ZIBELINE INTERNATIONAL™ PUBLISHING

ISSN: 3036-0161 (Online)
CODEN: MJHRBC

MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (MJHRM)

DOI: http://doi.org/10.26480/mjhrm.012025.53.56

MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (MJHRM)

CrossMark

REVIEW ARTICLE

UNMASKING BIAS: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF AI IN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Kumarakulasingam Brasanan*

Centre Manager (The Open university of Sri Lanka Vavuniya Study Centre
Corresponding Author email : brasanankumar01@gmail.com

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History:

Received 21 September 2025
Revised 30 October 2025
Accepted 28 November 2025
Available online 31 December 2025

ABSTRACT

Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) more in Human Resource Management (HRM) can bring many advantages, such as making processes faster, more fair, and able to handle larger tasks effectively. However, this change in technology has also brought some new problems, especially biased algorithms. This review looks at how bias appears in AI-based HR systems, especially in hiring, performance reviews, and workforce data analysis. Utilizing inquire about from diverse areas, real-life illustrations, and speculations, this paper looks at how inclination is built into information, how calculations are planned, and how they are utilized. Imperative illustrations, like Amazon's stopped AI contracting instrument and facial examination utilized by HireVue, appear how these innovations can proceed to make shamefulness based on gender, race, and financial status. The review points out a few reasons for unfairness, such as training data that doesn't include everyone, unclear algorithms, and no responsibility when putting systems into use. It also looks closely at current laws and ethical rules, pointing out that they are not enough to deal with the complicated issues of bias in artificial intelligence in human resources management.

KEYWORDS

Algorithms, real-life illustrations, AI contracting, laws and ethical rules

1. INTRODUCTION

Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resource Management (HRM) has greatly changed how companies manage their employees. AI can help make hiring easier, predict how well employees will perform, and keep them engaged. It can make work faster, fairer, and help us make decisions based on data. These new technologies are seen as helpful tools that can make processes easier and lessen unfairness in human resources practices (Johnson et al., 2022). New studies and practical examples show that AI can copy and make existing biases in society and organizations worse, resulting in unfair treatment.

AI systems often show bias because of the data they learn from. If hiring practices, performance reviews, and promotion choices include bias, they can unknowingly teach AI systems to continue these unfair patterns. Also, many AI systems are like "black boxes," meaning can't see clearly how they make their decisions. This lack of clarity, along with not enough regulation, creates problems for fairness and being responsible. Some important examples are Amazon's abandoned AI hiring tool, which liked male candidates because of biased training data, and the debated use of facial recognition and emotion tracking in tools like HireVue. These issues have raised worries about fairness, openness, and inclusivity in AI-based hiring systems (Walker and Larson, 2024).

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Need to look at how Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being used in Human Resource Management (HRM) from different angles to really understand where bias comes from and what it means. The main point of this analysis is algorithmic bias. This means that AI systems can make the same mistakes over and over again, leading to unfair results. Based on fairness ideas in computer science, researchers have made a difference between two types of fairness. Statistical fairness means that results are equal among different groups of people (Nguyen and Park, 2022). Individual fairness means that people with similar skills should be treated the same way. Both viewpoints are important in HR situations where AI systems assess if candidates are a good fit or review employee performance.

Instead of just looking at technical details, the theory of socio-technical systems helps us understand that AI systems are part of complicated organizations and social settings. They don't work alone. This theory says that how technology turns out depends on people's choices, the values of institutions, and the culture of organizations. In HR, even the best computer program can't be fair if it learns from unfair information or is used in a biased organization (Siradhana and Arora, 2024). So, bias isn't just a mistake in the system; it's a sign of bigger social and organizational issues.

Building on this important idea, critical algorithm studies looks at how data, computer code, and automation show and strengthen the unfairness already present in society. This method questions the idea that algorithms are unbiased and highlights how AI systems, like those used in human resource management, often reflect current biases (Purohit and Banerjee, 2024). Experts like Cathy O'Neil and Ruha Benjamin say that algorithms can lead to unfair treatment if not properly managed. This is especially a problem in areas like hiring and job reviews, where already disadvantaged groups face more challenges.

