ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management: A Global Comprehensive Overview of Applications, Human–AI Collaboration, Organizational Outcomes, and Ethical Challenges

Dr. Ceazar Jose H. Leyba
AMA Computer Learning Center, Arellano University, Philippines
Cjleyba555@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
September 18, 2026

Date Accepted:
October 15, 2026

Date Published:
November 14, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.24218185

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping human resource management (HRM) by extending data-driven systems across recruitment and selection, onboarding, learning and development, performance management, employee engagement, workforce planning, and employee services. These applications may improve processing speed, information access, consistency, and analytical capacity. Their organizational value, however, is conditional. AI-enabled HRM can reproduce historical discrimination, weaken employee autonomy, increase surveillance, obscure accountability, and encourage excessive reliance on automated recommendations. This article develops a global integrative overview of AI in HRM using selected peer-reviewed literature published from 2021 through 2026. It is a conceptual and narrative synthesis, not a completed systematic review; accordingly, it does not report PRISMA counts, exhaustive database coverage, or newly calculated effect estimates. The literature is organized around HR functional applications, human–AI collaboration, organizational and employee outcomes, responsible-AI governance, and implementation capabilities. Research on recruitment experiments, algorithmic performance systems, AI capability, and responsible AI indicates that outcomes depend on system design, organizational communication, governance, and the quality of human review. The article proposes a socio-technical framework in which organizational readiness and responsible governance shape the relationship between AI-enabled HR practices and outcomes through decision quality, employee experience, and workforce capability. It concludes that AI should be treated as an augmentation and accountability challenge rather than a technology-acquisition exercise.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, human resource management, human-AI collaboration, algorithmic management, responsible AI, recruitment, employee experience, HR analytics*

INTRODUCTION

Human resource management has traditionally combined administrative coordination with strategic activities concerned with acquiring, developing, motivating, evaluating, and retaining employees. Digital technologies have changed the infrastructure through which these activities are performed. Artificial intelligence adds a further layer by enabling systems to classify information, identify patterns, generate predictions or recommendations, process natural language, and support or automate selected decisions. In HRM, these capabilities are applied to candidate sourcing, résumé analysis, employee queries, learning recommendations, performance information, workforce planning, and people analytics.

Recent scholarship describes AI-HRM as a developing field in which opportunities for organizational efficiency coexist with questions about fairness, transparency, worker dignity, and the changing role of HR

professionals. Vrontis et al. (2022) mapped implications of intelligent automation across HR strategies and activities, while Budhwar et al. (2022) highlighted international HRM challenges and opportunities. More recent reviews have expanded attention to AI capabilities, responsible deployment, and implementation paradoxes (Gong et al., 2025; Naoum et al., 2026).

Bharadwaj (2024) provides a broad overview of AI applications across recruitment, diversity initiatives, assessment, onboarding, training, performance management, engagement, workforce planning, well-being, analytics, and compliance. The present article acknowledges that contribution as a prior general overview. It develops a distinct synthesis by placing human-AI collaboration, employee outcomes, organizational readiness, and responsible governance at the center of analysis. It also distinguishes AI from adjacent concepts such as digitization, HR information systems, conventional analytics, and algorithmic management.

The central argument is that the consequences of AI in HRM are conditional. A tool may improve the speed of shortlisting while reducing applicants perceived opportunity to demonstrate their capabilities; an employee analytics system may provide useful feedback or be interpreted as managerial surveillance; and an AI recommendation may support a decision while anchoring a human decision-maker to an erroneous ranking. The relevant question is therefore not simply whether AI is adopted, but under what conditions it creates reliable, fair, explainable, and human-centered HR outcomes.

Objectives and Guiding Questions

Map principal AI applications across the employee life cycle and core HRM functions.

Examine how AI changes the division of work, authority, and accountability between HR professionals, employees, applicants, and AI systems.

Synthesize potential organizational benefits and employee-related risks associated with AI-enabled HRM.

Propose an integrative conceptual framework and identify priorities for future empirical research.

The guiding questions are: (1) In which HRM functions are AI technologies applied, and what tasks do they support? (2) How does human-AI collaboration influence HR decision-making and employee experience? (3) What organizational, ethical, and employee-related outcomes are associated with AI-enabled HRM? (4) Which governance and organizational capabilities are needed for responsible implementation?

