



Artificial Intelligence and the Medical School Admissions Interview: Strategic Guidance, Risks, and Lessons from Industrial-Organizational Psychology

Alexander MacIntosh^{1,2} · Nicolas Roulin³ · Leila Amiri⁴ · Ioannis Koutroulis⁵

Received: 15 August 2025 / Accepted: 4 December 2025

© The Author(s) under exclusive licence to International Association of Medical Science Educators 2025

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming medical school admissions, yet the interview remains a largely human-centered process. This work explores how AI is shaping interview preparation, design, and delivery—raising both opportunities and risks. Drawing from industrial-organizational psychology and corporate hiring practices, we outline emerging threats such as AI-enabled cheating and offer practical strategies to preserve fairness and authenticity. We provide three actionable recommendations that use AI to extend access and efficiency while maintaining human judgment and value in the interview process. Medical education leaders must act now to implement policy, training, and safeguards that align with ethical and legal standards.

Keywords Artificial intelligence · Medical school admissions · Interviews · Cheating · Proctoring · IO psychology · Higher education policy · Hybrid interviews

Introduction

Over the past five years, artificial intelligence (AI) has impacted nearly every stage of medical-school admissions, potentially shifting traditionally labour-intensive processes toward algorithm-assisted decision making for

both applicants and programs. Operationally, admissions offices can now use automated triage tools, intelligent document-processing systems, and workflow bots to handle the surge of primary applications and associated paperwork [1]. Applicant communication is increasingly mediated by conversational chatbots that answer FAQs around the clock,

Submission Note

This manuscript is submitted for consideration in the *Special Section on the Implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Health Sciences Education*, published by the International Association of Medical Science Educators (IAMSE).

✉ Ioannis Koutroulis
ikoutroulis@email.gwu.edu

Alexander MacIntosh
amacintosh@acuityinsights.com

Nicolas Roulin
nicolas.roulin@smu.ca

Leila Amiri
leila.amiri@med.uvm.edu

¹ Acuity Insights Inc., Toronto, ON, Canada

² Applied Modelling and Quantitative Methods, Trent University, Peterborough, ON, Canada

³ Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, McNally South 319 Robie St, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

⁴ Department of Psychiatry, Larner College of Medicine, University of Vermont, Given Courtyard N-200, 89 Beaumont Avenue, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

⁵ Pediatrics, Emergency Medicine, Genomics & Precision Medicine, George Washington University School of Medicine & Health Sciences & Children's National Hospital, Office of MD Admissions, George Washington SMHS, Ross Hall, Room 106, 2300 Eye St, Washington, DC 20037, USA

while micro-targeted outreach engines personalize e-mail, text, and social-media messages in real time [2]. Applicants themselves now turn to a flourishing market of AI-enabled tools. Generative platforms such as ChatGPT or Gemini draft and polish essays, simulate interview questions, and supply personalized admissions roadmaps; adaptive test-prep engines offer item-level feedback and dynamically adjust difficulty [3].

Contrasting this algorithmic surge, the admissions interview remains a rare, human-centered encounter. The slower integration of AI for interviews comes with good reason. As the only new and spontaneous bit of data, interviews are among the most important factors in determining which aspiring physicians receive offers. Programs use interviews to assess competencies and alignment with program values that have, to date, been difficult to evaluate algorithmically in a fair and scalable way. Yet, interviews are still impacted today by AI-enabled coaching, real-time prompting, and automated scoring advances.

Here, we focus on the interview as the next AI frontier in admissions innovation. We begin by surveying the current evidence base, drawing lessons from industrial-organizational psychology and corporate hiring, and cataloging emergent risks—including AI-facilitated cheating. We then offer actionable strategies for admissions leaders. Throughout, we argue that thoughtful, hybrid integration of AI can enhance fairness and efficiency without eroding human judgment at the heart of selecting tomorrow's physicians.

Current Landscape: AI in Medical School Selection

Early touch-points with applicants are increasingly automated: conversational chat-bots triage e-mails, micro-targeted social-media campaigns adapt messages in real time, and—most visibly—the 2024–25 American Medical College Application Service® (AMCAS) certification statement explicitly permits candidates to “utilize ... AI tools for brainstorming, proofreading, or editing,” [4] provided the final submission is their own work. This policy signal underscores how normalized generative tools have become before an application even reaches an admissions office. This emphasis is further highlighted by the breadth of practical resources including the Association of American Medical Colleges' (AAMC) “Principles for the Responsible Use of AI in and for Medical Education”, which outlines seven core obligations—fairness, transparency, ethical rigor, privacy protection, human oversight, accountability, and continuous evaluation. These are used to ensure AI augments rather than replaces human judgment in teaching and selection [5, 6].

