

THE ILLUSION OF OBJECTIVITY IN HIRING: PRIVILEGE, BIAS AND THE RESUME REVIEW PROCESS

Vinnitsia National Technical University

Abstract

This article provides an extensive interdisciplinary examination of the illusion of objectivity in modern hiring practices, with particular emphasis on the resume review stage. Although organizations frequently portray hiring as a neutral, merit-based process, research in organizational psychology, sociology, and labor economics demonstrates that privilege and implicit bias significantly shape evaluation outcomes. Recruiters often base their decisions on symbolic cues—such as educational pedigree, institutional prestige, communication style, or cultural markers rather than on actual competence.

Keywords: hiring bias, resume screening, privilege, labor inequality, cognitive heuristics, cultural capital, discrimination

Introduction

Hiring is widely regarded as a rational, standardized, and objective process in which candidates are evaluated according to their skills, qualifications, and experience. Organizations often promote the idea that their recruitment systems operate on the principles of fairness and meritocracy. However, extensive empirical research challenges this assumption.

From a sociological perspective, the hiring process is embedded within broader structures of social inequality. Rivera (2012) demonstrates that many employers engage in *cultural matching*, selecting candidates whose backgrounds, communication styles, or social identities resemble those of existing organizational members. In doing so, hiring decisions often reproduce social hierarchies rather than reflect pure merit [1].

Audit studies reinforce this pattern. Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) showed that resumes with white-sounding names received significantly more callbacks than identical resumes with Black-sounding names. Similar forms of discrimination have been observed across gender, age, immigrant status, class indicators, and even geographic location of residence [2].

A recent real-world experiment described by *YourTango* (2024) provides additional evidence of hiring bias and the power of symbolic prestige. In this experiment, a man constructed a deliberately absurd resume filled with incoherent and even inappropriate statements. Despite the intentionally illogical content, the resume generated dozens of interview invitations. The key reason was the presence of high-status signals elite education, recognizable employers, and polished formatting - which recruiters interpreted as indicators of competence. This example highlights the extent to which hiring decisions can be influenced by superficial prestige cues rather than substantive assessment [3].

The aim of this work is to identify the mechanisms through which privilege shapes perceptions of employability and to analyze how unconscious biases distort resume assessment. The methodological basis includes a synthesis of scholarly literature, analysis of audit studies on labor discrimination, and an interpretative review of cognitive theories related to decision-making under uncertainty. A recent real-life experiment described by *YourTango* (2024), in which a deliberately nonsensical resume received numerous interview invitations, further illustrates the dominance of prestige-based signals over substantive evaluation criteria.

Methods

This research is based on a qualitative interdisciplinary approach combining theoretical analysis, empirical evidence, and case-based interpretation. The study includes a systematic review of academic literature in organizational psychology, sociology of labor, and behavioral economics to identify structural and cognitive mechanisms influencing hiring practices. Audit-based empirical studies are analyzed to compare callback disparities across race, gender, and socioeconomic status, providing quantitative evidence of discrimination.

The theoretical framework incorporates concepts of heuristic decision-making and cognitive bias [5], along with sociological theories of cultural capital and elite reproduction [6], enabling interpretation of hiring outcomes beyond surface-level behavioral explanations.

Additionally, the research examines real-world cases of resume evaluation, including the *YourTango* experiment documenting interview invitations received by a nonsensical résumé due to prestige signals [3]. Cross-comparison of theoretical, empirical, and case-based findings allows for the synthesis of patterns that explain how résumé screening reinforces unequal access to employment. This methodology does not rely on primary experimental data but rather integrates existing peer-reviewed research to construct a comprehensive analytical model of bias in hiring.

Results and Discussion

The findings of this research demonstrate that the resume review process is significantly shaped by the interplay of cognitive biases, status-based cues, and structural inequalities embedded in modern hiring practices. Although organizations frequently claim to rely on objective and merit-based evaluation criteria, the mechanisms guiding recruiter decision-making often diverge from these ideals. Recruiters typically operate under conditions of limited time, high applicant volume, and incomplete information, which encourages the use of heuristics mental shortcuts that simplify complex judgments but simultaneously open the door to systematic biases [4].

