

Analyst Autonomy

GATHER. BIASED SORTING AND DISPLAY.¹

Details John Flick, a junior analyst, worked on determining the requirements for an information system update² for an employment agency — Bazile Employments. The domain expert assigned to assist with the development, Małgorzata Rawls, explained that, when displaying those applicants whose qualifications³ appear to match those required for a particular job, the names of white applicants are to be displayed ahead of those of non-white applicants, the names of male applicants are to be displayed ahead of female applicants, and European appearing names before Asiatic. Flick asked if these were correct; Rawls simply repeated them.

Right from the start Flick thought that there was something not quite right about this and went to talk with their boss, Hannah Anscombe MACS, the senior analyst on the team. Anscombe said that, while they agreed with Flick, it was sensible to not challenge the customer⁴. “Don’t worry about it. Remember, the customer is always right.”

This did not sit well with Flick. They discussed the matter further with Anscombe who told Flick: “Just get on with it: the branch has more important jobs to get on with; the sooner we finish this one the sooner we can get on to them.”⁵

...

Radoll Legal Services, a long time customer of Bazile, put in a request for an employee⁶ a week after the system went live.

A current Radoll employee Catherine Locke (an equal rights law office administrator), who put in a CV did not appear in a list of recommended applicants⁷ even though they were registered with the employment agency. This was curious, as the CEO of Radoll Legal Services, John Płotka, requested Bazile Employments to find them an equal rights law office administrator.

Płotka then spoke with the CEO of Bazile Employments, G.E.M. Arendt. They wanted to know why one particularly well qualified person seeking such a job was not included in the list of recommended candidates.

After much evading and finger pointing the truth was revealed. Rawls and Anscombe had acted on their own without approval.

Małgorzata Rawls and Hannah Anscombe were both sacked and John Flick severely reprimanded.

¹ Based on an actual event related to me and eerily similar to: Oliver Burmeister, Applying the ACS Code of Ethics, *Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology*, Vol. 32, No. 2, May, 2000.

Cast	Role
Hannah Anscombe	Senior analyst
G.E.M. Arendt	Bazile CEO
John Flick	Junior analyst
Catherine Locke	Job applicant
John Płotka	Radoll CEO
Małgorzata Rawls	Domain expert

Table 1: A_1 Cast

² The Candidate Ranking Report. This report lists the three most suitable candidates for a position.

³ For a CV to be accepted race, sex, and ethnicity were required details.

⁴ All of the ICT personnel referred to other parts of the organization as *customers*. We think that this way of thinking creates a distancing between the groups that is unhelpful in so many ways.

⁵ Dejected, Flick did what they had done before with rejection and when others had previously not taken seriously their concerns: gave up hope that their concerns would be taken seriously and did what they were ordered to do.

⁶ The request was written to match exactly their incumbent senior administrator, Catherine Locke’s job description and skill set: they were market testing to see how much they ought to increase Locke’s pay and perhaps to employ an assistant for them. Locke was fully aware of this ploy, but as it was standard industry practice thought not much about it.

⁷ As part of the market testing Locke put in their CV even though they thought this was a bit suspect.