Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Mitigating Bias in AI-Driven Recruitment: Ethical Challenges and Governance Solutions

Rohan Chhatre[1], Prof. (Dr.) Seema Singh [2]
[1] *Research Scholar, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune*
[2] *Professor and Director, Symbiosis Centre for Corporate Education, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29 Dec 2024

Revised: 12 Feb 2025

Accepted: 27 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming Human Resources (HR) and recruitment by automating tasks like resume screening, candidate assessment, and hiring recommendations. However, the deployment of AI in these areas has raised ethical concerns, particularly around bias. This paper investigates bias within AI-driven recruitment tools, focusing on real-world case studies where biased algorithms have influenced hiring outcomes, diversity, and inclusion.

Objectives: This paper investigates bias within AI-driven recruitment tools, focusing on real-world case studies where biased algorithms have influenced hiring outcomes, diversity, and inclusion.

Methods: This study adopts a mixed-methods approach to address its objectives. The methodology includes a comprehensive literature review followed by case studies of specific instances.

Results: Key findings reveal that biases in training data—such as historical hiring trends favouring certain demographics—lead to skewed candidate assessments. Furthermore, opaque algorithmic designs hinder the detection and correction of such biases, making it difficult for HR teams to ensure equitable hiring. The study also finds that even well-intentioned algorithms can perpetuate stereotypes if not rigorously monitored.

Conclusions: To address these issues, the paper advocates for improved governance frameworks emphasizing transparency, regular bias audits, and collaboration between AI developers and HR professionals. The research highlights that ethical, accountable AI practices in recruitment are essential for fostering diverse, inclusive workplaces.

Keywords: AI in recruitment, Artificial intelligence bias, HR technology ethics, Algorithmic bias in hiring, Fairness in AI, Ethical AI governance, Bias mitigation strategies, Explainable AI (XAI), Responsible AI in HR, AI-driven decision-making in HR.

INTRODUCTION

The adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resource (HR) management has revolutionized recruitment processes, making tasks like resume screening, candidate assessment, and talent matching faster and more data-driven (Rietdijk, 2024). Organizations increasingly turn to AI tools in the hope of minimizing human biases, reducing costs, and expediting hiring decisions (Chen, 2023; Rodgers, Murray, & Stefanidis, 2023). AI algorithms can analyze large volumes of applicant data, providing standardized assessments designed to improve the objectivity of hiring processes (Wehner & Köchling, 2020). However, while AI in recruitment offers efficiency, it also raises significant ethical concerns. Research shows that AI systems can perpetuate or even amplify biases if they are based on historical hiring data that reflects existing inequities or if the algorithms are trained on datasets that lack diversity (Delecraz, Eltarr, Becuwe, & Bouxin, 2022; Drage & Mackereth, 2022).

This unintentional yet pervasive bias in AI-driven recruitment has led to documented cases where AI systems produced discriminatory hiring outcomes. For example, Amazon's AI recruitment tool was found to systematically downgrade resumes that included terms associated with women, a problem stemming from its training on historical

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

data favoring male candidates (Monica, Patel, & Ramanaiah, 2025). Such cases underscore the complexities of using AI in HR and highlight the need for improved governance frameworks that address fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI recruitment tools (Hunkenschroer & Kriebitz, 2023). Consequently, this paper investigates the sources of bias within AI recruitment systems and examines whether current ethical guidelines and governance measures adequately address these issues.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this research is to examine how bias occurs in AI-driven recruitment tools and to evaluate the effectiveness of existing governance frameworks in mitigating these biases. A key focus is on the ethical implications of using AI in HR, especially when biased outcomes could affect diversity, equity, and inclusivity within organizations (Rigotti & Fosch-Villaronga, 2024; Tsiskaridze, Reinhold, & Jarvis, 2023). By identifying common sources of bias, such as biased training data and algorithmic design limitations, this research seeks to provide HR professionals and policymakers with actionable insights for improving fairness in AI recruitment practices (Yanamala, 2023).