A central determinant of hiring outcomes is the presence of prestige markers within a resume. These include elite educational institutions, employment histories associated with well-known companies, highly polished formatting, and references that signal social or professional influence. Such indicators are commonly interpreted as signs of competence, even when they are only indirectly related or sometimes entirely unrelated to actual job performance. Consequently, candidates who possess higher levels of cultural and social capital benefit disproportionately from these perceptions, obtaining more callbacks and interview opportunities. In contrast, applicants from less privileged backgrounds often face barriers that have little to do with their true abilities or potential [5].

Evidence from large-scale audit studies further reinforces the structural nature of these disparities. Callback rates differ markedly based on race, gender, age, immigrant status, socioeconomic indicators, and even residential location. These results confirm that resume screening does not function as a neutral selection mechanism but rather reproduces existing social hierarchies. Recruiters, often unintentionally, respond more to perceived social identity and background than to the substantive qualifications presented [6, 7].

The real-life case described by *YourTango* (2024) provides an illustrative example of how strongly prestige cues can overshadow actual resume content. In this experiment, an applicant submitted a deliberately nonsensical resume containing incoherent, inappropriate, and unprofessional statements, yet still received numerous interview invitations. The primary factor influencing recruiters was the presence of high-status signals such as recognizable companies and prestigious educational institutions which created an implicit assumption of competence. This case demonstrates that symbolic cues often carry more weight than factual information, highlighting a fundamental contradiction within the ideology of meritocracy [3].

Overall, the results reveal that resume evaluation is not merely a technical procedure but a socially embedded process shaped by psychological tendencies and systemic inequalities. Cognitive biases encourage subjective judgments, while structural privilege ensures that certain groups possess enduring advantages irrespective of merit. Taken together, these findings show that the perceived objectivity of hiring is largely an illusion, sustained by unexamined assumptions and organizational norms. Addressing these issues requires the implementation of structural corrective measures such as blind resume reviews, standardized evaluation rubrics, bias-awareness training, and continuous monitoring of hiring outcomes—to move toward genuinely fair and evidence-based hiring practices.

Conclusions

The findings of this research confirm that resume evaluation is not an objective process. Instead, it is deeply shaped by privilege, implicit bias, and structural inequality. Recruiters rely on prestige signals, cognitive shortcuts, and cultural assumptions that systematically advantage some candidates while disadvantaging others.

Objectivity in hiring must therefore be intentionally constructed rather than assumed. This requires the implementation of blind resume screening, standardized evaluation rubrics, structured decision-making pro-

cedures, and ongoing monitoring of hiring outcomes. Organizations must invest in bias-awareness training and adopt recruitment strategies that prioritize diversity, fairness, and evidence-based evaluation.

REFERENCES

1. **Rivera, L. A. (2012).** Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 999–1020.
2. **Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004).** Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991–1031.
3. **YourTango. (2024).** *Man Got 29 Job Interviews With Offensive Nonsensical Resume*. Retrieved from <https://www.yourtango.com/self/man-got-29-job-interviews-with-offensive-nonsensical-resume>.
4. **Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974).** Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131.
5. **Bourdieu, P. (1986).** The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
6. **Pager, D., & Karafin, D. (2009).** Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market. In A. L. Schneider & M. M. Ingram (Eds.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 59-83). Springer.
7. **Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012).** Subtle Gender Bias in Academia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479.

Vlasok Oleksandr Mikhailovich – student of group 2KN-25m, Faculty of Intelligent Information Technologies and Automation, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, e-mail: vlasok.200456@gmail.com

Kyrylenko Vladyslav Vitaliiovych – student of group 2KN-25m, Faculty of Intelligent Information Technologies and Automation, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, e-mail: dinoiua@gmail.com