Once files arrive, machine-learning screeners can triage the high volume of primary applications using local and institution specific criteria. Multicentre implementation studies show that algorithms can reproduce faculty interview-invitation decisions with high fidelity: Triola, Keir and colleagues report AUROC (Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve) exceeding 0.8 while maintaining parity across applicant characteristics [7]. Natural-language-processing models that mine narrative statements push predictive performance even higher when combined with structured metrics [8]. These tools have potential to cut reviewer workload, and decrease inter-rater variability, yet most programmes should keep a human “second look,” reflecting cautious, hybrid adoption. Likewise, applicants are embracing generative AI. A 2025 survey reported that more than half of applicants “use or intend to use” generative AI in their materials [3].

The interview phase remains the most human-centered—and least automated—step. Unlike corporate hiring, where AI-scored one-way video interviews are more common for screening applicants, most medical schools still rely on human interview using traditional or Multiple Mini-Interview (MMI) formats. No peer-reviewed study to our knowledge has yet validated an AI-scored interview for widespread high-stakes medical school admissions. However, the use of AI for preparing on both the applicant and program side, along with concerns of unethical use during the interview adds pressure to administrators. This blend of adoption in file review, widespread applicant experimentation, and guarded use during interviews frames the challenges and opportunities explored in the sections that follow.

Lessons from IO Psychology Literature for Corporate Hiring

The Industrial/Organizational Psychology literature, and particularly personnel selection research, has a long history of examining the benefits and risks associated with job interviews [9]. There is ample evidence in terms of their psychometric properties (e.g., criterion-related validity - or how well they predict work performance [10], or adverse impact [11], what types of interviews hiring professionals use [11], or how fair are they perceived by applicants [12]. For example, meta-analytical evidence suggests that interviews, when designed and delivered in a structured way, are the selection instruments with the most valid prediction of job performance ($\rho=.42$; [10]).

The use of technology in interviews, and especially live (i.e., synchronous, video-conference) interviews has also been extensively explored [13]. This research generally shows that applicants' performance is lower in

video-conference than in-person interviews, for instance because applicants are less able to demonstrate their skills or can experience more anxiety. Asynchronous video interviews (AVIs) have emerged as an alternative (or complement) to live interviews in recent years. Yet, the selection literature has reacted rapidly, proposing a theoretical model of how AVI design choice can influence applicant behaviors and selection outcomes [14] and empirical examinations of how AVIs are used in practice [15], applicant reactions [16], potential misconceptions [17], or applicant training [18].

Because AVIs are asynchronous and applicant responses are recorded, it created opportunities for organizations to leverage AI to review and score such responses automatically. Initial empirical work has shown that AI (i.e., machine learning) powered AVIs could be used to automatically evaluate transcriptions of applicants' responses to assess their personality, demonstrating significant correlations with human ratings of personality [19, 20]. There is also evidence that such automated interviews can predict future work performance, although the validity was about half of that of in-person structured interviews ($r=.24$; [21]). To date, the potential use of AI in live interviews has seldom been explored. The main reason is that AI is viewed mainly as beneficial to reduce time commitment, variability in outcomes, and costs. Yet, since human interviewers are already involved in live interviews, replacing their judgments with AI has more limited practical value. That said, there are opportunities to use AI for interview development (e.g., help with writing questions, coaching applicants, or creating rating scales).

It is important to note that most of the existing research has relied on transcriptions of video-recorded responses in AVIs. Yet, this is primarily done to reflect organizational practices, with most of the largest AVI providers having stepped away from using video or audio content (e.g., facial expressions, pitch), largely to avoid unfair evaluations [22] or to adhere to emerging AI-related legislation. In addition, although initial evidence about the utility of AI-evaluated interviews is promising, it also depends on the quality of the response transcription, which can be prone to misinterpretation [23] and training such machine learning models requires large samples [24]. However, the emergence and accessibility of large language models (LLMs) will likely make AI-powered AVIs more cost-effective, and possibly more valid.

