

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Talent Acquisition and Its Impact on Decision Making

Dr. Iram Sultana Shahbaaz Ansari¹, Ms. Sakshi S. More², Dr. Aishwarya Gopalakrishnan³, Ms. Shilpa Kundle⁴

¹Assistant Professor, PCET's S.B. Patil Institute of Management

²Research Scholar PCET's S.B. Patil Institute of Management

³Assistant Professor PCET's S.B. Patil Institute of Management

⁴Research Scholar

Abstract:

The integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) into talent acquisition is transforming recruitment and selection by enabling faster, data driven and increasingly automated decision making. However, the effectiveness of Generative AI depends not only on its adoption but also on the accuracy and reliability of its outputs, perceived efficiency, objectivity, fairness and users' confidence in AI supported decisions. This study examines the relationship between Generative AI adoption in recruitment and selection and strategic effectiveness and decision confidence, with particular emphasis on the roles of Accuracy and reliability and usefulness of AI outputs, Efficiency of HR decisions and objectivity and fairness. A quantitative research design was adopted and primary data were collected from 120 HR professionals across different industries using structured questionnaire based on Likert scale measures. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, regression analysis, and mediation analysis. The findings indicate Generative AI is positively associated with recruitment efficiency, accuracy, consistency and objectivity. Among the dimensions examined, AI enabled efficiency demonstrated the strongest association with decision effectiveness. The mediation analysis further revealed that Objectivity and Fairness significantly mediated the relationship between Generative AI adoption and Strategic Effectiveness and Decision Confidence, with a significant indirect effect ($b = 0.411$, $p < 0.001$; 95% bootstrap CI [0.275, 0.536]). The findings suggest that the effectiveness of Generative AI in recruitment extends beyond operational efficiency and depends substantially on perception of fairness and objectivity. The study concludes that organizations should adopt Generative AI as a strategic decision support technology, complemented by human judgement, transparency, ethical governance, reliable data and appropriate HR training. The study contributes to the emerging literature on Generative AI in HRM by highlighting the importance of fairness and human trust in translating technological adoption into effective HR decision making.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Talent Acquisition, AI adoption, Objectivity and Fairness, HR decision Making, Decision Confidence, strategic effectiveness.

1. Introduction

The rapid evolution of digital technologies has significantly transformed organizational functions, particularly Human Resource Management (HRM). Among these advancements, Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a powerful and transformative tool that is reshaping talent acquisition and decision-making processes. Generative AI refers to advanced systems capable of analysing vast amounts of structured and unstructured data, generating insights, and supporting predictive decision-making (Tambe, Cappelli & Yokubovich, 2019). In the context of recruitment, these technologies are increasingly used to automate processes such as resume screening, candidate shortlisting, and communication, thereby enhancing both efficiency and effectiveness (Budhwar, Malik, De Silva & Nyfoudi (2023), emphasizing the strategic importance of AI in modern HR practices.

Traditionally, recruitment and selection processes were manual, time-intensive, and often influenced by subjective judgment and cognitive limitations. Herbert Simons's theory of bounded rationality explains this limitation: individuals possess finite information-processing capacity and therefore tend towards satisfying rather than

optimal decisions when the volume of complexity of information exceeds their cognitive capacity (Simon, 1955). Generative AI addresses these limitations by processing large datasets efficiently and providing data driven insights. In support to this Mehta and Singh (2023) added that AI helps HR manages to make better decisions through data driven analysis which improves the calibre and consistency of hiring results. The usefulness depends on how the technology is perceived and used by HR professionals, reliability and fairness of the output it generates, and on the degree of trust practitioners place in algorithmically generated recommendations (Cappelli, Tambe, & Yokubovich, 2019). Prior industry evidence has shown that poorly monitored algorithmic systems can reproduce or amplify historical biases present in training data, with documented cases of AI recruiting tools being discontinued after exhibiting discriminatory scoring patterns (Dastin, 2018, Raghavan, Barocas, Kleinberg & Levy, 2020). This variation between the operational use of generative AI and the practical, ethical and trust related challenges of its use motivates the present study.