Additionally, the paper aims to propose a set of recommendations that HR departments and regulatory bodies can adopt to strengthen the ethical governance of AI in recruitment. These recommendations are intended to ensure that AI systems used in recruitment support rather than hinder organizational goals around diversity and inclusion (Vivek, 2023). The insights from this research can help in developing AI frameworks that are more transparent, ethical, and capable of fostering fair hiring practices.

METHODS

This study employs a systematic literature review as the primary research design to investigate bias in AI-driven recruitment systems. The literature review is structured to provide a comprehensive examination of how bias occurs, its ethical implications, current governance frameworks, and proposed solutions for mitigating bias. This method allows for the synthesis of existing academic studies, industry reports, and case analyses, enabling an in-depth understanding of bias in AI recruitment and highlighting areas where existing frameworks may be insufficient.

The data sources for this study include a combination of academic journals, conference proceedings, industry white papers, and government or non-governmental organization (NGO) reports. Reputable academic databases such as IEEE Xplore, SpringerLink, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect are used to access peer-reviewed articles, while industry-specific reports and case studies are retrieved from websites of leading HR technology companies and trusted sources like the Harvard Business Review. Government and NGO reports related to AI ethics and policy are sourced from official platforms to ensure credible and reliable data.

A comprehensive search strategy is applied to systematically locate relevant studies across databases. Keywords and search terms include combinations of terms such as “AI bias in recruitment,” “ethical AI in HR,” “algorithmic bias in hiring,” “governance frameworks for AI,” and “AI-driven HR systems.” Boolean operators (AND, OR) are used to expand or refine searches. Searches are conducted with filters to include only English-language articles and publications from 2018 onward, ensuring a focus on recent advancements and contemporary challenges in AI-driven recruitment systems.

To enhance search effectiveness, reference lists of key articles are reviewed to identify additional relevant studies, a process known as backward citation searching. This approach allows for the inclusion of foundational studies as well as recent developments in AI ethics, governance, and bias mitigation in recruitment.

To ensure relevance and rigor, the following inclusion and exclusion criteria are applied:

Inclusion Criteria:

- Studies published in peer-reviewed journals, industry reports, or reputable organizational white papers.
- Articles published from 2018 onwards to focus on recent advancements.
- Research that specifically addresses AI in HR or recruitment, ethical considerations in AI, or governance and bias mitigation frameworks.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

- Sources providing empirical or theoretical insights into AI-related biases or ethical issues in recruitment contexts.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Studies that focus on AI applications outside of recruitment or HR, such as general AI applications in business or unrelated AI fields (e.g., robotics).
- Articles published before 2018, unless they provide foundational theories or are highly cited in recent studies.
- Non-peer-reviewed articles or opinion pieces lacking rigorous methodological approaches.

This criteria-based selection ensures that only studies with direct relevance to the research objectives are included, while studies that do not meet these standards are excluded.

Data extraction is conducted by compiling key information from each included study, focusing on aspects such as the type of bias identified, sources of bias, governance frameworks discussed, ethical challenges, and recommended solutions for bias mitigation. Extracted data is organized into a spreadsheet, categorizing studies by publication year, study type, key findings, and relevance to the research objectives.

Data analysis involves thematic synthesis, where the extracted data is coded and grouped into major themes, including sources of bias, ethical implications, governance gaps, and bias mitigation strategies. This method enables a systematic exploration of recurring themes across studies, highlighting patterns and differences in how AI bias is approached in various sectors and from different research perspectives.

Quality assessment is applied to ensure the credibility and rigor of included studies. Each study is evaluated using the following criteria:

- Methodological Rigor: Assessment of the research design, sample size, and methods used in each study to ensure validity and reliability.
- Relevance: Examination of whether the study's focus aligns with the research objectives, particularly in identifying bias sources, ethical challenges, and governance frameworks.
- Peer Review Status: Preference is given to studies published in peer-reviewed journals, adding credibility to the findings.

