

Article

AI Recruiting Tools and the Unfairness Behind the Face of Efficiency

Shielou Ebdao¹, Tyler Colandog¹, Ezra James Collado¹, Devorah Cutoban¹, Ohliver Dawat¹, Dewberry Claire Dormiendo¹, Jamiellah Raiza Dumagay¹, Jhunwhindel Dumanon¹, Johnwel Dumanon¹, Jelloh Enriquez¹, Daniela Esmael¹, Sophia B. Bernas¹, Diana Marie M. Tabamo¹, Vin Hinlay Montante¹, Lyan Joy B. Collado¹, Lizlit C. Cabag¹, Hardik Vachharajani^{2,4}, Vitalian Christopher L. Napone^{1,3,4,*}

¹ Caraga State University

² Symbiosis International University, India

³ Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, Philippines

⁴ National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

* Corresponding author: Vitalian Christopher L. Napone, vitalianchristopher@gmail.com

CITATION

Ebdao S, Colandog T, Collado EJ, et al. (2026). AI recruiting tools and the unfairness behind the face of efficiency. *Human Resources Management and Services*. 8(3): 5846.
<https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms5846>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 20 March 2026

Accepted: 1 May 2026

Available online: 30 June 2026

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2026 by author(s).
Human Resources Management and Services is published by PiscoMed Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract: This paper examines the ethical implications of artificial intelligence (AI) in recruitment, focusing on bias and discrimination, over-automation, and accountability. Although AI-driven hiring systems are widely promoted for efficiency and objectivity, their real-world application raises ethical concerns that extend beyond technical performance. Using a qualitative literature review approach, relevant peer-reviewed studies were analyzed to identify recurring ethical issues in AI recruitment. The analysis is guided by a Kantian ethical framework, emphasizing the moral obligation to treat individuals as ends in themselves rather than merely as means. Insights from Socratic inquiry, further support critical examination of the assumptions underlying algorithmic decision-making. Findings show that AI recruitment systems often reproduce social biases, reduce human judgment through over-automation, and obscure accountability due to limited transparency. In response, the paper proposes a normative Kantian framework that provides structured criteria for evaluating fairness, human oversight, and transparency in automated hiring systems. This study contributes to responsible AI discourse by emphasizing that ethical recruitment requires not only technical solutions but also sustained human judgment, critical reflection, and institutional accountability.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; philosophy; ethics; human resource; algorithm

1. Introduction

In earlier historical periods, artificial intelligence was largely conceptualized through myths, philosophical ideas, and speculative narratives, where it began as “an ancient wish to forge the Gods” (Groumpos et al, 2025). With the creation of computers and the possibilities it brought, this idea of “artificial intelligence” started to take shape in the 1950s, when Alan Turing (1950) published a paper about artificial intelligence where a question was asked: “Can machines think?” Artificial Intelligence, or what we simply call as “AI”, has been circulating throughout the Internet lately. It can be found in different fields and every sector in our society. Take the healthcare industry, for example, where AI technology has been utilized in many ways, such as in drug discovery, clinical trials automation, analysis of patients’ data and providing insights that improves patient care (Shaheen, 2021). Artificial intelligence has not only significantly influenced the healthcare sector, but has also expanded into other major industries, including agriculture and entertainment. The business domain is no exception, as companies are slowly integrating AI technology in different areas, like data analysis automation for executive decisions, predictive

analysis solutions, and the Human Resources department was not left out.

