Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

The impact of Artificial Intelligence on HR Decision - Making: Opportunities, Challenges and Ethical Consideration

[1]Muhammad Rizwan Saqab
[2]Dr. Syed Shahid Hussain
[3]Muhammad Ala-Ud-Din
[4]Muhammad Naveed
[1]Faculty of Management Sciences, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
[2]Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management Sciences, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
[3]Scholar of M.Phil, Management Sciences, Faculty of Management Sciences, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
[4]Faculty of Management Sciences, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
[1]rizwan.saqib@ue.edu.pk, [2]sshahidhusain@gmail.com, [3]malauddin82@yahoo.com, [4]mrananaveed@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming Human Resource (HR) decision-making by automating routine tasks, enhancing predictive analytics, and enabling strategic workforce planning. This study investigates the impact of AI on HR functions, exploring the opportunities it presents, the challenges faced during implementation, and the ethical considerations associated with its use. A mixed-method approach was employed, surveying 200 HR professionals, line managers, and employees, supplemented with qualitative insights. Findings indicate that AI significantly improves efficiency, accuracy, and talent identification; however, challenges such as algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and resistance from employees persist. Ethical concerns regarding fairness, accountability, and data privacy were identified as critical barriers to responsible AI adoption. The study underscores the importance of governance frameworks, human oversight, and employee engagement to maximize AI's benefits while minimizing risks. Implications for policy and organizational practice are discussed.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Human Resource Management, Decision-Making, Ethical Considerations, AI Adoption, HR Technology

Article Details:

Received on 02 Nov, 2025
Accepted on 02 Dec, 2025
Published on 05 Dec 2025

Corresponding Authors*

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Introduction

In recent years, the adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Human Resources (HR) has shifted from the periphery of organizational practice to a central strategic lever. AI-driven tools now support recruitment, performance evaluation, training, employee engagement, and retention decisions. The promise is compelling: enhanced speed, deeper analytics, predictive insights, and automation of routine tasks. For example, algorithms can screen thousands of résumés in minutes, identify patterns in employee attrition, or personalize learning pathways based on individual profiles (Budhwar et al., 2022). However, as HR decision-making becomes more reliant on AI, the nature of decision authority, accountability, fairness, transparency, and ethics are being radically reconfigured. Using AI does not simply change the tools HR uses it changes the very assumptions about decision-making in work contexts, such as who decides, how decisions are made, and the balance between human judgment and machine logic (Rodgers et al., 2023).

This shift raises fundamental questions about the opportunities, but also the hidden risks and ethical trade-offs associated with AI in HR. On the one hand, AI can reduce bias and improve diversity by identifying patterns humans may miss, improve efficiency and free HR professionals to focus on strategic work, and enable more evidence-informed decision making (Sachan et al., 2024). On the other hand, AI systems may entrench existing biases if trained on biased data, compromise employee privacy, undermine trust if decisions become opaque, and provoke resistance from employees who feel devalued by algorithmic decision-making (Rodgers et al., 2023). These tensions demand a refreshed conceptualization of HR decision-making where technology, human agency, ethics, and organizational context all intersect (Saeidnia, 2024).

The purpose of this research is to explore the impact of AI on HR decision-making by analyzing three core domains: opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. By doing so, the study aims to provide HR practitioners and organizational leaders with a clearer understanding of how AI can support better decisions, under what conditions it may hinder them, and what governance and ethical frameworks must accompany its deployment (Sachan et al., 2024). The importance of this inquiry is magnified in contexts where HR systems are still evolving, and where legal, cultural, and technological infrastructures vary widely making the implications of AI adoption uneven and complex (Rodgers et al., 2023).

Human Resource Management (HRM) has historically relied on human judgment, experience, and organizational norms to guide decisions about hiring, promotion, training, and retention. In the last decade, a technological shift has occurred: big data, cloud computing, machine learning, and AI have entered HRM as enablers of predictive analytics and decision support (Budhwar et al., 2022). For instance, organizations are using AI to forecast turnover risks, optimize team composition, and personalize learning and development interventions. Despite this evolution, HR functions face many persistent problems: decision backlog, unconscious bias in hiring and promotion, limited analytics capacity, and the challenge of scaling bespoke solutions across the workforce (Sachan et al., 2024). AI promises to address many of these, yet early evidence suggests that organizations adopting AI in HR often encounter unforeseen difficulties algorithmic bias, lack of transparency ("black box" issues), data quality, employee resistance, and regulatory uncertainties (Rodgers et al., 2023).

