

Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Recruitment and Selection

Prof. Ketaki Kukde¹ and Prajakta M. Misar²

Students, Department of MBA^{1,2}

Wainganga College of Engineering and Management, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: *Recruitment has always involved a mix of judgment and administration. Recruiters read applications, compare experience with job requirements, arrange interviews, and try to make a fair decision within a limited time. Artificial intelligence (AI) tools now assist with some of these tasks. They can sort resumes, match skills to vacancies, answer routine questions, and help schedule interviews. These uses may save time, but they also raise questions that cannot be answered by speed alone: are suitable candidates being identified, do applicants understand how they are assessed, and can the process disadvantage particular groups? This paper proposes a study of AI use in recruitment and selection, focusing on recruitment efficiency, perceived fairness, candidate experience, and the role of human review. A mixed-methods design is proposed. A questionnaire would gather responses from HR professionals, recruiters, job seekers, and employees, while interviews with a smaller group of HR professionals would provide more detailed examples. Academic publications and institutional reports would be used to frame the study. The paper does not present completed survey findings; its hypotheses and sample plan are proposals to be tested. The intended contribution is a practical, balanced account of how organizations can assess AI recruitment tools without assuming that automation is automatically faster, fairer, or more accurate.*

Keywords: artificial intelligence; recruitment; selection; human resource management; algorithmic bias; candidate experience; transparency; human oversight.

I. INTRODUCTION

Hiring decisions affect both sides of the employment relationship. Organizations need people with the right skills, while applicants want a process that gives them a fair chance and communicates clearly. In a traditional recruitment process, a recruiter may have to review hundreds of resumes, contact applicants, arrange interviews, and keep records up to date. When application numbers are high, these tasks can take time away from more careful evaluation and communication. AI-based tools are increasingly being used to support parts of this work. Some tools extract information from resumes; others compare applicants with a job description, respond to common questions, or help coordinate interviews. More advanced systems may score assessments or recommend which candidates should move forward. These are not all the same kind of technology, and their consequences depend on what information they use and how much influence they have over the final decision. The attraction is understandable: automation may reduce repetitive work and help recruiters handle applications at scale. Still, a system can process applications quickly and make poor recommendations. It may also reflect patterns in historical data or give applicants little information about why they were screened out. Research on algorithmic hiring therefore considers both operational benefits and issues such as fairness, validation, and accountability.

The topic matters to HR teams deciding whether to purchase or expand AI recruitment tools. It is also relevant to applicants, who may be assessed by systems they cannot see or easily question. From an academic perspective, considering efficiency and fairness together offers a more complete way to discuss recruitment technology than treating adoption itself as evidence of success.



- **For organizations:** The study may help HR teams identify useful performance measures and areas where manual review is still needed.
- **For candidates:** It considers whether communication, fairness, and trust are affected when automated tools are part of the process.

The proposed study covers AI use in sourcing, resume screening, candidate matching, online assessments, interview coordination, and selection support. Respondents may include HR professionals, recruiters, job seekers, and employees who have experienced a recruitment process that used AI. An Indian organizational context, with attention to IT and service-sector employers, would be a manageable starting point if respondents can be reached. The final scope should reflect the researcher's access to participants rather than assume that all organizations use AI in the same way.

Research Questions –

1. Which recruitment and selection tasks are being supported by AI?
2. How is AI use associated with perceived recruitment efficiency?
3. How do applicants and HR professionals judge the fairness of AI-assisted hiring?
4. What concerns arise when organizations use AI to screen or assess applicants?
5. What role does human review play in building trust in AI-supported decisions?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on AI in human resource management spans HRM, information systems, computer science, and employment law. One recurring point is that AI should not be viewed as a neutral piece of software operating outside an organization. Its results depend on the data supplied to it, the task it is asked to perform, the way its output is interpreted, and the checks that are in place. For recruitment, three connected themes are especially relevant: efficiency, fairness, and the experience of applicants. They overlap, but they should not be treated as interchangeable outcomes.

