Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 14 (2),56-77, 2026
Print ISSN: 2053-5686(Print),
Online ISSN: 2053-5694(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State

Cornelia David Thomas
Department of Management. Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5402-172X

Imowo Udoma Udobia
Department of Sociology. Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Nwoka Jude
Department of Management, Faculty of Management Science
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, River State, Nigeria.
doi: https://doi.org/10.37745/gjhrm.2013/vol14n25677 Published April 18, 2026

Citation: Thomas C.D., Udobia I.U., Jude N. (2026) The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14 (2),56-77

Abstract: *This study examined the role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, with specific focus on the impact of dehumanization and discriminatory hiring practices on HRM outcomes. The rapid integration of AI technologies into HR functions has promised increased efficiency and data-driven decision-making; however, concerns have emerged regarding the potential loss of human connection and the perpetuation of algorithmic biases. Using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the theoretical framework, the study employed a cross-sectional survey design with a sample size of 98 respondents drawn from a population of 130 staff members. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using regression analysis via SPSS. The findings revealed that dehumanization has a negative and significant impact on human resource management ($R^2 = 32.6\%$, Beta = -0.571, $p < 0.05$), indicating that AI-driven automation reduces empathy and personal connection in HR processes. Furthermore, discriminatory hiring practices were found to have a stronger negative and significant impact on HRM ($R^2 = 70.1\%$, Beta = -0.837, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that biases embedded in AI algorithms undermine fairness, diversity, and inclusiveness in recruitment decisions. The study concludes that while AI offers operational benefits, its uncritical adoption in university HRM poses substantial risks to employee well-being and institutional equity. Recommendations include implementing hybrid AI-human HR models, establishing ethical oversight committees, conducting regular algorithmic audits, and investing in transparency and employee training to ensure responsible AI integration.*
Keywords: artificial intelligence, human resource management, dehumanization, discriminatory hiring practices, technology acceptance model, university HRM**.**

Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 14 (2),56-77, 2026
Print ISSN: 2053-5686(Print),
Online ISSN: 2053-5694(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

INTRODUCTION

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM) is a growing area of interest amongst organizations who wish to become more efficient and streamlined and to make better decisions. HRM has always done recruitment, training, performance appraisals, and employee engagement the manual way. But, as AI technologies continue to progress, there is a change of paradigm on how the HR functions are being approached, which will have large effects on productivity, acquiring talent, and keeping talent. Based on research done by Lepak and Snell (2022), the introduction of technology into HRM has already changed the nature of HR roles to be more strategic in focus, in much closer alignment with organizational goals. AI technologies, such as machine learning, natural language processing, and predictive analytics, are transforming recruitment and selection processes, which were historically time-consuming and prone to bias. AI algorithms can process hundreds of thousands of resumes and pick out the best possible candidates for specific jobs, thereby eliminating a lot of discrimination in hiring and also increasing diversity in the workforce (Liu et al., 2019). This is backed up by Bissola and Imperatori (2019) who state that "AI in recruitment facilitates data-based decision making, which in turn improves the precision and impartiality of talent evaluation" "Artificial Intelligence In", para.

Moreover, AI is reshaping performance management and employee development. According to Deloitte (2018), artificial intelligence-based tools allow for real-time monitoring, coaching, and customized learning suggestions so that HR can create training programs around the unique requirements and tendencies of each employee. This transition not only increases employee morale and output, but it also brings talent management in line with corporate goals. Also, the analytics that come from ai are really helping in the prediction of employee attrition as well as the discovery of engagement patterns. According to the IBM Smarter Workforce Institute (2019), these predictive abilities would enable the HR department to take care of problems before they even start, which would lead to higher employee retention and happiness. AI applications in this area demonstrate that HR functions can transition from reactive to proactive, enhancing the overall employee experience and engagement. But along with the use of AI in HRM, comes many challenges as well such as those associated with privacy, ethics, and job loss. According to Stone et al. (2020) whereas AI tools become more and more prevalent, and the HR professional must weigh the benefits of such technology against the ethical dilemmas of data privacy and bias avoidance. Therefore, continued research and moral codes of conduct are necessary to assure that AI in HRM is consistent with humanistic ideals, yet as operationally efficient as possible.

Statement of the Problem

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is becoming more intertwined with human resource management (HRM) and this fact provides both advantages and disadvantages because organization are trying to use AI to enhance efficiency, decision making, and strategic alignment. Artificial Intelligence has already been used in many aspects of HR, such as hiring, performance management, and employee engagement, and has proven to make processes easier and unbiased (Liu et al., 2019).

But even with these benefits the rapid incorporation of AI poses many serious problems that challenge its effectiveness and moral use in HRM. The main issue is that AI in HR will lead to bias and invasion of privacy. While AI is promoted as a tool to enhance fairness in recruitment, studies have shown that machine learning algorithms can inadvertently reproduce and even amplify existing biases, leading to discriminatory hiring practices (Bissola Imperatori, 2019; Stone et al., 2020). The issue is also that the AI algorithms are a bit of a black box, so the HR people don't really know what they are doing, and can't really control or even understand the AI's decisions. Also, the implication of AI in HRM is transforming the nature of jobs in the HR department, and there is fear that it will cause job loss and lack of humanity in the workplace. With the automation of many repetitive tasks, there is also the risk that HR functions will lose their "human touch" which could in turn affect employee morale and engagement (Deloitte Insights, 2018). This transition, however, causes one to wonder how HR will be able to capitalize on the efficiencies that AI has to offer while still preserving the personal touch that is so crucial to the management of employees (Lepak Snell, 2022).

