



Research Article

EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF ALGORITHM-DRIVEN PERFORMANCE MONITORING ON EMPLOYEE TRUST, PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN DIGITAL WORKPLACES

Author: Reena Paliwal^{1*} ¹Faculty of MBA, Acharya Rajendra Suri Shiksha Mahavidhyalaya (ARSSM), Mandsaur (M.P.), 458002**KEYWORDS:**

Algorithmic management;
Performance monitoring;
Employee trust; Psychological
safety; Organizational
commitment

ARTICLE HISTORY**Received Date:** 10/04/2026**Revised Date:** 14/04/2026**Accepted Date:** 28/05/2026**Published Date:** 14/06/2026**DOI:** 10.69557/2czdkk06**CORRESPONDING AUTHOR****Reena Paliwal**reenapaliwal691@gmail.com**Orcid ID-** 0009-0002-6293-8136**ABSTRACT**

One of the most serious problems that the Indian entertainment industry is facing in the increasing use of artificial intelligence, algorithmic management, employee analytics, and digital monitoring systems has changed conventional approaches to workplace performance management. The present study examined the association of algorithm-driven performance monitoring with employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment in digitally managed workplaces. A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive-analytical design was adopted. A total of 320 questionnaires were distributed to employees working in technology-enabled organizations, of which 300 complete responses were retained for analysis. Participants were required to have direct experience with at least one digital performance-monitoring mechanism. Data were collected using a structured 39-item questionnaire comprising measures of algorithm-driven performance monitoring, employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment. All constructed items were assessed using a five-point Likert scale. Content relevance and clarity of the questionnaire were reviewed before administration, followed by a pilot assessment among 30 eligible employees who were excluded from the final sample. Descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression were used to examine the relationships between perceived algorithm-driven monitoring and the three employee outcomes. The mean perceived algorithm-driven monitoring score was 3.64 ± 0.71 . Mean scores for employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment were 3.12 ± 0.76 , 3.05 ± 0.81 , and 3.28 ± 0.73 , respectively. Higher perceived monitoring was associated with lower employee trust ($\beta = -0.48$; $R^2 = 0.230$; $p < 0.001$), psychological safety ($\beta = -0.52$; $R^2 = 0.270$; $p < 0.001$), and organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.44$; $R^2 = 0.190$; $p < 0.001$). The strongest observed association was with psychological safety. The findings indicate that employees reporting greater perceived algorithm-driven monitoring also tended to report less favorable perceptions of trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment. Because the study was cross-sectional, the results are interpreted as statistical associations rather than causal effects. The findings emphasize the importance of transparency, proportional monitoring, human oversight, employee participation, and clear mechanisms for reviewing algorithm-supported workplace decisions.

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has substantially changed how organizations coordinate, evaluate, and manage employee performance. Organizations increasingly use algorithm-driven performance-monitoring systems to collect and analyze information related to task completion, productivity, response time, attendance, digital activity, customer interactions, and work patterns ^[1–3]. Algorithmic management represents a broader transformation in organizational control because technological systems increasingly participate in work allocation, employee evaluation, and managerial decision-making ^[4]. Earlier research on electronic performance monitoring has also demonstrated relationships between monitoring practices, employee productivity, and stress, highlighting the importance of considering employees' psychological and social environments when implementing monitoring technologies ^[5,6].

Algorithmic systems may provide organizations with consistency, scalability, and rapid access to performance information. At the same time, their use raises questions concerning employee autonomy, fairness, transparency, privacy, and trust ^[7]. Research on algorithmic management has described new forms of organizational control and tensions between management and employees ^[8]. Employees may experience particular concern when they cannot understand how performance scores are generated or how collected information is used in employment-related decisions ^[9,10].

Employee trust is important because it involves employees' willingness to accept vulnerability based on expectations concerning competence, integrity, and benevolence ^[11]. Monitoring practices that are perceived as excessive, opaque, or primarily disciplinary may be associated with less favorable perceptions of organizational trust. Psychological safety refers to a workplace climate in which employees feel able to express ideas, ask questions, report errors, and engage in interpersonal risk-taking without fear of negative consequences ^[12,13]. Organizational commitment reflects employees' psychological attachment and identification with their organization and is relevant to organizational stability and employee retention ^[14,15].

Algorithm-driven monitoring may therefore be associated with employees' perceptions of trust, psychological safety, and commitment. However, these relationships may depend on how monitoring is implemented and interpreted. Monitoring used primarily for developmental feedback and transparent performance support may be perceived differently from continuous monitoring that employees experience as intrusive or control oriented.

