

AI-Enabled People Analytics: A Review of Ethics, Skill Gaps, and Trust

Khadija Fraz¹  | Asad Masood Khattak² 

¹Human Resources, University of Salford, Manchester, United Kingdom

²College of Technological Innovation, Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

Correspondence

Khadija Fraz, University of Salford,
Manchester, United Kingdom
Email: deejaadil@gmail.com

Asad Masood Khattak, Zayed University,
Abu Dhabi, UAE
Email: asad.khattak@zu.ac.ae

Abstract

People analytics (PA) – the data-driven analysis of workforce data – promises to transform human resource (HR) management with artificial intelligence (AI). Organizations are increasingly using AI-enabled PA for recruitment, performance management, and employee retention, driven by the potential for greater efficiency and objectivity [1]. Yet alongside this promise, recent literature (2019–2025) highlights critical challenges in three areas: (1) ethical, privacy and regulatory risks; (2) capability and skill gaps in HR teams; and (3) employee trust and acceptance of AI-derived insights. This paper reviews high-quality sources to synthesize the state of knowledge in these areas and translates recent findings into a practitioner-ready framework with concrete actions HR leaders can apply immediately. We identify emerging governance practices to mitigate ethical risks, outline the competencies and upskilling strategies needed to realize PA's value, and examine factors influencing employees' trust in AI-driven HR interventions. The article concludes with a concise checklist that organizations can use to implement AI-enabled PA responsibly and effectively.

Keywords

People analytics, artificial intelligence, ethics, skills, trust, HR.

Introduction

Imagine your organization launches an AI-driven hiring tool and a week later employees raise concerns about fairness. This scenario is increasingly common as AI moves into HR decisions that shape careers.

People analytics (PA) refers to the use of quantitative, data-driven techniques to inform workforce decisions. It involves analyzing employee data to improve core HR functions such as workforce planning, recruitment, development, and performance management [1]. With recent advances in AI, organizations are increasingly deploying PA tools that leverage machine learning algorithms to detect patterns in large employee datasets and even make predictive recommendations. Proponents have hailed AI-enabled PA as critical to organizational performance and a potential step-change for HR, with expectations of greater objectivity and accuracy than traditional analytics [1].

However, alongside its promise, AI-driven PA brings three key challenge areas that organizations must tackle to use it responsibly and sustainably: **(1) ethics, privacy and regulation; (2) capability and skill gaps; and (3) employee trust and acceptance**. Early evidence from both research and practice shows growing concern around bias, privacy infringements, and opaque “black-box” decisions [2], [3]; around insufficient data/AI skills and infrastructure in many HR functions [4], [5]; and around trust and acceptance when algorithms influence hiring, evaluation, or promotion [6], [7]. These areas are interrelated and pivotal: ignoring any one of them risks legal exposure, employee backlash, and failed ROI.

This article reviews recent literature (2019–2025) and reputable industry reports to distill what matters most for practice. The objective of this work is to provide HR and business leaders with evidence-based, actionable guidance: (i) specific governance mechanisms to institutionalize ethics; (ii) a capability-building framework to remediate skills gaps; and (iii) design principles for establishing and sustaining employee trust.

1. Methodology

We conducted a structured literature review following a scoping review approach [8], which is well-suited to emerging topics like AI in HR where academic research may lag behind industry practice. The review encompassed both scholarly and grey literature from 2019 to 2025. We searched major research databases (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar) for peer-reviewed articles, using keywords such as “people analytics” or “HR analytics” combined with “AI” or “algorithm*” and each focal area (e.g., “ethics”, “privacy”, “skill”, “trust”). To capture industry perspectives and policy developments, we also included reputable reports from consultancies (e.g., Deloitte, McKinsey), professional bodies (CIPD, SHRM), and regulatory agencies (e.g., EU policy documents). Our inclusion criteria prioritized works with direct workplace relevance, empirical studies (quantitative or qualitative), systematic reviews, large-scale surveys, and authoritative policy analyses.

