The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Recruitment: A Critical Narrative Review of Applications, Opportunities, Challenges and Future Directions

Tanuja Nihalchandani, Prof. Dr. Pooja Chaturvedi

Department of Management, Rabindranath Tagore University (RNTU), Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1310000184

Received: 23 October 2026; Accepted: 28 October 2026; Published: 12 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly discussed as a means of supporting recruitment through candidate search, resume screening, applicant communication, and decision support. However, claims of greater efficiency must be considered alongside questions of validity, fairness, transparency, and organisational readiness. This critical narrative review examines selected scholarship on AI-enabled recruitment and related digital selection technologies. The literature is organised into themes concerning operational efficiency, applicant experience, algorithmic fairness, managerial oversight, and implementation. Rather than treating automation as inherently beneficial, the review compares the assumptions and limitations of influential studies and distinguishes technological capability from demonstrated organisational outcomes. It also considers the applicability of international research to India's heterogeneous service sector, with particular attention to the limited evidence available for Madhya Pradesh. The paper contributes an integrated, context-sensitive analytical framework linking recruitment tasks, potential benefits, governance safeguards, and measurable outcomes. It concludes that AI is best understood as a decision-support resource whose value depends on job-relevant validation, accountable human oversight, and locally grounded evaluation. State-specific adoption and impact remain empirical questions rather than established findings.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, recruitment, talent acquisition, algorithmic fairness, applicant experience, India, Madhya Pradesh.

INTRODUCTION

Recruitment shapes organisational capability by influencing who enters the workforce and how well their knowledge and skills correspond to job requirements. Traditional recruitment has relied on advertisements, employment agencies, referrals, application review, and interviews. Digital job portals and applicant tracking systems subsequently increased the volume and accessibility of candidate information. AI-enabled applications represent a further development: some systems classify documents, identify potential skill matches, assist with candidate communication, or generate predictions intended to support recruitment decisions (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2018; Black & van Esch, 2020).

These technologies should not be conflated with digitalisation generally. An online application form or video interview is not necessarily AI-based. The distinction matters because algorithmic recommendations introduce additional questions about training data, measurement validity and accountability. The shift towards remote recruitment during the COVID-19 period heightened interest in digital processes, but it does not itself establish the extent or effectiveness of AI adoption.

Research presents a tension between the promise of streamlined recruitment and the possibility that automated tools reproduce historical inequalities or undermine applicants' confidence in selection procedures (Van Esch et al., 2019; Köchling & Wehner, 2020; Raghavan et al., 2020). These tensions may be particularly relevant

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

to service-sector employers with diverse roles, recruitment volumes and technological resources. Yet the implications for individual Indian states cannot be inferred directly from international literature.

Accordingly, this review critically examines what existing studies establish, where their conclusions remain conditional, and which questions require local empirical investigation. Its specific contribution is a structured synthesis connecting the recruitment task, claimed organisational benefit, corresponding risk, and evidence required to evaluate outcomes in the service-sector context of Madhya Pradesh.

Objectives and Review Questions

The review addresses four questions:

- Which recruitment activities can AI-supported technologies assist?
- How do existing studies characterise their operational advantages and limitations?
- What do the studies imply for applicant experience, fairness and managerial accountability?
- What evidence would be needed to evaluate these technologies among service-sector employers in Madhya Pradesh?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Review design

This paper adopts a critical narrative literature-review design. It synthesises selected academic and policy-oriented contributions to interpret concepts, competing arguments and research gaps. It does not claim exhaustive coverage, pooled effect estimates or the reproducibility associated with a systematic review. No primary survey, interviews or organisational records were analysed for this paper.

