JOHOR BUSINESS SCHOOL (JBS) NEXUS
e-ISSN: 3083-9130

Vol. 2 No. 2 (2025) 107-116
https://publisher.uthm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/jbsnexus

JBS Nexus

Human-Centered AI and Digital Technologies in HR: Empowering Employees and Redesigning Work

Abd Rahman Ahmad[1]*, Hairul Rizad Md Sapry[2], Alaa S Jameel[3]

[1] *Johor Business School,*
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400 Batu Pahat, Johor, MALAYSIA
[2] *Universiti Kuala Lumpur (UNIKL) Kampus Cawangan Malaysian Institute of Industrial Technology, Jalan Persiaran Sinaran Ilmu, Bandar Seri Alam, 81750 Masai, Johor, MALAYSIA*
[3] *Department of Business Administration,*
Al- Idrisi University College, Ramadi, Al-Anbar, IRAQ

*Corresponding Author: arahman@uthm.edu.my
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30880/jbsnexus.2025.02.02.010

Article Info

Received: 13 August 2025
Accepted: 26 November 2025
Available online: 15 December 2025

Keywords

Artificial intelligence, human-centred design, human resource management, employee empowerment, algorithmic fairness

Abstract

Human resource (HR) practices are undergoing a fundamental transformation due to the swift adoption of digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI). AI presents previously unheard-of opportunities to enhance productivity and tailor experiences throughout the employee lifecycle, from hiring and training to performance management and real-time feedback. However, there are also significant concerns regarding employee autonomy, equity, and welfare that arise from this change. This paper examines how AI is being increasingly incorporated into HR tasks, highlighting both the advantages and disadvantages of this approach. Based on theories of human-computer interaction, business ethics, and organisational behaviour, we investigate how algorithmic decision-making affects psychological safety, autonomy, and trust. Case studies from leading companies, such as those from Microsoft and Atlassian, provide empirical evidence of how AI can be applied to HR procedures to supplement human judgment rather than replace it. This paper advocates a human-centred AI model for human resources that prioritises ethical design, participatory development, transparency, and human oversight. The paper concludes with a research agenda and useful suggestions to ensure that the use of AI in HR advances corporate objectives and enhances employee empowerment.

1. Introduction

The adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) into human resource management (HRM) has emerged as a revolutionary influence, altering the methods by which organisations attract, develop, and oversee talent. AI is being utilised to automate monotonous HR tasks, analyse extensive employee data, and provide personalised experiences across the employee lifecycle (Jiang & Bai, 2025; SHRM, 2024). Intelligent recruiting systems utilise natural language processing to screen resumes, while AI-driven learning platforms customise content to meet individual requirements, hence enhancing efficiency, consistency, and scalability (Huang & Rust, 2021; Lee et al., 2021).

Recent global studies indicate that more than 60% of organisations are implementing AI in at least one HR function, with this figure anticipated to increase significantly (OECD, 2025). As adoption escalates, academics and professionals are increasingly expressing apprehension regarding the unforeseen ramifications of AI implementation. Although algorithms can optimise procedures, they may simultaneously limit human judgement, perpetuate existing prejudices, and undermine employee trust (Belhadi et al., 2023; Milne, 2024). The secrecy of numerous AI systems, frequently referred to as "black boxes," undermines conventional concepts of fairness, accountability, and procedural justice in the workplace (Riedl, 2022; Vassallo & Petropoulos, 2024). The influence of AI on employee autonomy is a very contested issue. As AI systems increasingly influence performance assessments, dictate work schedules, or suggest promotions, concerns emerge regarding the management of people by unseen, rigid systems rather than compassionate leaders (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2023). Studies based on self-determination theory indicate that a perceived loss of control can markedly diminish intrinsic motivation and engagement (Ryan & Deci, 2020; McAnally & Hagger, 2024).

Simultaneously, organisations are implementing AI for real-time surveillance and behavioural analysis, often under the pretext of improving efficiency or safety. Although these methods are technologically viable, they may engender a chilling impact on workplace interactions and foster cultures of monitoring (Choudhury et al., 2021; Glikson & Woolley, 2020). The ethical quandary intensifies when these techniques are deployed without adequate transparency or the consent of employees. However, recent data indicate that AI, when developed with ethical safeguards and collaborative participation, can enhance human talents rather than undermining them. Companies like Microsoft and Atlassian have initiated trials of AI-driven HR platforms that emphasise transparency, human supervision, and employee empowerment (DeRose, 2025; Bradford, 2024). These instances underscore a transition towards human-centred AI, wherein digital tools assist rather than replace managerial and staff decision-making.

