

Colleagues Debate AI Hiring Ethics

Listening · C1 · Conversation · 3 speakers (Sarah, Tom, Alex) · 470 words

1 Multiple Choice

- 1 **c**
Tom says it could "flag the top candidates in minutes, not hours" and imagines "the time we'd save for actual human interactions later on."
- 2 **c**
Alex says the systems "are trained on data that mirrors our world's inequalities" and asks, "What if it systematically weeds out non-native speakers or introverts?"
- 3 **c**
Sarah says, "the vendor swears it's been audited for bias. They use diverse datasets now," and adds that "recruiters have unconscious prejudices too."
- 4 **d**
Alex recalls that Amazon's AI "learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes," and that implementing it "without scrutiny" could make them "liable for discrimination lawsuits."
- 5 **b**
Tom asks, "wouldn't mandating explainable AI solve that?" and adds that it would "spit out the reasoning behind scores."
- 6 **b**
Sarah proposes they "trial it with oversight – metrics on demographics, appeal processes." Tom says, "Agreed," and Alex replies, "Reluctantly, yeah."

2 True / False

- 1 **True**
It analyses video interviews for soft skills like confidence and enthusiasm.
- 2 **True**
flag the top candidates in minutes, not hours.
- 3 **False**
What if it systematically weeds out non-native speakers or introverts?
- 4 **False**
Their AI learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes.
- 5 **False**
we favour people who look like us, talk like us.

6 **True**

Coffee's on me if it flops.

3 **Note Completion**

1 **confidence**

2 **introverts**

3 **Amazon**

4 **women**

5 **Coffee**

1 It analyses video interviews for soft skills like confidence and enthusiasm.

2 What if it systematically weeds out non-native speakers or introverts?

3 Remember the Amazon debacle a few years back?

4 Their AI learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes.

5 Coffee's on me if it flops.

4 **Matching**

1-B: Predicts that the top candidates could be identified in minutes rather than hours, thereby saving time for subsequent human interactions. → Tom

2-A: Asserts that the vendor has audited the system for bias and currently uses diverse datasets. → Sarah

3-C: Warns that discrimination lawsuits could follow if such a system were introduced without sufficient scrutiny. → Alex

4-A: Argues that the technology would augment rather than replace staff and that instant feedback would be advantageous for candidates. → Sarah

5-C: Undertakes to monitor the trial with the intensity of a hawk. → Alex

1. "This could streamline everything – flag the top candidates in minutes, not hours. Imagine the time we'd save for actual human interactions later on."

2. "the vendor swears it's been audited for bias. They use diverse datasets now."

3. "If we'd implemented that without scrutiny, we'd be liable for discrimination lawsuits."

4. "It's not about replacing us; it's augmenting. Plus, candidates get instant feedback – that's a win for them."

5. "I'll be watching like a hawk."

5 **Sentence Completion**

1 **confidence and enthusiasm**

It analyses video interviews for soft skills like confidence and enthusiasm.

2 **non-native speakers**

What if it systematically weeds out non-native speakers or introverts?

3 **male resumes**

Their AI learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes.

4 **lacking warmth**

What if it tells a qualified minority candidate they're 'lacking warmth' because they don't smile enough on camera?

6 **Short Answer**

1 *Possible answers:* **confidence**

It analyses video interviews for soft skills like confidence and enthusiasm.

2 *Possible answers:* **minutes**

This could streamline everything – flag the top candidates in minutes, not hours.

3 *Possible answers:* **Amazon**

Remember the Amazon debacle a few years back?

4 *Possible answers:* **women**

Their AI learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes.

Audio: play the MP3 included in your download.

TRANSCRIPT

Sarah: Hey, you two. I was just reading about that AI hiring tool we're thinking of rolling out. Sounds revolutionary, right? It analyses video interviews for soft skills like confidence and enthusiasm.

Tom: Absolutely, Sarah. We're drowning in applications these days. This could streamline everything – flag the top candidates in minutes, not hours. Imagine the time we'd save for actual human interactions later on.

Alex: Hold your horses, Tom. Isn't this just kicking the can down the road on ethics? These systems aren't magic; they're trained on data that mirrors our world's inequalities. What if it systematically weeds out non-native speakers or introverts?

Sarah: Mm-hm, I get the concern, Alex, but the vendor swears it's been audited for bias. They use diverse datasets now. And let's be honest, our current process isn't flawless – recruiters have unconscious prejudices too.

Alex: Audited how? By whom? It's the tip of the iceberg. Remember the Amazon debacle a few years back? Their AI learned to penalise women because the training data was mostly male resumes. If we'd implemented that without scrutiny, we'd be liable for discrimination lawsuits.

Tom: Yeah, but that's ancient history. They've iterated since then. And Alex, humans aren't objective either – we favour people who look like us, talk like us. AI could level the playing field, make decisions based on merit, not gut feelings.

Sarah: Exactly, Tom. It's not about replacing us; it's augmenting. Picture this: if the AI shortlists fairly, we focus on nuanced stuff like cultural fit. Plus, candidates get instant feedback – that's a win for them.

Alex: Cultural fit? That's code for 'do they blend in?' And instant feedback sounds great until you realise it's generated by the same opaque black box. What if it tells a qualified minority candidate they're 'lacking warmth' because they don't smile enough on camera? We'd never know why.

Tom: Fair point – transparency's key. But wouldn't mandating explainable AI solve that? Like, it spits out the reasoning behind scores.

Alex: In theory, yeah. But in practice? These models are so complex, even developers can't always unpack them. It's like trying to reverse-engineer a neural net blindfolded.

Sarah: Whoa, hadn't thought of it that way. Still, piloting it small-scale lets us test. We monitor outcomes, tweak as needed. If disparities emerge, we pull the plug. Risk-averse, but progressive.

Tom: Right, and ethically, aren't we obliged to innovate? Sticking to outdated methods because of hypotheticals – that's stagnation. Our competitors are already doing it.

Alex: Obligated? Debatable. What about dignity? Reducing humans to data points feels dehumanising. Interviews should probe character, not just patterns.

Sarah: I see both sides, really. But if we don't adapt, we fall behind. Let's at least trial it with oversight – metrics on demographics, appeal processes. Sound reasonable?

Tom: Agreed. Oversight makes it ethical.

Alex: Reluctantly, yeah. But I'll be watching like a hawk.

Sarah: Deal. Coffee's on me if it flops.