

A BNK KAM PRACTICE LIBRARY

One Hundred Recruitment Prompts

From job advert to a decision you can defend

100 fill-in prompts · Recruitment Safeguards Framework · 2026 edition

BNK KAM

That was the opening of the book plus ten complete prompts. The other ninety are your evidence.

You saw the cover, the full table of contents, the colophon, the foreword and the first ten prompts, each complete. The complete library gives you everything:

- ✓ 100 fill-in prompts across 8 categories, each with the Framework built into the prompt
- ✓ The complete Recruitment Safeguards Framework, with five figures
- ✓ Checklists, worksheets, case studies and a glossary
- ✓ 76 sources, each retrieved, read and independently re-checked

The reason to buy is not the price, it is your evidential position. If a rejected candidate presents facts that could suggest discrimination, the burden of proof shifts to you, and then only what you recorded in advance counts. Not one prompt in this book asks the model for a ranking, a score or a judgement about a person. The writing goes faster, the decision stays yours.

Buy the complete library

€ 59,99

Download directly at:

www.bnkkam.com/products/honderd-prompts-voor-recruitment

Contents

2. Colophon	5
Sources and IP accountability.....	5
Disclaimer.....	5
Copyright	6
3. Foreword	6
4. Management summary and how this library works	8
4.1 Three clocks, and why only one of them has been moved	8
4.2 What this library is, and what it emphatically is not	9
4.3 The structure: eight categories, one hundred prompts	9
4.4 The anatomy of a prompt in this library.....	10
4.5 The hard rule: no prompt asks the model for a judgement about a person.....	11
4.6 The five pillars of the Recruitment Safeguards Framework.....	12
4.7 How to use the library in five steps	13
5. Reading guide and the golden rules	14
5.1 Reading guide	14
5.2 The golden rules of responsible AI use in recruitment.....	14
6. Why this is on your desk now	17
6.1 The date everybody quotes is no longer correct	17
6.2 What does already apply, and has done for eighteen months.....	19
6.3 The GDPR has applied for eight years, and affects your daily work harder than the AI Act.....	20
6.4 What does not apply, and why that is news too	21
6.5 The clock that does keep ticking: pay transparency.....	22
6.6 Employee participation comes sooner than enforcement.....	23
6.7 And meanwhile your team is already using it	24
7. Context, what the law demands and what the science knows	26
7.1 The system at a glance, four layers	27
7.2 The decisive distinction, writing aid or selection system	28
7.3 Equal treatment, direct, indirect, and the burden of proof that reverses	30
7.4 What the opinions teach us	32
7.5 Data protection, the decision, the score and the human being.....	33

7.6 What the science knows about bias in models.....	35
7.7 What the science knows about selecting.....	38
7.8 What the science knows about making things up	40
7.9 And what does AI do to the candidate	41
8. The position of BNK KAM	43
8.1 AI is a tool for the form of an application, never for the judgement about a person...	43
8.2 A postponement is the worst moment to relax	44
8.3 Transparency is not an obligation but your best insurance.....	45
8.4 If you give the candidate five pages and yourself twenty-six, a complaint should come as no surprise	46
8.5 A ban produces shadow use, a framework produces visibility.....	47
8.6 The real work sits before the first prompt.....	48
8.7 What we expressly do not claim.....	49
9. The practice library	50
The placeholders	50
Why not one prompt asks for a judgement	51
The Framework block	51
The safeguard note and how heavy it is	51
9.1 Role profiles and job adverts	51
9.2 CV and candidate screening with bias safeguards	74
9.3 Interview questions and interview preparation.....	97
9.4 Candidate communication	120
9.5 Employer branding and recruitment campaigns.....	136
9.6 Assessment, evaluation and the substantiation of decisions	152
9.7 Non-discrimination and bias checks.....	167
9.8 GDPR, DPIA and human oversight.....	182
10. Decision frameworks	201
10.1 Framework 1: may AI touch this recruitment task?	201
10.2 Framework 2: from prompt output to a decision you can defend	203
10.3 Framework 3: who decides, who carries out, who checks, who signs	204
10.4 Framework 4: procuring a recruitment or matching system.....	206
10.5 Framework 5: the voluntary bias audit.....	207
11. Practice and cases.....	209

11.1 The vacancy where the aim was sound and the means was not.....	210
11.2 The language requirement at a language institute	210
11.3 The criterion from 2002 that was never recalibrated	211
11.4 The CVs that ended up on a public AI website	212
11.5 The client’s discriminatory request	213
11.6 The score everyone went along with	214
12. Checklists and worksheets.....	215
12.1 Input check: may this piece of text go into this tool?.....	216
12.2 Job advert check in two minutes	217
12.3 Release check before a decision goes out	219
12.4 Worksheet: is this tool a selection system?	220
13. Frequently asked questions	221
14. Pitfalls and misconceptions	225
15. Glossary.....	228
16. Sources and accountability	235
16.1 How we made this book	235
16.2 What we deliberately did not do.....	236
16.3 How to check this book yourself	237
16.4 Shelf life.....	238
16.5 Full source list.....	238
17. About BNK KAM and how we help.....	246
18. Image plan and list of figures	247
18.1 The five figures	247
18.2 Accountability for the imagery	248

2. Colophon

Title One Hundred Recruitment Prompts, from job advert to a decision you can defend

Subtitle A practice library with one hundred fill-in prompts and a safeguards framework, for recruiters, HR managers and recruitment agencies in the Netherlands

Publisher BNK KAM

Authors The knowledge desk of BNK KAM

Edition First edition

Position as at 16 August 2026

Language English. This work also appears in a Dutch edition.