This study therefore examines the extent of generative AI adoption in talent acquisition and its effect on four interrelated dimensions of HR decision making efficiency, accuracy, objectivity and decision making confidence among the HR professionals across industries. The study intends to provide a theoretically sound and practically significant contribution to the growing body of literature on AI augmented HRM by basing the empirical investigation on well-established organizational and technology adoption theory.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical framework:

2.1 Generative AI in Recruitment and Talent Acquisition: A growing body of literature documents the operational benefits of AI in recruitment. AI-driven systems are reported to streamline HR operations and reduce the administrative burden associated with high volume application screening (Nica, Stan, & Luta, 2024), while automating resume screening substantially accelerates time-to-hire (Mohture, Patil & Deshmukh, 2025). Parhad (2025) similarly finds that generative AI improves decision quality by enabling structured, data-driven evaluation of candidates rather than reliance on unstructured judgement. At the level of candidate job matching, AI powered systems have been found to improve the precision with which candidate profiles are matched to job requirements, which improves the quality of hires (Jain, Aggarwal & Sharma, 2024), while AI-enabled predictive analytics support broader workforce planning and talent forecasting (Gupta & Sharma, 2024).

2.2 Technology Acceptance Model (TAM): The adoption of generative AI in HR is also strongly supported by the **Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)**, which posits that perceived usefulness and ease of use influence technology adoption. TAM originally developed by Davis (1989), proposes that an individual's intention to use a new technology is determined primarily by two beliefs: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. TAM provides an appropriate lens for this study because HR professional's willingness to rely on generative AI in recruitment depends heavily on whether they perceive it as genuinely useful for reducing workload and improving the hiring outcomes. In recruitment, AI tools are increasingly perceived as useful due to their ability to reduce manual workload and improve efficiency Nica et al. (2024), which should translate into stronger adoption and more confident use over time.

2.3 Bounded Rationality and Data Driven Decision Making: Simon's (1955) theory of bounded rationality holds that decision makers operate under constraints of limited information, time, and cognitive capacity and thus settle for satisfactory rather than optimal choices. By analysing massive, multidimensional applicant datasets far more quickly and reliably than a human could, generative AI immediately tackles this limitation. This ability is consistent with the more general concept of Data Driven Decision Making, which stresses the methodical application of data and analytics rather than just intuition to guide managerial decision (Tuitt, Brown & Carter, 2025). This method may offer a more thorough and accurate assessment than conventional resume based screening since AI based systems can evaluate candidates in real time and take their behaviour into account (Tuitt et al., 2025)

2.4 Resources based Perceptive and Human Capital Theory: According to the resource based approach, resources that are uncommon, valuable, unique, and non-replaceable give business a persistent competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). This reasoning is extended to individuals by human capital theory, which view workers as important resources whose abilities directly improves company success. According to both of these views, an organization's talent acquisition process's capacity to accurately identify and choose highly qualified applicants

is a strategic competency. By enabling more methodical workforce planning (Gupta & Sharma, 2024) and increasing the accuracy of candidate job matching (Jain et al., 2024), generative AI supports this capability and positions AI enabled recruitment as potential source of competitive advantage in labour markets marked by skill scarcity.

2.5 Objectivity, Algorithmic biases and Ethical Governance: By Standardizing evaluation criteria among candidates, AI has the ability to lessen the subjectivity and unconscious bias that define traditional recruiting (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2023). However, when model outputs are not independently checked, Algorithmic bias theory suggest that AI systems may inherit and potentially magnify biases present in historical data on which they are trained (Parkodi & Cedro, 2025). Evidence from the actual world supports this concern: in one instance, a prominent technology business discontinued using AI recruitment tool after discovering that it devalued resumes from women. The AI learned and replicates these tendencies since it was trained on recruiting data from the past that was predominantly male (Dastin, 2018).

2.6 Research Gap: Literature review showed that Generative AI improves recruitment efficiency (Mohture et al., 2025), accuracy (Parhad, 2025; Jain et al., 2024) and objectivity (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2023). The majority of research looks at the results separately and pay relatively little empirical attention to decision confidence, the degree to which HR professionals genuinely believe and follow AI generated suggestions. Some research, especially those that use primary survey data from HR experts in various industries, concurrently model adoption, efficiency, correctness, and objectivity as joint determinants of both decision effectiveness and decision confidence within a single empirical framework. In order to close that gap, this study tests a multi construct model that connects the efficacy and confidence dimensions of HR decision making to the adoption of generative AI and its perceived operational use.

