International Journal of Community Service
ISSN 2961-7162 (online)
https://ejournal.ipinternasional.com/index.php/ijcs

OPEN ACCESS

Vol. 5, Issue 2, 2026

DOI : 10.55299/ijcs.v5i2.2169

# Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Educational Human Resource Management: A Systematic Literature Review on Organizational Capabilities, Barriers to Adoption, and Ethical Governance

**Yola Andarina[1], R. Sabrina[2]**

[1,2] *Postgraduate, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Medan*

*Corresponding andarinayola@gmail.com*

**ABSTRACT**

Integration of artificial intelligence in educational human resource management: a systematic literature review of organizational capabilities, barriers to adoption, and ethical governance**.** The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational human resource management (HRM) is rapidly changing the way educational organizations manage recruitment, performance evaluation, professional development, workforce planning, and employee services. However, the success of AI implementation depends not only on the availability of technology but also on organizational capabilities, employee readiness, and responsible governance. This systematic literature review aims to synthesize the latest evidence on the integration of AI in educational HRM, with a particular emphasis on organizational capabilities, barriers to adoption, and ethical governance. A systematic review approach is used to identify, screen, and synthesize relevant peer studies addressing AI and HRM. The literature was thematically analyzed to identify recurring patterns related to organizational readiness, human–AI collaboration, barriers to adoption, and ethical governance. Findings suggest that organizational capabilities are a fundamental condition for sustainable AI integration. Key capabilities include AI literacy, digital competencies, leadership support, organizational culture, data capabilities, technology infrastructure, and strategic alignment. Key barriers to adoption include resistance to change, inadequate HR skills, infrastructure limitations, implementation costs, data security issues, and privacy risks. Ethical governance emerges as a crucial dimension, particularly related to algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency, explanation, accountability, human oversight, and employee data protection. This synthesis also shows that AI is most beneficial when implemented as a mechanism to enhance human capabilities rather than replacing professional judgment. Based on these findings, the review proposes an integrated conceptual pathway: organizational capabilities → readiness for AI adoption → responsible AI governance → sustainable educational HR outcomes. This framework provides theoretical and practical implications for educational institutions that want to implement AI in a responsible, human-centered, and sustainable manner.

**Keywords:** artificial intelligence; educational human resource management; AI adoption; organizational capabilities; barriers to adoption; ethical governance; Systematic Literature Review**.**

| Received: | Revised: | Accepted: | Available online: |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20.09.2026 | 30.09.2026 | 06.10.2026 | 13.10.2026 |

[1]Corresponding Author Name: Yola Andarina; address; Email: andarinayola@gmail.com

**Suggested citations:**
Yola Andarina, R. Sabrina. "Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Educational Human Resource Management: A Systematic Literature Review on Organizational Capabilities, Barriers to Adoption, and Ethical Governance." *International Journal of Community Service, 5* (2), 796-816. DOI: 10.55299/ijcs.v5i2.2169

## INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has developed rapidly from specialized computing technology to organizational capabilities that affect decision-making, service delivery, and workforce management. According to the OECD (2024), an AI system is a machine-based system thatinfers from the input it receives for explicit and implicit purposes to produce outputs in the form of predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can affect the physical and virtual environment. Thus, in this study, AI is understood as a computing-based technology that can process data and produce predictions, recommendations, content, or decision support with a certain level of autonomy and adaptability (OECD, 2024). This definition includes various technologies such as machine learning, natural language processing, generative AI, decision support systems, and other AI technologies that can be used to support organizational activities. In the context of education, the use of AI also needs to be placed in a human-centred approach by considering human competence, privacy, security, fairness, and accountability (UNESCO, 2023).

In Human *Resource Management* (HRM), AI is increasingly applied to recruitment, candidate screening, workforce analytics, performance management, employee development, talent management, and decision-making support. In this study HRM is understood as a managerial function that includes the processes of planning, procuring, developing, maintaining, evaluating, and managing the workforce to support the achievement of organizational goals. From the perspective of AI-HRM, the function includes not only personnel administration but also how technology is used to improve the effectiveness of human management, employee experience, decision-making, and organizational development. Recent systematic reviews show that AI-HRM research has evolved significantly and increasingly addresses not only the application of technology but also organizational outcomes and the employee level (Jatoba et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2023).
In this study, the term AI integration does not simply refer to the use or installation of AI technology, but to the process of systematically incorporating AI into organizational functions, processes, structures, and decision-making so that the technology becomes part of the organization's work practices and strategies. Thus, integration is understood as the process of alignment between AI technology, humans, work processes, organizational structures, and strategic goals so that AI can be used effectively and sustainably. This perspective is in line with the view that AI-HRM is part of organizational transformation that requires the interconnectedness between technological capabilities, human resources, organizational processes, and management strategies (Chowdhury et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2023). Therefore, AI integration differs from the adoption of technology simply because integration

demands changes in the way organizations work, make decisions, develop the workforce, and manage risk.

The growing use of AI has important implications for educational organizations. In this study, educational organizations are understood as institutions that organize educational and learning processes, including schools, colleges, and other educational institutions, with the main characteristics of a high dependence on professional human resources and responsibility for the quality of educational services. Schools, universities, and other educational institutions are highly dependent on teachers, lecturers, educational leaders, education personnel, and administrative personnel. The quality, distribution, development, and retention of such human resources affect the quality of education and institutional performance. Therefore, AI-powered HRM can provide new opportunities for educational organizations to improve workforce planning, recruitment, professional development, performance monitoring, and talent management.

Recent evidence directly examining the adoption of AI in education shows that teacher attitudes, professional development, organizational support, change management, adjustment to educational goals, and ethical considerations are important dimensions in AI adoption (Gârdan et al., 2025). This suggests that AI adoption in educational organizations is inseparable from human resource management. The question is not only whether teachers are using AI to teach, but also whether educational organizations have the necessary capabilities to manage an AI-powered workforce system.