This article examines how organisations may effectively and ethically design and implement AI technology in human resources. We examine how a hybrid model of AI-human collaboration might enhance justice, autonomy, and trust in the workplace by integrating insights from organisational behaviour, corporate ethics, and human-computer interaction. We present a paradigm for human-centred AI in HRM through conceptual synthesis and practical case analysis, identifying essential areas for future research and application.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Rise of AI in Human Resource Management

The incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) into human resource management (HRM) has progressed from experimentation to a fundamental aspect of contemporary organisational personnel management. This advancement signifies the extensive digital transformation of employment and the rising necessity for data-centric, flexible, and customised HR solutions (Minbaeva, 2021). The progression of HR technology has transitioned from the first electronic HRM (e-HRM) platforms, which emphasised digital recordkeeping and administrative automation, to modern systems enhanced by machine learning, predictive analytics, and natural language processing (Strohmeier & Scherer, 2020). These intelligent technologies now impact practically every sector of human resources, including recruitment, employee development, performance evaluation, and organisational design.

One of the initial and most prominent implementations of AI in human resources has occurred in the domain of talent acquisition. AI-driven technologies currently automate the screening of resumes, align candidate profiles with job requirements, and do video interview analyses utilising sentiment and speech recognition (van Esch et al., 2021). These solutions have significantly reduced hiring cycle durations and improved candidate quality by enabling recruiters to focus on strategic assessment rather than administrative tasks (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2019). Margherita (2021) conducted a meta-analysis on HR technology adoption and discovered that organisations employing AI in recruitment achieved a 30–40% decrease in time-to-hire relative to those utilising conventional approaches.

In addition to recruitment, AI has advanced in the realm of learning and development (L&D). Adaptive learning platforms now tailor training modules to individual learning styles and knowledge deficiencies, resulting in more successful upskilling outcomes (Tursunbayeva et al., 2020). Real-time feedback instruments, along with performance metrics, enable managers to provide development suggestions and micro-coaching with enhanced accuracy (Meijerink et al., 2021). In multinational corporations such as Unilever and Vodafone, AI-driven learning and development systems have improved employee satisfaction and enhanced skill retention rates (Kaushik & Guleria, 2021).

A burgeoning application of AI is in internal mobility and talent analytics. Human Resource systems are progressively utilising artificial intelligence to identify flight risk, forecast leadership potential, and delineate career trajectories within the organisation (Collings et al., 2021). These qualities are especially beneficial in extensive, intricate organisations where conventional succession planning is challenging to implement on a wide scale. Artificial intelligence can assist diversity, equality, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives by identifying biases in promotion or remuneration data (van den Broek et al., 2021). This potential depends on ethical design and continuous monitoring of algorithmic behaviour. The significance of AI in employee engagement is increasingly gaining prominence. Organisations currently apply AI to assess employee sentiment by utilising natural language

Johor Business School (JBS) Nexus Vol. 2 No. 2 (2025) p. 107-116

processing on survey responses, emails, and internal communications (Lepak et al., 2021). This study facilitates preventive measures against disengagement and fosters more adaptive organisational environments. These advancements have transformed the HR paradigm from reactive policy enforcement to a proactive, data-driven people strategy (Angrave et al., 2016).

The epidemic expedited the adoption of AI in workforce planning and remote work administration. Organisations employed AI to enhance work schedules, evaluate productivity measures, and dynamically distribute resources in response to swiftly evolving demands (Jarrahi et al., 2021). These advancements illustrated AI's significance in optimising HR operations while also bolstering organisational resilience and agility. Nonetheless, the rapidity and magnitude of AI integration in HR have prompted significant enquiries around governance, employee rights, and enduring organisational effects. Certain scholars contend that organisations can be "digitally leaping" without comprehending the associated risks, such as inadvertent bias, lack of transparency, and data security issues (Newell & Marabelli, 2015). As AI advances, HR leaders must reconcile technological efficiency with human-centric principles, ensuring that the quest for innovation does not compromise justice, transparency, and trust.

2.2 Benefits of AI-Enabled HR Practices

The integration of artificial intelligence in human resources has been largely driven by its capacity to enhance efficiency, precision, and strategic decision-making throughout an employee's lifetime. In contrast to conventional HR systems that rely on manual procedures and human judgment, AI-driven platforms automate repetitive tasks, deliver real-time insights, and adapt to the specific needs of individual employees. These qualities enable HR departments to operate as both administrative hubs and strategic partners aligned with the company's overarching objectives. A primary advantage of AI in human resources is enhanced operational efficiency. Automated tools facilitate labour-intensive activities such as resume screening, interview scheduling, and documentation management (Strohmeier & Scherer, 2020; van Esch et al., 2021). These functions, formerly susceptible to human bias or delays, are now performed with efficiency and uniformity. Van Esch et al. (2021) demonstrated that AI algorithms can reduce time-to-hire by up to 40% while maintaining applicant quality, enabling HR experts to focus on more strategic responsibilities, such as culture development and stakeholder engagement.