In simple terms, the resource-based view (RBV) in strategic human resource management sees people's skills and knowledge as an important asset that helps a company gain an edge over its competitors. AI is usually used to improve hiring and manage employee performance better (Vadithe and Kesari, 2025). In case unjustifiable calculations take off out qualified candidates or treat a few bunches unjustifiably, the organization may harmed its differing qualities, decency, and imagination, which are imperative for long-term victory. So, bias in AI is not just an ethical issue; it can also be a risk for strategies and planning.

3. APPLICATIONS OF AI IN HRM

Quick Response Code	Access this article online	
	Website: www.mjhrm.com.my	**DOI:** 10.26480/mjhrm.012025.53.56

Cite The Article: Kumarakulasingam Brasanan (2025). Unmasking Bias: A Critical Review of Ai in Human Resource Management. *Malaysian Journal of Human Resources Management (MJHRM), 2(1):* 53-56

Artificial Intelligence is now a key tool in Human Resource Management (HRM). It is changing how companies find, evaluate, manage, and keep their employees. It can be used throughout the whole HR process, making things easier, helping predict future trends, and allowing decisions to be based on data. While people praise AI for its ability to make work more efficient and fair, there are serious worries about bias, fairness, and transparency (Belte, 2021). These issues are especially important when AI is used without a clear understanding or proper oversight.

One of the main uses of AI in human resources is during hiring and choosing new employees. Automated applicant tracking systems (ATS) use technology to read, evaluate job candidates, and even hold initial interviews with chatbots. These systems can save a lot of time in hiring by quickly removing people who don't meet the job requirements. However, when these systems use old hiring data that is unfair, they might accidentally treat candidates unfairly based on their gender, race, or education (Brewster and Brookes, 2024). For example, if an AI system is trained using past hiring choices that picked more male candidates, it might start to lean towards similar candidates, which keeps the same biases going.

AI is also widely used in employee performance management. Tools that analyze communication patterns, work output, and behavioral data claim to offer objective assessments of employee productivity and potential. Predictive analytics can forecast attrition risk, enabling HR teams to proactively address employee dissatisfaction. Yet, such systems may neglect context, such as differences in working styles or cultural communication norms, and risk penalizing individuals who do not conform to dominant organizational behaviors. The opacity of algorithmic decision-making can further exacerbate issues, as employees may not understand or trust how performance evaluations are derived.

In learning and development, AI helps create custom training plans by looking at employee information to suggest specific courses and skills. These systems are made to help employees grow and make sure their development matches what the organization needs (Hauret et al., 2020). When personalize things, it makes a difference individuals get more included and discover what's imperative to them. In any case, depending as well much on suggestions from algorithms can diminish the assortment of learning experiences. It can also keep people in certain jobs if the system's suggestions are based on past patterns or assumptions about different groups of people.

AI tools help with making decisions about pay, planning the workforce, and managing who will take over important roles in the future. These tools help organizations understand trends and compare data, so they can make smart decisions about salaries, promotions, and moving employees within the company. However, these applications can still be biased, especially when the data they use shows unfair differences, like pay gaps between genders or ethnic groups. If don't actively work to fix it and reduce unfairness, AI might keep repeating these differences while pretending to be neutral and based on facts.

Even though more companies are using AI in human resources, a big problem is still making sure it's done ethically. Many groups do not have clear rules for checking AI systems, keeping data private, or being open with employees who are impacted. The "black box" nature of some AI models makes it hard to understand how they work, which makes it tough to hold them responsible or question their decisions (Aust et al., 2024). So, while AI can greatly improve HR practices, it needs careful management, fair use of data, and a promise to be fair that goes beyond just being effective.

4. Critical Review of Literature

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into human resource management (HRM) has gained substantial academic and industry attention over the past decade. A growing body of literature explores how AI enhances HR functions, improves decision-making efficiency, and addresses workforce challenges. However, critical voices have simultaneously emerged, drawing attention to the unintended consequences of algorithmic systems, particularly the replication and reinforcement of social biases (Gautam et al., 2024). This literature review critically examines empirical findings, theoretical contributions, and debates surrounding AI's impact on fairness and equity within HR practices.