The concept of *organizational capabilities* is important in explaining these conditions. Organizational capabilities can be understood as an organization's capacity to combine, develop, and utilize resources, knowledge, skills, technologies, and internal processes to achieve goals and respond to environmental changes. In the context of AI-HRM, organizational capabilities include technology and data capabilities, AI literacy, workforce digital competencies, leadership, organizational culture, innovation capacity, infrastructure, change management capabilities, and strategic alignment. Chowdhury et al. (2023) argue that an organization's AI capabilities require more than just technical infrastructure. Their framework emphasizes complementary resources such as human skills and competencies, leadership, organizational culture, innovation orientation, governance strategies, and AI–employee integration. This perspective is particularly relevant for educational organizations because the value of AI depends on the capacity of teachers, education leaders, HR personnel, and institutional managers to work effectively with AI systems.

In addition to organizational capabilities, innovation *adoption* is an important concept in understanding the process of acceptance and use of AI. In this study innovation adoption is understood as a process when an organization recognizes, evaluates, decides to accept, implements, and uses an innovation in actual terms in the organizational process. Thus, AI adoption does not stop at the decision to purchase or provide technology but includes organizational readiness, user acceptance, implementation, sustainable use, and evaluation of the benefits and risks of the innovation. Jatoba et al. (2023), through a systematic review of AI in HRM, identified thematic clusters involving strategic human resources, recruitment, training, and the

future of work. Their findings also show the existence of various driving factors and obstacles that affect the implementation of AI. In the educational environment, the adoption process can become more complex because educational organizations operate within regulatory, budgetary, professional, pedagogical, and institutional constraints.

Similarly, Malik et al. (2023) developed an expanded strategic framework for AI-assisted HRM based on a systematic review of 67 *peer-reviewed* studies. Their analysis shows that AI influences organization- and employee-centric outcomes and that managers play an important role in strategic choices regarding AI adoption and implementation. These findings suggest that AI-HRM should be considered as part of strategic organizational transformation, not just an administrative automation tool.

However, technology adoption does not always result in organizational benefits. Jatoba et al. (2023) show that the application of AI in HRM is influenced by various organizational and technological factors. Fenwick et al. (2024) also emphasized the importance of HRM's role in helping organizations move from simply implementing AI to adopting human-oriented ones. Barriers such as competency limitations, resistance to change, inadequate infrastructure, data quality, cost, and concerns for privacy can hinder successful implementation. In an educational environment, these barriers may become more pronounced because educational organizations often operate within regulatory, budgetary, professional, and institutional constraints.

Another major issue relates to ethical *governance*. Ethical governance in this study is understood as a set of principles, mechanisms, procedures, and oversight structures that ensure that the use of AI is carried out in a fair, transparent, accountable, safe, accountable, and human oversight. Ethical governance not only serves to control risks once the technology is implemented but must be part of the entire life cycle of AI, from planning, development, procurement, use, monitoring, evaluation, to system termination. This approach is in line with the OECD's (2024) emphasis on the importance of human oversight throughout the AI system cycle and with the UNESCO s (2023) approach that places privacy, security, fairness, and human-centered use of AI as important aspects of education.

AI systems used in HRM can influence decisions related to hiring, promotion, performance evaluation, professional development, and career opportunities. These decisions have direct consequences for employees and therefore require fairness, transparency, accountability, and proper human oversight. Bujold et al. (2024), in a systematic review of empirical research on responsible AI in HRM, identified key principles of responsible AI, including bias and discrimination, perceptions of fairness and trust, privacy, explanation and transparency, and the role of humans. Their findings are particularly relevant because they show that the development and implementation of technologies can occur faster than the development of ethical governance mechanisms.

Recent research further emphasizes the dual nature of AI in HRM. A systematic review of 43 *peer-reviewed* studies found that AI can improve standardization, objectivity, and accessibility in HR processes, while also creating risks related to embedded bias, lack of transparency, privacy, and accountability. Mitigation strategies include explanation, participatory design, human oversight, and ethical governance (Naoum et al., 2026). Another systematic review of 64 studies shows that

research on AI bias and discrimination in HRM is still conceptually fragmented, including ambiguities in the definition of bias and discrimination. These conditions demonstrate the need for a clearer conceptualization of ethical risks in AI-powered HR decision-making (Kekez et al., 2025).

The context of education adds another layer of complexity. In contrast to many corporate organizations, educational institutions have strong professional norms and public service responsibilities. Teachers and lecturers are not just employees of the organization; they use professional judgment in a complex social environment. As a result, over-reliance on algorithmic performance appraisals or automated personnel decisions can affect professional autonomy and reduce the ability to consider individual contexts. Therefore, the integration of AI in educational HRM needs to place humans as the main actors who retain the authority to review, interpret, and account for AI-supported decisions.

Although the literature on AI-HRM is growing, three limitations are still visible. First, AI-HRM research focuses more on corporate organizations than educational institutions. Second, studies examining AI adoption often emphasize individual acceptance without adequately integrating organizational capabilities. Third, ethical governance is often examined separately from organizational adoption and readiness. These gaps demonstrate the need for approaches that connect organizational capabilities, innovation adoption processes, and ethical governance in the context of educational HRM.

Therefore, this systematic literature review integrates all three dimensions into a single analytical framework. This review addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: What organizational capabilities are required for successful AI integration in educational HRM?

RQ2: What are the barriers limiting the adoption of AI in educational HRM?

RQ3: What ethical governance principles and mechanisms are needed to ensure the responsible integration of AI in educational HRM?

The contribution of this review lies in the effort to connect organizational capabilities, innovation adoption, and ethical governance in the specific context of educational HRM. Instead of treating AI adoption as an isolated technology issue, this study conceptualizes it as a socio-technical transformation that requires alignment between technology, people, organizational processes, organizational capabilities, innovation adoption, and ethical governance. Based on a synthesis of the literature, this study further proposes the conceptual relationship between organizational capabilities → AI adoption readiness → responsible AI governance → sustainable educational HRM outcomes as a framework for understanding responsible and sustainable AI integration in educational organizations.

## METHODS

### 1.1 Research design

Thise study used a systematic literature review (SLR) following the PRISMA 2020 reporting framework. PRISMA 2020 provides a structured approach to the identification, screening, feasibility assessment, and inclusion reporting of studies in a

systematic review (Page et al., 2021).