Studies scoring low on methodological rigor or relevance are excluded from the final synthesis, ensuring that only high-quality studies inform the analysis.

As this research is based on a systematic literature review, no direct data collection from human participants is conducted, minimizing ethical risks. However, ethical guidelines are followed in handling secondary data by ensuring that all sources are accurately cited, and the intellectual property of original authors is respected. Furthermore, all included studies are obtained from legal and reputable sources to uphold ethical research standards.

While the literature review provides a robust foundation for understanding AI bias in recruitment, certain limitations must be acknowledged:

- Data Availability: As this research relies on secondary data, it may lack insights from unpublished industry practices or proprietary datasets used by corporations, potentially leading to incomplete data representation.
- Potential Publication Bias: Academic and industry publications may have a tendency to report on novel or extreme cases, which could introduce publication bias in the findings.
- Rapid Technological Advancements: Given the fast-paced evolution of AI, findings related to current biases and governance frameworks may quickly become outdated as new tools and regulations emerge.

By acknowledging these limitations, the research remains transparent about the potential constraints in scope and applicability of the findings.

RESULTS

The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resource (HR) management, especially in recruitment, has fundamentally transformed traditional hiring processes. While AI brings efficiency, scalability, and data-driven decision-making to recruitment, it also introduces new ethical and practical challenges, particularly regarding bias

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

and discrimination. This literature review explores the sources and types of bias in AI recruitment, the ethical implications, existing governance frameworks, and proposed methods to mitigate these biases.

The sources of bias in AI recruitment systems are multifaceted, often stemming from historical data, algorithmic design, and limited diversity in training datasets. Studies reveal that AI systems trained on historical hiring data frequently reproduce and reinforce existing biases present in past recruitment practices (Wehner & Köchling, 2020). For instance, training an AI model on hiring data from a male-dominated industry could lead to discriminatory outcomes against female candidates, as the algorithm might learn to favor male candidates based on historical hiring patterns (Chen, 2023). Delecraz, Eltarr, Becuwe, and Bouxin (2022) explain that without careful scrutiny of training data and adjustments for algorithmic fairness, such systems can perpetuate systemic inequities.

Algorithmic design choices are another major source of bias in AI recruitment. AI models are inherently influenced by their design parameters, which dictate how data is processed and weighted in decision-making (Drage & Mackereth, 2022). Delecraz et al. (2022) emphasize that algorithmic models lacking flexibility to adjust for differences across applicant backgrounds may disproportionately favor certain groups, especially if the models rely heavily on specific educational or professional backgrounds that are not equitably accessible to all demographics. In addition, interpretive limitations within HR departments can lead to over-reliance on AI-generated recommendations without a full understanding of the underlying decision-making logic (Yanamala, 2023). Drage and Mackereth (2022) argue that if HR professionals view AI recommendations as inherently objective, they may inadvertently follow biased decisions that disadvantage minority applicants.

AI bias in recruitment raises critical ethical concerns, particularly related to fairness, transparency, and accountability. The ethical dilemma arises from the "black box" nature of many AI algorithms, where complex models make decisions that are not easily interpretable by HR professionals or applicants (Bankins, 2021). As a result, candidates can be unfairly disadvantaged based on opaque criteria, potentially violating principles of fairness and equal opportunity. Hunkenschroer and Kriebitz (2023) contend that bias in AI-driven recruitment impacts not only the affected candidates but also the organizational culture and public trust in these technologies.

Drage and Mackereth (2022) highlight the broader societal implications of AI bias, arguing that gender and racial disparities in recruitment are exacerbated by biased algorithms. They emphasize that ethically responsible AI should prioritize inclusivity and that organizations deploying AI in HR have a responsibility to ensure that these tools do not inadvertently discriminate against certain groups. Rigotti and Fosch-Villaronga (2024) reinforce this viewpoint, arguing that existing ethical guidelines should be revised to include bias detection protocols and transparency requirements for AI in recruitment. These scholars advocate for greater corporate accountability, suggesting that companies conducting AI-based hiring must actively identify and mitigate potential sources of discrimination.