3. Objectives of the Study:

- i. To examine the impact of Generative AI on the efficiency of recruitment and HR decision making process.
- ii. To assess the influence of Generative AI on objectivity and fairness in candidate evaluation.
- iii. To examine the relationship between Generative AI adoption and HR professionals' confidence in AI assisted Decisions.

4. Research Methodology:

This study adopts a quantitative, cross sectional research design to examine the impact of Generative AI on Talent acquisition and Strategic HR decision making.

4.2 Sample and Sampling Technique: Primary data were collected from 120 HR professionals including HR Managers, HR Analysts, Recruiters and HR Executives drawn from multiple industries, including IT, BFSI, Manufacturing and Healthcare. Respondents were selected through convenience sampling, technique appropriate for exploratory survey research where a comprehensive sampling frame of AI using HR professionals is not ready available.

4.3 Instruments and Measures: Data were collected using a structured questionnaire comprising of two sections (a) respondent demographic information (age, gender, experience, industry and role) and (b) multi item five point Likert scale statements (1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree) measuring perceived AI adoption, efficiency, accuracy, objectivity, decision making and overall decision effectiveness. Cronbach' α measured was 0.89, which shows good reliability score.

4.3 Data Analysis Technique: Data was analysed using Jamovi software. Descriptive statistics, Correlation, regression and mediation analysis was conducted.

5. Data Analysis and Interpretation:

5.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents: The demographic analysis indicates a well-balanced representation across age groups, gender, educational qualifications, experience levels, and industries. A significant proportion of respondents belong to the age group of 26- 30 age group. Reflecting a young and technologically adaptive workforce. The dataset includes professionals from diverse HR roles majorly from HR executive and recruiters,

followed by HR managers and Analysts. The descriptive statistics are based on 120 valid responses for each construct with 2 missing responses in each variable. The mean values range from 3.68 to 3.93 indicating that respondents generally reported moderately positive to positive perception across all 5 dimensions.

Descriptive					
	Generative AI Adoption in Recruitment & Selection	Accuracy, Reliability & Usefulness of AI Outputs	Impact of Generative AI on Efficiency of HR Decisions	Objectivity & Fairness	Strategic Effectiveness & Decision Confidence
N	120	120	120	120	120
Missing	2	2	2	2	2
Mean	3.68	3.93	3.77	3.88	3.86
Median	3.60	4.00	3.67	3.83	3.67
Standard deviation	0.561	0.488	0.558	0.514	0.497
Minimum	2.20	2.67	2.33	2.67	2.67
Maximum	4.80	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

5.2 Correlation Analysis: A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships among Generative AI adoption, AI output quality, decision making efficiency, objectivity and fairness and strategic decision effectiveness. The results revealed that all variables were positively and significantly correlated ($p < 0.001$). Generative AI adoption was moderately associated with AI output quality, decision making ($r = 0.486$), objectivity and fairness ($r = 0.522$), and strategic decision effectiveness ($r = 0.475$), while demonstrated a strong positive association with AI driven decision efficiency ($r = 0.844$). AI output quality was positively related to decision efficiency ($r = .443$), and strongly associated with objectivity and fairness ($r = .891$) and strategic decision effectiveness ($r = .839$). Further, AI efficiency showed moderate positive correlations with objectivity and fairness ($r = .488$) and strategic decision effectiveness ($r = .454$). The strongest association was observed between objectivity and fairness and strategic decision effectiveness ($r = .894$, $p < .001$). Overall the findings indicate that greater adoption and more favourable perceptions of AI outputs are associated with higher perceived efficiency, objectivity, and strategic effectiveness in AI supported recruitment and selection.

Correlation Matrix						
		AI_Adoption	AI_Output	AI_Efficiency	Objectivity	Strategic Decision Effectiveness
AI_Adoption	Pearson's r	—				

Correlation Matrix						
		AI_Adoption	AI_Output	AI_Efficiency	Objectivity	Strategic Decision Effectiveness
	Df	—				
	p-value	—				
AI_Output	Pearson's r	0.486	—			
	Df	118	—			
	p-value	<.001	—			
AI_Efficiency	Pearson's r	0.844	0.443	—		
	Df	118	118	—		
	p-value	<.001	<.001	—		
Objectivity	Pearson's r	0.522	0.891	0.488	—	
	Df	118	118	118	—	
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	—	
Strategic Decision Effectiveness	Pearson's r	0.475	0.839	0.454	0.894	—
	Df	118	118	118	118	—
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—

5.3 Regression Analysis:

A simple linear regression was conducted to examine whether Generative AI adoption predicted the accuracy, reliability, and usefulness of AI outputs. The regression model was statistically significant, with Generative AI adoption positively predicting AI output quality, $\beta = .424$, $t(118) = 6.05$, $p < .001$. The model explained 23.7% of the variance in AI output quality ($R = .486$, $R^2 = .237$). Thus, higher Generative AI adoption was associated with higher perceived accuracy, reliability, and usefulness of AI outputs, supporting **H1**.

