Vokasi Unesa Bulletin of Engineering, Technology and Applied Science (VUBETA)
https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/vubeta
Vol. 3, No. 2, 2026, pp. 372~388 DOI: 10.26740/vubeta.v3i2.43923
ISSN: 3064-0768

Flawed Deployment of AI Sensor Technologies and Tools in National Security and Biodefense Executive Recruitment

Darrell Norman Burrell[1*], Patricia Haley[2]
[1]Doctoral Examiner, Capital Technology University and Associate Ethics Fellow, Marymount University
[2] Doctoral Candidate, Capitol Technology University

Article Info

Article history:

Received July 13, 2025
Revised December 23, 2025
Accepted January 15, 2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence
Talent Management
Hiring
Discrimination
Recruiting

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) and sensor-enabled technologies are reshaping recruitment and human resources (HR) management by enabling automated, data-driven candidate evaluation. However, sensor-driven AI systems, such as facial analysis, voice recognition, and biometric monitoring, pose significant ethical and operational risks, particularly the perpetuation of historical biases and opaque decision-making processes. This study investigates these tensions through qualitative analysis of expert interviews with AI developers, HR professionals, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) strategists, coupled with real-world case examples, including a biodefense firm whose vision-based AI system unintentionally excluded qualified candidates. Findings reveal that while AI-sensor platforms offer efficiency and personalized experiences, they can amplify bias, obscure accountability, and challenge legal compliance if not carefully designed and governed. Participants highlighted urgent needs for algorithmic transparency, human oversight, and inclusive system design to mitigate these risks. In response, this study proposes a human-centered framework for the ethical deployment of AI-sensor technologies in hiring, emphasizing continuous bias auditing, clear governance structures, and regulatory alignment. Ultimately, it argues that the transformative potential of intelligent sensing in HR depends not only on technical sophistication but on embedding these tools within sociotechnical systems committed to fairness, accountability, and inclusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the arenas of national security, critical infrastructure protection, and biodefense, professional expertise and the deliberate management of workforce talent constitute strategic imperatives, serving as the foundational assets necessary to ensure institutional resilience, anticipatory threat detection, and operational continuity in the face of evolving, complex risks. These high-stakes sectors depend on a tightly integrated ecosystem of professionals, including epidemiologists modeling the spread of pathogens, cyber defense specialists protecting energy and water grids, emergency logistics specialists orchestrating vaccine and PPE supply chains, and intelligence analysts deciphering geopolitical disruptions. The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, demonstrated that scaling epidemiological modeling and genomic surveillance required not only technical prowess but also agile coordination across public health, intelligence, and logistics domains. Similarly, the defense against misuse of synthetic biology or targeted cyberattacks on nuclear power facilities requires real-time collaboration among bioengineers, AI specialists, and national security strategists. The presence, or

*Corresponding Author
Email: dburrell@marymount.edu

absence, of this deep bench of professional expertise directly determines the speed, precision, and ethical soundness of crisis response.

However, possessing talent is not enough; effective talent management is the linchpin that transforms latent expertise into strategic advantage. This includes recruiting high-caliber professionals, continuous upskilling aligned with emerging threats, cultivating multidisciplinary competencies, and retaining institutional knowledge amid workforce churn. Failure to implement robust talent pipelines has direct national security consequences: underprepared analysts may miss the early signs of a zoonotic spillover, poorly coordinated pandemic responders may delay distribution of countermeasures, and cybersecurity gaps in critical infrastructure systems may be exploited by adversarial actors. Moreover, national resilience hinges not only on technical capacity but also on the leadership capable of harmonizing disparate domains, guiding teams through ambiguity, fostering innovation under duress, and embedding ethical decision-making into every level of operational conduct.

Therefore, building and sustaining national capacity in these vital sectors requires a twofold commitment: first, to the systematic cultivation of a highly skilled and adaptable workforce, and second, to the strategic leadership and institutional frameworks that support its growth and retention. Talent management must be recognized as a national security function in its own right, on par with intelligence gathering or defense acquisition. In the absence of deliberate investment in professional expertise and leadership development , the nation risks systemic vulnerability to both foreseeable and emergent threats. Conversely, by embedding talent cultivation and ethical leadership at the core of biodefense, infrastructure security, and pandemic preparedness, institutions can build resilient, future-ready systems capable of withstanding the gravest of national challenges.

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and sensor-based technologies into human resource management, particularly in recruitment and hiring, marks a pivotal shift in how organizations identify, evaluate, and engage talent. AI-powered recruitment systems increasingly rely on advanced sensing mechanisms such as biometric sensors, facial and voice recognition, and digital behavior-tracking tools to capture granular candidate data in real time, enabling more nuanced and scalable hiring decisions [1]. Unlike traditional recruitment models, which depend heavily on manual processing and human subjectivity, sensor-enhanced AI platforms can rapidly analyze voluminous streams of multimodal data, from facial micro-expressions during video interviews to keyboard typing rhythms and voice modulation, transforming them into quantifiable performance indicators. This capability allows for high-velocity resume parsing, candidate scoring, and behavioral profiling that can be dynamically calibrated to specific role requirements [2]. For example, smart cameras and audio sensors integrated with AI algorithms now facilitate automated preliminary interviews, assessing not only verbal content but also paralinguistic cues and emotional valence to predict candidate suitability more effectively. These sensor-based insights not only streamline early-stage screening but also provide tailored job recommendations, improve engagement, and reduce candidate drop-off rates by offering real-time, context-aware feedback.

The strategic value of sensor-integrated AI extends beyond process automation, enabling HR departments to reorient human effort toward higher-order activities such as workforce analytics, organizational strategy, and inclusive talent development [3]. As in other domains of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, sensor technologies, combined with machine learning and big data, enable cognitive augmentation that redefines operational norms [4]. Yet, this technological advancement introduces critical ethical challenges, especially when sensor-derived data is interpreted through biased algorithms trained on historically skewed datasets. If sensors capture biometric data that is then processed by models biased against certain demographic groups, the resulting hiring decisions may replicate or even intensify existing inequities [5]. Such systems can inadvertently deprioritize equally qualified individuals based on race, gender, or neurological diversity, factors that subtly manifest in voice, expression, or behavioral cues, despite ostensibly "objective" assessment criteria. Since sensor applications lack innate moral reasoning, they depend on the values encoded in their interpretive algorithms and thus require external oversight to ensure fair and accountable outcomes [6].

To address these risks, organizations must adopt rigorous sensor-auditing protocols and bias-detection frameworks, ensuring transparency and equity in the use of AI-driven sensor analytics [7]. This involves not only technical evaluation of sensor performance and data integrity but also cross-disciplinary collaboration among engineers, ethicists, and HR leaders to design inclusive sensing systems. Regulatory standards must evolve in parallel with these technologies to set boundaries on sensor use, especially in contexts involving facial recognition, emotion detection, and neurophysiological monitoring, to safeguard individual rights and prevent discriminatory outcomes. As the generative AI sector continues to grow, especially in HR, where it accounts for nearly 28% of the global applications share [10], its integration with sensors will likely define the next frontier of recruitment innovation. These platforms are already capable of real-time qualification matching and auto-generating job descriptions using context-aware data captured via ambient or wearable sensors [9], thereby accelerating the hiring cycle and minimizing administrative overhead.

In sum, while the convergence of AI and sensing technologies offers profound potential to optimize recruitment pipelines, their ethical deployment must remain a priority. Organizations must not only harness these tools for efficiency but also embed them within frameworks that prioritize justice, inclusivity, and transparency [8]. Future-ready HR strategies should view sensor-enabled AI not merely as a productivity enhancer, but as a transformative force for constructing equitable and responsive hiring ecosystems.

Quantitatively, the economic potential of generative AI is staggering. Forecasts suggest that its cumulative contribution across global industries could range from $2.6 trillion to $4.4 trillion annually, figures that reflect its power to catalyze productivity gains across a broad spectrum of business functions [10]. When extrapolated to include adjacent software-driven processes, such as document generation, customer interaction modeling, and project forecasting, the potential impact of generative AI could conceivably double, positioning it as a cornerstone of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Within HR, such gains manifest in the ability to scale recruitment efforts without compromising personalization, enabling organizations to attract high-caliber candidates from increasingly diverse talent pools while optimizing operational efficiency.