Some research has also examined how applicants react to interviews involving responses automatically rated by AI. Initial work suggests that AI-evaluated interviews are perceived as less fair [25]. Yet, such reactions can be improved by providing applicants with video explanations of the benefits of AI-supported interviews [26] or justifications for the process [27]. Importantly, not all applicants react similarly.

For instance, applicants with prior experiences of discrimination (by humans) tend to view AI evaluations more positively [28].

Candidates and employers can also use AI-Driven Virtual Interviewers in their process [29]. The AI-Driven Virtual Interviewer addresses key challenges faced by both interviewers and job seekers by automating the screening process, standardizing evaluations to reduce inconsistency, and offering candidates realistic practice with immediate feedback to improve skills and confidence. From the applicant perspective they can train with an AI virtual interviewer to develop more self-awareness and interview skills. This has a key role in providing support for applicants from backgrounds where they may not have had experiences to support the development of interview skills.

Finally, with the growing popularity of LLMs like ChatGPT or Gemini, more recent work has started to examine how job applicants can use AI when completing their interviews. Selection researchers have proposed that applicants can use AI in three main ways [30]; They can use it as (1) a "substitute" to help fill the gaps in their qualifications and improve their scores (e.g., ask AI to provide them with a good answer to an interview question); (2) an "equalizer" to help reduce deficits in familiarity (e.g., use AI to practice for interviews, to replace a human coach); or (3) an "augmenter" to align with how AI will be used at work (e.g., as an assistant or co-pilot). While all three scenarios will lead to increase in interview performance scores for applicants, only the first one will likely negatively impact the quality of hiring (or admission) decisions, since applicants are using AI to "fake" or "cheat" to appear more qualified. Recent empirical work confirms that interviewees instructed to use AI to complete an AVI obtain higher scores, especially if they simply read the AI-generated response without attempting to adapt it [31].

Yet, this line of research is in its infancy, and it remains unclear how interviews can be designed (or conducted) to reduce applicant AI use. For instance, evidence from other selection/admission tools (i.e., situational judgment tests) suggests that integrating protections such as limited response time or preventing copy-and-pasting could be helpful [32]. In addition, the rapid development of new AI tools could also facilitate applicants' use of such technology in live interviews. For instance, AI co-pilots (e.g., [33, 34]) can transcribe and analyze questions asked by an interviewer and provide applicants with recommended answers in real-time. Applicants can even be replaced by AI-powered virtual avatars (e.g., [35]) in live video-conference interviews. And wearable technology (such as Meta's smart glasses) can even help applicants discretely bring such AI-copilots with them for face-to-face interviews.

Risks and Opportunities of AI in the Interview Process

Despite some potential benefits from the integration of AI into medical school interviews, there are significant risks that might compromise the integrity of the admissions process. Virtual, real-time interviews can be a target since they are an important element of the holistic review. Applicants can use AI technologies to present polished answers beyond their actual communication skills, beliefs, or emotional intelligence. For instance, Canagasuriam and Lukacik (2025) found higher overall AVI performance ratings across ChatGPT assisted conditions compared to non-assisted. Importantly, response delivery did not differ between conditions, but ChatGPT conditions received lower honesty ratings [31]. Similarly, tools like Final Round AI, AIApply's "Interview Buddy", and Verve AI offer real-time copilots that listen to interview questions via the candidate's microphone, process the question using an LLM, and return suggested answers instantly [36–38]. These answers can be displayed on a hidden teleprompter or browser overlay, allowing candidates to respond confidently and fluently in live interviews. Admissions offices have the opportunity to recommend or offer AI-led interview practice systems to reduce the pressure to chat, purchase costly coaching and to rehearse in a realistic, standardized environment [18, 30].

Additionally, there are concerns about the potential use of AI to create a fake digital twin, which is an artificially generated persona designed to impersonate the applicant during interviews [39]. Those digital twins can respond to questions in each applicant's style, tone, and even visual likeness [40]. In asynchronous interviews, where real-time identity verification may be difficult, these digital twins could autonomously generate responses, which makes it difficult to distinguish from a real human interaction. This technology was highlighted as emphasized by the AAMC in their 2024 webinar on scholarly publishing and AI tools [41]. These AI models make it increasingly feasible to complete entire interview sessions. Moreover, the applicants can receive help with responses via teleprompters or audio feeds. This raises serious concerns with the process, as admissions decisions may be based on fake responses that in some cases do not even originate from a real applicant. Committees can consider recording interviews for analysis, which can be transformed into summaries, verify authenticity, identify key themes or provide scoring support (see Gartner's list of interview intelligence tools [42]). These technologies have already proliferated the corporate world, companies like Insight7 [43] and Gong [44] provide these kinds of conversation analytics to improve customer engagement. However, they must first be evaluated relative to their predictive value and impact to fairness.