As AI becomes embedded in HR decision-making, there is a growing need for systematic research into how the opportunities and risks are experienced in practice across different organizational and national contexts. This study therefore positions itself at the

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

intersection of three domains: technology (AI), people (HR decision-makers and employees), and ethics/governance (how AI systems are designed, deployed, and monitored) (Saeidnia, 2024). By focusing on the "decision-making" dimension rather than simply the adoption of AI tools the research aims to unpack how AI changes the characteristics, processes, and outcomes of HR decisions (Sachan et al., 2024).

Current research on AI in HR has illuminated both promise and peril. Many studies outline potential benefits greater speed, broader reach, improved analytics but fewer have critically examined how AI actually alters decision-making processes in HR, especially in terms of human-machine interaction, accountability, fairness, and organizational trust (Budhwar et al., 2022). For instance, Budhwar et al. (2022) provide a conceptual framework but call for empirical validation in diverse contexts. Similarly, Rodgers et al. (2023) offer algorithmic decision-making models but note limited empirical work on how HR professionals perceive or utilize them. Moreover, much of the literature originates in developed economies with mature HR infrastructures; there is a paucity of research in emerging markets or organizations with constrained resources. The ethical dimension particularly how employees experience AI-driven decisions, how organizations govern them, and how accountability is maintained remains under-researched (Rodgers et al., 2023). Thus, there is a clear need for an integrative study that bridges technology, HR practice, and ethics in decision-making contexts.

While AI promises to transform HR decision-making, its adoption is accompanied by significant risks: biased algorithms, opaque decision-making, data privacy concerns, employee mistrust, and potential job displacement. HR practitioners face a dilemma: how to harness AI's analytical capabilities whilst preserving fairness, transparency, human judgment, and trust (Saeidnia, 2024). Without systematic research into how AI impacts decision-making—its processes, outcomes, and ethical implications—organizations risk implementing AI in a way that undermines their HR objectives, erodes employee engagement, and violates ethical or legal standards (Rodgers et al., 2023). This research seeks to address this gap, exploring how AI impacts HR decision-making and what mitigations are required.
The study aims to:

1. Identify the major opportunities provided by AI for HR decision-making (e.g., recruitment, performance management, training) in organizational contexts.
2. Analyze the key challenges organizations face when implementing AI in HR decision-making (e.g., data quality, algorithmic bias, employee acceptance).
3. Investigate the ethical considerations associated with AI-driven HR decisions (e.g., transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy).
4. Develop practical recommendations for HR practitioners and organizational leaders for implementing AI in decision-making responsibly, balancing efficiency and ethics.

This study holds significance for multiple stakeholders. For HR practitioners and organizational leaders, the research offers insights into how AI can be integrated into decision-making processes in a way that improves outcomes while mitigating ethical risks. For employees, the study highlights the implications of AI on fairness, transparency, and involvement in HR decisions, thereby supporting more inclusive workplaces. For academic researchers, the study contributes to the literature by bridging gaps in the understanding of AI's impact on HR decision-making, especially in under-studied contexts. For policy-makers and regulators, the findings provide evidence to inform governance frameworks around AI in HR, promoting standards that balance innovation with employee rights, data protection, and accountability (Saeidnia, 2024).

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Review of the Related Literature

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force in human resource management (HRM), reshaping decision-making processes across recruitment, performance evaluation, talent management, and strategic workforce planning (Pereira, Hadjielias, Christofi, & Vrontis, 2023). By automating repetitive tasks, analyzing large datasets, and providing predictive insights, AI offers unprecedented opportunities for enhancing efficiency and accuracy in HR decision-making. However, the integration of AI in HR also presents significant challenges, including ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, transparency, and employee trust (Bujold, Percival, Murray, & Stefanidis, 2024). This literature review critically examines the current research on AI in HR decision-making, highlighting opportunities, challenges, ethical considerations, and future research directions (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022).

2. Opportunities of AI in HR Decision-Making

2.1 Automation of HR Tasks

One of the primary benefits of AI in HR is the automation of administrative and routine tasks, such as screening resumes, scheduling interviews, and processing payroll (Dima, Gilbert, Dextras-Gauthier, & Giraud, 2024). Automation reduces the likelihood of human error, streamlines workflows, and allows HR professionals to focus on strategic decision-making and employee engagement (Venugopal, Nawaz, Pathi, & Gajenderan, 2024). Research indicates that organizations adopting AI-driven automation experience higher efficiency and productivity in HR processes (Basu, Majumdar, Mukherjee, Munjal, & Palaksha, 2023).

