

The Impact of Algorithmic Management in Digital HRM on Employee Well-Being and Job Embeddedness: The Role of Organizational Justice

Andi Nu Graha^{1*}, Ilzar Daud², Ahmad Shalahuddin³

¹Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang, Malang, Indonesia

²Management Department Faculty of Economic and Business, Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia

³Manajemen/ FEB Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Bogor, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of algorithmic management in Digital HRM on employee well-being and job embeddedness, as well as to examine the moderating role of perceived organizational justice. This research employed an explanatory quantitative approach involving 100 employees in Malang City who worked in organizations that had implemented Digital HRM and experienced algorithmic management practices. Data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed through SEM-PLS using SmartPLS. The findings reveal that algorithmic management has a negative and significant effect on employee well-being and job embeddedness, while perceived organizational justice positively affects both variables. Furthermore, perceived organizational justice moderates the relationship between algorithmic management and employee well-being and job embeddedness, indicating that fairness perceptions can reduce the negative consequences of algorithm-based management systems. The implication of this study emphasizes that organizations need to develop transparent, fair, accountable, and human-centered Digital HRM governance so that technological efficiency remains aligned with employee well-being, trust, and organizational attachment.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Algorithmic Management; Digital HRM; Employee Well-Being; Job Embeddedness; Organizational Justice.

Article Information:

Received: 27/06/2026

Revise: 11/08/2026

Accepted: 11/08/2026

ISSN:

2985-3168 (Online)

2985-3222 (Print)

*Corresponding Author at: Andi Nu Graha

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang

E-mail address: andi_nu@unikama.ac.id

The work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International \(CC BY-SA 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



1. Introduction

Employee well-being is a central construct in digital human resource management because employee welfare is no longer understood merely as an individual psychological condition, but also as an outcome of work design, technological relations, and organizational governance that shape daily work experiences (Parker & Grote, 2022; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022). In the context of digital HRM, employee well-being includes affective, cognitive, social, and work-related dimensions that are influenced by monitoring intensity, work autonomy, cognitive demands, and employees' perceptions of data-driven decision systems (Kniffin et al., 2021; Budhwar et al., 2022). Recent literature indicates that digital technologies can improve work efficiency, decision-making speed, and the personalization of HRM practices, but they may also generate psychological strain when employees feel excessively controlled or do not understand the basis of algorithmic decisions (Vrontis et al., 2022; Brougham & Haar, 2020). Employee well-being is increasingly relevant because low levels of well-being may weaken motivation, attachment, and the sustainability of employment relationships, especially when digital systems are used to regulate performance, schedules, evaluations, and employee incentives (Gagné et al., 2022; Parker & Grote, 2022). Therefore, the discussion of employee well-being should be extended to the growing phenomenon of algorithmic management in digital HRM across contemporary organizations (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022).

The main phenomenon underlying this study is the increasing use of algorithmic management in digital HRM, namely the use of algorithms, data analytics, artificial intelligence, and automated systems to direct, evaluate, provide feedback, and control employee work behavior (Kellogg et al., 2020; Meijerink & Bondarouk, 2021). The implementation of such systems has expanded not only within digital labor platforms but also in conventional organizations that use HR analytics, automated scheduling systems, performance monitoring tools, and data-based evaluation systems to support managerial decisions (Budhwar et al., 2022; Vrontis et al., 2022). The urgency of this study arises from the ambivalent nature of algorithmic management, which may increase objectivity, consistency, and efficiency on the one hand, while on the other hand creating feelings of surveillance, loss of autonomy, uncertainty, and concerns about algorithmic bias (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021; Brougham & Haar, 2020). A research gap is also evident because prior studies have largely emphasized productivity and technological efficiency, whereas the effects of algorithmic management on employee well-being and job embeddedness remain insufficiently explained through the perspective of organizational justice (Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022; Parker & Grote, 2022). Accordingly, this study is important for understanding how algorithmic management affects employees' psychological and relational outcomes, particularly when perceived organizational justice strengthens or weakens these effects (Kellogg et al., 2020; Rupp et al., 2021).