In addition to recruitment, AI has greatly improved teaching and learning systems. Adaptive learning platforms utilise user behaviour data to tailor learning experiences, allowing employees to develop skills at their own speed and according to their own knowledge deficiencies (Tursunbayeva et al., 2020; Kaushik & Guleria, 2021). This tailored methodology enhances training completion rates and augments knowledge retention. In major corporations such as Unilever and Vodafone, these methods have led to a quantifiable improvement in employee productivity and engagement (Kaushik & Guleria, 2021). AI additionally facilitates data-driven performance management. Instruments that evaluate behavioural data, communication trends, and project results provide more objective evaluations than conventional annual reviews (Meijerink et al., 2021). These real-time feedback systems promote ongoing enhancement and mitigate bias in assessment by applying uniform, data-driven measures. Moreover, predictive analytics facilitates the identification of high-potential individuals and enhances succession planning, so connecting talent management with strategic forecasts (Collings et al., 2021).

A significant advantage of AI in HR is the enhancement of employee experience (EX). Sentiment analysis technologies analyse employee input from surveys, chat logs, and emails to identify unhappiness, engagement patterns, or early signs of burnout (Lepak et al., 2021). This enables HR teams to execute interventions proactively, rather than reactively addressing turnover or complaints. Consequently, organisations are shifting from transactional HR approaches to more sympathetic, personalised, and responsive models (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2019). Artificial intelligence significantly contributes to enhancing diversity and inclusion initiatives. When adequately audited and trained, AI systems can identify patterns of bias in recruitment, advancement, and compensation equity, enabling HR teams to formulate corrective plans (van den Broek et al., 2021). The efficacy of these interventions is significantly contingent upon the quality of the training data and the transparency of the employed AI models (Newell & Marabelli, 2015).

AI strategically enables HR leaders to significantly impact business change. Predictive models can anticipate future labour requirements, enhance headcount planning, and model the impacts of organisational change (Margherita, 2021). This foresight amplifies HR's function in company continuity and competitiveness, particularly in swiftly evolving contexts like the COVID-19 pandemic (Jarrahi et al., 2021). The advantages of AI in human resources are diverse, encompassing operational, developmental, and strategic areas. When executed judiciously, these technologies allow organisations to synchronise personnel management with agility, inclusiveness, and sustainable value generation. However, as the subsequent sections will examine, these advantages must be evaluated against ethical and psychological factors, particularly in scenarios involving the automation of decisions that significantly impact human lives.

2.3 Algorithmic Management and the Autonomy–Control Tension

As organisations progressively integrate AI into decision-making processes, the dynamics of administrative control and employee autonomy are being fundamentally altered. Algorithmic management, characterised by the assignment of supervisory roles to automated systems, has become a prominent aspect of modern workplaces, particularly in efficiency- and scalability-oriented contexts (Kellogg et al., 2020). Although AI systems provide reliable and data-driven assessments, they may reduce work to mere quantifiable outputs, thereby compromising the social and motivational dimensions of employment (Meijerink et al., 2021). A significant concern in this area is the possible diminishment of employee autonomy. Conventional management control permitted context-specific discretion, discussion, and reciprocal adjustment between employees and supervisors. Conversely, algorithmic systems typically establish control via stringent criteria and predictive models, with less scope for negotiation (Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2023). Employees frequently characterise these systems as rigid, impersonal, and lacking transparency, especially when utilised for job allocation or shift scheduling without prior consultation (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

The influence of algorithmic control on motivation and engagement can be analysed within the framework of self-determination theory (SDT), which asserts that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are fundamental psychological demands for intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Research indicates that employees perceive a diminished sense of competence and empowerment when subjected to algorithmic systems, particularly when the reasoning behind judgments is ambiguous (McAnally & Hagger, 2024). This phenomenon is especially apparent on gig platforms, where automated evaluations, task assignments, and even dismissals frequently occur without human involvement (Jarrahi et al., 2021; Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). Surveillance exacerbates the contradiction between autonomy and control. As AI-driven monitoring tools, such as keystroke trackers, facial recognition cameras, and productivity dashboards, become more prevalent, employees face heightened real-time surveillance (van den Broek et al., 2021). Employers contend that these technologies enhance performance and facilitate early issue detection; however, employees frequently perceive them as intrusive and indicative of distrust. Glikson and Woolley (2020) observe that perceived surveillance markedly diminishes trust in

