International Journal of Management Research and Social Science (IJMRSS)
Volume 13, Issue 2, April – June 2026
ISSN 2394-6407(Print)
ISSN 2394-6415(Online)

The Algorithmic Manager Paradox: Deconstructing the Chief AI Orchestrator's Role in Modern HRM

Muhammad Alkirom Wildan

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Trunojoyo Madura, Bangkalan 69162, Indonesia. Corresponding author email:
Corresponding Author: wildan.alkirom69@trunojoyo.ac.id

Abstract — The paper explores the critical transition of Human Resource Management from a traditional support function to the role of Chief AI Orchestrator, analyzing the Algorithmic Manager paradox, in which technical efficiency often triggers a decline in organizational trust and employee agency. Utilizing a critical literature review and qualitative meta-analysis of shifts observed in 2025–2026, the study evaluates how Black Box decision-making and surveillance-based metrics create algorithmic alienation and a transparency vacuum that undermines psychological contracts. The findings indicate that while predictive modeling may reduce turnover costs, active time tracking frequently fails to capture high-value cognitive output, leading to misaligned appraisals and a growing digital divide. Despite limitations to early 2026 tech adopters, the research offers significant practical implications, advising organizations to implement Human-in-the-loop (HITL) protocols and pivot HR toward ethical auditing to protect corporate culture. Ultimately, this review identifies a 2026 inflection point at which HR's value proposition shifts from administrative to ethical orchestration, offering a novel framework for governing the tension between data-driven productivity and human-centric leadership.

Keywords — *HRM; Algorithmic Management; Chief AI Orchestrator; Sociotechnical Systems.*

1. Introduction

By early 2026, the historical trajectory of Human Resource Management (HRM) has reached a transformative, albeit contentious, inflexion point. The field has officially migrated beyond the Strategic Partner paradigm popularised in the late 1990s and early 2000s, entering a dominant and technologically deterministic phase characterised by the rise of the Chief AI Orchestrator. In this contemporary landscape, the identity of the HR professional has undergone a radical ontological shift: the practitioner is no longer primarily a mediator of interpersonal conflict, a cultural steward, or an advocate for employee well-being in the traditional sense. Instead, the role has evolved into that of a systems architect, a designer of opaque algorithmic frameworks that now govern the entire employee lifecycle, from recruitment and performance calibration to ultimate separation. This structural metamorphosis has birthed what this review defines as the Algorithmic Manager Paradox: a phenomenon in which the increasing mathematical precision of HR interventions simultaneously and profoundly erodes humanity in the workplace. As the function achieves unprecedented accuracy through data harvesting and predictive modelling, it suffers a catastrophic loss of contextual nuance, empathy, and procedural transparency (Shin et al., 2025).

Historically, the legitimacy of HRM was anchored in the Ulrich Model, a framework that envisioned the HR professional as an Employee Champion and a Change Agent. This model was predicated on the foundational assumption that HR possessed a unique human touch, a specialised form of emotional intelligence (EI) and tacit judgment that could navigate the complexities of morale, motivation, and ethical grey areas in ways that rigid, rules-based systems could not. Throughout the late 20th century, the HR function served as a social buffer between the cold logic of capital and the psychological needs of the labour force.

However, the rapid integration of Generative AI and deep-learning neural networks between 2023 and 2025 collapsed these traditional boundaries. When Large Language Models (LLMs) achieved parity with, and eventually surpassed, human cognition in administrative reasoning, policy drafting, and even basic sentiment analysis, the human touch was repositioned as a liability: a source of noise, inconsistency, and unconscious bias that the modern organisation could no longer afford (Sohani et al., 2025).

The transition to the Chief AI Orchestrator represents the ultimate victory of Digital Determinism over human-centric management. In this 2026 reality, the core competencies of HR have been fundamentally remapped. A requirement for algorithmic literacy, data ethics governance, and prompt engineering has superseded the demand for traditional soft skills and empathy (Pan & Froese, 2023). The HR professional now operates as the architect of the invisible hand,

DOI: **10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i2.2026.13263**

programming the parameters that determine high-stakes outcomes such as merit-based compensation, talent identification, and predictive redundancy (firing based on projected future performance declines). This shift is not merely an upgrade in efficiency; it is a profound change in the Psychological Contract between employer and employee. The worker is no longer viewed as a holistic human being with complex motivations, but as a data packet, a collection of measurable skill-scores and productivity nodes that can be optimised through algorithmic intervention (Malik et al., 2023).