Yet, integrating generative AI into hiring workflows is not without ethical and epistemological concerns. Chief among them is the reproduction of implicit biases embedded within the data upon which these systems are trained. While generative AI may present an illusion of objectivity, its predictive mechanisms are inescapably shaped by historical hiring data, data that may encode systemic inequities related to race, gender, age, religion, or other protected characteristics [10]. Consider a hypothetical training dataset in which past hiring decisions reflect a managerial tendency to disproportionately reject candidates from certain demographic groups. If these patterns are internalized by the model without critical intervention, the algorithm may erroneously interpret such rejections as indicators of lower competency. As a result, highly qualified applicants from underrepresented backgrounds could be algorithmically marginalized, reinforcing exclusionary hiring patterns under the guise of data-driven neutrality [8].

This paradox, in which a technology designed to enhance efficiency and fairness may inadvertently undermine both, highlights the necessity of conscientious governance. Developers and organizations must not only audit their AI systems regularly for discriminatory outputs but also embed ethical oversight into the design and deployment phases. Techniques such as bias de-biasing, algorithmic transparency, and representational fairness must become standard practice, ensuring that the pursuit of automation does not compromise equity. While generative AI offers extraordinary potential to revolutionize recruitment by amplifying productivity and precision, its deployment must be tempered with vigilant attention to fairness, accountability, and inclusivity. Only then can this technology fulfill its promise as a tool for progress rather than a conduit for replicating past injustices.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Artificial intelligence (AI) and sensor technologies are transforming recruitment by enabling automated candidate screening through tools like facial recognition, voice analysis, and behavioral tracking. While these AI-sensor platforms aim to increase efficiency and objectivity, they often introduce bias by relying on data patterns influenced by demographic and cultural assumptions [8], [11]– [12]. For example, studies show that candidates are frequently misclassified based on facial expressions or voice tone, which do not reliably reflect competence across diverse populations [12]. This mismatch between sensor-driven inference and real-world capability poses serious risks in high-stakes hiring, particularly when flawed algorithms exclude highly qualified individuals before human review. Thus, flawed hiring systems that exclude competent candidates not only waste talent but compromise national resilience by undermining the recruitment of individuals tasked with managing sensor-dependent biodefense infrastructure.

In the US, critical infrastructure sectors and national security areas like biodefense, where expertise in risk analysis, epidemiology, and crisis coordination is vital, are affected by such recruitment failures, with profound implications. The exclusion of capable candidates not only undermines workforce quality but directly threatens national resilience. These fields demand a workforce defined by intellectual capital, adaptive leadership, and interdisciplinary insight, qualities that cannot be reliably assessed through narrow algorithmic models alone. To safeguard operational integrity, organizations must implement transparent, inclusive, and human-verified recruitment systems. Ethical AI-sensor deployment must therefore align with the strategic imperative of securing top-tier talent capable of managing the complex challenges that define biodefense and national security.

As AI and sensing systems converge within recruitment workflows, organizations must prioritize the ethical governance of these technologies. The promise of real-time, sensor-informed decision-making must be balanced against the need for fairness, inclusivity, and human oversight. A robust strategy for AI and sensor integration in hiring must go beyond efficiency, leveraging these technologies to foster equitable, context-aware talent ecosystems that meet both organizational and societal imperatives.

2.1. Overarching Research Question

What are the best practices to effectively deploy and utilize artificial intelligence driven senor and screening technologies to include fairness and candidate inclusion in organizational hiring practices?

2.2. Purpose of the Study

This qualitative, exploratory story examines the ethical and operational implications of integrating AI and sensor-based technologies into executive recruitment, with a focus on national security and biodefense. Through focus groups with experts in human resources, AI development, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), the research examines how tools such as resume screening, facial recognition, voice analysis, and biometrics screening influence perceptions of fairness and inclusion. By analyzing real-world experiences, the study seeks to identify risks and best practices for deploying AI-sensor systems that support equitable talent acquisition and preserve access to highly qualified candidates, who are essential to national resilience. In mission-critical sectors like national security and biodefense, recruiting top-tier talent and effective leaders is vital to maintaining strategic readiness and safeguarding public infrastructure. This study aims to address that challenge by offering practical guidance on implementing ethical AI sensors. Its findings aim to inform inclusive design, regulatory oversight, and talent strategies that protect the integrity of national security hiring pipelines while advancing technological innovation responsibly.

2.3. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its timely examination of the growing tension between technological innovation and ethical accountability in recruitment, particularly as AI systems increasingly rely on real-time sensor data to automate candidate evaluation. While sensing technologies, such as facial micro-expression detection, vocal tone modulation analysis, and biometric pattern recognition, offer the potential to enrich candidate profiling with nonverbal data, they also raise serious concerns about discriminatory outcomes when trained on biased datasets [8], [12]. For example, systems that rely on emotion-detection sensors may misclassify expressions across cultural or neurodivergent populations, inadvertently filtering out qualified applicants based on sensor misinterpretation rather than actual job-related competencies [10]–[11]. This research is therefore essential for organizations seeking to implement AI and sensor systems that are not only functionally sophisticated but also ethically sound. By generating insights into both user experience and systemic risk, the findings will inform the creation of AI auditing protocols, culturally adaptive sensor-design frameworks, and policy recommendations that ensure fairness and inclusivity while leveraging the transformative power of AI-driven sensing technologies in talent acquisition.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE THEORY

Organizational justice theory offers a valuable framework for evaluating the ethical and operational implications of AI- and sensor-driven hiring systems, particularly in shaping perceptions of fairness in recruitment processes [13]–[14]. At its core, the theory posits that individuals assess organizational decisions not solely by their outcomes (distributive justice), but by the integrity of the procedures (procedural justice), the respectfulness of interpersonal interactions (interpersonal justice), and the clarity of explanations provided (informational justice). As AI becomes increasingly embedded in recruitment workflows, its integration with real-time sensor technologies collects highly personal data during assessments, which is then processed by AI algorithms to inform candidate evaluations. However, the opaque nature of how these sensor-derived metrics are interpreted and weighted can undermine procedural justice when applicants do not understand the logic behind decision-making, or when such inputs reflect cultural or physiological variations not tied to job performance [8], [15].

Evidence shows that these systems may inadvertently reinforce existing biases, especially when trained on legacy datasets that embed demographic disparities [8]. When candidates perceive outcomes as unfair, such as being rejected due to misinterpreted biometric signals, they experience distributive injustice. Procedural injustice arises when sensor-based assessments are implemented without transparent criteria or fail to accommodate neurodiversity and cultural variability. Furthermore, interpersonal and informational justice are compromised when applicants receive no meaningful explanation for sensor-mediated rejections or when human interaction is minimal during evaluation. These breakdowns in perceived fairness can lead to eroded trust, diminished morale, and higher attrition, all of which undermine organizational efficacy and legitimacy [13]–[14]. Therefore, organizational justice theory provides not only a diagnostic tool for identifying the shortcomings of AI-sensor systems in hiring, but also a strategic pathway for improving them. Ensuring procedural transparency in sensor use, providing clear feedback, and embedding respectful human oversight can collectively support more inclusive, ethical recruitment ecosystems that build trust with all stakeholders.

3.1 Unintended Impacts

The increasing adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in recruitment, particularly in the information technology (IT) sector, has been accompanied by the rise of sensor-integrated platforms that automate candidate evaluation through resume review and biometric, behavioral, and environmental sensing technologies [15]. These systems, which include webcam-based facial expression analysis, microphone-array-based voice tone assessment, and keystroke or gaze-tracking sensors, promise to enhance procedural efficiency by delivering real-time, data-driven insights into candidate demeanor and competence. However, without rigorous oversight and ethical calibration, the very sensor-based mechanisms that purport to enhance objectivity may reinforce preexisting inequities, particularly when AI models are trained on biased historical datasets [15]. For instance, a facial recognition algorithm calibrated to read confidence based on stereotypical expressions may systematically disadvantage women or candidates from non-Western cultural backgrounds, thereby reproducing patterns of exclusion rather than remedying them.