Beyond issues of bias, another major ethical concern is the over-automation of recruitment processes, which reduces human oversight and judgment. Recruitment, as per Herschberg et al. (2018), can be defined as “those practices and activities carried out by the organization with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential employees”. This process allows organizations to find and hire potential employees who are capable and appropriate for a specific job title, which includes sourcing, screening, and interviewing potential employees. The recruitment process is one of the most important processes every organization has in them. In fact, countless studies have expressed that with one study conducted by Nahayo (2018) has shown how other functions of management can not properly operate without the right staff hired using the right methods. With that said, the Human Resources Department, who are the ones responsible for handling the recruitment process, have so much to deal with. Statistics have shown that in 2019, there are 250 applicant resumes Human Resources have to manually deal with in every recruitment openings, which is already a load of work, considering that they have to screen each of the resumes for the next process. In standard recruitment practice, only a small proportion of applicants typically progress beyond the initial screening stage, often estimated at approximately 2% to 10%, depending on the role and selection criteria. This highlights the highly selective nature of early-stage recruitment processes. This selectivity underscores the increasing reliance on automated screening tools, which aim to efficiently narrow large applicant pools.

The integration of AI in the field of recruitment has led to what we now call as “AI Recruitment Tools”, tools created for the automation of the process. It has helped Human Resources in the process through automation, increasing their performance efficiency, and also overcoming common problems like human bias, manual work and performance assessment, which were observed by a study conducted by Dadaboyev (2025). However, despite these provided benefits of AI Recruitment Tools, these tools have also raised ethical concerns among people, including the bias and discrimination the tools inflict, due to inaccurate or outdated data in their systems, the over-automation of work where some information of applicants are missed because of the lack of human monitoring, and lastly when the difficulty of getting people to hold accountability for the lack of transparency, that in return, threatens the fairness of the recruitment process. This reduction of individuals to algorithmic outputs overlooks the phenomenological richness of human existence and the intrinsic dignity that defines the human person (Napone et al., 2026). While existing studies primarily focus on the technical performance and bias mitigation of AI systems, this paper advances a normative ethical analysis by applying Kantian ethics as a central framework. Specifically, it examines how AI recruitment tools may violate the moral obligation to treat individuals as ends in themselves, rather than merely as data points for optimization. In doing so, the study moves beyond descriptive accounts of algorithmic bias and contributes a philosophically grounded perspective on fairness, accountability, and human dignity in automated hiring. This organizational structure allows the study to move from an overview of AI hiring systems toward a deeper methodological and philosophical examination of bias, accountability, and fairness.

2. Methodology

The paper uses a qualitative approach to further examine the ethical issues of using AI Recruitment Tools, focusing towards the unfairness of these tools,

particularly on bias & discrimination, over-automation of work, and accountability in the recruitment process. The method follows on systematically reviewing any peer-reviewed literature such as journal articles and case studies related to the topic. The data were analyzed thematically to identify matching patterns of ethical concerns and outcomes to emphasize the unfairness of using AI Recruitment tools, especially on bias & discrimination, over-automation, and accountability. Such methodological framing complements Napone's (2026) discussion of Socratic inquiry, emphasizing that systematic analysis of AI systems must remain grounded in human-led critical reflection rather than automated assumptions.

This study adopts a qualitative systematic literature review approach. Relevant literature was collected from major academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The search employed keywords such as "AI recruitment," "algorithmic bias," "automated hiring," "fairness in machine learning," and "AI ethics in HR."

Inclusion criteria were: (1) peer-reviewed journal articles, (2) publications between 2015 and 2025, and (3) studies directly addressing ethical, legal, or social implications of AI in recruitment. Excluded were non-academic sources, duplicate records, and studies not directly related to hiring processes.

An initial pool of 128 articles was identified through database searches. After removing duplicates and screening titles and abstracts, 67 articles remained. Following a full-text review based on relevance and inclusion criteria, a final set of 32 studies was selected for thematic analysis. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis following an iterative coding process. Initially, open coding was conducted to identify recurring ethical issues across the selected studies. These initial codes were then grouped into broader thematic categories through constant comparison. Through this process, three dominant themes emerged: bias and discrimination, over-automation, and accountability. This approach ensured a systematic and rigorous synthesis of the literature.

Moreover, this paper uses Kantian Ethics as both a theoretical framework and an analytical lens throughout the study. According to Kant (1785), actions must adhere to universally accepted moral laws, and individuals should always be treated as ends in themselves, never merely as means to an end. Building on this principle, AI recruitment processes are evaluated not only in terms of efficiency but also in relation to their capacity to uphold human dignity, autonomy, and moral agency.

