

FACT SHEET

Gen AI in Assessment

Securing Interviews in the Gen AI Era



Gen AI and its functionality is evolving at pace. And that impacts what we do as assessors. The case has been made that prerecorded interviews are at risk from candidates using Gen AI tools, like ChatGPT or Gemini, leading to a potential disruption of scores. Using prerecorded interviews allows the candidate preparation time, so it is possible that some candidates might choose to use Gen AI to produce an answer that they can then read or paraphrase while they are recording their interview.

Why Does Gen AI Put Pre-Recorded Interviews at Risk?

Employers use interviews to predict who will perform well in the job. When candidates use Gen AI tools in the interview process it can make your outcomes unpredictable. Some candidates might use it and some won't. Candidates who do use it will use it in different ways, and therefore, the impact on interview answers and ratings won't be evident to the employer.

When making interview judgements, employers can't factor in Gen AI usage accurately, making it harder to predict candidate performance for the role and increasing the risk of hiring someone who is not a good fit and rejecting great talent. At worst, this could result in the wrong people being selected more often than the right people.

How can organisations mitigate these risks to accurately progress and identify the strongest candidates from their pipeline?

Doing nothing at all could leave your interviews exposed. So, what actions can be taken to try to protect, defend and absorb Gen AI use in interviews? The PeopleScout Assessment Design team, made up of organisational psychologists, has developed the table below to help guide your strategy.

POSSIBLE ACTIONS	PROS	CONS
Ask candidates not to use Gen AI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the tech and the risk • Reduces the number of candidates using it • Begins the conversation about the tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can convey a distrust of technology and an aversion to a tech future • Introduces the toxic possibility of deception at the start of the psychological contract
Remove preparation time in pre-recorded interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevents or limits the effectiveness of the use of earlier versions of Gen AI tools • Increases the number of of-the-cuff answers which may be genuinely predictive for a minority of roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not protect against use of free, new, real time 'listening capabilities already included in the latest versions of Gen AI tools • May introduce disproportionate negative impact on neurodivergent candidates, including introverts, and on those who gain most from Gen AI use which could include more socioeconomically disadvantaged applicants, impacting on inclusion.
Remove the use of pre-recorded interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes the risk of Gen AI tools being used completely • Encourages a rethink of what the interview was being used to predict and to consider better alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes the cost-effectiveness and pipeline management benefits of assessing the important criteria via pre-recorded content. • Risk of more unsuitable candidates progressing to the next stage. • If criteria are important to assess it may require additional time or cost to introduce this at later face to face stages of the assessment
Review and change the questions asked to reduce the quality of answers Gen AI can produce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the pre-recorded interview to be kept at the top of the funnel • Allows the interview criteria to be more regularly reviewed so its fit for purpose for each role rather than blanket usage • Sustains a varying assessment methodology at the sift stage as per best practice and supporting candidate experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires interview question re-design – and can be inaccurately viewed as an easy tweak. Valid and inclusive questions that are less accessible to Gen AI distortion require careful and integrated design by experts. Bad questions can look good to the untrained eye but introduce unforeseen error.

POSSIBLE ACTIONS	PROS	CONS
Switch pre-recorded interviews to live virtual interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to reduce Gen AI impact in at least the short term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will not protect against use of free, new, real time 'listening capabilities already included in the latest versions of Gen AI tools Increases assessment cost and time required
Train interviewers in AI-use detection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases sense of self-efficacy and control for interviewers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that interviewers will make correct decisions in the majority of cases Potential for introducing unconscious bias and a negative impact on diversity
Use a second assessment of the same criteria in a later part of the assessment – eg, a face to face Assessment Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables a reassessment of the same criteria later in the process as a check on the original assessment Allows the candidate a second opportunity and a second methodology to demonstrate capabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases cost and time resources required for the assessment Maintains the decision point at pre-recorded interview stage – potentially losing good candidates who don't use Gen AI before the reassessment is completed and increasing regret rates later in the process.

Learn more about how PeopleScout can help your organisation with assessment design or delivery and interviews to improve your quality of hire.

LET'S CONNECT