This review adopts a thematic synthesis approach because the literature includes heterogeneous empirical, conceptual, and review studies. Meta-analyses were not conducted because the studies differed substantially in study design, population, variables, and outcome size.

1.2 Search strategy

Library search is designed based on five conceptual domains:

a) artificial intelligence;
b) human resource management;
c) education;
d) organizational and adoption capabilities;
e) Ethics and Governance.

The search strategy was designed to capture both studies that explicitly address educational HRM and broader AI-HRM studies whose findings have immediate conceptual relevance to educational organizations.

1.3 Database and publication period

The recommended databases for the final SLR are Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, ERIC, and Google Scholar for additional searches. The primary publication period is 2021–2026, reflecting the rapid development of contemporary AI, including machine learning, algorithmic HRM, and generative AI.

Older publications are excluded unless they are essential methodological or theoretical references. The primary evidence base is limited to the most recent literature, while PRISMA 2020 remains used as a methodological reference.

### 1.4 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

| Criteria | Inclusions | Exclusion |
|---|---|---|
| Year of Publication | 2021–2026 | Before 2021, except for methodological references |
| Language | English and Indonesian | Other languages |
| Types of publications | Peer-reviewed journal articles and systematic reviews | Editorial, news, opinion newspaper |
| Topics | Findings of AI + HRM + education or transferable AI-HRM | AI is only for student learning |
| Organizational focus | Schools, universities, higher education, education Organisasi | Non-organization consumer apps |
| HR Dimension | Recruitment, selection, workforce planning, training, performance, Talent, Retention | AI is not related to HR |
| Ethical dimension | Bias, fairness, privacy, transparency, explanation, accountability, human oversight | Pure technical AI studies |
| Methodological relevance | Empirical studies, conceptual studies, reviews | Documents without substantive relevance |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### General characteristics of literature

The literature shows the rapid expansion of research at the intersection of AI and HRM. Existing systematic reviews have shown the growth of research in the areas of strategic HRM, recruitment, training, workforce management, and the theme of the future of work (Jatoba et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2023).

The evidence also suggests that AI-HRM research is multidisciplinary. Studies appear in various journals of HRM, information systems, management, organizational studies, education, ethics, and technology. This interdisciplinary character reflects the socio-technical nature of AI adoption.

In education, the literature is still underdeveloped compared to the broader AI-HRM literature. However, recent research has shown increased attention to teacher perception, organizational support, professional development, and ethical concerns (Gârdan et al., 2025).

The thematic synthesis results in three interconnected domains:

1) organizational skills;
2) barriers to adoption;
3) ethical governance.

The following domains are discussed.

**Tabel 1. Karakteristik dan temuan utama dari 25 Artikel**

| No | Author (Year) | Research Focus | Design/Method | Context | Key Findings |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Bankins Formosa (2023) | AI & meaningful Works | Conceptual/ethical and review | HRM | AI can improve efficiency, but potentially reduce autonomy, meaning work, and human agency when implementation is too Automation-oriented. |
| 2 | Basu et Al. (2023) | AI-HRM interaction and outcomes | Systematic review + configuration explanation | HRM | The impact of AI is influenced by adoption patterns. Collective and gradual adoption is more likely to produce outcomes positive versus overly automation-oriented individual adoption. |
| 3 | Bujold et Al. (2024) | Responsible AI in HRM | Systematic reviews, PRISMA | HRM | The main issues include bias/ discrimination, fairness, privacy, transparency, explainability, trust, and human involvement. |
| 4 | Chowdhury et al. (2023) | AI capabilities in HRM | Conceptual framework/overview | HRM | The success of AI requires A combination of technological resources, human skills, leadership, organizational culture, innovation mindset, Governance, and human-AI coordination. |
| 5 | Fenwick et al. (2024) | HRM in AI-based digital transformation | Conceptual/overview | Organisasi | HRM plays an important role in shifting AI from just technology implementation to human-centric adoption through leadership, culture, skills, policies, and change management. |
| 6 | Gârdan et Al. (2025) | AI adoption and teacher perception | Empirical quantitative | Educaton | Teacher perception, organizational support, professional development, as well as practical and ethical considerations play a role in the acceptance of AI in the environment |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | education. |
| 7 | Hunkenschroer & Luetge (2022) | Ethics AI selection criteria | Literature review | Rekrutment HRM | AI can improve the efficiency and consistency of selection, but presents the risk of algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, privacy, and accountability. |
| 8 | Jatoba et Al. (2023) | AI and HR Inteligent | Systematic literature review | HRM | AI-HRM literature develops on strategic HR, recruitment, training, and future of work; HR needs to improve Competencies to adopt AI effectively. |
| 9 | Kekez et Al. (2025) | Bias dan diskriminasi AI-HRM | Systematic review | HRM | The concept of bias and discrimination in AI-HRM research is still not consistent; the definition and measurement of bias need to be clarified. |
| 10 | Langer & König (2023) | Opacity and transparency AI-HRM | Conceptual/overview | HRM mikrofon Algorith | Transparency is an important challenge because algorithmic decisions are often difficult to understand; strategies are needed to improve explanation and understanding of stakeholders. |
| 11 | Madanchian & Taherdoost (2025) | Barriers and AI-HRM supporters | Critical review | HRM | Key barriers: resistance to change, data security, integration costs. Supporting factors : digital leadership, organizational culture, and AI technology. |
| 12 | Madanchian et al. (2023) | AI-based HR tools | Systematic literature review | HRM | AI is used in recruitment, selection, performance management, employee engagement, and a variety of other HR functions; success is influenced by organizational readiness and technology |
| 13 | Malik et Al. (2023) | AI-assisted strategic HRM | Systematic review/framework Work | HRM | AI can be a strategic HR resource, but it needs to change structure, competence, leadership, employee involvement, and governance. |
| 14 | Malik et Al. (2022) | AI, HR cost-effectiveness and employee experience | Empirical case studies | Multinationals and Enterprises | AI can improve HR cost efficiency and personalize employee experiences, but it still requires human oversight and strategic integration. |
| 15 | Mori et Al. (2025) | AI recruitment and selection ethics | Systematic sastra review | Recruitment | AI efficiency in recruitment must be balanced with fairness, transparency, privacy, accountability, and human oversight. |
| 16 | Naoum et Al. (2026) | AI and Equality, Equality Inclusion | Systematic review | HRM | AI can improve standardization and accessibility, but it can also reinforce biases embedded in organizational data and systems. |
| 17 | Ncube et Al. (2025) | AI in HRM practice | Systematic review | HRM | AI supports recruitment, performance appraisals, training, and other HR functions; the benefits accompanied by ethical challenges and the need for human supervision. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Pan & Froese (2023) | Multidisciplinary AI and HRM | Interdisciplinary systematic review | HRM | The AI-HRM literature is still fragmented, so it is necessary to integrate technology, organizational, human behavior, ethics, and strategic HRM perspectives. |
| 19 | Pereira et Al. (2023) | AI and Workplace Outcomes | Systematic literature review | Workplace/HRM | AI influences various job outcomes through several processes, including task performance, employee attitudes, work design, and organizational processes. |
| 20 | Qadri & Moustafa (2026) | AI-HRM as an ethical system | Systematic review | HRM | Governance requires Justice, Accountability, Explanation, Humanity-Review thresholds, appeal mechanisms, audit trails, and vendor controls. |
| 21 | Rodgers et al (2023) | Algorithmic ethical decision-makers | Conceptual/theoretical | HRM | The use of algorithms in HR decisions requires intelligibility, accountability, and an ethical framework in order to AI decisions can be accounted for. |
| 22 | Varma et Al. (2023) | AI and human resource management | Critical review | HRM | AI brings efficiency benefits but raises issues of ethical judgment, human dignity, supervision, bias, and changes in employment relations. |
| 23 | Votto et Al. (2021) | AI dalam tactical HRM | Systematic review sastra | HRM | AI is applied to recruitment, selection, performance, training, and workforce management; the results show the need for further research on organizational impact and humans. |
| 24 | Vrontis et Al. (2022) | AI, robotics and advanced technologies in HRM | Systematic review sastra | HRM | AI and advanced technologies are significantly changing HR functions, but successful implementation depends on organizational readiness, human capabilities, and strategic Alignment, and ethical considerations. |
| 25 | zakaria & Khattak (2026) | Humans vs machine intelligence And ethical tensions | Systematic review | HRM | It found that there is tension between human judgment and machine intelligence, especially related to fairness, accountability, privacy, autonomy, transparency, and human supervision. |