H1: Generative AI adoption in recruitment and selection significantly positively influences the accuracy, reliability and usefulness of AI outputs.

Model Fit Measures		
Model	R	R ²
1	0.486	0.237

Model Coefficients - AI_Output				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	P
Intercept	2.374	0.2607	9.11	<.001
AI_Adoption	0.424	0.0700	6.05	<.001

H2: Generative AI adoption in recruitment and selection significantly positively influences the efficiency of HR decision-making.

The regression analysis showed that Generative AI adoption significantly and positively predicted HR decision-making efficiency, $R = .844$, $R^2 = .712$, $B = .840$, $t(118) = 17.08$, $p < .001$. Thus, AI adoption explained **71.2% of the variance** in decision-making efficiency, providing strong support for **H2**.

Model Fit Measures				
Model	R	R²		
1	0.844	0.712		
Model Coefficients - AI_Efficiency				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	P
Intercept	0.678	0.1831	3.70	<.001
AI_Adoption	0.840	0.0492	17.08	<.001

H3: Generative AI adoption significantly positively influences perceived objectivity and fairness in recruitment decisions.

Generative AI adoption significantly and positively predicted perceived objectivity and fairness in recruitment decisions, $R = .522$, $R^2 = .273$, $B = .479$, $t(118) = 6.65$, $p < .001$. The model explained **27.3% of the variance** in objectivity and fairness. Hence, **H3 was supported**.

Model Fit Measures		
Model	R	R ²
1	0.522	0.273

Model Coefficients – Objectivity				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	P
Intercept	2.120	0.2681	7.91	<.001
AI_Adoption	0.479	0.0720	6.65	<.001

H4: Generative AI adoption significantly positively influences strategic effectiveness and decision confidence.

The regression Analysis results showed a significant positive relationship, $R = .475$, $R^2 = .226$, $B = .422$, $SE = .072$, $t(118) = 5.87$, $p < .001$. Generative AI adoption explained **22.6% of the variance** in strategic effectiveness and decision confidence. The positive coefficient indicates that higher Generative AI adoption is associated with greater strategic effectiveness and decision confidence. Therefore, **H4 was supported**.

Model Fit Measures		
Model	R	R²
1	0.475	0.226

Model Coefficients - Strategic Effectiveness & Decision Confidence				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	P
Intercept	2.312	0.2675	8.64	<.001
Generative AI Adoption in Recruitment & Selection	0.422	0.0719	5.87	<.001

H5: Accuracy, reliability, and usefulness of Generative AI outputs significantly positively influence strategic HR decision effectiveness.

AI output quality significantly and positively predicted strategic decision effectiveness, $R = .839$, $R^2 = .704$, $B = .855$, $t(118) = 16.75$, $p < .001$. The model explained **70.4% of the variance** in strategic decision effectiveness, supporting **H5**.

Model Fit Measures				
Model	R	R²		
1	0.839	0.704		
Model Coefficients - Strategic Decision Effectiveness				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.501	0.2023	2.48	.015
AI_Output	0.855	0.0510	16.75	<.001

H6: The efficiency of Generative AI significantly positively influences strategic HR decision effectiveness.

AI efficiency significantly and positively predicted strategic decision effectiveness, $R = .454$, $R^2 = .206$, $B = .405$, $t(118) = 5.54$, $p < .001$. The findings indicate that AI efficiency explained **20.6% of the variance** in strategic decision effectiveness, supporting **H6**.

Model Fit Measures				
Model		R		R ²
1		0.454		0.206
Model Coefficients - Strategic Decision Effectiveness				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.337	0.2785	8.39	<.001
AI_Efficiency	0.405	0.0731	5.54	<.001

H7: Perceived objectivity and fairness of Generative AI significantly positively influence strategicHR decision effectiveness.