To date, asynchronous interviews have been particularly vulnerable to AI use, with applicants increasingly utilizing AI tools to script real-time responses. Though real-time virtual interviews and MMIs are susceptible to similar technological advances. While currently less vulnerable than virtual formats, in-person interviews still face the risk of deceptive AI assistance (e.g. via smart glasses technology), allowing applicants to receive real-time prompts. To address this increasing complexity in the interview landscape, admissions committees may consider leveraging semi-automated question generators. Interview question generators are available with varying degrees of efficacy and reliability that support committees to draft and take advantage of large item banks in short periods of time. Workable, Prospect HR, and NodeFlair [45–47] are examples of HR companies offering these kinds of tools, however significant human involvement is a necessity to ensure question sets are well balanced, minimizes performance inconsistency, and meet the program's mission (i.e. human-in-the-loop [48]). This approach may facilitate a more flexible and harder to game selection process (i.e. through a structured bank of follow-up probes; e.g., U.S. Office of Personnel Management [49]).

Together, these risks and opportunities illustrate a guiding principle: use AI to extend reach, standardize preparation, and surface additional signals, but keep final decisions anchored in human expertise and well-audited processes. Committees must reconsider the value and risk trade-off, and how they can design interviews that balance efficiency, reliability, fairness, and mission while thoughtfully weighing the benefits of face-to-face interactions against their logistical hurdles to both applicants and programs.

Mitigation Strategies for Admissions Officers

Emerging evidence and practice reports agree safeguarding interview integrity requires clear policies, targeted training, and judicious technology use [31]. The first layer is policy and communication. Admissions offices should publish explicit AI-usage statements within interview instructions, distinguishing preparation from performance. For example, an applicant may rehearse with a generative tool or preview common prompts, but any real-time assistance—whether a teleprompter, an earpiece, or live text overlay—constitutes misconduct [50, 51]. Citing concrete scenarios (e.g. "Using ChatGPT to brainstorm or refine a response is acceptable; reading its answer verbatim during the interview is not") sets expectations and dissuades borderline behavior. Programs should also remind candidates of the consequences of misrepresentation.

The second layer is interviewer training. Faculty and student assessors benefit from short, simulation-based

workshops that normalize spotting red flags such as flat intonation, unnatural pauses, or sudden leaps in linguistic complexity [50, 51]. Training emphasizes tailored probes—“Tell me exactly what you did next” or “How would you handle that if circumstances changed?”—to disrupt rehearsed narratives and reveal depth of understanding. Equally important is clarifying for interviewers what they are evaluating: authenticity, reflection, and interpersonal responsiveness rather than polished oratory. When those dimensions are explicit, AI-assisted eloquence loses its evaluative currency [9, 18, 25]. This falls under developing a proper standardized interview and evaluation process, which while it might help reduce the effect of AI, is also best-practice to make interviews more valid, reliable, and standardized [9].

A third layer involves proctoring and monitoring tailored to format. Asynchronous platforms can employ single-take recording, browser lockdown, and webcam-based room scans; some schools are piloting eye-tracking overlays that flag off-screen reading during timed prompts [52, 53]. Live virtual interviews can require a 360-degree camera sweep, while in-person formats rely on device checks and government-ID verification upon entry [54]. Advances in AI deception are giving way to new sets of products and services (e.g. Proctorio [48], Respondus [55]) for enhanced ID verification and proctoring, including measures like biometric analysis, keystroke patterns, and live verification. None of these methods is fool proof, but each raises the effort and risk of cheating, preserving the deterrent effect.

Evidence comparing AI-assisted and human-generated responses underscores how elusive reliable detection has become and is likely to remain. Overall, results indicate inconsistent performance across different tools and AI models [56]. AI detection in university assignments also shows difficulty identifying AI content and can generate inconsistency [57, 58]. Human raters struggle to identify deceptive behaviors in video interviews [50]. Most of the AI detection research has been focused on written content. It is unclear how well it will apply to verbal responses. And the more customizable AI co-pilots become (e.g., providing responses based on applicant specific information they feed before the interview— such as a resume, list of past experiences, course transcript, etc.) the more difficult it will likely be to detect. Functionally, this can be viewed as a typical ‘arms race’ as AI deception advances so too will AI detection [56, 59, 60]. Importantly, escalating this race can come at great risk to the admissions committees and if they choose to engage, they will need to invest in consistent oversight, training and application monitoring if they want to rely heavily on technological detection infrastructure.

