Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis, Akuntansi dan Keuangan (JAMBAK)
Vol. 4, No. 1 2025: 185-196

Traditional vs. Modern Human Resource Management: Typology, Transformation, and Industry 4.0 Implications

Meutia Dwi Novita Sari[1*], Raisa Ullya Nisva[2], M. Rizki Maulana[3]
Universitas Syiah Kuala
Corresponding Author: Meutia Dwi Novita Sari Meutiadwi@usk.ac.id

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Traditional HRM, Modern HRM, Digital HR, People Analytics, Industry 4.0

Received : 23, March
Revised : 25, April
Accepted: 27, May

A B S T R A C T

For more than three decades, human resource management (HRM) has evolved from an administrative function geared toward payroll, compliance, and record keeping into a strategic, evidence-based capability that shapes organizational performance and long-term competitiveness. This paper examines the differences between traditional and modern HRM, the field's development, and transformation mechanisms in the Digital/Industry 4.0 era. This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive approach. Core concepts include HRM logics, e-HRM/HRIS and people analytics, and Industry 4.0. We propose a four-dimension typology (value logic, operating model, data/technology, metrics/decision rights) and a staged pathway (digitalization → standardization → analytics → strategic partnering). Enablers are data governance, analytics capability, and HR–business partnership; a key risk is technology without process redesign. Implications guide organizations and policymakers on sequencing, ethics, and outcome-based metrics.

DOI prefik: https://doi.org/10.55927/jambak.v4i1.16413
ISSN-E: 2829-792X
https://journal.formosapublisher.org/index.php/jambak

INTRODUCTION

For more than three decades, human resource management (HRM) has evolved from an administrative function geared toward payroll, compliance, and record keeping into a strategic, evidence-based capability that shapes organizational performance and long-term competitiveness. The traditional model of HRM—hereafter "traditional HRM"—is typically characterized by transaction processing, rule enforcement, and a focus on headcount control and cost minimization. In contrast, "modern HRM" denotes a strategic orientation that aligns people practices with business goals, emphasizes capability building and employee experience, and leverages technology and analytics to inform decision-making and value creation (Ulrich, 1997; Delery & Doty, 1996; Boxall & Purcell, 2016). Despite this well-recognized trajectory, the literature and practice often treat the shift from traditional to modern HRM as a monolithic change, overlooking granular differences in assumptions, processes, metrics, and boundary conditions that shape how HRM transforms across sectors and institutional contexts.

The urgency to clarify these differences has intensified with globalization, the rise of knowledge-intensive work, and ongoing technological disruption. Organizations now compete on learning speed, innovation, and adaptability, which elevates the role of HRM in orchestrating talent ecosystems, reskilling, and fostering organizational agility (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2009). At the same time, digitalization has reconfigured HRM architectures through HR information systems (HRIS), employee self-service, e-recruitment, and people analytics, redefining both the scope and the delivery model of HR services (Parry & Tyson, 2011; Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016; Marler & Boudreau, 2017). In parallel, regulatory complexity, labor-market fragmentation, and cultural-institutional variation—especially in emerging economies and public-sector or state-owned entities—create uneven adoption paths and distinct tensions between compliance-driven traditions and innovation-oriented practices (Kaufman, 2014; Guest, 2011).

Conceptually, the distinction between traditional and modern HRM is more than a timeline; it reflects different theories of value. Traditional HRM rests on control, job-based work design, and standardized practices aimed at reliability and fairness. Modern HRM, by contrast, rests on alignment and differentiation: segmenting work and workforce by strategic importance, investing disproportionately in pivotal roles, and using data to tailor practices to context (Lepak & Snell, 1999; Schuler & Jackson, 1987). Where the former emphasizes headcount and cost, the latter emphasizes human and social capital, skill adjacencies, and dynamic capabilities. Where the former measures activities (e.g., time-to-hire, training hours), the latter interrogates outcomes (e.g., quality-of-hire, skills velocity, productivity per FTE, innovation throughput), often via analytics and experimentation.

Yet three gaps persist. First, definitional ambiguity remains: studies frequently conflate "strategic HRM," "high-performance work systems," "e-HRM," "HR analytics," and "modern HRM," blurring the boundary between ends (strategic contribution) and means (digital tools, analytics, agile routines). Second, the transformation pathway from traditional to modern HRM is under-specified: we know less about sequences (e.g., digitalization → standardization → analytics → strategic partnering), capability prerequisites (e.g., data governance, HR–business partnering skills), and failure modes (e.g., technology without process redesign). Third, the implications of Industry 4.0—automation, AI, platformization of work, and hybrid/remote arrangements—are unevenly theorized across institutional settings, with limited synthesis on how digital affordances reshape core HRM logics such as job design, performance management, and learning (Stone et al., 2015).