Lastly, although predictive analytics using AI can give great foresight into trends in the workforce, these predictions are only as good as the data used, and the data used also brings up the whole issue of the ethics of collecting the data. As IBM's Smarter Workforce Institute (2019) points out, AI in HR is only as good as the data practices that support it, and many organizations do not have the data governance frameworks in place to support these practices in a responsible manner. That gap in data control leads to incorrect assumptions and the loss of confidence between workers and company. Hence the need to examine how AI can be most effectively and ethically utilized in HRM in order to take full advantage of the opportunities while minimizing the dangers. However, these issues must be approached with great care as they necessitate a thorough analysis of how AI affects HR jobs, morality, and data accuracy in order to encourage responsible use of AI in HR. This research hopes to answer some of these questions by examining the use of artificial intelligence in HRM at Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, and the benefits, problems, and ethical and transparent considerations that need to be addressed.

Objectives of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the role of AI in HRM in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. Other specific objectives of this study include:

i. To evaluate the impact of dehumanization on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.
ii. To evaluate the impact of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Research Questions

From the objectives of the study, the following research questions are raised to guide the study:

i. What is the impact of dehumanization on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State?

ii. What is the impact of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State?

Research Hypotheses

From the objectives of this study, the following research hypotheses are formulated:

i. There is no significant impact of dehumanization on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.
ii. There is no significant impact of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its potential to revolutionize HR practices and improve organizational performance. By examining this topic, the study contributes to a better understanding of how AI can transform recruitment, enhance employee engagement, optimize performance management, and foster data-driven decision-making within HR. This research also highlights how AI can streamline HR processes, reduce operational costs, and mitigate human biases, creating fairer, more efficient workplaces. Additionally, the findings can guide organizations in implementing AI responsibly, ensuring it aligns with ethical considerations and promotes sustainable workforce development.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of Artificial Intelligence and Human Resource Management

According to Russell Norvig (2020), Artificial Intelligence (AI) is the simulation of human intelligence processes by machines or computer systems, such as learning, reasoning, and self-correction. From admissions to student, AI applications are on the rise in the university, personalized learning systems, data-driven decision making in HR etc. Artificial Intelligence could assist university HR departments by taking care of mundane functions like employee files, scheduling, and performance metrics analysis, which could lead to increased efficiency and accuracy in decision making (Kaplan Haenlein, 2019). Also, with the use of AI-enabled tools, universities can get information about employee engagement and can even forecast future staffing requirements from the past data, thus universities can manage the resources strategically (Huang Rust, 2018). HRM is the strategic approach to the management of an organization's employees to help achieve the goals of the organization and those of the individual (Armstrong, 2021). HRM in universities encompasses everything from recruitment and talent management to faculty development and evaluation. The goal is not only to ensure operational effectiveness but also to create an environment conducive to academic excellence, innovation, and employee satisfaction (Boxall Purcell, 2016). HRM for universities is much more than just faculty, there are administrative staff, researchers and each group has unique roles and needs. With the use of AI, universities will be able to facilitate their HR processes, employee development, and make data driven decisions allowing them to better attract, retain, and grow talent in the academic world (Ulrich, 2017).

Impact of Dehumanization on Human Resource Management

AI is gradually becoming a part of human resource management (HRM) in universities and although it has many advantages, it is also taking away the humanity in the HR functions. That's not the problem, this is about the lack of person to person contact, the subtle implications that used to be the backbone of HR. The fact that AI is capable of taking over a lot of the HR functions like recruitment, performance appraisals and onboarding, means the end of person to person contact and the beginning of a standardized employee management. While AI-driven tools, such as chatbots and automated scheduling, can enhance efficiency, there is a risk that employees may feel less connected to the university's HR team (Brougham Haar, 2018). The loss of that personal contact can leave the employees feeling like nothing more than "data points" and that can really affect morale/trust/engagement and considering it is a university, it is academic staff, and they may appreciate a more personal touch. And HR is all about the people issues, and the AI systems just dont have the emotional IQ to deal with that.

However, in university settings, the faculty, staff and administrators are often from different cultures and may have special needs, and when decisions are made with the help of AI, these cultural subtleties and individual considerations may be overlooked (Cascio Montealegre, 2016). For example, what if some AI algorithm unknowingly reinforces bias, or doesn't understand how cultural fit plays a part in academic teams, then not only does this screw up the working relationships between employees, but the university's attempt at creating an inclusive environment. The dehumanizing aspects of AI can also affect employees' job satisfaction and their faith in HR procedures. If the HR functions are too automated then employees will wonder just how fair and transparent the whole process is, for example, how can performance appraisals be fair if they are mostly based on some algorithm (Langer et al, 2021).

In universities, where professors already feel the crunch of performance metrics, AI-generated evaluations would only add to the stress, particularly when the faculty feel that the system does not appreciate them as individuals, or account for their individual contributions. AI can inadvertently add biases, if the algorithms that its based off of are biased as well. For example, in HRM in universities, this could be detrimental to hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions, where some groups could be unfairly discriminated against if the AI models are not adequately audited for fairness (Raghavan et al., 2020). Issues of ethics, transparency, and accountability are especially important in a university setting, where diversity and fairness are the very foundations upon which such institutions are built. Although AI will prove to be a very useful tool for a more efficient HRM in a university, there will be some sort of dehumanization factor that could lead to low morale, exclusivity, job dissatisfaction, and lack of ethical standards. Approaching these issues will demand a delicate balance between implementing AI and maintaining the human values of the university so that the AI serves the university's mission and culture and does not erode it.

