

# AI vs. Human Recruitment Evaluation Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Aspect	AI Recruitment Systems	Score	Human Recruiters	Score
<b>Bias Processing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply consistent rules without awareness of age bias</li> <li>• Cannot consciously correct for biases in training data</li> <li>• May inadvertently amplify biased historical hiring patterns</li> </ul>	6/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May have conscious/unconscious age biases from cultural stereotypes</li> <li>• Can recognise and deliberately counteract their own biases</li> <li>• Have more nuanced understanding of how experience translates across roles</li> </ul>	7/10
<b>Context Interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Struggle with unconventional career paths</li> <li>• Difficulty valuing life experience or unstated soft skills</li> <li>• Cannot read between the lines or infer qualifications</li> </ul>	4/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better recognise transferable skills from diverse backgrounds</li> <li>• Appreciate maturity, reliability, and judgement from experience</li> <li>• Give candidates benefit of the doubt for explainable gaps/transitions</li> </ul>	9/10
<b>Qualitative Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus heavily on quantifiable metrics and keywords</li> <li>• Miss nuanced qualifications not in standard terminology</li> <li>• Apply rigid weighting to different experience aspects</li> </ul>	5/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciate quality of experience over quantity</li> <li>• Evaluate cultural and team fit through personal interaction</li> <li>• Recognise industry reputation and value of established networks</li> </ul>	8/10
<b>Future Potential Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Often trained on data correlating youth with potential</li> <li>• Apply standardised progression metrics unsuited to experienced careers</li> <li>• Struggle to predict non-standard career trajectories</li> </ul>	3/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intuitively assess drive and adaptability through conversation</li> <li>• Recognise unique skill combinations that signal untapped potential</li> <li>• Sometimes favour "safe" experienced hires for critical roles</li> </ul>	7/10
<b>Negotiation Anticipation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May downrank candidates with higher expected salary requirements</li> <li>• Cannot evaluate flexibility on compensation or non-monetary motivations</li> <li>• Apply statistical patterns about experience-to-compensation ratios</li> </ul>	4/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise when candidates are genuinely interested despite potential salary mismatches</li> <li>• May personally advocate for valuable candidates to receive exceptions</li> <li>• Better understand full compensation picture beyond base salary</li> </ul>	8/10
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>22/50</b>		<b>39/50</b>

## Scoring Rationale

Scores are based on effectiveness when evaluating experienced candidates:

1-3: Poor - Significant limitations or bias potential

4-6: Adequate - Functional but with notable shortcomings

7-8: Good - Generally effective with minor limitations

9-10: Excellent - Highly effective with minimal limitations

## Analysis

The scoring reveals that human recruiters (39/50) significantly outperform AI systems (22/50) when evaluating experienced candidates, with the most pronounced advantages in context interpretation and qualitative assessment. AI systems score best in bias processing due to their consistent rule application, though they still fall short of human ability to consciously counteract biases.

The largest gap appears in future potential evaluation, where AI systems struggle to accurately assess experienced candidates whose career trajectories don't follow standard patterns. This suggests that while AI can effectively screen for basic qualifications, human judgement remains essential for evaluating the nuanced value that experienced candidates bring to organisations.