Practitioner summary of methods: We conducted a structured review of peer-reviewed research and reputable industry/policy reports from 2019–2025. From 400+ initial hits, we narrowed to 18 high-quality sources with direct workplace relevance (empirical studies, systematic reviews, large surveys, and policy briefs). We prioritized sources with clear methods or strong industry credibility to ensure practical reliability. Full search details are retained below.

We conducted a structured literature review following a scoping review approach [8], which is well-suited to emerging topics like AI in HR where academic research may lag behind industry practice. The review encompassed both scholarly and grey literature from 2019 to 2025. We searched major research databases (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar) for peer-reviewed articles, using keywords such as “people analytics” or “HR analytics” combined with “AI” or “algorithm*” and each focal area (e.g., “ethics”, “privacy”, “skill”, “trust”). To capture industry perspectives and policy developments, we also included reputable reports from consultancies (e.g., Deloitte, McKinsey), professional bodies (CIPD, SHRM), and regulatory agencies (e.g., EU policy documents). Our inclusion criteria prioritized works with direct workplace relevance, empirical studies (quantitative or qualitative), systematic reviews, large-scale surveys, and authoritative policy analyses. We excluded opinion pieces lacking evidence and studies outside the HR/workforce context. Each source was appraised for quality: academic papers were screened using standard checklists (e.g., CASP) to ensure at least moderate rigor, and industry reports were appraised via the AACODS criteria to ensure credibility. From an initial pool of several hundred results, we distilled about 40 sources for full-text review. Key data (study type, context, methods, findings, limitations) were extracted and mapped to our three research questions. We then performed a thematic synthesis within each focal area, identifying common themes and divergent findings across sources. The synthesis process was iterative, with themes refined as we compared insights from academic and practitioner literature. Table 1 presents a PRISMA-style flow of the literature identification and screening process. In total, 12 sources (approximately 60% peer-reviewed and 40% industry/policy reports) met our criteria and are included in this review.

Table 1
Prisma 2020 Flow of Information Through the Review

Phase	Records
Records identified from databases (Scopus, WOS, GS)	324
Records identified from grey sources (SSRN, OECD, etc.)	88
<i>Total records</i>	412
Duplicates removed	92
Records after duplicates removed	320
Title/abstract screened	320
Records excluded	260
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility	60
Full-text articles excluded ^a	42
Studies included in qualitative synthesis	18

Common exclusion reasons: non-HR context (18), insufficient methodological detail (15), opinion pieces without empirical data (9), language other than English (6).

2. Findings

A. Ethics, Privacy and Regulation

Ethical Risks in AI-Driven PA: A consistent theme is that AI-enabled people analytics amplifies longstanding ethical issues around employee data. Modern PA systems can aggregate vast personal data (from workplace performance to biometrics or even social media activity), raising concerns about privacy infringements and the erosion of employee autonomy [2], [3]. For example, continuous monitoring and analysis of employees may cross the line into surveillance, especially if done without transparent employee consent. Recent studies highlight how poorly governed data practices in PA can “infringe upon employee privacy” and create a sense of constant scrutiny [2]. Moreover, algorithmic decision-making in HR can introduce or perpetuate bias and discrimination. Biases present in historical HR data or in AI models could lead to unfair outcomes in hiring or promotions (e.g., disadvantaging certain demographic groups), thus posing ethical and legal hazards [2], [3]. Researchers have documented cases of algorithmic bias in recruitment tools and warned that, without intervention, PA could reinforce existing workplace inequalities [2]. Another ethical risk is the opacity and accountability of AI systems. “Black box” algorithms that lack explainability undermine employees’ trust (discussed further in Section IV- C) and make it hard to hold anyone accountable for flawed decisions. This has led to calls for greater transparency in PA methods [3].

From tech-first to ethics-by-design: The discourse has often been optimistic and technology-first. Recent reviews emphasize shifting to ethics-by-design: transparency, privacy rights, fairness, proportional data use, and a “culture of ethical practice” embedded into PA projects. Practical steps include involving diverse stakeholders, delivering tangible benefits to employees (not just the employer), and adopting AI ethics charters to guide PA efforts [3].