Source identification and selection

This critical narrative review draws on ten academic and policy-oriented works retained from the earlier manuscript, supplemented by four contextual sources on India and Madhya Pradesh. Sources were included purposively for their relevance to recruitment automation, applicant reactions, selection validity, algorithmic fairness, managerial implementation, or regional context. The earlier search history was not recorded; consequently, database coverage, search dates, search strings, screening counts, and exclusion decisions cannot be reconstructed. The additional contextual sources were considered separately from the core literature and are not treated as independent evaluations of AI recruitment effectiveness. No systematic or exhaustive search is claimed.

The absence of a reproducible search strategy limits coverage and introduces possible selection bias. A future systematic update should pre-specify databases, search terms, date limits, inclusion criteria, screening procedures and appraisal methods; these steps were not undertaken for the present manuscript.

Thematic organisation and synthesis

The ten core publications were compared across four interpretive themes:

- Recruitment efficiency and task automation.
- Applicant experience and selection validity.
- Discrimination, transparency and privacy.
- Organisational readiness and human oversight.

For each theme, the synthesis distinguishes proposed technical capabilities from empirically observed outcomes and methodological or ethical critiques. Contrasts were drawn across study focus, context, and

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

evidentiary strength. These themes were developed interpretively; no formal coding protocol, independent dual screening, or meta-analysis was conducted.

Methodological limitations

The review is limited by a small, purposively retained core source set and selectively added contextual sources, undocumented original retrieval procedures, possible publication and selection bias, and the absence of formal quality appraisal or independent coding. Differences in research design, geography, and outcome measures preclude pooled effect estimates or generalisable claims about adoption rates. The reviewed sources also provide no representative state-level evidence on AI recruitment adoption or outcomes in Madhya Pradesh. Consequently, this paper develops an interpretive framework and research agenda rather than estimating causal effects or regional prevalence.

Critical Review of Literature

Efficiency claims and the distinction between capability and evidence

Upadhyay and Khandelwal (2018) describe potential recruitment applications of AI, while Black and van Esch (2020) offer managerial guidance for adopting AI-enabled recruiting. Both help explain why employers may be attracted to automated screening and matching. However, their practical emphasis does not establish that a particular system consistently improves quality of hire or reduces cost in every setting. Tambe et al. (2019) place such claims within broader HR analytics challenges, including data quality and the difficulty of translating prediction into useful organisational decisions. Together, these studies suggest that faster processing is a plausible intermediate benefit, not sufficient evidence of recruitment effectiveness.

Applicant experience and assessment validity

Van Esch et al. (2019) examine applicant-facing dimensions of AI recruitment, while Woods et al. (2020) assess digital personnel selection in relation to validity and applicant reactions. Langer et al. (2019) consider acceptance of highly automated interviews. These studies address different selection technologies and populations; evidence of acceptance or convenience in one setting does not establish the validity or acceptability of AI scoring in another. The practical question is whether a specific tool improves job-relevant assessment without diminishing applicants' ability to understand and contest decisions.

Fairness: identifying risks versus demonstrating mitigation

Kochling A. and Wehner M. C. (2020) synthesise evidence on discrimination and fairness in algorithm-supported HR decisions. Raghavan et al. (2020), by contrast, scrutinise how vendors and organisations claim to mitigate bias in hiring. The first contribution establishes the breadth of fairness concerns, whereas the second questions whether commonly asserted remedies are adequately supported. Bogen and Rieke (2018) similarly draw attention to equity implications across hiring technologies. Read together, these works challenge the assumption that standardised automated decisions are necessarily impartial. A model can apply a rule consistently while that rule still disadvantages applicants because of unsuitable proxies, biased historical data or weak validation.