Applications of AI in Recruitment AI may be used at several stages of hiring. Resume-parsing tools extract details such as education, skills, and work history. Matching tools compare those details with job criteria. Chatbots can answer routine questions, while scheduling tools reduce back-and-forth communication.

Recruitment Efficiency Saving time is one of the most common reasons given for adopting AI recruitment tools. Automation can help with repetitive tasks and make it easier to manage a large applicant pool. However, efficiency should be measured rather than presumed. Useful indicators include time-to-shortlist, time-to-hire, cost-per-hire, recruiter workload, and the proportion of shortlisted candidates who meet the job's essential requirements.

Fairness and Algorithmic Bias Fairness is one of the most difficult questions in AI-supported hiring. A model may learn from previous recruitment records, and those records can contain the effects of earlier preferences or unequal opportunities.

From an applicant's point of view, recruitment is not only a sequence of administrative steps. It is also an early impression of the employer. A chatbot that answers questions promptly may be helpful, particularly outside normal office hours. On the other hand, automated messages can feel impersonal when an applicant needs an explanation or is dealing with an unusual situation.

Human oversight means more than having a recruiter click an approval button. A reviewer needs enough information, time, and authority to question an AI-generated score or recommendation. If the system is treated as automatically correct, human involvement may add little protection. Recruiters should understand the tool's purpose and limitations and should be able to investigate questionable results.

III. ANALYSIS OF PROBLEM

The main issue is not simply whether AI can be used in recruitment. It is whether its use improves the process in ways that matter to employers and applicants. A shorter time-to-hire is useful, but it does not tell us whether the shortlisted candidates are suitable or whether qualified applicants have been overlooked. Similarly, a standardized score may



appear consistent without necessarily being fair. This study will examine the relationship between AI adoption and selected recruitment outcomes, while giving attention to candidate perceptions and the role of human review. It will also consider practical concerns around transparency, privacy, and possible bias.

Objectives of the Study -

1. To describe the main ways AI is used during recruitment and selection.
2. To examine the association between AI use and perceived recruitment efficiency.
3. To explore how candidates and HR professionals view the fairness and transparency of AI-assisted hiring.
4. To identify concerns related to bias, privacy, trust, and human oversight.
5. To suggest practical steps for responsible use of AI in recruitment.

IV. METHODS AND MATERIAL

A. Research Design - A mixed-methods design is proposed. A structured questionnaire would provide comparable responses across participants, while semi-structured interviews would allow HR professionals to explain how AI tools are used in practice. The study is intended to be descriptive and analytical. Because the proposed survey is cross sectional, it can identify associations but cannot by itself prove that AI caused a particular outcome.

B. Population and Sample - The target population includes HR professionals and recruiters, as well as job seekers or employees who have encountered AI-supported recruitment. The following numbers are an initial planning estimate, not completed sampling or collected data.

Participant group	Proposed number	Purpose
HR professionals / recruiters	50	Workplace use and implementation experience
Job seekers / employees	50	Applicant or candidate perceptions
HR professionals for interviews	5	Detailed examples and context
Questionnaire total	100	Quantitative analysis

Fig. 1. Data Diagram

Convenience sampling may be practical if participants are recruited through professional networks, colleges, or online communities. Purposive sampling can be used for interviews so that participants have relevant experience. These methods limit how far the findings can be generalized, and that limitation should be stated in the final paper.

C. Sources of Data - Primary data would be collected through an online or paper questionnaire and interviews. Secondary material would come from peer-reviewed journal articles, conference papers, academic books, and institutional reports. Sources should be selected for relevance and quality, and the final paper should cite the original publication rather than relying only on summaries.

D. Questionnaire and Interview Plan - The questionnaire can be divided into four parts:

1. Respondent profile: role, industry, experience, and familiarity with AI recruitment.
2. AI exposure: whether the respondent has encountered resume screening, chatbots, automated assessments, or candidate matching tools.
3. Perceptions: views on speed, consistency, fairness, transparency, and candidate experience.
4. Concerns and suggestions: privacy, bias, trust, communication, and human review.