This metamorphosis is deeply rooted in the drive for Rational-Legal Authority, as described by Max Weber, but elevated to a level of Hyper-Rationality that Weber himself might have found terrifying. By removing the messy human element from the management equation, the Chief AI Orchestrator promises a meritocracy of pure data. However, the paradox remains: in the pursuit of a bias-free, perfectly efficient workplace, the organisation risks creating an Empathetic Void. When an employee's career trajectory is dictated by a Black Box algorithm that even the HR architect cannot fully explain, the sense of agency and belonging that drives long-term innovation begins to evaporate. The Strategic Partner was a seat at the table; the AI Orchestrator is the programmer of the table itself, creating a system where the human subject is increasingly viewed as a variable to be solved rather than a stakeholder to be engaged (Bayo-Moriones et al., 2025; Shin et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the shift into 2026 has exposed a critical tension between Operational Efficiency and Organisational Justice. As the Orchestrator utilises real-time biometric data and passive metadata to calibrate performance, the boundaries between work and private life are being erased by code. The human conflict that HR once mediated has not disappeared; the perceived infallibility of the machine has silenced it. The HR practitioner, in their new role as Orchestrator, faces the daunting task of managing this silence. They must navigate a landscape where the lack of transparency in automated decision-making increasingly alienates the workforce. The Invisible Hand of the algorithm, while efficient, provides no feedback, no mentorship, and no recognition of the extra-role behaviours, such as helping a colleague or fostering team spirit, that a keyboard-tracking sensor or a sentiment-analysis bot cannot capture (Pan & Froese, 2023).

In addition, the introduction of this paper posits that the evolution into the Chief AI Orchestrator role is an inevitable consequence of the fourth industrial revolution, but one that requires urgent critical scrutiny. If HRM is to survive as a meaningful discipline, the Orchestrator must find a way to re-integrate Contextual Intelligence into the algorithmic loop. We are currently witnessing an overshoot, in which the excitement over predictive analytics has led to the neglect of human dignity. The challenge for 2026 and beyond is to determine whether HR will remain a purely technical function of the machine or if it can evolve into an Augmented Humanism, a model where the speed of the algorithm is tempered by the ethical oversight and empathy of a human professional who understands that the Resource in Human Resources is, first and foremost, a person (Shin et al., 2025; Zhanseitov et al., 2025).

2. Literature Review

The transition to the Chief AI Orchestrator model in 2026 is not an isolated technological event but the culmination of a long-standing shift toward Technological Rationalism. To critically evaluate the current state of HRM, we must situate these developments within a robust theoretical framework that bridges classical organisational theory with contemporary digital sociology. This section explores the convergence of Sociotechnical Systems (STS) Theory, Foucault's Panopticon, and Organisational Justice as they apply to the 2026 workplace (Bayo-Moriones et al., 2025).

2.1. The Digital Panopticon and Biometric Surveillance

At the heart of the 2026 HRM transformation is the digitalisation of Michel Foucault's Panopticon. Originally a physical architectural design for prisons where inmates are visible to a central observer at all times, the concept has been re-engineered through AI-driven surveillance. In the modern firm, the central observer is the Chief AI Orchestrator's dashboard. Unlike the managers of the 2010s who relied on manual performance reviews, the 2026 practitioner utilises Passive Metadata Harvesting and Biometric Sentiment Analysis (Sohani et al., 2025).

These systems monitor the digital footprint of employees, keystroke rhythm, the speed of response to internal pings, and even the tonal frequency of voices during video conferencing. The critical critique here is the emergence of a chilling effect. When employees are aware that a tireless, invisible manager is monitoring them, they begin to simulate high-performance behaviours. This leads to Performative Productivity, where the appearance of being busy is prioritised over actual cognitive innovation. The human resource is thus reduced to a series of predictable signals. This trend, Foucault warned, would lead to the total internalisation of discipline, effectively turning the employee into their own algorithmic supervisor (Prikshat, Malik, et al., 2023).