Strategic adoption and organisational conditions

Black and van Esch (2020) frame AI-enabled recruiting as a managerial choice requiring alignment with recruitment objectives. Vrontis et al. (2022) broaden the discussion to advanced technologies across HRM, highlighting the wider organisational implications of technology adoption. Tambe et al. (2019) add a caution about the practical challenges of HR data and analytics. These perspectives indicate that technical functionality is only one element of implementation: workforce skills, process integration, vendor accountability and oversight determine whether a tool is suitable for a particular organisation.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

Synthesis of the evidence

The literature converges on the possibility of workflow change but not on universal performance gains. Application-oriented accounts emphasise processing speed and managerial opportunity (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2018; Black & van Esch, 2020), whereas selection research stresses validity and applicant reactions (Woods et al., 2020), and fairness scholarship questions both discriminatory effects and vendors' mitigation claims (Köchling & Wehner, 2020; Raghavan et al., 2020). Faster processing is therefore an intermediate outcome, not proof of better hiring. The unresolved challenge is to assess efficiency, selection quality, fairness and applicant experience together in specific organisational settings.

Applications of AI in Recruitment

Resume screening and candidate matching

AI-assisted tools may extract qualifications, identify skills and prioritise candidate profiles against role requirements. Such outputs should be checked for job relevance and for the exclusion of applicants with non-linear career histories. A match score is not a validated measure of overall suitability.

Applicant tracking and workflow support

Applicant tracking systems primarily organise applications; only some incorporate AI capabilities. Automated classification, communications, and prioritisation can support coordination, but employers should distinguish routine workflow automation from algorithmic selection.

Chatbots and candidate communication

Recruitment chatbots may respond to routine questions and support scheduling. Their value depends on accuracy, accessibility, and a clear route to human assistance when circumstances are complex.

Predictive analytics

Predictive models may assist workforce planning or estimate recruitment-related outcomes. Historical correlations should not be interpreted as causal evidence, and performance should be validated before predictions affect individual applicants.

Interviews and digital assessment

Video interviews and online assessments are not inherently AI-driven. Where automated scoring or behavioural inference is used, organisations should demand evidence of construct validity, fairness, and privacy protection (Woods et al., 2020; Langer et al., 2019).

Potential Benefits and Conditions

Potential advantages include reduced repetitive work, faster communication, improved information retrieval and more consistent documentation. These are possible operational effects, not verified outcomes for the organisations considered here. Benefits should be evaluated alongside implementation cost, false rejection rates, applicant experience, and fairness across relevant groups and the quality of subsequent hiring decisions. An increase in processing speed is not beneficial if it also reduces selection validity.

Challenges and Responsible Governance

Algorithmic bias may arise from historical training data, inappropriate target variables, or proxy features. Opacity can make decisions difficult to explain or contest. Recruitment information also raises privacy and confidentiality concerns, while high implementation costs and limited technical expertise may constrain smaller employers. Human reviewers may become over-reliant on algorithmic recommendations, a problem

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

that cannot be solved by merely declaring that humans make final decisions (Kochling & Wehner, 2020; Raghavan et al., 2020).

Responsible implementation therefore requires a defined purpose for each tool, job-related validation, documented data governance, periodic monitoring for unequal outcomes, accessible candidate communication, and meaningful authority to review or override recommendations. Employers should assess whether a simpler non-AI process could meet the same recruitment need with fewer risks.

Relevance to the Indian Service Sector and Madhya Pradesh

India's service sector encompasses IT-enabled services, financial services, healthcare, education, hospitality and other activities with substantially different hiring requirements. It would therefore be misleading to assume a single model of AI recruitment adoption. A high-volume employer may prioritise screening and communication, whereas a specialised employer may value skills search or structured assessment. These are illustrative use cases, not documented adoption rates.

Madhya Pradesh provides a useful setting for examining how such tools interact with regional labour markets and organisational capacity. The state contains service-sector employers of different sizes and types, but the publications reviewed here do not establish how many use AI-enabled recruitment, which tools they employ, or whether these tools improve outcomes. Assertions of widespread adoption, measurable cost savings, or reduced bias in the state would require local organisational data. Potentially relevant issues for investigation include software affordability, digital infrastructure, language accessibility, recruitment volumes, staff training and vendor support; these are research propositions rather than findings about local firms.