Sources and IP accountability

This book works with real, verifiable sources. Every factual statement refers, by means of a source number in square brackets, to the source list at the back, and every source there is provided with a publisher, a year and a place where it can be found. Statutory texts have been consulted in their consolidated form together with the validity rule, so that you can check which version has been used. Where a figure could not be traced back to a primary source, it is not in this book, not even when it is doing the rounds in the trade press.

Fact and opinion are strictly separated. What the law, a regulator, a court or a researcher says appears in the running text with a source reference. What BNK KAM makes of that appears under the labelled heading **BNK KAM position** and is supported by the same sources.

The one hundred prompts have been written fresh for this publication and are generic in design. They contain no components from BNK KAM's own production environment, no internal instructions and no build descriptions of our automations. Authorship rests with the knowledge desk of BNK KAM as a whole. The names of individual staff, researchers or advisers are not used in this book as an argument from authority.

Disclaimer

This book is not legal advice and is no substitute for a lawyer, an employment lawyer or a data protection officer, the internal supervisor of the handling of personal data. It describes the state of the law as at 16 August 2026 and sets out practical working methods. Your situation may differ because of your sector, your collective labour agreement, your size, your country of establishment or the precise set-up of your systems.

The state of the law in this area is moving, and on two files it is moving visibly. The first is the Dutch implementation of the European pay transparency directive: the bill was introduced on 21 May 2026 and, as at 16 August 2026, has not been adopted [S23], while the directive

itself requires employers with 150 to 249 employees to report for the first time by 7 June 2027 at the latest [S8]. The second is private member's bill 36908 amending the Arbeidsomstandighedenwet, the Dutch Working Conditions Act, in connection with countering labour market discrimination, introduced on 3 March 2026 and, as at 16 August 2026, pending [S22]. Both may change status after this book appears. Before a decision with consequences, always check the current text and the current status.

Copyright

© 2026 BNK KAM. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in an automated data file or made public, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

The purchaser of this copy may use the prompts within their own organisation, adapt them to their own roles and incorporate them into their own working instructions. Resale, republication, inclusion in a commercial training offering or distribution outside the purchaser's own organisation does not fall within that permission. Quotation with acknowledgement of the source is permitted.

Statutory texts, parliamentary papers (Kamerstukken) and official publications that are cited are public sources. The ordering, the interpretation, the safeguards framework and the one hundred prompts are not.

3. Foreword

It is quarter past eight in the evening. You have fourteen open vacancies, three hiring managers who wanted to hear something from you today, and a folder of applications that was already too full at nine o'clock this morning. You open a chat window, paste in a CV and type: summarise this against this role. Within twenty seconds you have a tidy paragraph. And while you read it, a small, nagging feeling comes over you. Was this actually allowed.

That feeling is justified, and it is no reason to stop. It is a reason to know what you are doing.

This book exists because the conversation about AI in recruitment and selection in the Netherlands is conducted in two ways, and neither way helps you. The first is the sales pitch: it goes faster, it is more objective, it takes work off your hands. The second is fear selling: a date is coming, and on that date everything changes, so buy a course now. We do neither. This book does not make you afraid. It makes you precise.

That precision begins with a reversal. The date the whole market quotes has been moved. The high-risk obligations of the AI Act for recruitment and selection did not take effect on 2 August 2026. Regulation (EU) 2026/1744, the Digital Omnibus on AI, entered into force on 27 July 2026 and moves the application of those obligations for systems under Annex III to 2

December 2027 [S6][S9]. Recruitment and selection appears in Annex III, point 4 [S1] and falls under that date. Anyone still reading today that they must comply with the high-risk requirements from August 2026 is reading outdated information.

And yet that is not the reassuring news it is taken for. Because postponement is not cancellation, and the postponement does not touch nearly everything. The General Data Protection Regulation has applied since 25 May 2018 and it has never been moved [S7]. The prohibition on AI that infers emotions in the workplace has applied since 2 February 2025, with no transitional period [S2], and the Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (the Dutch Data Protection Authority) counts application procedures as falling under it [S30]. The duty to ensure that your people know what they are doing with AI has likewise applied since 2 February 2025, albeit since 27 July 2026 in a weakened formulation [S6]. And the transparency obligation which requires that a person knows they are speaking to an AI system has applied since 2 August 2026 [S10]. Anyone sitting and waiting for December 2027 may already be in breach today.