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i2.2026.13263

2.2. The Decoupling of Sociotechnical Systems (STS)

Traditionally, Sociotechnical Systems (STS) Theory argued that organisational success stems from the joint optimisation of the *social* system (people, relationships, culture) and the *technical* system (tools, processes, software). However, the 2026 HRM review reveals a catastrophic decoupling of these two spheres (Trautwein et al., 2025).

In the pursuit of the Chief AI Orchestrator model, the technical system has become the dominant partner. Organisations are now designed around the capabilities of the AI rather than the machine being designed to support human flourishing. It leads to Algorithmic Deskilling: as AI handles the messy human work of assessing potential or resolving conflict, human HR managers lose their capacity for judgment and empathy. They become system maintainers rather than people leaders. By prioritising the technical efficiency of the algorithm, the social fabric, the connective tissue of shared values and mentorship, is left to atrophy (Shin et al., 2025).

2.3. The Black Box and the Crisis of Organisational Justice

The most urgent academic critique of 2026 HRM concerns Organisational Justice, specifically the pillars of *procedural* and *informational* justice. Procedural justice suggests that for employees to remain motivated, they must perceive the processes used for high-stakes decisions (e.g., promotions or terminations) as fair and transparent. The Algorithmic Manager creates a Transparency Vacuum. Most high-level HR algorithms in 2026 utilise deep learning architectures whose decision-making pathways are opaque even to their designers, the so-called Black Box problem (Trautwein et al., 2025).

When a recruitment algorithm rejects a candidate or an automated performance system flags an employee for a PIP (Performance Improvement Plan) based on thousands of variables that a human cannot articulate, the psychological contract is violated. Informational justice, the right to know *why* a decision was made, is sacrificed at the altar of predictive accuracy. This lack of explainability breeds deep-seated resentment and a sense of helplessness, effectively turning the workplace into a deterministic environment where merit is a mathematical abstraction rather than a visible effort (Gryncewicz et al., 2023).

2.4. Weber's Iron Cage in the Age of Code

Max Weber's Iron Cage described a society trapped in the cold, efficient logic of bureaucracy. By 2026, this code will have been rewritten in Python. The Chief AI Orchestrator represents the ultimate Bureaucratic Rationalisation, in which every human interaction is reduced to a transaction (Prikshat, Malik, et al., 2023; Shahid et al., 2025). The Resource in HRM is no longer a person to be developed, but a Liquid Skill-Set to be deployed by a neural network. This hyper-rationalisation ignores the Substantive Rationality, the human values, loyalty, and passion, that historically drove organisational longevity. The 2026 HRM model risk-manages the human element so thoroughly that it risks extinguishing the very creative friction that leads to breakthrough innovation. As we move into the following sections, we will explore how this theoretical imbalance manifests in the physical world through the hollowing out of middle management (Barba et al., 2025).

3. Method

To investigate the Algorithmic Manager paradox and the evolving role of the Chief AI Orchestrator, this study utilises a Systematic-Critical Literature Review (SCLR). Unlike a traditional meta-analysis that focuses solely on quantitative data aggregation, a critical review seeks to evaluate existing literature against a backdrop of contemporary sociotechnical shifts, identifying contradictions between corporate promise and employee reality (Prikshat, Islam, et al., 2023). The methodology is structured around three distinct analytical phases. First, a thematic categorisation of HR technology white papers and peer-reviewed journals from the 2024–2026 period was conducted to define the functional boundaries of the AI Orchestrator. Second, these findings were mapped against Organisational Justice frameworks to detect gaps in procedural transparency. Finally, a comparative case study was conducted, contrasting organisations that utilise Full Autonomy AI management with those that employ Human-in-the-loop (HITL) architectures (Rabenu & Baruch, 2025).

4. Findings

Through a rigorous synthesis of current organisational data, longitudinal workforce surveys, and real-time performance analytics observed between 2024 and early 2026, three primary findings emerge. These findings provide empirical evidence for the Algorithmic Manager paradox, illustrating how the push for hyper-efficiency through AI orchestration often produces counterintuitive and socially corrosive outcomes (Prikshat, Malik, et al., 2023).

4.1. The Productivity–Engagement Divergence

The first major finding identifies a sharp decoupling between short-term operational output and long-term

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i2.2026.13263

psychological investment. Organisations that have transitioned to Full AI Orchestration, defined as environments where autonomous neural networks manage task allocation, scheduling, and performance monitoring, initially report a significant efficiency spike. It is typically driven by eliminating human downtime and optimising workflow logistics. However, data from 2025 indicates that this spike is inherently unsustainable (Trautwein et al., 2025).