Although previous research has examined electronic monitoring, algorithmic management, trust, autonomy, fairness, and employee well-being, fewer studies have examined employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment together within digitally monitored workplaces. Therefore, the present study examined the association between perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring and employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment.

Study Objective

The primary objective was to examine the association between perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring and three employee outcomes: employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment.

Research Hypotheses

Based on previous research on algorithmic management, organizational control, trust, and employee psychological outcomes, the following hypotheses were examined:

H1: Perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring is negatively associated with employee trust.

H2: Perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring is negatively associated with psychological safety.

H3: Perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring is negatively associated with organizational commitment.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive-analytical research design was adopted to examine the relationship between perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring and employee-related organizational outcomes. The cross-sectional design enabled measurement of employees' perceptions and outcomes at a single period and therefore supported assessment of statistical associations rather than temporal or causal relationships.

Study Population and Setting

The study population consisted of employees working in technology-enabled organizations in which software-based systems were used for monitoring, evaluating, allocating, or documenting aspects of employee performance.

Employees from information technology, business-process services, financial services, pharmaceutical organizations, consulting, e-commerce, and other digitally managed sectors were eligible for participation. Inclusion of multiple sectors allowed the study to capture employee perceptions across different digitally enabled work environments.

Employees were eligible if they:

- were at least 18 years of age;
- had worked in their current organization for at least six months;
- worked at least 30 hours per week; and
- reported exposure to at least one digital performance-monitoring mechanism.

Self-employed individuals, temporary interns, and individuals unable to provide informed consent were excluded.

For this study, **algorithm-driven performance monitoring** referred to the use of software-based or algorithm-supported systems to collect, process, evaluate, or summarize employee performance-related information, including productivity, task completion, response time, attendance, digital activity, or automated performance scores.

This definition distinguishes algorithm-driven monitoring from conventional administrative information systems that primarily store or retrieve information without automated monitoring or evaluation functions.

Sampling and Sample Size

A total of 320 questionnaires were distributed, **and** 300 complete responses were retained for analysis, producing a usable response rate of 93.75%.

Purposive and convenience sampling were used because participation required direct experience with digital performance-monitoring systems.

Table 1. Participant Eligibility and Sampling Characteristics

Parameter	Specification
Questionnaires distributed	320
Valid questionnaires	300
Usable response rate	93.75%
Minimum age	18 years
Minimum organizational tenure	6 months
Minimum weekly working time	30 h
Required exposure	At least one digital monitoring mechanism
Sampling approach	Purposive/convenience
Study design	Cross-sectional quantitative

The sampling approach may limit the generalizability of the findings beyond employees with characteristics similar to those represented in the study sample.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of five sections.

- **Section A:** Demographic characteristics
- **Section B:** Algorithm-driven performance monitoring
- **Section C:** Employee trust
- **Section D:** Psychological safety
- **Section E:** Organizational commitment

Algorithm-driven performance monitoring was assessed using 10 items addressing perceived monitoring intensity and intrusiveness, including productivity tracking, work-activity monitoring, response-time monitoring, attendance monitoring, digital-behavior monitoring, and automated performance scoring. Employee trust was assessed using six items addressing confidence in organizational decision-making, managerial fairness, reliability, and integrity.

Psychological safety was assessed using seven items addressing employees' willingness to express opinions, ask questions, report errors, and disagree with colleagues or supervisors.

Organizational commitment was assessed using nine items addressing emotional attachment, organizational identification, willingness to remain, and organizational loyalty.

All construct items were assessed using a five-point Likert scale ranging from **1 = strongly disagree** to **5 = strongly agree**. Higher scores represented greater perceived monitoring intensity, employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment.

Table 2. Structure of the Research Instrument

Section	Construct	No. of items	Response scale
A	Demographic characteristics	7	Categorical
B	Algorithm-driven performance monitoring	10	1–5 Likert
C	Employee trust	6	1–5 Likert
D	Psychological safety	7	1–5 Likert
E	Organizational commitment	9	1–5 Likert
Total	—	39	—

Content Validation and Pilot Testing

Before administration, the questionnaire was reviewed by five individuals with experience in organizational behavior, human resource management, and digital workplace research. Reviewers assessed item clarity, relevance, wording, and suitability for digitally monitored workplaces. Ambiguous or repetitive items were revised.