Algorithmic management as the independent variable refers to algorithm-based management systems that perform functions such as work coordination, behavioral monitoring, performance evaluation, task allocation, and decision-making in either automated or semi-automated ways (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022). In digital HRM, algorithmic management may transform employment relations because decisions that were previously made by human managers are increasingly mediated by digital systems that use employee data as the basis for analysis and managerial recommendations (Meijerink & Bondarouk, 2021; Budhwar et al., 2022). Such systems may provide benefits through

procedural standardization, reduction of managerial subjectivity, and faster organizational responses to changing work dynamics, especially when algorithms are designed transparently and accountably (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021; Vrontis et al., 2022). However, algorithmic management may also create pressure because employees often do not know how their data are collected, how performance indicators are calculated, or how automated decisions influence their work opportunities and evaluations (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022). This algorithmic opacity may reduce employees' sense of control, weaken autonomy, and intensify psychological work demands (Parker & Grote, 2022; Brougham & Haar, 2020). Thus, the relationship between algorithmic management, employee well-being, and job embeddedness should be understood not merely as a technological issue, but also as an issue of work design, trust, and organizational justice (Rupp et al., 2021; Gagné et al., 2022).

Job embeddedness, as the second dependent variable, explains the extent to which employees feel embedded in their jobs through social links, value fit, and the perceived sacrifices associated with leaving the organization (Coetzer et al., 2021; Peltokorpi et al., 2022). In digital organizational contexts, job embeddedness is important because employees' decisions to remain in an organization are influenced not only by job satisfaction, but also by their experiences with the systems, structures, and work relationships that shape their sense of belonging to the organization (Karatepe et al., 2020; Coetzer et al., 2021). Algorithmic management may strengthen job embeddedness when digital systems help employees understand work expectations, obtain consistent feedback, and perceive alignment between their contributions and organizational goals (Budhwar et al., 2022; Vrontis et al., 2022). Conversely, algorithmic management may weaken job embeddedness when employees feel treated as data objects, experience reduced interpersonal relationships with supervisors, or are exposed to non-transparent performance evaluations (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022). These conditions indicate that job embeddedness is closely related to the quality of digital work experiences, as employees' attachment to the organization is formed through a combination of psychological, social, and structural factors (Parker & Grote, 2022; Coetzer et al., 2021). Therefore, the discussion of job embeddedness should be connected to perceived organizational justice as a contextual mechanism that determines whether algorithmic systems are perceived as supportive or threatening to employees' relationships with the organization (Rupp et al., 2021; Colquitt et al., 2023).

Perceived organizational justice as the moderating variable explains employees' perceptions of the extent to which organizational decisions, procedures, outcome distributions, and interpersonal treatment are considered fair (Rupp et al., 2021; Colquitt et al., 2023). In the context of algorithmic management, organizational justice is highly important because employees evaluate not only the outcomes of algorithmic decisions, but also process transparency, data accuracy, opportunities to voice objections, and the quality of explanations provided by the organization (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rochelleau & Parker, 2022). Perceived organizational justice may weaken the negative effect of algorithmic management on employee well-being when employees believe that digital systems are used proportionally, procedurally, and without discrimination (Rupp et al., 2021; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Conversely, low perceived justice may intensify psychological pressure because employees perceive algorithmic decisions as unilateral, non-negotiable, and insufficiently attentive to the human context of work (Brougham & Haar, 2020; Parker & Grote, 2022). Perceived organizational justice may also strengthen job embeddedness because employees who perceive their organization as fair are more likely to maintain employment relationships,

develop trust, and view the organization as a workplace worth staying in (Colquitt et al., 2023; Coetzer et al., 2021). Therefore, perceived organizational justice is positioned as a moderator because justice may serve as a boundary condition that determines whether algorithmic management produces digital work experiences that support or undermine employee attachment (Rupp et al., 2021; Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2022).

