



Research Article

INFLUENCE OF AI-ASSISTED HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT, ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND JOB SATISFACTION

Author: Gorav Sharma^{1*} 

^{1,2} Faculty of MBA, Acharya Rajendra Suri Shiksha Mahavidhyalaya (ARSSM), Mandsaur (M.P.), 458002

KEYWORDS:

Artificial intelligence; AI-assisted human resource management; Employee engagement; Organizational trust; Job satisfaction

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received Date: 09/07/2026

Revised Date: 12/07/2026

Accepted Date: 09/08/2026

Published Date: 01/09/2026

DOI: 10.69557/2czdkk06

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Gorav Sharma

goravsharma2989@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being integrated into human resource management (HRM) to support recruitment, employee communication, performance management, workforce analytics, learning and development, and administrative decision-making. AI-assisted HRM can improve the speed, consistency and personalization of HR processes; however, employees' perceptions of these systems may vary according to their perceived efficiency, personalization, transparency, fairness and human oversight. The present study examined the association between perceived AI-assisted HRM and employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction. A quantitative, cross-sectional research design was used among employees who had experience with AI-supported HR practices. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire comprising measures of perceived AI-assisted HRM, employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert scale. AI-assisted HRM was assessed across four dimensions: HR efficiency, personalization, transparency and fairness, and human oversight. Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha and Pearson's correlation coefficient were used for data analysis. A total of 384 completed responses were included in the analysis. The overall mean score for AI-assisted HRM was 3.71 ± 0.61 , with HR efficiency recording the highest mean score (3.89 ± 0.67), whereas transparency and fairness recorded the comparatively lower score (3.48 ± 0.74). AI-assisted HRM demonstrated positive associations with employee engagement ($r = 0.62, p < 0.001$), organizational trust ($r = 0.58, p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction ($r = 0.55, p < 0.001$). These findings indicate that employees reporting more favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM also tended to report more favorable employee outcomes. Because the study employed a cross-sectional design, the observed relationships should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects. The findings emphasize the importance of transparency, fairness and appropriate human oversight when implementing AI-supported HR practices.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has increasingly become an important component of contemporary human resource management (HRM), supporting activities such as recruitment, workforce analytics, performance management, employee communication, learning and development, and talent management. AI-enabled HR systems can process large volumes of employee information and provide decision-support capabilities that may improve the efficiency and consistency of HR activities ^[1]. The growing use of HR analytics has similarly expanded organizations' ability to make data-informed workforce decisions, although evidence regarding its organizational and employee-level consequences remains comparatively limited ^[2]. AI may function as a substitute for selected routine activities or as an augmentation mechanism through which employees and managers collaborate with intelligent systems ^[3].

For the purpose of the present study, AI-assisted HRM refers to the use of artificial intelligence-enabled systems to support, recommend, automate or inform HR-related activities and decisions. These activities may include recruitment, performance evaluation, employee self-service, workforce analytics, training recommendations, attendance management and HR chatbots. This definition distinguishes AI-assisted HRM from conventional HR information systems (HRIS) or routine digital HR tools that primarily store, retrieve or process information without AI-based prediction, recommendation, analytical or conversational capabilities.

The employee implications of AI-assisted HRM are important because algorithmic systems can shape perceptions of fairness, autonomy, transparency and organizational control ^[4]. Previous empirical evidence has indicated associations between AI adoption and psychological contracts, job engagement and employee trust, demonstrating the relevance of technological transformation to employee–organization relationships ^[5]. Recent research has also examined generative AI-supported HRM in relation to employee engagement and organizational outcomes, identifying trust as an important factor in these relationships ^[6]. Trust in AI systems depends not only on technical characteristics but also on the social and organizational conditions in which the technology is implemented ^[7].

Employee engagement represents a positive work-related psychological state characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption ^[8]. Organizational trust reflects employees' confidence in organizational actors, systems and decision processes, whereas job satisfaction represents employees' overall evaluation of their work experiences ^[9]. AI-supported decision-making may be viewed more positively when employees perceive such systems as useful, transparent and supportive. Conversely, concerns regarding surveillance, opacity and unfairness may be associated with less favorable employee perceptions ^[10].

The organizational justice perspective provides a useful theoretical basis for understanding these relationships. Organizational justice emphasizes employees' perceptions of fairness in organizational procedures, interpersonal treatment and decision-making ^[11]. In AI-assisted HRM, transparency, consistency, explainability and appropriate human involvement may therefore be relevant to how employees evaluate HR processes and their relationship with the organization.

