Teacher Answer Key

Case Study

1. DeShawn's experience raises concerns about opacity and cultural assumptions in AI video tools. He cannot know what criteria the algorithm used, whether his pause-to-think communication style was penalized, or whether the system's "energy pattern" analysis was validated for candidates from different cultural or socioeconomic backgrounds. The reading notes that these tools often measure traits whose scientific validity is unproven.

2. Lack of transparency means job seekers cannot identify whether they were rejected for legitimate reasons or due to algorithmic bias, and they cannot take steps to improve. The reading mentions that New York City passed a law requiring bias audits and disclosure, and Illinois requires consent notification for video AI tools, but no comprehensive federal law exists yet.

Multiple Choice

1. C
2. B
3. A

Matching

1-E, 2-C, 3-B, 4-A, 5-D

Fill-in-the-Blank

1) 2018, 2) bias, 3) high

Short Answer (Sample Responses)

Q1: Amazon's AI was trained on years of historical hiring records in which successful hires were predominantly male, reflecting the demographics of the tech industry at the time. The AI identified "male" as a success pattern, not because anyone wrote that rule, but because the data showed it repeatedly. It then penalized resumes containing signals of female identity, such as references to women's organizations, because those signals were statistically underrepresented among the historical successes it learned from.

Q2: "Culture fit" as measured by AI tools often means resemblance to the company's current employees. If current employees skew toward a particular demographic — for example, mostly young white men — the AI learns to favor candidates who match that profile. This means the tool effectively reproduces

whatever demographic makeup already exists, entrenching historical inequities rather than addressing them.

Q3: When tools are deployed before regulation catches up, job seekers have no legal right to know how they were evaluated, no mechanism to challenge discriminatory scores, and no way to determine whether a rejection was fair. Millions of applications can be screened and rejected by systems whose bias has never been independently audited, and the people harmed often cannot even identify that discrimination occurred.