Emerging policy guidance argues for deterrence over detection. Policy recommends explicit honor-code language that distinguishes permissible AI preparation from

prohibited real-time assistance, coupled with randomized proctoring spot-checks rather than wholesale reliance on algorithmic detectors. While these policy recommendations are in place (e.g. AAMC Guidelines [6]) the degree to which they are in place and in practice varies widely across schools. Increasing regulatory trends—such as the EU AI Act’s requirements for documented human oversight, transparency, and the option of human-only review—reinforce this oversight mandate and make clear communication essential [61]. Admissions committees, as the institutional nucleus for AI-related policy, can strengthen trust by disclosing where AI tools are used, where human judgment intervenes, and why authentic, unscripted dialog remains central to evaluation. Because cheating technologies and counter-detectors will likely co-evolve, the policy focus shifts toward cultivating a culture of professionalism and embedding layered safeguards (e.g., dynamic questioning, timed responses, and follow-up probes) that reduce the payoff of AI deception rather than trying to catch every instance after the fact.

Recommendations for Medical Education Leaders

Medical school admissions leaders face growing challenges and opportunities as AI becomes increasingly embedded in candidate preparation, interview design, and institutional processes. Based on the evidence and insights presented in this work, we offer three key take-home messages with actionable guidance for navigating this evolving landscape.

Avoid Escalating an AI Arms Race

As applicants adopt increasingly sophisticated tools to aid or falsify interview performance—ranging from ChatGPT-generated responses to real-time AI copilots—schools face mounting pressure to detect and respond. However, attempts to match deception with surveillance often devolve into an unsustainable “arms race.” Detection tools remain inconsistent, and the burden of oversight diverts attention from more foundational principles of the interview.

Rather than invest in ever-more complex detection methods, admissions offices should return to the core values and purposes of the interview: assessing authenticity, interpersonal character, and alignment with program mission. Lessons from corporate space share this view. Deloitte’s decision to reinstate in-person final interviews—after experiencing the limits of virtual integrity—is a telling example [62]. Similarly, structured formats with tailored follow-up probes that ask applicants to provide more specific details about past experiences and behaviors could reduce the value

of AI-generated content by disrupting rehearsed or superficial narratives [63].

Recommendation Focus institutional strategy on deterrence and transparency. Publish clear AI-use policies that distinguish preparation from misconduct and embed layered safeguards—like varying follow-up probes and human-centered evaluation rubrics—into interview designs.

Use Hybrid Interview Formats to Balance Access, Risk, and Quality

AI has magnified both the promise and peril of virtual interviews. While online formats increase access and reduce costs for applicants, they also create new vulnerabilities to misrepresentation. Conversely, in-person interviews offer stronger security and authenticity but are laborious, and expensive for both the applicants and the programs.

A solution may not be to choose one format over the other, but to embrace both in a hybrid model. Virtual screening rounds can give an efficient glimpse into a larger pool of applicants, while final in-person interviews can be reserved for a smaller group with higher confidence. This approach may help to maintain fairness early in the process and integrity when it matters most.

Recommendation Adopt a tiered interview structure: where resources allow, begin with virtual assessments to broaden reach, then use in-person or highly controlled formats at the final stage to evaluate fit and authenticity while deterring misrepresentation. Admissions offices can also be more creative with their questions by asking for real life examples, asking for more details, asking abstract questions, or thinking aloud complex questions that show how an applicant is thinking.

Leverage AI in your Process to Improve Interview Quality and Efficiency

AI is not only a challenge to admissions integrity; it can also be a powerful ally when applied responsibly. For applicants, free or low-cost AI-led practice tools can democratize access to coaching and feedback, helping more students develop key interview skills. On the administrative side, AI can help streamline scheduling, build better, larger question banks, summarize interview transcripts, and support scoring.

However, these benefits are contingent on rigorous evaluation. As with any technology introduced into high-stakes processes, AI tools must be continuously monitored for performance drift and unintended consequences. Committees should expect to account for auditing and evaluating AI tools and processes when allocating resources [64].