METHODS

This manuscript uses an integrative narrative-review approach to organize and interpret selected peer-reviewed literature published between 2021 and 2026. Sources were identified through targeted discovery of relevant journal articles and reviews and bibliographic verification against publisher pages, journal records, or institutional publication records. The source set includes conceptual articles, systematic and integrative reviews, and empirical studies addressing AI or algorithmic systems in HRM. Bharadwaj (2024) is retained as a cited background overview, not treated as evidence that the present article conducted a systematic search.

This is not a PRISMA-based systematic review or scoping review. No claim is made that all eligible records from Scopus, Web of Science, or other databases have been retrieved, deduplicated, screened by two independent reviewers, or assessed using a formal risk-of-bias tool. No PRISMA flow counts, pooled estimates, meta-analysis, or new empirical findings are reported. The synthesis is interpretive and selective. A journal requiring systematic-review methodology would require a separate reproducible search protocol, database exports, screening records, full-text eligibility decisions, and documented extraction.

For conceptual clarity, studies are interpreted according to the technology they actually examine. AI includes machine-learning, natural-language-processing, computer-vision, generative-AI, and related adaptive or predictive systems. Algorithmic HRM refers more broadly to HR processes in which algorithms

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

collect, rank, monitor, recommend, or make decisions; not every algorithmic system is necessarily AI. HR analytics, digital HR platforms, applicant-tracking systems, and automation are not classified as AI unless the source identifies an AI component.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Conceptual Foundations of AI-Enabled HRM

Defining AI in HRM

AI in HRM refers to computational systems that perform tasks commonly associated with human cognitive activity, such as learning from data, recognizing patterns, interpreting language, generating content, predicting outcomes, or recommending actions, within HR processes. The label covers different technical approaches and levels of autonomy. A résumé parser, a machine-learning model that ranks applicants, a chatbot that answers policy questions, and a generative-AI assistant that drafts job descriptions are not identical technologies and should not be evaluated as if they were.

An important boundary is the distinction between decision support and decision automation. Decision-support systems provide information or recommendations to a human decision-maker. Automated systems execute a decision or process with limited human intervention. Many systems combine both modes. The degree of autonomy, importance of the HR decision, quality of underlying data, and availability of meaningful human review determine associated risks.

AI as a Socio-Technical Capability

AI-HRM should be understood as a socio-technical arrangement rather than a standalone software product. Its operation depends on data quality, model design, system interfaces, organizational routines, managerial incentives, employee understanding, and institutional rules. Chowdhury et al. (2023) frame AI capability in HRM as an organizational capability that requires more than technical access. Organizations must combine data and technology resources with HR expertise, analytical skills, governance, and the capacity to redesign work.

Human–AI collaboration is not simply the presence of a human somewhere in the process. Meaningful collaboration requires that the human participant understands the system's purpose and limits, has access to relevant evidence, can question or override recommendations, and remains accountable for decisions within their authority. Malin et al. (2024) demonstrate why this matters: an AI-based ranking interface can produce status quo bias, directing decision-makers' attention disproportionately toward highly ranked applicants.

Applications of AI Across HRM Functions

Workforce Planning and Talent Forecasting

AI-enabled workforce planning can combine internal workforce data with operational and external information to identify staffing patterns, estimate skill requirements, forecast turnover risks, and support scenario analysis. Predictive models may help HR teams identify roles where vacancies or capability gaps are likely to emerge. Their value depends on whether historical data remain relevant to future conditions and whether predictions are interpreted as uncertain estimates rather than facts. Models trained on past workforce patterns may reproduce previous organizational decisions, including inequitable promotion or retention patterns.

Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment is among the most visible AI-HRM applications. Systems may assist with job-ad drafting, candidate sourcing, résumé classification, applicant matching, assessment scheduling, chatbot communication, and interview support. These applications can reduce administrative workload and help

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

recruiters process large applicant pools. However, automated ranking and assessment can affect who receives attention, how applicants demonstrate competence, and whether candidates perceive the process as fair. Köchling et al. (2023), using a scenario-based study with German employees, found that AI support at later recruitment stages such as telephone and video interviews was associated with lower perceived opportunity to perform and greater emotional creepiness; these responses were linked to organizational attractiveness. Malin et al. (2024) found that decision-makers using AI-based applicant rankings could exhibit status quo bias by focusing more on candidates ranked highly by the system. These studies indicate that recruitment outcomes depend on system design, stage of use, candidate experience, and recruiter behavior.

