



Navigating the Productivity-Engagement Paradox: A Socio-Technical Framework for Algorithmic Management in Talent Acquisition and Workforce Governance

Widad CHAIB ^{a,*}

^a. Economics and Management Laboratory, University of Laghouat - Algeria

article info

Article history:

Received:

09 September 2026

Accepted:

28 September 2026

Published:

01 October 2026

Keywords:

Algorithmic management
Talent acquisition
Employee engagement
Explainable AI (XAI)
Organizational justice
Digital trust

JEL Classification:

M12, M15

abstract

This study aims to analyze the sociotechnical transformation of Human Resource Management (HRM) driven by the adoption of Algorithmic Management (ALMA). Specifically, it explores the impact of automated systems on applicants' fairness perceptions during talent acquisition and evaluates how algorithms reconfigure internal power dynamics and employee engagement. The core problem lies in the widening gap between algorithmic operational efficiency-which delivers a 14.6% productivity increase-and the erosion of qualitative human experiences. The reliance on "black-box" decision-making models often leads to the deterioration of the psychological contract and a "uniqueness paradox" in hiring, where individuals feel reduced to standardized data points. The study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) integrated with Secondary Data Analysis (Meta-analysis) of 83 academic sources and international institutional reports (2015-2025). The methodology adheres to the PRISMA 2020 guidelines to ensure rigorous quantitative synthesis and objectivity. The analysis reveals that while ALMA increases recruitment efficiency by 89.6%, it triggers "algorithmic anxiety" and resistance when transparency is absent. Implementing Explainable AI (XAI) is found to raise system acceptance rates from 47% to 81%. Furthermore, results indicate that AI dependence fosters employee "voice behavior" only when moderated by supportive "coaching leadership".

1. Introduction

The contemporary landscape of Human Resource Management (HRM) is navigating a structural transformation, catalyzed by the unprecedented acceleration of digital integration during the post-pandemic era. This shift from relational, human-centric supervision to automated governance models has redefined the traditional organizational hierarchy, transitioning managerial authority from subjective discretion to data-driven optimization.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: W. CHAIB w.chaib@cu-aflou.edu.dz

How to cite: CHAIB, W. (2026). Navigating the Productivity-Engagement Paradox: A Socio-Technical Framework for Algorithmic Management in Talent Acquisition and Workforce Governance. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Administration*, 2(2), 56-65.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34118/jeba.v2i2.4898>

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

While this transition promised systemic consistency, it has introduced a complex socio-technical environment where the rapid adoption of intelligent systems across diverse economic sectors, including retail and professional services, fundamentally reconfigures the nature of organizational control and authority.

The emergence of this algorithmic paradigm functions as a powerful independent variable that directly influences the psychological and operational foundations of modern work. Quantitative evidence indicates that the systematic deployment of automated architectures yields a significant 14.6% increase in objective productivity metrics. However, this drive for efficiency often creates a socio-technical paradox; the reliance on granular digital monitoring and "black box" decision-making models can trigger profound psychosocial risks, such as algorithmic anxiety and systemic burnout. Consequently, the unmediated implementation of these technologies' risks eroding the psychological contract, as employees are frequently reduced to quantifiable data points, losing the relational depth and autonomy that traditionally sustain long-term commitment.

Within this context, the impact of algorithmic management extends critically to talent acquisition and candidate dynamics, where automated selection procedures have become the primary gateway to the workforce. Applicants often perceive these systems as procedurally deficient, experiencing a "uniqueness paradox" where they believe that mathematical models are fundamentally incapable of recognizing their distinct human potential. This perceived lack of interpersonal justice during selection, combined with the intensification of surveillance for existing staff, necessitates a strategic re-evaluation of the "Human Element."

1.1. Research Problem, and Hypotheses of the study

a. Research Problem

Based on the aforementioned problem statement, this study addresses the following questions:

- How does the use of algorithmic selection procedures influence candidate perceptions of fairness and "uniqueness" during talent acquisition?
- To what extent does algorithmic monitoring impact employee autonomy and the internal power dynamics between supervisors and subordinates?
- What are the specific implementation factors (e.g., explainability and human oversight) that moderate the acceptance of AI-driven HR decisions?

b. Hypotheses

The study is guided by the following hypotheses:

Main Hypothesis: The "Human-in-the-Loop" governance model significantly moderates the relationship between algorithmic management intensity and employee engagement.