Although previous research has examined AI adoption, HR analytics and employee responses to technology, comparatively limited attention has been given to the simultaneous association of perceived AI-assisted HRM with employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Examining these outcomes together provides a broader perspective on employee perceptions of AI-supported HR practices. Therefore, the present study examined the relationship between perceived AI-assisted HRM and employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction, with particular attention to perceived HR efficiency, personalization, transparency and fairness, and human oversight.

Study Hypotheses

Based on the organizational justice perspective and the existing literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Perceived AI-assisted HRM is positively associated with employee engagement.

H2: Perceived AI-assisted HRM is positively associated with organizational trust.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional research design was used to examine the relationship between perceived AI-assisted HRM and three employee outcomes: employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction. The study was structured as an employee-level survey because the principal variables represented individual perceptions and attitudes toward AI-supported HR practices.

The cross-sectional design enabled standardized measurement of the study constructs and examination of their statistical relationships. Perceived AI-assisted HRM was considered the principal explanatory variable, whereas employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction were considered outcome variables. The analysis was designed to determine whether employees reporting more favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM also reported more favorable workplace outcomes.

Because the study was cross-sectional and observational, the findings were interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

Study Population and Sampling

The target population comprised employees working in organizations in which AI or AI-assisted digital technologies were used for at least one HR-related activity. Eligible participants were required to be at least 18 years of age, employed within the organization for a minimum of six months, and familiar with at least one AI-assisted HR activity, such as recruitment, performance evaluation, employee self-service, workforce analytics, training recommendation, attendance management or HR chatbots.

Employees without exposure to AI-supported HR processes were excluded because they would not have been able to provide informed responses regarding AI-assisted HRM.

A total of 384 completed responses were included in the final analysis. Participants were recruited through organizational contacts and professional networks. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the academic purpose of the survey before completing the questionnaire.

The use of organizational contacts and professional networks represented a convenience/professional-network recruitment approach. Accordingly, the findings should be interpreted with caution regarding their generalizability to employees outside the sampled networks.

Definition and Measurement of AI-Assisted HRM

AI-assisted HRM was defined as the application of AI-enabled technologies to support, recommend, automate or inform HR-related activities and decisions. The construct was operationalized through four dimensions:

1. HR efficiency
2. Personalization
3. Transparency and fairness
4. Human oversight

The 12-item measure assessed perceptions of whether AI-supported HR processes reduced administrative burden, provided timely HR support, generated relevant recommendations, improved consistency, supported transparent decision-making and retained appropriate human involvement.

Questionnaire Development

A structured questionnaire was developed using concepts from established HRM and organizational-behavior literature. The questionnaire consisted of five sections.

Section A collected demographic and occupational characteristics, including age group, gender, educational qualification, work experience, organizational sector, job level and frequency of interaction with AI-supported HR systems.

Section B measured perceived AI-assisted HRM using 12 items distributed across HR efficiency, personalization, transparency and fairness, and human oversight.

Section C measured employee engagement using nine items representing vigor, dedication and absorption, consistent with the conceptualization of work engagement proposed by Schaufeli and Bakker^[8].

Section D measured organizational trust using eight items covering confidence in organizational decision-making, reliability, fairness, competence and organizational intentions. The measurement approach was informed by established work on cognition-based and affect-based trust^[10].

Section E measured job satisfaction using nine items addressing satisfaction with work, supervision, communication, recognition, organizational procedures, development opportunities and the general employment experience. The Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Spector^[9] provided the conceptual basis for this construct.

All attitudinal items were scored using a **five-point Likert scale**, where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.”

Table 1. Structure of the Study Questionnaire

Section	Construct	Items	Response scale
A	Demographic/work characteristics	7	Categorical
B	AI-assisted HRM	12	1–5 Likert
C	Employee engagement	9	1–5 Likert
D	Organizational trust	8	1–5 Likert
E	Job satisfaction	9	1–5 Likert
Total	—	45	—

Content Validation and Pilot Testing

The questionnaire was reviewed by experts in human resource management, organizational behavior and research methodology to assess item relevance, clarity and conceptual coverage. Items identified as ambiguous or repetitive were revised before administration.

A pilot test was conducted among 30 employees who met the inclusion criteria and were not included in the final analytical sample. The pilot assessment was used to assess the clarity and comprehensibility of questionnaire items and the feasibility of completing the instrument.