Table 1 presents the main characteristics and findings of the studies included in the systematic literature review on the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM), particularly in the context of education and organizations. The literature reviewed shows considerable methodological diversity, including systematic literature reviews, critical reviews, conceptual frameworks, theoretical analysis, quantitative empirical studies, and case studies. This methodological diversity suggests that AI-HRM research is an emerging multidisciplinary field involving information technology, human resource management, organizational behavior, education, and ethics.

These findings can be broadly categorized into three main areas. The first relates to organizational capabilities, including technology resources, AI and digital competencies, leadership, organizational culture, digital infrastructure, data

capabilities, and human–AI collaboration. Chowdhury et al. (2023), Jatoba et al. (2023), and Vrontis et al. (2022) show that the success of AI-HRM implementation depends not only on the availability of technology but also on organizational and human capabilities. Fenwick et al. (2024) further emphasize the role of HRM in transforming AI implementation into a more human-centered organizational process. The second major area relates to barriers to AI adoption. The reviewed studies consistently identified resistance to change, skills gaps, inadequate technology infrastructure, data security concerns, implementation costs, and lack of organizational readiness as important barriers. Madanchian and Taherdoost (2025) specifically identified resistance to change, data security, and integration costs as the main barriers to AI adoption in HRM. These findings suggest that AI implementation requires systematic organizational change management and continuous employee development.

The third key area relates to ethical governance. Bujold et al. (2024), Kekez et al. (2025), Langer and König (2023), and Rodgers et al. (2023) highlight algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency, explanation, privacy, fairness, and accountability as key challenges associated with AI-powered HRM. Recent studies also emphasize human oversight, audit mechanisms, appeal procedures, and clear allocation of responsibilities as essential components of responsible AI governance.

In the context of education, Gârdan et al. (2025) show the importance of teacher perception, organizational support, and professional development in AI adoption. These findings suggest that AI-powered HRM in educational institutions has distinctive characteristics because decisions related to teachers and educational personnel are strongly related to professionalism, autonomy, fairness, and quality of education.

Overall, Table 1 shows that AI-HRM research has gradually moved beyond a narrow focus on automation towards a more strategic, human-centric perspective. AI is increasingly viewed not only as a tool to improve HR administrative efficiency but also as a component of organizational transformation that requires capability development, employee engagement, strategic alignment, and ethical governance.

**Table 2. Thematic Synthesis of SLR Results**

| Tema Utama | Sub-theme | Evidence from the Article | Synthesis of Results |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Organizational Ability** | AI literacy competencies | Chowdhury et al. (2023); Jatoba et al. (2023); Vrontis et al. (2022) | Organizations need AI and digital competencies in order for technology to be used effectively. |
| | Leadership & strategic coordination | Chowdhury et al. (2023); Fenwick et al. (2024); Malik et al. (2023a) | Leadership is an important factor in connecting AI with organizational strategy and HRM. |
| | Organizational culture | Chowdhury et al. (2023); Fenwick et al. (2024); Madanchian & Taherdoost (2025) | A culture of innovation and openness to change strengthens AI adoption readiness. |
| | Human–AI collaboration | Basu et al. (2023); Malik et al. (2022); | AI is more effective when it functions as an augmentation of human capabilities, not just |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | a replacement. |
| **2. Obstacles Adoption** | Resistance to change | Madanchian & Taherdoost (2025); Fenwick et al. (2024) | Organizational and employee resistance is a significant obstacle to AI adoption. |
| | Skills gap | Jatoba et al. (2023); Vrontis et al. (2022) | The lack of AI competencies limits the optimal use of technology. |
| | Data & technology infrastructure | Madanchian et al. (2023); Madanchian & Taherdoost (2025) | Data quality, security, system integration, and cost are major barriers. |
| | Fragmented organizational readiness | Pan & Froese (2023); Votto et al. (2021) | AI readiness is not only technical but also organizational and human-related. |
| **3. Ethical Governance** | Bias algorithmics | Bujold et al. (2024); Kekez et al. (2025); Naoum et al. (2026) | Bias in data and algorithms can result in discrimination in HR decisions. |
| | Explanatory transparency | Langer & König (2023); Rodgers et al. (2023) | Organizations need mechanisms so that AI decisions can be understood and explained. |
| | Accountability | Bujold et al. (2024); Qadri & Moustafa (2026); Rodgers et al. (2023) | There must be a party responsible for AI-assisted decisions. |
| | Protection and privacy | Hunkenschroer & Luetge (2022); Mori et al. (2025); Varma et al. (2023) | The collection and processing of employee data poses privacy and surveillance risks. |
| | Human surveillance | Qadri & Moustafa (2026); Zakaria & Khattak (2026); Bujold et al. (2024) | High-risk decisions still require human review and intervention. |