There is a third reason why this book looks the way it does, and it is not legal but geometric. A language model predicts what is probable on the basis of what it was trained on, and therefore reproduces the average of the past. That average is precisely the pattern that a fair recruitment procedure is supposed to break. That is no ill will on the part of the technology, because technology wants nothing. It is a property of the method, and it is measurable. Research into CV screening with language models found a significant preference for names associated with white candidates in 85.1 per cent of the tests, and CVs with the names of black men were disadvantaged in up to 100 per cent of the comparisons [S48]. The Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens warns in addition that bias may look small at each step and still add up across the chain to something significant, and that it is difficult to trace afterwards [S30].

That is why no prompt in this book asks the model for a judgement about a person. No ranking, no mark, no score, no suitability advice. What it does ask for: a job advert that is accurate, a summary against criteria you have recorded yourself, a question you are going to put yourself, a rubric with which you form your own judgement, a rejection that a person can read without feeling like a number. The work goes faster, and the decision remains yours.

What you have in your hands, then, is not a compliance manual and not a little book of inspiration. It is a toolbox. One hundred prompts, arranged in eight categories that follow the recruitment procedure from intake to file, written in the language of your profession. Every prompt has the boundary built in, in the prompt itself and not in a footnote behind it. And every prompt states what you check before you use the result.

You do not have to read this book from front to back. You may open it at the prompt you need this evening. Do read section 5.2 first, though, because that is where you will find the answer to the question with which this foreword began.

The knowledge desk of BNK KAM

reality a description of the person who left. Anyone who carries that through to the screening, the interview and the decision screens, speaks and decides impeccably against the wrong yardstick. That is why the intake meeting with the hiring manager and the criteria set in advance come first in this library, and not the job advert itself.

What goes wrong in this part of the funnel is, moreover, measurable. Age is the fastest rising ground at the equal treatment body: the number of reports about age rose by 77 per cent in 2025 to 175 reports, and the number of requests for an opinion by 31 per cent to 42 [S35]. The wordings identified as problematic are precisely the sentences that appear in thousands of job adverts: a hard limit such as “maximum 35 years of age”, and indirect signals such as asking for “students” or for “people starting out on the labour market” [S35]. With 74 of the 139 opinions in 2025, employment is by far the largest field in which the body issues opinions [S36].

The boundary that weighs heaviest here is the prohibition of discrimination in the offering of a post. Both the Algemene wet gelijke behandeling (AWGB, the Dutch Equal Treatment Act) and the Wet gelijke behandeling op grond van leeftijd bij de arbeid (WGBL, the Dutch Equal Treatment in Employment (Age Discrimination) Act) expressly prohibit discrimination in “the offering of a post and the treatment in the filling of a vacant post” [S11][S12]. A job advert is therefore not a marketing message with a legal edge to it, it is the act itself. On top of that, instructing another party to discriminate falls under the same prohibition, which means that a client who asks an agency to filter is independently liable [S11].

A second boundary runs through this entire category: a language model that helps you formulate produces the average of what it has read. That average is precisely the pattern a fair procedure is supposed to break. Every prompt below therefore first forces out your own context, and delivers you a structured question or a checklist instead of a judgement. Not one prompt in this category asks the model to assess, score or rank a human being. That remains your work, with your signature underneath.

9.1.1 The intake meeting with the hiring manager: the questionnaire that brings the real profile to the surface.

Purpose. You get a discussion guide with which you bring the real work, the real result and the real preconditions of a role to the surface in a single intake meeting, instead of a wish list.

When to use it. Before you hold the intake meeting, so before a single line of profile or job advert exists.

The prompt.

Role: You are an experienced recruiter preparing an intake meeting with a manager who will be directing this role personally.

Framework: You write questions only, no profile and no conclusion. This assignment contains no candidate data, no CVs and no names. Questions about or referring to age, origin, sex, health, pregnancy, religion, family situation or the "type of person who fits" are not permitted, not even if the manager asks for them. Where such a wish is to be expected, you instead formulate a question about the underlying work interest.

Context: This role is [job title] at [brief description of the employer, sector and size]. The reason for the vacancy is [reason: departure, growth, new contract, temporary replacement]. The team consists of [number and type of roles]. During the previous recruitment for this or a comparable role, this went wrong: [what went wrong]. If one of these details is missing, first ask your questions about it and only write afterwards. Do not fill anything in with a plausible average from your training data.

Task: Put twenty to twenty-five questions, spread over five blocks: (1) what result must be delivered twelve months from now, (2) what does this person do on an ordinary working day, (3) who does he work with and where does that get stuck, (4) which preconditions are hard and why, (5) what made the previous occupancy of this role successful or difficult. Give one follow-up question for each question in case the answer stays general.

Format: A numbered list per block. Three lines per question: the question, why you are asking it, and how you can tell that the answer is usable.

Check: Only use the list once every question is traceable to work that is actually done, and no question is about who someone is instead of what he does.