Furthermore, algorithmic control does not eradicate subjectivity; it merely redistributes it. Biases may be ingrained in algorithmic decision-making via training data or design choices, thereby intensifying inequity while masquerading as objectivity (Newell & Marabelli, 2015). In the absence of open governance processes, employees possess few avenues for recourse or appeal, thereby constraining their feeling of agency (Riedl, 2022). Not all studies present a consistently adverse perspective. When executed with openness and collaborative design, algorithmic management can enhance justice by diminishing inconsistencies in human judgment (Gürerk et al., 2021). In large organisations where bias in performance evaluations is common, algorithmic tools that undergo frequent audits and incorporate employee feedback can promote equal outcomes and improve managerial efficiency (Leicht-Deobald et al., 2019). Nonetheless, these results are contingent upon the systems being constructed with human control, transparency, and avenues for redress.

The challenge ultimately resides not in the explicit rejection of algorithmic administration, but in its configuration to preserve human dignity, autonomy, and equity. An increasing number of studies advocate for a transition from "algorithmic control" to "algorithmic enablement," wherein AI assists rather than replaces human judgment (Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2023; Kellogg et al., 2020). This transition necessitates both technological design modifications and a reevaluation of the managerial principles that dictate the implementation and legitimisation of these technologies within organisations.

2.4 Fairness, Bias, and Discrimination in AI Systems

Although artificial intelligence has the capacity to enhance consistency and scalability in human resources procedures, increasing evidence indicates that AI systems may unintentionally perpetuate bias and discrimination. In human resource management, these risks are especially pronounced due to the critical importance of recruiting, evaluating, promoting, and compensating employees. AI models trained on historical data that embody previous disparities or social biases frequently reproduce and exacerbate these distortions (Binns, 2020; Kim, 2021). Hiring algorithms have faced criticism for exhibiting discrimination based on race, gender, or age, which is often attributed to biased training data or proxy variables that correlate with protected attributes (Raghavan et al., 2020). A notable instance involved a recruitment tool that inadvertently discriminated against submissions with terminology linked to women's universities or careers in female-dominated fields (Cowgill et al., 2021). These challenges pose significant enquiries regarding the application of machine learning in scenarios where fairness is both a normative ideal and a legal obligation.

The concept of fairness in algorithmic decision-making is complex and contentious. Researchers differentiate between various definitions, including demographic parity (equivalent outcomes among groups), equal opportunity (identical true positive rates), and calibration (probabilistic correctness across groups) (Corbett-Davies & Goel, 2018). Implementing these measurements frequently necessitates trade-offs, and optimising for one form of justice may deteriorate performance in another. In Human Resource Management, the

Johor Business School (JBS) Nexus Vol. 2 No. 2 (2025) p. 107-116

implementation of these measures is a significant problem due to the multi-dimensional and context-sensitive nature of decision-making (Holstein et al., 2019).

A significant issue is the opacity of AI systems, often referred to as the "black box" problem. Numerous predictive models, particularly those utilising deep learning, exhibit a deficiency in interpretability, complicating the ability of HR professionals to comprehend or elucidate the rationale behind specific decisions (Lipton, 2018). The absence of openness compromises accountability and limits employees' capacity to challenge choices, especially in performance management and disciplinary procedures (Wachter et al., 2017).

Regulatory frameworks are beginning to address these issues. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the European Union includes provisions for the "right to explanation," which requires that individuals affected by automated decision-making receive clear and understandable information regarding the underlying reasoning (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2021). Comparable dialogues are arising in the United States, particularly in municipalities such as New York City, which have enacted laws mandating audits of computerised hiring decision algorithms for bias (Barocas et al., 2023). Nonetheless, self-regulation and internal audits continue to be the principal methods via which organisations mitigate AI bias currently. Accountable companies are initiating the formation of AI ethics committees, conducting fairness assessments, and incorporating diverse stakeholder viewpoints into system development (Binns et al., 2018). These methods are prevalent in technological organisations; however, their use is expanding in areas such as finance, retail, and healthcare, where algorithmic systems increasingly influence employment practices.

An expanding corpus of studies highlights the significance of explainable AI (XAI) in mitigating bias and ensuring justice in human resource management (Miller, 2019; Gilpin et al., 2018). Explainability refers to a system's ability to articulate the rationale behind its decisions in a manner comprehensible to non-technical users. XAI technologies in HR assist hiring managers in validating AI-generated suggestions and enable candidates or employees to contest unfavourable decisions, thereby enhancing procedural justice.