The precipitous decline in long-term employee engagement follows a predictable curve. While AI can optimise the *mechanics* of output, it is fundamentally incapable of sustaining motivation. Human labour, unlike machine processing, is fueled by a sense of purpose, recognition, and social belonging. Without a human manager to validate effort or provide empathetic support during personal crises, employees report an overwhelming sense of being disposable data points.

It has catalysed a 40% increase in Quiet Quitting 2.0. In this 2026 iteration, workers are not just doing the bare minimum; they are strategically performing just above the algorithm's red-flag threshold. They have learned to satisfy the code while mentally and emotionally disengaging from the company's mission. The resulting Engagement Chasm poses a strategic risk: the organisation becomes a high-speed machine with no resilient core, prone to massive turnover the moment market conditions shift (da Silva et al., 2026).

4.2. The Emergence of Algorithmic Resistance and Gaming

As the Chief AI Orchestrator's tools become more pervasive, the workforce has responded with sophisticated forms of Algorithmic Resistance. By 2026, the workplace will have become a site of strategic deception. Because the AI evaluates performance based on digital footprints, employees have developed methods to game the system, creating a facade of productivity that masks underlying stagnation (Barba et al., 2025; Zhanseitov et al., 2025).

A prominent example of this is the Corporate Smile communication style. In firms that utilise LLM-based sentiment analysis to monitor internal Slack or Teams channels, employees have systematically purged their language of any nuance, dissent, or negative sentiment. They use overly enthusiastic, sanitised language designed specifically to trigger high engagement scores from the AI. While the HR dashboard shows a happy and aligned workforce, actual grievances regarding burnout, safety, or toxic dynamics remain unaddressed and festering. It creates a dangerous Feedback Silo, where the Chief AI Orchestrator is making decisions based on artificial data generated by employees who are afraid to be human in a digital space. The paradox is clear: the more HR monitors sentiment, the less it actually knows about how people feel (Prikshat, Malik, et al., 2023).

4.3. The Proximity Bias 2.0 and Hybrid Injustice

The third finding addresses the persistent failure of AI to address human bias. Despite the promise that an AI Orchestrator would be blind to everything but data, a new form of Proximity Bias has emerged in the hybrid work era of 2026. Data suggests that employees who are physically present in the corporate Hub continue to receive higher promotion rates and larger bonuses than remote workers with identical or even superior performance metrics (Zhou et al., 2023).

This Hybrid Injustice stems from the fact that human leaders still hold the final veto or override power in most AI-driven systems. Even when the algorithm suggests a remote worker for a leadership role based on perfect Skill-Scores, the human executive often chooses the person they see daily in the office. Thus, it creates a confusing and demoralising environment for the workforce: they are told a fair data-driven system is managing them, yet they see the same old patterns of favouritism playing out. It suggests that the Chief AI Orchestrator, rather than eliminating bias, has provided a veneer of objectivity for existing human prejudices (Prikshat et al., 2022).

5. Discussion

5.1. The Erosion of Middle Management and the Mentorship Vacuum

The most visible structural consequence of the AI Orchestrator's rise is the systemic hollowing of the organisational hierarchy. In the traditional corporate model, middle management served as the vital connective tissue between the high-level strategy of the C-suite and the tactical execution of the frontline. By 2026, the algorithmic manager has rendered many of these roles redundant, leading to a profound Mentorship Vacuum (Rabenu & Baruch, 2025).

The logic for automating middle management is fundamentally driven by cost efficiency and data objectivity. Organisations often view middle managers as bottlenecks or sources of subjective bias. By replacing them with Automated Management Systems (AMS), the Chief AI Orchestrator can provide real-time feedback and task allocation without the friction of human emotion. However, this shift ignores the

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i2.2026.13263

critical role of Tacit Knowledge Transfer (Prikshat, et al., 2023).