How to fill it in. - [job title]: work planner, non-residential construction. - [brief description of the employer, sector and size]: installation company, forty employees, working area Zuid-Holland. - [reason: departure, growth, new contract, temporary replacement]: departure of the only work planner, with a notice period of two months. - [number and type of roles]: three project managers, two estimators, one draughtsman. - [what went wrong]: the previous hire left within seven months because in practice the role turned out to be mainly procurement.

Safeguard note. The intake meeting is the place where personal characteristics enter the procedure, usually unintentionally and in polite words: "someone young who will stay a long time", "someone who fits the team". As soon as such a wish becomes a requirement, it touches the offering of a post, and there the prohibition of discrimination applies in full [S11][S12]. Instructing another party to discriminate falls under the same prohibition, so as a client you cannot hide behind an agency that carries out the filter [S11]. Before you use this prompt, check that there are no candidate data in the window. In December 2025 the Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (the Dutch Data Protection Authority) expressly warned about data breaches caused by the unauthorised use of free chatbots [S34].

9.1.2 From wish list to job requirements: the distinction between must-have and nice-to-have, with the reason attached.

Purpose. You turn the raw harvest of the intake meeting into two separate lists, in which every must-have carries a reason you can say out loud.

When to use it. Immediately after the intake meeting, before you adopt the profile and before anyone starts writing.

The prompt.

Role: You are a critical reviewer who converts a raw wish list into a defensible role profile.

Framework: You assess requirements, not people. You add no requirement that is not on the list supplied. A requirement may only become a must-have if the reasoning supplied carries it; if that reasoning is missing, you place the requirement in the column "reason missing" and you ask for it. Personal characteristics such as age, origin, sex, health and family situation are never a requirement.

Context: Role: [job title]. Raw wish list from the intake meeting: [paste the full list here, unsorted]. What this person must deliver in the first year: [result]. What the organisation can teach or facilitate itself: [what we train ourselves]. Statutory or contractual obligations that genuinely apply: [for example a mandatory certification, with the source]. If the wish list or the result is missing, ask for it first.

Task: Sort every wish into one of three categories: must-have, nice-to-have, or drop. For every must-have, state in one sentence why the work cannot be done without that requirement. For every requirement you drop, name the alternative: train, facilitate, organise differently, or place it jointly with a colleague.

Format: Three tables with the columns requirement, reasoning, how you will test this later, and whether a less excluding alternative exists.

Check: Only publish or use the profile once you can explain every must-have in one sentence to someone who was rejected because he lacked that requirement.

How to fill it in. - [job title]: customer service team leader. - [paste the full list here, unsorted]: the literal notes from the intake meeting, including the wishes you already have doubts about yourself. - [result]: bringing down the average waiting time and getting the roster to work independently. - [what we train ourselves]: our own ticketing system, the product knowledge and the reporting tool. - [for example a mandatory

certification, with the source]: none, or: VCA-VOL, made mandatory in the contract with the client.

Safeguard note. The separation between must-have and nice-to-have is not bureaucracy, it is your defence. Where a requirement is apparently neutral but affects a protected group in particular, the prohibition does not apply if the discrimination is objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means are appropriate and necessary [S11]. Direct discrimination on the grounds of the Algemene wet gelijke behandeling does not have that open test, there only closed statutory exceptions exist [S11]. With age it is different: there, direct discrimination too can be objectively justified, which is exactly what makes it tempting and risky to “just add some reasoning” to an age requirement [S12]. Record the reasoning at the moment you adopt the requirement, not afterwards.

9.1.3 The requirement check: which requirement in this profile actually measures something, and which is habit.

Purpose. You expose, requirement by requirement, whether it measures something that has to do with the role, or whether it has travelled along from an old job advert.

When to use it. Once the draft profile is on the table, and compulsory whenever you reuse an existing job advert.

The prompt.

Role: You are an auditor of job requirements. You look only at the requirements, never at people.

Framework: You express no judgement about candidates and you write no selection rule. For each requirement you establish: what does this requirement actually measure, how is it tested in the procedure, and which group does it exclude that would in fact be able to do the work. Where a requirement is a categorical exclusion, you name it as such and you ask whether individual assessment with any adjustments is possible.

Context: Profile: [paste the draft profile or the existing job advert]. These requirements come from [origin: intake meeting, previous vacancy, job architecture, collective labour agreement, client]. The work actually consists of [three to five core tasks]. The workplace and working conditions are [description]. If the origin of the requirements or the description of the work is missing, ask for it first and write no further.

Task: Go through the requirements one by one. Mark each requirement as: (a) measurable and role-related, (b) plausible but not testable as formulated, (c) habit with no traceable origin, (d) categorical exclusion. For (b), propose a testable reformulation. For (c), put the question the hiring manager must answer before the requirement stays in. For (d), describe which individual assessment or adjustment is conceivable.

Format: Table with requirement, category, explanation in one sentence, and the proposed follow-up action.

Check: Leave no requirement in the text that falls into category (c) and for which the question has remained unanswered.

How to fill it in. - [paste the draft profile or the existing job advert]: the full text, including the standard sentences at the bottom. - [origin: intake meeting, previous vacancy, job architecture, collective labour agreement, client]: taken over from the 2022 vacancy, origin unknown. - [three to five core tasks]: drawing up quotations, directing suppliers, monitoring additional work. - [description]: office with two days working from home, occasional visits to construction sites.