Onboarding and Employee Services

Conversational agents and generative-AI assistants can answer routine questions about policies, benefits, leave, procedures, and onboarding schedules. They may provide round-the-clock access to standardized information and reduce repetitive queries directed to HR service teams. Limitations include inaccurate or outdated answers, weak handling of sensitive or unusual cases, and the risk that employees disclose personal information without understanding data practices. Organizations should establish clear escalation routes to human HR staff and ensure that employees can distinguish generated responses from authoritative policy.

Learning and Development

AI-enabled learning platforms can recommend courses, identify potential skill gaps, support personalized learning pathways, and help employees locate relevant resources. Generative AI may also support practice exercises, simulations, and individualized explanations. These tools can increase access to learning but may narrow development opportunities if recommendations rely too heavily on existing job profiles or inferred career paths. Learning systems should preserve employee agency, permit exploration beyond predicted needs, and be evaluated for accessibility and quality.

Performance Management and Feedback

AI and algorithmic systems can consolidate performance indicators, summarize feedback, identify patterns, and support performance conversations. They may improve feedback timeliness, but can privilege measurable outputs over less visible contributions such as mentoring, collaboration, emotional labor, or creative problem-solving. Edwards et al. (2024) found that employee interpretations of algorithmic HR systems mattered: perceiving the system as managerial control was associated with extrinsic motivation and greater prioritization of metricized tasks; perceiving it as constructive feedback was associated with intrinsic motivation and lower emotional exhaustion. Organizational communication and perceived intent are consequential parts of implementation.

Employee Engagement, Voice, and Retention

AI-enabled chatbots and sentiment tools may support employee voice by making it easier to submit questions, provide feedback, or access organizational information. Dutta et al. (2023) examine AI-enabled chatbots in relation to employee voice and engagement. Predictive models may identify patterns associated with turnover or disengagement. Yet sentiment analysis can misinterpret language, dialect, cultural expression, humor, or silence. Engagement analytics should be transparent, proportionate, and used to improve working conditions rather than penalize employees for inferred attitudes.

Compensation, Benefits, and HR Administration

AI may assist with compensation benchmarking, payroll anomaly detection, benefits navigation, workforce scheduling, and routine HR administration. These applications can improve consistency and detect unusual patterns, but pay decisions require careful review of job comparability, market data, performance criteria, and potential indirect discrimination. Automated recommendations should not replace transparent compensation policies or established appeal procedures.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

Occupational Well-Being, Safety, and Workforce Analytics

Workforce analytics may help organizations identify workload patterns, absenteeism trends, scheduling pressures, and potential safety risks. In physically demanding or high-risk industries, predictive systems may contribute to hazard identification and resource planning. However, continuous monitoring can intensify surveillance and create pressure to optimize measurable activity at the expense of recovery, autonomy, and well-being. The same data may be used for supportive intervention or punitive control; governance and employee perceptions influence which interpretation prevails.

Human–AI Collaboration and Decision-Making

Human–AI collaboration can take several forms. In an assistive arrangement, AI retrieves or summarizes information while a human makes the decision. In an advisory arrangement, AI generates rankings or recommendations that a human evaluates. In a delegated arrangement, the system executes routine decisions within defined limits, with human review for exceptions. In an autonomous arrangement, the system makes consequential decisions with minimal human intervention. These arrangements differ in their distribution of discretion and accountability.

The central challenge is to avoid both underuse and overreliance. HR professionals may disregard useful recommendations because they distrust the system, lack skills, or perceive threats to professional judgment. Conversely, they may accept recommendations uncritically because of automation bias, workload pressure, interface design, or organizational expectations. Malin et al. (2024) show that the presence of a human decision-maker does not by itself guarantee independent evaluation. Human oversight must be designed into the workflow through access to underlying evidence, adequate time for review, authority to challenge the model, and documentation of overrides.

Human–AI collaboration also requires role clarity. AI developers are responsible for technical design and documentation; vendors for contractual transparency and support; HR leaders for appropriate use and governance; line managers for fair application; and senior leaders for accountability and resource allocation. Employees and applicants should have meaningful information about AI use where it affects them and accessible channels to question or appeal consequential decisions.

Organizational Outcomes and Employee Experience

Potential Organizational Benefits

Potential benefits include faster processing of routine tasks, improved access to information, more consistent application of defined criteria, expanded analytical capacity, and the ability to identify patterns that would be difficult to detect manually. AI may free HR professionals from repetitive work and enable greater attention to workforce strategy, employee development, and organizational change. These benefits are conditional rather than universal; they depend on implementation costs, system accuracy, workflow fit, user capability, and the consequences of errors.

