Center for Management Science Research
ISSN: 3006-5291 3006-5283 Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026

ALGORITHMIC HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING: ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND TRANSPARENCY AS EXPLANATORY MECHANISMS

Zeeshan Zaib Khattak*

* *NUST Business School, National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Islamabad, Pakistan*

*zeeshan.khattak@nbs.nust.edu.pk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22339050

Keywords
algorithmic management; human resource management; employee well-being; organizational justice; transparency; artificial intelligence

Article History
Received: 19 January 2026
Accepted: 04 March 2026
Published: 18 March 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Zeeshan Zaib Khattak

Abstract

As software increasingly enters conventional organisations, algorithmic human resource management (AHRM), originally developed in the context of platform work, is also expanding into traditional organisations with software appearing as a participant in recruitment, scheduling, performance evaluation, compensation, promotion, and discipline. While these systems hold the promise of consistency, speed, and data-informed coordination, their implications for workers remain theoretical. While efficiency-oriented accounts typically regard algorithms as neutral tools, critical accounts highlight their opacity, surveillance, diminished agency and asymmetrical managerial control. This integrative review provides a way to conceptualise AHRM as both a job resource and a job demand. Based primarily on organisational justice theory and the job demands-resources perspective, this paper argues that AHRM influences employee well-being through employees' evaluations of procedural, informational, interpersonal and distributive justice. The reason for this is that algorithmic transparency is proposed not in an unqualified manner but as a boundary condition: explanations for AI systems can help improve predictability and contestability at some level, but, when technical disclosure is imperfect, they become a cognitive burden or create mere symbolic openness. The synthesis distinguishes between informational visibility and meaningful transparency, and the organisational safeguards it identifies include human review, employee voice, data proportionality, and appeal mechanisms. In particular, five propositions define the expected relationships among AHRM intensity, perceived justice, transparency quality, employee autonomy, and well-being. It contributes by weaving together perspectives of efficiency and control, positioning justice as the focal psychological mechanism, and proposing a research design appropriate for organisations in emerging economies. He concludes that responsible AHRM cannot rely on perfect algorithms but must instead provide real procedural justice that enables employees to comprehend, question, and contribute to potentially consequential decisions.

1. Introduction

There is an increasing number of algorithms performing tasks that were once the domain of managers and HR professionals. Modern systems can screen applicants, forecast turnover tendencies, assign shifts and schedules, suggest training to fill skill gaps, set average targets for productivity measurement, and enable the setting

of performance incentives; they can even flag workers for review for disciplinary action. These applications have been classified by Parent-Rocheleau and Parker (2022) as management functions that engage personnel in monitoring, goal setting, scheduling, performance rating, compensation and termination. Their diffusion varies much more than the technical efficiency of HR departments. It enables the redistribution of information and discretion, embeds managerial assumptions in software, and alters employees' experience of power (Bushra et al., 2022; Abbass et al., 2022).

There is a strong managerial case for AHRM. Not only can algorithms handle more information than an individual manager, but they also apply decision rules consistently, spot patterns in data that would be nearly impossible for a human to find, and enable real-time coordination of work (Iqbal et al., 2025ab). Optimal scheduling software might reduce the amount of random allocation of shifts; a clearly structured performance dashboard may make expectations easier to assess; and data-driven promotion processes may limit personal bias. Thus, algorithms may enable greater standardisation, supporting consistency and procedural reliability in decision-making. However, these very capabilities may be what intensifies surveillance and work, reduces employee discretion, and cloaks value judgments in a veneer of objectivity. Kellogg et al. Algorithmic Control: Recording, Rating, Recommending, Restricting, Rewarding and Replacing (Zuboff, 2020; Al-Abrrow et al., 2021). Such mechanisms transform algorithmic management from a mere technical upgrade into a contested arena.

Findings on employee outcomes are similarly mixed. Workers may want fast feedback and more precise performance criteria, but may be anxious when ratings are continuous, standards are vague, or the technology governing decisions is immutable. Parent-Rocheleau and Parker (2022) argue that algorithms act on autonomy, skill use, demands, feedback, and social relations to "redesign" jobs. In a similar vein, Meijerink and Bondarouk (2023) highlight that algorithmic management can both enable and constrain autonomy and value. Consequently, rather than asking whether AHRM is beneficial or detrimental overall, the more pertinent question is which organisational processes shape well-being and under what conditions positive or negative behaviours are most likely to occur (Khattak et al., 2017).