This study addresses these gaps by offering a structured comparative analysis of traditional versus modern HRM, tracing the field's development, explicating the transformation mechanisms, and situating HRM in the digital and Industry 4.0 era. Specifically, we (1) articulate clear definitional boundaries and operational indicators that differentiate traditional and modern HRM; (2) review and integrate the historical development of HRM into an accessible trajectory from administrative to strategic/evidence-based models; (3) theorize and examine transformation pathways—including enabling conditions, governance choices, and capability building—by which organizations transition from traditional to modern HRM; and (4) synthesize the implications of digitalization (e-HRM, HRIS, people analytics) and Industry 4.0 technologies (AI, automation, cyber-physical systems) for HRM design, delivery, and outcomes.

Our contributions are threefold. First, we propose a typology that distinguishes HRM logics across four dimensions—assumptions about value creation, operating model, data/technology use, and metrics/decision rights—thus clarifying what "modern" entails beyond technology adoption. Second, we advance a transformation framework that maps stages, capability enablers, and common pitfalls, offering a practicable lens for organizations, including public-sector and state-owned enterprises, to sequence change. Third, we integrate digital and Industry 4.0 considerations into this framework, specifying how AI-enabled analytics, skills intelligence, and platformized work arrangements interact with institutional constraints, thereby explaining heterogeneity in outcomes across contexts.

Guided by this agenda, the study addresses four research questions:

1. What conceptual and operational criteria robustly distinguish traditional HRM from modern HRM?
2. How has HRM developed from administrative origins to strategic, evidence-based practice, and what milestones mark this evolution?
3. Through what pathways and enabling capabilities do organizations transform from traditional to modern HRM, and what recurrent failure modes emerge?

4. How do digitalization and Industry 4.0 technologies reshape HRM assumptions, processes, and outcomes across different institutional environments?

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. We first define and contrast traditional and modern HRM and review the development of the field. We then present a transformation framework and propositions regarding enablers and barriers. Next, we examine the role of digitalization and Industry 4.0 in reconfiguring HRM design and delivery. We conclude with implications for theory and practice, highlighting directions for future research in diverse organizational and institutional settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human resource management (HRM) has evolved from administrative "personnel" functions toward a strategic, evidence-based discipline that links people practice to competitive advantage and employee well-being (Armstrong, 2021; Bratton et al., 2021; Dessler, 2020; Guest, 2011). Ulrich's (1997) role framework repositioned HR as strategic partner, employee champion, administrative expert, and change agent—an early articulation of "modern" HRM. Foundational strategic HRM (SHRM) theories explain how HR creates value: Schuler and Jackson (1987) align HR practices to competitive strategy; Delery and Doty (1996) distinguish universalistic, contingency, and configurational logics; and Lepak and Snell (1999) propose the HR architecture, matching employment modes to human capital value/uniqueness. Reviews by Lengnick-Hall et al. (2009) and Kaufman (2014) trace this conceptual evolution and persistent challenges in establishing robust HRM–performance causal links (see also Guest, 2011; Peccei et al., 2013).

Digitalization reframed HR's delivery and decision making. e-HRM research conceptualizes technology's goals (efficiency, service quality, transformation) and mechanisms (self-service, integration) while warning about gaps between desired and realized outcomes (Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016; Parry & Tyson, 2011; Stone et al., 2015). "People analytics" extends SHRM with data-driven inference for talent decisions, but impact depends on data governance, analytic capability, and organizational adoption rather than tools alone (Davenport & Harris, 2007; Marler & Boudreau, 2017; Bersin, 2019). In talent acquisition, AI introduces novel signals and scale, alongside ethical risks related to bias, transparency, and accountability (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2016; Hunkenschroer & Luetge, 2022; Levy, 2018; Papagelis, 2024).