A pilot assessment was subsequently conducted among **30 employees** who met the eligibility criteria but were not included in the final analytical sample. Participants evaluated the clarity of questionnaire statements and the ease of completion. Minor wording modifications were made following pilot feedback. The pilot assessment supported content clarity and questionnaire usability. However, the pilot process was not considered a substitute for formal construct validation.

Measurement Quality and Reliability

Internal consistency was assessed for the principal study constructs using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients obtained for the study measures were considered in conjunction with item relevance and the pilot assessment.

Because the present study used multidimensional organizational constructs, internal consistency was treated as evidence of measurement reliability rather than as proof of construct validity. Future research should additionally examine factor structure and discriminant validity using exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis and appropriate construct-validity indices.

Table 3. Measurement-Quality Assessment

Construct	Items	Scale	Measurement assessment
Algorithm-driven performance monitoring	10	1–5 Likert	Internal consistency assessment
Employee trust	6	1–5 Likert	Internal consistency assessment
Psychological safety	7	1–5 Likert	Internal consistency assessment
Organizational commitment	9	1–5 Likert	Internal consistency assessment

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected using an anonymous structured questionnaire. Participants received information concerning the study purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and their right to discontinue participation.

No personally identifying information was requested. Participants were not required to disclose the identity of their employer, individual performance scores, or other personally identifiable employment information.

Completed questionnaires were screened for completeness before inclusion in the final dataset. Responses with missing or unusable information were excluded according to the predefined completeness criterion.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary and informed consent was obtained before questionnaire completion. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout data collection and analysis.

The study did not collect personally identifiable employee information or individual employer performance records.

Statistical Analysis

Data were entered into statistical software and screened for completeness and invalid entries. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participant characteristics and principal study variables.

Multiple linear regression was used to examine the statistical association between perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring and each of the three dependent variables:

- **employee trust;**
- **psychological safety; and**
- **organizational commitment.**

Separate regression models were specified for each outcome.

Standardized regression coefficients (β), coefficients of determination (R^2), direction of association, and statistical significance were reported. Statistical significance was evaluated using a two-sided threshold of $p < 0.05$.

Because the study was cross-sectional, regression coefficients were interpreted as statistical associations and not as evidence that monitoring caused changes in employee outcomes.

Regression diagnostics should include examination of linearity, residual distribution, homoscedasticity, influential observations, and multicollinearity where applicable. These diagnostics were not reported in the original analysis and therefore should be added if available from the statistical output.

RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

A total of **300 employees** were included in the final analysis. The sample represented employees from several digitally enabled sectors, including information technology/business-process services, banking/finance, pharmaceutical organizations, consulting, and e-commerce/other digital sectors.

Table 4. Participant Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Age	≤25 years	76	25.3
	26–35 years	102	34.0
	36–45 years	91	30.3
	>45 years	31	10.3
Organizational tenure	<1 year	28	9.3
	1–5 years	137	45.7
	6–10 years	86	28.7
	>10 years	49	16.3
Sector	IT/BPO	101	33.7
	Banking/Finance	53	17.7
	Pharmaceutical	46	15.3
	Consulting	41	13.7
	E-commerce/Other digital	59	19.7

Exposure to Algorithm-Driven Performance Monitoring

Algorithm-driven monitoring was commonly reported among participating employees. Frequently reported mechanisms included productivity tracking, automated task monitoring, attendance or login monitoring, and automated performance dashboards.

The mean perceived algorithm-driven monitoring score was **3.64 ± 0.71** on the five-point scale. This represented a moderately high level of perceived monitoring.

Approximately **61%** of employees reported high or very high exposure to algorithmic monitoring, **24%** reported moderate exposure, and **15%** reported low exposure.

Monitoring related to productivity, task completion, digital activity, and response time was frequently reported. Monitoring of employee communication and behavioral patterns was less frequently reported but was associated with stronger perceptions of intrusiveness.

Descriptive Statistics of Principal Variables

The mean employee trust score was 3.12 ± 0.76 , while the mean psychological safety score was 3.05 ± 0.81 . The mean organizational commitment score was 3.28 ± 0.73 . Because the measures used a five-point scale, these values were interpreted as **moderate average levels**, rather than as strongly favorable or unfavorable perceptions.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Principal Study Variables

Variable	No. of items	Mean $\pm$ SD	Minimum	Maximum
Algorithm-driven performance monitoring	10	3.64 ± 0.71	1.60	5.00
Employee trust	6	3.12 ± 0.76	1.50	5.00
Psychological safety	7	3.05 ± 0.81	1.29	5.00
Organizational commitment	9	3.28 ± 0.73	1.44	5.00

Employee Outcomes According to Monitoring Intensity

Participants were descriptively categorized according to perceived monitoring scores:

- **Low monitoring:** <3.00
- **Moderate monitoring:** $3.00\text{--}3.99$
- **High monitoring:** ≥ 4.00

Among the 300 participants, 45 (15.0%) were categorized as having low perceived monitoring, 147 (49.0%) as having moderate monitoring, and 108 (36.0%) as having high monitoring.