Despite the ethical concerns, current governance frameworks and policies often fall short of addressing the complexities of bias in AI-driven recruitment. Tsiskaridze, Reinhold, and Jarvis (2023) conducted a comprehensive review of AI deployment in HRM recruitment and found that while there are some guidelines to promote fairness, they lack specificity in enforcement and oversight mechanisms. This absence of robust regulatory controls allows companies to deploy biased AI systems without sufficient accountability. Fernández-Martínez and Fernández (2020) also analyze the legal and ethical implications, arguing that many existing frameworks are not equipped to handle the unique challenges posed by AI systems in HR, including issues related to privacy, accountability, and bias.

Yanamala (2023) examines the roles of transparency, privacy, and accountability in AI recruitment, arguing that traditional HR policies must evolve to include AI-specific principles like explainability and accountability. Vivek (2023) further supports this by recommending that policies focus on establishing standards that guide AI development and deployment in HR. These standards would ensure that AI systems used in recruitment are both fair and transparent. Such frameworks are necessary not only for ethical compliance but also to build public trust in AI recruitment systems and to provide applicants with confidence that they are being evaluated fairly.

Several studies have proposed strategies for mitigating bias in AI-driven recruitment, ranging from improving data diversity to enhancing algorithmic transparency. Rodgers, Murray, and Stefanidis (2023) outline a comprehensive bias mitigation approach that includes diversifying training datasets, conducting regular audits of AI systems, and designing adaptable algorithms capable of handling diverse applicant profiles. These measures are designed to reduce instances of unintentional bias and ensure that AI recruitment tools are applied ethically.

Monica, Patel, and Ramanaiah (2025) advocate for "ethics-by-design" principles, which involve embedding ethical considerations into AI systems from the design phase rather than addressing them after deployment. They argue that by prioritizing diversity and inclusivity in the design stage, companies can minimize the risk of biased hiring decisions. Additionally, Hunkenschroer and Kriebitz (2023) emphasize the role of transparency, suggesting that making algorithms more interpretable to HR professionals can reduce reliance on black-box models. By understanding how the algorithms make decisions, HR teams are better equipped to assess the fairness of AI recommendations and intervene if biases are detected.

López and Peralta (2023) propose a framework for continuous monitoring and evaluation of AI recruitment tools to ensure that they align with organizational diversity and inclusion goals. This iterative approach, which involves regular audits and adjustments, allows companies to identify and address biases before they significantly impact hiring outcomes. Vivek (2023) supports this approach, suggesting that HR departments partner closely with AI developers to create governance frameworks that integrate bias detection and accountability mechanisms, which are crucial for sustaining fair recruitment practices over time.

The literature on AI-driven recruitment systems presents a complex picture of the potential and pitfalls of using AI in HR. While AI can standardize and improve efficiency in hiring, significant ethical and practical challenges exist due to biases in data, algorithmic design, and organizational practices (Rietdijk, 2024; Fernández-Martínez & Fernández, 2020). Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach that includes transparent algorithms, diverse training datasets, and robust governance frameworks designed to uphold fairness and accountability (Tsiskaridze et al., 2023; Yanamala, 2023). This review reveals a consensus among researchers on the importance of policy reforms and organizational initiatives to mitigate bias, thus promoting more equitable and inclusive AI-driven recruitment processes.

Ultimately, the reviewed studies underscore the importance of aligning AI recruitment systems with ethical standards to foster diversity and inclusivity within organizations. This literature review forms the foundation for exploring effective governance solutions to address bias in AI recruitment and establishes the need for policies that balance technological innovation with ethical responsibility.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this research reveal that while AI has the potential to make recruitment more efficient, its application in HR remains fraught with ethical challenges, primarily due to biases embedded in data, algorithms, and governance practices. This discussion synthesizes these findings with existing literature, highlighting the implications for HR practices, policy development, and future research. Key areas of focus include the sources of bias, limitations in current governance frameworks, the feasibility of mitigation strategies, and broader ethical considerations.

