Volume 8 Issue 2 (2025) Pages 1153 - 1164
YUME : Journal of Management
ISSN : 2614-851X (Online)

AI-Powered Performance Appraisal: Balancing Automation with Human Judgment in Performance Management Systems

Taryana Taryana ✉
Politeknik Penerbangan Indonesia Curug

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into performance appraisal systems is transforming how organizations assess and manage employee performance. This study presents a literature-based review exploring the dynamic interplay between AI-driven automation and human judgment in performance management. Five key themes emerge from the review: efficiency and standardization, bias and fairness, human oversight and trust, ethical and psychological impacts, and the need for human-AI collaboration. Through real-world cases, including examples from Indonesian companies such as Gojek and Tokopedia, the study illustrates both the benefits and limitations of AI applications in appraisal systems. The findings highlight the importance of maintaining human involvement in decision-making to ensure fairness, contextual understanding, and ethical accountability. The paper concludes with recommendations for hybrid models that combine algorithmic insights with managerial discretion, advocating for transparent, fair, and adaptive systems of performance evaluation.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI); Performance Appraisal; Evaluation; HR Technology.*

✉ Corresponding author :
Email Address : taryana@ppicurug.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In today's fast-paced workplaces, organizations are under constant pressure to evaluate employee performance efficiently, fairly, and transparently. Traditionally, performance appraisals have relied heavily on human judgment—which brings valuable context and empathy, but also the risk of subjectivity and bias (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). With the rise of digital transformation, artificial intelligence (AI) has entered the picture, promising more consistent, data-driven, and scalable evaluation methods (Jatobá et al., 2021).

AI tools are now being used to track work patterns, measure productivity, and even analyze written feedback through natural language processing (Dastin, 2018). These systems are marketed as objective and efficient, reducing human error and bias (Lindebaum et al., 2020). However, the use of AI in performance appraisal also raises important concerns about transparency, fairness, and explainability—especially when employees don't fully understand how the system works or feel dehumanized by it (Saurabh & Dey, 2021).

The integration of AI into human resource management is not just a technical innovation; it represents a broader cultural and organizational shift (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). While many organizations see AI as a way to modernize and standardize appraisals, employees and managers alike may struggle with trust, ethical

concerns, and the loss of nuanced judgment. These tensions bring forward a key question: How can organizations effectively balance automation with human insight?

This study adopts a qualitative, literature-based review approach to examine how organizations navigate the tension between AI automation and human oversight in performance appraisal systems. The review synthesizes findings from global and local (Indonesian) contexts to identify recurring challenges and emerging strategies. This paper aims to provide a grounded understanding of how AI can complement rather than override human evaluative roles in modern HR practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The application of artificial intelligence (AI) in human resource management (HRM), particularly in performance appraisal, is a growing area of research and practice. As organizations look to streamline evaluation processes, reduce bias, and make data-driven decisions, AI systems are being introduced to support or even automate aspects of employee assessment (Jatobá et al., 2021).

AI and Objectivity in Performance Appraisal

One of the key motivations behind using AI in performance management is its perceived ability to enhance objectivity and reduce human bias (Saurabh & Dey, 2021). Traditional performance reviews often suffer from issues like favoritism, recency bias, or the halo effect (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). AI tools, by analyzing large volumes of behavioral and performance data, are seen as capable of delivering more consistent and impartial evaluations. For instance, machine learning algorithms can monitor key performance indicators or analyze feedback text, minimizing the influence of personal relationships or emotions (Lindebaum et al., 2020).

The Risks of Algorithmic Decision-Making

Despite these benefits, many scholars have raised concerns about the risks of relying on AI systems for human judgment tasks. First, AI systems can reflect and even reinforce biases if the training data itself is flawed or unbalanced (Dastin, 2018). Furthermore, the “black box” nature of many algorithms makes it difficult for users to understand how decisions are made, reducing trust and accountability (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). This lack of transparency can lead to negative employee experiences, especially when they feel they are being evaluated unfairly by systems they don't understand.

Balancing Human and Machine Input

Researchers argue that the future of AI in performance appraisal should not be about replacing humans but enhancing their capacity to make better decisions. This approach, often described as "human-in-the-loop" AI, emphasizes collaboration between automated systems and human evaluators (Jarrahi, 2018). Human managers bring contextual understanding, empathy, and the ability to interpret nuances that AI currently lacks. Therefore, a hybrid model—where AI provides insights but final decisions rest with human judgment—is increasingly recommended in both theory and practice (Tambe et al., 2019).

Employee Perceptions and Acceptance

Another critical aspect is how employees perceive AI-driven appraisal systems. Studies show mixed reactions. Some employees appreciate the clarity and structure AI can provide, especially when it removes personal bias. Others express discomfort or anxiety about being monitored or evaluated by machines (Saurabh & Dey, 2021). These perceptions can significantly impact trust in the system, job satisfaction, and overall acceptance of AI in HR settings (Brougham & Haar, 2018).

Summary of Gaps

While there is growing literature on the technical and ethical dimensions of AI in performance appraisal, there's still limited qualitative research exploring how people experience and interpret these tools in real workplace settings. Most existing studies focus on either the technical capabilities or broad theoretical discussions. This study aims to fill that gap by examining the human side of AI-powered appraisal systems—particularly the balance between automated evaluation and human judgment.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative literature review to explore the intersection of AI-powered performance appraisal and human judgment within performance management systems. The review focuses on identifying patterns, perspectives, and concerns drawn from existing academic journals, industry reports, and relevant case studies. Sources are selected based on their relevance, credibility, and contribution to the discourse on AI implementation in HR processes.