The current paper contends that organisational justice is the missing link bridging algorithmic systems and employee well-being (Iqbal et al., 2020; Ibrahim et al., 2024). It is not just whether the system is accurate or convenient that employees are responding to; they evaluate whether the system's processes are consistent, its information understandable, its outcomes fair and how implementation occurs with human dignity. The theory of organisational justice includes distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001; Iqbal et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2026). Linking big data analytics to firm performance: exploring the mediating effects of data-driven culture and networking capability. Business Process Management Journal, 1-23. This multidimensional perspective is particularly apt for AHRM because an algorithm may achieve a satisfactory outcome through an unaccountable process or make a technically accurate recommendation through a procedure that employees experience as pro forma and unchallengable (Khattak et al., 2018a,b).

Introducing Algorithmic Transparency as A Boundary Condition. Transparency can mitigate uncertainty by indicating what data are collected, how they are used, which factors inform decisions, and how employees may request that their data be corrected. However, disclosure alone is insufficient. A long formal technical description can be transparent in the strict sense but entirely opaque in practice. Transparency is also likely to justify intrusive monitoring without generating any employee agency. As such, this paper demarcates three distinct features of meaningful transparency: data visibility, explanation and contestability.

This article attempts to address three questions: How does AHRM affect employee well-being via organisational justice? When does transparency

add value to fairness and when is it just a symbol of fairness? How do organisations balance algorithmic consistency and human judgment/employee voice? The review weaves together perspectives from HRM, organisational behaviour, information systems, and platform-work research to answer these questions. The model we propose applies to both traditional firms and digitally mediated work while also providing a research agenda for emerging economies where regulatory capacity, algorithmic literacy and employment protections may vary widely.

2. Methodology

We used an integrative literature review design. Integrative reviews are appropriate when the problem concerns a phenomenon studied across disciplines using conceptual, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods evidence, and they aim at theoretical synthesis rather than estimating a pooled effect (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). The approach allows for an evaluation of efficiency-related HRM research, critical workplace control studies, the organisational justice literature, and empirical studies on employee well-being (Khattak et al., 2019).

The four stages follow the review logic. The first step was to operationalise the focal constructs, i.e., AHRM, algorithmic transparency, organisational justice, autonomy, and employee well-being (see section 1). Second, we identified studies using keywords such as “algorithmic management”, “AI-enabled HRM”, “algorithmic control”, “organisational justice”, “transparency”, “employee autonomy”, and “well-being”. Third, peer-reviewed journal articles that advanced theory, provided empirical evidence, or validated conceptualisations were favoured. Some seminal works were occasionally used to construct the foundations of organisational justice and job design. Fourth, evidence was conceptually coded for an AHRM function, positive resources or negative demands, within the level of the justice dimensions, transparency conditions and outcomes.

In keeping with concept-driven review, the synthesis revolves around the relationship theme rather than the chronological cataloguing of studies (Webster & Watson, 2002). This review is not a comprehensive systematic review or meta-analysis; it does not try to cover every database or compute effect sizes. Thus, it contributes to reconciling competing arguments and finding hypotheses that can be tested. This constraint is recognised as preventing the overstatement of methodological certainty.

3. Conceptual Background

3.1 Algorithmic HRM as management infrastructure

AHRM involves transferring some or all of workforce management to data-driven computational systems. Unlike other HR information systems that only store employee records, it is different. The predictions, recommendations, classifications, or actions it generates shape work opportunities and employment outcomes. This delegation can range from decision support, allowing managers to retain authority over key decisions, to automation with software assigning work or dispensing punishments with little human involvement.

The distinction matters because "use of AI" is too vague to account for employee responses. A train algorithm is not a terminating algorithm. The stakes of decisions, reversibility, frequency, and visibility influence employees' interpretation of the system. Similarly, monitoring can be sporadic and proportional, or continuous and intrusive. Parent-Rocheleau et al.: The Algorithmic Management Questionnaire. The article (2024) operationalises those functions across different managerial functions and suggests that AHRM needs to be treated as a multi-dimensional process.