Most perception questions can use a five-point response scale, from strongly disagree to strongly agree. An option such as 'not sure' or 'not applicable' should be included where respondents may not know whether AI was used. Interviews can ask what worked well, what went wrong, and how recruiters review automated recommendations.



E. Variables -

Category	Variables / indicators	Role in the study
Independent variable	Extent and type of AI use in recruitment	Main explanatory factor
Outcome variables	Perceived efficiency, candidate experience, perceived selection quality	Recruitment outcomes to examine
Additional factors	Perceived fairness, transparency, human oversight	Factors that may help explain differences in responses
Possible controls	Industry, organization size, respondent role, recruitment experience	Context for comparing groups

Fig. 2. Role of variables in study

The final treatment of fairness and human oversight will depend on the research model. For example, they may be examined as separate explanatory variables or as factors that change the relationship between AI use and trust. The study should avoid adding too many variables for the size of the sample.

F. Proposed Hypotheses –

- H1: Greater use of AI in recruitment is associated with higher perceived recruitment efficiency.
- H2: Greater perceived transparency is associated with higher perceived fairness in AI-assisted recruitment.
- H3: Greater perceived fairness is associated with higher candidate trust in the recruitment process.
- H4: Meaningful human oversight is associated with greater trust in AI-supported selection decisions.

The corresponding null hypotheses would state that the relevant relationships are not statistically significant. These are hypotheses to test, not conclusions. They should be adjusted if the literature review or pilot survey suggests that the wording or measures need to change.

G. Data Analysis

Method	How it may be used
Frequencies and percentages	Describe participants and their experience with AI recruitment
Means and standard deviations	Summarize scale responses where appropriate
Cross-tabulation	Compare responses by role or experience
Correlation	Examine associations between measured variables
Regression	Estimate associations while controlling for selected factors, if the sample supports it
Thematic analysis	Group recurring ideas from interview responses

Fig. 3. Usage of AI

The final choice of tests should be based on the measurement scales, data quality, sample size, and assumptions of each test. A pilot study can identify confusing questions. Where multi-item scales are used, internal consistency can be checked, but a reliability statistic should not be reported unless it has actually been calculated.

H. Reliability, Validity, and Ethics - The questionnaire should be reviewed by a research supervisor or someone with HRM research experience and piloted with a small group before wider distribution. Where established scales are adapted, their original sources should be cited and the wording changes documented. Participation should be voluntary.



Respondents should be told what the study is about, how their answers will be used, and that they can choose not to answer a question. The survey should avoid collecting names or confidential candidate information unless there is a clear, approved reason. Any organization-specific information should be reported in a way that does not identify individuals or disclose sensitive hiring practices.

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The framework starts with AI adoption in recruitment, including resume screening, candidate matching, chatbots, and automated assessments. The study will examine how this use is associated with four outcomes: recruitment efficiency, perceived fairness, candidate experience, and perceived selection quality. Transparency and meaningful human oversight are included as factors that may shape trust in the process.

Starting point	Outcomes to examine	Potential safeguards / context
AI adoption: screening, matching, chatbots, assessments	Efficiency: time, cost, workload	Human review of recommendations
	Fairness: consistency and transparency	Bias testing and periodic audits
	Candidate experience: communication and trust	Clear applicant communication
	Selection quality: job relevance and suitability	Review of criteria and outcomes

Figure 4. Proposed conceptual framework

Workflow of AI-assisted recruitment –

1. Identify the vacancy and agree on job-related criteria.
2. Advertise the position and receive applications.
3. Use a screening tool to extract relevant information, where appropriate.
4. Compare candidate information with the stated requirements.
5. Have a recruiter review the shortlist and investigate questionable results.
6. Conduct interviews and any job-relevant assessments.
7. Make the selection decision with accountable human involvement.
8. Communicate the outcome to candidates.
9. Review process measures, candidate feedback, and potential disparities.
10. Use the review to improve the process before the next recruitment round.