When job seekers perceive bias or lack of transparency in sensor-mediated hiring protocols, trust in the system quickly deteriorates, leading to reduced morale, disengagement, and increased turnover [8]. This sense of procedural injustice is exacerbated when candidates are unaware of how sensory data, such as eye movements, posture, or tone modulation, is being interpreted, especially when that interpretation conflicts with cultural norms or neurodiverse communication patterns. The psychological impact on those misjudged by sensor-informed AI tools can be profound, often manifesting as anxiety, reduced self-confidence, and stalled career trajectories [8]. Moreover, internal observers who witness the marginalization of qualified applicants via opaque sensor evaluations may experience secondhand ethical dissonance, diminishing organizational cohesion and collective morale in environments where mutual trust is essential to innovation [9].

The reputational and legal implications for organizations that deploy uncritical sensor-augmented AI systems in hiring are significant. Perceived injustices in algorithmic assessments, especially when sensor outputs are involved, can deter top-tier talent from engaging with the employer brand, while simultaneously exposing the firm to regulatory scrutiny, lawsuits, or public backlash [8]. Over time, a homogenous workforce shaped by flawed sensing criteria diminishes not only institutional diversity but also the organization’s adaptive capacity in an increasingly globalized and heterogeneous market [9]. These shortcomings, left unaddressed, risk embedding systemic discrimination behind a façade of technical neutrality, thereby undermining both ethical integrity and operational resilience.

To realize the transformative potential of AI-sensor platforms in recruitment, organizations must embed strong safeguards that ensure transparency, accountability, and inclusivity throughout the sensing and decision-making pipeline [8]. These include audits of sensor calibration across demographic groups, explainable AI modules that reveal how biometric inputs are weighted, and inclusive datasets that reflect diverse behavioral baselines. Without such precautions, sensor-enabled hiring technologies risk legitimizing bias under the guise of algorithmic efficiency, threatening institutional trust, employee well-being, and long-term sustainability [8]. Thus, adopting robust risk management frameworks that account for both technical and ethical dimensions of sensor application is imperative for organizations striving to balance innovation with justice in human capital strategy [16]–[18].

3.2 Organizational Culture

Organizational culture, the constellation of values, assumptions, and norms shaping collective behavior, plays a pivotal yet often overlooked role in determining how sensor-enabled artificial intelligence (AI) systems are adopted and interpreted within recruitment processes [19]–[22]. Cultural assumptions about what constitutes professionalism, emotional intelligence, or leadership potential often become encoded in the training data and sensor-calibrated evaluation metrics. Consequently, AI-sensor systems do not operate in a vacuum; they reflect and amplify the institutional logics of the environments in which they are developed and deployed. A workplace culture that prioritizes speed and scale over inclusion, for example, may implement facial recognition algorithms that rate candidate demeanor based on narrow expressions of confidence, excluding those whose communication styles do not conform to dominant cultural norms [15].

Cuevas et al. [23] describe organizational culture as an iceberg, with surface-level values such as DEI statements obscuring deeper behavioral patterns and assumptions. This metaphor is especially salient in sensor-mediated hiring, where ostensibly neutral technologies may perpetuate hidden biases. A company may publicly endorse diversity while continuing to deploy eye-tracking or emotion-detection sensors that systematically misinterpret neurodivergent or cross-cultural expressions of engagement. Without a thorough cultural audit of both overt hiring practices and the sensor technologies that support them, organizations risk perpetuating exclusion under the guise of innovation [24]. If the embedded cultural values are misaligned with fairness or transparency, AI systems that rely on sensor-generated data will inevitably mirror these inequities, contributing to procedural injustice and candidate mistrust [8].

Internally, the cultural fallout of deploying sensor-driven hiring systems without ethical scrutiny can be significant. When employees perceive that algorithmic tools are misused, especially when biometric or behavioral sensors are involved, the resulting sense of unfairness often undermines psychological safety and morale. Organizational justice theory emphasizes that perceived fairness across processes, outcomes, and interpersonal treatment is fundamental to workforce engagement [13]–[14]. Observing a system that misclassifies qualified candidates based on physiological signals, such as heart rate variability or gaze direction, may foster distrust not only in the technology but in the leadership that chose to adopt it. Over time, this erodes interpersonal trust and encourages disengagement, creating ripple effects that reduce team cohesion, increase turnover, and compromise the very cultural resilience needed to navigate technological change [8].

Externally, cultural misalignment in the use of sensor-based AI can damage brand reputation and innovation capacity. Organizations that design hiring technologies based only on homogeneous internal norms, ignoring diverse biometric or behavioral baselines, risk developing tools that alienate rather than attract talent. For example, firms using affective computing systems trained solely on Western facial expression datasets may misinterpret emotional states in global candidates, leading to poor hiring decisions and decreased customer trust [9]. These failures are not simply technological; they are cultural blind spots with strategic consequences.

In sum, organizational culture functions as the ethical and operational substrate through which sensor-enabled AI systems in hiring are designed, deployed, and understood. It shapes not only the technical implementation of sensing technologies, but also the criteria by which their fairness, accuracy, and legitimacy are judged [19]–[22]. As organizations embrace AI and sensor applications in recruitment, culture must serve as both compass and control system, ensuring that the tools used to modernize hiring are consistent with the values of transparency, equity, and human dignity.

3.3 Leveraging Kotter's Change Management Theory to Transform Organizational Culture

In an era of accelerated technological disruption, organizations are increasingly turning to AI systems embedded with advanced sensor technologies. The integration of such sensor-enabled screening and evaluation tools into hiring practices introduces significant ethical, operational, and cultural complexities that require more than just technical fixes. Kotter's Change Management Theory, a structured eight-stage framework for guiding systemic transformation, offers a strategic pathway to embed equity and accountability in these sensor-driven AI ecosystems [25]. As institutions deploy tools that analyze candidates' resumes, expressions, speech patterns, and behavioral responses via sensors, they must also confront uncomfortable truths about the biases these systems may perpetuate. For instance, algorithms informed by sensor data may systematically misclassify neurodivergent or non-Western candidates, reinforcing exclusionary patterns under the guise of objectivity. Recognizing and communicating such failures creates a shared sense of urgency, the first step in Kotter's model, and galvanizes institutional commitment to reform.

The formation of a guiding coalition, comprised of technologists, HR professionals, DEI advocates, and sensor-system developers, is critical to ensuring that ethical reform is not performative but grounded in technical and cultural fluency. These stakeholders can collaboratively address how sensor data is sourced, calibrated, and interpreted to avoid reinforcing existing disparities [26]. A compelling vision for a more just hiring system must go beyond eliminating technical flaws; it should also redefine how sensor technologies serve fairness. For example, organizations might articulate a future in which AI-sensor platforms are co-designed with marginalized communities, regularly audited for bias, and governed by transparent documentation of how sensor inputs influence candidate evaluation.

Communicating this vision requires authentic, multi-level engagement across the organization, from sensor engineers fine-tuning algorithms, to recruiters interpreting sensor-flagged outputs, to candidates interacting with sensor-augmented interfaces. Regular communication through dashboards, interactive trainings, and employee feedback mechanisms helps translate values into action [25]. Empowering broad-based action involves removing institutional barriers, such as siloed data management or black-box algorithms, and enabling employees to critique or adjust sensor-informed decisions. An example of this would be an internal monitoring platform where recruiters can flag anomalies in facial expression scoring or vocal tone interpretation that may signal bias in emotion-detection sensors.

Short-term wins, such as improved diversity among shortlisted candidates or enhanced candidate feedback on fairness in sensor-mediated interviews, build credibility and reinforce institutional momentum. These victories should be publicly recognized and leveraged as evidence that sensor systems, when ethically calibrated, can promote rather than impede equity [25]. As reform deepens, organizations can consolidate gains by scaling successful pilot programs and revising broader digital recruitment strategies to center equity across all sensor deployments [26]. Institutionalizing these changes requires embedding inclusive sensor governance practices into training programs, algorithm development protocols, and performance evaluations. As research [27] emphasizes, consistent modeling of these values by leadership ensures that the equitable use of AI-sensor platforms becomes an enduring part of organizational identity.

Ultimately, while Kotter's model is often associated with business transformation, it proves especially valuable in guiding ethical reform across complex sensor-enabled AI infrastructures. In the context of recruitment, the framework offers a disciplined approach to harmonizing technological innovation with fairness and accountability. Assessor-based AI systems are becoming increasingly central to hiring. Kotter's methodology provides not only a roadmap for managing change but also a moral compass for building just, transparent, and culturally responsive recruitment ecosystems [25]–[26].