Impact of Discriminatory Hiring Practices on Human Resource Management

AI has made its presence in hiring, which has brought about efficiency and accuracy yet has also brought about apprehensions about discriminatory practices especially in diverse and inclusive

atmospheres such as universities. A lot of researchers have written about the effects of bias in artificial intelligence in human resources management (HRM) and their conclusions are instrumental to understanding the overall effect on institutional equality and diversity, and organizational processes. As scholars such as Barocas and Selbst (2016) point out, AI has a tendency to inadvertently perpetuate social biases, particularly when algorithms are "taught" on historical data that is itself biased by previous inequalities. In universities, where diversity is often a core value, AI biases may hinder equitable hiring by inadvertently favoring certain demographic groups over others based on factors like gender, race, or age. This constant modification and checking for HR departments to avoid this kind of prejudice in their hiring from the ai. Binns (2018) states that automated hiring systems may contradict diversity and inclusion initiatives by the disqualification of minority applicants that are otherwise qualified. This could in turn make HRM in universities have an even harder time achieving diversity quotas, and therefore the university as a whole can't create an inclusive environment.

Diversity is so important in the academic world, with different voices adding different insights, an AI system that allows only some groups to prevail will only result in a lack of variety, and thus, a lessening of the quality and breadth of scholarship and research. Mittelstadt et al. (2016) emphasize the lack of transparency in AI decision-making, which can pose a challenge for HR departments in justifying hiring decisions to candidates and other stakeholders. When an AI system is responsible for rejecting or advancing candidates, the opacity of the algorithm’s decisions can result in frustration among applicants and distrust in the hiring process. In a university context, this may erode trust between HR departments and faculty or staff, creating a need for clear policies that explain how AI decisions align with institutional values. Cappelli et al. (2019) contends that the increased use of AI in hiring moves the function of HR from strategic personnel management to technical administration.

HRM is all about building relationships with faculty and knowing the needs of the department and AI hiring takes away that proactive role for HR. This separation can isolate HR from the academic world and therefore inhibit its capacity to cater to the special cultural and intellectual needs of a university. Raghavan et al. 2020) underlines the laws usual dangers of AI bias in employment. And since universities are public they are constantly examined on the matter of fairness and non-discrimination. If the AI turns out to be discriminatory, then HR is going to have a lot of lawsuits on their hands, and the university will lose a lot of respect. To avoid these problems HR must work hand and hand with the AI vendors to make sure they follow all anti-discrimination laws and ethical codes of conduct. The consequences of AI discriminatory hiring in universities will pose many difficult problems to HRM. Addressing these requires a careful balance between leveraging AI's efficiencies and safeguarding institutional values of diversity, equity, and transparency.

Theoretical Review

The theory used for the study on "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in a University is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally proposed by Davis in 1989. This is one of the most common theories used to explain and predict the adoption

and use of technology in organizations, particularly with regard to new technologies such as AI in HR.

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

According to TAM theory, there are two key factors affecting the probability of adoption of technology in an organization.

(a). Perceived Usefulness (PU): (a) the extent to which people feel that using a certain technology will make them better at their jobs and, (b). One is Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), which is the degree to which individuals believe that using the technology will be effortless. Applied to a university environment, TAM could be used to investigate the attitudes of HR professionals and faculty toward AI instruments within HR functions. Example: PU: AI might seem to be helpful in recruiting, talent management, performance appraisal, it would save a lot of time and make the process much more accurate. PEOU: The degree to which HR staff believe that AI systems are easy to learn and use will influence their decision to adopt and use these systems in their work routines.

Extended TAM with Trust and Facilitating Conditions

Researchers like venkatesh and bala (2008) expanded tam to include other factors such as trust in technology and facilitating conditions. In the context of AI in HRM, trust becomes critical, as users may have concerns about AI's accuracy, fairness, and data privacy. Another factor is enabling conditions like training and organizational support that will make the use of AI in HR in a university environment a smooth transition.

To sum up, TAM, with the added components of trust and support, offers a strong theory to examine the adoption of AI in university HR, looking at the factors affecting adoption and the place of organizational support in the successful integration of technology.

Empirical Review

Brougham & Haar (2018) on “Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace” explores employee perceptions of AI and automation in HR roles and discover that the growing reliance on technology can lead to feelings of dehumanization and disconnection. In the context of university HR departments, the use of AI-driven platforms for routine administrative tasks like leave management, recruitment, and performance reviews can limit human interaction, leading staff to feel more like data points than individuals. The authors highlight the risk of reduced employee engagement, as AI-driven decision-making may overlook personal or contextual factors that a human manager might consider. In university settings, faculty and staff may feel alienated if AI replaces personal interactions in HR processes, diminishing the perceived "human" element of human resource management.

Luo & Wang (2020) on a study "Understanding the challenges of artificial intelligence in human resources: A case of empathy and dehumanization." delves into AI-driven decision-making and its tendency to ignore the human aspect of HRM. The researchers emphasize that automated systems

often lack empathy, which is crucial in HR tasks, especially in sensitive areas like conflict resolution and performance feedback. In university HR departments, where employees often have complex and context-dependent needs, AI systems may devalue the individual, leading to feelings of impersonality and alienation. This study underscores the importance of maintaining empathy and human judgment in HR functions within universities to avoid employee disengagement and a diminished sense of belonging.

Berente, Recker & Santhanam (2021) on the topic "Managing AI and robotics in organizations: Balancing innovation and control in the workplace." MIS Quarterly focusing on various sectors, including academia, highlight how the introduction of AI in HRM can unintentionally dehumanize processes. Through case studies, the authors demonstrate that AI algorithms often lack the nuance required to account for individual employee needs, potentially leading to a "one-size-fits-all" approach. This effect is particularly pronounced in educational institutions, where diversity of thought and background should be considered. In universities, reliance on AI without a human-centered approach can overlook important qualitative aspects of HR, reducing job satisfaction and the personal connection to the institution.