Potential Employee Benefits

Employees may benefit from faster responses to routine queries, more accessible learning resources, personalized development support, and clearer feedback. AI-enabled systems may improve accessibility when designed to accommodate different communication needs and work contexts. However, personalization can become intrusive if it relies on extensive monitoring or opaque profiling. Employee benefit should be assessed through employee-reported outcomes as well as organizational efficiency measures.

Risks and Unintended Consequences

Risks include discrimination, privacy loss, surveillance, reduced autonomy, diminished opportunity to explain individual circumstances, inaccurate predictions, opaque decisions, and deskilling of HR professionals. Algorithmic management may also change the nature of work by intensifying measurement

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

and directing attention toward metrics. Technical performance and social legitimacy are separate questions: a model can be statistically accurate while still being perceived as unfair or inappropriate for a particular decision.

Ethical, Legal, and Governance Challenges

Bias, Fairness, and Inclusion

AI systems learn from data and design choices that reflect social and organizational histories. If historical hiring, performance, or promotion data contain unequal treatment, a model may reproduce those patterns. Bias can also enter through proxy variables, labels, measurement choices, missing data, and the definition of success. Naoum et al. (2026) synthesize the dual potential of AI for diversity, equity, and inclusion: standardization and accessibility may support fairness, while biased data and opaque systems may perpetuate exclusion. Fairness requires pre-deployment testing, subgroup analysis where lawful and appropriate, ongoing monitoring, stakeholder participation, and remediation mechanisms.

Privacy, Data Protection, and Proportionality

HR data are particularly sensitive because they can reveal identity, health, compensation, performance, family circumstances, location, and behavioral patterns. Organizations should collect only data necessary for a specified legitimate purpose, define retention periods, control access, secure data, and explain how information is used. Secondary use of employee data for unrelated profiling or performance decisions should be carefully assessed. Privacy notices should be understandable, and consent should not be treated as a universal solution where employment power relationships limit genuine choice.

Transparency and Explainability

Transparency requires more than announcing that an organization uses AI. Applicants and employees need to understand the role of the system, the categories of data used, the types of outputs produced, the extent of human review, and the channels available to challenge a decision. Explainability should be proportionate to the consequence of the decision. A low-risk administrative chatbot may require different documentation from a model that ranks applicants, evaluates performance, or informs dismissal.

Accountability and Human Oversight

Organizations should identify a responsible owner for every AI-enabled HR use case. Accountability should cover procurement, validation, deployment, monitoring, incident response, and retirement of systems. Human oversight must be substantive: reviewers need relevant competence, access to evidence, sufficient time, and authority to change an outcome. A nominal human sign-off that routinely accepts machine recommendations does not constitute meaningful oversight.

Generative AI-Specific Concerns

Generative AI expands HR use cases to drafting job descriptions, preparing interview questions, summarizing employee feedback, creating learning content, and assisting HR professionals with policy interpretation. It also introduces risks of hallucinated information, fabricated citations, inconsistent advice, exposure of confidential data, and reproduction of stereotypes. Generative outputs should be treated as drafts requiring verification, not as authoritative HR decisions. Organizations should establish approved-use policies, prohibit entry of sensitive data into unapproved services, and train users to verify factual and legal claims.

Proposed Integrative Framework

This article proposes a conditional socio-technical framework for AI-enabled HRM. It contains five connected elements: (1) AI-enabled HR practices; (2) organizational readiness; (3) responsible-AI governance; (4) human–AI collaboration mechanisms; and (5) organizational and employee outcomes. The framework is conceptual and has not been empirically tested in this article.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 11 (November 2026)

Framework element	Core components	Expected role
AI-enabled HR practices	Recruitment, onboarding, learning, performance, engagement, workforce planning, administration	Provides task-level applications and system capabilities.
Organizational readiness	Digital infrastructure, data quality, HR analytics skills, leadership support, change capacity	Enables effective and context-appropriate implementation.
Responsible-AI governance	Fairness testing, privacy, transparency, accountability, audit, appeal and human oversight	Constrains risks and establishes legitimacy.
Human–AI collaboration	Task allocation, decision authority, reviewer competence, contestability, employee participation	Shapes how recommendations are interpreted and acted upon.
Outcomes	Decision quality, process efficiency, employee trust, autonomy, inclusion, learning, well-being and organizational performance	Captures multidimensional and potentially conflicting effects.