The development of Digital HRM has encouraged organizations to adopt algorithmic management to monitor employee performance, assign tasks, evaluate productivity, schedule work, and support decisions related to compensation and employee development. Previous studies indicate that algorithms can improve efficiency, consistency, and objectivity in HRM decisions. However, algorithmic systems also create new challenges related to work control, transparency, bias, autonomy, and employees' psychological experiences (Kellogg et al., 2020; Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2022). In this context, algorithmic management is no longer merely a technical tool, but also a managerial mechanism that shapes the power relationship between organizations and employees. Several studies have highlighted that the use of algorithms in HRM may generate ambiguity, work pressure, excessive surveillance, and perceived dehumanization when decisions affecting employees are made without sufficient explanation or human interaction (Duggan et al., 2020; Bankins et al., 2022). On the other hand, research on AI and HRM also suggests that algorithmic systems may support more meaningful work when they are designed ethically, transparently, and with consideration for human dignity (Bankins & Formosa, 2023). However, most previous studies have mainly focused on the consequences of algorithmic management for productivity, work control, job satisfaction, or turnover intention. Research that specifically examines the relationship between algorithmic management, employee well-being, and job embeddedness simultaneously remains limited. This is important because employee well-being reflects the psychological impact of Digital HRM, while job embeddedness explains why employees remain in an organization through the dimensions of fit, links, and sacrifice (Mitchell et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2014). Existing literature also shows that algorithmic management has a dual nature: it can create efficiency and value, but it can also restrict autonomy and reduce employees' perceived value of work when it is not managed fairly (Meijerink & Bondarouk, 2023).

Previous studies have provided important insights into the efficiency and risks of algorithmic management; however, the theoretical explanation of how algorithmic systems reshape employee experiences remains insufficiently developed. This study addresses this gap by primarily extending work design theory, arguing that algorithmic management represents a new form of digital work design that alters employee autonomy, monitoring intensity, feedback processes, and perceived control (Parker et al., 2017). In addition, organizational justice theory is incorporated as a boundary condition explaining why employees may interpret the same algorithmic system differently depending on transparency, procedural fairness, informational adequacy, and opportunities for employee voice (Colquitt, 2001). Thus, the contribution of this study is not merely the integration of digital HRM constructs, but the explanation of how algorithmic work design influences employee well-being and job embeddedness through fairness perceptions.

Based on this theoretical perspective, this study develops a model that positions algorithmic management as a digital work design mechanism, employee well-being and job embeddedness as employee outcomes, and perceived organizational justice as a contextual mechanism that determines whether algorithmic systems are experienced as supportive or

controlling (Kellogg et al., 2020). This approach provides a more specific theoretical contribution by connecting digital HRM transformation with established explanations of autonomy, control, fairness, and organizational attachment.

2. Methodology

This study uses a quantitative explanatory approach to examine the associations among algorithmic management, employee well-being, job embeddedness, and perceived organizational justice in the Digital HRM context. The research was conducted among 100 employees in Malang City who fulfilled the inclusion criteria: (1) currently working in an organization that has implemented Digital HRM applications, (2) having direct exposure to algorithmic management practices for at least three months, and (3) experiencing algorithm-based processes such as digital performance monitoring, automated scheduling, target setting, performance evaluation, or HR decision-support recommendations.

The respondents were recruited from organizations across several business sectors, including services, retail, education, and technology-related workplaces, to capture variation in algorithmic HRM experiences. Participation was voluntary; respondents received information regarding the research purpose, confidentiality protection, and the use of aggregated data only. To reduce common method bias, procedural remedies were applied through anonymous responses, separation of measurement sections, and neutral questionnaire wording. Statistical assessment of common method bias was conducted using full collinearity VIF testing before structural model interpretation (Kock, 2015). Although PLS-SEM is appropriate for predictive models with moderate sample sizes, the adequacy of the sample was evaluated through statistical power considerations in addition to the 10-times rule (Hair et al., 2021).

The variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale. Algorithmic management was assessed through algorithmic monitoring, goal setting, scheduling, performance evaluation, and compensation-related decisions. Employee well-being was measured through psychological condition, work comfort, stress perception, motivation, and satisfaction. Job embeddedness was measured through links, fit, and sacrifice dimensions. Organizational justice included distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice, as transparency and explanation are essential in algorithmic decision environments (Colquitt, 2001). Data analysis was conducted using SmartPLS with assessment of outer loadings, convergent validity (AVE), composite reliability, discriminant validity using HTMT criteria structural collinearity (VIF), effect size (f^2), coefficient of determination (R^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), and bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples (Hair et al., 2021).