Internal consistency was assessed using **Cronbach's alpha (α)**. A coefficient of approximately 0.70 or greater was considered acceptable for the study constructs.

Data Collection Procedure

The final questionnaire was distributed electronically using a secure online survey form. Participants first viewed an informed-consent statement and proceeded only after confirming voluntary participation. No personally identifying information was requested, and participants could discontinue the survey at any stage.

Completed responses were screened for completeness. Responses containing substantial missing information or evidence of patterned/inattentive responding were excluded from the final dataset. The retained responses were coded numerically and transferred to statistical software for analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Participation in the study was voluntary. Respondents were informed about the academic purpose of the research and provided informed consent before completing the questionnaire. Participants were informed that they could discontinue participation at any stage.

No personally identifying information was requested during data collection. The collected information was used for research purposes and was handled confidentially.

Variables and Scoring

Composite scores were calculated for each major construct by averaging the corresponding questionnaire items. Higher AI-assisted HRM scores represented more favorable perceptions of AI-supported HR practices.

Higher employee engagement scores represented stronger vigor, dedication and absorption. Higher organizational trust scores represented greater confidence in organizational systems and decision-making. Higher job-satisfaction scores represented more favorable evaluations of the employee's work experience. The principal relationships examined were:

- AI-assisted HRM and employee engagement
- AI-assisted HRM and organizational trust
- AI-assisted HRM and job satisfaction

The four AI-assisted HRM dimensions were also examined descriptively to identify comparatively stronger and weaker areas of employee perception.

Common-Method Considerations

Because AI-assisted HRM, employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction were measured through self-reported responses in a single questionnaire, the possibility of common-method variance was recognized.

Procedural measures were used to reduce potential response bias. Participation was voluntary, no personally identifying information was requested, and respondents were informed that there were no right or wrong answers.

However, because all major constructs were measured using self-reported data collected during the same survey period, common-method variance and perceptual overlap cannot be completely excluded. This issue was therefore considered when interpreting the findings.

Statistical Analysis

Data were summarized using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α).

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationships

between the composite scores for AI-assisted HRM, employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction.

Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < 0.05$. Correlation coefficients were interpreted as measures of association and were not considered evidence of causal relationships.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic and Occupational Characteristics

A total of **384 completed responses** were included in the analysis. The largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 26–35-year age group (38.5%), followed by respondents aged 18–25 years (24.0%), 36–45 years (22.7%) and above 45 years (14.8%).

Male respondents constituted 54.9% of the sample, whereas female respondents represented 43.0%; 2.1% preferred not to disclose their gender.

Regarding professional experience, 39.3% of respondents had 5–10 years of experience, 32.8% had less than 5 years and 27.9% had more than 10 years of experience.

Employees from private-sector organizations constituted the largest group (62.0%), followed by public-sector employees (26.8%) and employees from other organizational sectors (11.2%).

Regarding job level, 46.4% of respondents occupied middle-management positions, 29.2% were in entry-level/junior positions and 24.4% were in senior-management positions.

With respect to AI-assisted HRM exposure, 45.3% reported moderate interaction, 29.7% reported frequent interaction and 25.0% reported occasional interaction.

Table 2. Demographic and Occupational Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Age	18–25 years	92	24.0
	26–35 years	148	38.5
	36–45 years	87	22.7
	>45 years	57	14.8
Gender	Male	211	54.9
	Female	165	43.0
	Other/Prefer not to say	8	2.1
Work experience	<5 years	126	32.8
	5–10 years	151	39.3
	>10 years	107	27.9
Organizational sector	Private	238	62.0
	Public	103	26.8
	Other	43	11.2
Job level	Entry-level/Junior	112	29.2
	Middle management	178	46.4
	Senior management	94	24.4
AI-HRM exposure	Occasional	96	25.0
	Moderate	174	45.3
	Frequent	114	29.7
Total	—	384	100.0

Descriptive Findings for AI-Assisted HRM

The overall mean score for AI-assisted HRM was 3.71 ± 0.61 . Among the four dimensions, HR efficiency obtained the highest mean score (3.89 ± 0.67), followed by personalization (3.74 ± 0.69) and human oversight (3.71 ± 0.72). Transparency and fairness recorded the comparatively lower mean score (3.48 ± 0.74).