In this study, Kantian ethics is systematically applied across the three identified themes—bias and discrimination, over-automation, and accountability—to assess whether algorithmic decision-making respects the intrinsic worth of applicants. This ensures that the analysis moves beyond a descriptive review of literature toward a normative ethical evaluation of AI-driven hiring practices.

Furthermore, the framework is used to interpret findings by examining whether recruitment outcomes can be justified under universal moral principles and whether organizations maintain responsibility for decisions influenced by automated systems. In line with this, the study emphasizes the importance of ethical design and responsible governance in AI systems (Sharif & Ghodoosi, 2022; Hanna et al., 2020).

Additionally, the discussion considers broader human dimensions—such as the depth of human potential and interpretive understanding—drawing from pedagogical and philosophical perspectives (Napone, 2026), while ensuring that these concepts are aligned with the ethical evaluation of AI recruitment practices.

Section 1: Fairness in Algorithmic Decision-Making (Bias and Discrimination)

Recent developments in machine learning have led to its widespread adoption as a way to help make better choices. It now plays a significant role across various domains, such as employment selection or determining criminal sentencing. However, despite this optimism, Selbst et al.'s (2019) “Can Algorithmic Fairness Be Achieved If The Societal Conditions It Aims To Remedy Persist? ” says that using math or rules alone can’t make things fair. This is because these systems have people, groups, old ways, and who has control. Technological interventions alone cannot resolve systemic inequalities, as human contexts fundamentally shape technological outcomes. Power and history also play a big part in how fair each thing is. So, math tools are not enough when people and old systems are involved. From a Kantian perspective, this limitation is ethically significant. When algorithmic systems rely on historical data that reflect existing inequalities, they risk treating applicants merely as means to achieve efficiency rather than as individuals with intrinsic moral worth. Such practices undermine the principle of respect for persons, as decisions are based on generalized patterns rather than the unique qualities of each candidate.

Big data presents complex and often ambiguous challenges; it is made to help all and make things fair, but it can also make things less fair and less equal. Barocas and Selbst (2016) describe this as the disparity of big data systems impacting various groups differently. A key concern is that data-driven systems often rely on historical patterns and proxy variables, which may inadvertently encode and reproduce existing social biases. This makes it difficult to detect discrimination, as bias may emerge indirectly through seemingly neutral variables. Still, this makes it hard to tell if this kind of bias is happening. It can lead to unfair treatment that is not as strong, and sometimes no one will notice or act on it by law, since there may be no clear proof that someone meant to harm or judge others. Some academics argue algorithms are not inherently biased. However, their integration into societal contexts reinforces pre-existing inconsistency. For example, tools that rate credits or those that pick people for jobs can use things that stand in for race or gender. These can keep old gaps in place while acting like all is fair. The failure of algorithms to account for holistic factors—such as the influence of spirituality on individual performance, further highlights the limitations of using historical data tables to predict future success (Napone, 2024). Such scenarios demonstrate the importance of evaluating data collection, algorithm performance, and governance structures before implementation.

Machine learning systems are capable of processing decisions more efficiently than a human, it can make it more accurate, and it has fewer errors. Caton and Haas (2023) have taken a look at this issue by thinking about how machine learning fits into our world and its technology. They say that just because something works right does not always make it fair or good for people. The authors say that fairness has many sides and can change based on where and how it is used. When people try to set rules or put fairness to use in machines, it can never show every part of what fairness means. Making rules for fairness will always show what people in a group think is right and good.

Authors look at many ways to judge if things are fair, like if groups are treated the same or if odds are even. They also study new ways to make these rules better. These ways help tell how much harm is done to groups of people who are often not treated right because of certain acts. They say justice is what guides us in our actions. With the methodological framework in place, the analysis proceeds to examine the

major ethical issues in AI-driven hiring, beginning with how algorithmic bias impacts decision-making and fairness.