According to Meijerink and Bondarouk (2023), algorithmic HRM is a mode of organising, defined by the conditioning role that digital systems play in the distribution and governance of labour. This formulation emphasises that algorithms envelop organisational arrangements. Choices made by managers manifest themselves in the training data, performance indicators, thresholds, and interface designs. Treating an output as 'what the algorithm chose to do' will

obscure accountability for those who defined the objectives and approved the deployment. Consequently, AHRM should be considered a socio-technical management infrastructure rather than an autonomous actor.

3.2 Employee well-being

Well-being, hence, includes affective, psychological, and work-related dimensions of the employee. Examples of relevant indicators are job satisfaction, strain, anxiety, engagement, exhaustion, perceived autonomy and sense of security. Applications that explore AHRM could enhance well-being if they attenuate role ambiguity, more evenly distribute undesirable shifts, provide meaningful feedback or remove the burden of administratively routine activities. On the other hand, it could harm well-being via work intensification (especially for female employees), uninterrupted monitoring and unpredictable target changes, weak social support and permanent anxiety of unreviewable errors.

Such duality is explained through the job demands-resources model. Job demands are characterised by sustained physical and/or mental effort that may produce strain. In contrast, job resources are considered job characteristics that help workers meet their goals, maintain their motivation, and learn (Demerouti et al., 2001). That same technology can be an input for one worker, but a demand for another. Flexibility is possible with automated scheduling when workers can express preferences, but it becomes a demand when registration changes unexpectedly. Performance analytics can be developmental when they include clear, constructive feedback, but if the ranking is continuous and punitive, it can create anxiety.

3.3 Organisational justice

Organisational justice refers to the perception of fairness in employee decision-making and workplace treatment. Distributive justice concerns whether outcomes such as pay, shifts, ratings, and promotions are fair. In contrast, procedural justice concerns the extent to which decision-making processes are consistent, unbiased, accurate, correctable, and inclusive [8]. Informational justice deals with the adequacy and honesty of the explanations. Interpersonal justice focuses on being treated well and with dignity (Colquitt et al., 2001).

The set of dimensions is analytically disparate in algorithmic contexts. A favourable schedule will be offered to an employee who finds the data collection invasive. One might accept an adverse rating if the standards were clear, the data were correct or falsifiable, and there was some form of appeal. Jabagi et al. (2023). This is why justice evaluations offer a more accurate picture than trust in AI overall.

4. Integrative Framework and Propositions

4.1 The resource pathway

Through a combination of consistency, clear information, rapid feedback, and better coordination, AHRM can build on well-being. Algorithms can impose similar scheduling restrictions on similar workers and record the reasons for decisions. We can curb favouritism by replacing human supervisors with formalised rules whenever human supervisors exercise undocumented discretion. Through data analytics, it is also possible to identify heavy workloads or hazards. Thanks to technology, these situations can be quelled, as it enforces reliability and procedure and provides the resources that help employees plan work and optimise performance.

However, consistency is not fairness. A rule applied uniformly could replicate past disadvantages or overlook significant differences between workers when the organisational goals or metrics are valid, when the data on which they depend are sufficiently representative, and when exceptions can be learned from, while managers continue to be held accountable for their employees. Hence, resource effects are mediated through justice judgments rather than being an automatic product of technical sophistication.

Proposition 1: AHRM practices that enforce role clarity, consistency in decisions, and feedback for development could positively

affect employee well-being by building greater perceived procedural and informational justice.

4.2 The demand and control pathway

Next, managerial control can be amplified in algorithmic systems. Continuous monitoring helps us measure behaviour in finer detail, and rankings and automated prompts turn data into pressure points. Kellogg et al. (2020) argue that algorithmic control can limit options and reshape the power balance between workers and organisations. With dynamic target updates, employee expectations may not be fixed. Reducing performance to concrete output could mean excluding relational, contextual, or creative contributions.

The psychological effects are probably the loss of autonomy, anticipatory anxiety, and emotional burnout. Visible metrics can lead employees to change their behaviour for a better rating, rather than for service quality or judgment. When the bases for negative outcomes are attributed to a remote system, and supervisors distance themselves from blame, experiences of interpersonal and procedural injustice can be heightened.

