JGIES
JOURNAL OF GLOBAL ISLAMIC ECONOMIC STUDIES
https://journal.merdekakreasi.co.id/index.php/JGIES

Ethical Challenges and Algorithmic Bias in AI Implementation in HRM

Abd. Rasyid Syamsuri[1], Rifki Arohman[2], Muhammad Renaldy Saputra[3], Marcella Angraini[4]
[1,2,3,4]Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Riau, Indonesia

Article Information

Article History:
Received: -
Accepted: -
Published: -

Keywords:
Artificial intelligence, human resource management, algorithmic bias, ethics, transparency

Abstract

This article explores the ethical challenges and algorithmic biases that emerge from the implementation of artificial intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM). Through a systematic literature review of recent studies, the analysis reveals that while AI can significantly improve recruitment efficiency, workforce analytics, and strategic HR functions, it also introduces substantial risks, including bias in decision-making, lack of transparency, and ethical concerns around privacy and employee well-being. The findings highlight that algorithmic bias is not only a technical issue but also a reflection of broader social and organizational dynamics, which if left unaddressed can reinforce workplace inequalities. Furthermore, the discussion emphasizes that effective governance, transparency mechanisms, and a human-centered approach are crucial for balancing technological innovation with fairness and inclusivity. Ultimately, the study concludes that responsible AI adoption in HRM requires embedding ethical principles into every stage of design and deployment to ensure that efficiency gains do not come at the expense of employee trust, dignity, and organizational sustainability.

✉ Correspondence Address:
abd.rasyidsyamsuri@lecturer.unri.ac.id
© 2024 Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become one of the most transformative forces in the global economy, reshaping not only industrial operations but also the way human resource management (HRM) functions are executed. Across sectors, organizations have begun to integrate AI in recruitment, performance evaluation, training, and employee engagement, motivated by promises of efficiency, speed, and predictive accuracy (Galanaki et al., 2023; Ghosh, 2022). The deployment of AI-driven recruitment systems, for instance, allows organizations to process large volumes of applications rapidly, while predictive analytics provide managers with insights into workforce productivity and turnover (Bose et al., 2023). These advancements are not only technical but also strategic, as companies increasingly consider AI essential for gaining competitive advantage in a rapidly digitalizing world

(Huang & Rust, 2021). Yet, while the positive narrative of AI adoption dominates much of the discourse, critical perspectives highlight that these systems are not neutral, as their decision-making processes often reflect the data and design principles underpinning them.

Within the field of HRM, the implementation of AI raises significant ethical dilemmas that extend far beyond efficiency gains. Automated hiring and performance monitoring systems, though designed to eliminate human subjectivity, can inadvertently reproduce or even amplify societal inequalities embedded in historical data (Arohman & Syamsuri 2025; Leicht-Deobald et al., 2019). Concerns about fairness, accountability, and transparency are increasingly voiced as organizations encounter evidence of biased outcomes, such as gender or racial discrimination in algorithmic recruitment (Raghavan et al., 2020). Moreover, the use of AI in HR decision-making introduces challenges regarding privacy and surveillance, as systems collect and analyze vast amounts of employee data without always providing clear boundaries of consent (Meijerink et al., 2021). These issues illustrate that adopting AI in HRM is not a purely technical process but one that is socially embedded, requiring organizations to balance innovation with ethical responsibility. As AI systems assume a more prominent role in managing people, the stakes of ethical missteps become considerably higher, as they can damage employee trust, organizational reputation, and legal compliance simultaneously.

Given this context, a systematic examination of the ethical challenges and algorithmic biases in AI applications for HRM is both timely and necessary. Recent scholarship suggests that while organizations are eager to embrace AI to optimize human capital strategies, few are adequately prepared to address the ethical complexities that emerge from these technologies (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021; Strohmeier & Parry, 2021). The literature increasingly points to a paradox: while AI has the potential to augment human decision-making in HR, it also risks undermining fairness and inclusivity if biases remain unaddressed (Vrontis et al., 2022). This study responds to that paradox by synthesizing recent research to map out the contours of ethical challenges and algorithmic bias in HRM, with the aim of identifying not only risks but also pathways toward more responsible AI adoption. By critically reviewing the latest contributions in this domain, the paper seeks to highlight the importance of transparent governance frameworks, continuous auditing of algorithms, and the cultivation of organizational cultures that prioritize ethical accountability alongside technological advancement. In doing so, it underscores the imperative of situating AI adoption within a broader human-centered framework that safeguards dignity and equity in the workplace.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence in organizational systems has prompted scholars to investigate its implications in human resource management (HRM) beyond efficiency, focusing instead on structural and ethical complexities. Researchers argue that algorithmic systems, while powerful in optimizing large-scale data processing, carry risks of reinforcing structural inequalities within the workforce (Ajunwa, 2020; Bogen & Rieke, 2018). These risks are particularly significant in contexts where training data reflect historical biases, leading to the reproduction of discriminatory practices in hiring, promotion, or employee evaluation (Ajunwa, 2020). Studies highlight that the mere reliance on quantitative precision does not guarantee fairness, as algorithms are shaped by the

