

Models In Epidemiology And Biostatistics

Gordon Hilton Fick

Gender Bias Study

Data were collected as part of a University of California at Berkeley study to assess whether men were being given preferential treatment over women in admission to graduate programs (Bickel & O'Connell, 1975, Freedman et al., 1991, pp. 16 - 19). Assuming that the men and women who applied for admission to the graduate programs were equally well-qualified, one would expect equal acceptance rates by gender. However, it initially appeared as if men were being admitted in greater proportions than women. The data are in bias.dta

```
. table nacc female major
```

nacc	major and female											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
0	512	89	353	17	120	202	138	131	53	94	22	24
1	313	19	207	8	205	391	279	244	138	299	351	317

```
. cc accept male,exact
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed
Cases	1198	557	1755	0.6826
Controls	1493	1278	2771	0.5388
Total	2691	1835	4526	0.5946
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]	
Odds ratio	1.84108		1.621141	2.090932 (exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.4568406		.3831507	.5217445 (exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.311849			
1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000				
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000				

On the basis of this 2x2 table, one might be tempted to conclude that the odds of acceptance for males is estimated to be more than 1.8 times the odds of acceptance for females.

```
. cs accept male,exact
```

	male		Total
	Exposed	Unexposed	
Cases	1198	557	1755
Noncases	1493	1278	2771
Total	2691	1835	4526
Risk	.4451877	.3035422	.3877596
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]
Risk difference	.1416454		.113447 .1698439
Risk ratio	1.466642		1.35235 1.590592

```

+-----+
1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000

```

Notice that Stata gives the 'risk of acceptance'. We would say 'success rate' rather than 'risk'. It would be better to reverse code accept and gender.

```
. cc accept male,by(major)
```

major	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight	
1	.349212	.1971148	.5920123	29.85745	(exact)
2	.8025007	.2944774	2.005611	6.015385	(exact)
3	1.13306	.8452664	1.516368	45.10893	(exact)
4	.9212838	.6789529	1.250452	46.14773	(exact)
5	1.221631	.8067614	1.838862	22.21233	(exact)
6	.8278727	.433305	1.575535	11.79832	(exact)
Crude	1.84108	1.621141	2.090932		(exact)
M-H combined	.9046968	.7719074	1.06033		

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(5) =    18.00  Pr>chi2 = 0.0029
```

```

Test that combined OR = 1:
Mantel-Haenszel chi2(1) =    1.52
Pr>chi2 =    0.2169

```

The relationship between the odds of acceptance and gender is modified by major.

```
. cs accept male,by(major)
```

major	RR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight	
1	.753095	.6799474	.8341117	78.69775	
2	.9269958	.7032172	1.221985	16.2735	
3	1.08393	.9045434	1.298892	71.51416	
4	.9473337	.7801407	1.150358	68.97348	
5	1.160131	.8690445	1.548718	30.74315	
6	.838025	.4788977	1.466463	12.53782	
Crude	1.466642	1.35235	1.590592		
M-H combined	.944905	.8664522	1.030461		

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(5) =    23.288  Pr>chi2 = 0.0003
```

```
. cc accept male if major!=1,by(major)
```

major	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight	
2	.8025007	.2944774	2.005611	6.015385	(exact)
3	1.13306	.8452664	1.516368	45.10893	(exact)
4	.9212838	.6789529	1.250452	46.14773	(exact)
5	1.221631	.8067614	1.838862	22.21233	(exact)
6	.8278727	.433305	1.575535	11.79832	(exact)
Crude	1.563947	1.353682	1.806933		(exact)
M-H combined	1.03103	.8701288	1.221685		

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(4) =    2.55  Pr>chi2 = 0.6350
```

```

Test that combined OR = 1:
Mantel-Haenszel chi2(1) =    0.12
Pr>chi2 =    0.7237

```

The modification appears to be attributable to major==1 compared with the other majors. We might then argue that, apart from this modification, the relationship is confounded by major.

```
. cs accept male if major!=1,by(major)
```

major	RR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight
2	.9269958	.7032172	1.221985	16.2735
3	1.08393	.9045434	1.298892	71.51416
4	.9473337	.7801407	1.150358	68.97348
5	1.160131	.8690445	1.548718	30.74315
6	.838025	.4788977	1.466463	12.53782
Crude	1.356622	1.230477	1.4957	
M-H combined	1.020364	.9131851	1.140123	

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(4) =      2.688  Pr>chi2 = 0.6113
```