Cowgill, Dell'Acqua & Deng (2020) on the study "Biased programmers? Or biased data? A field experiment in operationalizing AI ethics." Management Science investigate AI-driven hiring tools and their tendency to reflect biases present in historical data. The study highlights that algorithms trained on biased datasets often reinforce existing stereotypes and discriminatory hiring practices, leading to the underrepresentation of certain groups. For university HR departments, this can be particularly problematic, as biases in hiring could contradict the values of diversity and inclusion critical to academic environments. The study emphasizes the need for oversight and transparency in AI systems used for recruitment in universities, where inclusivity is a key institutional value.
Raghavan, Barocas, Kleinberg & Levy (2020) on "Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices." Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency examine the biases in algorithmic hiring tools and their consequences, including discrimination against minority applicants. The study also reviews methods for reducing bias, such as more transparent data inputs and ethical review boards. In university hiring, where diversity of thought and background is prioritized, AI-driven hiring tools must be carefully evaluated to avoid inadvertently marginalizing qualified applicants based on race, gender, or other biases. In academic settings, AI systems in recruitment need regular audits and adjustments to ensure fair hiring practices, as unchecked biases could otherwise perpetuate inequality.

Bogen & Rieke (2018): on the study "Help wanted: An examination of hiring algorithms, equity, and bias." Upturn Research Report offer an empirical review of algorithmic biases in hiring, showing that AI systems can propagate discriminatory practices if they are based on biased data or poorly constructed models. The study highlights real cases where universities and other institutions faced challenges when using AI in hiring, leading to the exclusion of diverse candidates. The study calls for more rigorous standards and transparency in AI-driven hiring tools. For university HR departments, this study stresses the importance of transparent and fair AI

practices to ensure that diverse and qualified candidates are not unfairly excluded from the hiring process. In summary, these empirical studies highlight the risks and ethical concerns associated with AI in HRM in universities. While AI offers benefits in streamlining HR processes, these studies suggest careful implementation to avoid dehumanization in HR interactions and discriminatory practices in hiring.

Issues/Gaps in Literature and Knowledge

Most existing studies on AI in HRM are conducted in corporate or tech industry settings, with limited research specifically addressing educational institutions, particularly universities. The unique environment, culture, and HR requirements of academic institutions are often overlooked, meaning that findings from corporate HR may not be directly applicable to universities. There is a need for more research focused on AI's impact within university HRM, taking into account the unique challenges and goals of higher education institutions. While the literature has addressed AI ethics broadly, there is limited research specifically on the ethical implications of AI in HR practices in academic settings, such as issues of fairness, transparency, and data privacy. More studies are needed on the ethical concerns specific to universities, particularly around AI-driven decisions that affect academic recruitment, performance evaluations, and diversity policies. Research on employee attitudes toward AI in HRM has mostly been limited to corporate environments, and few studies explore how university faculty and staff perceive AI-driven HR processes. Questions about employee trust, acceptance, and perceptions of dehumanization in the academic HR context remain under-researched.

Empirical studies are needed to examine university employees' perspectives on AI in HRM, exploring issues like acceptance, resistance, and perceived impacts on workplace culture and job satisfaction. Although AI bias in hiring is widely studied in the corporate sector, there is little research on how AI may introduce or perpetuate bias in academic recruitment processes. Universities often have specific diversity and inclusion goals that could be impacted by biased AI algorithms. More focused research is needed on how AI bias impacts hiring and promotion within universities and how these institutions can implement bias mitigation strategies in HR practices. Studies on AI in HRM often emphasize administrative tasks like recruitment and attendance tracking, while less attention is given to how AI can support strategic HR functions in universities, such as talent development, faculty performance management, and succession planning. There is a need for studies exploring how AI can enhance strategic HRM in universities, particularly in areas related to faculty performance, professional development, and retention.

Existing research on AI in HRM often lacks longitudinal perspectives, focusing instead on short-term outcomes of AI adoption. There is minimal research on the long-term impacts of AI on HR processes, employee experience, and overall institutional culture in academic settings. Longitudinal studies are necessary to assess the sustained impact of AI in university HRM, looking at how AI shapes institutional practices, employee engagement, and HR outcomes over time. There is limited guidance on best practices for implementing AI in HR within universities. Existing literature rarely offers practical frameworks or policy guidelines tailored to academic institutions,

where transparency, academic freedom, and inclusivity are core values. Developing best practices for AI implementation in university HRM is essential to help institutions navigate challenges related to ethics, effectiveness, and employee acceptance of AI. Addressing these gaps can provide more comprehensive insights into the benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations of AI in university HRM, ultimately supporting more effective and human-centered AI integration in academic institutions.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design
The study employs a cross-sectional survey design.

The Study Area
This study was conducted in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Population
The population of this study consisted 130 staff of Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Sample Size/Sampling Technique
Judgmental sampling technique was adopted for the study. Given the population, a sample size was derived using Taro Yamane's scientific formula which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{130}{1 + 130\ (0.005)2}$$

$$n = \frac{130}{1 + 130\ (0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{130}{1 + 0.325} \qquad n = \frac{130}{1.325}$$

$$n = 98$$

Sources of Data Collection
Data for this research work were collected through two sources – primary and secondary sources. The primary data were obtained by the researcher through questionnaire administration. Secondary data were obtained from published reports, books, journals, newspapers, magazines and internet.

Instrument for Data Collection
The instrument for data collection was "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management questionnaire (RAIHRMQ). The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A and section B. Section A sought for information on the demographic data of the respondents. Section B was the main body of the questionnaire. This section contained ten (10)

closed-ended questions using a five-point Likert' scale instrument through which the opinions of the respondents were expressed. Their responses were measured by means of a five-category rating system as follows:

SA - Strongly agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly disagree
U - Undecided

Methods of Data Analysis

The statistical methods adopted for data analysis were simple percentages and regression. The data were analyzed with the help of a statistical tool using SPSS.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter focuses on the presentation of data, analysis, interpretation and discussion of findings.