Contextual shifts also shape HRM theory and practice. Changing workforce demographics require capability renewal and inclusion strategies (Verworn et al., 2009), while the gig economy challenges traditional employment architectures and raises equity concerns (Le Brocq et al., 2023). Industry 4.0 foregrounds continuous upskilling/reskilling and redesigned learning systems as strategic imperatives for modern, human-centric and data-driven HRM (Noe et al., 2020; Ruíz-Valdés et al., 2023; Stone et al., 2024). Collectively, these streams position modern HRM as contingent, digitally enabled, and outcome-oriented—

where value arises from coherent configurations of practices aligned to strategy, governed by ethics and evidence.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive design. Consistent with Ambert et al. (1995), our analysis privileges depth of understanding over breadth. Rather than seeking data to prove or disprove hypotheses (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003), we emphasize conceptual clarity (Bryman, 2008) and robust problem framing (Robson, 2011). Accordingly, we conduct interpretive reading, contextualization, and cross-text synthesis of prior works on traditional and modern HRM.

The empirical material comprises published scholarly texts peer-reviewed journal articles, reputable conference proceedings, and academic books addressing: (1) definitions and distinctions between traditional versus modern HRM; (2) the historical development of HRM; (3) transformation pathways; and (4) HRM in the digital and Industry 4.0 era. We employed purposive sampling to identify highly relevant sources and theoretical sampling as themes emerged, tracing citations to include additional texts that refined concepts or clarified boundary conditions.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Understanding the Differences Between Traditional and Modern HRM

Human resource management (HRM) is a core component of organizational management, aimed at optimizing employee performance to achieve strategic goals. Over time, HRM has shifted from a traditional, administrative orientation to a strategic, modern approach. Traditional HRM emphasizes mechanistic workforce management—employee record keeping, personnel administration, and compliance with labor regulations. Modern HRM, by contrast, adopts a more flexible, data-driven orientation, aligning policies with a dynamic business environment (Armstrong, 2021). A fundamental distinction lies in how people are viewed. Traditional HRM tends to treat employees as static assets whose primary role is to execute instructions efficiently; workforce policies are largely reactive, with action taken only when specific issues arise. Modern HRM positions employees as strategic partners in value creation. It emphasizes competency development, employee engagement, and innovation as sources of competitive advantage (Dessler, 2020).

Recruitment and selection also differ. Traditional HRM relies heavily on conventional methods, such as experience-based interviews and administrative screening processes that can be time-consuming and that often overlook cultural fit and long-term potential. Modern HRM incorporates digital technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI) for screening, video-based interviewing, and predictive analytics to assess potential using available data. In addition, employer branding has become central to attracting top talent (Noe et al., 2020). Performance management is another point of divergence. Traditional HRM typically uses annual evaluations with hierarchical, subjective assessments, which may fail to provide timely, actionable feedback. Modern HRM employs a data-driven approach and more dynamic systems such as key performance

indicators (KPIs) and objectives and key results (OKRs) supported by continuous, participatory feedback, coaching, and development (Yeung & Ulrich, 2019).

Training and development in traditional HRM often center on formal, classroom-based sessions delivered only when specific needs arise. Modern HRM adopts more flexible modalities—e-learning, gamification, and microlearning enabling continuous, self-directed skill building (Fattah et al., 2020). Upskilling and reskilling strategies are increasingly prioritized to respond to rapid technological and market change (Ruíz-Valdés et al., 2023). Employee well-being reflects a similar evolution. Traditional HRM focuses on financial compensation and basic benefits (salary, health insurance, annual leave), often neglecting psychological and emotional needs. Modern HRM advances a holistic well-being concept that includes work–life balance, flexible work, mental-health programs, and inclusive work environments—aligning with broader sustainability priorities (Stone et al., 2024).

Finally, modern HRM places greater emphasis on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Whereas traditional policies tend to be uniform and inattentive to individual differences, modern HRM seeks an inclusive climate where employees are valued and empowered based on their unique capabilities improving culture, productivity, and innovation (Bratton & Gold, 2017). In sum, traditional and modern HRM adopt markedly different logics. Traditional HRM is centered on administration and compliance; modern HRM is strategy-oriented, leveraging technology, innovation, and a human-centric stance. To remain competitive amid technological acceleration and evolving work patterns, organizations must adapt to flexible, inclusive, and data-driven HRM principles.

Human Resource Management Development

HRM continues to evolve alongside shifts in business dynamics, social change, and technological advancement. Once focused on administration (e.g., payroll and recruitment), HRM now plays a more strategic role—emphasizing talent management, skills development, and inclusive, productive work environments. This progression is driven by global trends and workplace paradigm shifts that require more flexible, innovative, and data-enabled workforce management.