The identification of historical data bias, algorithmic bias, and interpretive bias as primary sources in AI-driven recruitment underscores a fundamental issue in how these systems are designed and implemented. These biases often arise from the datasets on which AI models are trained, with historical data often reflecting previous hiring trends that favored certain demographic groups, leading to a continuation of these trends (Wehner & Köchling, 2020). This finding aligns with earlier studies, such as Chen (2023), which suggests that AI's reliance on historical data can reproduce systemic biases.

The tendency for algorithms to make decisions based on narrow patterns or over-simplified indicators also highlights the need for more sophisticated and flexible algorithmic models. Rather than using one-size-fits-all metrics, algorithms should be designed to accommodate diverse candidate backgrounds and experiences, allowing for more nuanced assessments that avoid reinforcing social inequalities. Drage and Mackereth (2022) emphasize the potential for these algorithms to exacerbate rather than mitigate bias if not properly calibrated.

The interpretive bias within HR practices, where AI recommendations are often followed without questioning the underlying rationale, suggests a need for better training and awareness among HR professionals. This issue has broader implications for AI governance, as it points to a gap in the understanding and control HR departments have

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

over AI-driven decisions. The reliance on opaque, black-box models limits HR professionals' ability to critically assess AI outputs and make fair, informed hiring decisions (Bankins, 2021). Together, these sources of bias underline the need for multi-dimensional strategies to ensure AI tools in recruitment are used ethically.

The ethical challenges posed by AI bias in recruitment cannot be overstated. AI-driven recruitment tools, while aimed at removing human bias, introduce their own biases that can be less visible and harder to challenge, creating unique ethical concerns. Transparency emerged as a critical issue throughout this research, particularly given the "black-box" nature of many AI models used in recruitment. Without transparency, accountability becomes diffuse, making it difficult to identify where and why biased decisions occur, and who is responsible for addressing them.

Hunkenschroer and Kriebitz (2023) argue that transparency is a prerequisite for ethical AI use, as it allows HR professionals and candidates to understand how decisions are made. This research supports the view that increasing transparency through explainable AI models and open communication about evaluation criteria can build trust in AI systems and promote fairer hiring practices. However, transparency alone is insufficient without clear accountability structures to ensure ethical compliance. As Rigotti and Fosch-Villaronga (2024) note, accountability must accompany transparency to ensure that biased outcomes are not ignored but rather addressed as a core organizational responsibility.

Current governance frameworks appear insufficient in addressing the complex biases present in AI-driven recruitment. A significant limitation in these frameworks is the lack of standardization, with different organizations applying varying levels of scrutiny and ethical consideration to their AI models (Tsiskaridze, Reinhold, & Jarvis, 2023). This variability limits the effectiveness of bias mitigation efforts across the industry, as there are few universally accepted guidelines or protocols for evaluating AI fairness in recruitment. Fernández-Martínez and Fernández (2020) highlight that without a standardized approach, organizations are left to interpret ethical guidelines as they see fit, often resulting in inconsistent practices that may leave biases unchecked.

Additionally, the absence of mandated bias audits and accountability protocols reduces the incentives for companies to proactively address bias in their AI recruitment tools. Yanamala (2023) emphasizes the need for regular evaluations of AI models to ensure continued fairness, a recommendation echoed in this study's findings. Introducing mandatory audits and explicit guidelines on accountability could bridge some of these gaps, ensuring that organizations not only identify and mitigate biases but also have systems in place for continuous improvement.

The proposed strategies for bias mitigation—such as data diversification, algorithmic transparency, and regular bias audits—are crucial but challenging to implement. Data diversification, while theoretically effective, may not always be feasible for all organizations, especially smaller companies that lack the resources to gather extensive, representative datasets. As Rodgers, Murray, and Stefanidis (2023) suggest, AI model diversity depends on the availability of diverse data, which can be a limiting factor. Nevertheless, ensuring that training data is as inclusive and representative as possible is an essential step toward reducing bias.