Objectivity and fairness significantly and positively predicted strategic decision effectiveness, $R = .894$, $R^2 = .799$, $B = .864$, $t(118) = 21.63$, $p < .001$. The model explained **79.9% of the variance** in strategic decision effectiveness, providing strong support for **H7**.

Model Fit Measures				
Model	R	R²		
1	0.894	0.799		
Model Coefficients - Strategic Decision Effectiveness				
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.508	0.1565	3.24	.002
Objectivity	0.864	0.0400	21.63	<.001

5.4 Mediating effect: To analyse H8,H9,H10 Mediation Analysis was conducted

H8: Accuracy, reliability, and usefulness of AI-generated outputs significantly mediate the relationship between Generative AI adoption and strategic effectiveness and decision confidence.

H9: The efficiency of Generative AI-supported HR decisions significantly mediates the relationship between Generative AI adoption and strategic effectiveness and decision confidence.

H10: Perceived objectivity and fairness significantly mediate the relationship between Generative AI adoption and strategic effectiveness and decision confidence.

Mediation analysis tested whether Objectivity & Fairness mediated the relationship between Generative AI Adoption and Strategic Effectiveness & Decision Confidence (N = 120), following Hayes (2022). The indirect effect was 0.411 (Sobel $z = 6.251$, $p < .001$). The bootstrap 95% CI [0.275, 0.536] excluded zero, indicating the indirect effect was significant (the bootstrap CI is the recommended test for indirect effects; the Sobel test is reported for comparison). The mediation type was classified as Full mediation, supporting H10.

Mediation Path Coefficients

Path	Coefficient	SE	95% Boot CI	P
a ($X \rightarrow M$)	0.479	0.072	—	< .001***
b ($M \rightarrow Y$)	0.858	0.047	—	< .001***
c' (direct)	0.010	0.043	—	= .808
a×b (indirect)	0.411	—	—	
c (total)	0.422	0.072	—	< .001***

Note. Bootstrap CI based on 5000 resamples. Indirect effect significance inferred from CI not containing zero. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Mediation: Generative AI Adoption in Recruitment & Selection → Objectivity & Fairness → Strategic Effectiveness & Decision Confidence

Effect Decomposition

Effect	B	95% CI (boot)	P
Indirect (a×b)	0.411	[0.275, 0.536]	<.001
Direct (c')	0.010	—	.808
Total (c)	0.422	—	<.001

Note. Bootstrap CI is the primary significance criterion; Sobel p shown for the indirect effect. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

6. Discussions:

The findings of the study indicate that Generative AI adoption has significance role in recruitment and selection, particularly in improving efficiency, accuracy, consistency and decision related outcomes. The findings are consistent with the broader literature suggesting that AI can support HR professionals by processing large volumes of information and reducing repetitive administrative work (Nica et al., 2024). This study also found that AI efficiency had a particularly strong relationship with decision effectiveness, suggesting that faster screening, reduced manual effort, and improved workflow can contribute substantially to HR systems and reduce administrative burden (Nica et al., 2024). The findings related to Accuracy, Reliability and usefulness of AI output further suggest that the quality of ai generated information is important for effective HR decision making. Respondents generally perceived AI outputs positively, although some neutral response indicated that confidence in AI generated recommendations is still developing. This finding is consistent with that view that the effectiveness of AI in HR depends not merely on adoption but the quality, reliability and usefulness of the information generated by the system (Jain et.al., 2024).

From the standpoint of bounded rationality, artificial intelligence (AI) can help HR professionals process vast amount of data that might surpass the time and cognitive capacities of individual decision makers (Simon, 1955). Additionally, the study discovered a positive correlation between decision confidence potential to improve candidate assessment consistency by standardizing evaluation criteria and minimizing some types of subjective judgement. Prior studies on AI assisted talent acquisition have revealed similar results (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2023). However, because algorithmic systems may replicate biases seen in the training or historical data, AI should not be immediately regarded as impartial. Thus, human oversight, proper data governance, and ongoing monitoring are necessary for fairness (Kulkarni & Joshi, 2024; Porkadi & Cedro, 2025). An important finding of the present study is the significant mediating role of objectivity and fairness between Generative AI adoption and Strategic Effectiveness and Decision Confidence. The finding extends the existing discussion of AI n recruitment by suggesting that the value of AI is not limited to operational efficiency, perception of fairness may represent an important mechanism through which AI adoption contributes to decision effectiveness. At the same time, the moderate level of decision confidence observed in the study suggests that technological adoption does not automatically translate into complete trust in AI supported decisions. This is consistent with the existing literature which highlights concerns regarding transparency, ethics and trust in AI enabled decision making (Garcia & Kwok, 2025 ; Porkodi & Cedro, 2025). The finding thus supports Human AI collaboration approach.