Section 2: Over-Automation

Cath, Floridi (2022) inquired into the ethical implications of the AI-driven hiring process: a human rights concern? Their review shows that AI can help when looking at people for a job. The authors looked at the issue from a human rights view. They ask if using AI to pick people for jobs will allow for equal chances for all, keep people's private things safe, and show clear steps in the process. They wonder if AI can help make sure that everyone gets a fair shot at job roles and that the rules are open and just for all.

Cath and Floridi (2022) contend that while AI can ethically contribute to recruitment, it necessitates human oversight, transparency in its decision-making processes, and responsibility for the ultimate candidate selection. Hunkenschroer and Luetge (2022) also sees that more and more firms are now using AI tools to help with hiring and picking staff. They use things such as making resumes by machine, checking resumes fast, looking at how people act in video talks, and picking people who fit what the job needs. Even if they agree that AI is good and trustful and that it can save time, they still believe that it's not okay to do that for recruiting because that's a huge part of someone's life, and it can affect their ability to earn a living. Through the lens of Kantian ethics, over-automation in recruitment raises concerns about the erosion of human agency and moral responsibility. When decision-making is delegated entirely to AI systems, human evaluators may abdicate their duty to exercise judgment, thereby reducing applicants to passive objects of algorithmic evaluation. This contradicts the Kantian imperative to recognize individuals as autonomous agents deserving of meaningful consideration.

Upon reviewing 51 articles, they identify and articulate the ethical benefits and risks/uncertainties of AI-enabled hiring. However, significant challenges remain. AI systems can replicate and entrench human biases, while the opacity of algorithmic decision-making limits effective oversight. People may have less free will or may not feel in charge when they use AI, but people worry about being safe and being treated right too.

In particular, the writers point out that most of the current writing on bias in computer programs does not talk about other key moral issues like who is to blame, if people trust the system, if things are clear to the public, or how these systems affect nature. These factors highlight the necessity for comprehensive empirical validation to ensure the efficacy and fairness of AI-driven hiring.

Section 3: Accountability

The growing use of AI for hiring raises serious questions regarding accountability and the legal framework around AI when hiring automated systems produce biased results. According to Fabris et al. (2023), the lack of transparency makes it difficult to determine whether or not AI outputs are generating equitable decisions or whether or not they are reflecting hidden bias present in the training data that was used to train the AI.

Algorithmic hiring systems often elevate or magnify pre-existing biases found in historical records, but when the AI cannot be traced back to any particular decision made by the AI system, it leaves individuals with little recourse for obtaining damages (Mesriani, 2024). Engler (2021) explains that current anti-discrimination laws were authored to cover only human decision-makers and thus have created enforcement inconsistency and ambiguity regarding legal liability

when AI systems discriminate against a jobseeker. While audits of algorithms are a proposed solution, Engler also notes that many audits do not have uniform techniques for assessing algorithmic fairness, and there are limits due to proprietary software used for hiring. This accountability gap underscores the critical need for regulatory frameworks, such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the EU AI Act. Specifically, Article 22 of the GDPR grants individuals the right not to be subject to a decision based solely on automated processing, including profiling, which produces legal or similarly significant effects. In the context of AI recruitment, this legally mandates a 'right to explanation,' counteracting the black-box problem by requiring transparency and human intervention to justify algorithmic disqualifications.

Furthermore, Raghavan et al. (2020) indicate that vendors developing these hiring tools provide limited information about the testing process used to ensure the fairness of their systems. The situation is further exacerbated by the findings of Dima et al. (2024) who demonstrate that AI vendors rarely supply sufficient documentation regarding the efforts to develop their systems in a manner that mitigates potential inequitable outcomes.

3. Result and Discussion

This study contributes to the literature by offering a normative ethical interpretation of AI recruitment through a Kantian framework, moving beyond purely technical or empirical discussions of algorithmic bias. Rather than treating fairness as a computational problem alone, the analysis reframes it as a moral obligation grounded in respect for persons as ends in themselves.