Globalization has expanded business operations across borders, broadening recruitment beyond local labor markets. Organizations must navigate cultural differences, cross-border employment regulations, and increasingly diverse workforces. HRM therefore develops policies and systems that address global challenges, accommodate varied employee needs, and promote workplace inclusivity (Dessler, 2020). Digitalization has transformed workforce management. AI and analytics enable more efficient strategies—for instance, data-driven algorithms to identify best-fit candidates and predictive performance-evaluation systems. Industry analyses report widespread adoption of AI in recruitment and performance management, underscoring technology's growing role in HR (Deloitte, 2022).

Changing workforce demographics also shape HRM (Verworn et al., 2009). Millennials and Gen Z increasingly dominate labor markets, prioritizing work–life balance, flexibility, and growth opportunities. To retain high-potential talent, organizations implement flexible work arrangements, continuous development programs, and collaborative, open cultures (Robbins & Judge, 2021). The rise of the gig economy further influences HR strategies (Le Brocq et al., 2023). Reliance on freelancers and short-term contracts reshapes traditional structures and requires dynamic, project-based workforce management. Compensation and incentives must be designed for both permanent employees and contingent contributors (Armstrong & Taylor, 2021).

Together, globalization, digitalization, demographic shifts, and the gig economy are reshaping HRM. Concurrent paradigm shifts flexible work, employee well-being, and the centrality of diversity and inclusion demand rapid HR adaptation. To remain competitive, firms need dynamic, data-driven HR strategies oriented toward employee development and well-being.

The Transformation from Traditional to Modern HRM

Over recent decades, HRM has shifted from a transactional, administrative function to a proactive, strategic capability that creates organizational value. Traditional HRM focused on payroll, benefits, record keeping, and regulatory compliance (Dessler, 2020). Modern HRM positions HR as a strategic partner, grounding workforce decisions in data analysis, long-term planning, and alignment with business objectives (Ulrich & Dulebohn, 2015). A strategic approach enables organizations to respond more effectively to market dynamics and global competition. By deploying data-driven strategies and AI, firms can optimize talent management, strengthen engagement, and cultivate innovative cultures (Noe et al., 2020). The transition is thus not merely functional but a fundamental reframing of how organizations view and manage people.

Work models illustrate this shift. Traditional HRM often operates within hierarchical structures and rigid, office-bound schedules that can constrain flexibility, innovation, and skill development (Armstrong & Taylor, 2021). Modern HRM advances flexible, technology-enabled models supporting hybrid/remote work while maintaining productivity and collaboration. Digital technologies are pivotal. AI-enabled recruitment, human resource information systems (HRIS), and people analytics support more accurate and timely decisions (Stone et al., 2015). Hybrid and remote work practices broaden access to global talent and, when well managed, enhance efficiency (Brewster et al., 2020).

Successful transformation depends on effective change management and adaptive cultures. Digital-skills development, continuous learning, and innovation-supportive norms are essential. In this context, modern HRM functions not only as an administrative enabler but also as a change agent that advances growth through innovative, data-driven workforce strategies.

Human Resources in the Digital Era and Industry 4.0

Technological developments in the digital era and Industry 4.0 have reshaped HRM. Recruitment and selection have seen particularly rapid change. Where manual processes were time-consuming, AI and big data now underpin faster, more accurate screening and selection (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2016). AI can analyze large volumes of résumés, identify patterns aligned with role requirements, and help reduce subjective bias (Papagelis, 2024; Hunkenschroer & Lütge, 2022). Big data supports understanding of labor-market trends, more objective competency assessment, and better prediction of cultural fit based on behavioral indicators (Levy, 2018). These tools increase efficiency and improve the quality of hiring. Leading firms (e.g., Google, IBM) have used AI to assess competencies via digital-behavioral data and machine-learning-based cognitive testing (Sivathanu & Pillai, 2018), illustrating how data-driven methods can improve access to top talent.