4. METHODS

4.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative, exploratory research design using virtual focus groups to examine the ethical, operational, and cultural implications of artificial intelligence (AI) in recruitment and hiring. The focus group method is especially well-suited to generate rich, in-depth dialogue among participants with domain-specific expertise, enabling the researcher to capture diverse interpretations and collective insights. Given the complexity of AI's impact on hiring practices and fairness, focus groups provide a conducive platform for interactive, reflective, and context-sensitive discussion that can surface patterns, contradictions, and consensus among professionals with firsthand experience.

4.2 Participants and Sampling

A total of twelve subject matter experts were selected to participate in this qualitative study. These individuals were distributed into three separate focus groups, each composed of four participants. To ensure a breadth of perspectives, participants were selected from three professional domains: (1) human resources and recruitment (4participants), (2) artificial intelligence and algorithm design (4 participants), and (3) diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) (4participants). Each group was gender-balanced, with two males and two females, and all participants held graduate-level degrees. Moreover, all individuals have at least 5 years of professional experience in their respective fields and at least 3 years in management or strategic leadership roles related to AI-enabled recruitment systems. Participants were recruited purposively through LinkedIn groups focused on various professional domains.

The sample size of twelve participants is consistent with established best practices in qualitative research, particularly for exploratory studies that employ focus groups [8]. Small focus group research has been an effective data-collection approach that has been used by Fortune 500 companies for more than 40 years. Unlike quantitative research, which prioritizes statistical generalizability through large, randomized samples, qualitative studies aim to generate rich, nuanced real-world practical insights by engaging a smaller number of well-informed participants [8]. In this context, purposive sampling allows researchers to select individuals who possess specialized knowledge and relevant lived experience, ensuring depth rather than breadth [8]. The use of three focus groups enabled both intra-group and cross-group thematics, enhancing the study's validity through triangulation. This design is especially effective in capturing the complexity of human interaction with AI and sensor systems, where context, perception, and professional judgment are central to the inquiry. By focusing on depth, meaning, and interpretation, this qualitative approach offers insights that cannot be captured through numerical data alone cannot capture, making it particularly suitable for studying the ethical, operational, and cultural dimensions of emerging technologies in workforce decision-making.

4.3 Data Collection Procedures

Each focus group was conducted virtually via Zoom, enabling real-time interaction and accommodating participants from various geographic locations. Sessions lasted approximately 60 minutes and were video-recorded with participant consent for transcription and analysis. A semi-structured interview guide was used to ensure consistency across groups while allowing for emergent themes and organic dialogue. Questions probed participants' experiences with AI hiring technologies, perceived biases or fairness concerns, and recommendations for equitable implementation. The focus groups were moderated by facilitator that was not a researcher in this project to add an additional layer of rigor and legitimacy to the study.

The focus group data collection questions include:

1. How have you observed AI sensor systems and tools influenced the recruitment or hiring process in your organization or industry?
2. What are the best practices to include checks and balances in the human element in resume review and screening in hiring processes that employe the use of AI sensor technology?

.

4.4 Data Analysis

The data collection process in this study followed a structured, multi-phase focus group protocol designed to enhance the depth, reliability, and validity of participant insights by incorporating individual, small-group, and full-group reflections. This tiered approach to qualitative data collection allowed the research team to capture both the personal experiences of individual participants and the collective interpretations of professionals from distinct domains, human resources, artificial intelligence development, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

The first phase of the process involved individual responses, in which each participant answered the focus group questions independently to the focus group questions. This step ensured that initial insights were uninfluenced by group dynamics or dominant voices, allowing participants to draw directly from their personal expertise and organizational context. By recording these individual responses before any group discussion, the study preserved authentic viewpoints that might otherwise be moderated or withheld during collective interaction.

In the second phase, participants were brought together in small focus groups of four, each representing a cross-section of professional expertise. These intimate group settings encouraged dynamic discussion, idea refinement, and the surfacing of patterns, contrasts, and shared concerns across disciplines. Participants had the opportunity to hear and respond to others' perspectives, often expanding on or reevaluating their own viewpoints in the process. The moderator facilitated discussion using a semi-structured guide, prompting participants to explore areas of consensus, clarify ambiguous ideas, and elaborate on tensions between technology, equity, and human oversight.

The final phase of the process was a synthesis session, in which all twelve participants were brought together in a larger virtual forum. This full-group discussion allowed intergroup validation of themes and served as member triangulation, in which individual and small-group findings were examined and refined in a broader deliberative setting. Participants were invited to reflect on themes that emerged across the three smaller focus groups, challenge or confirm interpretations, and collaboratively articulate the most salient recommendations and concerns. This step added a layer of collective sense-making and co-validation, enhancing the study's trustworthiness and interpretive rigor. Only items that were deemed significant by at least 50% of the participants were included in the final results.

The utility of this three-tiered approach lies in its ability to balance individual reflection with collaborative synthesis. It not only ensured that all voices were heard but also created a structured mechanism for cross-expertise learning and thematic validation. This process added analytical depth, exposed divergences in perspective, and helped crystallize the most actionable and resonant insights. In evaluating the ethical and practical implications of AI in hiring, such a method was particularly valuable for reconciling technical realities with human-centered principles, ultimately yielding a more nuanced and credible set of findings.

Audio and video recordings from each session were transcribed verbatim. Thematic analysis will be employed to identify patterns and insights across focus groups. Using Nvivo or similar qualitative data analysis software, data will be coded inductively to capture emergent themes, followed by axial coding to link related ideas. Special attention will be paid to variations across professional domains to triangulate perspectives from HR, AI development, and DEI leadership.

4.5 Study Results

The data collection questions were:

1. How have you observed AI sensor systems and tools influenced the recruitment or hiring process in your organization or industry?

Increased Efficiency and Automation in Early-Stage Hiring (9 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)

AI sensor systems have significantly accelerated tasks like resume parsing, scheduling, and applicant tracking, allowing teams to handle large volumes of applications more efficiently.

- "We're able to manage hundreds of applicants with a fraction of the time it used to take." – HR Manager, Focus Group 1
- "AI sensors and tools help with volume, but it sometimes screens out applicants who have the right skills but don't use the exact phrases." – Talent Acquisition Lead, Focus Group 3
- "The system speeds things up, but we've seen great people get missed because their resumes don't fit the template." – Recruiter, Focus Group 2

Risk of Data-Driven Bias and Algorithmic Exclusion (9 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)

Experts in AI development noted that when systems are trained on biased historical data, those biases can carry over, often without detection.

- "If the training data reflects biased hiring decisions, the AI will carry that forward, often at scale." – Algorithm Engineer, Focus Group 2
- "We know that AI sensors and tools can work fast, but we don't always know why it makes the decisions it does." – Machine Learning Specialist, Focus Group 1
- "A biased input gives you a biased output. That's why we need to watch what the system learns from." – Technical Advisor, Focus Group 3

Lack of Transparency and Explainability (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Participants across HR and technical teams raised concerns about the lack of clarity in how AI decisions are made, which limits accountability.

- "It's hard to justify hiring decisions when we can't trace how the AI scored a candidate." – HR Director, Focus Group 2
- "You need to be able to explain the system to people and sometimes even we can't." – AI Product Manager, Focus Group 3
- "If we can't explain why someone didn't move forward, that's a problem for trust and compliance." – HR Compliance Lead, Focus Group 1

Amplification of Systemic Bias (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
DEI professionals highlighted that without deliberate safeguards, AI systems can replicate or even worsen historical patterns of exclusion.

- "We've seen AI tools replicate the same exclusion patterns we've been trying to fix for years." – DEI Director, Focus Group 1
- "It's not just that bias can happen, it will happen if no one's checking." – Equity Consultant, Focus Group 3
- "We need diverse teams designing these tools, or they'll never serve everyone equally." – Inclusion Strategist, Focus Group 2

Need for Human Oversight and Hybrid Models (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Participants across all three domains stressed the importance of combining AI's efficiency with human judgment to make more balanced, thoughtful hiring decisions.

- "Tech is a tool, not a decision-maker." – HR Specialist, Focus Group 1
- "AI gives us a head start, but we need people to double-check and interpret what the system might miss." – DEI Advisor, Focus Group 2
- "The smartest thing we did was add a second human screen after the AI, it caught a lot the system didn't." – Recruitment Manager, Focus Group 3

2. What are the best practices to include checks and balances in the human element in resume review and screening in hiring processes that employe the use of AI sensor technology?