Safeguard note. A requirement that excludes an entire group in advance rarely holds up. In 2026 the equal treatment body ruled that an absolute contra-indication without individual assessment and without any weighing of effective adjustments is not acceptable, and that held even where evident safety interests were at stake [S29]. That is the standard against which you hold your own requirements: is the interest current and substantiated, and is it established in advance that no adjustment whatsoever is possible. If you cannot answer those two questions per candidate, the requirement is a categorical exclusion and it does not belong in your profile. When reusing an old text, also check the requirements you have never noticed, because those are precisely the ones that travel along unseen.

9.1.4 The level of education held up to the light: is this a real requirement or a filter.

Purpose. You establish whether the level of education required is a necessary condition, or an easy filter that costs you candidates without measuring anything.

When to use it. Before the level of education is recorded in the job advert and in the screening criteria.

The prompt.

Role: You are an analyst examining one single requirement: the level of education required.

Framework: You assess the requirement, not the people who meet it or do not. You do not assume that a diploma automatically proves a competence. You treat foreign qualifications and non-linear careers as equivalent. You set no lower limit, you put the question back to the recruiter.

Context: Role: [job title]. Level required now: [level and discipline]. Reason given by the hiring manager: [literal reason]. What the post holder must actually be able to do: [three concrete tasks with the level of

thinking or craft required]. Statutory or contractual requirement regarding the diploma: [yes, with the source, or no]. Availability on the labour market: [what you know about it, or: unknown]. If the reason or the tasks are missing, ask for them first.

Task: Answer four questions. (1) Does the requirement follow directly from a statutory or contractual obligation. (2) Which underlying skill is the diploma assumed to prove. (3) In what other ways can that same skill be demonstrated, for example with work experience, a work sample test, a certificate or a portfolio. (4) Which wording in the job advert indicates the level as a direction without excluding people without that diploma in advance.

Format: Four short answers, followed by two ready-to-use wordings for the job advert: one with a hard requirement and one with an equivalence clause, with the consequence for the intake for each variant.

Check: Only choose the hard requirement once answer (1) is affirmative, or once you can defend answers (2) and (3) in writing to someone who was rejected on the diploma.

How to fill it in. - [job title]: finance officer. - [level and discipline]: hbo business economics. - [literal reason]: “we want someone who can think along at a tactical level”. - [three concrete tasks with the level of thinking or craft required]: running the monthly close independently, spotting and explaining variances, dealing with the accountant. - [yes, with the source, or no]: no. - [what you know about it, or: unknown]: three earlier placements ran aground on too few responses.

Safeguard note. An education requirement is almost never direct discrimination, but it is a classic source of indirect discrimination: an apparently neutral criterion that affects a protected group in particular. Such a requirement is only permitted if it is objectively justified by a legitimate aim, with means that are appropriate and necessary [S11]. In 2025 the equal treatment body showed how that works with a language requirement: an apparently functional requirement led to indirect discrimination because people who do not have Dutch as their mother tongue were particularly affected [S26]. The same reasoning applies to diploma requirements for holders of a foreign qualification. Record the reasoning at the moment you choose the requirement, because the burden of proof is reversed as soon as someone puts forward facts that give rise to a presumption of discrimination [S11].

9.1.5 The years of experience held up to the light, and why a number is rarely a competence.

Purpose. You replace a number, “at least five years of experience”, with the experience you actually mean, and you see which age signal was hidden in that number.

When to use it. For every vacancy in which a number of years of experience is asked for, and compulsory for every upper limit.

The prompt.

Role: You are an analyst dissecting one requirement: the number of years of experience required.

Framework: You assess no people. You assume that a number of years does not measure a skill but a period that has passed. An upper limit on experience or on age, and words that refer to it indirectly, you always mark as a risk, even when they are meant as atmosphere.

Context: Role: [job title]. Asked for now: [the literal number and the wording]. Intention according to the hiring manager: [literal reason]. Situations the post holder must be able to handle independently: [two to four concrete situations]. What we induct and supervise ourselves: [induction period and supervision]. If the intention is missing or the situations are missing, ask for them first.

Task: (1) Translate the number into the situations someone must have experienced, regardless of how many years that took. (2) Name which words in the current wording refer directly or indirectly to age, such as an upper or lower limit, "starter", "student", "recent graduate", "digital native", "young and energetic team". (3) Write a wording that describes the experience instead of counting it. (4) If the organisation still wants an age-related limit, state which reasoning is needed for it and which statement in the text becomes compulsory.

Format: Four blocks, with a literal list of the marked words at (2) and a rewritten paragraph of no more than sixty words at (3).

Check: Publish nothing containing an age limit unless the ground for it is stated in the text itself and unless the reasoning is recorded in writing.