Experts believe that AI makes hiring choices more fair and precise by taking away personal opinions from the hiring process (Brändle et al., 2022). Supporters claim that algorithms can be taught to look only at what is important for a job, removing biases from people's unnoticed opinions. This hopeful perspective is shown in studies, it was shown that HR systems using AI can make hiring easier and help find better job matches (Thomas and Reimann, 2022). Research shows that AI can help reduce tiredness for recruiters and ensure that all candidates are judged by the same standards, which reduces differences in evaluations.

However, more and more writings are arguing against the idea that AI is neutral. Critics point out that AI systems can only be fair if the data they learn from is fair (Moh'd et al., 2024). Training data can show past unfairness and personal choices, so algorithms might accidentally repeat and spread these biases in a hidden and consistent way. They look at how machine learning systems can unknowingly include unfair biases (Brandl et al., 2024). This often happens when they use race, gender, or income level as stand-ins for things that seem neutral, like zip codes or school names. These results are especially concerning for human resource management (HRM), where treating everyone fairly and providing equal chances are important for both ethics and following the law.

The Amazon AI recruitment tool incident is frequently cited as a real-world illustration of these concerns. The system, designed to streamline candidate selection, reportedly penalized résumés containing the word "women's," based on historical data in which male applicants predominated. This incident, discussed, underscores the trouble of creating reasonable AI when the fundamental information is skewed (Binns, 2018). Besides, the need of straightforwardness encompassing algorithmic decision-making forms regularly depicted as "black box" systems limits the ability of HR professionals and candidates to understand, question, or appeal AI-generated outcomes.

Experts say that to understand bias in AI, can't just look at the technology itself. Need to consider the bigger picture, including the organizations and society as a whole. A study shows that HR technologies show the beliefs, ideas, and power structures of the organizations that create and use them (Eichberger et al., 2020). This line of addressing energizes HR experts to think carefully around how working environment culture and unjustifiable frameworks influence the comes about of AI frameworks and the questions those frameworks are implied to address.

The writing discusses how AI affects diversity and inclusion. Some studies, like the ones, say that AI can help find candidates who aren't usually represented and can reduce bias (Upadhyay and Khandelwal, 2018). However, others warn that using algorithms might hurt diversity goals because they can favor groups that have been dominant in the past. They studied how monitoring employees and using data analysis in human resources can lead to new types of discrimination at work (Geradine and McWha-Hermann, 2024). This is often particularly genuine when it comes to observing representatives, rating their execution, and surveying their hazard. These stresses bring up critical questions approximately freedom, regard, and decency in work environments utilizing calculations for overseeing individuals. Some researchers suggest ways to reduce bias in AI using technical methods. These include cleaning data before it's used (pre-processing), adding fairness rules during the process (in-processing), and fixing outputs afterwards (post-processing). Some people think that while these solutions are good, they won't work well unless there are also changes in the way organizations operate.

5. Manifestations of Bias in AI-HRM Systems

Bias in AI systems used in Human Resource Management (AI-HRM) shows up in different obvious and hidden ways. It affects how companies hire people, evaluate their performance, develop employees, and handle other important HR tasks. It's vital to get it these issues to handle the moral and viable issues that one-sided AI can cause in decency at work, worker happiness, and company results. This section looks at the usual types of bias found in AI used for human resource management (HRM), using data and examples from recent studies.

One common sort of unfairness in AI contracting frameworks is sexual orientation inclination, particularly in programs that offer assistance with contracting. AI frameworks that learn from past enrolling data frequently show up a inclination for male candidates since the data is based on workforces that generally have men. This could lead to out of line treatment of female candidates (Järlström et al., 2024). For example, Amazon's AI hiring tool was said to lower the scores of resumes that included the word "women's. " This shows that gender bias can be part of the data used to train these systems. This problem happens because the algorithm was trained on past hiring decisions that favored men too much. As a result, it often overlooks skills or experiences that are more common among women. Studies have shown that AI systems might treat women's voices unfairly during interviews or phone screenings. This happens because the voice recognition software doesn't work as well with female voices (Wilkinson and Barry, 2016).