Across the reviewed literature, a consistent pattern emerges: AI recruitment systems are often presented as objective and efficient, yet their real-world application frequently reproduces structural inequalities and obscures responsibility. This reveals a fundamental tension between the technical promise of fairness and the ethical reality of its implementation.

To deepen this analysis, the study draws on the concept of Socratic inquiry as discussed by Napone (2026), which emphasizes critical questioning as a means of uncovering hidden assumptions. Applied to AI recruitment, this perspective challenges the tendency to accept algorithmic outputs as inherently objective. Instead, it encourages continuous interrogation of decision-making processes: What data informs these systems? What biases are embedded within them? Who is ultimately accountable for their outcomes?

Through this lens, AI recruitment systems are not neutral tools but socially embedded technologies shaped by human decisions and institutional priorities. The failure to critically examine these systems risks reinforcing unjust outcomes while maintaining an illusion of objectivity.

Bias and Discrimination: Beyond Technical Fairness

The literature consistently demonstrates that algorithmic systems inherit and amplify biases embedded in historical data. Solon Barocas and Andrew D. Selbst (2016) argue that even without intentional discrimination, data-driven systems can produce disparate impacts because they rely on historically biased datasets. Similarly, Selbst et al. (2019) identify multiple "traps" in fairness research—such as framing, portability, and formalism—that arise when complex social realities are reduced to simplified mathematical representations.

Taken together, these studies suggest that fairness cannot be achieved through

technical adjustments alone. While algorithmic models may satisfy statistical definitions of fairness, they often fail to address the broader social conditions that produce inequality. Caton and Haas (2023) further emphasize that bias can emerge at every stage of the machine learning pipeline, requiring both technical intervention and ethical judgment.

From a Kantian perspective, this reliance on generalized data patterns raises a fundamental ethical concern. When individuals are evaluated based on probabilistic similarities to past candidates, they are reduced to data points rather than recognized as autonomous agents with intrinsic worth. This violates the moral principle that persons must always be treated as ends in themselves. Thus, what appears as “efficient classification” in technical terms may, in ethical terms, constitute a form of dehumanization.

Over-Automation: The Displacement of Moral Responsibility

While AI recruitment tools offer speed and consistency, the literature indicates that excessive reliance on automation introduces significant ethical risks. Corinne Cath and Luciano Floridi (2022) argue that AI systems cannot replace human judgment, particularly in decisions that carry moral and social consequences. Over-automation may lead hiring professionals to defer uncritically to algorithmic outputs, thereby diminishing their sense of responsibility.

This dynamic is further reinforced by the perceived objectivity of AI systems. When decisions are framed as data-driven, they are often seen as more reliable, even when underlying biases persist. Hunkenschroer and Luetge (2022) highlight that such systems raise unresolved ethical issues related to transparency, trust, and governance, particularly when oversight mechanisms are weak or absent.

From a Kantian standpoint, this shift represents a form of ethical disengagement. Moral responsibility requires active judgment and the capacity to justify decisions based on universal principles. When decision-making is delegated entirely to automated systems, human agents risk abdicating this responsibility. In such cases, applicants are no longer engaged as individuals deserving of consideration, but are instead processed as inputs within a technical system.

Accountability: The Ethical Implications of the “Black Box”

A central concern in the literature is the opacity of AI systems, often described as the “black box” problem. Many algorithms operate with limited transparency, making it difficult for both applicants and employers to understand how decisions are made. As Manish Raghavan et al. (2020) note, vendors rarely disclose how their systems are tested or whether they are free from bias, leaving organizations with limited capacity to evaluate their reliability.

This lack of transparency has significant ethical implications. From a Kantian perspective, ethical action requires that decisions be justifiable through rational explanation. Black-box systems undermine this requirement by obscuring the reasoning behind outcomes, making it difficult to assess whether decisions are fair or discriminatory.