How to fill it in. - [job title]: infrastructure project manager. - [the literal number and the wording]: "at least 5 years of experience, preferably a starter in the infrastructure sector". - [literal reason]: "someone who no longer needs their hand held". - [two to four concrete situations]: bringing a delayed project back on schedule, conducting a discussion about additional work with a client. - [induction period and supervision]: three months shadowing a senior colleague.

Safeguard note. This is the sharpest boundary in this whole category. Where discrimination on the ground of age is applied in a public offering of a post, the ground for it must be expressly stated in the offer [S12]. That statement does not make the discrimination permitted, it comes on top of it: the justification must hold up in addition [S12]. How strict that is, is shown by the opinion on a maximum age limit of thirty. The aim, bringing in the perspective of a younger generation, was considered legitimate and the

means appropriate, but it foundered on necessity: a hard age limit was not needed to achieve that aim, because there were less onerous alternatives such as removing the limit and adjusting the experience requirement [S25]. Watch out for the back road via salary as well. In the annual figures for 2025 a complainant is quoted who was rejected because he “would be too expensive, and therefore also too old” [S35].

9.1.6 From job requirement to observable behaviour, the basis for the later interview.

Purpose. You translate abstract requirements such as “strong communicator” into behaviour you can observe in an interview or work sample test, so that the later judgement rests on observation and not on impression.

When to use it. Once the profile has been adopted and before you produce the job advert and the interview questions.

The prompt.

Role: You are a designer of assessment criteria for a structured selection procedure.

Framework: You translate requirements into observable behaviour. You assign no points, marks, weightings or rankings, and you make no statement about candidates. You describe only what someone does or says, not who he is and not how he comes across. Personality traits and impressions such as “enthusiastic” or “fits with us” are not a criterion.

Context: Role: [job title]. Adopted requirements: [the definitive must-have list]. The work takes place in [description of the working environment and the collaboration]. Examples of work in this role that went well and that went badly: [two short practical examples from your own organisation]. If the requirements or the practical examples are missing, ask for them first.

Task: Translate every requirement into two to four behavioural indicators that can become visible in an interview or work sample test. Formulate every indicator as an action in the past tense, so that a real example can be asked for. For each requirement, also give one indicator that demonstrably does not work as evidence, with the reason.

Format: For each requirement a block with the requirement, the indicators, the source the evidence can come from (interview, work sample test, reference), and the counter-indicator.

Check: Only include an indicator once two colleagues would independently record the same observation for the same answer.

How to fill it in. - [job title]: service engineer, climate technology. - [the definitive must-have list]: the adopted list from prompt 9.1.2, taken over word for word. - [description of the working environment and the collaboration]: alone on site at customers, telephone consultation with the work planner. - [two short practical examples from your own organisation]: a fault that was resolved on the third attempt, and a customer complaint that arose from unclear feedback.

Safeguard note. This prompt is the hinge between the profile and everything that comes after it. Recording observable behaviour before you see candidates is the only way to prevent the criterion from bending itself towards the candidate afterwards. The Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens points out that bias accumulates throughout the recruitment and selection chain, where the distortion per phase may be small and the effect across the chain considerable nonetheless [S30]. Two hard boundaries: never let the model produce a score, a ranking or a suitability judgement about a person, and allow no indicators that in fact concern appearance, accent, health or private circumstances. Inferring emotions with AI in the workplace is prohibited, and the Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens counts recruitment procedures as falling under that [S2][S30].

9.1.7 Writing the job advert on the basis of the adopted profile.

Purpose. You get a complete job advert that contains nothing that is not in the adopted profile, and that contains the statements a candidate needs in order to decide whether to apply.

When to use it. Only once the profile has been adopted and the requirements have been checked, so after 9.1.2 up to and including 9.1.6.

The prompt.

Role: You are a specialist editor who writes job adverts for this employer, in the employer's own voice.

Framework: You write solely on the basis of the profile supplied and the facts supplied. You invent no term of employment, no cultural promise, no growth figure and no atmosphere. What you do not know, you mark as [MISSING] instead of filling it in plausibly. No requirement or wording refers to age, origin, sex, health, religion, family situation or mother tongue. The text is gender-neutral in job title and form of address.

Context: Employer: [name, sector, size, place]. Role: [job title]. Adopted profile: [paste the definitive must-have and nice-to-have list]. Brand voice in three words: [brand voice in three words]. What actually sets this employer apart: [two verifiable facts]. Terms of employment: [type of contract, hours, starting pay or range, secondary conditions]. Procedure: [how to apply, response period, closing date, which selection steps follow]. If one of these blocks is missing, first ask your questions and

only write afterwards.

Task: Write a job advert of four hundred to six hundred words with these parts: what the candidate is going to do, how he will know that it has worked, what we ask (must-have and nice-to-have separated and identified as such), what we offer including the pay, how the procedure runs and within what period he will get a response.

Format: Plain text with subheadings, no list of more than six points in a row. Close with a list of all [MISSING] markers.

Check: Only publish once the list of [MISSING] markers is empty and once every sentence about the employer can be confirmed by a colleague.