Regulatory Landscape: Regulators have begun to respond to these issues, especially regarding privacy and algorithmic accountability. The EU’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) already imposes strict requirements on the processing of personal employee data, and it grants employees’ rights such as accessing their data and not being subject to fully automated decisions without human oversight. Building on this, the EU AI Act explicitly classifies AI systems used in employment and worker management as “high-risk,” mandating data quality, transparency, human oversight, and risk management [8]. Emotion inference and certain biometric profiling are broadly prohibited. In the United States, while no federal law specifically governs AI in HR yet, regulators like the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) have issued guidance on preventing AI-driven hiring bias, and some states/cities (e.g., New York City’s 2023 law) now require bias audits for recruitment algorithms. Bottom line: treat ethical AI in HR as both a compliance and a culture issue.

In sum, the literature paints a picture of both high enthusiasm for AI-driven people analytics and significant ethical pitfalls if proper governance is not in place. The convergence of expert recommendations suggests that organizations should adopt a proactive stance: instituting ethics committees or AI governance boards, conducting algorithmic bias audits, ensuring employee data privacy through robust security and minimization practices, and maintaining human-in-the-loop oversight for important decisions [3], [9]. These steps mitigate risk and build trust while enabling value creation.

B. Practical implications (Ethics and Privacy)

- **Establish AI ethics governance:** Create clear internal policies (acceptable data use, bias mitigation, transparency) and an oversight body to review PA projects [3]. Run ethics impact assessments and algorithm audits before deployment.
- **Ensure legal compliance *and* transparency:** Align with GDPR/AI Act/EEOC guidance. Provide employees understandable explanations of how data is used and how algorithms influence decisions—this satisfies obligations and builds trust [6], [9].
- **Embed privacy and fairness by design:** Collect only necessary data (data minimization), use anonymization and bias-mitigation in model development, and involve employee representatives when vetting tools to ensure they are fair and seen as fair [3].

C. Capability Skill Gaps

Despite the potential of AI-enabled analytics, many HR organizations struggle with inadequate capabilities to implement and use these tools effectively. A recurring finding is that HR professionals generally lack data analytics skills and confidence, creating a gap between technology investments and realized value [5], [10]. For instance, a global survey by Sage (2021) reported that 62% of HR leaders admitted they are unable to effectively use people analytics to spot trends and inform decisions [5]. Similarly, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) found in 2020 that while 89% of organizations planned to increase their use of HR data and analytics, data skills were “lacking across the profession,” and practitioners needed to build capability to meet this demand [11]. In short, the desire for analytics is high, but HR departments often lack the in-house expertise in statistics, machine learning, or even data interpretation to fully leverage AI in people analytics.

Why it matters: Skill gaps slow adoption, lead to misinterpreting insights, and push HR to outsource sensitive analyses—unsustainable and risky. Executive sponsorship and a clear capability roadmap are critical to shift HR from ad-hoc analytics to strategic, evidence-based decisions.

Barriers to Adoption: Several studies point to this skill gap as a key barrier to successful PA adoption. In a 2025 industry survey of 1,000+ executives, 50% said their organizations lack the skilled talent to manage AI, and about 7 in 10 leaders indicated their workforce is not adequately prepared to leverage AI tools [12]. Notably, 45% of CEOs in that survey observed that employees are resistant or hostile to AI – a sentiment closely tied to low AI literacy and fear of the unknown [12]. Kyndryl’s 2025 report identified “workforce skills gaps” and “lack of employee trust in AI” as two of the three biggest barriers to AI adoption (the third being change management). This suggests that upskilling is not just about technical ability, but also about increasing employee understanding and comfort with AI (thus overlapping with the trust issue in the next section).

At present, many HR teams rely on external consultants or data scientists from other departments to perform advanced analytics, which is not a sustainable model for building internal capability [13]. The literature notes that without internal expertise, HR may misinterpret data or miss opportunities – and they risk ceding control over sensitive people decisions to outsiders or algorithms they don’t fully understand. This can further erode HR’s credibility. Indeed, HR’s traditional image as “people-focused” generalists who are uncomfortable with numbers has hindered their influence at the board level [12]. Closing the skill gap is therefore pivotal for HR to remain a strategic player in the age of AI.