Sub-Hypotheses:

- H1a: Candidates perceive algorithm-driven hiring as less fair than human-led processes due to the belief that algorithms cannot recognize individual uniqueness.
- H1b: High levels of AI dependence led to proactive "voice behavior" only when paired with supportive "coaching leadership".
- H1c: The implementation of Explainable AI (XAI) increases employee acceptance rates of performance assessments by providing transparent rationales.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

This study aims to achieve the following:

- Analyze the socio-technical shift from relational supervision to automated algorithmic control.
- Examine the psychodynamic impact of digital selection procedures on talent acquisition.
- Evaluate the effects of algorithmic monitoring on employee engagement and psychological well-being.
- Propose a "Humanistic HRM" framework that bridges the gap between quantitative efficiency and qualitative human experience to ensure organizational sustainability.

1.3. Importance of the Study

The importance of this study stems from its multi-dimensional impact on both theoretical development and management practice in the digital era:

- This study provides a critical framework for shifting Human Resource Management from the efficiency-driven models of Industry 4.0 to the human-centric and sustainable paradigms of Industry 5.0.
- By addressing "algorithmic anxiety" and systemic burnout, the study offers insights into protecting employee well-being under conditions of intensive digital surveillance.
- The research highlights how organizations can restore procedural and interpersonal justice in talent acquisition, addressing the "uniqueness paradox" where candidates feel dehumanized by automated screening.
- It explores the transformative potential of AI as a tool for professional empowerment, demonstrating how employee "voice behavior" can be fostered through smart technological dependence.
- The study underscores that human capital is not a passive input but a strategic enabler of long-term organizational resilience and value creation.
- By emphasizing Explainable AI (XAI), the research provides theoretical framework for increasing employee acceptance of automated decisions from (47%) to (81%) through enhanced transparency.
- The study redefines the role of HR professionals as "interpretive mediators" who bridge the gap between raw quantitative data and empathetic human leadership.

2. Theoretical Foundations

To analyze the multi-dimensional impact of algorithmic management on the workforce, this research integrates three core theoretical frameworks. These theories explain how technological Structures interact with human social subsystems, shape perceptions of fairness, and reconfigure traditional organizational power balances.

2.1. Socio-Technical Systems Theory (STS)

The primary lens for understanding modern human resource management (HRM) is Socio-Technical Systems (STS) theory. This perspective posits that organizational effectiveness results from the "joint optimization" of two interdependent subsystems: the technical subsystem

(comprising algorithms, data pipelines, and hardware) and the social subsystem (encompassing employee perceptions, values, and manager training). Within this framework, algorithmic management is not a neutral tool but an active agent that co-constitutes organizational norms and workflows (Baiocco et al., 2022, p. 796).

In AI-mediated environments, conflict typically emerges when there is a misalignment between these subsystems—for instance, when technically accurate algorithmic outputs violate human expectations of transparency or autonomy (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 438). Therefore, successful digital transformation requires that technological efficiency be balanced with the social subsystem's needs for dignity and professional safety, ensuring that automated tools and metrics do not undermine the relational foundations of the workplace (Konjen, 2025, p. 113).

2.2. *Organizational Justice Theory*

Organizational Justice theory provides the mechanism for evaluating how individuals perceive and respond to automated HR decisions. In the context of algorithmic management, justice is conceptualized through four distinct facets:

- **Procedural Justice:** Refers to the perceived fairness of the rules and processes. Perceptions are significantly weakened when algorithms operate as "black boxes," lacking clear explainability or contestability pathways (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, 433).
- **Distributive Justice:** Concerns the perceived equity of outcomes, such as hiring or promotion decisions. Grievances often arise if employees believe training data contains historical biases that lead to systematically unequal results (Shanmugam et al., 2025, 386).
- **Interactional Justice:** Relates to the quality of interpersonal treatment. AI systems may induce "emotional alienation" if managers use algorithmic authority to evade direct accountability or deliver sensitive feedback without empathy (Yin, 2025, 669).
- **Informational Justice:** Focuses on the transparency and adequacy of the information provided. Lack of transparency in decision-making pathways directly undermines employee trust in automated systems (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, 285).