How to fill it in. - [name, sector, size, place]: a construction firm, sixty employees, Alphen aan den Rijn. - [job title]: estimator, residential construction. - [paste the definitive must-have and nice-to-have list]: the outcome of 9.1.2, unchanged. - [brand voice in three words]: down to earth, concrete, warm. - [two verifiable facts]: ninety per cent of the projects within fifty kilometres, and a fixed crew with an average of eight years of service. - [type of contract, hours, starting pay or range, secondary conditions]: one-year contract with the prospect of a permanent one, 36 hours, range 3,800 to 4,600 euros gross per month. - [how to apply, response period, closing date, which selection steps follow]: by email, response within ten working days, closing in three weeks, two interviews and a practical assignment.

Safeguard note. In law a job advert is the offering of a post, and there the prohibition of discrimination applies directly [S11][S12]. In addition to that prohibition, self-regulation sets requirements for the content. The NVP Sollicitatiecode 2025 (the Dutch recruitment code of conduct) [S69] prescribes that an organisation states at least how to apply, the response period, the closing date and any additional selection procedures such as psychological testing, assessment, medical examination or background screening, and that the terms of employment including starting salary or salary scale are named. The European Pay Transparency Directive also obliges employers to ensure that vacancies are gender-neutral and that recruitment procedures are conducted in a non-discriminatory manner [S8]. Finally, watch out for the tendency of every language model to fill in missing facts plausibly. An invented secondary term of employment in a job advert is not a stylistic error, it is a promise that brings a candidate to your door.

9.1.8 The opening paragraph that says what the candidate is going to do instead of who we are.

Purpose. You get three opening paragraphs that start with the work and with the reader, instead of with the history and the size of the organisation.

When to use it. Once the job advert stands, as a separate improvement step on the first hundred words.

The prompt.

Role: You are an editor who rewrites only the first paragraph of a job advert.

Framework: You work with the facts from the text supplied and you add nothing. No superlatives, no exclamation marks, no promises about atmosphere, ambition or growth that are not in the facts supplied. No words that refer to age, sex, origin or health, not even as atmosphere. You do not write about the employer except where that helps the reader understand what he himself is going to do.

Context: Full draft vacancy: [paste the text]. Role: [job title]. The first task this person picks up in week one: [concrete task]. The problem this role solves for the organisation: [problem in one sentence]. Brand voice in three words: [brand voice in three words]. The channel where the reader sees this text: [channel]. If the first task or the problem is missing, ask for it first.

Task: Write three variants of no more than eighty words. Variant A starts with the first task, variant B with the problem that is being solved, variant C with a concrete working day. For each variant, explain in one sentence which reader you are addressing with it and which reader you are missing with it.

Format: Three numbered paragraphs, each followed by that one sentence of explanation. Below that a list of all the facts you have used from the source text, so that every assertion can be traced.

Check: Only choose a variant once every factual assertion in it can be found word for word in the source text.

How to fill it in. - [paste the text]: the full draft vacancy, including the salary section. - [job title]: accounts receivable administrator. - [concrete task]: going through the outstanding items older than sixty days and calling the customers about them. - [problem in one sentence]: invoices stay outstanding too long because nobody chases them up systematically. - [brand voice in three words]: direct, friendly, businesslike. - [channel]: our own careers page.

Safeguard note. An opening paragraph feels like style, but it falls under the same rules as the rest of the text, because it too forms part of the offering of a post [S11][S12]. Two risks are concrete here. The first is the atmosphere word that carries an age signal: the equal treatment body expressly identifies wordings such as asking for “people starting out on the labour market” as problematic, and words like those land precisely in opening paragraphs [S35]. The second is the invented assertion. A language model supplements a thin source

text with what sounds statistically plausible, and that is exactly what you do not want here. So ask for the traceability list and go through it before you choose.

9.1.9 The language check on the job advert: which words unintentionally exclude.

Purpose. You get a word-by-word check of your text for wordings that exclude a group, with an alternative for each finding that preserves the functional intention.

When to use it. Just before publication, and again on every reuse of an existing text.

The prompt.

Role: You are a language reviewer checking a job advert for excluding wordings.

Framework: You assess text only, never people. You remove nothing yourself and you do not rewrite the text as a whole. For each finding you supply: the literal quotation, which group it affects, whether it is a direct or an indirect reference, and one alternative that expresses the same functional intention. Where you have doubts, you report the doubt instead of writing it away.

Context: Text: [paste the full job advert, including the heading, the salary section and the closing sentence]. Role: [job title]. The functional intention behind the requirements: [short summary of the adopted profile]. Particularities of the workplace that may justify requirements: [for example: working at height, working alone in the evening]. If the profile is missing, ask for it first, because without the intention you cannot propose an alternative.

Task: Check six categories: (1) age, including indirect signals such as "starter", "student", "recent graduate", "young team", "digital native" and upper or lower limits on experience; (2) sex, including job titles and forms of address; (3) origin, nationality and language, in particular requirements such as "native speaker"; (4) health and disability, including requirements as to physical capacity and appearance; (5) family situation, availability and pregnancy; (6) religion and belief. At the end, give a separate list of wordings that look neutral but in practice affect a group in particular.