Moreover, accountability becomes diffuse. When biased outcomes occur, it is unclear whether responsibility lies with the developer, the organization, or the system itself. This ambiguity limits the ability of affected individuals to challenge decisions, thereby weakening both ethical and legal accountability.

Synthesis: From Technical Problem to Moral Obligation

Taken together, the findings demonstrate that the challenges of AI recruitment

cannot be reduced to technical inefficiencies. Instead, they reflect deeper ethical tensions embedded within the design and implementation of these systems. Bias, over-automation, and lack of accountability are not isolated issues, but interconnected problems that stem from the misalignment between technological efficiency and moral responsibility.

The integration of Kantian ethics and Socratic inquiry provides a framework for addressing this misalignment. While Kantian ethics establishes the moral obligation to respect human dignity, Socratic inquiry emphasizes the need for continuous critical reflection. Together, they shift the evaluation of AI recruitment from a focus on performance metrics to a broader consideration of ethical legitimacy.

A Kantian Ethical Framework for AI Recruitment

This paper proposes a normative Kantian ethical framework for evaluating AI recruitment systems, offering a structured set of ethical criteria that extends beyond purely technical and legal approaches to algorithmic fairness.

Central to this framework is the principle that all candidates must be treated as ends in themselves, possessing intrinsic dignity that cannot be reduced to algorithmic outputs. This requires that AI systems be designed and implemented in ways that prioritize fairness, transparency, and human oversight.

First, fairness must extend beyond statistical measures to include respect for individual uniqueness, ensuring that candidates are not evaluated solely based on historical data patterns. Second, human oversight must remain integral to the decision-making process to preserve moral responsibility and prevent over-reliance on automated systems. Third, transparency must be upheld to allow decisions to be explained and justified, aligning with the Kantian requirement for rational accountability.

This framework demonstrates that ethical AI recruitment is not merely a technical challenge but a moral obligation, requiring organizations to align technological efficiency with respect for human dignity.

4. Conclusion

While AI recruitment tools offer increased efficiency and scalability, their widespread adoption introduces complex ethical challenges that cannot be addressed through technical solutions alone. This study demonstrates that such systems, despite their promise of objectivity, often reproduce existing social biases, displace human judgment, and obscure accountability. These issues reveal a fundamental tension between computational efficiency and ethical responsibility.

From a Kantian perspective, these shortcomings are not merely operational flaws but moral concerns. When individuals are evaluated primarily through algorithmic classifications, they risk being treated as means to organizational ends rather than as autonomous agents with intrinsic dignity. This raises critical questions about the legitimacy of delegating consequential decisions—such as hiring—to systems that lack the capacity for moral reasoning.

To address these challenges, this paper advances a normative Kantian ethical framework for AI recruitment, offering a structured basis for evaluating fairness, accountability, and transparency in algorithmic hiring systems. By emphasizing the principles of respect for persons, human oversight, and rational justification, the framework moves beyond existing approaches that rely solely on statistical or regulatory definitions of fairness.

Furthermore, the integration of Socratic inquiry, as discussed by Napone (2026),

reinforces the need for continuous critical engagement with AI systems. Rather than accepting algorithmic decisions as inherently objective, organizations must actively question the assumptions, limitations, and consequences embedded within these technologies.

In this context, the responsible use of AI in recruitment requires more than technical refinement. It demands sustained human involvement, ethical reflection, and institutional accountability. Organizations must ensure that AI systems are rigorously evaluated for bias, supported by meaningful human oversight, and designed with transparency that allows decisions to be explained and contested.

Ultimately, this study contributes to the growing discourse on AI ethics by bridging philosophical theory and technological practice. It positions ethical evaluation not as a secondary consideration, but as a central requirement in the design and deployment of AI-driven hiring systems, affirming that true fairness must be grounded in the dignity and moral worth of every individual.

