SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

# ETHICAL CHALLENGES OF AI BASED HIRING DECISION

**Yogathara D[1], Mrs. R. Anitha M.C.A., M.Phil., (Ph. D)[2]**
[1]*Final Year, B.COM With Information Technology,*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Computer Science*
*Dr N.G.P Arts and Science College, Coimbatore*

**ABSTRACT**

*AI-based hiring tools, while enhancing recruitment efficiency, introduce critical ethical challenges, including algorithmic bias, lack of transparency ("black box" problem), and data privacy concerns. These systems risk perpetuating discrimination by trained on historical data, often disadvantaging minority groups and undermining diversity. The reliance on automated decisions reduces human oversight and empathy, highlighting the need for ethical frameworks, algorithmic accountability, and human-in-the-loop systems to ensure fairness.*

*Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly used by companies to help with hiring decisions. AI systems can quickly analyze resumes, rank candidates, and even conduct automated interviews. While these tools can save time and reduce costs, they also raise several ethical challenges. One major concern is bias, because AI systems learn from past data that may already contain human discrimination related to gender, race, or age. This can lead to unfair hiring decisions. Another issue is lack of transparency, since many AI systems work like a "black box," making it difficult to understand how decisions are made. Privacy is also a concern because AI may collect and analyze large amounts of personal data from applicants.*

**KEYWORDS:**

- *Artificial Intelligence (AI) in hiring*
- *AI-based hiring tools*
- *AI recruitment systems*
- *Automated hiring decisions*
- *AI in recruitment*

## INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly used in recruitment and selection processes to screen resumes, assess candidates, conduct video interviews, and predict job performance. Companies such as Amazon and Hire Vue have adopted AI-driven hiring tools to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and speed up decision- making.

Candidates may not understand how decisions are made, which affects fairness and accountability. Issues related to data privacy, informed consent, and the security of personal information further complicate AI- based recruitment practices. However, the use of AI in hiring also raises several ethical concerns. AI systems are often trained using historical data, which may contain human biases. As a result, the system may unintentionally favor or reject certain candidates based on gender, age, ethnicity, or other unrelated factors. Another challenge is the lack of transparency in AI decision-making, where candidates and employers may not clearly understand how the system evaluates applicants.

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To examine the concept and application of Artificial Intelligence in recruitment and selection processes.
- To assess the impact of AI-based hiring decisions on fairness, diversity, and equal employment opportunity.
- To identify the major ethical challenges associated with AI-based hiring decisions.

## SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study examines the ethical challenges arising from the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in recruitment and selection processes within organizations. It focuses on how AI-driven hiring systems are used for resume screening, candidate shortlisting, online testing, and video interview analysis through platforms such as Hire Vue.
Discrimination based on gender, race or age, lack of transparency in decision- making, accountability issues, and the "black box" nature of AI systems.

## STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The rapid adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in recruitment and selection processes has transformed traditional hiring practices. Organizations are increasingly using AI-powered tools developed by companies such as Hire Vue and Amazon to screen resumes, assess video interviews, and rank candidates. While these systems improve efficiency and reduce time and cost, they raise significant ethical concerns.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Barocas & Selbst (2016) –** Algorithmic systems can unintentionally discriminate because they rely on historical data that may already contain social biases, leading to unequal hiring outcomes.

**Bogen & Rieke (2018) –** Automated Employment Decision Tools (AEDTs) lack transparency, proper validation, and independent auditing, increasing the risk of unfair hiring decisions.

**Raghavan et al. (2020) –** AI hiring tools often fail to remove bias and may still produce gender and racial disparities despite technical fairness adjustments**.**

**Barocas & Nissenbaum (2014) –** The use of big data in recruitment threatens applicant privacy, as AI systems may analyze personal information without full awareness or consent.

**Raghavan et al. (2020) –** AI hiring tools often fail to remove bias and may still produce gender and racial disparities despite technical fairness adjustments**.**

**Bogen & Rieke (2018) –** Automated Employment Decision Tools (AEDTs) lack transparency, proper validation, and independent auditing, increasing the risk of unfair hiring decisions.

**Doshi-Velez & Kim (2017) –** The "black-box" nature of AI systems makes it difficult to understand or explain hiring decisions, reducing trust and fairness**.**

**Ajunwa, Crawford & Schultz (2019) –** AI-driven hiring challenges existing labor and antidiscrimination laws, as legal frameworks are not fully prepared for automated decision making.

**Zarsky (2016) –** Automated decision systems create accountability gaps because it is unclear whether responsibility lies with developers, employers, or software vendors.

**Citron & Pasquale (2014) –** Strong regulatory oversight is necessary to ensure algorithmic transparency and protect job applicants from hidden biases.