Because the response scale ranged from 1 to 5, the mean scores were above the scale midpoint. These findings therefore indicate generally favorable or moderately positive perceptions rather than demonstrating an unequivocally strong favorable attitude. The comparatively lower score for transparency and fairness indicates that this aspect may require greater organizational attention.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of AI-Assisted HRM Dimensions

AI-assisted HRM dimension	No. of items	Mean $\pm$ SD
HR efficiency	3	3.89 ± 0.67
Personalization	3	3.74 ± 0.69
Transparency and fairness	3	3.48 ± 0.74
Human oversight	3	3.71 ± 0.72
Overall AI-assisted HRM	12	3.71 ± 0.61

Employee Engagement

The overall employee engagement score was 3.76 ± 0.64 . Dedication showed the highest mean score (3.84 ± 0.68), followed by vigor (3.73 ± 0.71) and absorption (3.70 ± 0.69).

The results indicate that the respondents reported engagement levels above the midpoint of the five-point scale. Dedication was the highest-rated engagement dimension.

Table 4. Employee Engagement Scores

Engagement dimension	Items	Mean $\pm$ SD
Vigor	3	3.73 ± 0.71
Dedication	3	3.84 ± 0.68
Absorption	3	3.70 ± 0.69
Overall employee engagement	9	3.76 ± 0.64

Organizational Trust

The overall organizational trust score was 3.63 ± 0.67 . Reliability obtained the highest score (3.75 ± 0.70), followed by organizational competence (3.69 ± 0.72), confidence in organizational decisions (3.61 ± 0.73) and fairness (3.47 ± 0.78).

The comparatively lower score for fairness was consistent with the comparatively lower rating observed for transparency and fairness within AI-assisted HRM. This pattern highlights the relevance of fairness and transparency in employees' evaluations of AI-supported HR practices. However, the cross-sectional design does not establish a causal relationship between these constructs.

Table 5. Organizational Trust Scores

Trust component	Items	Mean $\pm$ SD
Reliability	2	3.75 ± 0.70
Fairness	2	3.47 ± 0.78
Organizational competence	2	3.69 ± 0.72

Confidence in decisions	2	3.61 ± 0.73
Overall organizational trust	8	3.63 ± 0.67

Job Satisfaction

The overall job satisfaction score was **3.68 ± 0.65**. Satisfaction with the work itself produced the highest mean score (**3.81 ± 0.69**), followed by supervision (**3.74 ± 0.71**), recognition (**3.61 ± 0.75**), HR/organizational procedures (**3.58 ± 0.73**) and development opportunities (**3.56 ± 0.78**). All reported mean values were above the midpoint of the five-point scale. Satisfaction with the work itself represented the highest-rated component, whereas development opportunities received the comparatively lower rating.

Table 6. Job Satisfaction Scores

Job-satisfaction component	Items	Mean ± SD
Work itself	2	3.81 ± 0.69
Supervision	2	3.74 ± 0.71
Recognition	2	3.61 ± 0.75
Development opportunities	1	3.56 ± 0.78
HR/organizational procedures	2	3.58 ± 0.73
Overall job satisfaction	9	3.68 ± 0.65

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha coefficients indicated acceptable-to-good internal consistency for all major study constructs. The AI-assisted HRM scale produced $\alpha = 0.91$, while employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction produced $\alpha = 0.89, 0.87$ and 0.88 , respectively. These coefficients indicate adequate internal consistency among the items comprising each major construct. However, internal consistency alone does not establish factorial, convergent or discriminant validity.

Table 7. Internal Consistency of Study Variables

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α
AI-assisted HRM	12	0.91
Employee engagement	9	0.89
Organizational trust	8	0.87
Job satisfaction	9	0.88

Association Between AI-Assisted HRM and Employee Outcomes

Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated positive and statistically significant associations between AI-assisted HRM and all three employee outcomes.

AI-assisted HRM demonstrated a **positive association with employee engagement ($r = 0.62, p < 0.001$)**. Thus, employees reporting more favorable perceptions of AI-supported HR practices also tended to report higher employee engagement.

AI-assisted HRM also demonstrated a **positive association with organizational trust ($r = 0.58, p < 0.001$)**. This indicates that favorable perceptions of AI-supported HR processes were associated with greater reported confidence in organizational systems and decision-making.

The association between AI-assisted HRM and job satisfaction was also positive and statistically significant (**$r = 0.55, p < 0.001$**). Employees reporting more favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM also tended to report higher job satisfaction.