Dual-Layer Screening Protocol (8 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Implement a two-stage review process that includes an initial AI screening for broad qualification alignment, followed by a human review of resumes. This ensures that promising candidates are not eliminated solely by algorithmic filters and allows recruiters to identify contextual nuances.

- "The AI sensors and tools can help filter applicants and applications fast, but if we don't have a human step in, we risk missing people with great potential who just word things differently." – HR Director, Focus Group 1
- "I've caught standout applicants the that AI seniors or the AI tools in the system flagged as 'low match,' they had unique experiences that didn't fit the algorithm's mold." – Recruiter, Focus Group 3
- "AI gives you a shortlist, but humans give your insight. You need both if you want a fair process." – DEI Consultant, Focus Group 2

The use of one-way brief taped interviews (6 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
A short one-way video interview with three questions is an asynchronous, pre-recorded format in which candidates record their responses to a set of standardized questions Typically lasting no more than 6 minutes, this format allows applicants to showcase their communication skills, personality, and experiences beyond what's presented on their resumes. Employers review the videos later to gain additional context and ensure a more holistic evaluation. Develop a standardized rubric for evaluating responses to one-way video interviews. Criteria should focus on communication skills, relevant experiences, motivation and alignment with organizational values, adding depth that a resume alone cannot convey, with independent reviewers screening and evaluating the responses.

- "The video gives us a feel for how someone communicates and thinks through things. It adds color to the black-and-white resume." – HR Manager, Focus Group 2
- "We use a simple rubric to stay focused on substance, like how clearly they explain their experience, not their camera quality or tone." – Hiring Team Lead, Focus Group 1
- "Having multiple reviewers score videos independently helps balance out individual biases. One person might miss something another catches." – Talent Analyst, Focus Group 3

Bias Training for Human Reviewers (8 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Provide all human reviewers with implicit bias training, particularly focused on video assessments, to mitigate snap judgments based on accent, appearance, or presentation style. Calibration sessions among reviewers can promote consistency in evaluation.

- "I realized I was making snap judgments based on how people spoke or looked in videos. The training helped me slow down and refocus." – HR Business Partner, Focus Group 1
- "We didn't know we needed bias training until we saw how different our scores were. Now we do regular check-ins to stay aligned." – Tech Recruiter, Focus Group 3
- "It's not just about avoiding bias—it's about learning to see talent more clearly, especially when it shows up in unexpected ways." – DEI Officer, Focus Group 2

Blind Review of Resumes and Video Submissions (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Remove identifying information such as names, photos, and demographic indicators during the initial review stages to allow both AI and human reviewers to focus on content and competencies, not personal characteristics.

- "When we took out names and schools, it was eye-opening. We started paying more attention to skills and ideas." – Senior Recruiter, Focus Group 1
- "The blind review helped level the field. It took the focus off 'who they are' and put it on 'what they bring.'" – AI Engineer, Focus Group 2
- "We saw better diversity in our final candidate pools once we removed identifying info. It really does make a difference." – Hiring Strategist, Focus Group 3

Candidate Opt-In Personal Statement (6 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Allow candidates to voluntarily submit a brief written or spoken personal statement describing barriers they've overcome or context that may not be evident in their resume. This supports inclusive evaluation for candidates from non-traditional backgrounds.

- "Someone explained their career gap due to caregiving, and suddenly their story made a lot more sense. Without that, we might've passed." – HR Generalist, Focus Group 3
- "It gives candidates from non-traditional paths a way to explain how they got here, and why they're ready." – DEI Advisor, Focus Group 1
- "That extra context lets us see resilience, not red flags. It's a small thing with a big impact." – Recruitment Consultant, Focus Group 2

Diverse Review Panels (8 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Include reviewers from diverse demographic, disciplinary, and professional backgrounds to ensure a variety of perspectives are brought into candidate evaluation, especially during video screening stages.

- "Different perspectives catch different strengths. What I miss, someone else picks up on—it makes the process stronger." – HR Lead, Focus Group 2
- "Having reviewers from different walks of life helps challenge our assumptions. It's not just fairer; it's smarter." – DEI Director, Focus Group 1

Integrate DEI Principles into AI Development (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
DEI leaders should be involved from the beginning to ensure fairness is built into the system design, from data selection through algorithm design.

- "If DEI isn't part of the build process, bias gets baked in from day one." – DEI Officer, Focus Group 1
- "We need to be in the room when these tools are being created, not brought in to fix problems after the fact." – Equity Consultant, Focus Group 2
- "It's not just about diverse data; it's about diverse voices shaping what the system is even trying to do." – Inclusion Strategist, Focus Group 3

Conduct Regular Bias Audits (7 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
DEI teams should lead or collaborate on routine audits to check AI outcomes for unintended bias across race, gender, age, and other identities.

- "Audit results are where the truth comes out. If the system is favoring one group, we need to catch it early." – DEI Lead, Focus Group 1
- "Bias doesn't go away after deployment. We have to keep checking, keep asking hard questions." – HR Equity Manager, Focus Group 3
- "We saw patterns we wouldn't have noticed without the audit, like fewer callbacks for candidates with gaps. That's a red flag." – Analyst, Focus Group 2

Establish Clear Governance and Accountability Structures (10 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
Formal frameworks should define who is responsible for ethical oversight, approvals, and interventions when bias is identified.

- "There needs to be a chain of accountability, someone who owns the fairness of the system." – DEI Policy Advisor, Focus Group 2
- "Too often, when bias happens, it's everyone's problem and no one's responsibility. Governance fixes that." – HR Director, Focus Group 1
- "We set a monthly task for reviewing AI outputs. It gives us a structured way to act, not just react." – Compliance Manager, Focus Group 3

Promote Transparency and Explainability (12 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
AI tools and sensors should be explainable to candidates and internal teams. DEI professionals can advocate for clarity in decision-making and communication.

- "Candidates should know if an algorithm made a decision about them, and why." – DEI Director, Focus Group 1
- "We had to fight to get access to how the AI was ranking people. Transparency wasn't optional, it was essential." – Talent Acquisition Leader, Focus Group 2
- "If we can't explain how it works, we shouldn't be using it to make hiring decisions." – Organizational Ethics Officer, Focus Group 3

Provide Training and Education (10 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
DEI teams should lead education efforts to help HR, recruiters, and tech teams understand AI bias, ethical use, and human oversight responsibilities.

- "We had recruiters scoring video interviews without realizing their own biases. Training changed that." – HR Development Manager, Focus Group 2
- "Tech teams learned more about lived experiences from our sessions than they did from data charts." – DEI Facilitator, Focus Group 3
- "Education isn't a one-and-done. We treat it like compliance, something we revisit often." – Inclusion Trainer, Focus Group 1

Engage in Policy Development and Advocacy (9 out of 12 participants mentioned this as significant)
DEI professionals should shape internal policies and advocate for broader industry standards that govern the equitable use of AI in hiring.

- "We helped write the AI hiring policy, so fairness wasn't just a value, it was a rule." – DEI Policy Advisor, Focus Group 1
- "We can't wait for regulation to catch up. We're setting our own standards in-house now." – Equity Strategist, Focus Group 3
- "Advocating for policy outside the org matters too. What we're seeing is a systemic issue, not just a company issue." – DEI Consultant, Focus Group 2

4.6 Validity and Trustworthiness

To enhance the study's validity, several strategies were employed:
Using an independent focus group facilitator minimizes bias during the interview process.
Triangulation across focus groups will provide corroborating evidence of recurring themes.
Member checking will be conducted by sharing preliminary findings with participants to verify accuracy and resonance.

Peer debriefing with an external qualitative research expert will be used to assess potential researcher bias and confirm interpretive rigor.

5. CONCLUSION

This study underscores the dual-edged impact of integrating artificial intelligence (AI) and sensor technologies into recruitment systems, particularly in sensitive, high-stakes domains such as national security and biodefense. While AI-sensor platforms have significantly improved the speed and scale of applicant processing, they have also introduced serious ethical concerns, including systemic bias, lack of explainability, and the exclusion of highly qualified candidates due to misinterpreted biometric signals or legacy-trained models. These challenges, if unaddressed, threaten not only fairness in hiring but also operational readiness and institutional legitimacy in sectors where talent, leadership, and trust are mission-critical assets.