The workflow is illustrative rather than a universal model. Some organizations use AI only for administration, while others use it to support assessment. The checks required should reflect the tool's actual role in the decision



Component	Example indicators	Purpose
AI adoption	Screening, matching, chatbots, assessments	Describe how and where AI is used
Recruitment efficiency	Time-to-shortlist, time-to-hire, workload	Assess operational experience
Perceived fairness	Consistency, transparency, perceived bias	Understand how fair the process appears
Candidate experience	Communication, trust, perceived respect	Capture the applicant perspective
Selection quality	Job relevance, recruiter judgment, suitability	Explore perceived quality of decisions
Human oversight	Review, ability to challenge, audits	Examine accountability and error detection

Fig. 5. Summary of framework variables

VI. CONCLUSION

AI can take some of the repetitive work out of recruitment, especially when organizations receive many applications. It may help recruiters organize information, respond to routine queries, and identify applicants whose experience appears relevant to a vacancy. Those advantages should not be treated as proof that the overall hiring process has improved. The quality of the shortlist, the treatment of applicants, and the ability to identify errors matter just as much as speed. This proposed study will look at recruitment efficiency alongside fairness, candidate experience, and human oversight. Questionnaires can show how respondents view AI-assisted hiring, while interviews can provide examples that explain those views. Once data have been collected, the results can be used to assess the proposed hypotheses and develop recommendations grounded in evidence. Until then, the paper should be read as a research plan rather than a report of proven findings.

A. Practical Implications

1. Set clear, job-related goals before introducing an AI recruitment tool.
2. Ensure that recruiters can review and challenge recommendations rather than approving them automatically.
3. Tell candidates when AI is used in a meaningful part of the process and provide a way to ask questions.
4. Test systems for errors and possible differences in outcomes across relevant groups.
5. Track speed and workload, but also examine shortlist quality and candidate feedback.
6. Train HR staff to understand both the tool's capabilities and its limits.

B. Limitations

1. A convenience sample may not represent all job seekers or HR professionals.
2. Respondents may not know exactly which technologies an employer uses.
3. Self-reported perceptions are not the same as objective measures of hiring performance.
4. A one-time survey can identify associations but cannot establish causation.
5. Organizations may be unwilling to share internal recruitment data.
6. Results from a limited set of Indian industries may not apply to other contexts.

C. Future Research

1. Compare recruitment metrics before and after an organization introduces an AI tool.



2. Study whether applicant perceptions differ by industry, job level, or previous experience.
3. Examine how human review affects the correction of screening errors.
4. Investigate how generative AI changes candidate communication and assessment design.
5. Use longitudinal research to track whether benefits and risks change over time.
6. Compare candidate perceptions with actual process outcomes where suitable data are available.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Albaroudi, E., Mansouri, T., & Alameer, A. (2024). A comprehensive review of AI techniques for addressing algorithmic bias in job hiring. *AI*, 5(1), 383–404. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5010019>
- [2]. Fabris, A., Baranowska, N., Dennis, M. J., Graus, D., Hacker, P., Saldivar, J., Zuiderveen Borgesius, F., & Biega, A. J. (2025). Fairness and bias in algorithmic hiring: A multidisciplinary survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 16(1), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3696457>
- [3]. Herold, M., & Roedenbeck, M. R. H. (2025). AI-driven research in the recruitment and selection process: Application of an AI taxonomy with a systematic literature review. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251361746>
- [4]. Raghavan, M., Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J., & Levy, K. (2020). Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 469–481). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372828>
- [5]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *OECD Employment Outlook 2023: Artificial intelligence, job quality and inclusiveness*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-employment-outlook-2023_08785bba-en.html
- [6]. AI-based human resource management tools and techniques: A systematic literature review. (2023). *Procedia Computer Science*, 229, 367–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.12.039>
- [7]. An interdisciplinary review of AI and HRM: Challenges and future directions. (2023). *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), Article 100924. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100924>