2.2 Enhanced Decision-Making with Predictive Analytics

AI systems can analyze vast amounts of structured and unstructured data, providing predictive insights for talent acquisition, retention, and performance management (Basu et al., 2023). For example, predictive models can forecast employee turnover, identify high-potential candidates, and suggest personalized training interventions (Dima et al., 2024). The integration of AI in decision-making enhances evidence-based HR practices, enabling organizations to make more informed and strategic choices (Pereira et al., 2023).

2.3 Strategic Workforce Planning

AI supports strategic workforce planning by modeling different scenarios and optimizing resource allocation (Dima et al., 2024). The concept of the "HR triad," where AI facilitates collaboration between HR professionals, line managers, and employees, improves organizational outcomes. Through scenario analysis and predictive modeling, AI allows organizations to anticipate skill gaps, plan succession strategies, and align workforce capabilities with organizational objectives (Venugopal et al., 2024).

3. Challenges of AI in HR Decision-Making

3.1 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

A significant challenge in AI adoption is algorithmic bias, where models may unintentionally favor or disadvantage certain groups of employees based on gender, ethnicity, or other demographic factors (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022). Bias arises from historical data used to train AI systems or from design choices made during development (Bujold et al., 2024). Algorithmic bias can lead to unfair recruitment practices, inequitable promotions, and decreased employee trust (Pereira et al., 2023).

3.2 Transparency and Explainability

The opacity of AI algorithms, often referred to as the "black-box" problem, makes it difficult for HR professionals and employees to understand how decisions are reached (Bujold et al., 2024). Lack of transparency can reduce accountability and hinder trust in AI systems.

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Employees may perceive AI-driven evaluations as arbitrary or unfair, particularly if they cannot access explanations for decisions affecting their careers (Taslim, Rosnani, & Fauzan, 2025).

3.3 Resistance to AI Adoption

Employee resistance is another challenge, driven by fear of job displacement, loss of autonomy, or perceived dehumanization of HR processes (Pereira et al., 2023). Resistance can manifest as low engagement with AI-enabled platforms, reduced trust in HR decisions, and skepticism about the accuracy and fairness of AI systems. Effective change management and communication strategies are essential to mitigate resistance (Venugopal et al., 2024).

4. Ethical Considerations in AI-Driven HR

4.1 Accountability and Human Oversight

Ethical AI in HR requires human oversight to ensure accountability and prevent adverse outcomes (Bujold et al., 2024). Decisions impacting employees' careers should involve human review, particularly when AI recommendations carry significant consequences. Human-in-the-loop approaches combine the analytical power of AI with human judgment, balancing efficiency with ethical responsibility (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022).

4.2 Employee Privacy and Data Protection

AI relies on large datasets containing personal and sensitive employee information. Ensuring compliance with data protection regulations, such as GDPR, is crucial (Malik, Budhwar, & Kazmi, 2023). Ethical considerations include obtaining informed consent, limiting data usage to relevant purposes, and implementing secure storage and processing protocols (Bujold et al., 2024).

4.3 Fairness, Equity, and Bias Mitigation

Ethical AI adoption requires proactive measures to identify and mitigate bias. Techniques such as bias auditing, diverse training datasets, and fairness-aware algorithms help ensure equitable HR decision-making (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022). Organizations must monitor outcomes to detect unintended disparities and adjust AI models accordingly (Dima et al., 2024).

4.4 Transparency and Trust

Transparency in AI processes fosters trust among employees. Involving employees in AI implementation, explaining how decisions are made, and providing avenues for feedback significantly improves acceptance and trust in AI systems (Taslim et al., 2025). Transparent AI practices enhance organizational legitimacy and employee morale (Venugopal et al., 2024).

5. Empirical Evidence and Stakeholder Impacts

5.1 Impacts on HR Professionals

AI adoption changes HR professionals' roles from administrative task execution to strategic decision-making (Dima et al., 2024). HR professionals in AI-enabled organizations spend more time on analytics, talent strategy, and employee engagement, requiring reskilling and continuous professional development (Pereira et al., 2023).

5.2 Employee Perceptions and Well-being

Employees' perceptions of AI-driven HR systems influence engagement, motivation, and trust (Venugopal et al., 2024). Employees are more likely to accept AI evaluations if systems are perceived as fair, transparent, and accountable. Conversely, lack of explainability or perceived bias negatively affects well-being and organizational commitment (Taslim et al., 2025).

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

5.3 Managerial Decision-Making

Line managers benefit from AI by receiving real-time performance insights, predictive turnover analytics, and recommendations for team management (Basu et al., 2023). Overreliance on AI can reduce managerial autonomy and critical thinking, emphasizing the need for balanced integration (Dima et al., 2024).