The framework proposes that AI-enabled HR practices influence outcomes indirectly through decision quality and employee experience, while organizational readiness and responsible governance moderate these relationships. Human–AI collaboration is a central mechanism: the same technical system may produce different outcomes depending on whether people can understand, question, and appropriately use its outputs. Employee experiences and audit findings should feed back into system redesign, training, and policy revision.

Propositions for Future Empirical Research

P1: Higher organizational AI readiness is positively associated with the effective integration of AI into HRM processes.

P2: The relationship between AI-enabled HRM and decision quality is stronger when AI recommendations are explainable and subject to meaningful human review.

P3: Perceived procedural fairness and transparency mediate the relationship between AI-enabled HR decisions and employee/applicant trust.

P4: Employee perceptions of algorithmic HR systems as developmental feedback are associated with more positive motivational and well-being outcomes than perceptions of the systems as primarily managerial control.

P5: The relationship between AI-enabled recruitment and applicant reactions varies by recruitment stage, the opportunity for applicants to demonstrate their capabilities, and the degree of automated evaluation.

P6: Responsible-AI governance practices moderate the relationship between AI adoption and adverse outcomes such as perceived discrimination, privacy concerns, and loss of autonomy.

P7: Employee participation in system design and evaluation is positively associated with perceived legitimacy and acceptance of AI-enabled HRM.

These propositions are derived from the conceptual synthesis and are hypotheses for future testing, not findings established by the present article.

Implications for HR Practitioners and Organizations

Start with a defined HR problem. Specify the process problem and intended outcome before selecting an AI tool; adoption should not be driven solely by vendor claims or technology trends.

Classify use cases by risk. Routine information retrieval should be distinguished from systems that influence hiring, promotion, pay, performance, discipline, or termination. Higher-impact uses require stronger validation and oversight.

Establish human accountability. Name decision owners, define review authority, document when human judgment is required, and create an accessible appeal route.

Validate systems in context. Test data quality, job relevance, subgroup performance, accessibility, and operational fit. Reassess after changes in workforce composition, job requirements, or system versions.

Invest in HR capability. HR professionals need AI literacy, data interpretation, critical evaluation, privacy awareness, and the ability to question automated recommendations.

Communicate with employees and applicants. Explain where AI is used, what it does, what it does not do, and how people can seek human assistance or challenge an outcome.

Monitor outcomes over time. Track efficiency alongside selection quality, employee trust, fairness, autonomy, well-being, error rates, complaints, and patterns of overrides.

Future Research Agenda

First, longitudinal research is needed to determine whether AI-HRM effects persist after implementation and whether employees adapt to, resist, or reinterpret algorithmic systems over time. Second, comparative research should examine how national employment institutions, privacy regimes, labor-market structures, and organizational cultures shape AI-HRM adoption. Third, more research should examine small and medium-sized organizations, public-sector employers, and industries beyond technology-intensive firms. Fourth, empirical studies should distinguish among AI types and HR functions rather than treating AI-HRM as a single intervention. Fifth, research should evaluate generative AI in real HR workflows, including error patterns, confidentiality, quality assurance, and the distribution of responsibility. Finally, employee and applicant perspectives should be integrated into technical evaluation so that model performance is not treated as a substitute for procedural justice, dignity, and meaningful human agency.

Limitations

This article has several limitations. It is an integrative narrative synthesis based on selected, identifiable literature rather than a completed systematic search. It therefore cannot claim exhaustive coverage of all studies published from 2021 to 2026. Publication dates and online-first dates can differ from issue dates, and the 2026 literature is still emerging. Studies vary in definitions of AI, research designs, populations, HR functions, and outcome measures, limiting direct comparison. Some research concerns algorithmic HR systems or digital analytics rather than AI in a narrow technical sense; this article flags that distinction but cannot resolve every construct-boundary issue. The proposed framework and propositions require empirical testing.

CONCLUSION

AI is changing the tools and decision environments through which organizations manage people. Its applications extend across recruitment, onboarding, learning, performance management, engagement, workforce planning, and HR services. The literature reviewed here suggests that AI can support efficiency, information access, personalization, and analytical decision-making, but these possibilities are accompanied by risks involving bias, privacy, transparency, surveillance, autonomy, and overreliance. The evidence does not support a universal claim that AI makes HRM more objective or more effective. Outcomes depend on data and system design, organizational readiness, employee perceptions, the distribution of decision authority, and the strength of governance.