Table 2 presents a thematic synthesis resulting from the coding process of the reviewed studies. Four main themes emerged: organizational capabilities, barriers to adoption, ethical governance, and organizational and human outcomes. These themes show that the integration of AI in HRM involves interconnected organizational processes, starting from organizational readiness and capability development, continuing through technology adoption, and ultimately influencing organizational and human outcomes.

The first theme, organizational capabilities, includes AI literacy, digital competence, leadership, strategic alignment, organizational culture, and human–AI collaboration. The literature shows that organizations with stronger digital and AI capabilities are better prepared to strategically integrate AI into HR processes. Chowdhury et al. (2023) conceptualize AI capabilities as a combination of technology resources and human capabilities. In educational institutions, these capabilities should extend beyond HR personnel to include institutional leaders, teachers, administrative staff, and other decision-makers.

The second theme, barriers to adoption, suggests that AI adoption is affected by organizational and technological constraints. Resistance to change, skills gaps, inadequate infrastructure, data security, privacy concerns, and implementation costs

can delay or weaken AI implementation. Madanchian and Taherdoost (2025) emphasize that these organizational and technological barriers need to be addressed simultaneously. Therefore, successful adoption requires change management, leadership support, professional development, and an appropriate technology infrastructure.

The third theme, ethical governance, is one of the issues most consistently identified in the literature. Algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency, explanation, privacy, fairness, and accountability are often highlighted. Bujold et al. (2024) show that responsible AI in HRM requires attention to fairness, trust, privacy, transparency, and human engagement. Kekez et al. (2025) further point out that the conceptualization of bias and discrimination remains inconsistent in AI-HRM research, highlighting the need for a systematic approach to identifying and reducing algorithmic bias. The fourth theme, organizational and human outcomes, suggests that AI can improve efficiency, employee experience, decision-making support, workforce planning, and HR effectiveness. However, these benefits do not automatically occur. Bankins and Formosa (2023) emphasize that excessive automation can affect meaningful work and employee autonomy, while Varma et al. (2023) highlight concerns related to human dignity and managerial judgment.

Combined, these four themes demonstrate that organizational capabilities are the foundation for AI adoption, while ethical governance ensures that AI implementation delivers benefits without sacrificing justice, privacy, trust, and human interests. Therefore, AI-enabled sustainable HRM requires a balance between technological efficiency and human-centric governance.

**Table 3. Frequency of Identified Themes**

| No. | Theme | Number of Articles Discussing It | Proportion |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Organizational capabilities/readiness | 19 | 76% |
| 2 | Ethical governance | 18 | 72% |
| 3 | Barriers to adoption | 17 | 68% |
| 4 | Human–AI collaboration | 15 | 60% |
| 5 | AI skills/digital competencies | 14 | 56% |
| 6 | AI skills/digital competencies | 14 | 56% |
| 7 | Transparency/explanation | 13 | 52% |
| 8 | Leadership/strategic alignment | 12 | 48% |
| 9 | Privacy/data protection | 11 | 44% |
| 10 | Employee/workplace outcomes | 11 | 44% |
| 11 | Organizational culture | 10 | 40% |
| 12 | Employee experience | 7 | 28% |

Table 3 presents the frequency of the occurrence of the main themes in the reviewed literature. The coding results show that organizational capability/readiness is the most frequently identified theme, followed by ethical governance and adoption barriers. The prominence of organizational capabilities suggests that organizational readiness is a fundamental prerequisite for deriving value from AI-enabled HRM.

Organizational capabilities or readiness were identified in 19 studies. These findings suggest that AI-HRM research is increasingly moving beyond the question of whether AI can be technically implemented toward the more strategic question of whether

organizations have the capabilities needed to use AI effectively. These capabilities include digital competence, AI literacy, leadership, technology infrastructure, organizational culture, data capabilities, and strategic alignment (Chowdhury et al., 2023; Jatoba et al., 2023; Vrontis et al., 2022). Ethical governance was identified in 18 studies, suggesting that ethical considerations have become a central component of AI-HRM research. Algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency, privacy, accountability, and human oversight are some of the most frequently discussed concerns. The high frequency of ethical governance suggests that the increase in AI-based decision-making in HR is simultaneously creating a stronger need for institutional safeguards and employee protections.

Barriers to adoption were identified in 17 studies. These findings suggest that the challenges associated with AI implementation are not solely technological in nature. Human and organizational factors also play an important role. Resistance to change, skills gaps, infrastructure limitations, data security, and implementation costs are the main barriers to successful AI adoption. Human–AI collaboration was identified in 15 studies, while AI skills/digital competencies and algorithmic bias were identified in 14 studies each. This pattern suggests a strong movement in the literature towards understanding AI as an augmented technology, where AI enhances human capabilities rather than simply replacinges human workers.

Transparency and explanation emerged in 13 studies, while leadership and strategic alignment emerged in 12 studies. Data privacy and protection were identified in 11 studies. Organizational culture and employee experience emerged less frequently than organizational capabilities and ethical governance. This distribution presents opportunities for future research to more explicitly examine how organizational culture and employee experience affect the sustainability of AI-HRM implementation.

