

Artificial Intelligence in HRM: Opportunities, Legal Risks, Ethical Concerns, and Managerial Challenges

Sunil Kumar Sharma¹, Dr. Anupama Pandey^{2*}

¹ Ph.D. Scholar, Nims School of Business, Nims University Rajasthan, Jaipur

² Professor, Department of Management, Nims School of Business, Nims University
Rajasthan, Jaipur

Email: anupama.pandey@nimsuniversity.org

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Anupama Pandey

Professor, Department of Management, Nims School of Business, Nims University
Rajasthan, Jaipur

Email: anupama.pandey@nimsuniversity.org

Abstract:

AI is revolutionising human resource management (HRM) by automating recruiting, performance evaluation, workforce analytics, employee engagement, and talent development. While AI offers increased efficiency, data-driven decision-making, and personalisation, its implementation presents substantial legal, ethical, and administrative issues. Algorithmic bias can result in discriminatory outcomes, making companies liable under anti-discrimination legislation and data protection regimes like the GDPR and the EU AI Act. Opacity ("black box" judgements), invasions of privacy, depreciation of human dignity, and accountability gaps are all ethical difficulties. Managers encounter skills shortages, reluctance to change, integration challenges, data quality issues, and strategic misalignment. This article synthesizes recent literature and regulatory developments to examine these challenges and outlines governance, technical, and organizational responses necessary for responsible AI-HRM. Successful integration requires human oversight, bias auditing, transparency, clear accountability frameworks, and alignment with organizational values to balance efficiency with fairness, trust, and compliance..

Keywords: EU AI Act, GDPR, ethical AI, HRM.

INTRODUCTION

Historically, organisational rules, standard operating procedures, interpersonal interactions, and managerial judgement have all played a significant role in human resource management. The advent of Artificial Intelligence has established a new paradigm in which employee-related choices can increasingly be influenced or partially automated by algorithms, machine learning, natural language processing, predictive analytics, and generative AI1. It makes sense that AI would be appealing to HRM. Employers are under growing pressure to find skilled workers quickly, cut administrative expenses, increase worker productivity, and make evidence-based decisions. AI is capable of processing data at a speed and scale that would be challenging for human HR specialists. However, because employment decisions directly impact people's livelihoods, careers, dignity, privacy, and prospects, they differ fundamentally from many other organisational decisions2.

These tools can reduce administrative burden, improve speed and consistency, and surface insights from large datasets. However, AI systems trained on historical data often inherit and amplify societal or organizational biases. Decisions affecting hiring, promotion, compensation, monitoring, or termination carry high stakes for individuals and organizations3. The dual nature of AI—as both an efficiency enabler and a source of risk—has prompted growing regulatory attention, academic scrutiny, and practitioner concern. Previous studies have found a.,.

significant disconnect between the potential and actual application of AI in HRM⁴. The intricacy of human conduct, incomplete or subpar information, the need for accountability and fairness, and the possibility of unfavourable employee responses to algorithmic management are all significant issues. The worry that faulty goals, skewed data, and opaque programming could jeopardise AI applications in hiring, pay, scheduling, and performance management is strengthened by more recent studies and global policy debates⁵

Even in the absence of express intent, biased results can be produced by AI systems. Algorithms may penalise women, older workers, racial minorities, or those with impairments due to historical training data that reflects past under-representation (e.g., primarily male technical hires)⁶. Notable cases include *Mobley v. Workday*, an ongoing lawsuit alleging age, racial, and disability discrimination by an AI screening engine used by numerous large businesses, and Amazon's discontinued recruiting tool that penalised resumes containing the word "women's." Regardless of whether an algorithm or a human made the decision, companies are nevertheless accountable for disparate impact under U.S. law (Title VII, Age Discrimination in Employment Act, Americans with Disabilities Act). In addition to pursuing lawsuits using age-filtering tools, the EEOC has issued warnings about voice analysis and facial recognition systems that can prejudice protected groups.⁶

Methodology:

The methodology used in this article is conceptual narrative review. AI, HRM, employment, data protection, ethics, and algorithmic decision-making-related peer-reviewed academic literature, international institutional reports, regulatory frameworks, and current policy papers were examined.

Three main dimensions were used to study the literature thematically:

Legal difficulties

Ethical dilemmas

Organisational and managerial difficulties

The European Union's AI Act, India's Digital Personal Data Protection framework, and the NIST Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework were among the recent legislative advancements that were taken into consideration. For organisations looking to manage AI-related risks and advance reliable and responsible AI, the NIST AI Risk Management approach offers a voluntary approach. Validity, reliability, safety, security, accountability, explainability, transparency, privacy enhancement, and fairness are among the qualities it highlights⁷.

Artificial Intelligence in HR Administration: In HRM, artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the application of computing systems that can carry out activities like pattern recognition, prediction, classification, language processing, and decision support that have historically required human intellect. AI can help with reviewing resumes, ranking candidates, matching jobs, communicating with applicants, setting up interviews, evaluating skills, recommending candidates, and spotting possible talent. However, preexisting organisational biases may be present in past recruiting statistics. The AI system may replicate or magnify those biases if such data are utilised to train an algorithm. Because recruiting and selection processes can have a substantial impact on people's employment prospects and careers, the EU AI Act expressly identifies them as potentially high-risk.

Employee Selection:

Candidates may be ranked by AI based on their credentials, experience, abilities, behavioural traits, Automated ranking can increase efficiency and consistency, but whether the algorithm's criteria are reliable and applicable to real-world work performance is a big worry.