assumptions, priorities, and limitations embedded during their design (Barocas et al., 2019). Consequently, critical literature increasingly calls for HRM scholars and practitioners to balance the promise of AI with broader considerations of justice, inclusivity, and accountability (Kim, 2022). This shift underscores the need to move beyond the technocentric narrative of AI toward a more socio-ethical framework that situates algorithmic decision-making in organizational and societal contexts.

Another strand of literature emphasizes transparency and explainability as fundamental to responsible AI adoption in HRM. According to Shrestha et al. (2021), the opacity of algorithms often creates challenges for both employees and managers in understanding how decisions are reached, which can undermine trust and legitimacy. Scholars note that when employees cannot comprehend or challenge algorithmic outcomes, a power imbalance emerges between organizations and their workforce (Cheng & Hackett, 2021). Research further suggests that enhancing algorithmic transparency not only mitigates ethical risks but also strengthens compliance with emerging regulatory standards around data protection and employment law (Bodie et al., 2017). Transparency is particularly critical in recruitment systems where automated filtering can invisibly exclude candidates, raising concerns of hidden discrimination (Köchling & Wehner, 2020). Overall, these findings stress that algorithmic explainability is not a technical luxury but an ethical imperative that directly shapes the legitimacy of HRM practices.

In addition to transparency, the role of governance frameworks has emerged as a central concern in addressing algorithmic bias within HRM. Scholars argue that effective governance must combine organizational policies with external oversight mechanisms to ensure accountability (Dattner et al., 2019; Martin, 2019). For instance, the establishment of auditing practices for AI tools allows organizations to detect and rectify bias before it affects critical HR decisions such as promotions or layoffs (Raghavan et al., 2020). At the same time, scholars caution that governance must be dynamic, capable of evolving alongside the rapid pace of technological development and shifting regulatory landscapes (Calo, 2020). Ethical governance frameworks also require collaboration between HR professionals, data scientists, and legal experts to address the multifaceted challenges that AI introduces to workplace fairness (Zhu et al., 2018). This literature thus situates the ethical challenges of AI in HRM not as isolated organizational issues but as part of broader socio-technical systems requiring interdisciplinary solutions.

The literature also identifies the psychological and cultural consequences of AI-driven HRM, which are increasingly recognized as critical in shaping employee experience and organizational climate. Studies indicate that algorithmic decision-making can reduce employees' perception of autonomy and fairness, particularly when systems are perceived as rigid or dehumanizing (Jia et al., 2021). In some cases, employees have expressed heightened stress levels and job insecurity due to constant monitoring and performance tracking powered by AI technologies (Arohman, Syamsuri, & Angraini, 2025). On the other hand, research also suggests that when implemented ethically and transparently, AI can foster employee engagement by reducing administrative burdens and enabling HR professionals to focus on more strategic, human-centered roles (Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016). These findings reveal a dual narrative: AI in HRM can either erode or enhance workplace culture depending on the ethical considerations guiding its design and deployment. As a result, the literature increasingly emphasizes the importance of embedding

human values into AI systems, ensuring that technological efficiency is complemented by respect for dignity, inclusivity, and psychological well-being in the workplace.

METHOD

This study employs a literature review method by examining a wide range of relevant scholarly sources, including international journal articles, research reports, academic books, and policy documents addressing the use of artificial intelligence in human resource management. The literature selection was carried out systematically through searches in leading academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, with an emphasis on publications from the last five years to ensure the currency of the review. Inclusion criteria focused on studies that explicitly discuss AI implementation in HRM, particularly those dealing with ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, transparency, privacy, and implications for organizational fairness. Sources that did not directly relate to HRM or failed to address ethical dimensions were excluded from the analysis. The selected literature was analyzed descriptively to identify conceptual patterns, classify the main challenges, and synthesize both theoretical and practical perspectives on the impact of algorithmic bias in AI-driven decision-making. This approach was chosen to provide a comprehensive understanding of the emerging issues while establishing a robust foundation for the development of a conceptual framework on ethics in AI applications within HRM.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis of the reviewed literature highlights that the integration of artificial intelligence into human resource management generates both significant opportunities and substantial risks. On the one hand, AI tools provide organizations with the ability to streamline recruitment processes, enhance talent acquisition strategies, and improve workforce analytics by uncovering patterns not easily observable through human judgment (Upadhyay & Khandelwal, 2019; van Esch et al., 2019). Predictive algorithms can identify potential candidates with higher accuracy, while advanced analytics assist managers in aligning workforce planning with long-term business objectives (Tambe et al., 2019). These benefits demonstrate how AI has the potential to transform HR from a primarily administrative function into a strategic partner capable of driving organizational value (Minbaeva, 2021). Yet, the literature also indicates that the very same systems that offer these efficiencies introduce risks of opacity and bias, thereby necessitating a more critical evaluation of their practical implications (Strohmeier & Parry, 2021). This dual nature of AI in HRM underscores the importance of examining not just its technical potential but also the ethical and organizational frameworks in which it operates.