Overall, the frequency distribution suggests that current AI-HRM research places a great emphasis on organizational readiness and ethical risk management, rather than focusing on the technical aspects of AI implementation. These findings support the development of an integrated approach that combines organizational capabilities, adoption readiness, and responsible AI governance.

**Table 4. Synthesis Matrix Based on Research Questions**

| Research Question | SLR Results | Supporting Articles |
|---|---|---|
| RQ1. What organizational capabilities are AI support in educational HRM? | AI integration requires AI literacy, digital competence, leadership, strategic alignment, cultural organization, infrastructure, data capabilities, and human–AI collaboration capabilities. | Chowdhury et al. (2023); Jatoba et al. (2023); Fenwick et al. (2024); Malik et al. (2023); Vrontis et al. (2022) |
| RQ2. What barriers are influencing the adoption of AI in educational HRM? | Barriers including resistance to change, gaps skills, technology infrastructure, data quality, privacy, cybersecurity, implementation costs, lack of organizational readiness, and fragmented governance. | Madanchian & Taherdoost (2025); Madanchian et al. (2023); Pan & Froese (2023); Votto et al. (2021) |
| | Governance requires clarity transparency, fairness, bias | Bujold et al. (2024); Langer & König (2023); Rodgers et al. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RQ3. What ethical governance mechanisms are needed? | mitigation, accountability, privacy protection, human oversight, audit trails, appeal mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. | (2023); Qadri & Moustafa (2026); Zakaria & Khattak (2026) |

Table 4 synthesizes the findings based on three research questions that guide this systematic literature review. For RQ1, regarding organizational capabilities that support the integration of AI in educational HRM, the findings show that AI literacy, digital competencies, leadership, organizational culture, data capabilities, technology infrastructure, strategic alignment, and human–AI collaboration are key components. These findings show that organizational readiness is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to technology readiness alone.

For RQ2, related to barriers affecting AI adoption, the review identified resistance to change, skills gaps, infrastructure limitations, data security, privacy concerns, implementation costs, and fragmented organizational readiness as the main barriers. These findings suggest that educational institutions need a comprehensive adoption strategy that combines technology readiness with organizational change management and employee development.

Regarding the ethical governance mechanisms required for responsible AI integration, the reviewed study consistently identified transparency, explanation, fairness, bias mitigation, accountability, privacy protection, human oversight, auditability, and appeal mechanisms as important components. The findings suggest that ethical governance should not be introduced only after the implementation of AI; rather, governance should be incorporated into the design and implementation process from the outset.

A comparison of the three research questions shows a strong interconnectedness among the identified dimensions. Organizational capabilities create the foundation of AI adoption readiness, while responsible AI governance provides a mechanism to control the risks associated with AI implementation. Therefore, these findings do not support treating technology adoption and ethical governance as separate processes. Instead, they should be developed simultaneously.

This synthesis provides the basis for an integrated conceptual framework that links organizational capabilities → AI adoption readiness → responsible AI governance → educational HRM outcomes. This framework provides a more comprehensive perspective than approaches that focus solely on technology readiness, employee onboarding, or ethical risk.

**Table 5. SLR Result Synthesis Model**

| Input | Organizational Process | AI Integration | Results |
|---|---|---|---|
| AI Literacy | Training & development | AI-powered HR processes | Better efficiency |
| Infrastructure digital | Change management | AI Recruitment | Better decision support |
| Data capabilities | HR strategic planning | Performance AI Management | Improved HR effectiveness |
| Leadership | Organizational transformation | AI workforce planning | Better Experience An employee |
| Leadership | Transformation | AI workforce planning | Better employee |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | organization | | experience |
| Organizational culture | Human–AI collaboration | AI-based assessment | Personalized HR Services |
| Ethical ability | Governance & monitoring | Responsible AI | Trust and legitimacy |
| Employee participation | Human surveillance | Human-centered AI | Sustainable adoption |

Table 5 presents an integrated synthesis model obtained from the literature that has been reviewed. This model illustrates the relationship between organizational input, organizational processes, AI integration, and expected outcomes. The ~~f~~Findings show that AI literacy, digital infrastructure, data capabilities, leadership, organizational culture, ethical capability, and employee participation are key organizational inputs that build the foundation of AI integration.

At the organizational process level, these inputs translate into training and development, change management, HR strategic planning, organizational transformation, human–AI collaboration, governance, and monitoring. These findings suggest that the success of AI-HRM implementation depends on how the organization transforms available resources and capabilities into a structured implementation process.

The next stage involves AI integration, including AI-powered HR processes, AI-driven recruitment, performance management, workforce planning, assessment, and responsible AI applications. These findings suggest that AI can support a wide range of HR functions, from administrative activities to strategic decision-making. However, the appropriate level of automation must be determined based on the characteristics and risk levels of each HR decision.

Expected outcomes include increased efficiency, better decision-making support, increased HR effectiveness, improved employee experience, personalized HR services, increased trust, and continued adoption of AI. The literature suggests that positive outcomes are more likely to occur when AI is used to enhance human capabilities rather than completely replacing human judgment.

The model also shows that ethical capabilities and employee participation should serve as cross-sector elements throughout the AI integration process. Ethical governance is not limited to the final outcome of AI-based decisions; it also deals with how data is collected, how algorithms are designed, how decisions are generated, and how employees can question or appeal AI-powered decisions.

Therefore, this synthesis suggests that AI-powered educational HR can generate sustainable value when there is alignment between organizational capabilities, implementation processes, responsible governance, and human-centered outcomes. The resulting conceptual relationships can be expressed as: Organizational Capabilities → AI Adoption Readiness → Responsible AI Governance → Continuing Education HRM Outcomes.

This relationship places organizational capabilities as the foundation, readiness to adopt AI as an implementation mechanism, responsible AI governance as a mekanisme pengendalian risiko, and HRM educational outcomes as the primary objective of the organization.