Performance Management:

AI systems are capable of analysing a variety of workplace data, including productivity metrics, job outputs, attendance, communication patterns, and project completion. Managers may receive ongoing information regarding worker performance from such systems. Excessive surveillance, however, can erode trust, diminish autonomy, and put people under psychological strain.

Learning and Development:

AI is able to determine skill gaps among employees and provide customised training plans. Additionally, learning materials, tests, simulations, and customised training programs can be produced by generative AI.

Algorithmic Discrimination:

Discrimination brought on by algorithmic decision-making is one of the biggest legal issues. When training datasets contain historical disparities, AI systems may inadvertently discriminate. An algorithm that was trained mostly on the profiles of successful employees in the past, for instance, would determine that candidates who are similar to those individuals are more qualified.

Discrimination may relate to: gender, age, disability, race or ethnicity, socioeconomic background; language or accent, religion where legally protected, pregnancy or family status, other legally protected characteristics.

Discussion:

Although AI presents significant prospects for HR transformation, its application should not be seen as only a technological advancement. It signifies a fundamental shift in how businesses perceive, assess, and handle employees⁸. The intricacy of HR issues, data limits, concerns about accountability and justice, and unfavourable employee reactions to algorithmic conclusions were the four major obstacles noted by earlier study. Because human behaviour cannot always be reduced to historical connections, these issues are nevertheless very relevant today. AI related to employment is seen as a high-impact field, as evidenced by the current regulatory landscape. A number of employment-related apps are categorised as high-risk under the EU AI Act because they have the potential to affect hiring, promotion, termination, task distribution, and employee monitoring⁹.

At the same time, international governance frameworks are moving toward a lifecycle approach. The NIST AI RMF emphasizes managing AI risks throughout design, development, deployment, use, testing, and evaluation¹⁰.

The changing data-protection landscape in India is especially crucial for HR departments since hiring and recruitment procedures require a lot of processing of personal data^{11,12}. As a result, the DPDP Act and Rules are significant components of the developing Indian governance framework for AI-enabled HRM. The main management takeaway is that businesses shouldn't assess AI based only on efficiency or cost reductions. Additionally, an effective AI-HRM system should be evaluated in terms of: Fairness, privacy, openness, employee confidence, legal compliance, and organisational efficacy.^{13,14,15}

Conclusion:

AI has significant chances to improve HRM effectiveness, impartiality, and customisation. However, its use in choices that affect lives and careers creates interrelated management, ethical, and legal issues. Proactive, multidisciplinary responses are required in the face of discrimination risk, data protection limitations, opacity, privacy issues, accountability gaps, skills shortages, and organisational opposition. Instead of rejecting AI, the way forward is to responsibly integrate technology into systems that are still subject to human judgement in high-stakes situations, rigorously audited, integrated into transparent governance, and in line with justice and dignity values. Organisations that approach AI-HRM as both a technological and a socio-ethical endeavour will be best able to capitalise on its advantages while reducing its dangers as regulations develop and litigation challenges established principles. Future studies should look at comparative results across regulatory regimes, the efficacy of certain governance methods, and long-term effects on employee well-being.

REFERENCES

- Majumder, S., Salman, S. & Dey, N. AI in human resources: efficiency, ethics, and emerging challenges. *AI Ethics* 6, 59 (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00862-x>
- Prikshat, V., Malik, A., Budhwar, P.: AI-augmented HRM: antecedents, assimilation and multilevel consequences. *Hum. Resource Manag. Rev.* 33(1), 100860 (2023)
- Del Giudice, M., Scuotto, V., Orlando, B., Mustilli, M.: Toward the human-centered approach. A revised model of individual acceptance of AI. *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.* 33(1), 100856 (2023)
- Tambe P, Cappelli P, Yakubovich V. Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Management: Challenges and a Path Forward. *California Management Review*. 2019;61(4):15–42. doi:10.1177/0008125619867910.

Berg J, Johnston H. AI in human resource management: The limits of empiricism. International Labour Organization Working Paper 154. 2025. doi:10.54394/NMSH7611.

Cappelli P, Rogovsky N. Artificial intelligence in human resource management: a challenge for the human-centred agenda? International Labour Organization Working Paper 95. 2023

Tabassi E. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2023.

European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). 2024.

Government of India. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology.

Government of India. Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. 2025.

International Labour Organization. AI, human resource management and the human-centred agenda. ILO publications.

Zakaria KS, Khattak MN. A systematic review of human vs machine intelligence and ethical tensions in human resource management. Discover Artificial Intelligence. 2026;6:861.

Sithambaram, R.A., Tajudeen, F.P.: Impact of artificial intelligence in human resource management: a qualitative study in the Malaysian context. Asia Pac. J. Hum. Resour. 61, 821 (2022)

Pillai, R., Sivathanu, B., Mariani, M., Rana, N.P., Yang, B., Dwivedi, Y.K.: Adoption of AI-empowered industrial robots in auto component manufacturing companies. Prod. Plann. Control. 33(16), 1517–1533 (2022)

Kambur, E., Yildirim, T.: Changes in human resources management with artificial intelligence. In: Handbook on Artificial Intelligence-Empowered Applied Software Engineering: VOL. 2: Smart Software Applications in Cyber-Physical Systems, pp. 89–102. Springer, Cham (2022)..