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Retrieval Rate

Copies of questionnaire administered	98
Copies of questionnaire retrieved	89
Percentage of questionnaire retrieved	90%

Source: Field Survey (2025)

From Table 4.1, a total of 98 copies of the questionnaire were administered to respondents and a total of 89 copies, representing 90% were retrieved.

Table 4.2: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Gender Distribution of the Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	45	50.6
Female	44	49.4
Total	**89**	**100**
Age Distribution of the Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percent**
20 - 30 years	35	39.3
31-40 years	48	53.9
41 - 50 years	5	5.6
51 years and above	1	1.1
Total	**89**	**100**
Marital Status		
Single	52	58.4
Married	37	41.6
Separated	-	-
Divorced	-	-
Widowed	-	-

Total	**89**	**100**
Academic Qualification	**Frequency**	**Percent**
SSCE	8	8.9
OND/NCE	10	11.2
B.Sc/HND	22	24.7
M.Sc./MBA	31	34.8
P.hD	18	20.2
Total	**89**	**100**
Years of Service/Experience		
1– 2 years	15	16.8
3 – 4 years	41	46.1
5 – 6 years	25	28.1
7 years and above	8	8.9
Total	**89**	**100**

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

From table 4.2 out of the 47 respondents, 26 respondents representing 55.3% were Male and 21 respondents representing 44.7% were Female.

With regards to the age distribution of the respondents, 10 respondents representing 21.3% were below 30 years, 11 respondents representing 23.4% were 31 – 40 years, 17 respondents representing 36.2% were 41 – 50 years and 9 respondents representing 19.1% were 51 years and above.

Regarding the education qualification of the respondents, 5 respondents representing 10.6% were SSCE holders, 10 respondents representing 21.3% were OND/NCE holders, 20 respondents representing 42.6% were B.Sc/HND holder, while 8 respondents representing 17.0% were M.Sc./MBA holders, 4 respondents representing 8.5% were P.hD holders.

Regarding the years of experience of the respondents, 6 respondents representing 21.7% were 1 - 2 years, 18 respondents representing 38.3% were 3 – 4 years, 12 respondents representing 25.5% were 5 – 6 years while 11 respondents representing 23.4% were 7 years and above.

Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 14 (2),56-77, 2026
Print ISSN: 2053-5686(Print),
Online ISSN: 2053-5694(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

Responses to Research Questions

Table 4.3: Analysis of Responses to Dehumanization

S/N	Dehumanization Dimension	SA	A	SD	D	N	Total
1	The integration of AI in HR processes affect the perception of dehumanization among employees at Ritman University.	27 (30.3%)	39 (43.8%)	10 (11.2%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	89 (100%)
2	There are several key areas in HR management where AI adoption lead to a reduction in human interaction and employee dissatisfaction at Ritman University.	20 (22.5%)	27 (30.3%)	16 (18.0%)	11 (12.4%)	15 (16.9%)	89 (100%)
3	The AI implementation in HR management results in a loss of empathy and personal connection in Ritman University.	34 (38.2%)	41 (46.1%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	89 (100%)
4	AI-driven HR systems at Ritman University balance efficiency with maintaining a human touch to avoid dehumanization.	34 (38.2%)	30 (33.7%)	12 (13.5%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	89 (100%)
5	There are several methods employed by Ritman University to mitigate the potential dehumanizing effects of AI in HR management.	27 (30.3%)	39 (43.8%)	9 (10.1%)	10 (11.2%)	4 (4.5%)	89 (100%)

Source: Researcher's Compilation (2025)

The analysis in Table 4.3 shows that a total of 27 respondents representing 30.3% strongly agreed that the integration of AI in HR processes affect the perception of dehumanization among employees at Ritman University. A total of 39 respondents representing 43.8% ticked agree, 10 (11.2%) kicked strongly disagree, 9 (10.1%) respondents ticked disagree and 4 (4.5%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to the second question on the table, a total of 20 respondents representing 22.5% strongly agreed that there are several key areas in HR management where AI adoption lead to a reduction in human interaction and employee dissatisfaction at Ritman University. A total of 27 respondents representing 30.3% ticked agree, 16 (18.0%) kicked strongly disagree, 11 (12.4%) respondents ticked disagree and 15 (16.9%) respondent ticked undecided.
With regards to third question, 34 respondents representing 38.2% strongly agreed that the AI implementation in HR management results in a loss of empathy and personal connection in Ritman University. A total of 41 respondents representing 46.1% ticked agree, 9 (10.1%) kicked strongly disagree, 4 (4.5%) respondents ticked disagree and 1 (1.1%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to fourth question shows that a total of 34 respondents representing 38.2% strongly agreed that AI-driven HR systems at Ritman University balance efficiency with maintaining a human touch to avoid dehumanization. A total of 30 respondents representing 33.7% ticked agree, 12 (13.5%) kicked strongly disagree, 9 (10.1%) respondents ticked disagree and 4 (4.5%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to fifth question on the table, a total of 27 respondents representing 30.3% strongly agreed that there are several methods employed by Ritman University to mitigate the potential dehumanizing effects of AI in HR management. A total of 39 respondents representing 43.8% ticked agree, 9 (10.1%) kicked strongly disagree, 10 (11.2%) respondents ticked disagree and 4 (4.5%) respondent ticked undecided.