Among the three employee outcomes, employee engagement demonstrated the strongest association with AI-assisted HRM, followed by organizational trust and job satisfaction.

Table 8. Pearson Correlations among AI-Assisted HRM and Employee Outcomes

Variable	AI-assisted HRM	Employee engagement	Organizational trust	Job satisfaction
AI-assisted HRM	1.00	0.62***	0.58***	0.55***
Employee engagement	0.62***	1.00	0.61***	0.57***
Organizational trust	0.58***	0.61***	1.00	0.64***
Job satisfaction	0.55***	0.57***	0.64***	1.00

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, two-tailed.

The strongest association among the employee outcomes was observed between organizational trust and job satisfaction ($r = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$), followed by employee engagement and organizational trust ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$).

Overall, the findings indicate that favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM were consistently associated with more favorable employee outcomes. However, these relationships should not be interpreted as causal effects because the study employed a cross-sectional design.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that employees generally reported favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM, although the strength of perceptions differed across its dimensions. HR efficiency obtained the highest mean score, suggesting that employees particularly recognized the operational value of AI-supported HR processes. This observation is consistent with the broader literature emphasizing the potential of AI and HR analytics to support efficiency and data-informed HR decision-making^[1,2].

Personalization also received an above-midpoint score, suggesting that respondents generally perceived AI-supported HR services and recommendations as relevant to individual employee needs. This finding is consistent with the increasing use of AI to provide individualized HR support and recommendations.

Transparency and fairness received the comparatively lowest AI-HRM score. From an organizational justice perspective, this finding is important because employees may evaluate technology-supported HR decisions not only according to efficiency but also according to whether decision processes are understandable and perceived as fair^[11]. The result supports the importance of transparent communication and explainability when AI is used in HR-related decisions.

Human oversight received a relatively favorable score, indicating that respondents recognized the importance of retaining human involvement in AI-supported HR processes. This is particularly relevant because AI-assisted HRM represents an interaction between technological decision-support and human managerial judgment rather than a purely technological process.

The positive association between AI-assisted HRM and employee engagement ($r = 0.62$) was the strongest relationship between AI-assisted HRM and the three employee outcomes. This suggests that employees who evaluated AI-supported HR practices more favorably also tended to report greater engagement. Previous research has similarly linked AI adoption with employee engagement and related workplace outcomes^[5,6].

AI-assisted HRM also demonstrated a positive association with organizational trust ($r = 0.58$). This relationship is theoretically relevant because trust may depend on employees' perceptions of organizational reliability, competence, fairness and decision-making processes. AI-supported HR systems that are perceived as consistent and appropriately governed may therefore coexist with higher levels of

organizational trust.

The association between AI-assisted HRM and job satisfaction ($r = 0.55$) was also positive and statistically significant. This indicates that more favorable perceptions of AI-supported HR practices were associated with higher reported job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the result should not be interpreted as evidence that AI-assisted HRM directly increases job satisfaction.

The correlations among employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction were also positive. In particular, organizational trust and job satisfaction demonstrated the strongest relationship ($r = 0.64$). These relationships suggest that the employee outcomes examined in the present study are interconnected and should not necessarily be viewed as independent organizational phenomena.

Overall, the findings provide empirical support for the three proposed hypotheses at the level of **association**. They are consistent with an organizational justice perspective in which perceptions of efficiency, transparency, fairness and human involvement may be relevant to employees' evaluations of AI-supported HR processes.

Theoretical Contribution

The present study contributes to the AI-HRM literature by examining AI-assisted HRM in relation to three employee-level outcomes simultaneously: employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction.

The organizational justice perspective provides a useful explanation for why the quality of AI-supported HR processes may matter beyond operational efficiency. Employees may evaluate AI-supported HR systems according to whether procedures are transparent, consistent, fair and subject to appropriate human oversight. These perceptions may be reflected in broader workplace attitudes.

The findings particularly highlight transparency and fairness as areas requiring attention because this dimension received the lowest mean among the four AI-assisted HRM dimensions. The results therefore extend the discussion of AI-HRM beyond automation and efficiency toward employee-centered governance.

Managerial Implications

The findings provide several implications for organizations implementing AI-assisted HRM.

First, organizations should recognize that employees evaluate AI-supported HR practices not only in terms of efficiency but also in terms of transparency, fairness and human involvement.

Second, organizations should communicate clearly how AI-supported HR systems are used, particularly when they contribute to recruitment, performance evaluation, employee assessment or other consequential decisions.