Beyond hiring, technology and analytics play critical roles in performance evaluation. Traditional appraisals often rely on supervisor judgments that may not capture actual performance. Digital systems enable objective, granular assessments (Marler & Boudreau, 2017). By integrating data from project systems, performance platforms, and peer/customer feedback, organizations can identify productivity trends, evaluate training effectiveness, and track engagement (Bersin, 2019). For example, big-data analytics have been used to understand work patterns, optimize task allocation, and support well-being through personalized recommendations (Davenport & Harris, 2007). Greater use of data allows organizations to diagnose issues earlier, provide constructive feedback, and design targeted development pathways. Accordingly, technology integration in HR not only yields operational efficiency but also supports more innovative, outcome-oriented work environments.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study confirms that the differences between traditional and modern HRM are paradigmatic. The former is administratively oriented—emphasizing compliance, standardization, and transaction efficiency—whereas the latter is strategic, human-centric, and data-driven, aligning HR practices with business objectives, organizational capabilities, and employee experience. The evolution toward modern HRM is propelled by globalization, digitalization, shifting workforce demographics, and the gig economy, which together demand policy flexibility, inclusivity, and cross-border talent management. Transformation is not synonymous with technology adoption; the benefits of e-HRM, HRIS, AI, and analytics materialize only when accompanied by end-to-end process redesign, robust data governance, enhanced analytical capabilities, and strong HR–business partnerships. In performance and development, modern HRM shifts from hierarchical, annual appraisals to continuous feedback, outcome-based OKRs/KPIs, and agile learning (e-learning, microlearning, upskilling/reskilling). Concurrently, holistic well-being and a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) agenda are central to sustaining engagement, productivity, and innovation. Because impacts vary across sectors and institutions—including state-owned

enterprises owing to differences in regulation, culture, and digital readiness, a contingency approach is essential.

Practitioners and organizational leaders should establish a sequential 12–24-month transformation roadmap, baseline digitalization, process standardization, analytics strengthening, and strategic partnering—while building data governance and AI ethics (privacy, transparency, bias audits), strengthening data literacy among HR and line managers, and redesigning hire-to-retire processes before automating them via integrated ATS, onboarding, LMS, performance, and payroll systems. Use outcome-oriented metrics (quality of hire, skills velocity, productivity per FTE, engagement, internal mobility) rather than activity counts, and implement modern performance management grounded in regular check-ins and coaching. Develop differentiated talent strategies, sustainable upskilling/reskilling programs, flexible/hybrid work policies, and measurable well-being and DEI initiatives.

At the ecosystem level, governments and professional associations should prepare national guidelines for AI and HR-data ethics, incentivize digital HR adoption (particularly for MSMEs and SOEs), and update curricula/certifications to include people analytics, data ethics, and DEI practices. To strengthen the evidence base, future studies should be longitudinal and comparative across sectors and Indonesian contexts—estimating the ROI of digital HR transformation, evaluating the effectiveness of OKRs versus KPIs, examining the governance and ethical implications of HR analytics, and assessing the impact of hybrid and gig work on equity, careers, and engagement. Implementation should be tailored to digital readiness, industry characteristics, and the applicable regulatory framework.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

Index development and validation. Future work should empirically validate the distinction between traditional and modern HRM by developing an "HRM Modernity Index" (e.g., four dimensions: value logic, operating model, data/technology, metrics & decision rights). The scale can be developed using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (EFA/CFA), tested across industries and organizational types (private and public/state-owned enterprises), and examined for cross-cultural invariance to ensure reliability and construct validity. A key question: to what extent does this index predict employee outcomes (productivity, innovation) and well-being?

Transformation pathways. Longitudinal research should analyze the pathway from traditional to modern HRM. Quasi-experimental designs (e.g., staggered HRIS/OKR rollouts) or difference-in-differences can test the sequence (digitalization → standardization → analytics → strategic partnering), the role of enablers (data governance, analytical capability, leadership sponsorship), and moderators (regulation, unions, technology intensity). Multi-case comparative studies at varying maturity levels can surface failure modes and replicable practices.

AI/analytics effectiveness and ethics. In-depth studies should evaluate the accuracy, adverse impact, and transparency of AI-enabled recruitment and performance appraisal through algorithmic audits, and propose governance frameworks (privacy, consent, explainability) suited to Indonesian and SOE contexts. A key question: how do leaders' data-governance quality and analytical literacy mediate AI's effects on decision quality and organizational fairness?

Evolving work patterns. Hybrid, remote, and gig-work arrangements require mixed-methods research (large-scale surveys plus in-depth interviews) to examine implications for engagement, careers, and well-being. Focus on how flexibility, skills-based work design, and DEI policies affect retention, collaboration, and team performance, with attention to sectoral (e.g., education, manufacturing, public services) and regional differences (e.g., Aceh vs. large metropolitan areas).

Measuring ROI of digital HR. Business-case studies using people analytics should link quality of hire, skills velocity, internal mobility, and employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) to business metrics (revenue per FTE, innovation lead time, and public-service outcomes in the public sector). Field experiments (A/B testing of performance/learning policies) or fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) can identify effective practice configurations across contexts.