Proposition 2: AHRM practices that are continuously monitored, unilaterally targeted, and consequently automated will be negatively related to employee well-being through lower autonomy than autonomous humans in decision-making.

4.3 Transparency as a differentiated construct

Both algorithm transparency and transparency as a general recommendation for responding to algorithmic opacity are funnelled through multiple levels. Data transparency tells employees what information is collected and how long it will be kept. Process transparency helps explain what influences decisions—outcome transparency reveals why a recommendation is made—in the context of that particular recommendation. Governance transparency identifies accountability, error rectification, and appeal mechanisms for decisions. The ones that do not are the combination approaches, which come close to meaningful transparency.

In summary, by providing information to workers and thus reducing uncertainty, transparency can help in improving informational justice. Semujanga et al. (2024) found that transparency can increase fairness perceptions in algorithmic compensation, but they are less clear on whether it decreases stress. This is a critical distinction: we can learn about an intensive or intrusive system without making it any less demanding. Overly technical explanations can produce the impression of transparency while alienating employees. We should therefore assess the quality of explanations by relevance, comprehensibility, timeliness, and actionability.

Proposition 3: Compared with incomprehensible, general, or non-actionable explanations, perceived organisational justice and the relationship between algorithmic transparency and perceived organisational justice will be stronger when explanations are comprehensible, decision-specific, and linked to actionable review or appeal procedures.

4.4 Human control and the voice of employees

The benefit of human review is that it can prevent misclassification and account for context; however, this depends on whether reviewers have true discretion. Having a nominal "human in the loop" who routinely checks off recommendations adds little additional safety. Oversight is about power, time, skill, and paper. Managers need the ability to deviate from algorithmic outputs while documenting why, and workers should know when automation played a role in their decisions.

Employee voice is equally important. Workers have situated knowledge about their tasks, customer interactions, equipment limitations, and edge cases. This kind of participatory system design can detect not

only invalid metrics but also foreseeable harms prior to deployment. Channels to report anomalies or contest data. It also conveys interpersonal respect and enhances procedural legitimacy.

Proposition 4: Human review will attenuate the perceived justice deficit of high-stakes AHRM, but only if reviewers have meaningful power and employees can precisely clarify contextual information.

Algorithmic literacy and differential susceptibility

Employees are not equally trained to comprehend data practices, translate scores and manoeuvre digital appeals. Recession workers have higher algorithmic literacy, which may alleviate uncertainty-related fears and facilitate quicker error identification. However, it can also show just how hunted they are and heighten fears. Similarly, if formal channels exist for protesting a decision, workers in precarious employment may be reluctant to use them. Thus, transparency and voice are only effective under specific conditions such as employment security, digital competence and language accessibility, as well as in relation to power.

Proposition 5: The positive effect of meaningful transparency on justice and well-being is weaker for employees who are not algorithmically literate, lack employment security, or do not meaningfully control the use of appeal mechanisms.

5. Discussion

The framework resolves the contradiction between the two prevailing perspectives on AHRM: an overwhelmingly positive view and an equally received critique of such an overly optimistic view. Efficiency arguments recognise that consistency, expedited coordination, and evidence-based decisions will likely be achieved separately. Critical accounts rightly highlight surveillance, opacity, intensification of work and asymmetrical control. When the design and governance of AHRM are treated as variables, this apparent contradiction disappears. The impact of algorithms on well-being is not set in stone, as workers shape their effects through management goals, data practices, stakes in the decisions they affect, how these parties reason through implementation, and the extent to which workers pursue corrective action.

At the core of this theoretical idea is that organisational justice mediates the relationship between socio-technical design and employee experience. This statement represents an improvement over models which link technology adoption more directly with satisfaction or performance. Employees pass judgment on whether a tool is useful and if the organisation has exercised authority in good faith. The four dimensions of justice enable a more diagnostic analysis. Paper 3: Low informational justice means improvements that bestow, whereas low procedural justice demands representativeness, correctability, and proper voice. In cases where an algorithm is accurate, low interpersonal justice may persist because managers use automation to avoid difficult conversations.