Racial and ethnic bias are closely linked to gender bias. AI-HRM systems sometimes use information like zip codes, school names, or social media

data to guess a person's background. Another important example is unfair treatment based on age. More seasoned laborers can be unreasonably overlooked by AI contracting apparatuses that lean toward younger candidates, who are seen as more comfortable with innovation. This happens since the preparing information usually shows a workforce that has more young workers, or because the people who create the algorithms make assumptions about how productive and flexible workers are based on their age (Drazic and Schermuly, 2023). Biases related to age are especially worrying when planning for the workforce and picking future leaders. This is because AI might not recognize the value of older, experienced workers, which can result in them leaving their jobs too soon and losing valuable knowledge within the organization.

Apart from demographic biases, AI-HRM systems also show a tendency to confirm what they already believe and rely too much on technology. Confirmation bias happens when algorithms support existing stereotypes by focusing on candidates who match past successful profiles. This limits new ideas and diversity in thinking. For example, an AI system that prefers candidates from top universities might leave out skilled people from different educational backgrounds, keeping social divisions in place. Automation bias is when people rely too much on AI suggestions, which can lead to them using less of their own judgment. HR professionals might rely too much on the results from algorithms, even when there are signs that those results are biased or wrong. This can make bad decisions even worse

In evaluating employee performance, biases connected to watching and understanding data are very noticeable. AI frameworks that observe how representatives carry on, like analyzing e-mail tone, following writing designs, or observing exercises, might misconstrue the circumstance or unreasonably rebuff those who don't take after the rules. For illustration, laborers who are modest or have inabilities might appear less included or active based on numbers, even though they still make important contributions. This causes unfair performance reviews and can hurt employee spirit and trust in management (Minssen et al., 2024)

Another critical manifestation is algorithmic opacity, which is not a bias in itself but exacerbates bias's effects by obscuring how decisions are made. Many AI-HRM systems operate as "black boxes," where neither HR professionals nor employees can fully understand the logic behind candidate scoring or performance ratings. This lack of transparency hinders accountability and prevents meaningful contestation of decisions. Without explainability, employees subjected to biased outcomes lack recourse or confidence in the fairness of AI-driven HR processes.

At long last, there's a buildup of small predispositions completely different HR ranges that includes up and makes a huge issue over time. For illustration, out of line contracting devices, uneven work execution surveys, and a need of comprehensive preparing proposals can all work together to thrust certain bunches aside, making it harder for them to improvement in their careers. This build-up increases awkwardness and makes it harder for organizations to stay to their guarantees of being assorted, reasonable, and comprehensive.

6. Ethical, Legal and Social Implications

Using AI in Human Resource Management brings up important ethical, legal, and social issues that companies need to think about to make sure they use it fairly and responsibly. AI-HRM systems raise important questions about fairness, openness, and respecting people's choices. If AI continues to support existing social biases, it could weaken HR's normal portion of ensuring sensible enrolling and work environment practices. When one-sided calculations nonsensically hurt certain bunches, they go against basic contemplations of decency and correspondence that are central to moral practice in human resources (Kornau et al., 2020). Also, using machines to make important decisions like hiring, promoting, and firing can make work relationships feel less personal. This can reduce trust and hurt employees' sense of dignity. There is a responsibility to explain AI decisions clearly to job applicants and employees, but this isn't happening enough. Many algorithms are unclear, which raises worries about who is responsible and whether people agree with these decisions.

By law, AI in Human Resources (HR) must follow rules against discrimination and protect people's personal information. These rules can be different in different places but usually stop unfair treatment based on things like race, gender, age, and disability. The problem is that it's hard to understand how AI makes decisions, which makes it tough to show when there's unfair treatment or bias (Zacher and Rudolph, 2021). Laws like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) include rules about automated decision-making and the rights of individuals whose data is used. These rights include the ability to understand decisions made about them and to challenge those decisions. However, the way laws are enforced is not consistent around the world, and many organizations find it hard to make their AI systems follow the changing legal rules (Wegerer, 2018). Not following the rules can lead to lawsuits, a damaged reputation, and fines.