Mean employee trust decreased from **3.61** in the low-monitoring group to **2.75** in the high-monitoring group. Psychological safety decreased from **3.57** to **2.61**, while organizational commitment decreased from **3.63** to **2.94**.

Table 6. Employee Outcomes According to Perceived Monitoring Intensity

Monitoring category	n (%)	Employee trust, mean	Psychological safety, mean	Organizational commitment, mean
Low (<3.00)	45 (15.0)	3.61	3.57	3.63
Moderate (3.00–3.99)	147 (49.0)	3.20	3.12	3.35
High (≥ 4.00)	108 (36.0)	2.75	2.61	2.94
Overall	300 (100.0)	3.12	3.05	3.28

Regression Analysis

Three separate multiple linear regression models were examined.

The first model showed a negative statistical association between perceived algorithm-driven monitoring and employee trust ($\beta = -0.48$, $R^2 = 0.230$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, higher perceived monitoring scores were

associated with lower employee trust scores. The model accounted for 23.0% of the observed variance in employee trust.

The second model demonstrated the strongest negative association with psychological safety ($\beta = -0.52$, $R^2 = 0.270$, $p < 0.001$). Perceived monitoring accounted for 27.0% of the observed variance in psychological safety.

The third model showed a negative association between perceived algorithm-driven monitoring and organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.44$, $R^2 = 0.190$, $p < 0.001$), with the model accounting for 19.0% of the observed variance.

These regression results indicate that greater perceived algorithm-driven monitoring was statistically associated with lower scores on all three employee outcomes. The cross-sectional design does not establish temporal direction or causality.

Table 7. Regression Analysis of Algorithm-Driven Performance Monitoring and Employee Outcomes

Dependent variable	β	R^2	Direction	p-value	Interpretation
Employee trust	-0.48	0.230	Negative	<0.001	Significant association
Psychological safety	-0.52	0.270	Negative	<0.001	Significant association
Organizational commitment	-0.44	0.190	Negative	<0.001	Significant association

Note: β = standardized regression coefficient; R^2 = coefficient of determination. The reported models were statistically significant at $p < 0.001$. Confidence intervals and regression diagnostics should be added if available from the original statistical output.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the association between perceived algorithm-driven performance monitoring and employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment among employees working in digitally enabled organizations.

The mean monitoring score of 3.64 ± 0.71 indicated that perceived algorithm-driven monitoring was moderately high within the study sample. Productivity tracking, task monitoring, attendance or login monitoring, and automated performance dashboards were among the frequently reported forms of digital monitoring.

The average scores for employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment were 3.12, 3.05, and 3.28, respectively. These values indicate moderate average perceptions across the three employee outcomes.

The descriptive comparison demonstrated a consistent pattern. Employees in the high-monitoring category reported lower mean trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment than those in the low-monitoring category. The trust score decreased from 3.61 in the low-monitoring group to 2.75 in the high-monitoring group. Psychological safety decreased from 3.57 to 2.61, and organizational commitment decreased from 3.63 to 2.94.

The regression analysis further demonstrated negative statistical associations between perceived algorithm-driven monitoring and each employee outcome. The association was strongest for psychological safety ($\beta = -0.52$), followed by employee trust ($\beta = -0.48$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.44$).

The relationship with psychological safety is particularly relevant because continuous or intrusive monitoring may affect employees' perceptions of interpersonal and organizational risk. When employees believe that routine activities, communication, or behavioral patterns are continuously evaluated, they may become more cautious about expressing concerns, reporting mistakes, or questioning decisions. However,

the present cross-sectional design does not establish that monitoring itself caused lower psychological safety.

The negative association with employee trust is also consistent with the possibility that employees may evaluate monitoring systems less favorably when they perceive them as opaque, excessive, or control oriented. Transparent explanation of what information is collected, why it is collected, who can access it, and how it contributes to performance decisions may therefore be important for maintaining trust.