References

1. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671-732. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2477899
2. Bogen, M., & Rieke, A. (2018). *Help wanted: An examination of hiring algorithms, equity, and bias*. Upturn. <https://www.upturn.org/reports/2018/hiring-algorithms/>
3. Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 81, 1–15. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html>
4. Crawford, Kate. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300209570/atlas-of-ai/>
5. Cath, C., & Floridi, L. (2022). Is AI recruiting (un)ethical? A human rights perspective on the use of AI for hiring. *AI and Ethics*, 3, 199–213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00166-4>
6. Caton, S., & Haas, C. (2023). Fairness in Machine Learning: a survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(7), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3616865>
7. Dadaboyev, S. M. U., Abdullayeva, J., Abbosova, N., Suleymenova, A., & Mamadjanova, K. (2025). Role of artificial intelligence in employee recruitment: systematic review and future research directions. *Discover Global Society*, 3(1), 99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-025-00246-w>
8. Dima, J., Gilbert, M., Dextras-Gauthier, J., & Giraud, L. (2024). The effects of artificial intelligence on human resource activities and the roles of the human resource triad: opportunities and challenges. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1360401. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1360401>
9. Engler, A. (2021, March 12). Auditing employment algorithms for discrimination. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/auditing-employment-algorithms-for-discrimination/>
10. Fabris, A., Baranowska, N., Dennis, M. J., Hacker, P., Saldivar, J., Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J., & Biega, A. J. (2023). Fairness and bias in algorithmic hiring. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13933.
11. Groumpos, P. P., et al. (2022). A critical overview of the "Ancient Artificial Intelligence" science, today's AI, and its relation to the Pandora's myth! *Proceedings of Emerging Tech Conference: Edge Intelligence 2022*, 324-331.
12. Hanna, A., Denton, E., Smart, A., & Smith-Loud, J. (2020). Towards a critical race methodology in algorithmic fairness. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*, 501–512. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372826>
13. Herschberg, C., Benschop, Y., & Van Den Brink, M. (2018). Precarious postdocs: A comparative study on recruitment and selection of early-career researchers. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(4), 303–310. doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2018.10.001
14. Kant, I., (1785). Immanuel Kant: Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/blog.nus.edu.sg/dist/c/1868/files/2012/12/Kant-Groundwork-ng0pby.pdf>
15. Kant, I. (1993). Grounding for the metaphysics of morals (J. W. Ellington, Trans., 3rd ed.). *Hackett Publishing*. (Original

- work published 1785) <https://hackettpublishing.com/grounding-for-the-metaphysics-of-morals-3rd-edition>
16. Hunkenschroer, A. L., & Luetge, C. (2022). Ethics of AI-Enabled Recruiting and Selection: A Review and Research agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178(4), 977–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05049-6>
 17. Mesriani, K. (2024, October 31). AI & HR: Algorithmic discrimination in the workplace. The Issue Spotter. <https://jlpp.org/ai-hr-algorithmic-discrimination-in-the-workplace>
 18. Nahayo, O. (2018). The Analysis of Effective Recruitment towards Organizational Performance and Competitiveness in Rwanda. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0007537100410044>
 19. Napone, V. C. L. 2026. Plato's Metaphors and Socratic Style: An Insight to Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 58 (3): 249–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2025.2593287>.
 20. Napone, V. C. L. 2024. Correlation between Spirituality and Academic Performance Using the Instrument General Theology Scale (GenTheS). *International Studies in Catholic Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2024.2418005>
 21. Napone, V. C. L., et al. (2026). "Phenomenology of God." *International Studies in Catholic Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2026.2642728>
 22. Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press. <https://nyupress.org/9781479837243/algorithms-of-oppression/>
 23. Raghavan, M., Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J., & Levy, K. (2020). Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*, 469–481. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372828>
 24. Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *In Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FA* '19)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>
 25. Shaheen, M. Y. (2021). Applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: A review. *ScienceOpen Preprints*. doi.org/10.14293/s2199-1006.1.sor.ppvry8k.v1
 26. Sharif, M. H., & Ghodoosi, F. (2022). The ethics of AI in human resource management: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
 27. Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing Machinery and Intelligence. *Mind*, 59(236), 433–460. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2251299>