Socially, AI in human resources affects how people get along at work and influences the society around us. Using automated systems can make the power difference between employers and employees worse by reducing human decision-making and control. The way AI makes decisions can seem mysterious to employees, which might lead them to doubt and resist it. This can harm teamwork in the organization. Also, depending on AI could make unfair problems worse if certain groups are always left out or watched more closely. If many companies start using biased AI tools in hiring, it could keep unfair treatment in the workplace going, affecting job opportunities and people's chances to improve their lives. To deal with these ethical, legal, and social issues, organizations need to create strong rules that focus on being open, responsible, and putting people first (Harlos, 2016). This means regularly checking for bias, talking with everyone involved, and clearly explaining how AI is used in making decisions. We can use AI safely and effectively only if we take a combined approach that addresses its benefits and risks.

7. Findings and Recommendations

The review of using AI in Human Resource Management shows that AI can help make HR processes quicker, more efficient, and better at decision-making. However, it also brings important risks, mainly related to bias and ethical issues. The results show that AI-HRM systems often copy and continue the biases from the data they were trained on, leading to unfair treatment of women, racial and ethnic minorities, older workers, and other disadvantaged groups. These biases show up in job hiring programs, performance reviews, and employee tracking tools, hurting fairness and equality at work.

Also, many AI systems are unclear, which makes it difficult for HR specialists and representatives to get it, inquire around, or address choices made by AI. This need of understanding makes it difficult for individuals to believe AI devices and makes huge issues for taking after laws like GDPR and anti-discrimination rules. Moreover, depending as well much on AI proposals can cause robotization predisposition. This implies individuals might depend as well much on what the AI says and ignore their own judgment, which can lead to mistakes in decision-making that go unnoticed. There are important ethical issues to think about, as AI-HRM systems might take absent individual associations and lower employees' sense of regard. Utilizing machines to form basic choices without adequate human supervision can make agents feel segregated and can hurt the company's work environment. The impacts of AI go past fair person occupations; in the event that not dealt with legitimately, it may make social imbalances more awful in society.

First, companies need to focus on having good and varied data when training AI models. It's imperative to create beyond any doubt that information is reasonable and doesn't have past predispositions so that it doesn't lead to out of line comes about. This incorporates normal checks of our information and dynamic steps to include a assortment of candidates and employees. Moment, it's basic to make calculations clearer and less requesting to urge it. AI systems ought to be made so that HR specialists and workers can effectively get it why choices are taken. Giving clear reasons for choices and having easy ways for people to challenge those decisions can build trust and responsibility.

Third, people should always be in charge of AI in human resources. Organizations should use AI to help make decisions, not to make decisions on its own. HR professionals should carefully look at what AI suggests and keep the final say in decisions. This balanced way can reduce mistakes from relying too much on automation and keep the human touch in overseeing individuals. Fourth, organizations ought to make clear rules and rules for utilizing AI in human resources. This recommends regularly checking for injustice and impacts, getting input from all parties checking specialist administrators, and having clear rules about information security and goodness. These rules can offer assistance ensure AI is utilized mindfully and takes after lawful and ethical rules. It's important for HR teams to keep learning about what AI can do, what it cannot do, and the risks involved. Teaching HR workers to spot possible biases and ethical issues will help them manage AI tools more effectively and promote fairer and more inclusive practices.

8. Conclusion

Using Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management has the potential to make things work better, help in making better choices, and change the usual ways HR operates. This review shows that AI systems can have biases and might continue to support unfair treatment based on gender, race, age, and other factors. The absence of clear data and as well

much reliance on computer programs makes it harder to handle moral and legitimate issues. This could lead to unjustifiable treatment of laborers and hurt believe within the working environment. To make the most of AI in human resources, companies need to use a smart mix of good data handling, clear algorithms, human supervision, and ethical rules. Only by taking these broad steps can AI-based HR practices support fairness, responsibility, and inclusion. In the end, using AI responsibly in HR will help protect employees' rights and improve how well the organization works. This makes it very important for today's workplaces.