Ultimately, fairness should be recognised as both a technological and sociopolitical issue. Even meticulously constructed processes can yield inequitable outcomes when implemented in circumstances deficient in inclusion, openness, or trust. Consequently, addressing bias in AI necessitates both algorithmic adjustments and cultural as well as structural reforms within human resources departments (Selbst et al., 2019). This involves reconceptualising fairness not merely as a singular statistical attribute, but as a multifaceted construct integrated within wider ethical and organisational principles.

2.5 Trust, Transparency, and Human–AI Collaboration

The integration of AI technologies into human resource management systems highlights the crucial importance of trust and transparency in shaping their impact. Trust is a fundamental element in the implementation and efficient utilisation of AI inside organisational contexts, especially in processes that directly impact persons, such as recruitment, assessment, and dismissal (Glikson & Woolley, 2020). Insufficient trust in AI systems may lead employees and managers to dismiss their advice, view them as dangers, or feel increased fear and resistance (De Visser et al., 2020). Trust in AI is influenced by multiple interconnected elements, such as system efficacy, predictability, equity, and transparency. In the context of human resources, this suggests that employees and decision-makers are more likely to trust AI systems that demonstrate consistency, accuracy, and the ability to clearly explain their outputs (Wang et al., 2020). Studies indicate that exposure to opaque algorithms making critical decisions without transparency leads to a decline in trust, even if the system operates effectively (Shin, 2021).

Transparency is crucial for cultivating trust and accountability. In artificial intelligence systems, transparency involves revealing the rationale, constraints, data origins, and any hazards linked to algorithmic decision-making (Binns et al., 2018). In Human Resource Management, transparency involves notifying employees of the timing and methodology used for AI tools in personnel decisions. Nonetheless, attaining substantial transparency is challenging, particularly for intricate models such as deep neural networks, which lack inherent interpretability (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017). The domain of explainable AI (XAI) has gained significance in addressing this challenge. XAI seeks to provide models and interfaces that enable non-experts to comprehend the rationale behind an AI system's specific outcomes. In recruiting, an XAI system may elucidate the rationale for a candidate's shortlisting grounded in particular abilities, experiences, or assessment results rather than presenting a binary decision devoid of context (Guidotti et al., 2019). This degree of transparency enhances user trust and facilitates adherence to evolving legal and ethical norms.

The partnership between humans and AI in human resources transcends simply technical design; it is fundamentally a socio-organisational concern. Research indicates that individuals are more inclined to accept AI conclusions when they participate in the process, when the AI system enhances rather than supplants human judgement, and when they maintain the capacity to challenge or overturn decisions (Shrestha et al., 2021). The notion of human-in-the-loop design is increasingly regarded as crucial in high-stakes scenarios, including hiring, promotions, and performance evaluations (Ananny & Crawford, 2018).

Significantly, excessive trust in AI can be as perilous as insufficient trust in it. Automation bias, the tendency for individuals to rely on machine outputs despite their inaccuracies, can lead to suboptimal decision-making and ethical lapses (Logg et al., 2019). Consequently, establishing calibrated trust that corresponds with the AI's genuine capabilities and constraints is essential (Schlicker et al., 2021). Organisations seeking to promote reliable AI in human resources must transcend mere technical solutions. Establishing trust necessitates leadership dedication to responsible AI governance, employee education, participatory system design, and institutional accountability frameworks (Zhou et al., 2021). Organisations such as IBM and Deloitte have established AI ethical committees and transparency dashboards to oversee and document the processes of algorithmic decision-making and assessment (DeRose, 2025).

Here, trust and transparency are fundamental components of safe AI use in human resource management. Successful human–AI collaboration requires the development of technologies that empower rather than displace individuals and supervisors, alongside the integration of transparency, empathy, communication, and accountability.

3. Toward a Human-Centred AI Paradigm in HR

The incorporation of AI in human resource management has predominantly adhered to a technology-centric approach, emphasising automation, efficiency, and scalability. This trajectory has elicited an increasing demand for realigning AI implementation with human values, needs, and well-being, advocating for a human-centred AI (HCAI) framework in human resources. Human-centred AI prioritises systems that are ethical, transparent, user-friendly, and conducive to human autonomy, competence, and dignity (Shneiderman, 2020; Dignum, 2019). In Human Resource Management, a human-centred paradigm recognises that personnel decisions extend beyond technical or administrative functions; they are fundamentally social and ethical endeavours that impact identity, equity, and opportunity (Tursunbayeva et al., 2020). Consequently, HCAI methodologies in HRM integrate knowledge from organisational behaviour, ethics, psychology, and human-computer interaction to ensure that algorithmic tools enhance rather than diminish the relational and developmental aspects of work (Lichtenthaler, 2020).