Algorithmic transparency, though critical, remains a technically challenging goal, particularly in complex models like deep learning, where decision-making processes are less interpretable (Hunkenschroer & Kriebitz, 2023). Explainable AI (XAI) techniques are increasingly important in mitigating bias and ensuring fairness in AI-driven recruitment by making algorithmic decisions more transparent and interpretable. One popular XAI approach is feature importance analysis, which helps HR professionals understand the factors or features that most influence an AI's decision. By identifying which features, such as educational background or specific keywords, disproportionately impact hiring decisions, companies can adjust models to prevent unfair advantages. Another approach is LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations), which explains individual predictions by creating simple, interpretable models around each instance. This method allows HR teams to see why specific candidates were favored or filtered out, making it easier to detect and correct potential biases in real time.

Counterfactual explanations provide another equitable XAI solution by showing how small changes in an applicant's profile could alter the hiring outcome. This method helps HR teams understand whether non-relevant attributes (like demographic factors) are unduly affecting the algorithm's decisions. Fairness constraints can also be integrated into algorithms, where the model is programmed to treat certain demographic groups equitably by adjusting decision thresholds or weighting criteria differently for underrepresented groups. Techniques like adversarial debiasing work

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(48s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

by training an additional model alongside the main model, focusing specifically on identifying and reducing bias in predictions. Through these techniques, XAI not only makes AI decision-making more transparent but also actively supports fairer and more inclusive hiring processes by identifying and mitigating bias before it impacts recruitment outcomes.

The implementation of regular bias audits and monitoring protocols appears feasible for larger organizations with dedicated compliance resources, but may be harder to sustain for smaller firms. Nevertheless, companies of all sizes could benefit from periodic assessments of their AI systems to ensure alignment with fairness goals. López and Peralta (2023) argue that even basic monitoring can help identify emerging biases before they impact hiring outcomes significantly.

The findings from this research have significant implications for HR practices and policy development. First, training HR professionals on AI and its limitations could mitigate interpretive bias, enabling them to evaluate AI recommendations more critically rather than following them blindly. Drage and Mackereth (2022) highlight the value of informed oversight in AI recruitment, which can help HR teams recognize when and how to override biased AI decisions.

From a policy perspective, there is a clear need for standardized, enforceable governance frameworks that prioritize ethical AI in recruitment. Vivek (2023) recommends a collaborative approach to policy-making, involving both technology experts and HR professionals to develop practical guidelines that reflect both technical capabilities and ethical considerations. Additionally, policies should mandate transparency in AI hiring systems and require organizations to disclose key criteria used in candidate evaluations, as this would promote procedural fairness and bolster public trust in AI-driven hiring.

Finally, the study's findings suggest that developing global standards for ethical AI in recruitment could enhance consistency across industries and regions. International cooperation in establishing these standards, as advocated by Fernández-Martínez and Fernández (2020), could provide a unified ethical foundation for AI in recruitment, ensuring that companies worldwide adhere to principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability.

Given the limitations of current governance frameworks and the complexities of mitigating bias in AI-driven recruitment, future research should focus on developing innovative solutions for creating more transparent and accountable AI systems. Studies that explore technical advancements in explainable AI could yield valuable insights into making complex algorithms more interpretable for non-experts. Additionally, longitudinal research examining the effects of regular bias audits on hiring outcomes could provide empirical evidence supporting the benefits of ongoing monitoring.

Future research should also investigate the impact of diverse data augmentation techniques to improve AI fairness, especially in underrepresented groups. An exploration of case studies where successful bias mitigation was achieved could offer practical examples for other organizations to follow. Lastly, research focused on developing cost-effective governance frameworks for smaller companies could bridge existing gaps, ensuring that AI-driven recruitment is fair and inclusive across all organizational sizes.

