Reading Response April 06

Kritika Chugh
SUID: 882046659

kchugh@syr.edu

The two papers are particularly interesting as one of that paper discusses how judges make decisions based on the algorithm-risk assessment and the other discusses the importance of the study of algorithms that create these moral buffers and discusses the ways to avoid this conundrum. The paper discusses a study, and one takeaway would be that even though an algorithm might be a good predictor, it might still not as good of propagator when it comes to decision making. To give algorithms a benefit of the doubt, I will say that they might not be creating more risk discretion but merely shifting the discretion in judgement to a different place. For example- a judge might use an algorithm interpretation into account when dealing with a black defendant over a white defendant. In this case the discretion is shifted to a person-of-color. So how strongly a judge rely on the prediction by the algorithm might get sway away by the fact that he/she is dealing with a black defendant. This was very different approach to evaluate the algorithms. The reason paper gave was that people are bad at incorporating quantitative predictions into their decisions. For example, a judge might give lenient sentence to a high-risk defendant if their current crime does not directly correlate with the crimes in the past. But this is not true for the judges who know when to listen to a algorithmic prediction and when to rely on their own judgement from the data analyzed by the algorithm. But most often than not, judges' mis predict. Their own decisions are noisy. This is mor because of their mood or irrelevant case characteristics.

Prediction policy problems are very socially important, and It would be interesting to see how people's – risk relationship might evolve over the period. I feel this is also a great example of cross study of behavioral diagnostic with predictive algorithms. We already know the nature of human error and we are now giving another dimension to it.