Organizational commitment also demonstrated a negative association with perceived monitoring. Employees who perceive workplace monitoring as disproportionate or primarily disciplinary may have less favorable evaluations of their relationship with the organization. Conversely, monitoring systems used for transparent developmental feedback may be perceived differently.

Importantly, the regression models explained 23.0%, 27.0%, and 19.0% of the variance in trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment, respectively. These R^2 values indicate that algorithm-driven monitoring represented one statistically relevant factor among potentially numerous organizational and individual determinants of employee outcomes.

The findings should therefore not be interpreted as evidence that algorithm-driven monitoring independently determines employee trust, psychological safety, or organizational commitment. Other factors, including leadership style, organizational culture, workload, job autonomy, job insecurity, organizational fairness, employment sector, tenure, and individual attitudes toward technology may also contribute to these outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined the association between algorithm-driven performance monitoring and employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment in digitally managed workplaces. Higher perceived monitoring was statistically associated with lower employee trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment. The strongest observed association was with psychological safety ($\beta = -0.52$), followed by employee trust ($\beta = -0.48$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.44$). The corresponding models explained 27.0%, 23.0%, and 19.0% of the observed variance, respectively.

These findings suggest that employees who perceive greater levels of algorithm-driven monitoring may also report less favorable perceptions of trust, psychological safety, and organizational commitment. The findings highlight the importance of transparent communication, proportional monitoring, human oversight, employee participation, and mechanisms for reviewing algorithm-supported decisions.

Because the study used a cross-sectional design and relied on self-reported measures, the findings should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects. Future research should use longitudinal designs, probability-based sampling where feasible, validated measurement models, relevant control variables, and more comprehensive regression or structural-equation approaches to further examine these relationships.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The anonymized dataset generated and/or analyzed during the study should be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to participant confidentiality and applicable institutional requirements.

Where ethically permissible, an anonymized dataset containing the study variables may be deposited in an appropriate research repository to facilitate reproducibility.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The study followed principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and their right to discontinue

participation. No personally identifiable employee information or individual employer performance records were collected.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Kellogg, K. C.; Valentine, M. A.; Christin, A. Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2020**, *14*, 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>.
2. Aiello, J. R.; Kolb, K. J. Electronic Performance Monitoring and Social Context: Impact on Productivity and Stress. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1995**, *80*, 339–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.3.339>.
3. Rosenblat, A.; Stark, L. Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers. *Int. J. Commun.* **2016**, *10*, 3758–3784.
4. Wood, A. J.; Graham, M.; Lehdonvirta, V.; Hjorth, I. Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy. *Work Employ. Soc.* **2019**, *33*, 56–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616>.
5. Mago Moritz, J.; Schmidt, C. Trust in Algorithmic Management: The Role of Task Type and Prior Discrimination Experience. *Acad. Manag. Proc.* **2024**, *2024*, 14136. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2024.14136>.
6. Mayer, R. C.; Davis, J. H.; Schoorman, F. D. An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335>.
7. Edmondson, A. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Adm. Sci. Q.* **1999**, *44*, 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>.
8. Meyer, J. P.; Allen, N. J. A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Hum. Resour. Manage. Rev.* **1991**, *1*, 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z).
9. Meyer, J. P.; Stanley, D. J.; Herscovitch, L.; Topolnysky, L. Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2002**, *61*, 20–52.
10. Eisenberger, R.; Huntington, R.; Hutchison, S.; Sowa, D. Perceived Organizational Support. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1986**, *71*, 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>.
11. Schoorman, F. D.; Mayer, R. C.; Davis, J. H. An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust: Past, Present, and Future. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2007**, *32*, 344–354. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24348410>.
12. Stanton, J. M. Traditional and Electronic Monitoring: A Comparison of Perceptions and Behaviors. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2000**, *85*, 859–866.
13. Ball, K. Workplace Surveillance: An Overview. *Labor Hist.* **2010**, *51*, 87–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00236561003654775>.
14. Tarafdar, M.; Tu, Q.; Ragu-Nathan, B. S.; Ragu-Nathan, T. S. The Impact of Technostress on Role Stress and Productivity. *J. Manage. Inf. Syst.* **2007**, *24*, 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109>.
15. Robert, L. P.; Pierce, C.; Morris, L.; Kim, S.; Alahmad, R. Designing Fair AI for Managing Employees in Organizations: A Review, Critique, and Design Agenda. *Hum.-Comput. Interact./Preprint literature* **2020**. The work develops an organizational-justice-based framework for fairness in AI-mediated employee management.