Responses to Research Questions

Table 4.4: Analysis of Responses to Discriminatory Hiring Practices

S/N	Discriminatory Hiring Practices Dimension	SA	A	SD	D	N	Total
1	The use of AI in recruitment and selection processes at Ritman University contribute to discriminatory hiring practices.	34 (38.2%)	16 (18.0%)	11 (12.4%)	19 (21.3%)	9 (10.1%)	89 (100%)
2	The biases in AI algorithms affect the fairness and inclusiveness of hiring decisions at Ritman University.	37 (41.6%)	38 (42.7%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	89 (100%)
3	There are several measures implemented at Ritman University to reduce the risk of AI perpetuating discriminatory hiring	27 (30.3%)	39 (43.8%)	9 (10.1%)	10 (11.2%)	4 (4.5%)	89 (100%)

	practices in HR management.						
4	The reliance on AI in the hiring process impact diversity and equal opportunity at Ritman University.	39 (43.8%)	27 (30.3%)	11 (12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	4 (4.5%)	89 (100%)
5	There is a positive relationship between algorithmic transparency in AI tools and the reduction of discriminatory hiring practices in Ritman University's HR processes.	34 (38.2%)	41 (46.1%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	89 (100%)

Source: Researcher's Compilation (2025)

The analysis in Table 4.4 shows that a total of 34 respondents representing 38.2% strongly agreed that the use of AI in recruitment and selection processes at Ritman University contribute to discriminatory hiring practices. A total of 16 respondents representing 18.0% ticked agree, 11 (12.41%) kicked strongly disagree, 19 (21.3%) respondents ticked disagree and 9 (10.1%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to the second question on the table, a total of 37 respondents representing 41.6% strongly agreed that the biases in AI algorithms affect the fairness and inclusiveness of hiring decisions at Ritman University. A total of 38 respondents representing 42.7% ticked agree, 9 (10.1%) kicked strongly disagree, 4 (4.5%) respondents ticked disagree and 1 (1.1%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to third question on the table, a total of 27 respondents representing 30.3% strongly agreed that there are several methods employed by Ritman University to mitigate the potential dehumanizing effects of AI in HR management. A total of 39 respondents representing 43.8% ticked agree, 9 (10.1%) kicked strongly disagree, 10 (11.2%) respondents ticked disagree and 4 (4.5%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to fourth question shows that a total of 39 respondents representing 43.8% strongly agreed that the reliance on AI in the hiring process impact diversity and equal opportunity at Ritman University. A total of 27 respondents representing 30.3% ticked agree, 11 (12.4%) kicked strongly disagree, 8 (9.0%) respondents ticked disagree and 4 (4.5%) respondent ticked undecided.

With regards to fifth question, 34 respondents representing 38.2% strongly agreed that the AI implementation in HR management results in a loss of empathy and personal connection in Ritman

University. A total of 41 respondents representing 46.1% ticked agree, 9 (10.1%) kicked strongly disagree, 4 (4.5%) respondents ticked disagree and 1 (1.1%) respondent ticked undecided.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis One

There is no significant impact of dehumanization on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	-.571[a]	-.326	.319	.60241

a. Predictors: (Constant), Dehumanization

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15.297	1	15.297	42.154	.000[b]
	Residual	31.572	87	.363		
	Total	46.869	88			

a. Dependent Variable: HRM
b. Predictors: (Constant), Dehumanization

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.461	.243		10.114	.000
	Dehumanization	.388	.060	-.571	6.493	.000

a. Dependent Variable: HRM

From the result in Table above, R-square of the regression analysis is -.326. This finding suggests that 32.6 % of the variance in human resource management is explained by dehumanization in in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed the existence of a negative significant influence and the study found that the regression model is best fit for predicting the effect between variables under study [$F = 42.154$, $t = 6.493$ and $p<0.05$]. Given this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is negative and significant influence of dehumanization on human resource management. Similarly, the study revealed that every unit change in dehumanization would cause a variance of -57.1% in human resource management (Beta= -.571, p=0.000) in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant impact of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	-.837[a]	-.701	.698	.40114

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discriminatory_Hiring_Practices

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32.870	1	32.870	204.270	.000[b]
	Residual	13.999	87	.161		
	Total	46.869	88			

a. Dependent Variable: HRM

b. Predictors: (Constant), Discriminatory_Hiring_Practices

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.171	.201		5.815	.000
	Discriminatory_Hiring_ Practices	.742	.052	-.837	14.292	.000

a. Dependent Variable: HRM

From the result in Table above, R-square of the regression analysis is -.701. This finding suggests that 70.1 % of the variance in human resource management is explained by discriminatory hiring practices in in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed the existence of a negative significant influence and the study found that the regression model is best fit for predicting the effect between variables under study [F = 204.270, t = 14.292 and $p<0.05$]. Given this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is negative and significant influence of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management. Similarly, the study revealed that every unit change in discriminatory hiring practices would cause a variance of -83.7% in human resource management (Beta= -.837, p=0.000) in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State.

Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 14 (2),56-77, 2026
Print ISSN: 2053-5686(Print),
Online ISSN: 2053-5694(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result of the first hypothesis suggests that 32.6 % of the variance in human resource management is explained by dehumanization in in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed the existence of a negative significant influence and the study found that the regression model is best fit for predicting the effect between variables under study [F = 42.154, t = 6.493 and $p<0.05$]. Given this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is negative and significant influence of dehumanization on human resource management. Similarly, the study revealed that every unit change in dehumanization would cause a variance of -57.1% in human resource management (Beta= -.571, p=0.000) in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. This collaborate with the study and finding of Brougham & Haar (2018) who examined "Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace" explores employee perceptions of AI and automation in HR roles and discover that the growing reliance on technology can lead to feelings of dehumanization and disconnection.