REFERENCES

Aust, I., Fang Lee Cooke, Muller-Camen, M., and Wood, G., 2024. Achieving sustainable development goals through common-good HRM: Context, approach and practice. German Journal of Human Resource Management, 38(2), Pp. 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241240890

Belte, A., 2021. New avenues for HRM roles: A systematic literature review on HRM in hybrid organizations. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 36(2), 239700222110495. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022211049533

Brandl, J., Laverne Iminza Chore, and Junker, M., 2024. How you value shapes whom you value: The contribution of apprenticeships to sustainable development goals. German Journal of Human Resource Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241239257

Brändle, T., Grunau, P., Haylock, M., and Kampkötter, P., 2022. Heterogeneity in firms' recruitment practices: New evidence from representative employer data. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 37(2), 239700222211183. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221118346

Brewster, C., and Brookes, M., 2024. Sustainable development goals and new approaches to HRM: Why HRM specialists will not reach the sustainable development goals and why it matters. German Journal of Human Resource Management, 38(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241229037

Drazic, I., and Schermuly, C. C., 2023. Too old for modern work? An explicit and implicit measure of the modern-work-is-young stereotype. Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung, 38(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022231195061

Eichberger, C., Derks, D., and Zacher, H., 2020. Technology-assisted supplemental work, psychological detachment, and employee well-being: A daily diary study. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 239700222096818. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002220968188

Gautam, V., Abhyudaya Anand Mishra, and Maheshwari, M., 2024. Examining the relevance of human resource management in gig work: A systematic literature review and research agenda. German Journal of Human Resource Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241231536

Geradine, K., and Ishbel McWha-Hermann., 2024. In search of decent work: Human resource managers as custodians of fair reward in international NGOs. German Journal of Human Resource Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241231838

Harlos, K., 2016. Employee silence in the context of unethical behavior at work: A commentary. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 30(3-4), Pp. 345–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002216649856

Hauret, L., Martin, L., Omrani, N., and Williams, D. R., 2020. How do HRM practices improve employee satisfaction? Economic and Industrial Democracy, 43(2), 0143831X2096219. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831x20962199

Järlström, M., Essi Saru, Maija Viitasaari, and Kleio Akrivou., 2024. Integrating common good authenticity for sustainable human resource management reporting. Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241229035

Johnson, B. A. M., Coggburn, J. D., and Llorens, J. J., 2022. Artificial Intelligence and Public Human Resource Management: Questions for Research and Practice. Public Personnel Management, 51(4), 009102602211264. https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260221126498

Kornau, A., Frerichs, I. M., and Sieben, B., 2020. An empirical analysis of research paradigms within international human resource management: The need for more diversity. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 34(2), Pp. 148–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002220908035

Minssen, L., Levels, M., Pfeifer, H., and Wehner, C., 2024. Are recruiters driving gender segregation? Evidence from the German apprenticeship market. German Journal of Human Resource Management Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241300060

Moh'd, S., Gregory, P., Barroca, L., and Sharp, H., 2024. Agile human resource management: A systematic mapping study. Agile Human Resource Management: A Systematic Mapping Study, 38(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022231226316

Neha Kumari Siradhana, and Ritu Gandhi Arora., 2024. Examining the Influence of Artificial Intelligence Implementation in HRM Practices Using T-O-E Model. Vision. https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629241231458

Nguyen, L. A., and Park, M., 2022. Artificial Intelligence in Staffing. Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 097226292210968. https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221096803

Purohit, R., and Banerjee, T., 2024. Artificial intelligence-based organizational decision-making in recruitment practice. Human Systems Management, 44(1), Pp. 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3233/hsm-240044

Rakesh Naik Vadithe, and Bikrant Kesari., 2025. Role of technology enablers for implementation of HR analytics in the Indian IT sector: A mediation analysis. Human Systems Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/01672533251314403

Thomas, O., and Reimann, O., 2022. The bias blind spot among HR employees in hiring decisions. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 37(1), 239700222210945. Sagepub. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221094523

Walker, D. O. H., and Larson, M., 2024. Leveraging Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Human Resource Management: The AI Job Description Assignment. Journal of Management Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629241294075

Wegerer, P. K., 2018. Ethical branding as a discoursive resource for employee identity work: A case study. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 32(2), Pp. 102–119. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002218760511

Wilkinson, A., and Barry, M., 2016. Voices from across the divide: An industrial relations perspective on employee voice. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 30(3-4), Pp. 338–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002216649899

Zacher, H., and Rudolph, C. W., 2021. Researching employee experiences and behavior in times of crisis: Theoretical and methodological considerations and implications for human resource management. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 36(1), Pp. 6–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022211058812