A feasible empirical extension would compare employers by sector and size, using recruiter interviews and documented workflow measures alongside applicant surveys. Indicators could include time to shortlist, cost per hire, completion and withdrawal rates, and applicant understanding of automated decisions, adverse-impact indicators, and subsequent job performance where appropriate. A comparison with non-AI recruitment processes, with attention to differences in role complexity and applicant pools, would be needed before attributing observed outcomes to AI.

Regional service-sector context

Madhya Pradesh offers a relevant context for studying the adoption of AI-supported recruitment, but its general service-sector development must not be confused with evidence of AI hiring outcomes. NITI Aayog (2025) discusses state-level services employment and structural differences; the precise figures cited in the earlier draft should be checked against the underlying tables before publication. Stapleton et al. (2023) examine AI-related labour demand using Indian job advertisements. National job-advertisement evidence indicates changes in skills demand, not verified adoption of AI recruitment tools by employers in Madhya Pradesh.

Screening, chatbots and workforce intelligence

For high-volume IT-enabled services and financial-service roles, AI-assisted résumé parsing and candidate matching may reduce the effort required for initial shortlisting. Conversational agents can answer standard applicant questions and coordinate interviews, while predictive analytics may help identify skills or support workforce planning (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2018; Black & van Esch, 2020). These are possible uses, not verified practices across Madhya Pradesh. Screening speed should be evaluated together with false exclusions, role-related validity, and candidate satisfaction. Automated processing does not eliminate bias: training data and proxy variables can reproduce discriminatory patterns (Kochling & Wehner, 2020; Raghavan et al., 2020).

Emerging ecosystem and institutional initiatives

Commercial recruitment technology illustrates the availability of AI-enabled screening and candidate-engagement products, but vendors' descriptions are not independent evidence of accuracy, fairness or local

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

uptake. For example, PramitiHR (n.d.) advertises AI-supported hiring functions; no independent evaluation of its outcomes among Madhya Pradesh employers was identified in the materials reviewed. A government communication concerning IndiaAI and Madhya Pradesh describes AI-related institutional engagement (Press Information Bureau, 2026). Such activity may strengthen digital skills and infrastructure, but it does not demonstrate recruitment productivity gains. Specific claims about local vendor headquarters, multinational hiring practices or the number of colleges using AI require separately verifiable evidence and are not advanced here.

From administrative recruiting to accountable talent advisory

AI-supported workflow automation could allow recruitment managers to spend less time on routine classification, follow-ups and scheduling, and more time on job analysis, candidate engagement and structured assessment (Black & van Esch, 2020; Tambe et al., 2019). This transition is neither automatic nor necessarily beneficial. Recruiters require data literacy to scrutinise recommendations, define measurable job criteria, detect model errors, protect applicant information and retain meaningful authority over consequential decisions. Training, documented validation and audit processes are particularly important where organisational resources differ. Local comparative research should test time-to-shortlist, cost per hire, applicant experience, selection validity and unequal outcomes before claiming improved candidate placement or retention.

Research Gaps and Original Contribution

Three gaps follow from the reviewed material.

First, descriptions of AI capability are often presented without corresponding evidence of improved quality of hire, cost or retention.

Second, operational efficiency, applicant experience, selection validity and fairness are frequently evaluated separately, despite important trade-offs between them.

Third, the purposively selected sources provide no representative estimates of AI recruitment adoption, effectiveness or governance among service-sector employers in Madhya Pradesh. These gaps should be interpreted in light of the review's limited and non-systematic coverage.

The contribution is conceptual and integrative, not a new empirical discovery. By linking each recruitment task to a claimed operational benefit, a corresponding applicant or governance risk, and an observable evaluation measure, the proposed four-part framework addresses the separation between efficiency, fairness, and applicant experience in much of the selected literature. Applied to Madhya Pradesh, it specifies testable questions without presuming local adoption: which employers use AI, for which tasks, under what governance arrangements, and with what measurable effects? The framework requires future empirical validation.