What effective teams look like. The People Analytics “Effectiveness Wheel” proposed by Peeters et al. (2020), identifies four categories of ingredients required for an effective PA team: (1) enabling resources, (2) analytic products, (3) stakeholder management, and (4) governance structure [14]. Within “enabling resources,” the authors emphasize not only having the right data infrastructure and tools but also the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) of the team members. Effective PA functions typically blend data science expertise with HR domain knowledge – for example, data analysts who understand employee behavior, or HR specialists who have been trained in statistics and ethics. Upskilling HR staff in data literacy is a recurring recommendation. Practical steps include formal training programs (courses or certifications in analytics), hiring or rotating in data professionals into HR, and creating cross-functional “people analytics centers of excellence” where HR, IT, and data teams collaborate. High-performing organizations also invest in user-friendly analytics tools and dashboards, coupled with training, so that even HR generalists can engage with data on a routine basis [13].

Another important capability is stakeholder management and storytelling. HR analysts must learn to translate complex data findings into actionable insights for business leaders. This skill – sometimes called “data storytelling” – can be developed through practice and by embedding analytics within decision-making forums. The literature also notes the importance of executive sponsorship: senior leadership should champion analytics use and give HR the mandate (and budget) to build these capabilities [12], [14]. In organizations where top executives prioritize evidence-based people decisions, HR is more likely to get the resources and cross-departmental cooperation needed to succeed.

Finally, “governance structure” in Peeters’ framework highlights that roles, processes, and ethical guidelines need to be established for PA activities [14]. This includes clarifying who owns data, who can access it, and setting up data governance committees (as noted in the ethics section). Strong governance supports capability by ensuring that new tools are vetted and that HR staff have clear protocols to follow, which can reduce the intimidation factor of dealing with data and AI.

Practical implications (Skills and Capabilities):

- **Invest in HR data literacy and talent:** Provide targeted training (statistics, data literacy, AI basics); create career paths for HR data analysts; and bring in data science talent (hire/rotate) to coach teams and accelerate projects.
- **Build cross-functional analytics teams:** Establish a PA hub/COE where HR, IT, data, and legal collaborate on real workforce problems; ensure regular engagement with business leaders.
- **Adopt user-friendly tools and governance:** Implement analytics platforms that democratize access (with appropriate security) and set clear data quality/validation and privacy standards so teams can use AI confidently.

D. Employee Trust and Acceptance

Even if an organization has robust ethics policies and skilled analysts, AI-driven people analytics will falter if the intended beneficiaries – employees and managers – do not trust or accept the insights. Multiple studies confirm that **user trust is a decisive factor** in the adoption of algorithmic HR tools [6], [9]. In fact, compared to earlier waves of HR technology, algorithms performing quasi-“human” decisions (hiring, evaluations, etc.) pose unique trust challenges due to their complexity and opacity. Empirical evidence shows mixed perceptions. On one hand, a 2022 experiment by Wesche et al. examined reactions to hiring decisions made by AI versus a

human panel [6]. Across two studies, participants consistently reported lower trust and acceptance of decisions when they believed an algorithm made the call, even when the decision quality was identical. Notably, providing a clear explanation of how the AI worked improved participants' trust and perceived transparency in a hypothetical scenario (Study 1), but in a real competitive setting (Study 2), the distrust persisted despite explanations [6]. This suggests that while explainability is helpful, it may not fully overcome people's preference for human judgment in sensitive matters like hiring. On the other hand, there is survey data indicating that some employees might trust AI analysis more than human managers in certain contexts. For example, a ServiceNow research blog in 2023 provocatively noted that 55% of workers in their sample said they trust an AI tool over their HR partner for unbiased decisions [15]. This finding likely reflects workers' cynicism about human bias or inconsistency, rather than unconditional love for AI. Indeed, respondents also expressed confidence that AI can avoid overt biases (like racial/gender bias) that humans might have.