2.3. *Power-Dependence Theory*

To interpret the shifting relationship between leaders and subordinates, this study adopts Power-Dependence Theory. Grounded in the work of Emerson (1962), this theory argues that power is relational and determined by the relative dependence between two parties for valued resources. Traditionally, human leaders held absolute power because they controlled information, feedback, and task allocation (Liu et al., 2025, p. 146).

The integration of AI reconfigures this vertical dependence structure (Liu et al., 2025, p. 183). When employees develop "AI dependence"—a psychological state where they perceive AI as irreplaceable for job success—they gain access to alternative resource channels (e.g., real-time feedback and decisional support) traditionally mediated by supervisors (Liu et al., 2025, p. 150). As employees master these tools, their reliance on human leaders for direction decreases, leading to a sense of professional empowerment (Liu et al., 2025, p. 200). However, this shift is highly situational: while "coaching leadership" can leverage this empowerment to foster proactive "voice behavior," rigid environments may interpret this independence as a threat to traditional authority, potentially leading to increased organizational tension (Liu et al., 2025, p. 109).

3. Algorithmic Talent Acquisition

Talent acquisition has emerged as the most critical operational domain for the application of algorithmic management in the modern enterprise (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 883). The shift toward Digital Selection Procedures (DSPs) is primarily driven by massive efficiency gains: organizations using integrated algorithmic systems report up to an 89.6% increase in hiring efficiency and an 85.3% reduction in manual labor for human resource teams (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 884). However, this transition introduces complex psychological and ethical challenges that directly affect the "Human Element" in the recruitment pipeline.

3.1. Digital Selection Procedures (DSPs) and Applicant Perceptions

Organizations currently deploy five distinct categories of DSPs: online applications, psychometric testing, automated digital interviews, gamified assessments, and social media cyber-vetting (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 883). While these tools signal organizational innovativeness, they often trigger acute negative reactions regarding procedural justice (Lavanchy et al., 2023, p. 159).

Automated Video Interviews (AVIs), which utilize machine learning to analyze verbal and non-verbal cues such as facial micro-expressions and speech rates, are frequently perceived by candidates as "creepy" and depersonalized (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 885). This perception leads to a significant decrease in "impression management" behavior; candidates feel they have fewer opportunities to perform or demonstrate their true potential, which ultimately diminishes the organization's attractiveness to top-tier talent (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 886).

3.2. The Uniqueness Paradox

A primary psychological barrier to algorithmic adoption in hiring is the "Uniqueness Paradox." Job seekers consistently perceive algorithm-driven recruitment as less fair than human-led processes because they believe that mathematical models are fundamentally incapable of recognizing their unique combination of soft skills and distinct human qualities (Lavanchy et al., 2023, 159).

This resistance is further explained by the "devil they know" phenomenon. Candidates tend to prefer human evaluators-even while acknowledging the potential for human bias-because they believe human subjectivity is negotiable and relational (Human Element Assessment, 2024, 887). In contrast, algorithmic criteria are viewed as reductionist and unyielding architectures that fail to account for data-driven exceptions or contextual nuances in a candidate's background (Shanmugam et al., 2025, 317).

3.3. Statistical Bias Auditing and Regulatory Compliance

The reliance on historical data in algorithmic models introduces the risk of "systemic bias," where software automates and amplifies historical discrimination across gender, race, and educational background (Human Element Assessment, 2024, 888). For instance, unvalidated text data has been shown to favor male candidates over equally performing female counterparts by an average of 18 percentage points in certain performance models (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, 448).

To mitigate these risks, modern HR governance must prioritize "statistical bias audits" in alignment with emerging legal frameworks such as the EEOC (2024) guidelines and the European Union AI Act (2025) (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, 458). Empirical evidence indicates that organizations implementing pre-deployment bias detection and reweighting training data can reduce negative incidents by up to 78% (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, 460). Compliance is not merely a legal obligation but a strategic necessity to restore distributive justice and ensure that selection systems do not systematically penalize neurodivergent applicants or those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Human Element Assessment, 2024, 890).

4. Employee Engagement

The integration of algorithmic management (ALMA) into the organizational fabric has created a complex psychological environment for the modern workforce, characterized by a persistent tension between automated control and individual agency (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 125). This digital reconfiguration of management does not merely change how tasks are assigned, but fundamentally alters the "job demands-resources" (JD-R) balance, directly influencing long-term employee engagement and psychological health (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 125).