One of the most consistent findings across the literature is the manifestation of algorithmic bias in recruitment and evaluation systems. Research shows that machine learning models often inherit bias from training datasets, resulting in discriminatory patterns against women, minorities, or individuals from underrepresented backgrounds (Bogen & Rieke, 2018; Arohman, Syamsuri, & Angraini, 2025). For instance, resume-screening algorithms trained on historical data may unintentionally prioritize candidates who resemble the demographics of past successful hires, perpetuating homogeneity in the workforce (Cowgill, 2019). Such findings reinforce the notion that bias in AI is not simply a technical flaw but a social and organizational issue rooted in historical inequities (Ajunwa, 2020). Moreover, studies suggest that when bias manifests in algorithmic decision-making, its scale and invisibility make it more harmful than human bias, since affected individuals often lack

avenues to question or appeal such outcomes (Köchling & Wehner, 2020). These insights emphasize the urgent need for organizations to institute rigorous auditing mechanisms to detect and mitigate bias before deploying AI systems in critical HR decisions.

The challenges identified in the literature also extend to the broader ethical and psychological consequences of AI adoption. Several studies indicate that employees often perceive AI-enabled monitoring systems as invasive, leading to heightened stress levels and decreased job satisfaction (Mateescu & Nguyen, 2019; Jia et al., 2021). Concerns about constant surveillance, particularly through AI-driven performance management tools, create tensions between efficiency and employee well-being (Hensher et al., 2021). Additionally, scholars argue that the lack of explainability in algorithmic systems erodes trust in HR decisions, as employees struggle to understand the logic behind automated judgments (Shrestha et al., 2021). When workers perceive HR practices as opaque or unfair, organizational culture and morale suffer, undermining long-term productivity (Arohman, Syamsuri, & Angraini, 2025). These psychological and ethical costs illustrate that successful AI adoption in HRM is not solely about technological capability but also about aligning innovation with human values. Without such alignment, AI risks becoming a source of disempowerment rather than empowerment in the workplace.

At a strategic level, the implications of these findings suggest that organizations must adopt a holistic governance framework to manage the ethical risks of AI in HRM. Scholars recommend embedding ethical considerations directly into the design and deployment of AI systems, including fairness checks, transparency protocols, and employee feedback mechanisms (Dattner et al., 2019; Martin, 2019). Furthermore, regulatory pressures are likely to intensify in the coming years, requiring organizations to demonstrate compliance with evolving data protection and anti-discrimination laws (Calo, 2020). This implies that companies cannot treat ethics as an afterthought but must view responsible AI adoption as a strategic priority that safeguards both organizational reputation and employee trust (Kim, 2022). Beyond compliance, organizations that actively embrace fairness and inclusivity in their AI strategies may also gain competitive advantages by cultivating more diverse and engaged workforces (Galanaki et al., 2023). Thus, the literature collectively emphasizes that the responsible use of AI in HRM requires a balance of technological innovation, ethical governance, and cultural adaptation, ensuring that AI enhances rather than undermines the principles of fairness and dignity in the workplace.

CONCLUSION

This study underscores that the integration of artificial intelligence into human resource management represents both a transformative opportunity and a profound ethical challenge, demanding careful attention from scholars and practitioners alike. The review demonstrates that while AI enhances efficiency in recruitment, performance analysis, and strategic workforce planning, it simultaneously introduces significant risks in the form of algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and ethical dilemmas surrounding privacy and fairness. The literature consistently reveals that these risks are not merely technical shortcomings but deeply rooted in social and organizational contexts, requiring holistic solutions that involve governance frameworks, accountability measures, and cultural adaptation. Furthermore, the findings highlight the psychological and cultural dimensions of AI adoption, where systems perceived as opaque or dehumanizing can undermine trust, increase stress, and erode employee well-being, while transparent and ethically designed

tools can foster engagement and inclusivity. Taken together, the analysis points to the necessity of embedding human values into the design and deployment of AI in HRM, ensuring that technological innovation is accompanied by fairness, inclusivity, and respect for employee dignity. The path forward lies in treating responsible AI not as an optional add-on but as a strategic imperative, one that aligns organizational competitiveness with the principles of ethical accountability and sustainable human resource practices.