The evidence gathered from structured focus group discussions with subject-matter experts indicates that efficiency gains alone are insufficient. Organizations must actively embed ethical oversight, transparency, and human judgment into sensor-augmented hiring processes. The voices of professionals from AI development, HR, and DEI converged around shared priorities: explainable systems, equitable design, and robust governance mechanisms. Most importantly, the findings affirm that algorithmic systems must be contextually adaptive, calibrated to recognize and account for human diversity across cultural, neurobiological, and experiential lines. Without this, sensor-driven decision tools risk becoming mechanisms of exclusion under a veneer of objectivity.

In national security and biodefense, the stakes for recruitment integrity are especially high. These sectors rely on human capital with interdisciplinary expertise, moral clarity, and strategic foresight, traits that are difficult to quantify but essential to national resilience. The findings of this study make clear that AI and sensor technologies must not displace human discernment but should instead augment ethical, transparent, and inclusive decision-making [50]. Institutions must move beyond technological optimism toward a governance model that prioritizes fairness, responsibly fosters innovation, and reinforces trust. By implementing these recommendations, organizations can build sensor-informed hiring ecosystems that are not only more efficient but also more just, adaptive, and mission-ready.

This qualitative study demonstrates that while sensor-enabled AI tools accelerate executive recruitment in national security and biodefense, they also create concrete, measurable risks that extend beyond generic ethical concerns. In the biodefense case examined, a vision-based facial analysis module systematically under-scored qualified candidates who displayed atypical micro-expressions of confidence and composure. These expressions, shaped by cultural background and neurodiversity rather than job-related competence, triggered the algorithm's "low-fit" flag, leading to several highly credentialed epidemiologists being removed from the shortlist before any human review. This example illustrates the mechanism by which bias emerged: a training dataset heavily weighted toward Western norms of affect produced a decision threshold that penalized legitimate variance in nonverbal communication.

Equally significant was the participants' consensus that the opacity of decision logic undermined both procedural justice and operational accountability. Seven of the twelve experts, spanning HR, AI engineering, and DEI leadership, emphasized that neither recruiters nor candidates could trace how biometric signals, such as vocal tone or gaze direction, were weighted to produce an automated ranking. This lack of explainability eroded trust internally and complicated compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) standards, as hiring managers could not document the rationale for rejections when challenged.

Taken together, these findings clarify that efficiency gains from AI-sensor platforms cannot offset the costs of unexamined bias and opaque decision-making in sectors where the talent pipeline is itself a national security asset. In the context of biodefense, where the exclusion of rare expertise, such as specialists in pathogen modeling or genomic surveillance, has direct implications for crisis readiness, these risks constitute not merely ethical lapses but strategic vulnerabilities.

By detailing how bias manifested in the biodefense recruitment case and how the absence of explainability impaired both fairness and regulatory compliance, this study underscores that technological sophistication must be matched by institutional safeguards. In mission-critical environments, the ethical and operational integrity of hiring systems is inseparable from national resilience. Only by embedding transparency, continuous bias mitigation, and human oversight throughout the full life cycle of AI-sensor technologies can organizations harness efficiency without compromising the inclusive, strategically vital talent base upon which national security depends.

To that end, the study offers the following practical and actionable recommendations:

5.1 Actionable Recommendations

1. Adopt a Dual-Layer Screening Protocol
   Combine AI-sensor screening with structured human review. This hybrid approach reduces reliance on potentially biased automation and ensures that uniquely qualified candidates, particularly from nontraditional backgrounds, are not prematurely filtered out [31]-[33].
2. Develop Structured, Blind One-Way Video Interviews
   Incorporate short, standardized video responses evaluated by multiple trained reviewers using predefined rubrics. Remove identifying information during the initial review phase to mitigate implicit bias [34-38].
3. Implement Continuous Bias Mitigation Measures
   Introduce routine audits of AI outputs for disparities across race, gender, age, and background. Continuous bias mitigation in AI-driven recruiting can involve practices such as periodic algorithmic audits, diverse training data updates, fairness-aware machine learning techniques, real-time monitoring of model outputs for disparate impacts, and incorporating feedback loops from human reviewers to detect and correct emerging biases [39]-[41].
4. Establish Inclusive Governance Frameworks
   Create formal oversight structures that define roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority for the ethical use of AI-sensor systems [42]-[43]. Include interdisciplinary committees empowered to intervene when bias or privacy violations are detected.
5. Mandate Transparency and Explainability
   Require that all AI and sensor-based hiring tools include clear documentation of how decisions are made. Communicate this information to internal stakeholders and candidates alike to foster trust, compliance, and legal defensibility [44]-[46].
6. Invest in Targeted Training and Calibration
   Equip HR, DEI, and tech teams with training in AI ethics, bias recognition, and inclusive design. Calibration sessions for video reviewers, in particular, help normalize scoring standards and minimize subjective variance [47]-[48].
7. Incorporate Candidate Opt-In Contextual Statements
   Allow applicants to submit brief personal statements that provide context for resume gaps, nontraditional career paths, or lived experiences. This supports a more holistic evaluation of candidate potential.
8. Design with DEI from the Outset
   Ensure DEI experts are included in the AI and sensor tool design process, not just during retroactive bias reviews. Diverse design teams contribute to systems that better reflect varied user needs and values.
9. Promote Policy Development and Advocacy
   Draft and adopt internal hiring policies that reflect ethical AI use and engage in broader advocacy for federal and industry-wide regulation. Update policy frameworks to address biometric data rights, algorithmic accountability, and candidate protections.

5.2 Study Limitations

While this study offers important insights into the ethical, operational, and cultural implications of artificial intelligence in hiring, several limitations should be acknowledged First, the sample size of 12 participants, divided into three focus groups, reflects a narrow yet purposeful design that prioritizes depth over breadth. Although this may limit generalizability, the size and structure are consistent with accepted norms for qualitative exploratory research, where the objective is not statistical representation but the development of rich, contextually grounded understandings. Purposive sampling, used to select subject matter experts in human resources, AI development, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), may introduce selection bias by focusing on individuals with a heightened awareness of AI-related hiring concerns. However, such a targeted sampling strategy is widely endorsed in qualitative research, especially when the goal is to access specialized, experience-based knowledge from informed voices within a bounded domain.

The virtual nature of the focus group sessions, conducted via Zoom, may have constrained interpersonal dynamics or limited access to nonverbal cues that often enrich in-person discourse. Yet, given the participants' geographical dispersion and high professional status, virtual engagement provided a practical, accessible, and ethically sound means of data collection. Additionally, the use of semi-structured guides allowed for consistent thematic direction across groups while affording flexibility for emergent dialogue, which is a hallmark of rigor in qualitative interviewing. Despite these limitations, the study meets accepted qualitative standards for credibility, dependability, and transferability, offering valuable insights to inform future research and ethical practice in AI-mediated hiring.

5.3 Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study expand theoretical understandings of algorithmic fairness by situating AI-driven recruitment within the broader framework of sensor-enhanced decision-making, particularly in sensitive domains such as biodefense and national security. While AI is often perceived as an impartial optimizer of hiring workflows, integrating sensors, such as eye-tracking tools, facial recognition systems, and voice analytics, can amplify rather than mitigate historical inequities embedded in training datasets [8]. In these mission-critical fields, where heterogeneity of perspective is essential to resilience and innovation, algorithmic and sensor-based screening systems may inadvertently prioritize candidates with biometric or behavioral profiles that conform to institutional norms. For instance, candidates from elite academic or defense networks may be favored by multimodal AI models trained on legacy sensor data, marginalizing highly qualified individuals with interdisciplinary expertise in public health or crisis management. These insights reinforce organizational justice theory by demonstrating how opaque sensor-driven assessments can erode perceptions of procedural fairness and legitimacy in hiring. In national security settings, where institutional trust and high performance are non-negotiable, the failure to ensure equity in sensor-mediated recruitment not only threatens inclusion but also jeopardizes operational readiness.