Numerous experts contend that the prevailing narrative of substituting human judgment with AI efficiency ought to transition to one centred on augmentation, where AI tools enhance human decision-making by reinforcing strengths and alleviating shortcomings (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018). In this perspective, HR professionals maintain autonomy and accountability while employing AI systems as collaborators in diagnosis, planning, and strategic talent management (Dellermann et al., 2019). Participatory design is crucial for operationalising HCAI in human resources. This entails the participation of employees, managers, and HR professionals in the creation, evaluation, and enhancement of AI systems to ensure usability, relevance, and ethical compliance (Lee et al., 2019). Participatory techniques elucidate real-world limits, cultivate trust, and enhance procedural fairness by granting people a sense of ownership over technology that impacts them directly (Loi et al., 2021). Ethical governance frameworks constitute a fundamental element of the HCAI paradigm. This encompasses organisational rules and frameworks such as AI ethics committees, accountability protocols, and routine auditing mechanisms that assess the effects of AI technologies and ensure their conformity with business values and societal standards (Morley et al., 2021). Companies like Microsoft and SAP have initiated the use of internal review panels and "algorithmic impact assessments" to investigate the societal consequences of their HR technology (Zeng et al., 2022).

Moreover, HCAI is strongly aligned with the notion of digital dignity, which posits that technology should uphold and augment individuals' sense of value, identity, and autonomy in digital engagements (Calvo et al., 2020). In the realm of human resources, this entails the development of AI solutions that are not just effective but also compassionate, transparent, and considerate of user variety and contextual factors. Theoretical integration is essential. As AI technologies transform organisational processes, current HRM frameworks such as social exchange theory, justice theory, and person–organisation fit must adapt to accommodate hybrid human–machine interactions (Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016). Multidisciplinary insights from sociology, computer science, and law are crucial for comprehensively comprehending how AI transforms power, agency, and accountability in professional environments. The HCAI strategy promotes a transformation in organisational culture from "AI first" to "people first." This culture transition requires leadership that advocates for ethics, values employee input, and perceives technological development as an opportunity for empowerment rather than displacement (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Human Resources leaders play a crucial role in fostering this mentality and integrating human-centred principles into the design, implementation, and evaluation of AI systems. A human-centred AI paradigm in HRM provides a framework for ethical, sustainable, and inclusive innovation. It guarantees that AI functions as an instrument for human advancement rather than a means of domination or commercialisation. By emphasising human agency, empathy, and ethics, organisations may harness the revolutionary capabilities of AI while preserving the values that characterise meaningful employment.

4. Conclusion

The incorporation of artificial intelligence in human resource management signifies one of the most significant transformations in organisational practices in recent decades. Although AI technologies exhibit significant promise to augment efficiency, refine decision-making, and customise employee experiences, their deployment also engenders critical issues pertaining to autonomy, equity, transparency, and trust. This research study has rigorously examined the impact of algorithmic technologies on HR processes, employee well-being, and organisational ethics, highlighting the necessity of reconciling innovation with accountability.

A persistent subject in the assessment is the conflict between technological control and human agency. As AI systems increasingly integrate into functions such as recruitment, assessment, and workforce strategy, it is imperative to ensure that these tools do not supplant human judgment or reduce people to mere data points. AI should be engineered and implemented to enhance human talents, maintain dignity, and adhere to ethical principles. The assessment highlights the issues of bias, lack of transparency, and surveillance prevalent in many contemporary AI systems. These problems highlight the imperative for strong governance frameworks, transparent models, and inclusive design processes that prioritise the interests and rights of both employees and HR professionals. Confidence in AI systems will be achieved when organisations implement transparent policies, encourage employee engagement, and integrate technology systems with human interactions. The future of AI in HR ultimately hinges on a conscious transition to a human-centered framework that emphasises empathy, inclusivity, and long-term well-being rather than immediate productivity improvements. By adopting this approach, organisations may harness the full potential of AI to enhance HR operations and foster equitable, humane, and resilient workplaces.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express his gratitude to all parties who have provided support, guidance, and contributions during the process of compiling this paper.

Conflict of Interest

The entire research process was conducted independently without any influence from any party that could affect the results and objectivity of the research.