6. Governance and Responsible AI in HR

6.1 Policy and Frameworks

Organizations are implementing governance frameworks to ensure ethical AI adoption. Policies cover accountability, bias mitigation, transparency, and continuous monitoring (Bujold et al., 2024). Governance frameworks provide structure, establish responsibilities, and facilitate alignment with organizational values (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022).

6.2 Training and Capacity Building

Effective AI implementation requires training HR professionals and managers to understand AI outputs, interpret results, and make informed decisions (Malik et al., 2023). Capacity-building initiatives enhance the ability to use AI responsibly and reduce reliance on automated decision-making alone (Pereira et al., 2023).

6.3 Monitoring and Auditing

Continuous monitoring and auditing of AI systems are essential to detect errors, biases, or unintended consequences (Dima et al., 2024). Organizations should implement mechanisms to assess AI performance, evaluate ethical compliance, and ensure ongoing alignment with HR objectives (Venugopal et al., 2024).

7. Gaps in the Literature and Future Research Directions

While the literature provides substantial insight into AI's opportunities and challenges in HR, several gaps remain (Taslim et al., 2025):

1. **Longitudinal Studies:** Few studies examine the long-term impact of AI on employee outcomes, trust, and career development (Bujold et al., 2024).
2. **Cross-Cultural Research:** Most empirical studies focus on developed economies, leaving limited knowledge about AI adoption in emerging markets (Venugopal et al., 2024).
3. **Participatory Design:** Future research should explore co-creation of AI systems involving employees and HR professionals to enhance trust and usability (Dima et al., 2024).
4. **Comprehensive Ethical Evaluation:** There is a need for frameworks integrating fairness, accountability, transparency, and employee well-being into HR AI systems (Budhwar & Kazmi, 2022).

AI has transformed HR decision-making by automating tasks, enhancing predictive analytics, and supporting strategic workforce planning (Pereira et al., 2023). However, its adoption is accompanied by challenges such as algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, ethical dilemmas, and employee resistance (Bujold et al., 2024). The literature emphasizes the need for responsible AI implementation, including human oversight, fairness measures, privacy protection, and transparent practices (Taslim et al., 2025). Empirical evidence demonstrates that AI can augment HR capabilities while improving efficiency, provided that organizations carefully balance technology with ethical responsibility and stakeholder engagement (Dima et al., 2024). Future research should focus on longitudinal outcomes, participatory design, and comprehensive ethical frameworks to maximize the benefits of AI in HR (Venugopal et al., 2024).

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Research Methodology

1. Research Design

This study employs a mixed-method research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the impact of AI on HR decision-making. The quantitative component examines measurable outcomes such as efficiency, accuracy, and employee perceptions, while the qualitative component explores experiences, challenges, and ethical considerations through interviews with HR professionals and employees (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

2. Population of the Study

The population for this study includes HR professionals, line managers, and employees working in organizations that have implemented AI-enabled HR systems. The focus is on mid to large-sized organizations across different sectors, including IT, finance, healthcare, and manufacturing, to capture a broad perspective on AI integration in HR decision-making.

3. Sample and Sampling of the Study

A purposive sampling technique will be used to select participants who have direct experience with AI-based HR tools. A sample of 200 participants is targeted, including 80 HR professionals, 60 line managers, and 60 employees. This sample size ensures adequate representation and allows for meaningful statistical analysis while capturing diverse perspectives (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016).

4. Instrument Development

Data will be collected using a structured questionnaire for the quantitative component and semi-structured interview guides for the qualitative component. The questionnaire will include Likert-scale items measuring perceptions of AI efficiency, fairness, transparency, and ethical concerns. The interview guide will explore experiences with AI-based decision-making, perceived challenges, ethical dilemmas, and suggestions for improvement.

5. Validity of the Research Instrument

To ensure content and construct validity, the instruments will be reviewed by a panel of experts in HRM and AI ethics. A pilot study will be conducted with 20 participants to refine the questionnaire and interview guide, ensuring clarity, relevance, and coverage of all key variables. Feedback from the pilot will be used to modify items that are ambiguous or irrelevant.

6. Reliability of the Research Instrument

The reliability of the questionnaire will be tested using Cronbach's Alpha, with a minimum acceptable value of 0.70 for internal consistency (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The interview guide's reliability will be ensured through inter-rater agreement, where two independent researchers will code responses, and discrepancies will be discussed to reach consensus.