The framework also disqualifies assertions regarding transparency. More data is not better data. Transparency is context-bound to the employee's decision-making and paired with recourse. Because a score that cannot be interpreted can lead to anxiety, we may all share the same voice when it comes to our browsing senses. In contrast, a one-page summary limited to key drivers, uncertainty, and the appeal process can facilitate informed agency across the scenarios. So, transparency needs to be evaluated as a governance capability, not as the quantity of disclosure.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Organisations should start with an algorithmic impact assessment that clearly states the purpose of making a decision, who the groups affected by it are, and links these to data sources (e.g. YouTube comments), foreseeable errors (e.g. are these groups more likely to spread misinformation?) Finally, how severe and reversible the outcome is for those affected. When it comes to recommendations that include high-stakes scenarios, such as hiring, firing,

promotion, and compensation from those who do not have direct experience with the persons being reviewed, they likely need more stringent review than checking lower-stakes advice. These tests of accuracy should be accompanied by reporting of positive and negative predictive values, subgroup analyses, and exploration of whether the selected metric actually captures high-priority work.

Second, ensure that there is a clear accountability framework within organisations. Responsibility should rest with named managers and governance bodies, not software or vendors. Auditable procurement contracts to allow corrections for bad data and justification of material choices. Third, provide, prior to implementation, a plain-language notice on what information is collected, how long it will be kept, which decisions are affected by its use, and where an employee can go to ask questions.

Fourth, they should be independent, timely, and free from retaliation. This would involve training human reviewers to assess both technical outputs and contextual evidence. Third, organisations must ensure post-deployment monitoring of well-being through surveys and interviews, and the analysis of turnover patterns, sickness absence, grievances, and workload indicators. A successful system does not boost output while leaving a wake of indefinite anxiety or inequity.

Future Research

Another priority is separating employee data usage for development and evaluation purposes. One performance signal that can be used for different purposes, including providing coaching or allocating rewards and sanctions. Even if the underlying measurement is the same, employees will interpret these purposes differently. Researchers should thus define the organisational implications corresponding to each algorithmic feature and assess the plausibility of development assurances using the same data, which could later serve as a basis for discipline. Such a separation would enhance construct validity and enable organisations to design purpose constraints for workforce data more effectively.

Future empirical research should employ longitudinal and multi-source designs. Cross-sectional surveys cannot determine whether AHRM improves well-being or whether dissatisfied workers view systems more negatively. A two-wave protocol might assess AHRM functions and transparency at Time 1, justice (and autonomy) at Time 2, and wellness at Time 3. HR documents, manager ratings, and other employee reports could be merged. Individual-level perception or organisation-level governance could be analysed separately using multilevel analysis.

Rather than asserting the theoretical novelty of the national context, research in emerging economies should focus on developing precise conditions composed of a set of institutional elements. Employment informality, collective representation, regulatory enforcement, linguistic diversity, and digital inequality could affect access to explanation and recourse. Comparative work could examine whether the same technical system yields different justice evaluations under varying levels of labour protection. It is also important to conduct qualitative studies to explore how employees interpret algorithmic scores in everyday interactions with supervisors.

Future research should also disentangle first impression responses from experience-based evaluations. Employees might think well of a system at launch because it appears to deliver on consistency, but they update their views when they see errors, exceptions, or managerial responses. Research with repeated measures could discern the occasions on which transparency fortifies lasting trust and those in which it delays the detection of rogue behaviour or inequity by a greater margin.

8. Conclusion

AHRM might enhance coordination while also limiting management's leeway, or making it harder to contest decisions with far-reaching ramifications. It is not just about algorithmics, but also about thinking through the fairness of the management system. This paper integrates organisational justice and job demands-resources perspectives to clarify the resource and control

pathways through which AHRM influences employee well-being. Legitimate implementation requires meaningful transparency, genuine human oversight, employee voice, and accessible recourse. So, to manage algorithms responsibly, organisations need to determine how technology will be governed and how the power it wields will be decided.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

During the preparation and revision of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT and Paperpal for language editing, grammatical correction, and improvements in clarity and readability. These tools were not used to generate or modify research data, conduct statistical analyses, fabricate references, or make substantive research decisions. The authors critically reviewed and verified all AI-assisted content and accept full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the published manuscript.

