

Amazon ditched AI recruiting tool that favored men for technical jobs

Specialists had been building computer programs since 2014 to review résumés in an effort to automate the search process



📷 Amazon's automated hiring tool was found to be inadequate after penalizing the résumés of female candidates. Photograph: Brian Snyder/Reuters

Reuters

Wed 10 Oct 2018 19:42 EDT

Amazon's machine-learning specialists uncovered a big problem: their new recruiting engine did not like women.

The team had been building computer programs since 2014 to review job applicants' résumés, with the aim of mechanizing the search for top talent, five people familiar with the effort told Reuters.

Automation has been key to Amazon's e-commerce dominance, be it inside warehouses or driving pricing decisions. The company's experimental hiring tool used artificial intelligence to give job candidates scores ranging from one to five stars - much as shoppers rate products on Amazon, some of the people said.

"Everyone wanted this holy grail," one of the people said. "They literally wanted it to be an engine where I'm going to give you 100 résumés, it will spit out the top five, and we'll hire those."

But by 2015, the company realized its new system was not rating candidates for software developer jobs and other technical posts in a gender-neutral way.

That is because Amazon's computer models were trained to vet applicants by observing patterns in résumés submitted to the company over a 10-year period. Most came from men, a reflection of male dominance across the tech industry.

In effect, Amazon's system taught itself that male candidates were preferable. It penalized résumés that included the word "women's", as in "women's chess club captain". And it downgraded graduates of two all-women's colleges, according to people familiar with the matter.

Amazon edited the programs to make them neutral to these particular terms. But that was no guarantee that the machines would not devise

other ways of sorting candidates that could prove discriminatory, the people said.

The Seattle company ultimately disbanded the team by the start of last year because executives lost hope for the project, according to the people, who spoke on condition of anonymity. Amazon's recruiters looked at the recommendations generated by the tool when searching for new hires, but never relied solely on those rankings, they said.

Amazon declined to comment on the recruiting engine or its challenges, but the company says it is committed to workplace diversity and equality.

The company's experiment, which Reuters is first to report, offers a case study in the limitations of machine learning. It also serves as a lesson to the growing list of large companies including Hilton Worldwide Holdings and Goldman Sachs that are looking to automate portions of the hiring process.

Some 55% of US human resources managers said artificial intelligence, or AI, would be a regular part of their work within the next five years, according to a 2017 survey by talent software firm CareerBuilder.

Masculine language

Amazon's experiment began at a pivotal moment for the world's largest online retailer. Machine learning was gaining traction in the technology world, thanks to a surge in low-cost computing power. And Amazon's Human Resources department was about to embark on a hiring spree; since June 2015, the company's global headcount has more than tripled to 575,700 workers, regulatory filings show.

So it set up a team in Amazon's Edinburgh engineering hub that grew to around a dozen people. Their goal was to develop AI that could rapidly crawl the web and spot candidates worth recruiting, the people familiar with the matter said.

The group created 500 computer models focused on specific job functions and locations. They taught each to recognize some 50,000 terms that were found on past candidates' résumés. The algorithms learned to assign little significance to skills that were common across IT applicants, such as the ability to write various computer codes, the people said.

Instead, the technology favored candidates who described themselves using verbs more commonly found on male engineers' resumes, such as "executed" and "captured", one person said.

Gender bias was not the only issue. Problems with the data that underpinned the models' judgments meant that unqualified candidates were often recommended for all manner of jobs, the people said. With the technology returning results almost at random, Amazon shut down the project, they said.

The problem or the cure?

Other companies are forging ahead, underscoring the eagerness of employers to harness AI for hiring.

Kevin Parker, chief executive of HireVue, a startup near Salt Lake City, said automation is helping companies look beyond the same recruiting networks upon which they have long relied. His firm analyzes candidates' speech and facial expressions in video interviews to reduce reliance on résumés.

"You weren't going back to the same old places; you weren't going back to just Ivy League schools," Parker said. His company's customers include Unilever PLC and Hilton.

Goldman Sachs has created its own résumé analysis tool that tries to match candidates with the division where they would be the "best fit",

the company said.

LinkedIn, the world's largest professional network, has gone further. It offers employers algorithmic rankings of candidates based on their fit for job postings on its site.

Still, John Jersin, vice-president of LinkedIn Talent Solutions, said the service is not a replacement for traditional recruiters.

"I certainly would not trust any AI system today to make a hiring decision on its own," he said. "The technology is just not ready yet."

Some activists say they are concerned about transparency in AI. The American Civil Liberties Union is currently challenging a law that allows criminal prosecution of researchers and journalists who test hiring websites' algorithms for discrimination.

"We are increasingly focusing on algorithmic fairness as an issue," said Rachel Goodman, a staff attorney with the Racial Justice Program at the ACLU. Still, Goodman and other critics of AI acknowledged it could be exceedingly difficult to sue an employer over automated hiring; job candidates might never know it was being used.

As for Amazon, the company managed to salvage some of what it learned from its failed AI experiment. It now uses a "much watered-down version" of the recruiting engine to help with some rudimentary chores, including culling duplicate candidate profiles from databases, one of the people familiar with the project said.

Another said a new team in Edinburgh has been formed to give automated employment screening another try, this time with a focus on diversity.

I hope you appreciated this article. Before you move on, I wanted to ask if you would consider supporting the Guardian's journalism as we enter one of the most consequential news cycles of our lifetimes in 2024.

With the potential of another Trump presidency looming, there are countless angles to cover around this year's election - and we'll be there to shed light on each development in the 2024 election, with explainers, key takeaways and analysis of what it means for America, democracy and the world.

From Elon Musk to the Murdochs, a small number of billionaire owners have a powerful hold on so much of the information that reaches the public about what's happening in the world. The Guardian is different. We have no billionaire owner or shareholders to consider. Our journalism is produced to serve the public interest - not profit motives.

And we avoid the trap that befalls much US media: the tendency, born of a desire to please all sides, to engage in false equivalence in the name of neutrality. We always strive to be fair. But sometimes that means calling out the lies of powerful people and institutions - and making clear how misinformation and demagoguery can damage democracy.

From threats to election integrity, to the spiraling climate crisis, to complex foreign conflicts, our journalists contextualize, investigate and illuminate the critical stories of our time. As a global news organization with a robust US reporting staff, we're able to provide a fresh, outsider perspective - one so often missing in the American media bubble.

Around the world, readers can access the Guardian's paywall-free journalism because of our unique reader-supported model. That's because of people like you. Our readers keep us independent, beholden to no outside influence and accessible to everyone - whether they can afford to pay for news, or not. **If you can, please consider supporting us just once from \$1, or better yet, support us every month with a little more. Thank you.**

Betsy Reed

One-time

Monthly

Annual

\$5 per month


\$13 per month


Other


Continue →

Remind me in March

VISA









More on this story

Ruha Benjamin: 'We definitely can't wait for Silicon Valley to become more diverse'

29 Jun 2019



Rise of the racist robots - how AI is learning all our worst impulses

8 Aug 2017 308



More from Headlines

Middle East crisis
US says strikes on Iran-linked militias 'just the beginning' of its response

3h ago



Michigan
Dearborn ramps up police patrol after 'bigoted' WSJ op-ed as Biden condemns anti-Arab hate

2h ago



Nikki Haley
Trump spends more time 'ranting' than fighting for American people

6h ago



Most viewed