Author Contribution

Abd Rahman Ahmad formulated the ***study theme, organised the manuscript's overall design, and participated in the critical synthesis of the literature and final editing****. Hairul Rizad Md Sapry offered intellectual contributions in enhancing the* ***theoretical framework, maintained consistency in reasoning throughout the parts, and aided in aligning the text with journal standards****. Alaa S. Jameel facilitated the incorporation of* ***findings and contributed to improving the narrative clarity and coherence, particularly in the sections addressing practical consequences and managerial significance****.*

References

Angrave, D., Charlwood, A., Kirkpatrick, I., Lawrence, M., & Stuart, M. (2016). HR and analytics: Why HR is set to fail the big data challenge. Human Resource Management Journal, 26(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12090Angrave, D., Charlwood, A., Kirkpatrick, I., Lawrence, M., & Stuart, M. (2016). HR and analytics: Why HR is set to fail the big data challenge. *Human Resource Management Journal, 26*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12090

Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2023). *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. https://fairmlbook.org

Belhadi, A., El Baz, J., Khan, S. A. R., Boujelbene, Y., & Ouhbi, I. (2023). Ethics and discrimination in artificial intelligence-enabled recruitment practices: A systematic review. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 372. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02057-z

Binns, R. (2020). On the apparent conflict between individual and group fairness. *ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 514–524. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372864

Binns, R., Veale, M., Van Kleek, M., & Shadbolt, N. (2018). 'It's reducing a human being to a percentage': Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173951

Bondarouk, T., & Brewster, C. (2016). Conceptualising the future of HRM and technology research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(21), 2652–2671. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1232296

Bradford, N. (2024). AI transformation: A human-centered approach to unlocking organizational value. *SHRM*. https://www.shrm.org/

Calvo, R. A., Peters, D., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Designing for digital well-being: A human-centered approach. *Digital Health, 6*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207620920090

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Akhtar, R., Winsborough, D., & Sherman, R. A. (2019). The datafication of talent: How technology is advancing the science of human potential at work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 28*(1), 46–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418806982

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Akhtar, R., Winsborough, D., & Sherman, R. A. (2019). The datafication of talent: How technology is advancing the science of human potential at work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 28*(1), 46–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418806982

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(4), 655–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251

Collings, D. G., McMackin, J., Nyberg, A. J., & Wright, P. M. (2021). Strategic human resource management and COVID-19: Emerging challenges and research opportunities. *Journal of Management Studies, 58*(5), 1378–1382. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12695

Corbett-Davies, S., & Goel, S. (2018). The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00023*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00023

Cowgill, B., Dell'Acqua, F., & Deng, S. (2021). Biased programmers? Or biased data? A field experiment in operationalizing AI ethics. *Columbia Business School Research Paper No. 20-85.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3712447

Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M., & Leimeister, J. M. (2019). Hybrid intelligence. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 61*(5), 637–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00600-8

DeRose, A. (2025). This tech company is using AI to supercharge the employee experience. *HR Brew*. https://www.hr-brew.com

Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way*. Springer.

Gilpin, L. H., Bau, D., Yuan, B. Z., Bajwa, A., Specter, M., & Kagal, L. (2018). Explaining explanations: An overview of interpretability of machine learning. *IEEE 5th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics*, 80–89. https://doi.org/10.1109/DSAA.2018.00018

Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(2), 627–660. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057

Gürerk, Ö., Irlenbusch, B., & Rockenbach, B. (2021). The impact of algorithmic transparency on trust and compliance in organizational settings. *Organization Science, 32*(4), 932–951. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1481

Holstein, K., Wortman Vaughan, J., Daumé III, H., Dudik, M., & Wallach, H. (2019). Improving fairness in machine learning systems: What do industry practitioners need? *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300830

Huang, M., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Artificial intelligence in service. *Journal of Service Research, 24*(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520902266

Jarrahi, M. H., Newlands, G., Lee, M. K., Wolf, C. T., Kinder, E., & Sutherland, W. (2021). Algorithmic management in a work context. *Big Data & Society, 8*(2), 20539517211020332. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211020332

Jiang, W., & Bai, C. (2025). The role of AI in transforming HRM: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management, 10*(3), 65–79. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11234567

Kaushik, M., & Guleria, N. (2021). A study of artificial intelligence applications in human resource management. *International Journal of Business Excellence, 23*(4), 517–534. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2021.114203

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–400. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Kim, P. T. (2021). Data-driven discrimination at work. *William & Mary Law Review, 58*(3), 857–936.