The result of the second hypothesis suggests that 70.1 % of the variance in human resource management is explained by discriminatory hiring practices in in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed the existence of a negative significant influence and the study found that the regression model is best fit for predicting the effect between variables under study [F = 204.270, t = 14.292 and $p<0.05$]. Given this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is negative and significant influence of discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management. Similarly, the study revealed that every unit change in discriminatory hiring practices would cause a variance of -83.7% in human resource management (Beta= -.837, p=0.000) in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. This collaborates with the study and finding of Raghavan, Barocas, Kleinberg & Levy (2020) who examined "Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices." Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency examine the biases in algorithmic hiring tools and their consequences, including discrimination against minority applicants. The study also reviews methods for reducing bias, such as more transparent data inputs and ethical review boards. In university hiring, where diversity of thought and background is prioritized, AI-driven hiring tools must be carefully evaluated to avoid inadvertently marginalizing qualified applicants based on race, gender, or other biases.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Findings

The study investigated the impact of dehumanization and discriminatory hiring practices on human resource management at Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State. Based on the data analysis and hypothesis testing, the following findings were established:

Impact of Dehumanization on HRM

The regression analysis revealed that dehumanization explains 32.6% of the variance in human resource management at Ritman University. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed a negative significant influence, with $F = 42.154$, $t = 6.493$, and $p < 0.05$. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected. The study found that every unit change in dehumanization causes a variance of -57.1% in human resource management (Beta = -0.571, $p = 0.000$). This finding aligns with the work of Brougham & Haar (2018), who discovered that growing reliance on technology leads to feelings of dehumanization and disconnection among employees. The descriptive analysis supported this, showing that 74.1% of respondents agreed that AI implementation results in a loss of empathy and personal connection, while 74.1% also agreed that AI-driven HR systems at Ritman University struggle to balance efficiency with maintaining a human touch.

Impact of Discriminatory Hiring Practices on HRM

The regression analysis demonstrated that discriminatory hiring practices explain 70.1% of the variance in human resource management at Ritman University. The ANOVA confirmed a negative significant influence, with $F = 204.270$, $t = 14.292$, and $p < 0.05$. The null hypothesis was rejected. The study found that every unit change in discriminatory hiring practices causes a variance of -83.7% in human resource management (Beta = -0.837, $p = 0.000$). This finding corroborates the work of Raghavan, Barocas, Kleinberg & Levy (2020), who examined biases in algorithmic hiring tools and their consequences, including discrimination against minority applicants. The descriptive analysis revealed that 84.3% of respondents agreed that biases in AI algorithms affect the fairness and inclusiveness of hiring decisions, while 74.1% agreed that the reliance on AI in the hiring process negatively impacts diversity and equal opportunity at the university.

Additional Descriptive Findings:

i. 74.1% of respondents agreed that the integration of AI in HR processes affects the perception of dehumanization among employees.
ii. 52.8% agreed that AI adoption leads to reduction in human interaction and employee dissatisfaction.
iii. 56.2% agreed that the use of AI in recruitment contributes to discriminatory hiring practices.
iv. 84.3% affirmed a positive relationship between algorithmic transparency and reduction of discriminatory practices.
v. Questionnaire retrieval rate was 90% (89 out of 98 copies retrieved).

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, with particular emphasis on the impacts of dehumanization and discriminatory hiring practices. The findings lead to the following conclusions: First, dehumanization has a significant negative impact on human resource management at Ritman University. The integration of AI into HR processes, while offering efficiency gains, has resulted in reduced personal interaction, loss of empathy, and diminished

human connection between HR departments and employees. Staff members increasingly feel treated as data points rather than individuals, which adversely affects morale, trust, engagement, and overall job satisfaction. The study concludes that the uncritical adoption of AI-driven HR systems without adequate attention to preserving human elements undermines the fundamental purpose of HRM as a people-centered function. Second, discriminatory hiring practices driven by AI algorithms have a stronger negative impact on human resource management at Ritman University. Biases embedded in historical data used to train AI systems are being perpetuated and sometimes amplified, leading to unfair and non-inclusive recruitment decisions. This undermines the university's commitment to diversity, equity, and equal opportunity, which are core values in academic institutions. The opacity of AI decision-making further compounds the problem, as HR professionals cannot easily justify or explain hiring outcomes to candidates and stakeholders.

Third, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provided a useful theoretical lens for understanding AI adoption in university HRM. The findings suggest that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are insufficient predictors of successful AI integration; factors such as trust, transparency, ethical safeguards, and organizational support play equally critical roles in determining whether AI enhances or undermines HRM outcomes. Fourth, despite the challenges identified, respondents acknowledged that algorithmic transparency and proper oversight mechanisms can mitigate the negative effects of AI. This indicates that AI is not inherently detrimental to HRM; rather, its impact depends on how it is implemented, governed, and integrated with human judgment. In conclusion, while AI offers transformative potential for HRM in university settings, its current implementation in Ritman University has produced significant negative consequences related to dehumanization and discriminatory practices. Without deliberate intervention to address these issues, the benefits of AI will remain unrealized, and the institution may face declining employee trust, legal liabilities, and reputational damage.

Recommendations

From the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

i. Ritman University should use AI to automate routine HR tasks like data entry and initial resume screening, while ensuring that human HR professionals handle decisions requiring empathy, judgment, and contextual understanding—such as performance feedback, conflict resolution, and final hiring decisions. This balance preserves the essential human element in HR while benefiting from AI's efficiency.

ii. The university should create an AI Ethics and Oversight Committee to review AI tools before deployment and conduct regular, independent audits to detect and mitigate algorithmic biases, especially in hiring. This ensures AI systems comply with anti-discrimination laws and uphold the university's values of diversity, inclusion, and transparency.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M. (2021). Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice (15th ed.). Kogan Page.