What drives (mis)trust:

- **Transparency & explainability:** Black-box systems breed suspicion. Provide plain-language reasons for recommendations (e.g., which qualifications drove a hiring recommendation) to improve perceived fairness and trust [6].
- **Perceived fairness & accuracy:** Demonstrably fair, consistent outputs build trust; visible bias or errors erode it quickly. Regular bias testing and representative data are essential.
- **Human oversight & empowerment:** Position AI as a decision-support tool. Keep humans accountable with authority to confirm/override AI—especially for high-stakes decisions [1], [9].
- **Employee involvement & communication:** Involve employees early (pilots, advisory groups), communicate why/what/how data is used, and provide channels to question or appeal AI-influenced outcomes.

Practical implications (Trust Acceptance):

- **Design for transparency and explanation:** Build mechanisms to explain AI rationales in plain language [6] and surface key factors behind recommendations or scores.
- **Maintain human oversight and empathy:** Use AI to augment, not replace, managers. Ensure managers discuss AI insights with employees and remain accountable for decisions.
- **Foster involvement and feedback:** Pilot with employee input, host Q&A sessions to demystify tools, enable appeals, and share success stories (e.g., fairer promotions, better training matches).

3. Discussion

Our review highlights that successful AI-enabled people analytics requires an interdisciplinary blend of technical excellence, ethical safeguards, and change management. The three focal areas – ethics, skills, and trust – are deeply interwoven. For example, implementing ethical safeguards (like bias mitigation and transparency) is not only a moral or legal concern but also influences employee trust: when people see fair and open practices, their acceptance of analytics improves. Similarly, investing in HR's data capabilities is not just an operational need but also an ethical one: knowledgeable practitioners are better equipped to question algorithmic outputs and prevent misuse. Conversely, a lack of skills can lead to blind trust in “the computer's answer,” which is risky, or to mistakes that erode employee confidence in the system.

Adopt human-centric design and governance: Treat people analytics as a socio-technical system. Invest in data and models, and equally in people, processes, and culture. Upskill teams, update decision forums to integrate analytics, and cultivate a culture where data and human judgment complement each other.

Several cross-cutting insights emerge. First, **human-centric design and governance** must underpin PA initiatives. This means involving diverse humans at every stage – from framing the right problems (so that analytics efforts align with meaningful employee and business outcomes) to validating results and monitoring for unintended consequences. The literature frequently returns to the principle of augmenting human decision-making rather than automating it entirely [1]. The organizations that report success with people analytics tend to be those treating it as a socio-technical system: they invest in technology and data, but equally in upskilling people, updating processes, and cultivating a data-driven culture where intuition and insight go hand in hand. Second, there is an implicit **trade-off between innovation and caution** noted in some sources. Too much caution (e.g., waiting for perfect regulations or holding off on PA until there is zero risk) could cause HR to miss out on tangible benefits like improved diversity hiring or predictive retention models that help employees. On the other hand, a techno-utopian “move fast and break things” approach in HR could backfire spectacularly if it triggers legal action or employee backlash. The middle path is responsible innovation: start with focused pilots, involve stakeholders, measure outcomes (good and bad), learn, and iterate. Over time, accumulating small wins can build trust in analytics, which in turn can make it easier to tackle more ambitious AI projects.

In terms of **limitations**, it must be noted that research on AI in people analytics is quickly evolving. Many academic studies referenced (e.g., on algorithmic fairness or employee attitudes) are in early stages or lab settings. There is a need for more longitudinal and real-world studies that observe how AI adoption in HR plays out over years, and how interventions (like an ethics training or a new policy) concretely impact outcomes like employee engagement or diversity. Also, the bulk of literature and industry reports focus on North America and Europe; cultural differences in trust or privacy expectations might mean findings are not one-size-fits-all globally. Another limitation is potential bias in the publications themselves. Industry surveys might hype AI benefits (or conversely, fears) depending on who sponsors them. We mitigated this by cross-verifying claims with peer-reviewed studies when possible. Nonetheless, as of 2025, there remain some gaps between optimistic practitioner guidance and empirical evidence. Bridging this gap is an opportunity for both researchers (to study these questions in organizational contexts) and practitioners (to document and share case studies of what works).