References

Abbas, S., Al-Abrrow, H., Abdullah, H. O., Alnoor, A., Khattak, Z. Z., & Khaw, K. W. (2022). Encountering COVID-19 and perceived stress and the role of a health climate among medical workers. Current Psychology, 41(12), 9109–9122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01381-8

Al-Abrrow, H., Al-Maatoq, M., Alharbi, R. K., Alnoor, A., Abdullah, H. O., Abbas, S., & Khattak, Z. Z. (2021). Understanding employees' responses to the COVID-19 pandemic: The attractiveness of healthcare jobs. Global Business and Organisational Excellence, 40(2), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22070

Bushra, M. F., Ahmad, A., Ahmad, W., Khattak, Z. Z., Saeed, I., Han, H., & Ariza-Montes, A. (2022). Empirical investigation of the domain knowledge and team advertising creativity typology: The case of Nescafé coffee. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 69, 103086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103086

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organisational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Ibrahim, N., Rahim, Z. A., & Iqbal, M. S. (2024). Exploring generic green skills in enhancing the TVET curriculum in Malaysia. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 14(10), 1518–1532.

Iqbal, M. S., Rahim, Z. B. A., Hussain, S. A., Ahmad, N., Kaidi, H. M., Ahmad, R., & Dziyauddin, R. A. (2020). Mobile communication (2G, 3G & 4G) and future interest of 5G in Pakistan: A review. Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, 15(3), 211–229.

Iqbal, M. S., Rahim, Z. A., & Ohshima, N. (2024). TRIZ-informed intervention framework for sustainable 4IR adoption in Malaysian manufacturing and related services (MRS) industries. *J Adv Res Appl Sci Eng Tech*, *50*(1), 203–19.

Iqbal, M. S., Rahim, Z. A., & Omerkhel, Q. (2025). Harnessing generative AI for educational innovation: a TRIZ-PLR perspective. Discover Applied Sciences, 7(7). https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-025-07467-3

Iqbal, M. S., & Abdul Rahim, Z. (2025)b. Driving emerging technology adoption in Malaysian micro-, small, and medium-sized enterprises: A strategic intervention framework. Journal of the International

Council for Small Business, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2025.2539866

Jabagi, N., Croteau, A.-M., Audebrand, L. K., & Marsan, J. (2025). Do algorithms play fair? Analysing the perceived fairness of HR decisions made by algorithms and their impacts on gig-workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2441448

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Khattak, Z. Z., Abbas, S., Khushnood, M., Kaleem, M., & Mufti, O. (2017). Effects of gendering on the performance of academics in Pakistani universities. *Journal of Managerial Sciences, 11*(3, Special Edition), 161–184.

Khattak, Z. Z., Faraz, M., Abbas, S., Manzoor, H., & Bangash, R. (2018a). Factors affecting working capital investment: An international evidence. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences, 11*(Special Issue: IGCETMA 2018), 115–127.

Khattak, Z. Z., Sallam, A., Abbas, S., & Khushnood, M. (2018b). Pyramidal ownership composition and the firm's capital structure policy. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences, 11*(Special Issue: IGCETMA 2018), 30–41.

Khattak, Z. Z., Abbas, S., & Kaleem, M. (2019). Servant leadership style and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of the cognitive style index. *Global Social Sciences Review, 4*(2), 165–172. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-II).22

Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2023). The duality of algorithmic management: Toward a research agenda on HRM algorithms, autonomy and value creation. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(1), 100876. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100876

Parent-Rocheleau, X., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Algorithms as work designers: How algorithmic management influences the design of jobs. *Human Resource Management Review, 32*(3), 100838. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100838

Parent-Rocheleau, X., Parker, S. K., Bujold, A., & Gaudet, M.-C. (2024). Creation of the algorithmic management questionnaire: A six-phase scale development process. *Human Resource Management, 63*(1), 25–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22185

Semujanga, B., & Parent-Rocheleau, X. (2024). Time-based stress and procedural justice: Can transparency mitigate the effects of algorithmic compensation in gig work? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 21*(1), 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21010086

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analysing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly, 26*(2), xiii–xxiii.

Peng, D., Iftikhar, H., Kampoowale, I., Ali Hussin, H. A. A., & Mohammed Ali, N. B. (2025). Linking big data analytics to firm performance: exploring the mediating effects of data-driven culture and networking capability. Business Process Management Journal, 1–23.

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research