Recruitment task	Potential benefit	Risk or limitation	Evidence required
Screening	Faster shortlisting	Unfair exclusion	Time, validation and subgroup outcomes
Chatbots	Timely responses	Inaccurate or inaccessible guidance	Response accuracy and applicant feedback
Matching	Skills-based search	Poor job-fit proxies	Role-related validity and error rates

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

Predictive analytics	Planning support	Unreliable extrapolation	Out-of-sample predictive performance

Table 1. Analytical framework for evaluating AI-supported recruitment. Note. Author-developed synthesis of the cited literature; the entries are propositions for evaluation, not empirical results.

Future Research Directions

Future studies should document actual AI adoption in Madhya Pradesh rather than infer it from national or international trends. Comparative designs could examine small and large service-sector organisations, distinct occupational groups and different levels of recruitment automation. Longitudinal research may assess whether observed changes in recruitment speed are sustained and whether they correspond to improvements in employee retention or performance. Candidate-centred research should examine perceived fairness, opportunities to seek explanations, and experiences of applicants whose backgrounds do not fit standardised profiles.

Further work should test the proposed evaluation framework with transparent measures and explicit comparison groups. It should also examine how governance requirements can be implemented realistically in organisations with limited technical resources.

CONCLUSION

AI offers tools that may assist recruiters with information processing, candidate communication and structured decision support. Nevertheless, technological sophistication is not evidence of superior hiring. The reviewed literature highlights unresolved tensions between efficiency, selection validity, applicant experience and fairness. Its implications are therefore conditional on the recruitment task, organisational context and quality of implementation.

For Madhya Pradesh, the principal conclusion is an evidence gap, not a finding of established AI adoption or effectiveness. This review contributes a context-sensitive framework for specifying potential benefits, associated risks and the measures needed to test them. Future empirical research should determine which tools are in use, under what conditions they operate, and whether they improve recruitment outcomes without compromising fairness and accountable human judgement.

REFERENCES

1. Black, J. S., & van Esch, P. (2020). AI-enabled recruiting: What is it and how should a manager use it? Business Horizons, 63(2), 215–226.
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. Kochling, A., & Wehner, M. C. (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, 13, 795–848. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-020-00134-w.
4. Langer, M., König, C. J., & Papathanasiou, M. (2019). Highly automated job interviews: Acceptance under the influence of stakes. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 27(3), 217–234. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12246.
5. NITI Aayog. (2025). India's services sector: Insights from employment trends and state-level dynamics. https://www.niti.gov.in/node/2028.
6. PramitiHR. (n.d.). The agentic AI platform for smarter hiring [Company website]. https://pramitihr.ai/.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue X October 2026

7. Press Information Bureau. (2026, January 15). IndiaAI Mission, MeitY & Government of Madhya Pradesh conclude the Madhya Pradesh Regional AI Impact Conference 2026 in Bhopal. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2215098.
8. 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.
9. Stapleton, K., Copestake, A., & Pople, A. (2023). AI and services-led growth: Evidence from Indian job adverts (STEG Working Paper No. WP060). Centre for Economic Policy Research. https://cepr.org/publications/wp060.
10. Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. California Management Review, 61(4), 15–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619867910.
11. Upadhyay, A. K., & Khandelwal, K. (2018). Applying artificial intelligence: Implications for recruitment. Strategic HR Review, 17(5), 255–258.
12. Van Esch, P., Black, J. S., & Ferolie, J. (2019). Marketing AI recruitment: The next phase in job application and selection. Computers in Human Behavior, 90, 215–222.
13. Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Pereira, V., Tarba, S., Makrides, A., & Trichina, E. (2022). Artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies and human resource management: A systematic review. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33(6), 1237–1266.
14. Woods, S. A., Ahmed, S., Nikolaou, I., Costa, A. C., & Anderson, N. R. (2020). Personnel selection in the digital age: A review of validity and applicant reactions, and future research challenges. European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 29(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1681401.