**Tene & Polonetsky (2013) –** Predictive analytics in hiring can undermine individual autonomy by profiling candidates based on behavioral data and digital footprints**.**

**Kamiran & Calders (2012) –** Fairness-aware machine learning techniques can help reduce discrimination, but technical fixes alone may not fully solve ethical issues.

**Kamishima et al. (2012) –** Proposed algorithmic modifications to suppress discriminatory patterns in training data used for hiring systems.

**Friedler, Scheidegger & Venkatasubramanian (2019) –** Fairness is context- dependent, and no single fairness metric can guarantee ethical hiring outcomes.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

**AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS**

| S.NO | AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS | NO. OF. RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Below 20 | 21 | 19.6 |
| 2 | 21- 30 | 33 | 30.8 |
| 3 | 31 - 40 | 35 | 32.7 |
| 4 | 41 - 50 | 15 | 14.0 |
| 5 | Above 50 | 3 | 2.8 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

**SOURCE:**(Primary Data)

**INFERENCE**

Out of 107 respondents, the majority are between 21–40 years (63.5%), with the largest group being 31–40 years (32.7%), followed closely by 21–30 years (30.8%). Very few respondents are above 50 years (2.8%).

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

**GENDER OF THE RESPONDENTS**

| S.NO | GENDER OF THE RESPONDENTS | NO. OF. RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Male | 54 | 50.5 |
| 2 | Female | 53 | 49.5 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

**SOURCE**:(Primary data)

**INFERENCE**

Out of 107 respondents, 50.5% are male and 49.5% are female.

**OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

| S.NO | OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENTS | NO. OF. RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Student | 30 | 28.0 |
| 2 | Employed (non- HR) | 48 | 44.9 |
| 3 | HR professional | 23 | 21.5 |
| 4 | Recruiter | 6 | 5.6 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

**SOURCE:**(Primary data)

**INFERENCE**

Most respondents are Employed (Non-HR) (44.9%), followed by Students (28%) and HR professionals (21.5%). Very few are Recruiters (5.6%).

**REDUCE OF RESPONDENTS**

| S.NO | REDUCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | NO. OF. RESPONDENTS | PERCE NTAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Strongly agree | 37 | 34.6 |
| 2 | Agree | 45 | 42.1 |
| 3 | Disagree | 23 | 21.5 |
| 4 | Total | 105 | 98.1 |
| 5 | Missing System | 2 | 1.9 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

**SOURCE**:(Primary data)

**INFERENCE**

A majority of respondents agree (42.9%) or strongly agree (35.2%), totalling 78.1% positive responses. About 21.9% disagree.

**RISK OF THE RESPONDENTS**

| S.NO | RISK OF THE RESPONDENTS | NO. OF. RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Improved Efficiency | 23 | 21.5 |
| 2 | Lack of Accountability | 51 | 47.7 |
| 3 | Increased Transparency | 24 | 22.4 |
| 4 | Reduced Workload | 9 | 8.4 |
| | Total | 107 | 100.0 |

**SOURCE**:(Primary data)

**INFERENCE**

The majority of respondents (47.7%) see lack of accountability as the main concern, while increased transparency (22.4%) and improved efficiency (21.5%) are seen as benefits. Only 8.4% mention reduced workload

**SUGGESTION**

- Use AI as a support tool, not as a complete replacement for human decision-making.
- Increase transparency in AI hiring processes so candidates understand how decisions are made. Clear explanations help build trust in the system.
- Maintain human involvement in hiring decisions. AI should assist recruiters but not completely replace human judgment.

## CONCLUSION

The correlation analysis shows that most respondents believe AI is mainly used to make the hiring process faster and easier (51.4%). Fewer respondents think AI slows hiring, confuses candidates, or replaces employees. This indicates a positive perception of AI as

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

a tool that improves recruitment efficiency rather than replacing human workers.

Therefore, the majority opinion shows that AI is mainly seen as a tool to improve the efficiency of hiring rather than to replace employees. However, some respondents still have concerns about its impact, which shows the need for proper understanding and responsible use of AI in recruitment.

## REFERENCES

1. *Langenkamp, M., Costa, A., & Cheung, C. (2020) – Hiring Fairly in the Age of Algorithms – analyzes bias amplification, legal questions, and transparency challenges in algorithmic hiring*
2. *Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2022) – in Ethics of AI-Enabled Recruiting and Selection: A Review and Research Agenda – examines ethical risks like bias, accountability, and obfuscation of responsibility when using AI in hiring.*
3. *Chen, Z. (2023) – Ethics and discrimination in artificial intelligence-enabled recruitment practices – discusses algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency and fairness issues in AI hiring.*