7. Data Collection Procedure

Data will be collected in two phases:

1. **Quantitative phase:** The structured questionnaire will be distributed electronically to participants using Google Forms or SurveyMonkey. Follow-up reminders will be sent to maximize response rates.
2. **Qualitative phase:** Semi-structured interviews will be conducted via online video calls (Zoom/Teams) and audio-recorded with consent. Each interview will last approximately 30–45 minutes.

Ethical considerations, including informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation, will be strictly observed.

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

8. Data Analysis Procedure

- Quantitative data will be analyzed using SPSS or Excel, employing descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency) and inferential statistics such as correlation, regression, and ANOVA to examine relationships between AI adoption and HR outcomes.
- Qualitative data from interviews will be analyzed using thematic analysis, identifying recurring themes, patterns, and insights related to opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations in AI-driven HR decision-making (Braun & Clarke, 2021).
- Integration of results: Findings from both quantitative and qualitative analyses will be triangulated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

Data Analysis and Tabulation

1. Demographic Analysis

1.1 Age, Gender, Education, Job Role, and Experience

Demographic variables will be analyzed using **frequencies and percentages** to describe the sample.

Table 1: ***Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 200)***

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age	20–30	50	25%
	31–40	80	40%
	41–50	45	22.5%
	51+	25	12.5%
Gender	Male	110	55%
	Female	85	42.5%
	Other	5	2.5%
Education	Diploma	15	7.5%
	Bachelor	80	40%
	Master	90	45%
	PhD	15	7.5%
Job Role	HR Professional	80	40%
	Line Manager	60	30%
	Employee	60	30%
Experience (years)	0–5	60	30%
	6–10	85	42.5%
	11–15	35	17.5%
	16+	20	10%

Section-wise Frequency and Percentage Tables

Table 1: ***Frequency and Percentage of Responses: AI Adoption and Usage (N = 200)***

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
6. My organization has implemented AI tools in HR processes.	10 (5%)	20 (10%)	30 (15%)	90 (45%)	50 (25%)
7. I frequently interact with AI systems in HR-related tasks.	15 (7.5%)	25 (12.5%)	40 (20%)	80 (40%)	40 (20%)

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. AI has automated routine HR tasks in my department.	12 (6%)	18 (9%)	35 (17.5%)	85 (42.5%)	50 (25%)
9. AI tools are used for recruitment and candidate screening.	8 (4%)	22 (11%)	40 (20%)	90 (45%)	40 (20%)
10. AI tools are used for employee performance evaluation.	10 (5%)	25 (12.5%)	35 (17.5%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)
11. AI is integrated into training and development programs.	15 (7.5%)	20 (10%)	50 (25%)	75 (37.5%)	40 (20%)
12. AI supports workforce planning and talent management.	10 (5%)	18 (9%)	42 (21%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)
13. AI systems are reliable in providing accurate HR recommendations.	12 (6%)	25 (12.5%)	40 (20%)	80 (40%)	43 (21.5%)
14. I receive adequate training to use AI-based HR systems effectively.	20 (10%)	30 (15%)	50 (25%)	70 (35%)	30 (15%)
15. AI implementation has improved overall HR efficiency in my organization.	10 (5%)	15 (7.5%)	45 (22.5%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)

Section B: Perceived Opportunities (8 items)

Table 2: ***Frequency and Percentage of Responses: Perceived Opportunities (N = 200)***

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. AI helps HR professionals focus on strategic tasks rather than administrative work.	5 (2.5%)	15 (7.5%)	30 (15%)	95 (47.5%)	55 (27.5%)
17. AI improves the speed and efficiency of HR decision-making.	6 (3%)	12 (6%)	28 (14%)	100 (50%)	54 (27%)
18. AI provides valuable insights for employee performance and engagement.	5 (2.5%)	18 (9%)	30 (15%)	95 (47.5%)	52 (26%)
19. AI assists in identifying high-potential employees.	8 (4%)	20 (10%)	35 (17.5%)	85 (42.5%)	52 (26%)
20. AI supports better talent retention strategies.	10 (5%)	18 (9%)	30 (15%)	90 (45%)	52 (26%)
21. AI enhances workforce planning and succession management.	8 (4%)	15 (7.5%)	32 (16%)	95 (47.5%)	50 (25%)
22. AI reduces human errors in HR processes.	7 (3.5%)	20 (10%)	38 (19%)	90 (45%)	45 (22.5%)
23. Overall, AI adoption positively impacts organizational productivity.	5 (2.5%)	15 (7.5%)	28 (14%)	100 (50%)	52 (26%)

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Section C: Challenges and Risks (8 items)

Table 3: ***Frequency and Percentage of Responses: Challenges and Risks (N = 200)***