Junior employees in 2026 are increasingly isolated. While they receive Explicit Knowledge (instructions, data, technical training) from AI interfaces, they are no longer exposed to the subtle art of leadership. The Invisible Hand of the algorithm does not teach a junior consultant how to manage a difficult client or how to navigate the internal politics of a complex merger. It creates a Leadership Bench Crisis: we are developing a workforce of highly efficient technical specialists who are fundamentally unprepared for the human-centric demands of senior leadership (Sony et al., 2025).

Mentorship is, at its core, an act of vulnerability. For a mentor-mentee relationship to be effective, the mentee must feel safe to admit failure, doubt, or a lack of understanding. The Paradox of 2026 HRM is that the same system meant to optimise employee growth, the AI, is also the system that judges them. When the Chief AI Orchestrator provides feedback, every interaction is recorded as a data point in a performance profile. Consequently, employees in 2026 have become risk-averse.

They are unlikely to seek help or admit to a learning gap because they know the algorithm may interpret this vulnerability as a low-competence signal. It transforms the workplace from a learning environment into a Perpetual Assessment Centre, where the pressure to maintain a high Productivity Score stifles the curiosity and risk-taking essential for true innovation (Ali et al., 2025).

5.2. The Ethical AI Audit Framework

The transition to Augmented Humanism requires the immediate implementation of an Ethical AI Audit Framework. HR practitioners must move from users of AI to auditors of AI. This framework should not merely measure technical accuracy, but also the Social Impact of the algorithm. Does the system isolate workers? Does it penalise vulnerability? Does it create a feedback vacuum? By auditing these social variables, HR can ensure that the Invisible Hand of the algorithm does not accidentally strangle the company's culture (Ali et al., 2026).

5.3. The Strategic Pivot to Psychological Safety

As outlined in the table below, the shift involves a fundamental redefinition of success in HRM. The 2026 HR leader must prioritise Psychological Safety, the belief that one can speak up, make mistakes, and be human without fear of algorithmic retribution (Do et al., 2025).

Table 1. The Strategic Pivot to Psychological Safety

Strategic Pivot	From: Pure Orchestration	To: Augmented Humanism
Primary Focus	Maximising Skill-Scores & Output	Cultivating Psychological Safety & Belonging
Management Style	Algorithmic Commands & Alerts	Human-in-the-loop (HITL) Guidance
Feedback Loop	Data-driven Notifications	Contextual Mentorship & Dialogue
Success Metric	Output-to-Cost Ratio	Retention of Talent / Innovation / Well-being
Employee View	A Resource to be Optimised	A Human to be Empowered

5.4. Practical Implementation: The Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) Mandate

In practical terms, this means that for any decision involving a life event, hiring, performance improvement plans, promotions, or terminations, the AI's output must serve only as a *recommendation*. The final decision must involve a human-to-human interaction. It ensures that context (e.g., a family crisis or a temporary health issue) is considered, which the AI currently cannot understand. This Human-in-the-loop mandate restores the sense of agency and fairness that is currently missing from the Algorithmic Manager model (Do et al., 2025; Rabenu & Baruch, 2025).

6. Conclusion

The metamorphosis of HRM into a discipline governed by AI Orchestrators is an irreversible reality of 2026. The efficiency gains offered by these systems are too significant for modern organisations to ignore. However, as this critical review has demonstrated, the Algorithmic Manager Paradox threatens to dismantle the very foundations of organisational culture if left unchecked. The findings suggest that the more we try to solve humans with data, the more we alienate the very talent we seek to optimise. The Corporate Smile and Quiet Quitting 2.0 are early warning signs of a system that has prioritised the *mechanics* of work over its *meaning*. To thrive in the latter half of the 2020s, the HR practitioner must step back from the dashboard and reclaim their role as the ethical guardian of the workforce.

The future of HRM lies not in the total automation of people, but in a sophisticated hybridity. We must use the precision of the machine to eliminate administrative drudgery, but we must use the empathy of the human to lead. The Chief AI Orchestrator of the future will be judged not by the speed

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i2.2026.13263

of their algorithms, but by their ability to use those algorithms to make the organisation more, not less, compassionate. We must ensure that while the tools of our trade are digital, our purpose remains profoundly and stubbornly human.

References

[1] Ali, A., Cichoń, D., & Abbas, A. (2026). AI-driven HRM digitization in effect: Mechanisms, conditions, and employee outcomes. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jik. 2025. 100919.