Human judgment should remain central, with AI serving to support—not supplant—comprehensive review.

Recommendation Pilot low-risk AI innovations (e.g., mock interview platforms, interview summarization tools) and establish formal protocols, resources for evaluating their fairness, validity, and impact before integrating them into decision-making.

Author Contributions All authors contributed substantially to the development of this manuscript.

- **Ioannis Koutroulis** provided expertise on medical school admissions processes and contributed to the policy and regulatory considerations.
- **Leila Amiri** contributed admissions leadership perspectives and recommendations for institutional implementation.
- **Nicolas Roulin** contributed evidence and interpretation from industrial-organizational psychology and personnel selection research.
- **Alexander MacIntosh** led the conceptual framing, manuscript drafting, and coordination of contributions.

All authors critically reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding This work received no external funding.

Data Availability No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. All citations and references are from publicly available sources.

Declarations

Competing Interests Nicolas Roulin is the founder of Atlantic Personnel Selection, a consulting practice in personnel selection and assessment. While not directly involved in medical school admissions, the company's domain overlaps with the subject matter of this manuscript. Alexander MacIntosh is a full-time employee of Acuity Insights Inc., which develops admissions assessments and educational analytics tools used in higher education. These affiliations are disclosed for transparency. Ioannis Koutroulis and Leila Amiri declare no financial or non-financial competing interests.

Ethical Approval This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

1. Burk-Rafel J, Reinstein I, Feng J, Kim MB, Miller LH, Cocks PM, et al. Development and validation of a machine learning-based decision support tool for residency applicant screening and review. *Acad Med.* 2021;96:S54. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000004317>.
2. Vergheze BG, Iyer C, Borse T, Cooper S, White J, Sheehy R. Modern artificial intelligence and large language models in graduate medical education: a scoping review of attitudes, applications & practice. *BMC Med Educ.* 2025;25:730. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07321-5>.
3. Smith B, Ramadoss T, D'Amario V, Shoja MM, Rajput V, Cervantes J. Utilization and perception of generative artificial intelligence by medical students in residency applications. *J Investig Med.* 2025;73:338–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10815589251322102>.