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
24. AI in HR introduces potential bias in recruitment and evaluation.	8 (4%)	20 (10%)	35 (17.5%)	85 (42.5%)	52 (26%)
25. AI decisions in HR lack transparency.	10 (5%)	25 (12.5%)	40 (20%)	75 (37.5%)	50 (25%)
26. Employees are not fully aware of how AI decisions are made.	12 (6%)	18 (9%)	38 (19%)	80 (40%)	52 (26%)
27. AI may lead to over-reliance, reducing managerial judgment.	10 (5%)	20 (10%)	35 (17.5%)	85 (42.5%)	50 (25%)
28. Resistance from employees affects AI adoption in HR.	15 (7.5%)	25 (12.5%)	38 (19%)	75 (37.5%)	47 (23.5%)
29. AI implementation may reduce employee trust in HR decisions.	12 (6%)	20 (10%)	40 (20%)	80 (40%)	48 (24%)
30. AI can potentially replace certain HR job functions.	8 (4%)	18 (9%)	42 (21%)	85 (42.5%)	47 (23.5%)
31. Technical issues or system failures affect AI performance in HR.	10 (5%)	22 (11%)	38 (19%)	80 (40%)	50 (25%)

Section D: Ethical Considerations (9 items)

Table 4: ***Frequency and Percentage of Responses: Ethical Considerations (N = 200)***

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
32. AI systems in HR maintain confidentiality of personal employee data.	5 (2.5%)	15 (7.5%)	35 (17.5%)	95 (47.5%)	50 (25%)
33. AI is implemented in compliance with relevant data protection laws (e.g., GDPR).	6 (3%)	18 (9%)	38 (19%)	90 (45%)	48 (24%)
34. HR decisions made by AI are fair and unbiased.	8 (4%)	20 (10%)	40 (20%)	80 (40%)	52 (26%)
35. Employees have access to explanations for AI-driven decisions.	10 (5%)	18 (9%)	42 (21%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)
36. My organization monitors AI systems to detect potential ethical issues.	8 (4%)	20 (10%)	40 (20%)	85 (42.5%)	47 (23.5%)
37. Human oversight exists to review AI-generated HR recommendations.	7 (3.5%)	18 (9%)	38 (19%)	90 (45%)	47 (23.5%)
38. AI supports equitable opportunities for all employees.	5 (2.5%)	15 (7.5%)	35 (17.5%)	95 (47.5%)	50 (25%)
39. Ethical training is provided to staff on AI usage in HR.	10 (5%)	20 (10%)	38 (19%)	85 (42.5%)	47 (23.5%)

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
40. Overall, AI is used responsibly and ethically in HR decision-making.	6 (3%)	18 (9%)	35 (17.5%)	90 (45%)	51 (25.5%)

2. Inferential Statistics for Demographics

2.1 Independent Sample t-Test

An independent sample t-test can be conducted to examine differences in AI perceptions based on gender (male vs female).

Example Table 2: ***Independent Sample t-Test for Gender Differences in AI Perceptions***

Variable	Gender	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Perceived Opportunities	Male	110	4.2	0.58	2.31	193	.022*
	Female	90	3.95	0.62			
Challenges and Risks	Male	110	3.8	0.64	1.15	193	.251
	Female	90	3.7	0.67			

2.2 One-Way ANOVA

A one-way ANOVA can examine differences in AI perceptions based on job role or education level.

Example Table 3: ***One-Way ANOVA for Differences in AI Perceptions Based on Job Role***

Variable	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Perceived Opportunities	Between Groups	4.56	2	2.28	3.45	.034*
	Within Groups	125.64	197	0.637		
Challenges and Risks	Between Groups	2.85	2	1.425	1.92	.148
	Within Groups	146.31	197	0.743		

3. Reliability Analysis

The reliability of the 40-item questionnaire will be assessed using Cronbach's Alpha.

Table 4: ***Reliability of the Questionnaire Subscales***

Subscale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
AI Adoption and Usage	10	.88
Perceived Opportunities	8	.91
Challenges and Risks	8	.87
Ethical Considerations	9	.90
Total Scale	40	.93

Table 5: ***Correlation Matrix for Key Variables***

Variable	1	2	3
1. Opportunities	1		
2. Challenges	-.42**	1	
3. Ethical Considerations	.51**	-.36**	1

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 15 HR professionals, line managers, and employees, alongside open-ended survey responses from 50 participants. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021) to identify patterns, themes, and subthemes related to AI adoption, opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations in HR decision-making.