In conclusion, while AI offers promising opportunities to streamline and standardize recruitment processes, this research underscores the importance of ethical governance in its application. Bias in AI recruitment poses risks not only to individuals affected by discriminatory outcomes but also to organizational diversity and public trust in AI technologies. By fostering greater transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI-driven hiring practices, organizations can create more inclusive workplaces and strengthen the ethical foundations of AI in HR. As AI technologies continue to evolve, it is imperative that organizations, policymakers, and researchers work together to establish ethical standards that ensure AI serves as a tool for equitable and inclusive growth in the workforce.

REFRENCES

[1] Chen, Z. (2023). Ethics and discrimination in artificial intelligence-enabled recruitment practices. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-02079-x
[2] Delecraz, S., Eltarr, L., Becuwe, M., & Bouxin, H. (2022). Responsible Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Technology: An innovative inclusive and fair by design matching algorithm for job recruitment. Journal of

Responsible Technology. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S266665962200018X
[3] Drage, E., & Mackereth, K. (2022). Does AI debias recruitment? Race, gender, and AI's "eradication of difference". Philosophy & Technology. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13347-022-00543-1
[4] Du, J. (2024). Exploring gender bias and algorithm transparency: Ethical considerations of AI in HRM. Journal of Theory and Practice of Management. Retrieved from https://centuryscipub.com/index.php/JTPMS/article/view/539
[5] Fernández-Martínez, C., & Fernández, A. (2020). AI and recruiting software: Ethical and legal implications. Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics. Retrieved from https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/pjbr-2020-0030/html
[6] Hunkenschroer, A., & Kriebitz, A. (2023). Is AI recruiting (un)ethical? A human rights perspective on the use of AI for hiring. AI and Ethics. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43681-022-00166-4
[7] Kriebitz, A., & Bankins, S. (2021). The ethical use of artificial intelligence in human resource management: A decision-making framework. Ethics and Information Technology. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10676-021-09619-6
[8] López, V., & Peralta, J. C. (2023). AI-Driven Human Resource Management: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. Journal of Contemporary Healthcare. Retrieved from https://publications.dlpress.org/index.php/jcha/article/view/133
[9] Monica, M., Patel, S., & Ramanaiah, G. (2025). Promoting fairness and ethical practices in AI-based performance management systems. In Innovations in Intelligent Process Management. Retrieved from https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/promoting-fairness-and-ethical-practices-in-ai-based-performance-management-systems/358031
[10] Rigotti, C., & Fosch-Villaronga, E. (2024). Fairness, AI & recruitment. Computer Law & Security Review. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364924000335
[11] Rodgers, W., Murray, J. M., & Stefanidis, A. (2023). An artificial intelligence algorithmic approach to ethical decision-making in HRM processes. Human Resource Management. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053482222000432
[12]
[13] Rietdijk, S. (2024). The relationship between AI recruitment and gender bias: A literature review. Retrieved from http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=172389
[14] Tsiskaridze, R., Reinhold, K., & Jarvis, M. (2023). Innovating HRM recruitment: A comprehensive review of AI deployment. Marketing i menedžment innovacij. Retrieved from https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/bitstream/11159/652864/1/1877941581_0.pdf
[15] Vivek, R. (2023). Enhancing diversity and reducing bias in recruitment through AI: A review of strategies and challenges. Informatics, Economics, Management. Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/enhancing-diversity-and-reducing-bias-in-recruitment-through-ai-a-review-of-strategies-and-challenges
[16] Wehner, M. C., & Köchling, A. (2020). Discriminated by an algorithm: A systematic review of discrimination and fairness by algorithmic decision-making in the context of HR recruitment and HR development. Business Research. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40685-020-00134-w
[17] Yanamala, K. K. R. (2023). Transparency, privacy, and accountability in AI-enhanced HR processes. Journal of Advanced Computing Systems. Retrieved from https://scipublication.com/index.php/JACS/article/view/26