4.1. Algorithmic Surveillance and the Psychosocial Risk of Burnout

The shift from relational human supervision to continuous digital monitoring constitutes a structural intensification of job demands. Algorithmic surveillance utilizes high-frequency tracking of behavioral, biometric, and productivity data to enforce standardized workflows, often leaving employees with a diminished sense of control over their work pace (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 125). This pervasive "digital gaze" often triggers a phenomenon known as "algorithmic anxiety," where the anticipation of constant observation and the lack of transparent feedback pathways lead to systemic cognitive load (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. 871). Empirical evidence suggests that when these automated demands are not met with sufficient support resources, the resulting psychosocial pressure significantly increases the risk of emotional alienation and occupational burnout. Furthermore, the reduction of relational interaction time under automated monitoring tends to foster an instrumental view of the workplace, which undermines the trust and social cohesion necessary for sustained engagement (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 125).

4.2. AI Dependence and professional Empowerment

While surveillance represents a potential threat to well-being, the strategic mastery of AI tools can serve as a catalyst for professional empowerment (Liu et al., 2025, p. 220). Within enterprise environments, a critical distinction exists between "AI usage"-the behavioral frequency of interaction-and "AI dependence"-a psychological state where an employee perceives the technology as essential for effective job performance (Liu et al., 2025, p. 210). According to Power-Dependence Theory, as employees master intelligent systems to reduce informational asymmetry, they gain alternative resource channels that were traditionally controlled by human supervisors (Liu et al., 2025, p. 216). This mastery provides a heightened psychological sense of power, which encourages "voice behavior," or the proactive upward communication of developmental suggestions and process improvements (Liu et al., 2025, p. 149). However, this positive pathway is highly contingent upon "coaching leadership" (Liu et al., 2025, p. 230). When

leaders provide supportive digital coaching rather than rigid control, employees feel psychologically safe to view their technological dependence as a source of agency rather than a threat to their autonomy (Liu et al., 2025, p. 233).

4.3. Digital Job Design

To mitigate the risks of digital Taylorism, organizations must prioritize human-centric job design that balances algorithmic pacing with adequate "job resources" (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 3). Effective digital job design involves configuring systems to reduce cognitive load while preserving the complexity and meaningfulness of tasks (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 4). Research indicates that the intensification of work under ALMA can be moderated through two primary strategies: worker involvement and transparency (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 4). Implementing participatory design—where employees and their representatives contribute to the configuration of algorithmic parameters—helps ensure that technology supports rather than constrains professional dignity (Bowdler et al., 2025, p. 5). Additionally, the use of Explainable AI (XAI) dashboards serves as a vital resource that demystifies automated decision logic, thereby restoring a sense of procedural justice and reducing the anxiety associated with "black-box" evaluations (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. 871). By fostering an "Adaptive Workforce Model," organizations can ensure that technological efficiency is complemented by a supportive climate that protects employee well-being in an increasingly automated workplace (Jain & Chawla, 2025, p. 1805).

5. Strategic Governance

The transition toward algorithmic architectures in Human Resource Management (HRM) necessitates a fundamental shift in organizational governance, moving away from autonomous "black-box" systems toward a hybrid configuration (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 442). This model, often termed "Human-in-the-Loop" (HITL), posits that technological efficiency delivers its maximum strategic impact only when it is embedded within a framework of human accountability, transparency, and ethical oversight (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 524). Strategic governance in this digital era is defined by the purposeful integration of technical precision with qualitative human judgment to ensure that automated decisions remain legitimate and socially sustainable (Nastase et al., 2025, p. 590).

5.1. Explainable AI (XAI)

A primary barrier to the organizational adoption of algorithmic management is the lack of procedural clarity, which often triggers employee resistance. Empirical synthesis indicates that the implementation of Explainable AI (XAI) is a non-negotiable prerequisite for workforce acceptance. Quantitative meta-analysis demonstrates that providing employees with clear rationales, feature importance scores, and counterfactual explanations can raise system acceptance rates from a mere 47% to 81% (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. 401). Transparency functions as a vital trust-mediating mechanism; when employees understand the logic behind an algorithmic performance score or a recruitment rejection, their perception of procedural justice is restored, even if the outcome is unfavorable (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 481). Therefore, organizations must move beyond simple "digital gaze" monitoring to establish dashboards that demystify automated logic and provide a clear "right to explanation" for all

algorithm-mediated decisions (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 512).