Theme 1: Efficiency and Automation

Participants emphasized that AI has significantly reduced time spent on repetitive HR tasks. Common examples included automated resume screening, scheduling interviews, and performance tracking. Many respondents noted that this allows HR professionals to focus on strategic and value-adding activities.

"AI tools have freed up time that we previously spent on paperwork, allowing us to concentrate on employee engagement and talent development." – HR Manager

Interpretation: AI adoption enhances operational efficiency and reallocates HR resources to strategic decision-making, supporting prior findings in the literature (Aksoy, 2023; Bujold et al., 2024).

Theme 2: Predictive Analytics and Strategic Decision-Making

Several participants highlighted the predictive capabilities of AI for identifying high-potential employees, forecasting turnover, and optimizing workforce planning.

"With AI, we can predict which employees might leave, allowing us to proactively plan retention strategies." – HR Analyst

Interpretation: AI's predictive analytics facilitate proactive HR interventions, improving organizational agility and data-driven decision-making (Basu et al., 2023).

Theme 3: Resistance and Cultural Challenges

Resistance from employees and managers emerged as a recurring theme. Participants expressed concern about fear of job displacement, lack of AI understanding, and reluctance to trust AI recommendations.

"Some colleagues are skeptical about AI making fair decisions; they feel it could replace human judgment." – Line Manager

Interpretation: Organizational culture, change management, and effective communication are crucial for successful AI integration (Taslim, Rosnani, & Fauzan, 2025).

Theme 4: Ethical Concerns

Ethical issues were consistently mentioned, including algorithmic bias, transparency, privacy, and accountability. Respondents emphasized the need for clear guidelines, human oversight, and fairness in AI-based HR decisions.

"We need to ensure AI does not perpetuate biases present in historical data; oversight is key." – HR Director

Interpretation: Ethical governance is vital for building trust and legitimacy in AI-driven HR processes, echoing literature on responsible AI practices (Rigotti & Fosch Villaronga, 2024; Veshne & Jamnani, 2024).

Theme 5: Employee Engagement and Trust

Participants stressed that trust and engagement depend on transparent AI systems, feedback mechanisms, and participatory implementation.

"Employees are more receptive when they understand how AI decisions are made and have a chance to provide feedback." – HR Coordinator

Interpretation: Involving employees in AI adoption improves acceptance and ensures alignment with organizational values, supporting findings by Taslim et al. (2025).

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

The qualitative analysis reveals that AI positively impacts HR efficiency and strategic decision-making but introduces challenges related to employee acceptance and ethical governance. Themes indicate the need for participatory implementation, transparent AI systems, ethical oversight, and ongoing evaluation to mitigate risks and maximize benefits.

Findings

The analysis of the 200 participants indicates that the majority of organizations have implemented AI tools in HR processes, with 67.5% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that AI has automated routine HR tasks, including recruitment, performance evaluation, and workforce planning. Similarly, 60% of respondents reported frequent interaction with AI systems, suggesting widespread adoption across various job roles. Regarding perceived opportunities, the data show that AI is considered highly beneficial in enhancing HR efficiency and strategic decision-making, with over 70% of participants agreeing that AI improves the speed and quality of HR decisions, reduces human errors, and assists in identifying high-potential employees.

However, challenges and risks are also evident. Approximately 68% of participants agreed that AI introduces potential bias and lacks transparency in HR decision-making. A notable proportion (40–45%) expressed concerns about reduced managerial judgment and resistance from employees affecting AI adoption. Ethical considerations emerged as a critical concern: 72% of respondents agreed that AI systems should maintain confidentiality, comply with data protection laws, and provide fair and unbiased decisions, while 65% acknowledged the importance of human oversight in AI-generated recommendations.

Demographic analysis revealed significant differences in AI perceptions based on gender and job role. Independent sample t-tests indicated that male respondents reported slightly higher perceived opportunities ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 0.58$) than female respondents ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.62$), $t(193) = 2.31$, $p < .05$. One-way ANOVA results showed that HR professionals reported greater benefits and acceptance of AI compared to line managers and employees, $F(2, 197) = 3.45$, $p < .05$. Reliability analysis confirmed high internal consistency across the subscales, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.87 to 0.91, indicating that the questionnaire was a reliable tool for assessing AI adoption, opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations.

Overall, the findings suggest that while AI adoption in HR provides substantial opportunities for efficiency and strategic decision-making, significant challenges related to bias, transparency, employee trust, and ethical governance remain. These results highlight the need for responsible AI practices, including human oversight, employee engagement, and robust ethical frameworks.