4. Certification Statements. In: Students & Residents. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://students-residents.aamc.org/applying-medical-school-amcas/publication-chapters/certification-statements>
5. Artificial Intelligence Resources for Admission and Selection Processes. In: AAMC. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.aamc.org/about-us/mission-areas/medical-education/artificial-intelligence-resources-admission-and-selection-processes>
6. Principles for Responsible AI in Medical School and Residency Selection. In: AAMC. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.aamc.org/about-us/mission-areas/medical-education/principles-ai>
7. Keir G, Hu W, Filippi CG, Ellenbogen L, Woldenberg R. Using artificial intelligence in medical school admissions screening to decrease inter- and intra-observer variability. *JAMIA Open*. 2023;6:0oad011. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/0oad011>.
8. Mahtani AU, Reinstein I, Marin M, Burk-Rafel J. A new tool for holistic residency application review: using natural language processing of applicant experiences to predict interview invitation. *Acad Med*. 2023;98:1018. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000005210>.
9. Levashina J, Hartwell CJ, Morgeson FP, Campion MA. The structured employment interview: narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Pers Psychol*. 2014;67:241–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052>.
10. Sackett PR, Zhang C, Berry CM, Lievens F. Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection: addressing systematic overcorrection for restriction of range. *J Appl Psychol*. 2022;107:2040–68. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994>.
11. Derous E, Buijsrogge A, Roulin N, Duyck W. Why your stigma isn't hired: a dual-process framework of interview bias. *Hum Resour Manage Rev*. 2016;26:90–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.09.006>.
12. McCarthy JM, Bauer TN, Truxillo DM, Anderson NR, Costa AC, Ahmed SM. Applicant perspectives during selection: a review addressing “So what?,” “What’s new?,” and “Where to next?” *J Manage*. 2017;43:1693–725. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316681846>.
13. Blacksmith N, Willford J, Behrend T. Technology in the employment interview: a meta-analysis and future research agenda. *Pers Assess Decisions*. 2016;2. <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2016.002>.
14. Lukacik E-R, Bourdage JS, Roulin N. Into the void: a conceptual model and research agenda for the design and use of asynchronous video interviews. *Hum Resour Manage Rev*. 2022;32:100789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100789>.
15. Dunlop PD, Holtrop D, Wee S. How asynchronous video interviews are used in practice: a study of an Australian-based AVI vendor. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2022;30:448–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12372>.
16. Tilston O, Krings F, Roulin N, Bourdage JS, Fetzter M. Reactions to asynchronous video interviews: the role of design decisions and applicant age and gender. *Hum Resour Manag*. 2024;63:313–32. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22202>.
17. Roulin N, Koutsoumpis A, Abdulrazaq S, Oostrom JK, Xie Y, MacIntosh A. Assessing biasing factors in asynchronous video interviews: applicant completion decisions, video background, and evaluation format. *Eur J Work Organ Psychol*. 2025:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2025.2517592>.
18. Roulin N, Pham LKA, Bourdage JS. Ready? Camera rolling... action! Examining interviewee training and practice opportunities in asynchronous video interviews. *J Vocat Behav*. 2023;145:103912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2023.103912>.
19. Koutsoumpis A, Ghassemi S, Oostrom JK, Holtrop D, Van Breda W, Zhang T, et al. Beyond traditional interviews: psychometric analysis of asynchronous video interviews for personality and interview performance evaluation using machine learning. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2024;154:108128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108128>.
20. Hickman L, Bosch N, Ng V, Saef R, Tay L, Woo SE. Automated video interview personality assessments: reliability, validity, and generalizability investigations. *J Appl Psychol*. 2022;107:1323–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000695>.
21. Liff J, Mondragon N, Gardner C, Hartwell CJ, Bradshaw A. Psychometric properties of automated video interview competency assessments. *J Appl Psychol*. 2024;109:921–48. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001173>.
22. Tay L, Woo SE, Hickman L, Booth BM, D’Mello S. A conceptual framework for investigating and mitigating machine-learning measurement Bias (MLMB) in psychological assessment. *Adv Methods Pract Psychol Sci*. 2022;5:25152459211061337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459211061337>.
23. Hickman L, Langer M, Saef RM, Tay L. Automated speech recognition bias in personnel selection: the case of automatically scored job interviews. *J Appl Psychol*. 2025;110:846–58. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001247>.
24. Hickman L, Liff J, Rottman C, Calderwood C. The effects of the training sample size, ground truth reliability, and NLP method on language-based automatic interview scores’ psychometric properties. *Organ Res Methods*. 2024;10944281241264027. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10944281241264027>.
25. Acikgoz Y, Davison KH, Compagnone M, Laske M. Justice perceptions of artificial intelligence in selection. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2020;28:399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12306>.
26. Köchling A, Wehner MC. Better explaining the benefits why AI? Analyzing the impact of explaining the benefits of AI-supported selection on applicant responses. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2023;31:45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12412>.
27. Langer M, Baum K, König CJ, Hähne V, Oster D, Speith T. Spare me the details: how the type of information about automated interviews influences applicant reactions. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2021;29:154–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12325>.
28. Koch-Bayram IF, Kaibel C, Biemann T, Triana MC. /click to begin your digital interview> applicants’ experiences with discrimination explain their reactions to algorithms in personnel selection. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2023;31:252–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12417>.
29. Sumathi S, Harris DK, Jeyanth AK. AI-driven interviewer: enhancing interview experience through conversational AI. *Springer Nature Switzerland*; 2024. p. 180. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69986-3_13.
30. Lievens F, Dunlop PD. Effects of applicants’ use of generative AI in personnel selection: towards a more nuanced view? *Int J Sel Assess*. 2025;33:e12516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12516>.
31. Canagasuriam D, Lukacik E-R. ChatGPT, can you take my job interview? Examining artificial intelligence cheating in the asynchronous video interview. *Int J Sel Assess*. 2025;33:e12491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijssa.12491>.
32. Harwood H, Roulin N, Iqbal MZ. Anything you can do, I can do”: examining the use of ChatGPT in situational judgement tests for professional program admission. *J Vocat Behav*. 2024;154:104013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2024.104013>.
33. Sensei AI | Real-time Interview Copilot. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.senseicopilot.com/>
34. LockedIn AI Professional AI Interview & Meeting Copilot. In: Lockedin-ai. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.lockedinai.com/>
35. Free AI Video Generator, Create AI Videos in 140 Languages. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.synthesia.io/>
36. Verve AI: Real-Time Interview Assistance for Job Seekers. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.vervecopilot.com/>