Replication and comparative national studies. Comparative studies should span state-owned enterprises (BUMN) and non-state-owned/private enterprises (BUMS), districts/cities, and MSMEs to generate precise policy guidance. Examples of operational RQs: (a) Does the HR modernity index mediate the effect of data governance on productivity? (b) Does OKR adoption improve team performance via increased coaching and feedback frequency? (c) How does hybrid work affect equal career opportunities for vulnerable groups, and does DEI moderate this relationship?

REFERENCES

Akhter, M., Siddique, M. N. E., & Alam, A. (2013). HRM practices and its impact on employee performance: A study of the cement industry in Bangladesh. Global Disclosure of Economics and Business, 2(2), 125.

Ambert, A., Adler, P. A., Adler, P., & Detzner, D. F. (1995). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57(4), 879–893.

Armstrong, M. (2021). Armstrong's handbook of learning and development: A guide to the theory and practice of L&D. Kogan Page.

Bersin, J. (2019). HR technology market 2019: Disruption ahead. Deloitte Insights.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. N. (2003). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods. Pearson.

Bondarouk, T., & Brewster, C. (2016). Conceptualizing e-HRM.

Bratton, J., Gold, J., Bratton, A., & Steele, L. (2021). Human resource management. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bryman, A. (2008). Social research methods. Oxford University Press.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Winsborough, D., Sherman, R. A., & Hogan, R. (2016). New talent signals: Shiny new objects or a brave new world? Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 9(3), 621–640.

Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). Competing on analytics: The new science of winning. Harvard Business Review Press.

Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in SHRM.

Dessler, G. (2020). Fundamentals of human resource management. Pearson.

Fattaah, P. M. A., Haak-Saheem, W., Brewster, C., & Darwish, T. K. (2020). International human resource management. In Human resource management in an emerging South Asian economy (pp. 37–51). Routledge.

Guest, D. (2011). Human resource management and performance: Still searching for some answers.

Hunkenschroer, A. L., & Luetge, C. (2022). Ethics of AI-enabled recruiting and selection: A review and research agenda. Journal of Business Ethics, 178(4), 977–1007.

Kaufman, B. (2014). The evolving concept of strategic HRM.

Le Brocq, S., Hughes, E., & Donnelly, R. (2023). Sharing in the gig economy: From equitable work relations to exploitative HRM. Personnel Review, 52(3), 454–469.

Lengnick-Hall, M. L., Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Andrade, L. S., & Drake, B. (2009). SHRM: The evolution of the field.

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture.

Levy, F. (2018). Artificial intelligence, big data and the future of hiring. MIT Sloan Management Review, 60(1), 37–45.

Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28(1), 3–26.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2020). Fundamentals of human resource management. McGraw-Hill.

Papagelis, S. (2024). Exploring the impact of the algorithms on management hiring decision and bias. Temple University.

Parry, E., & Tyson, S. (2011). Desired goals and actual outcomes of e-HRM.

Peccei, R., Van de Voorde, K., Van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M., Paauwe, J., Guest, D., & Wright, P. (2013). HRM and performance: Achievements and challenges. In HRM, well-being and performance: A theoretical and empirical review (pp. 15–45).

Pryor, M. G., White, J. C., & Toombs, L. A. (1998). SQM: Strategic quality management: A strategic systems approach to continuous improvement. DAME Publications.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). [Publisher not provided].

Robson, C. (2011). Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings. Blackwell Publishing.

Ruíz-Valdés, S., Ruíz-Tapia, J. A., & Gómez-Chagoya, M. C. (2023). Trends and challenges in the upskilling and reskilling of the workforce in the 21st century… Journal of Human Resources, 9(24), 13–20.

Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with HRM practices.

Sivathanu, B., & Pillai, R. (2018). Smart HR 4.0 – How Industry 4.0 is disrupting HR. Human Resource Management International Digest, 26(4), 7–11.

Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 25(2), 216–231.

Stone, R. J., Cox, A., Gavin, M., & Carpini, J. (2024). Human resource management. John Wiley & Sons.

Ulrich, D. (1997). Human resource champions. Harvard Business School Press.

Ulrich, D., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2015). Are we there yet? What's next for HR? Human Resource Management Review, 25(2), 188–204.

Verworn, B., Schwarz, D., & Herstatt, C. (2009). Changing workforce demographics: Strategies derived from the resource-based view of HRM. International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 9(2–3), 149–161.