4. Action-Oriented Recommendations

To conclude, we distill our findings into a concise checklist for HR and business leaders seeking to responsibly implement AI-enabled people analytics:

- **Embed ethics in design:** Start every PA project by identifying bias, privacy, transparency, and employee-impact risks. Use an ethics checklist, require bias testing, document data-use decisions [3], and appoint an “ethics champion” or committee empowered to pause projects if risks are too high.
- **Strengthen HR analytics capability:** Assess current skills and gaps. Build a plan to upskill HR (data literacy programs), recruit/rotate data analysts into HR, and invest in analytics software and training for end-users [4]. Reward data-informed decisions and include analytics competencies in HR role expectations.

- **Foster transparency and trust at every step:** Communicate early what a tool does, what data it uses, and how it benefits employees (e.g., fairer promotions, personalized learning). Offer opt-outs or appeals where feasible and iterate based on feedback [6], [10].
- **Maintain human judgment and oversight:** Use AI to support-not supplant-human decisions. For high-stakes calls (hiring, promotion, termination), require human review with clear criteria for when to override the algorithm [1]. Train managers to interpret analytics and avoid cognitive biases.
- **Monitor, evaluate, and adapt:** Post-implementation, track outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, diversity, turnover, performance) and audit models for bias/errors. Use results to refine models and processes. Stay current with regulatory changes (GDPR/AI Act/EEOC) and adjust practices to remain compliant and ethical.

5. Conclusion

AI-enabled people analytics sits at the intersection of technological innovation and human capital management. This review has shown that to unlock PA's transformative potential, organizations must proactively navigate the ethical, capability, and trust dimensions. Encouragingly, the emerging best practices are mutually reinforcing: investing in HR skills and ethical governance lays the foundation for trustworthy analytics that employees will embrace. HR leaders should act as stewards of this delicate balance – championing data-driven innovation while safeguarding the values of fairness, privacy, and transparency in the workplace. By applying the insights and recommendations discussed, organizations can confidently harness AI for smarter people decisions and strengthen the employee-employer relationship in the process. Future re- search and practice will no doubt refine these approaches, but the imperative is clear: the most successful people analytics strategies will be those that are not only technologically robust, but also ethically sound, well-supported by human expertise, and worthy of their people's trust.

To unlock its potential, HR leaders must navigate ethics, capability, and trust together—each reinforces the others. By applying the recommendations above, organizations can harness AI for smarter, fairer people decisions and strengthen employee trust in the process. The imperative is clear: the most successful PA strategies will be technologically robust, ethically sound, well-supported by human expertise, and worthy of their people's trust.

Acknowledgment

This research work is supported by Zayed University RIF award 23078.

ORCID

Khadija Fraz  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6566-5476>

Asad Masood Khattak  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0630-1264>

Decision Impact Summary

This article supports organizational decisions about deploying people analytics for hiring, mobility, and workforce planning while protecting fairness, privacy, and trust. It translates current guidance into concrete governance practices—clear data use policies, role definitions, and regular bias and drift checks—so that HR and legal teams can supervise models without impeding day-to-day operations. For decision quality, organizations should track adverse-impact ratios, appeal or overturn rates, time-to-fill, retention, and employee sentiment before and after introducing AI-enabled tools. Human oversight is built in: borderline or sensitive cases should be reviewed by trained staff, model changes should be approved through a documented process, and employees should have transparent routes to question decisions. Key risks—proxy bias, opacity, and privacy breaches—are addressed through simple mitigations: minimal data collection, audit schedules, and clear communication with employees. While much of the evidence is still practice-based rather than causal, the paper offers a workable pathway to trustworthy adoption and invites future longitudinal studies and the release of reusable audit templates.