Format: Table with quotation, category, direct or indirect, alternative, and a column "doubt" for findings you cannot establish firmly.

Check: Only publish once every finding has been dealt with or has been deliberately rejected with a written reason under your own name.

How to fill it in. - [paste the full job advert, including the heading, the salary section and the closing sentence]: the text as it would be posted, so including the standard closing. - [job title]: customer service officer. - [short summary of the adopted profile]: customer contact by telephone and in writing in Dutch, rostered shifts until 8 p.m. - [for example: working at height, working alone in the evening]: no particularities, or: lifting up to 25 kilos.

Safeguard note. This check touches the core of the risk in this category. A requirement that looks neutral may amount to indirect discrimination: the equal treatment body ruled that a language requirement of the “native speaker” type is an apparently neutral criterion by which people of non-Dutch origin who do not have Dutch as their mother tongue are particularly affected [S26]. With age, the duty to state the ground also applies: if you discriminate on the ground of age in a public offer, the ground for it must be expressly stated in the text, and that statement still does not make the discrimination lawful [S12]. Do not forget that discrimination can also be a criminal matter: article 429quater of the Wetboek van Strafrecht (the Dutch Criminal Code) provides for detention of up to two months or a third-category fine, since 1 January 2026 eleven thousand euros, whereby the grounds in the first paragraph do not include age [S14]. The model supplies signals, you take the decision.

9.1.10 The readability check: does someone outside your organisation understand this text.

Purpose. You discover which words in your job advert only have meaning within your own walls, and which sentences make a reader drop out before he reaches the requirements.

When to use it. After the language check and before publication, and always for roles for which you are looking for career changers.

The prompt.

Role: You are a reader from outside this organisation who is seeing this job advert for the first time.

Framework: You assess comprehensibility, not the person who wrote the text and not the people who will respond. You do not replace a technical term that the role genuinely requires, you only mark what is incomprehensible without prior knowledge. You do not lower the language level at the expense of the precision of the requirements.

Context: Text: [paste the full job advert]. The reader you want to reach: [description of the target group, including educational background and whether he comes from the sector]. Technical terms that genuinely belong to the work: [list]. Internal terms only we use: [list, or: unknown]. If the description of the target group is missing, ask for it first.

Task: (1) Mark every word and every abbreviation that a reader from outside cannot place, and split those into two groups: technical term that stays, and internal term that must be explained or deleted. (2) Mark sentences of more than twenty-five words and sentences with more than one subordinate clause. (3) State at which point in the text a reader is likely to drop out, and why. (4) For each marking, give a rewrite that keeps the same content.

Format: Numbered findings with quotation, category and rewrite. Close with the three most important interventions, in order of effect on comprehensibility.

Check: Put the rewritten text to one colleague outside the department. Only publish once that colleague can retell the role in his own words.

How to fill it in. - [paste the full job advert]: the text after the language check of 9.1.9. - [description of the target group, including educational background and whether he comes from the sector]: mbo-4 electrical engineering, possibly a career changer from the installation trade. - [list]: return pipe, differential pressure controller, handover file. - [list, or: unknown]: PVA list, blue folder, fortnightly stand-up.

Safeguard note. Readability is not a statutory duty, and you should not create that impression. It is, however, a reduction of risk on a boundary that is. A text that can only be understood with prior knowledge from your own sector works as a filter that you have recorded nowhere and cannot defend, and that is the form in which indirect discrimination arises [S11]. Bear language and origin in mind here as well: with a language requirement, the equal treatment body showed how quickly a wording intended as functional affects a group in particular [S26]. Two practical boundaries with this prompt. Do not let the model attach a language level or a readability score to people, and do not let the substantive requirements become diluted, because a vague requirement leads later to a judgement based on feeling.

9.1.11 The salary section: what you state, how you substantiate the range and what you do not ask.

Purpose. You get a salary paragraph that names a starting pay or range, that is substantiated with your own explainable criteria, and that does not ask about the candidate's salary history.

When to use it. When drawing up the job advert, and again before you make an offer.

The prompt.

Role: You are a reward adviser writing one section of a job advert: the salary section.

That was the opening of the book plus ten complete prompts. The other ninety are your evidence.

You saw the cover, the full table of contents, the colophon, the foreword and the first ten prompts, each complete. The complete library gives you everything:

- ✓ 100 fill-in prompts across 8 categories, each with the Framework built into the prompt
- ✓ The complete Recruitment Safeguards Framework, with five figures
- ✓ Checklists, worksheets, case studies and a glossary
- ✓ 76 sources, each retrieved, read and independently re-checked

The reason to buy is not the price, it is your evidential position. If a rejected candidate presents facts that could suggest discrimination, the burden of proof shifts to you, and then only what you recorded in advance counts. Not one prompt in this book asks the model for a ranking, a score or a judgement about a person. The writing goes faster, the decision stays yours.

Buy the complete library

€ 59,99

Download directly at:

www.bnkkam.com/products/honderd-prompts-voor-recruitment