The central contribution of this article is its integrative emphasis on the conditions under which AI-HRM can create responsible value. Organizations should approach AI as a socio-technical capability requiring human expertise, employee participation, continuous evaluation, and accountable oversight. AI should augment rather than obscure professional responsibility. A human-centered approach is not achieved

by retaining a human name on an approval chain; it requires people to have the knowledge, authority, and practical opportunity to question the system. Future research should test the proposed framework across countries, industries, organizational sizes, and HR functions.

REFERENCES

Bharadwaj, V. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence in human resource management: A comprehensive overview. *Journal of Management*, 11(3), 71–78. https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/JOM/VOLUME_11_ISSUE_3/JOM_11_03_006.pdf

Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M. T. T., & Thevisuthan, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence—Challenges and opportunities for international HRM: A review and research agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1065–1097. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2035161

Chowdhury, S., Dey, P., Joel-Edgar, S., Bhattacharya, S., Rodriguez-Espindola, O., Abadie, A., & Truong, L. (2023). Unlocking the value of artificial intelligence in human resource management through AI capability framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), Article 100899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100899

Chowdhury, S., Joel-Edgar, S., Dey, P. K., Bhattacharya, S., & Kharlamov, A. (2023). Embedding transparency in artificial intelligence machine learning models: Managerial implications on predicting and explaining employee turnover. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(14), 2732–2764. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2066981

Dutta, D., Mishra, S. K., & Tyagi, D. (2023). Augmented employee voice and employee engagement using artificial intelligence-enabled chatbots: A field study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(12), 2451–2480. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2085525

Edwards, M. R., Zubielevitch, E., Okimoto, T., Parker, S., & Anseel, F. (2024). Managerial control or feedback provision: How perceptions of algorithmic HR systems shape employee motivation, behavior, and well-being. *Human Resource Management*, 63(4), 691–710. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22218

Einola, K., & Khoreva, V. (2023). Best friend or broken tool? Exploring the co-existence of humans and artificial intelligence in the workplace ecosystem. *Human Resource Management*, 62(1), 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22147

Figueroa-Armijos, M., Clark, B. B., & da Motta Veiga, S. P. (2022). Ethical perceptions of AI in hiring and organizational trust: The role of performance expectancy and social influence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 186(1), 179–197. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05166-2

Gong, Q., Fan, D., & Bartram, T. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence and human resource management: A review and future research agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 103–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2440065

Heidemann, A., Hülter, S. M., & Tekieli, M. (2024). Machine learning with real-world HR data: Mitigating the trade-off between predictive performance and transparency. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(14), 2343–2366. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2335515

Jaiswal, A., Arun, C. J., & Varma, A. (2022). Rebooting employees: Upskilling for artificial intelligence in multinational corporations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1179–1208. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1891114

Jatobá, M. N., Ferreira, J. J., Fernandes, P. O., & Teixeira, J. P. (2023). Intelligent human resources for the adoption of artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 36(7), 1099–1124. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-03-2022-0075

Kaushal, N., Kaurav, R. P. S., Sivathanu, B., & Kaushik, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence and HRM: Identifying future research agenda using systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. *Management Review Quarterly*, 73(2), 455–493. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00249-2

Köchling, A., Wehner, M. C., & Warkocz, J. (2023). Can I show my skills? Affective responses to artificial intelligence in the recruitment process. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17, 2109–2138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00514-4

Kong, H., Yuan, Y., Baruch, Y., Bu, N., Jiang, X., & Wang, K. (2021). Influences of artificial intelligence (AI) awareness on career competency and job burnout. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 717–734. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2020-0789

Malin, C. D., Fleiß, J., Seeber, I., Kubicek, B., Kupfer, C., & Thalmann, S. (2024). The application of AI in digital HRM—An experiment on human decision-making in personnel selection. *Business Process Management Journal*, 30(8), 284–312. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-11-2023-0884

Naoum, R. F., Szakadáti, T., & Balogh, G. (2026). Artificial intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM): A systematic review of its dual impact on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). *Management Review Quarterly*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00580-y

Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Pereira, V., Tarba, S., Makrides, A., & Trichina, E. (2022). Artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies and human resource management: A systematic review. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1237–1266. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1871398