7. Practical Implications:

The findings have several implications for HR professionals and Organizations implementing Generative Ai in HR processes.

Organizations should focus on AI quality and reliability, rather than measuring adoption only by the extent of which employees use AI tools. High Quality and reliable data are essential for generating useful AI outputs and supporting effective recruitment decisions (Jain et al., 2024). Organization should establish mechanisms for bias monitoring and fairness auditing. Although AI can standardize recruitment criteria and potentially reduce subjective judgements, biased training data or poorly designed algorithms may reproduce existing inequalities. Continuous monitoring and ethical governance are therefore necessary (Kulkarni & Joshi, 2024). Organizations should adopt a Human in the loop Approach. Generative AI should augment the HR expertise. Human Judgements remains important when dealing with contextual, ethical, and candidate specific considerations.

8. Conclusion:

The study concludes that Generative AI has significant potential to transform recruitment and selection by improving efficiency, accuracy, consistency, and decision support. The findings indicate that AI adoption is positively associated with important HR decision Making outcomes, while a particularly strong relationship between AI enables efficiency and decision effectiveness highlights the operational value of Generative AI in recruitment. The Mediation finding demonstrated that objectivity and fairness significantly mediate the relationship between Generative AI adoption and Strategic Effectiveness and decision confidence. This suggest that the effectiveness of AI enables recruitment depends not only on the technological adoption but also on whether HR professionals perceive AI assisted decision process as fair, and appropriately governed. This finding is consistent with previous research highlighting fairness, accountability and ethical considerations as important challenges in the use of AI for HR decision Making (Leicht Deobald et al., 2019, Tambe et al., 2019).

References:

- [1] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- [2] Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M. T., & Nyfoudi, M. (2023a). Applications of AI in HRM: A rapid review and future research agenda for a sustainable society. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100893.
- [3] Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M. T., & Nyfoudi, M. (2023b). The role of artificial intelligence in human resource management: Opportunities and challenges. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100900.
- [4] Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*.
- [5] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- [6] Garcia, P., & Kwok, L. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the future of HR: Building resilience and adapting to technological change. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 15(2), 45–60.
- [7] Gupta, R., & Sharma, V. (2024). Transforming talent acquisition through artificial intelligence: A strategic perspective. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(3), 78–92.
- [8] Jain, S., Aggarwal, R., & Sharma, K. (2024). Adoption of AI in recruitment and selection: Evidence from Indian organizations. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 59(2), 210–225.
- [9] Kulkarni, P., & Joshi, A. (2024). Ethical implications of artificial intelligence in HR practices: A study of Indian organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics and Technology*, 9(1), 34–48.
- [10] Mehta, A., & Singh, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence in HR decision-making: Enhancing efficiency and transparency. *Journal of Management Analytics*, 10(4), 567–582.
- [11] Mohture, S., Patil, R., & Deshmukh, S. (2025). Role of artificial intelligence in modern recruitment practices. *International Journal of HR Analytics*, 7(1), 15–28.

- [12] Nica, E., Stan, C., & Luță, V. (2024). Artificial intelligence in HRM: Transforming talent acquisition and employee experience. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 12(1), 25–40.
- [13] Parhad, S. (2025). Application of generative AI in recruitment and selection processes. *Journal of Emerging HR Technologies*, 6(2), 55–70.
- [14] Patil, M., & Deshmukh, A. (2025). AI-based recruitment tools and their impact on candidate experience. *International Journal of Human Capital Management*, 11(1), 90–105.
- [15] Porkodi, R., & Cedro, J. (2025). Ethical considerations in AI-driven HR decision-making: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(3), 765–780.
- [16] 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>
- [17] Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- [18] Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
- [19] 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>
- [20] Tuitt, J., Brown, M., & Carter, L. (2025). Generative AI and multi-agent systems in psychometric evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology and Technology*, 14(2), 120–135.
- [21] Upadhyay, D., & Khandelwal, K. (2023). Artificial intelligence in talent acquisition: An Indian perspective. *Global Business Review*, 24(5), 890–905.