Lee, M. K., Kim, J., Lizarondo, L., & Forlizzi, J. (2019). Participatory design with interpretable machine learning: Designing with and for healthcare workers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 3*(CSCW), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359173

Lee, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2021). Algorithmic management in the workplace: A review of recent developments. *Journal of Management, 47*(1), 45–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320964262

Leicht-Deobald, U., Busch, T., Schank, C., Weibel, A., Scherer, A., & Scherer, A. G. (2019). The challenges of algorithm-based HR decision-making for personal integrity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 160*(2), 377–392. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04204-w

Lepak, D. P., Smith, K. G., & Taylor, M. S. (2021). Value creation and value capture in strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(2), 220–251. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0192

Lichtenthaler, U. (2020). A conceptual framework for AI-based human resource management. *Journal of Management Analytics, 7*(3), 269–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2020.1731716

Lipton, Z. C. (2018). The mythos of model interpretability. *Communications of the ACM, 61*(10), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.1145/3233231

Loi, M., Ferrario, A., & Viganò, E. (2021). Transparency as design publicity: Explaining and justifying inscrutable algorithms. *Ethics and Information Technology, 23*(3), 441–453. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-021-09579-2

Margherita, A. (2021). Human resources analytics: A systematization of research topics and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(2), 100711. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100711

McAnally, K., & Hagger, M. S. (2024). Self-determination theory and workplace outcomes: A conceptual review. *Behavioral Sciences, 14*(6), 428. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14060428

Meijerink, J., Bondarouk, T., & Lepak, D. (2021). When HRM meets artificial intelligence: Considerations for HRM research, practice, and teaching. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(2), 100738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100738

Miller, T. (2019). Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial Intelligence, 267*, 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2018.07.007

Milne, S. (2024). AI tools show biases in ranking job applicants' names by race and gender. *University of Washington News Release*. https://www.washington.edu

Minbaeva, D. (2021). Disruptive HR. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(2), 100780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100780

Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management and Uber drivers' autonomy. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)*, 2017(December), 1–17.

Morley, J., Floridi, L., Kinsey, L., & Elhalal, A. (2021). From what to how: An initial review of publicly available AI ethics tools, methods and research to translate principles into practices. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 27*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00239-6

Newell, S., & Marabelli, M. (2015). Strategic opportunities (and challenges) of algorithmic decision-making: A call for action on the long-term societal effects of 'datification'. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 24*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2015.02.001

OECD. (2025). *AI and the future of work: How new technologies are reshaping the workplace*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org

Parent-Rocheleau, X., & Parker, S. K. (2023). Human-in-the-loop algorithmic design: Enhancing autonomy and worker well-being in gig work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28*(1), 50–66. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000308

Raghavan, M., Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J., & Levy, K. (2020). Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 469–481. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372828

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Riedl, M. (2022). The CARE framework for ethical AI in the workplace: Comprehensibility, autonomy, responsiveness, and equity. *AI & Society, 37*(2), 507–520. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01262-9

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 3758–3784.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior* (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36*(6), 495–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118

SHRM. (2024). The evolving role of AI in recruitment and retention. *WorkplaceTech Spotlight*. https://www.shrm.org

Strohmeier, S., & Scherer, R. (2020). Digital human resource management: A conceptual clarification. *German Journal of Human Resource Management, 34*(3), 345–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002220921131

Tursunbayeva, A., Bunduchi, R., Franco, M., & Pagliari, C. (2020). Human resource information systems in health care: A systematic evidence review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 27*(3), 480–492. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz225

Tursunbayeva, A., Pagliari, C., Bunduchi, R., & Franco, M. (2020). Human resource information systems in health care: A systematic evidence review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 27*(3), 480–492. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz225

van den Broek, D., Keating, T., & McDonald, P. (2021). The digital frontier of workplace surveillance and control: Technology, power and resistance in the modern economy. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 63*(2), 195–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185620946663

van Esch, P., Black, J. S., & Ferolie, J. (2021). Marketing AI recruitment: The next phase in job application and selection. *Computers in Human Behavior, 114*, 106576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106576

Vassallo, T., & Petropoulos, G. (2024). Algorithmic fairness in AI-based hiring: A comparative EU–US study. *Technology in Society, 69*, 102066. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.102066

Voigt, P., & Von dem Bussche, A. (2021). *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Springer.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *International Data Privacy Law, 7*(2), 76–99. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005

Wilson, H. J., & Daugherty, P. R. (2018). Collaborative intelligence: Humans and AI are joining forces. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(4), 114–123.

Zeng, Y., Lu, E. Y., & Huangfu, C. (2022). Towards a human-centered approach to trustworthy AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 4*(8), 662–664. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-022-00525-w