CS #2: AI at the Tennis Tournament (Discussion Reflection)

Libo Zhang (lz200)

Question 1 – In responding to the case study reflection questions, where did I disagree with others in my group? What was the nature of our differing perspectives?

Answer 1 – In our group discussion, actually I did not totally agree that we should focus on the executives' options of the Durham Club all the time. I think simply judging whether the executives should pay a large amount of money to correct the bias or not is not enough, and I insisted that, according to the last question for reflection, the highlight system provider, GCS, should take more responsibility. In particular, I think the executives of GCS should be to blame, instead of those of the Club, because it is the GCS decision to publish the biased system to the market and even set a higher "correcting price" for a highlight system which is not biased.

As for the nature of our differing perspectives, I think it is just a matter of perspectives with which we prefer to stand. I think my group members would like to analyze the case study from the fans' perspective, and therefore it is very normal to make complaints about the Durham Club since the Club hosts the tournament. However, I would analyze the case study based on the highlight system itself, and if there is something wrong with the system, then I think the company who builds such problematic system should take more responsibility.

Question 2 – Where did I agree with others in my group? What was our shared perspective?

Answer 2 – Although our group had some disagreement about who should take more responsibility, we did agree with each other that it was definitely the correct decision from the executives of the Durham Club, to pay the money for fixing the bias in the highlight-selecting system.

As for our shared perspective, we all agree that fixing the bias is actually beneficial to all parties. The fans will be happy with higher-quality highlights, the Club has complied with their stated mission and will earn more profits in the future, and the participating tennis players will have relatively equal opportunities to show up in the highlights and earn contracts. Therefore, fixing the bias is indeed beneficial to all parties in the case study.

Question 3 – What were different views our group imagined others might have? How did these views disagree with our views?

Answer 3 – Our group also discussed about what "other pressing problems that needed to be solved" could be, if the executives of the Durham Club finally decided not to fix the bias. We think such pressing problems could include tennis court maintenance, employee salary payment, and other high-tech system purchase.

We expected that other groups might have some additional perspectives about what the pressing problems could be, so that we could better understand why the Club executives hesitated for a while to pay for correcting the bias. However, it seemed that other groups either did not discuss comprehensively about our topic or had very similar ideas with us, which I think kind of disagrees with what we have imagined.

Question 4 – What are my impressions of the advantages, or benefits, of a consequentialist framework for ethical reasoning?

Answer 4 – For ethical reasoning, I think a consequentialist framework has two very explicit advantages.

First, it can force us to make decisions which comply with ethical reasoning to most people, which means most ones will be happy or satisfied with such decisions, so that we can achieve the so-called "happy ending".

Second, I think a consequentialist framework from an ethical perspective could give us enough motivations, because if we have a goal which conforms to ethical reasoning, and we believe such a goal could benefit others, then we will be motivated to accomplish our goal as the best consequence.

Question 5 – What are my impressions of the disadvantages, or drawbacks, of a consequentialist framework for ethical reasoning?

Answer 5 – For ethical reasoning, I think a consequentialist framework also has two disadvantages.

First, simply focusing on achieving an ethical consequence may not be an appropriate way to solve a very complicated problem which involves many other factors. Take our case study for example, the executives finally decided to pay a large amount of money to fix the bias, which indeed obeyed their stated mission, and therefore concluded as ethical. However, what about other pressing problems that needed to be solved? What are the negative effects of not solving these pressing problems? Actually, we do have clear answers to these problems in our case study, and we can also assume such negative effects could be significant.

Second, I think if we pay too much attention to a consequence for ethical reasoning, then such a consequence itself might be biased, because under many situations, one or several ethical standards might not apply to all participants, which could probably result in an unethical consequence.