Overall, the findings of this systematic literature review suggest that the integration of AI in educational HRM is shaped by the interaction between organizational capabilities, adoption readiness, and responsible governance. Evidence suggests that the

implementation of technology alone does not guarantee positive HR outcomes. Continuous AI integration requires adequate organizational capabilities, continuous employee development, strategic leadership, effective change management, and strong ethical safeguards. This synthesis thus provides a basis for discussing the theoretical and practical implications of AI-based educational HRM as well as the development of an integrated framework for responsible and human-centered AI adoption.

**Discussion**

The findings of this systematic literature review suggest that the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational human resource management (HRM) is not just a process of technology implementation but a multidimensional organizational transformation. Across the reviewed literature, three interrelated dimensions consistently emerge: organizational capabilities, barriers to AI adoption, and ethical governance. These dimensions suggest that the effectiveness and sustainability of AI-based HRM depends not only on the availability of AI technology but also on the readiness of educational organizations, the capabilities of their human resources, and the quality of governance mechanisms around the use of AI.

**1.1 Organizational Capabilities as the Basis for AI Integration**

The first key finding is that organizational capabilities are a fundamental condition for successful AI integration in educational HRM. The reviewed study emphasizes the importance of AI literacy, digital competencies, leadership, organizational culture, data capabilities, infrastructure, and strategic alignment. These findings are consistent with the perspective of AI capabilities proposed by Chowdhury et al. (2023), which conceptualize AI capabilities as a combination of technological, organizational, and human resources that enable organizations to generate value from AI. Similarly, Jatoba et al. (2023) show that HR functions require strategic and technological capabilities to successfully integrate AI into recruitment, training, workforce management, and other HR processes.

In educational institutions, organizational capabilities have a broader meaning because HRM is strongly linked to professional responsibility, institutional values, and the quality of educational services. Therefore, the implementation of AI requires more than just providing access to AI applications. Teachers, school leaders, administrative staff, and HR professionals need sufficient knowledge to understand the capabilities and limitations of AI and determine when the outputs generated by AI can support professional decisions appropriately. Gârdan et al. (2025) show that teacher perception and organizational support are important factors in determining the acceptance of AI in the educational environment.

These findings suggest that educational institutions must systematically develop AI readiness. Investment in AI infrastructure should be accompanied by ongoing professional development, AI literacy programs, data management capabilities, and leadership support. Without these complementary capabilities, AI adoption may remain fragmented and may fail to result in sustained improvements in HR effectiveness.

### 1.2 Barriers to AI Adoption in Educational HRM

The second major thematic dimension identified in this review relates to barriers to AI adoption. The most frequently reported barriers include resistance to change, inadequate digital and AI skills, inadequate infrastructure, data security concerns, privacy risks, implementation costs, and fragmented organizational readiness. These barriers indicate that AI adoption is influenced by technological and organizational conditions.

Madanchian and Taherdoost (2025) emphasize that the adoption of AI in HRM depends on the interaction between organizational factors and technology. Similarly, Fenwick et al. (2024) highlight the critical role of HRM in enabling organizations to move beyond simple AI implementations towards human-centered adoption. These findings imply that educational institutions should avoid technology-based implementation strategies that ignore employee perceptions and organizational readiness.

The rejection of AI should not automatically translate to a rejection of technological innovation. In many cases, resistance can reflect legitimate concerns regarding job security, supervision, fairness, loss of professional autonomy, or uncertainty about how AI will affect existing roles. Therefore, effective change management must involve employees in the implementation process, provide transparent information about AI's goals, and offer training and participation opportunities.

The findings also show that barriers to adoption are intertwined. For example, inadequate AI literacy can increase employee uncertainty, which can strengthen resistance to change. Similarly, poor data quality and inadequate infrastructure can reduce trust in AI-generated recommendations. Therefore, organizations need an integrated adoption strategy rather than separate interventions that target individual barriers.

### 1.3 Ethical Governance as a Core Component of AI-HRM

Ethical governance emerged as one of the strongest themes in the literature that was reviewed. Key concerns include algorithmic bias, discrimination, transparency, explanation, accountability, privacy, human oversight, and auditability. These findings suggest that responsible AI governance should be considered an integral component of AI-powered HRM, rather than an additional compliance mechanism.

Hunkenschroer and Luetge (2022) identified substantial ethical concerns related to AI-based recruitment and selection, particularly regarding fairness, transparency, and potential discrimination. Bujold et al. (2024) also emphasized the importance of responsible AI principles in HRM. Recent systematic reviews further show that bias and discrimination remain persistent concerns throughout AI-based HR processes (Kekez et al., 2025; Mori et al., 2025).

In educational HRM, these concerns become especially important when AI is used to support recruitment, teacher evaluation, promotion, workload allocation, professional development, or employee monitoring. Algorithms trained on historical organizational data can reproduce existing inequalities if the underlying data contains bias. Therefore, AI implementation should include algorithmic audit mechanisms, bias detection, transparency, and periodic evaluations.

Human oversight is essential in high-impact HR decisions. AI systems should preferably provide decision-making support rather than acting as autonomous decision-makers in situations that could significantly affect an employee's career or professional status. Educational institutions should also establish a clear accountability structure so that employees understand who is responsible when AI-powered decisions produce inaccurate, discriminatory, or detrimental outcomes.

## CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review examines the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational human resource management (HRM), with particular attention to organizational capabilities, barriers to adoption, and ethical governance. This synthesis shows that AI integration is not just a matter of adopting new technological tools, but represents a broader organizational transformation involving people, processes, capabilities, culture, and governance.

The findings show that successful AI integration requires strong organizational capabilities, including AI literacy, digital competencies, leadership support, organizational culture, data capabilities, technology infrastructure, strategic alignment, and effective human–AI collaboration. At the same time, organizations face several barriers, including resistance to change, skills gaps, inadequate infrastructure, data security and privacy concerns, implementation costs, and differences in organizational readiness.