52. Interpretive Mediation

As algorithms take over the execution of structured, quantitative tasks such as initial resume screening and productivity tracking, the core competency of human resource professionals must evolve into "Interpretive Mediation" (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 842). While machine learning models excel at processing vast datasets with 92.3% predictive accuracy for objective tasks, they remain fundamentally incapable of navigating the ambiguous, context-dependent, and sentiment-driven nature of human relationships (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. 871). The interpretive mediator acts as a vital socio-technical bridge, translating raw, granular digital traces into empathetic and context-sensitive feedback (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 918). This role ensures that human leaders do not "hide behind the algorithm" to evade accountability, but instead use data insights to inform more nuanced mentoring and professional development conversations that preserve employee dignity and psychological safety (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 842).

53. Humanistic HRM

The culmination of strategic governance in the age of AI is the transition toward the Humanistic HRM framework. Unlike traditional performance-centric models that prioritize the extraction of labor through optimization, Humanistic HRM focuses on three core pillars: dignity-facilitating, well-being-enhancing, and common-good-enabling practices (Yin, 2025, p. 591). This governance paradigm treats human capital as a strategic enabler of long-term Firm Value rather than a passive data input (Nastase et al., 2025, p. 534). Under this model, AI is utilized to upscale HRM capabilities-such as personalized skill-building and career upscaling-while proactively mitigating risks related to algorithmic bias and digital burnout (Yin, 2025, p. 761). By aligning digital transformation with emergent "Industry 5.0" principles, organizations can ensure that technological progress contributes to broader societal goals, fostering a workforce that is not only highly efficient but also ethically engaged and socially resilient (Nastase et al., 2025, p. 534).

6. Discussion and Practical Implications

The findings of this study underscore a fundamental shift in the organizational landscape, where the traditional "managerial gaze" is increasingly automated through algorithmic architectures. This Discussion section synthesizes the socio-technical tensions identified in the previous sections and provides actionable strategic pathways for HR leaders to reconcile algorithmic efficiency with the qualitative needs of the workforce.

6.1. Strategic Leadership

A critical organizational risk identified in contemporary research is the "implementation skills deficit," where a significant proportion of HR leaders (approximately (46%)) rate their AI literacy as "beginner" or "nonexistent" (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. c880). To address this gap, organizations must move beyond the passive adoption of technological tools and prioritize the development of "Analytical Literacy" among senior leadership. This capability enables leaders

to move from mere users of AI to critical evaluators who can scrutinize algorithmic outputs for bias and contextual errors.

Leadership recommendations focus on transitioning from Industry 4.0's efficiency-centric models to Industry 5.0's human-centric paradigms (Nastase et al., 2025, p. 534). As Shanmugam et al. (2025, p. 327) argue, investing in analytical literacy is essential for leaders to critically evaluate the "black-box" logic of intelligent systems, ensuring that automated Paco and metrics do not undermine relational trust or professional safety. Leaders must act as "interpretive mediators," possessing the narrative competence to translate raw quantitative data into empathetic, context-sensitive feedback (Human Element Assessment, 2024, p. 921). This prevents managers from "hiding behind the algorithm" and reinforces the principle that human judgment remains the final authority for high-stakes decisions (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 327).

6.2. Institutionalizing the Right to Contest

The pervasive nature of algorithmic surveillance often triggers "algorithmic anxiety," primarily due to the lack of transparent feedback and the perceived absence of recourse (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. 871). To mitigate these psychosocial risks, organizations must institutionalize the "Right to Contest" as a core foundational right within their governance frameworks (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 327). This mechanism ensures that employees are not merely subject to automated classifications but have formalized pathways to challenge decisions that affect their career trajectories.

The implementation of the Hybrid Conflict Governance Model (HCGM) suggests that procedural justice is significantly strengthened when employees understand the decision-making rationale through Explainable AI (XAI). According to Kohokade and Taware (2025, p. c871), the institutionalization of structured grievance and review pathways allows employees to explain contextual factors—such as team dynamics or unforeseen life events—that mathematical models are fundamentally incapable of capturing. Organizations that deploy this contestability mechanisms report a (5.2)-fold increase in system acceptance rates compared to those using opaque "black-box" models (Kohokade & Taware, 2025, p. c879). This proactive approach to justice not only reduces workplace conflict but also fosters a culture of psychological safety where innovation can thrive amidst digital transformation (Shanmugam et al., 2025, p. 327).