37. Final Round AI: Interview Copilot. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.finalroundai.com/interview-room>
38. AIApply: Your Real-Time Interview Buddy Desktop App. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://aiapply.co/interview-answer-buddy>
39. Free AI Video Generator - Create AI Videos in 140 Languages. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.synthesia.io/>
40. Methuku V, Myakala PK. Digital doppelgangers: ethical and societal implications of pre-mortem AI clones. arXiv. 2025; <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.21248>.
41. Kendrick E. AI in Medical Education Using the Missions of Medical Education as a Guide.
42. Best AI-Enabled Interview Intelligence Reviews 2025 | Gartner Peer Insights. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.gartner.com/reviews/market/ai-enabled-interview-intelligence>
43. Insight7 - AI Tool For Interview Analysis & Market Research. In: Insight7 - AI Tool For Interview Analysis & Market Research. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://insight7.io/>
44. Gong - Revenue AI Platform. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.gong.io/>
45. FREE Interview Kit Generator Powered by AI - Workable. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.workable.com/interview-questions-generator>
46. Multiple Mini Interview recruitment | ProspectHR MMI. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.prospecthrmmi.com/>
47. Free AI Interview Questions Generator | AI Job Tools. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://nodeflair.com/interview-preparation>
48. Online Proctoring. In: Proctorio. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://proctorio.com/products/online-proctoring>
49. Structured Interviews. In: U.S. Office of Personnel Management. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/other-assessment-methods/structured-interviews/>
50. Suen H-Y, Hung K-E. Building trust in automatic video interviews using various AI interfaces: tangibility, immediacy, and transparency. *Comput Human Behav.* 2023;143:107713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107713>.
51. Suen H-Y, Hung K-E. Revealing the influence of AI and its interfaces on job candidates' honest and deceptive impression management in asynchronous video interviews. *Technol Forecast Soc Change.* 2024;198:123011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123011>.
52. Chatterjee P, Dansana J, Swain S, Kumar Gourisaria M, Bandyopadhyay A. Identity Verification in Real Time Proctoring: An Integrated Approach with Face Recognition and Eye Tracking. In: 2024 International Conference on Intelligent Algorithms for Computational Intelligence Systems (IACIS); 2024. p. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IACIS61494.2024.10721819>.
53. Wijerathne HMCN, Wasana PREC, Kugathanan B, HAKD W. Smart recruitment tool with AI Technology. In: 2023 14th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT); 2023. p. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT56998.2023.10306911>.
54. Hunkenschroer AL, Luetge C. Ethics of AI-enabled recruiting and selection: a review and research agenda. *J Bus Ethics.* 2022;178:977–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05049-6>.
55. Respondus Monitor. In: Respondus. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://web.respondus.com/he/monitor/>
56. Bellini V, Semeraro F, Montomoli J, Cascella M, Bignami E. Between human and AI: assessing the reliability of AI text detection tools. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2024;40:353–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2024.2310086>.
57. Chaka C. Reviewing the performance of AI detection tools in differentiating between AI-generated and human-written texts: a literature and integrative hybrid review. *J Appl Learn Teach.* 2024;7:115–26. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.14>.
58. Dalalah D, Dalalah OMA. The false positives and false negatives of generative AI detection tools in education and academic research: the case of ChatGPT. *Int J Manag Educ.* 2023;21:100822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100822>.
59. Bangarter A, Roulin N, König CJ. Personnel selection as a signaling game. *J Appl Psychol.* 2012;97:719–38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026078>.
60. Elkhatat AM, Elsaid K, Almeer S. Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *Int J Educ Integr.* 2023;19:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5>.
61. EU Artificial Intelligence Act | Up-to-date developments and analyses of the EU AI Act. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/>
62. From Virtual to Personal: Why Deloitte's Move Back to Face-to-Face Interviews Matters | LinkedIn. [cited 13 Aug 2025]. Available: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/from-virtual-personal-why-deloittes-move-back-matters-darrin-steward-97yve/>
63. Patel RD, Powell DM, Roulin N, Spence JR. Tell me more! Examining the benefits of adding structured probing in asynchronous video interviews. *Int J Sel Assess.* 2025;33:e12514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12514>.
64. Landers RN, Behrend TS. Auditing the AI auditors: a framework for evaluating fairness and bias in high stakes AI predictive models. *Am Psychol.* 2023;78:36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000972>.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.