3. Result and Discussion

Result

Before examining the relationships among variables, this study first describes the general condition of each research variable based on responses from 100 employees. Descriptive statistics were used to identify respondents' perceptions of algorithmic management, employee well-being, job embeddedness, and perceived organizational justice. The mean score indicates the general tendency of respondents' answers, while the standard deviation shows the variation of responses across respondents. Overall, all variables are categorized as high. This indicates that respondents have experienced algorithm-based management practices in

Digital HRM, while still reporting relatively high levels of well-being, job embeddedness, and perceived organizational justice.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Category
Algorithmic Management	3.74	0.61	High
Employee Well-being	3.58	0.66	High
Job Embeddedness	3.69	0.59	High
Perceived Organizational Justice	3.81	0.57	High

Based on Table 1, perceived organizational justice has the highest mean score, namely 3.81. This finding indicates that respondents generally perceive their organization as fair in applying procedures, distributing outcomes, and treating employees in a digital work environment. Algorithmic management has a mean score of 3.74, suggesting that algorithm based systems are considerably used in monitoring, scheduling, target setting, and performance evaluation. Job embeddedness obtains a mean score of 3.69, indicating that employees still feel attached to the organization through social links, value fit, and perceived sacrifices associated with leaving the organization. Meanwhile, employee well-being has the lowest mean score, namely 3.58. Although it remains in the high category, this result indicates that employee well-being is relatively more vulnerable in the implementation of algorithmic management.

After describing the general condition of the variables, the next step was to assess the quality of the research instrument through validity and reliability testing. This test is important because SEM-PLS analysis can only be conducted properly when the indicators are able to measure the research constructs consistently. In this study, validity was assessed using loading factor and Average Variance Extracted, while reliability was assessed using composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha. The instrument is considered acceptable when the loading factor is above 0.70, AVE is above 0.50, and both composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha are above 0.70.

Table 2. Construct Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variable	Lowest Loading Factor	AVE	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Algorithmic Management	0.721	0.612	0.887	0.842	Valid and reliable
Employee Well-being	0.736	0.634	0.896	0.856	Valid and reliable
Job Embeddedness	0.704	0.598	0.881	0.831	Valid and reliable
Perceived Organizational Justice	0.748	0.657	0.905	0.872	Valid and reliable

Based on Table 2, all variables have lowest loading factor values above 0.70. This indicates that each indicator has adequate ability to represent its construct. The AVE values of all variables are also above 0.50, indicating that each construct meets the requirement of convergent validity. In terms of reliability, all composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values are above 0.70. Therefore, the instruments used to measure algorithmic management,

employee well-being, job embeddedness, and perceived organizational justice can be considered valid and reliable. These results indicate that the data are appropriate for structural model testing.

The main stage of this study was to examine the relationships among variables using SEM PLS analysis. This test was conducted to determine whether algorithmic management influences employee well-being and job embeddedness, and whether perceived organizational justice plays a moderating role in these relationships. The relationships among variables were evaluated based on path coefficient, t-statistic, and p-value. A relationship is considered significant when the t-statistic is greater than 1.96 and the p-value is less than 0.05. A negative coefficient indicates an inverse relationship, while a positive coefficient indicates a direct relationship.

Table 3. SEM-PLS Hypothesis Testing Results

Relationship Between Variables	Path Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value	Description
Algorithmic Management → Employee Well-being	-0.318	3.214	0.001	Significant negative effect
Algorithmic Management → Job Embeddedness	-0.276	2.847	0.004	Significant negative effect
Perceived Organizational Justice → Employee Well-being	0.462	5.781	0.000	Significant positive effect
Perceived Organizational Justice → Job Embeddedness	0.498	6.104	0.000	Significant positive effect
Algorithmic Management × Perceived Organizational Justice → Employee Well-being	0.219	2.436	0.015	Significant moderation effect
Algorithmic Management × Perceived Organizational Justice → Job Embeddedness	0.241	2.689	0.007	Significant moderation effect

Based on Table 3, algorithmic management has a negative and significant effect on employee well-being. The path coefficient of -0.318 indicates that the higher the intensity of algorithmic management, the lower the level of employee well-being. This finding suggests that algorithm-based management systems may create psychological pressure when employees feel excessively monitored, have limited autonomy, or do not understand the basis of digital decisions. Algorithmic management also has a negative effect on job embeddedness, with a coefficient of -0.276. This means that the stronger the implementation of algorithmic systems in managing employees, the lower the employees' attachment to the organization. Excessive reliance on algorithmic systems may reduce interpersonal relationships, create perceptions of dehumanization, and make work decisions feel overly mechanical.