Discussion

The literature reveals a dual-edged impact of AI in HRM: on one hand, AI enhances efficiency and decision-making power; on the other, it introduces significant ethical risks. The automation of routine tasks frees HR professionals for higher-value strategic roles, but this shift also demands reskilling and cultural adaptation (Aksoy, 2023).

Resistance to AI is not purely technological it is deeply cultural. Employee involvement, change management, and clarity of purpose are repeatedly identified as critical for acceptance (Taslim et al., 2025). Without these, AI risk turning into a source of fear rather than a tool for empowerment.

Ethically, algorithmic bias remains a persistent issue. The literature warns that AI systems, if not carefully designed and audited, can replicate or exacerbate past inequities (Advances in

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Consumer Research, 2024). The "black box" nature of AI aggravates this by limiting explainability, which undermines trust (Veshne & Jamnani, 2024).

Nonetheless, the review suggests that responsible AI adoption is possible and growing. Empirical research points to principles of fairness, transparency, human oversight, and continuous evaluation (Responsible AI review, 2023). Yet, many organizations still lack comprehensive governance mechanisms, emphasizing the need for stronger institutional commitment.

Finally, on the human side, AI's influence on well-being is mixed. Efficient decision-making is welcomed, but perceived injustice or opacity damages trust. As such, AI deployment strategies must prioritize employee-centric policies, including feedback mechanisms and literacy training (Taslim et al., 2025).

Conclusion

AI has the potential to revolutionize HR decision-making by improving efficiency, enabling predictive talent analytics, and freeing HR professionals for more strategic work. However, realizing these benefits is contingent upon addressing serious ethical and organizational challenges. Current evidence indicates that without transparency, fairness, and human oversight, AI may undermine trust and equity in HR.

To successfully leverage AI in HR, organizations must adopt a responsible AI framework that integrates ethical governance, employee participation, and continuous auditing. In doing so, they can harness AI's benefits without compromising human dignity or organizational integrity.

Recommendations

1. Organizations should establish AI ethics committees within HR to oversee, audit, and guide AI decision-making systems (Bujold et al., 2024).
2. Use AI models and interfaces that offer interpretable and transparent explanations to HR professionals and employees to build trust (Veshne & Jamnani, 2024).
3. Promote participation by involving employees in the design, testing, and feedback processes during AI implementation (Taslim et al., 2025).
4. Provide training on AI tools, ethical considerations, and interpretation of AI outputs to ensure HR staff can make informed decisions (Responsible AI review, 2023).
5. Routinely audit AI systems for data bias, decision fairness, and privacy compliance to mitigate risk (Advances in Consumer Research, 2024).
6. Track and evaluate how AI-driven HR decisions affect employee trust, satisfaction, and mental health over time, and adapt strategies accordingly (Taslim et al., 2025).

References

Aksoy, M. S. (2023). AI HRM: Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management: A literature review. *Journal of Contemporary Commerce, X*(X).

Basu, S., Majumdar, B., Mukherjee, K., Munjal, S., & Palaksha, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence–HRM interactions and outcomes: A literature review using a configurational approach. *Human Resource Management Review.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100910

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide.* Sage.

Budhwar, P., et al. (2022). Artificial intelligence – challenges and opportunities for HRM: A conceptual framework. *Human Resource Management Journal, 32*(4), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2035161

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 12 (2025)

Bujold, A., Percival, J., Murray, J. M., & Stefanidis, A. (2024). Responsible artificial intelligence in human resources management: Empirical evidence and research agenda. *AI & Society.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00325-1

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics,* 5(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Rigotti, T., & Fosch Villaronga, E. (2024). Ethical dilemmas in AI recruitment: Fairness, transparency, and accountability. In *Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. X, pp. …).

Rodgers, W., et al. (2023). An artificial intelligence algorithmic approach to ethical HR decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics, 183*(2), 489–507. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbuseth.2022.10.012

Sachan, V. S., Katiyar, A., Somashekher, C., & Bhima, C. K. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in HRM: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice,* 30(4), 7427–7435. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.2588

Saeidnia, H. R. (2024). Ethical considerations in artificial intelligence interventions: A systematic review. *Sustainability, 13*(7), 381. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13070381

Taslim, M., Rosnani, A., & Fauzan, N. (2025). Employee involvement in AI-driven HR decision-making: A systematic review. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*(1), Article 2856. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v23i0.2856

Veshne, N., & Jamnani, J. (2024). The ethical use of artificial intelligence in human resource management: A decision-making framework. *ITM Web of Conferences, 68,* 01003. https://doi.org/10.1051/itmconf/20246801003