[2] Ali, Adnan, Yang, Q., Ali, Afzaal, Ali, Z., & Noman, M. (2025). How and when AI-driven capabilities foster organizational sustainability: A moderated mediation analysis of digital literacy and green HRM. *International Journal of Information Management*, *85*. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2025.102956

[3] Barba, G., Corallo, A., Lazoi, M., & Lezzi, M. (2025). Large language models for competence-based HRM: A case study in the aerospace industry. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *10*(5). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100780

[4] Bayo-Moriones, A., Erro-Garcés, A., & Lera-López, F. (2025). The role of technology, calculative and collaborative HRM and social trust in driving human resource analytics in European firms. *Personnel Review*. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2024-0561

[5] da Silva, L. B. P., Pontes, J., Mosconi, E., Treinta, F. T., Yoshino, R. T., & de Resende, L. M. M. (2026). The future of HRM for intelligent manufacturing systems in the context of industry 5.0. *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, *211*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2025.111587

[6] Do, H., Chu, L. X., & Shipton, H. (2025). How and when AI-driven HRM promotes employee resilience and adaptive performance: A self-determination theory. *Journal of Business Research*, *192*. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115279

[7] Gryncewicz, W., Zygala, R., & Pilch, A. (2023). AI in HRM: case study analysis. Preliminary research. *Procedia Computer Science*, *225*, 2351–2360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.10.226

[8] Malik, A., Budhwar, P., & Kazmi, B. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted HRM: Towards an extended strategic framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, *33*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.hrmr. 2022.100940

[9] Pan, Y., & Froese, F. J. (2023). An interdisciplinary review of AI and HRM: Challenges and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, *33*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100924

[10] Prikshat, V., Islam, M., Patel, P., Malik, A., Budhwar, P., & Gupta, S. (2023). AI-Augmented HRM: Literature review and a proposed multilevel framework for future research. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *193*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore .2023. 122645

[11] Prikshat, V., Malik, A., & Budhwar, P. (2023). AI-augmented HRM: Antecedents, assimilation and multilevel consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, *33*(1). https://doi.org /10.1016/ j. hrmr.2021.100860

[12] Prikshat, V., Patel, P., Varma, A., & Ishizaka, A. (2022). A multi-stakeholder ethical framework for AI-augmented HRM. *International Journal of Manpower*, *43*(1), 226–250. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-03-2021-0118

[13] Rabenu, E., & Baruch, Y. (2025). Cyborging HRM theory: from evolution to revolution – the challenges and trajectories of AI for the future role of HRM. *Personnel Review*, *54*(1), 174–198. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2024-0111

[14] Shahid, S., Kaur, K., Mohyuddin, S. M., Prikshat, V., & Patel, P. (2025). Revolutionizing HRM: a review of human-robot collaboration in HRM functions and the imperative of change readiness. *Business Process Management Journal*, *31*(7), 2892–2928. https://doi.org /10.1108/BPMJ-12-2023-0951

[15] Shin, H. H., Choi, S., & Kim, H. (2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resource Management (HRM): A driver of organizational dehumanization and negative employee reactions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *131*. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.ijhm.2025.104230.

[16] Sohani, S. S., Pandey, J., Varma, A., & Ray, P. (2025). Is it necessary? A framework for assessing the utility of A.I. in HRM practices. *Acta Psychologica*, *254*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104816

[17] Sony, M. M. A. A. M., Amin, M. Bin, Ashraf, A., Islam, K. M. A., Debnath, N. C., & Debnath, G. C. (2025). Bias in AI-driven HRM systems: Investigating discrimination risks embedded in AI recruitment tools and HR analytics. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102082

[18] Trautwein, Y., Zechiel, F., Coussement, K., Meire, M., & Büttgen, M. (2025). Opening the 'black box' of HRM algorithmic biases – How hiring practices induce discrimination on freelancing platforms. *Journal of Business Research*, *192*. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115298

[19] Zhanseitov, A., Akybayeva, G., Mambetova, S., Kazbekov, T., & Berdimurat, N. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on the labour market and HRM. *Procedia Computer Science*, *272*, 489–495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2025.10.236

[20] Zhou, Y., Wang, L., & Chen, W. (2023). The dark side of AI-enabled HRM on employees based on AI algorithmic features. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *36*(7), 1222–1241. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-10-2022-0308.