Ethical governance is emerging as a key requirement for responsible and AI-enabled HRM. Governance key priorities include fairness, bias mitigation, transparency, clarity, privacy protection, accountability, human supervision, auditability, and employee appeal mechanisms. These elements are critical in educational institutions because HR decisions can directly affect teacher professional development, performance evaluation, promotion, workload, and career opportunities. A key contribution of this review is the development of an integrated perspective that connects organizational capabilities, AI adoption readiness, responsible AI governance, and sustainable educational HRM outcomes. The proposed framework suggests that organizational capabilities are the foundation for AI adoption, adoption readiness facilitates effective implementation, and responsible governance ensures that AI is used fairly, transparently, and in accordance with human and institutional values.

The review also emphasizes that AI should primarily serve as a mechanism to enhance human capabilities rather than completely replace professional judgment. In educational HRM, human oversight remains important because many HR decisions require contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, interpersonal sensitivity, and professional accountability.

In conclusion, the continuous integration of AI in educational HRM does not depend solely on technology but on the capacity of organizations to combine technological innovation with human competence, strategic leadership, responsible governance, and protection of human dignity. Therefore, a human-centered and ethically regulated approach provides a more sustainable path to realizing the potential of AI in

educational HRM.

## Declaration of Conflict of Interest

The authors declas that they are not connected to or part of any group or organization that has a financial interest in the topics or material discussed in this manuscript.

.

## REFERENCES

Aydin, E., et al. (2025). Is artificial intelligence (AI) research biased and conceptually vague? A systematic review of research on bias and discrimination in the context of using AI in human resource management. *Technology in Society, 81*, 102818. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102818

Bankins, S., & Formosa, P. (2023). The ethical implications of artificial intelligence (AI) for meaningful work. *Journal of Business Ethics, 185*(4), 725–740. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05339-7

Basu, S., Majumdar, B., Mukherjee, K., Munjal, S., & Palaksha, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence–HRM interactions and outcomes: A systematic review and causal configurational explanation. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100893

Bujold, A., Roberge-Maltais, I., Parent-Rocheleau, X., Boasen, J., Sénécal, S., & Léger, P.-M. (2024). Responsible artificial intelligence in human resources management: A review of the empirical literature. *AI and Ethics, 4*, 1185–1200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00325-1

Chowdhury, S., Dey, P., Joel-Edgar, S., Bhattacharya, S., Rodriguez-Espindola, O., Abadie, A., & Truong, L. (2023). Unlocking the value of artificial intelligence in human resource management through AI capability framework. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100899

Fenwick, A., Molnar, G., & Frangos, P. (2024). The critical role of HRM in AI-driven digital transformation: A paradigm shift to enable firms to move from AI implementation to human-centric adoption. *Discover Artificial Intelligence, 4*, Article 34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00125-4

Gârdan, I. P., Manu, M. B., Gârdan, D. A., Negoiță, L. D. L., Paștiu, C. A., Ghiță, E., & Zaharia, A. (2025). Adopting AI in education: Optimizing human resource management considering teacher perceptions. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1488147. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1488147

Hunkenschroer, A. L., & Luetge, C. (2022). Ethics of AI-enabled recruiting and selection: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics, 178*(4), 977–1007. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05049-6

Jatoba, M., Ferreira, J. J. M., Fernandes, P. O., & Teixeira, J. P. (2023). Intelligent human resources for the adoption of artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 36*(7), 1099–1124. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-03-2022-0075

Kekez, I., Lauwaert, L., & Begičević Redep, N. (2025). Is artificial intelligence (AI) research biased and conceptually vague? A systematic review of research on bias

and discrimination in the context of using AI in human resource management. *Technology in Society, 81*, 102818. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102818

Langer, M., & König, C. J. (2023). Introducing a multi-stakeholder perspective on opacity, transparency and strategies to reduce opacity in algorithm-based human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100881

Madanchian, M., & Taherdoost, H. (2025). Barriers and enablers of AI adoption in human resource management: A critical analysis of organizational and technological factors. *Information, 16*(1), 51. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16010051

Malik, A., Budhwar, P., & Kazmi, B. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted HRM: Towards an extended strategic framework. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100940. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100940

Malik, A., Budhwar, P., Patel, C., & Srikanth, N. R. (2022). May the bots be with you! Delivering HR costeffectiveness and individualized employee experiences in an MNE. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(6), 1148–1178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1859582

Mori, M., Sassetti, S., Cavaliere, V., & Bonti, M. (2025). A systematic literature review on artificial intelligence in recruiting and selection: A matter of ethics. *Personnel Review, 54*(3), 854–878. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2023-0257

Naoum, R. F., Szakadáti, T., & Balogh, G. (2026). Artificial intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM): A systematic review of its dual impact on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). *Management Review Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00580-y

Ncube, T. R., Sishi, K. K., & Skinner, J. P. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on human resource management practices: An investigation. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*, Article a2960. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v23i0.2960

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Pan, Y., & Froese, F. J. (2023). An interdisciplinary review of AI and HRM: Challenges and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100924. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100924

Pereira, V., Hadjielias, E., Christofi, M., & Vrontis, D. (2023). A systematic literature review on the impact of artificial intelligence on workplace outcomes: A multi-process perspective. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100857. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100857

Qadri, U. A., & Moustafa, A. M. (2026). AI-enabled HRM as an ethical system: A systematic review of fairness, accountability, governance and legitimacy. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-04-2026-0308

Rodgers, W., Murray, J. M., Stefanidis, A., Degbey, W. Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2023). An artificial intelligence algorithmic approach to ethical decision-making in human resource management processes. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100925

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.

Varma, A., Dawkins, C., & Chaudhuri, K. (2023). Artificial intelligence and people management: A critical assessment through an ethical lens. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100923

Votto, A. M., Valecha, R., Najafirad, P., & Rao, H. R. (2021). Artificial intelligence in tactical human resource management: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights, 1*(2), 100047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjimei.2021.100047

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. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*.

Zakaria, K. S., & Khattak, M. N. (2026). A systematic review of human vs machine intelligence and ethical tensions in human resource management. *Discover Artificial Intelligence, 6*, Article 861. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-026-01926-5

**Copyright and License**

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2026 Yola Andarina[2], R. Sabrina[2]

Published by IPI Global Press in collaboration with the Inovasi Pratama Internasional Ltd

[2]Corresponding Author Name: Yola Andarina; address; Email: *andarinayola@gmail.com*