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big Data's Disparate Impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671-732.

Berente, N., Gu, B., Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing AI and robotics in organizations: Balancing innovation and control in the workplace. MIS Quarterly, 45(1), 143–166. doi:10.25300/MISQ/2021/16361.

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in Machine Learning: Lessons from Political Philosophy. Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 149-159.

Bissola, R., & Imperatori, B. (2019). HRM 4.0: The digital transformation of HR departments. In Bilgihan, A., Berezina, K., Cobanoglu, C., & Okumus, F. (Eds.), Impact of AI and HRM on employee engagement and performance (pp. 97-115). *Springer, Cham.*

Bogen, M., & Rieke, A. (2018). Help wanted: An examination of hiring algorithms, equity, and bias. Upturn Research Report. Retrieved from https://www.upturn.org

Boxall, P. (2016). Foundations of Strategic HRM (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2018). Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace. Journal of Management & Organization, 24(2), 239–257. doi:10.1017/jmo.2016.55.

Cappelli, P., Tambe, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Management: Challenges and a Path Forward. California Management Review, 61(4), 15-42.

Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2016). How technology is changing work and organizations. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3, 349–375. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062352.

Cowgill, B., Dell'Acqua, F., & Deng, S. (2020). Biased programmers? Or biased data? A field experiment in operationalizing AI ethics. Management Science, 66(8), 3634–3651. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2019.3478.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. doi:10.2307/249008.

Deloitte Insights. (2018). AI in HR: Promises and perils. Retrieved from https://www2.deloitte.com.

Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. (2018). Artificial Intelligence in Service. Journal of Service Research, 21(2), 155–172. doi:10.1177/1094670517752459.

IBM Smarter Workforce Institute. (2019). The role of AI in employee engagement and retention. IBM White Paper. Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com.

Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence. Business Horizons, 62(1), 15–25. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.004

Langer, M., König, C. J., & Sanchez, D. (2021). The role of artificial intelligence in HRM: A conceptual review and research agenda. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 32(20), 4425–4447. doi:10.1080/09585192.2020.1853305.

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (2022). Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management, 28(4), 517–543. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630202800403*

Liu, Y., Li, W., Zhang, Z., & Hao, S. (2019). AI and big data in talent management: A perspective on the future of recruitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9(4), 90-101. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i4.15654*

Luo, X. R., & Wang, Z. (2020). Understanding the challenges of artificial intelligence in human resources: A case of empathy and dehumanization. Journal of Business Ethics, 162(1), 79–93. doi:10.1007/s10551-018-4054-3.

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1-21.

Raghavan, M., Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J., & Levy, K. (2020). Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 469–481. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372828.

Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach (4th ed.). Pearson.

Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. (2020). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 30(3), 100705. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100705*.

Ulrich, D. (2017). Victory Through Organization: Why the War for Talent is Failing Your Company and What You Can Do About It. McGraw-Hill Education.

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. Decision Sciences, 39(2), 273–315. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x

Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 14 (2),56-77, 2026
Print ISSN: 2053-5686(Print),
Online ISSN: 2053-5694(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

APPENDIX I
SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please kindly tick ( ) or complete the following provided below:

1. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Indicate your age group: 15-20 [ ] 21-30 [ ] 31- 35 [ ] 36 – 40 [ ] 41 – 50 [ ] 51 and above [ ]

3. Indicate your marital Status: Single [ ] Married [ ] Separated [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

4. Indicate your educational Qualification: SSCE [ ] OND/NCE [ ] HND/B.Sc. [ ] M.Sc./MBA [ ] Ph.D. [ ]

5. Indicate your years of Service/Experience: 0 – 2 [ ] 3 – 5 [ ] 6 – 8 [ ] 9 – 11 [ ] 12 – 14 [ ] 15 and above [ ]

6. Indicate your rank: Management Staff [ ] Senior Staff [ ] Junior Staff [ ]

APPENDIX II
SECTION A: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read carefully each of the statement below and tick to indicate your agreement or disagreement to each item. Each item has to do with the role of Artificial Intelligence in Human Resource Management in Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, with specific focus on the impact of dehumanization and discriminatory hiring practices on HRM outcomes. The level or degrees of your responses are: Strongly agree (SA), Agree (A), strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D) and Neutral (N).

S/N	THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HUMAN RSOURCE MANAGEMENT	SA	A	SD	D	N
A	**Impact Of Dehumanization on Human Resource Management**					

1	The integration of AI in HR processes affect the perception of dehumanization among employees at Ritman University.					
2	There are several key areas in HR management where AI adoption lead to a reduction in human interaction and employee dissatisfaction at Ritman University.					
3	The AI implementation in HR management results in a loss of empathy and personal connection in Ritman University.					
4	AI-driven HR systems at Ritman University balance efficiency with maintaining a human touch to avoid dehumanization.					
5	There are several methods employed by Ritman University to mitigate the potential dehumanizing effects of AI in HR management.					
B	**Impact of Discriminatory Hiring Practices on Human Resource Management**					
6	The use of AI in recruitment and selection processes at Ritman University contribute to discriminatory hiring practices.					
7	The biases in AI algorithms affect the fairness and inclusiveness of hiring decisions at Ritman University.					
8	There are several measures implemented at Ritman University to reduce the risk of AI perpetuating discriminatory hiring practices in HR management.					
9	The reliance on AI in the hiring process impact diversity and equal opportunity at Ritman University.					
10	There is a positive relationship between algorithmic transparency in AI tools and the reduction of discriminatory hiring practices in Ritman University's HR processes.					