Third, appropriate human oversight should be retained for important HR decisions. Human review can provide an additional layer of accountability and may help address employee concerns regarding fairness and explainability.

Fourth, organizations should provide employees with mechanisms through which they can ask questions, seek clarification and raise concerns regarding AI-supported HR decisions.

Finally, AI-HRM implementation should balance technological efficiency with employee-centered governance, transparency and accountability.

Limitations

The present study has several limitations.

First, the cross-sectional design does not establish temporal order or causality. Therefore, the observed relationships should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

Second, participants were recruited through organizational contacts and professional networks. This convenience/professional-network recruitment approach may limit the generalizability of the findings to employees outside the sampled networks.

Third, all major constructs were measured using self-reported responses collected through a single questionnaire. Consequently, common-method variance and perceptual overlap cannot be completely excluded.

Fourth, the AI-assisted HRM measure comprised 12 items across four dimensions. Although the scale demonstrated good internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha alone does not establish factorial, convergent or discriminant validity.

Fifth, the analysis relied primarily on descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations. Potential confounding variables such as age, work experience, organizational sector, job level and AI-HRM exposure were not statistically controlled in the reported analysis.

Finally, the study examined employees' perceptions of AI-assisted HRM rather than objective organizational measures of AI implementation. Future studies should therefore combine employee-level perceptions with organizational and system-level indicators.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined the association between perceived AI-assisted human resource management and employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction.

Employees reported generally favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HRM, employee engagement, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Among the four AI-assisted HRM dimensions, HR efficiency received the highest mean score, whereas transparency and fairness received the comparatively lower score.

Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated positive and statistically significant associations between AI-assisted HRM and employee engagement ($r = 0.62, p < 0.001$), organizational trust ($r = 0.58, p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction ($r = 0.55, p < 0.001$). The strongest association involving AI-assisted HRM was observed with employee engagement.

These findings indicate that employees with more favorable perceptions of AI-assisted HR practices also tended to report more favorable workplace outcomes. However, the findings do not establish causal effects because the study employed a cross-sectional design and correlational analysis.

The comparatively lower evaluation of transparency and fairness highlights the importance of explainable AI-supported HR processes, procedural fairness, employee communication and appropriate human oversight. Organizations implementing AI-assisted HRM should therefore balance the operational benefits of AI with employee-centered governance and accountability.

Future research should use longitudinal designs, broader sampling approaches and more comprehensive multivariable analytical methods to further investigate the relationships identified in the present study.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to applicable confidentiality and institutional requirements.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from respondents before questionnaire completion. Participants were informed about the academic purpose of the research and their right to discontinue participation. No personally identifying information was requested during data collection, and responses were handled confidentially.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Tambe, P.; Cappelli, P.; Yakubovich, V. Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Management: Challenges and a Path Forward. *Calif. Manage. Rev.* **2019**, *61*, 15–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619867910>.
2. Marler, J. H.; Boudreau, J. W. An Evidence-Based Review of HR Analytics. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2017**, *28*, 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699>.
3. Raisch, S.; Krakowski, S. Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation–Augmentation Paradox. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* **2021**, *46*, 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>.
4. Kellogg, K. C.; Valentine, M. A.; Christin, A. Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Acad. Manage. Ann.* **2020**, *14*, 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>.
5. Braganza, A.; Chen, W.; Canhoto, A.; Sap, S. Productive Employment and Decent Work: The Impact of AI Adoption on Psychological Contracts, Job Engagement and Employee Trust. *J. Bus. Res.* **2021**, *131*, 485–494. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.08.018>.
6. Prasad, K. D. V.; De, T. Generative AI as a Catalyst for HRM Practices: Mediating Effects of Trust. *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.* **2024**, *11*, 1362. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03842-4>.
7. Watermann, L.; Lerner, E.; Kubowitsch, S. From AI Use to Positive Functioning: The Roles of Trust and Need Satisfaction. *Gruppe. Interaktion. Organ.* **2026**. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-026-00886-9>.
8. Schaufeli, W. B.; Bakker, A. B. Job Demands, Job Resources, and Their Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi-Sample Study. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2004**, *25*, 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>.
9. Spector, P. E. Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* **1985**, *13*, 693–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>.
10. McAllister, D. J. Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *Acad. Manage. J.* **1995**, *38*, 24–59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256727>.
11. Colquitt, J. A. On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2001**, *86*, 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>.