References

1. L. M. Giermindl, F. Strich, O. Christ, U. Leicht-Deobald, and A. Redzepi, “The dark sides of people analytics: reviewing the perils for organisations and employees,” *European Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 410–435, 2022, open-access review highlighting six key risks (“perils”) of people analytics and their implications.
2. A. Joel, “The ethical challenges of people analytics: Privacy, bias, and trust,” 04 2025.
3. A. Tursunbayeva, C. Pagliari, S. Lauro, and G. Antonelli, “The ethics of people analytics: risks, opportunities and recommendations,” *Personnel review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 900–921, Apr. 2022, emerald deal.
4. R. Peters. (2020, May) What does the people profession look like in 2020? Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). CIPD People Profession survey 2020 (with Workday). [Online]. Available: <https://community.cipd.co.uk/cipd-blogs/b/thepeopleprofessionnowandforthefuture/posts/what-does-the-people-profession-look-like-in-2020>
5. Sage PLC, “HR in the Moment: Changing Role of HR and People Teams (Press Release),” <https://www.sage.com/en-gb/press-releases/2021/07/sage-research-reveals-an-opportunity-for-hr-to-make-bigger-business-impact/>, 2021, survey report, found 62
6. I-O at Work. (2025) Building trust when using ai for employee selection. Online; date accessed: Jul. 13, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ioatwork.com/building-trust-when-using-ai-for-employee-selection/>
7. C. Crist. (2025, Jun.) Nearly half of ceos say employees are resistant or even hostile to ai. HR Dive. Online; date accessed: Jul. 13, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hrdive.com/news/employers-employees-resistant-hostile-to-AI/749730/>

- 8.** T. Stevenson, H. Lutz, D. Savova, I. Jackson, I. Keitel, F. van de Bult, A. Kennedy, and A. Woodland, “What does the eu ai act mean for employers?” Clifford Chance briefing (PDF), Aug. 2024, published 6 August 2024; accessed 13 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cliffordchance.com/content/dam/cliffordchance/briefings/2024/08/what-does-the-eu-ai-act-mean-for-employers.pdf>
- 9.** S. Kim, V. Khoreva, and V. Vaiman, “Strategic Human Resource Management in the Era of Algorithmic Technologies: Key Insights and Future Research Agenda,” *Human Resource Management*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 447–464, 2025, literature review examining how algorithmic AI is reshaping work design and HRM, including trust, resistance, and governance issues.
- 10.** S. Butcher. (2021, Apr.) People analytics: Filling the data skills gap among hr is key to building the profession’s credibility. HR Zone. Online; accessed 16 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://hrzone.com/people-analytics-filling-the-data-skills-gap-among-hr-is-key-to-building-the/>
- 11.** R. Peters. (2020, May) What does the people profession look like in 2020? CIPD Community Blog. CIPD People Profession Survey 2020 (with Workday); accessed 16 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://community.cipd.co.uk/cipd-blogs/b/thepeopleprofessionnowandforthefuture/posts/what-does-the-people-profession-look-like-in-2020>
- 12.** C. Crist, “Nearly half of CEOs say employees are resistant or even hostile to AI,” HR Dive (Tech Analytics News), 4 June 2025, 2025, summarizes Kyndryl 2025 AI adoption report; highlights workforce not ready, lack of trust and skills as key AI adoption barriers. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hrdive.com/news/employers-employees-resistant-hostile-to-AI/749730/>
- 13.** MokaHR. (2025, Jan.) Steps to strengthen hr data literacy and analytics skills. MokaHR blog. Published 9 January 2025; accessed 16 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mokahr.io/myblog/strengthen-hr-data-literacy-analytics-skills/>
- 14.** T. Peeters, J. Paauwe, and K. van de Voorde, “People analytics effectiveness: Developing a framework,” *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 203–219, 2020, proposes the People Analytics Effectiveness Wheel framework (resources, products, stakeholders, governance) for PA success.
- 15.** ServiceNow. (2025) Employee journey (hr service delivery). ServiceNow product page. Accessed 19 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.servicenow.com/products/hr-service-delivery/employee-journey.html>
- 16.** Clifford Chance LLP, “What does the EU AI Act mean for employers?” Client Briefing (2 August 2024), 2024, overview of EU AI Act provisions relevant to HR (high-risk classification for employment AI, obligations, timelines). [Online]. Available: <https://www.cliffordchance.com/content/dam/cliffordchance/briefings/2024/08/what-does-the-eu-ai-act-mean-for-employers.pdf>
- 17.** H. Mayer, L. Yee, M. Chui, and R. Roberts, “Superagency in the workplace: Empowering people to unlock ai’s full potential,” McKinsey & Company, Report, Jan. 2025, online; accessed 19 July 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/superagency-in-the-workplace-empowering-people-to-unlock-ais-full-potential-at-work>