```
. cc accept male,by(major1)
```

major1	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight
1	.349212	.1971148	.5920123	29.85745 (exact)
2	1.563947	1.353682	1.806933	153.6989 (exact)
Crude	1.84108	1.621141	2.090932	(exact)
M-H combined	1.366357	1.195366	1.561807	

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(1) =     30.45  Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
Test that combined OR = 1:
```

```
Mantel-Haenszel chi2(1) =      20.79
Pr>chi2 =      0.0000
```

```
. cs accept male,by(major1)
```

major1	RR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight
1	.753095	.6799474	.8341117	78.69775
2	1.356622	1.230477	1.4957	243.0526
Crude	1.466642	1.35235	1.590592	
M-H combined	1.209004	1.115439	1.310417	

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(1) =     87.801  Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
. cs nacc male,by(major)
```

major	RR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight
1	2.156555	1.420635	3.273698	16.80064
2	1.155134	.6457439	2.066352	7.65812
3	.9566398	.864462	1.058646	138.4259
4	1.028276	.9301607	1.13674	128.4697
5	.9496577	.8559325	1.053646	97.78938
6	1.012263	.9738279	1.052215	165.6036
Crude	.7966202	.7612901	.83359	
M-H combined	1.027683	.9829126	1.074493	

```
Test of homogeneity (M-H)      chi2(5) =     16.993  Pr>chi2 = 0.0045
```

Now we will see if some modelling can enhance this analysis. We will now use non-acceptance and female.

We will have $p = \text{pr}(\text{not accepted})$, $F = \text{female}$, $M = \text{major}$, and then the model with $\text{major} = 1$ as baseline :

$$\log\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 F + \beta_2 M_2 + \beta_3 M_3 + \beta_4 M_4 + \beta_5 M_5 + \beta_6 M_6 + \beta_7 FM_2 + \beta_8 FM_3 + \beta_9 FM_4 + \beta_{10} FM_5 + \beta_{11} FM_6$$

and so we have

$$\log(\text{OR}) = \beta_1 + \beta_7 M_2 + \beta_8 M_3 + \beta_9 M_4 + \beta_{10} M_5 + \beta_{11} M_6$$

```
. logit nacc i.female##i.major
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =      4,526
                                LR chi2(11)        =      877.06
                                Prob > chi2         =      0.0000
Log likelihood = -2583.6421       Pseudo R2      =      0.1451
```

nacc	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1.female	-1.052076	.2627081	-4.00	0.000	-1.566974	-.5371775
major						
2	-.0416278	.1131892	-0.37	0.713	-.2634746	.1802189
3	1.02764	.1354968	7.58	0.000	.7620707	1.293209
4	1.19608	.1264066	9.46	0.000	.9483272	1.443832
5	1.449083	.1768115	8.20	0.000	1.102539	1.795627
6	3.261867	.2311961	14.11	0.000	2.808731	3.715003
female#major						
1 2	.8320534	.5103948	1.63	0.103	-.168302	1.832409
1 3	1.176998	.299558	3.93	0.000	.5898748	1.76412
1 4	.9700888	.3026187	3.21	0.001	.3769669	1.563211
1 5	1.252263	.330322	3.79	0.000	.6048437	1.899682
1 6	.8631784	.4026666	2.14	0.032	.0739662	1.65239
_cons	-.4921214	.0717497	-6.86	0.000	-.6327482	-.3514947

```
. logit nacc i.female##i.major if major!=1
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =      3,593
Log likelihood = -1985.7974       Pseudo R2      =      0.1196
```

nacc	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1.female	-.2200224	.4375926	-0.50	0.615	-1.077688	.6376434
major						
3	1.069267	.1444824	7.40	0.000	.7860872	1.352448
4	1.237707	.1359941	9.10	0.000	.9711639	1.504251
5	1.490711	.1837881	8.11	0.000	1.130493	1.850929
6	3.303488	.2365737	13.96	0.000	2.839812	3.767164
female#major						
1 3	.344944	.460659	0.75	0.454	-.557931	1.247819
1 4	.1380352	.4626552	0.30	0.765	-.7687524	1.044823
1 5	.4202094	.4812321	0.87	0.383	-.5229883	1.363407
1 6	.0311313	.5334903	0.06	0.953	-1.01449	1.076753
_cons	-.5337492	.087543	-6.10	0.000	-.7053304	-.3621681

```
. tab major major1
```

major	major1 1	2	Total
1	933	0	933
2	0	585	585
3	0	918	918
4	0	792	792
5	0	584	584
6	0	714	714
Total	933	3,593	4,526

```
. logit nacc i.female##i.major1
```

Logistic regression

Number of obs = 4,526
 LR chi2(3) = 376.21
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0622

Log likelihood = -2834.0656

nacc	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
1.female	-1.052078	.2627083	-4.00	0.000	-1.566977 - .5371797
2.major1	1.034514	.0863319	11.98	0.000	.8653061 1.203721
female#major1					
1 2	1.499291	.272492	5.50	0.000	.9652167 2.033366
_cons	-.4921214	.0717497	-6.86	0.000	-.6327482 -.3514947

```
. counterplot nacc female major1, measure(or)
```