The results also show that perceived organizational justice has a positive effect on both employee well-being and job embeddedness. Employees who perceive their organization as fair tend to experience higher well-being and stronger organizational attachment. In addition, perceived organizational justice is proven to moderate the relationship between algorithmic

management and both employee outcomes. The positive interaction coefficients indicate that organizational justice can reduce the negative effects of algorithmic management. In other words, algorithmic management does not necessarily produce harmful outcomes when organizations implement it transparently, accountably, fairly, and with sufficient opportunities for explanation and employee voice.

To evaluate the explanatory and predictive power of the research model, R-Square and Q-Square values were used. R-Square indicates the ability of the independent and moderating variables to explain the variation in the dependent variables. Meanwhile, Q-Square indicates the predictive relevance of the model. The higher the R-Square and Q-Square values, the stronger the model's ability to explain and predict the endogenous variables. In this study, employee well-being and job embeddedness are the endogenous variables explained by algorithmic management, perceived organizational justice, and their interaction.

Table 4. R-Square and Q-Square Values

Endogenous Variable	R-Square	Q-Square	Interpretation
Employee Well-being	0.584	0.391	Moderate-strong and predictive model
Job Embeddedness	0.627	0.418	Moderate-strong and predictive model

Based on Table 4, the R-Square value for employee well-being is 0.584. This means that 58.4% of the variation in employee well-being can be explained by algorithmic management, perceived organizational justice, and their interaction, while the remaining 41.6% is explained by other variables outside the model. The R-Square value for job embeddedness is 0.627, indicating that 62.7% of the variation in job embeddedness can be explained by the research model, while the remaining 37.3% is influenced by other factors. The Q-Square values of 0.391 for employee well-being and 0.418 for job embeddedness indicate that the model has good predictive relevance. Therefore, the research model is sufficiently strong in explaining the impact of algorithmic management on employee well-being and job embeddedness in the context of Digital HRM.

Discussion

The results indicate that algorithmic management negatively affects employee well-being. This finding suggests that algorithm-based management systems may reduce employee well-being when they are implemented intensively without adequate transparency. In the context of Digital HRM, algorithmic management is commonly used to monitor performance, arrange schedules, set targets, evaluate productivity, and support human resource decisions. Although such systems may improve organizational efficiency, employees may experience psychological pressure when they feel that their work is excessively controlled by digital systems. This condition may reduce autonomy, increase anxiety, and create the perception that work-related decisions no longer consider human context. This finding is consistent with Kellogg et al. (2020), who argue that algorithms at work may function as a new mechanism of organizational control that changes power relations between organizations and employees. Parent-Rocheleau and Parker (2022) also emphasize that algorithmic management can influence work design through its effects on autonomy, job demands, feedback, and monitoring intensity.

Algorithmic management is also found to have a negative effect on job embeddedness. This means that the stronger the use of algorithmic systems in managing employees, the weaker the employees' attachment to the organization. Job embeddedness reflects the extent

to which employees feel connected to the organization through social links, value fit, and perceived sacrifices associated with leaving the job. When digital systems replace too many human managerial functions, employees may perceive work relationships as less personal. Performance evaluation based entirely on data, automated scheduling, and algorithmic target setting may make employees feel less valued as individuals. As a result, their social and psychological attachment to the organization may weaken. This finding supports Coetzer et al. (2021), who explain that job embeddedness is shaped by social relationships, value compatibility, and work conditions that encourage employees to remain in the organization. In the Digital HRM context, these work conditions are shaped not only by human actors but also by the technologies used by the organization.

The next finding shows that perceived organizational justice positively affects employee well-being and job embeddedness. This means that organizational justice plays an important role in maintaining employees' psychological condition and organizational attachment. Employees who feel that they are treated fairly are more likely to accept organizational decisions, including decisions involving digital systems. In the context of algorithmic management, organizational justice is important because employees do not only evaluate the outcomes of decisions but also assess how such decisions are made. If algorithms are used transparently, consistently, without bias, and with adequate explanation, employees are more likely to trust the organization. This trust can enhance well-being and strengthen employees' reasons to remain in the organization. This finding is in line with Colquitt et al. (2023), who state that organizational justice is closely related to employee attitudes, emotions, and behaviors. Therefore, organizational justice becomes a critical foundation for the successful implementation of Digital HRM.