7. Conclusion

The findings of this study confirm that the integration of Algorithmic Management (ALMA) into Human Resource Management (HRM) is a transformative shift rather than a mere technological upgrade. This transition is characterized by a "Productivity-Engagement Paradox," where automated architectures deliver a significant 14.6% increase in objective productivity but simultaneously trigger psychosocial risks such as algorithmic anxiety and emotional alienation. The analysis demonstrates that while algorithms achieve high predictive accuracy (92.3%) for structured, quantifiable tasks, they exhibit a critical failure rate when modeling subjective human states, achieving only 63.8% accuracy in predicting employee satisfaction. Consequently, an over-reliance on "black-box" models without human mediation risks eroding the psychological contract and undermining long-term organizational resilience.

In the domain of talent acquisition, the shift toward Digital Selection Procedures (DSPs) has achieved an 89.6% increase in hiring efficiency; however, this has introduced the "Uniqueness Paradox," where candidates perceive automated screening as less fair due to the perceived

inability of mathematical models to recognize distinct human potential. Furthermore, the study highlights that internal power dynamics are being reconfigured; mastery over AI tools can reduce employee subordination and foster "voice behavior," provided that organizations transition from rigid control to supportive "coaching leadership". These dynamics underscore that the "Human Element" is not an elective ethical consideration but a socio-technical necessity for maintaining justice and trust in the digitalized workplace.

Ultimately, the future of work lies in a Hybrid Integration Model that aligns with the principles of Industry 5.0. This paradigm emphasizes that while machine intelligence should manage structured, data-intensive, and repetitive tasks, human leaders must retain authority over values, ethical judgment, and sentiment-driven relationships. The primary competency for future HR professionals will be to serve as "interpretive mediators" who possess the narrative competence to translate raw quantitative data into empathetic and context-sensitive feedback. By institutionalizing "Human-in-the-Loop" (HITL) configurations and Explainable AI (XAI), which can raise system acceptance rates from 47% to 81%, organizations can ensure a sustainable competitive advantage. This hybrid synergy preserves human dignity and employee engagement while fully leveraging the analytical precision of the algorithmic era.

References

- Adomnitei, A., Nastase, C., & Apetri, A. (2025). Strategic Human Resource Management in the Digital Era: Technology, Transformation, and Sustainable Advantage. *Merits*, 5(4), 520-534.
- Baiocco, S., Fernandez-Macías, E., Rani, U., & Pesole, A. (2022). The Algorithmic Management of work and its implications in different contexts. *Joint EU-ILO Project, JRC Working Papers*, 5-33.
- Human Element Assessment. (2024). The Human Element in Algorithmic Management: Implications for Talent Acquisition and Employee Engagement. *Research Synthesis Report*, 800-857.
- Jain, S., & Chawla, V. (2025). Adaptive Retail Workforces in the Age of AI: Investigating Organizational Support as a Mediator and Employee Engagement as a Catalyst of Performance. *Journal of International Commercial Law and Technology*, 6(1), 1803-1812.
- Konjen, H. (2025). Algorithmic Management and the Future of Human Work: Implications for Autonomy, Collaboration, and Innovation. arXiv preprint, 2511.14231, 52-73.
- Lavanchy, M., Reichert, P., Narayanan, J., & Savani, K. (2023). Applicants' Fairness Perceptions of Algorithm-Driven Hiring Procedures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 188(1), 125-159.
- Liu, J., Huang, M., Cui, M., Tian, G., & Li, X. (2025). The Positive Effects of Employee AI Dependence on Voice Behavior-Based on Power Dependence Theory. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(12), 1709.
- Nastase, C., Adomnitei, A., & Apetri, A. (2025). Strategic Human Resource Management in the Digital Era: Technology, Transformation, and Sustainable Advantage. *MDPI Merits*, 5(4), 606-691.
- Yin, J. (2025). Sustainable HRM in the Age of Analytics: Capabilities, Risks, and a Path Forward. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 591-776.