams et al. 2017) is a text dataset that contains Wikipedia comments labelled by human annotators for various forms of toxicity, converted to a binary text classification task by discretizing the overall toxicity score. Given the significantly large size of the dataset, we use the test split of the dataset, still containing close to 100k Wikipedia comments. We use the labels associated with *religion*, *sexual orientation*, *gender identities* and *race* as the protected attributes. All datasets are split 80 – 20 into train and test sets.

Models and Learning Setup We use a feed-forward network with a single hidden layer containing 10 neurons and ReLU for the South German Credit dataset and train 1000

models with changing random seeds to capture the multiplicity. Similarly, we use ResNet18, trained from scratch, for the UTKFace dataset, and train 50 models with changing random seeds. Finally, we use a set of 25 publicly available BERT models (Sellam et al. 2021) that were all trained with the same setup but different random seeds and learn logistic regression on the embeddings for the Jigsaw dataset.

B.1 New Rashomon Sets

To emphasize the broader definition of Rashomon sets, we perform a case study on the South German Credit dataset. In this study, we train 1000 models on the South German Credit dataset with changing random seeds. We then select models based on two criteria: (i) based solely on the accuracy with a 2% threshold, and (ii) considering both accuracy and group fairness (accuracy disparity across different age groups) again with a 2% threshold. The first criterion led to the selection of 121 models, while the second criterion resulted in the selection of only 6 models, out of the original 1000. This setup aims to simulate real-world model selection, where a user might want to select the best performing model. For both scenarios, we record the self-consistency scores of predictive multiplicity across all 200 individuals from the test set: results are collected in Figure 2(a).

Remarkably, despite being a more refined model selection criterion and with fewer models in the Rashomon set, the second set of constraints results in lower self-consistency scores for a greater number of individuals. That is, despite *similar performance* in terms of accuracy and group fairness, we find that the final prediction for many individuals still relies heavily on the arbitrariness of model selection among the 6 final models. We highlight the shift in multiplicity trends under various choices of performance constraints, underscoring the reality of model selection that would have been missed if the Rashomon sets were solely examined through the lens of similar accuracy.

We repeat the same case study with a fixed model selection criteria (i.e., both accuracy and group fairness); and our focus instead shifts towards measuring multiplicity using two distinct effects of multiplicity: (i) model predictions and (ii) membership inference. We perform membership inference using a simple threshold-based algorithm (Yeom et al. 2018). Among the 1000 individuals in our dataset, we predict the top 800 individuals with the highest output logits for each model as members, designating the remaining 200 as non-members (utilizing our knowledge of the train-test split). This assignment thus becomes the membership inference prediction for a data point, given a specific model. The subsequent measurements then closely mirror model predictions. This time, we gather the self-consistence scores of both scenarios for individuals in the train set: the results are collected in Figure 2(b).

In line with our earlier discussion, the trends in self-consistency between these two distinct multiplicity metrics are noticeably different. The self-consistency scores for membership inference are lower, which suggests that the arbitrary selection of a model has a more pronounced impact on an individual’s privacy than their predictions. These case studies together showcase the significance of formalizing a

broader definition of model multiplicity.

B.2 Disparate Arbitrariness across Demographics

We begin by studying the predictive multiplicity across various racial groups in the UTKFace dataset. For fairness constraints, we employ threshold optimization to improve accuracy parity (Hardt, Price, and Srebro 2016), while using a single threshold for all groups. The results are presented in Figure 3. In Figure 3(a), a substantial portion of the test data exhibits self-consistency scores below 1, indicating that predictions for these individuals (unfortunately) depend on the arbitrariness of model selection. Notably, this trend is more pronounced for certain racial groups. The *Asian* racial group, in particular, has twice as many fractions of individuals with lower self-consistency scores compared to any other racial group, highlighting a significant disparity in multiplicity. At first glance, one might attribute this disparity to biases in the model, expecting it to diminish under fairness constraints. However, Figure 3(b) shows that the introduction of threshold optimizations in this setting instead amplifies the arbitrariness for all groups. This result aligns with observations of higher multiplicity under fairness constraints by Long et al. (2023), emphasizing that the disparity in multiplicity can exist in the absence of a disparity in performance.

We extend our experiments to the Jigsaw toxicity classification dataset and record the multiplicity across various protected groups in Figure 4. We see similar trends of high disparity in multiplicity across groups. For instance, text comments referencing Christianity exhibit an ambiguity of only ~ 0.3 in toxicity classification—indicating that only 30% of the data is affected by the arbitrariness of model selection. Conversely, comments referencing Muslims show a higher ambiguity of ~ 0.68 in toxicity classification, i.e., 68% of the data from this group is susceptible to the arbitrariness of model selection. Thus, predictions on the toxicity of a text can undergo significant changes for certain demographics simply because of an arbitrary change in the model’s random seed during training, while the predictions for the other demographic groups would remain mostly consistent.

We conclude our empirical study by underscoring the disparity of multiplicity across various protected groups when examining the arbitrary nature of model selection in machine learning. We even saw this vulnerability increase with explicit fairness constraints, despite the reduction in bias scores for existing fairness metrics.




Figure 2: **(a)** Distribution of self-consistency scores for individuals in the South German Credit test set (Hofmann 1994), across models selected using only accuracy vs both accuracy and fairness. The impact of multiplicity is more pronounced in the latter case, which underscores the significance of the *performance metrics*. **(b)** Distribution of self-consistency scores for individuals in the South German Credit train set (Hofmann 1994) under a fixed model selection criteria (both accuracy and fairness) but measured on either model predictions, i.e., predictive multiplicity, or membership inference predictions. Although not as pronounced as before, distinct trends persist between the two settings, reiterating the importance of the multiplicity metric in model multiplicity.




Figure 3: Model multiplicity across four different racial groups on the UTKFace dataset (Zhang, Song, and Qi 2017). **(a)** We find a clear disparity in multiplicity across different groups, where the under-represented group contains a significantly higher percentage of individuals with low self-consistency scores than other majority groups. **(b)** Not only do these trends generalize to other measures of multiplicity, we even find an increase in multiplicity scores under fairness constraints (here, threshold optimization to achieve accuracy parity).




Figure 4: Model multiplicity (measured as ambiguity) across various protected groups on the Jigsaw toxicity classification dataset (cjadams et al. 2017) The multiplicity disparity between groups is dramatically high in this setting, emphasizing the previously seen trends.

(Legend) Budd: Buddhist; Christ: Christian; Jew: Jewish; Bi: Bisexual; Hetero: Heterosexual; Homo: Homosexual; Trans: Transgender.