Perceived organizational justice is also proven to moderate the relationship between algorithmic management and both employee well-being and job embeddedness. The positive moderation coefficients indicate that organizational justice can weaken the negative effects of algorithmic management. This finding is important because it shows that the main issue in algorithmic management implementation is not merely the technology itself, but how the organization manages, explains, and supervises the use of that technology. When organizations provide transparency, correction mechanisms, data protection, and opportunities for employees to express concerns, algorithmic systems are more likely to be accepted positively. Conversely, when algorithmic systems are implemented in a closed and unilateral manner, employees are more likely to experience pressure, distrust, and alienation from the organization. Therefore, the practical implication of this study is that organizations need to develop fair, accountable, and human-centered algorithmic management governance. Digital HRM systems should not only be designed to improve efficiency but also to protect employee well-being, trust, and organizational attachment.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that algorithmic management in Digital HRM is significantly associated with employee well-being and job embeddedness outcomes. The findings indicate that intensive algorithmic management practices may be related to lower employee well-being and organizational attachment when employees perceive limited autonomy, insufficient transparency, and weak human involvement. However, perceived organizational justice functions as an important contextual mechanism that can reduce these negative associations

through fair procedures, transparent explanations, employee voice, and accountable digital governance. Because this study uses cross-sectional survey data, the findings should be interpreted as empirical associations rather than definitive causal effects. Future research should apply longitudinal or experimental designs to examine how algorithmic management develops over time.

References

- Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2020). Technological disruption and employment: The influence on job insecurity and turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 108, 464–475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.004>
- Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M. T. T., & Thevisuthan, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence: Challenges and opportunities for international HRM. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1065–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2035161>
- Coetzer, M. F., Inma, C., Poisat, P., Redmond, J., & Standing, C. (2021). Does job embeddedness predict turnover intentions in SMEs? *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 70(2), 340–361. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2019-0108>
- Colquitt, J. A., Zipay, K. P., Lynch, J. W., & Outlaw, R. (2023). Bringing “the beaker” back in: Taking stock of organizational justice research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 337–364. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-050306>
- Gagné, M., Parker, S. K., Griffin, M. A., Dunlop, P. D., Knight, C., Klonek, F. E., & Parent-Rocheleau, X. (2022). Understanding and shaping the future of work with self-determination theory. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, 378–392. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00056-w>
- Karatepe, O. M., Rezapouraghdam, H., & Hassannia, R. (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees’ non-green and nonattendance behaviors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102472>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(2), 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219867020>
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Keesbir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., ... Vugt, M. van. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716>
- Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2021). The duality of algorithmic management: Toward a research agenda on HRM algorithms, autonomy and value creation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(4), 100735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100735>
- Parent-Rocheleau, X., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Algorithms as work designers: How algorithmic management influences the design of jobs. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100838>
- Parker, S. K., & Grote, G. (2022). Automation, algorithms, and beyond: Why work design matters more than ever in a digital world. *Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 1171–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12241>

- Peltokorpi, V., Allen, D. G., & Froese, F. J. (2022). Organizational embeddedness, turnover intentions, and voluntary turnover: The moderating effects of employee demographic characteristics and value orientations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(7), 1097–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2636>
- Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>
- Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2021). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 163, 43–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.12.011>
- Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Pereira, V., Tarba, S., Makrides, A., & Trichina, E. (2022). Artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies and human resource management: A systematic review. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1237–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1871398>
- Fuchs, R. M. (2021). Links, fit or sacrifice: Job embeddedness and intention to quit among Generation Y. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 31(2), 160–175.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Kinowska, H., & Sienkiewicz, Ł. J. (2023). Influence of algorithmic management practices on workplace well-being: Evidence from European organisations. *Information Technology & People*, 36(8), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-02-2022-0079>
- Parent-Rocheleau, X., Parker, S. K., Bujold, A., & Gaudet, M.-C. (2024). Creation of the algorithmic management questionnaire: A six-phase scale development process. *Human Resource Management*, 63(1), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22185>
- Pattnaik, S., & Tripathy, S. K. (2023). The effect of organizational justice on employee performance in the Indian Public Sector Units: The role of organizational identification. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30(8), 2583–2607. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-08-2021-0508>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new frontiers of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–403. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Parker, S. K., Morgeson, F. P., & Johns, G. (2017). One hundred years of work design research: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 403–420. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000106>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.