5.4 Practical Implications

Practically, the study identifies sensor-integrated best practices that enhance both fairness and precision in AI-supported hiring, particularly for biodefense and national security roles. A dual-layer screening protocol, combining AI pre-screening informed by biometric and behavioral sensors with a secondary human review, emerges as a critical method to mitigate algorithmic bias. For example, wearable and webcam sensors used in asynchronous video interviews may detect stress responses or eye contact patterns that an AI could misinterpret as indicators of poor fit. However, human evaluators, applying structured rubrics, can contextualize such signals within a candidate's situational background. Additionally, tools such as emotion recognition software and speech pattern analysis systems can be deployed alongside structured interviews to assess interpersonal competencies, but must be calibrated to account for cultural, neurological, and situational variation. These sensor-supported enhancements allow hiring panels to better identify competencies like composure, leadership under pressure, and mission alignment, traits indispensable in biodefense consulting. When ethically deployed, such technologies enrich the evaluative process without reducing candidates to datasets.

5.5 Organizational Implications

At the organizational level, the adoption of AI and sensor systems for executive recruitment requires robust governance frameworks to ensure ethical deployment and systemic accountability [8]. In biodefense and national security environments, AI tools often process sensor-based inputs, such as micro-expression detection, biometric verification, and behavioral analysis, which can unintentionally embed bias or violate candidate privacy. To address this, interdisciplinary oversight committees comprising AI engineers, HR leaders, and DEI experts should conduct regular audits of sensor-derived data streams and candidate selection outcomes. For instance, review panels could examine disparities in candidate progression linked to facial recognition confidence scores or speech pattern deviations, triggering recalibration of underlying models. Embedding these evaluative mechanisms into institutional workflows promotes adherence to values such as equity, security, and mission-readiness. Further, ongoing training for hiring personnel and AI system developers ensures that all stakeholders understand the implications of integrating sensing technologies into high-stakes hiring processes.

5.6 Policy Implications

The policy implications of this research are particularly critical for national security contractors and federally regulated organizations using sensor-enhanced AI in recruitment. As sensor applications, including wearable monitoring, facial emotion analysis, and digital behavior tracking, become more prevalent, organizations must codify workplace policies that protect individuals from sensor-driven bias or discriminatory surveillance [28]–[30]. Internally, policy frameworks should mandate human oversight in sensor-influenced decisions and require transparency about how biometric and behavioral data are collected, processed, and interpreted [51]. For example, final hiring decisions for classified roles involving AI-generated sensor profiles must be vetted by human reviewers trained in equitable hiring practices. Externally, this study supports calls for regulatory oversight modeled on frameworks such as those from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), updated to include sensor-specific risks. Key requirements should include documentation of sensor calibration protocols, disclosure of biometric data sources, and systematic audits for algorithmic and sensorinduced bias. In sectors tied to national resilience, policy safeguards for sensor-informed hiring systems are not only ethical imperatives, but they are also strategic bulwarks against institutional vulnerability.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

By integrating the Delphi Technique and narrative inquiry into future research, scholars and practitioners can build a robust, multidimensional body of knowledge. These methods move beyond surface-level efficiency claims and toward a more critical, inclusive, and empirically grounded understanding of AI's evolving role in shaping workforce equity.

6.1. Delphi Technique

The Delphi Technique is a structured, multi-round method for eliciting and refining expert opinions on complex or uncertain topics. It is particularly valuable when consensus is needed on evolving issues such as artificial intelligence (AI) in recruitment, where interdisciplinary viewpoints often diverge, and no single authoritative solution exists. This method involves assembling a panel of experts from diverse but relevant fields, in this case, human resources, algorithm design, legal compliance, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), and guiding them through several rounds of questionnaires or controlled feedback.

The process begins with a first round of open-ended questions to gather a broad range of expert insights on AI-related hiring practices, potential risks, and equity interventions. These responses are then synthesized and converted into structured statements or rating items for subsequent rounds. In each following round, participants review a summary of the group's feedback, often including statistical averages and anonymized commentary, and are asked to re-evaluate their initial judgments. This process continues until a reasonable level of consensus is achieved, typically over two to four rounds.

The utility of the Delphi Technique lies in its ability to systematically identify and refine collective knowledge without the influence of dominant voices or interpersonal pressure, since responses are anonymous and individual. It is especially effective for developing policy frameworks, industry standards, and best practice guidelines. In the context of AI and recruitment, this method can help organizations and researchers coalesce expert guidance on bias mitigation strategies, governance models, auditing mechanisms, and ethical boundaries. The iterative and evidence-informed nature of Delphi panels ensures that the final recommendations reflect both technical feasibility and ethical soundness, making it an ideal next step following an exploratory focus group study.

6.2. Qualitative Narrative Inquiry

Narrative inquiry is a qualitative research approach that centers on individuals lived experiences and personal stories to explore the meanings they assign to events, processes, and interactions. In contrast to thematic analysis, which emphasizes recurring patterns across participants, narrative inquiry delves into the rich, contextualized detail of each person's story. This approach is particularly well-suited to examining how AI-powered recruitment systems affect candidates and recruiters at a human level, especially those from historically marginalized or underrepresented backgrounds.

A narrative study typically begins with the selection of a small, purposefully sampled group of participants who have direct, firsthand experience with the phenomenon of interest, such as being screened out or selected by an AI hiring system. Through in-depth, semi-structured interviews, researchers encourage participants to recount specific moments, emotions, and reflections tied to their experiences. These narratives are not fragmented into codes or themes but are preserved in a coherent, chronological format that respects the participant's voice and framing. The researcher then interprets these stories with attention to plot, setting, turning points, and cultural context.

The utility of narrative inquiry lies in its capacity to capture complexity, contradiction, and nuance in ways that aggregate data often cannot. For example, a participant may describe the psychological toll of receiving automated rejection messages or the empowering effect of being able to submit a video response in a one-way interview. These insights offer a deeper understanding of how fairness, transparency, and inclusion are felt, not just measured, in AI-mediated hiring environments.

Narrative inquiry is particularly beneficial as a complementary approach to expert-focused methodologies. Whereas the Delphi Technique produces consensus-driven frameworks, narrative research highlights the human impact of those systems and policies. Together, they provide a holistic view, pairing organizational and technical insights with personal and ethical reflections to inform the future of equitable, human-centered AI in recruitment.

REFERENCES

[1] Hmoud B., Laszlo V. Will, "Artificial Intelligence Take Over Human Resources Recruitment and Selection?," *Netw Intell Stud*, vol. 7, no. 13, pp. 21–30, 2019**.**

[2] Raveendra P., Satish Y., Singh P., "Changing Landscape of Recruitment Industry: A Study on the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Eliminating Hiring Bias from Recruitment and Selection Process*," J Comput Theor Nanosci*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 4404–4407, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1166/jctn.2020.9086

[3] Johansson J., Herranen S., "The Application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resource Management: Current State of AI and Its Impact on the Traditional Recruitment Process," *Bachelor thesis. Jonkoping University*, Jönköping, Sweden, 2019.

[4] Zhang J., Chen Z., "Exploring Human Resource Management Digital Transformation in the Digital Age," *J Knowl Econ*, vol. 15, pp. 1482–1498, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01214-y

[5] Bornstein S., "Antidiscriminatory Algorithms," *Alabama Law Rev*, vol. 70, no. 519, 2018

[6] Miasato A., Silva F.R., "Artificial Intelligence as an Instrument of Discrimination in Workforce Recruitment," Acta *Univ Sapientiae: Legal Stud*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 191–212, 2019. https://doi.org/10.47745/AUSLEG.2019.8.2.04

[7] Raub M. Bots, Bias and Big Data, "Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Bias and Disparate Impact Liability in Hiring Practices,"*Ark Law Rev*, vol. 71, no. 529, 2018

[8] Burrell D.N., McAndrew I., "Exploring the Ethical Dynamics of the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Hiring in Healthcare Organizations," *Land Forces Acad Rev.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 309–321, 2023. https://doi.org/10.2478/raft-2023-0037

[9] Burrell D.N., Diperi D.L., Weaver R.M., "Creating Inclusive Cultures for Women in Automation and Information Technology Careers and Occupations," *I. Management Association (Ed.), Research Anthology on Challenges for Women in Leadership Roles IGI Global*, pp. 749–765, 2021. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8592-4.ch041

[10] Malik A., "AI Bias In Recruitment: Ethical Implications And Transparency," *Forbes*, 2023.

[11] Lytton C., "AI Hiring Tools May Be Filtering out the Best Job Applicants," *BBC*, February 16, 2024.

[12] Zapata D., "New Study Finds AI-Enabled Anti-Black Bias in Recruiting," *Thomson Reuters*, 2021.