REFERENCES

Ajunwa, I. (2020). The paradox of automation as anti-bias intervention. *Cardozo Law Review, 41*(5), 1671–1714.

Arohman, R., & Syamsuri, A. R. (2025). Optimizing the role of artificial intelligence in enhancing effectiveness of human resource management in the hybrid work era. *IJMaKS: International Journal of Management Knowledge Sharing, 2*(1), 241–250.

Arohman, R., Syamsuri, A. R., & Angraini, M. (2025a). A literature review on work-life balance and employee stress levels. *IJMaKS: International Journal of Management Knowledge Sharing, 2*(1), 311–323.

Arohman, R., Syamsuri, A. R., & Angraini, M. (2025b). Exploring wage increase strategy in the context of employee productivity: A literature review. *IJMaKS: International Journal of Management Knowledge Sharing, 2*(1), 320–333.

Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). *Fairness and machine learning: Limitations and opportunities.* MIT Press.

Black, J. S., & van Esch, P. (2020). AI-enabled recruiting: What is it and how should a manager use it? *Business Horizons, 63*(2), 215–226.

Bogen, M., & Rieke, A. (2018). *Help wanted: An examination of hiring algorithms, equity, and bias.* Upturn Report.

Bose, I., Chen, X., & Leung, A. C. M. (2023). Artificial intelligence in human resource management: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management, 69*, Article 102583.

Calo, R. (2020). Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. *University of California Davis Law Review, 51*(2), 399–435.

Cappelli, P., Tambe, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2020). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review, 61*(4), 15–42.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Winsborough, D., Sherman, R. A., & Hogan, R. (2019). New talent signals: Shiny new objects or a brave new world? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12*(2), 252–268.

Cheng, Y., & Hackett, R. D. (2021). Predictive analytics in employee turnover: A review and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(3), Article 100782.

Cowgill, B. (2019). Bias and productivity in humans and algorithms: Theory and evidence from résumé screening. *Columbia Business School Research Paper.*

Dattner, B., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Buchband, R., & Schettler, L. (2019). The legal and ethical implications of using AI in hiring. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(4), 34–42.

Galanaki, E., Lazazzara, A., & Parry, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence in human resource management: Emerging trends and future research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(2), Article 100947.

Ghosh, R. (2022). AI-enabled HRM: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research, 145*, 508–520.

Hensher, D. A., Ho, C., & Mulley, C. (2021). Ethics and AI: Understanding public acceptability of algorithmic systems. *Information Systems Frontiers, 23*(2), 329–343.

Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Artificial intelligence in service. *Journal of Service Research, 24*(1), 3–20.

Jarrahi, M. H., Sutherland, W., & Sawyer, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and knowledge work: A human–AI centric perspective. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 73*(5), 650–664.

Jia, H., Guo, Y., & Barnes, S. J. (2021). The effects of algorithmic HRM systems on employee experience: A cultural perspective. *Information Systems Journal, 31*(6), 923–951.

Kim, T. W. (2022). Algorithmic bias and fairness in human resource management systems. *Business Horizons, 65*(3), 309–319.

Köchling, A., & Wehner, M. C. (2020). Discriminated by an algorithm: A systematic review of discrimination and fairness by algorithmic decision-making in HR. *Business Research, 13*(3), 795–848.

Leicht-Deobald, U., Busch, T., Schank, C., Weibel, A., Schafheitle, S., Wildhaber, I., & Kasper, G. (2019). The challenges of algorithm-based HR decision-making for personal integrity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 160*(2), 377–392.

Margherita, A. (2022). Human resources analytics: A systematization of research and directions for future studies. *Human Resource Management Review, 32*(3), Article 100860.

Martin, K. (2019). Designing ethical algorithms. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 18*(2), 125–139.*

Mateescu, A., & Nguyen, A. (2019). Algorithmic management in the workplace. *Data & Society Research Institute Report, 1–25.*

Minbaeva, D. (2021). Disrupted HR? Human Resource Management in the digital age. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(2), Article 100820.

Pan, Y., Yang, X., & Yu, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in employee training: A systematic literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 5*, Article 100154.

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.

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

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2021). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review, 63*(4), 46–69.

Strohmeier, S., & Parry, E. (2021). HRM in the digital age – Digital changes and challenges of the HR profession. *Employee Relations, 43*(2), 421–437.

Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review, 61*(4), 15–42.

Upadhyay, A. K., & Khandelwal, K. (2019). Applying artificial intelligence: Implications for recruitment. *Strategic HR Review, 18*(2), 62–65.

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. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(6), 1237–1266.

Zhu, H., Song, M., & Ni, C. (2018). Achieving fairness in algorithmic decision-making: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 159*(2), 335–351.