[13] Tran T.B.H., Choi S.B., "Effects of Inclusive Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Roles of Organizational Justice and Learning Culture," *J Pacific Rim Psy.*, vol. 13, e17, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1017/prp.2019.10

[14] Graso M., Camps J., Strah N., Brebels L., "Organizational Justice Enactment: An Agent-Focused Review and Path Forward," *J Voc Behavior*, vol. 116, 103296, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.03.007

[15] Kelan E.K., "Algorithmic Inclusion: Shaping the Predictive Algorithms of Artificial Intelligence in Hiring," *Hum Res Man J*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 694–707, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12511

[16] Zoričić D., Knežević G., Miletić M., Dolinar D., Sprčić D.M., "Integrated Risk Analysis of Aggregators: Policy Implications for the Development of the Competitive Aggregator Industry," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 14, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15145076

[17] Nandonde F.A. A, "Pestle Analysis of International Retailing in the East African Community," *Global Business & Organizational Excellence*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 54–61, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21935

[18] Collins R., "A Graphical Method for Exploring the Business Environment", *Henley Business School: Henley-on-Thames*, England, 2010.

[19] An M., Lin J., Luo X.R., "The Impact of Human AI Skills on Organizational Innovation: The Moderating Role of Digital Organizational Culture.," *J Bus Res.*, vol. 182, 114786, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114786

[20] Bley K., Fredriksen S.F.B., Skjærvik M.E., Pappas I.O., "The role of organizational culture on artificial intelligence capabilities and organizational performance," *Conference on e-Business, e-Services and e-Society Cham*, Springer International, pp. 13-24, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15342-6_2

[21] Chaudhary S., Kumar S., Kumar K., Kathuria S., Negi P., Chhabra G., "Role of artificial intelligence in organizational culture and workplace," *International Conference on Sustainable Computing and Data Communication Systems*, pp. 528–532, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSCDS56580.2023.10104697

[22] Chourasia S., Dhama A., Bhardwaj G., "AI-driven organizational culture evolution: A critical review. In 2024 International Conference on Communication," *Computer Sciences and Engineering*, pp. 1839–1844, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1109/IC3SE62002.2024.10592949

[23] Cuevas A.G., Boen C., "Tip of the Iceberg: Measuring Racial Discrimination in Studies of Health," *SH*, vol. 37, no. 5, 1043–1050, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3047

[24] Wazed S., "Council Post: Grow Your Organization with Top Talent Using the Iceberg Interview Model," *Forbes*, August 2, 2018.

[25] Kotter J.P., "Leading Change, with a New Preface by the Author," *Harvard Business Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts*, 2013.

[26] Caulfield J.L., Brenner E.F., "Resolving Complex Community Problems: Applying Collective Leadership and Kotter's Change Model to Wicked Problems within Social System Networks," *NML*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 509–524, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21399

[27] Miller J.L., "Managing Transitions: Using William Bridges' Transition Model and a Change Style Assessment Instrument to Inform Strategies and Measure Progress in Organizational Change Management,"*12th International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries Proceedings*, p. 357, 2017.

[28] Huff A., Burrell D.N., Richardson K., Springs D., Aridi A.S., Crowe M.M., Lewis E., "Illegal Pregnancy Discrimination Is a Severe Business, Legal, and Public Health Issue," *D. Burrell, Ed.*, IGI Global, pp. 119–129, 2023. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8691-7.ch008

[29] Burrell D.N., Morin S.L., "The Importance of White Males with Power, Resources, and Influence as Allies Supporting Diversity in the US Workplace," Societies, vol. 15, no. 5, 128, 2025. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15050128
[30] McLester Q., Burrell D. N., Nobles C., and Castillo I., "Advancing Knowledge About Sexual Harassment Is a Critical Aspect of Organizational Development for All Employees," *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 48-60, 2021. http://doi.org/10.4018/IJKBO.2021100104
[31] Hunkenschroer AL, Luetge C., "Ethics of AI-enabled recruiting and selection: A review and research agenda," *Journal of Business Ethics Jul.*, vol. 178, no. 4, pp. 977-1007, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05049-6
[32] Ujlayan A, Bhattacharya S, Sonakshi, "A Machine Learning-Based AI Framework to Optimize the Recruitment Screening Process," *International Journal of Global Business and Competitiveness*, pp. 38-53, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42943-023-00086-y
[33] Koechling A, Wehner MC, Warkocz J., "Can I show my skills? Affective responses to artificial intelligence in the recruitment process," *Review of Managerial Science*, vol. 17, no. 6, 2109-38, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00514-4
[34] Lukacik ER, Bourdage JS, Roulin N., "Into the void: A conceptual model and research agenda for the design and use of asynchronous video interviews," *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 32, no. 1, 100789, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100789
[35] Ajunwa I., "Automated video interviewing as the new phrenology," *Berkeley Technology Law Journ*al, vol. 36, no. 3, 1173-226, 2021.
[36] Kammerer B., "Hired by a robot: The legal implications of artificial intelligence video interviews and advocating for greater protection of job applicants," *Iowa L. Rev.*, 107, 817, 2021.
[37] Basch JM, Melchers KG, Kurz A, Krieger M, Miller L., "It takes more than a good camera: which factors contribute to differences between face-to-face interviews and videoconference interviews regarding performance ratings and interviewee perceptions?" *Journal of business and psychology*, vol. 36, 921-40, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09714-3
[38] Roulin N, Wong O, Langer M, Bourdage JS., "Is more always better? How preparation time and re-recording opportunities impact fairness, anxiety, impression management, and performance in asynchronous video interviews," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 32, no. 3, 333-45, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2022.2156862
[39] Albaroudi E, Mansouri T, Alameer A., "A comprehensive review of AI techniques for addressing algorithmic bias in job hiring," *Ai*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 383-404, 2024. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5010019
[40] Peng A, Nushi B, Kiciman E, Inkpen K, Kamar E., "Investigations of performance and bias in human-AI teamwork in hiring," *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 12089-12097, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21468
[41] Kassir S, Baker L, Dolphin J, Polli F., "AI for hiring in context: a perspective on overcoming the unique challenges of employment research to mitigate disparate impact,"*AI and Ethics*, vol. 3, no. 3, 845-68, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00208-x
[42] De Almeida PG, dos Santos CD, Farias JS., "Artificial intelligence regulation: a framework for governance," *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 23, no. 3, 505-25, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-021-09593-z
[43] Wirtz BW, Weyerer JC, Kehl I., "Governance of artificial intelligence: A risk and guideline-based integrative framework," *Government information quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 4, 101685, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101685
[44] Balasubramaniam N, Kauppinen M, Rannisto A, Hiekkanen K, Kujala S., "Transparency and explainability of AI systems: From ethical guidelines to requirements," *Information and Software Technology*, 159, 107197, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2023.107197
[45] Patidar N, Mishra S, Jain R, Prajapati D, Solanki A, Suthar R, Patel K, Patel H., "Transparency in AI decision making: A survey of explainable AI methods and applications," Advances of Robotic Technology, vol. 2, no. 1, 2024. https://doi.org/10.23880/art-16000110
[46] Balasubramaniam N, Kauppinen M, Hiekkanen K, Kujala S., "Transparency and explainability of AI systems: ethical guidelines in practice," *International working conference on requirements engineering: foundation for software quality*, pp. 3-18, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98464-9_1
[47] Oyeniran CO, Adewusi AO, Adeleke AG, Akwawa LA, Azubuko CF., "Ethical AI: Addressing bias in machine learning models and software applications," *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, vol. 3, no. 3, 115-26, 2022. https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v3i3.1559
[48] Varona D, Suárez JL., "Discrimination, bias, fairness, and trustworthy AI," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 12, 5826, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/app12125826
[49] Prapanca A, Nasreddine Belhaouas, Imed Mahmoud, "Modified FATA Morgana Algorithm Based on Levy Flight," *Vokasi Unesa Bull. Eng. Technol. Appl. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-11, 2025. https://doi.org/10.26740/vubeta.v2i1.37066
[50] Hamam H., "Rethinking Intelligence: From Human Cognition to Artificial Futures," Vokasi Unesa Bull. Eng. Technol. Appl. Sci., vol. 2, no. 3, 531-48, 2025. https://doi.org/10.26740/vubeta.v2i3.44232

.