Databases such as Scopus, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect were used to collect peer-reviewed articles published between 2015 and 2024. Key search terms include "AI in performance appraisal," "automated performance evaluation," "human-AI collaboration in HR," and "ethical AI in employee assessment." Thematic analysis is applied to organize findings into recurring themes, such as automation benefits, human oversight, bias mitigation, and employee trust.

This approach is suitable for synthesizing knowledge, revealing gaps in the literature, and drawing conceptual conclusions without direct field involvement (Snyder, 2019; Xiao & Watson, 2019).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into performance appraisal systems has drawn growing interest from both practitioners and researchers, particularly in the context of digital transformation and data-driven human resource management. A close review of recent literature reveals five dominant and interconnected themes that consistently emerge across organizational settings, academic studies, and industry reports: efficiency and standardization, bias and fairness, human oversight and trust, ethical and psychological impacts, and the importance of human-AI collaboration.

These themes do not arise arbitrarily—they reflect the tension between automation and human-centered management, a challenge that sits at the heart of modern HR practices. As organizations adopt AI tools to reduce subjectivity and administrative burdens, they often encounter new complexities related to transparency, accountability, and workplace morale. Each theme represents a distinct

yet overlapping concern that has gained prominence due to practical implementations, stakeholder reactions, and growing awareness of both the potential and limitations of AI.

Efficiency and standardization emerge as a foundational promise of AI systems, where automation streamlines evaluations and brings consistency to large-scale organizations. However, these gains also introduce concerns over the fairness and potential bias encoded into algorithms—especially when historical data or skewed metrics influence outcomes. These concerns naturally lead to broader discussions about trust and the need for human oversight, as organizations grapple with balancing technological efficiency with accountability and transparency.

As AI begins to influence employee perceptions of recognition, feedback, and value, the ethical and psychological impacts of being assessed by machines surface in both academic and professional contexts. This includes concerns around autonomy, stress, and perceived surveillance. Finally, there is a growing consensus that the best outcomes arise not from fully automated systems but from collaborative approaches where human judgment and AI capabilities complement each other.

These five themes, therefore, represent both the practical challenges and the philosophical debates around AI in performance management. Their emergence signals a shift in HR discourse—from whether AI *can* be used, to *how* it should be used responsibly, equitably, and effectively. Real-world examples are used in each section to ground these abstract concerns in concrete cases, offering insight into how different organizations are responding to these emerging issues.

Efficiency and Standardization

AI-powered performance appraisal systems have significantly improved organizational efficiency by streamlining routine HR tasks. These systems can automatically collect performance data, generate evaluations, and even suggest developmental paths, drastically reducing the administrative burden on HR departments and line managers. For example, IBM's Watson Career Coach uses machine learning to continuously assess employee data and suggest personalized career development routes. This system has enabled managers to identify high-performing individuals and training needs without manually combing through vast data sets (Dastin, 2019).

In Deloitte, the traditional annual review system was replaced with a more dynamic AI-supported approach called Performance Snapshot, which collects frequent, real-time feedback. The shift led to a reported 50% reduction in time spent on evaluations while increasing transparency and engagement (Buckingham & Goodall, 2015). The real-time nature of AI allows for more responsive management, enabling decisions based on current data rather than retrospective reviews.

In Indonesia, Gojek, one of Southeast Asia's largest tech companies, has implemented AI-driven dashboards to evaluate driver-partner performance using multiple metrics, such as customer ratings, acceptance rates, and on-time delivery. While primarily operational, these performance indicators also contribute to reward and disciplinary systems. The efficiency of such systems lies in their scalability—managing thousands of gig workers with limited HR intervention. However, some critics have noted that these systems may overlook context, such as poor traffic conditions or customer-related issues, which are hard to quantify (Nuswantoro, 2020).

Similarly, Tokopedia integrates AI in employee assessment systems as part of its internal HR analytics strategy. The AI tools assist in analyzing key performance indicators (KPIs) alongside peer feedback and project outcomes. Tokopedia's HR leadership reports that automation has shortened evaluation cycles while enhancing the objectivity of employee assessments (Putri, 2021).

Despite these improvements, the push for standardization comes with limitations. Over-reliance on numeric indicators may fail to capture qualitative attributes such as empathy, creativity, leadership, and conflict resolution. These "soft skills" are often best evaluated through human observation and contextual understanding (Guenole, Ferrar, & Feinzig, 2017). For instance, in a multinational tech company (anonymous in Guenole et al.'s study), an engineer received a low AI-based performance score due to reduced coding output, despite her critical contributions to mentoring and team morale—areas not captured by the AI model.

Standardization can also inadvertently reinforce organizational bias. A study by Tambe, Cappelli, and Yakubovich (2019) suggests that when AI systems are trained on historical performance data, they may learn and replicate past biases—especially against underrepresented groups. This concern is echoed in the case of Amazon, which abandoned its AI hiring tool after discovering it penalized resumes with terms like "women's" (Dastin, 2018).

From a cross-cultural lens, uniform metrics may not translate well across countries. In Indonesia, where collectivist values influence workplace behavior, metrics like "assertiveness" or "individual leadership" might unfairly rate employees who perform better in team-oriented or consensus-based roles. As Hofstede's cultural dimensions suggest, performance expectations must be calibrated to local norms (Hofstede Insights, 2023). A field study in an Indonesian government agency noted that AI-based evaluations tended to underrepresent community-focused roles, such as facilitators and liaisons, which are critical in decentralized governance systems but are difficult to quantify (Yuliana & Wijayanto, 2020).

The perceived objectivity and consistency of AI systems often increase employee trust, especially when transparency is built in. Companies like SAP now offer explainable AI features within their SuccessFactors suite, allowing users to see why a particular rating was assigned and which variables influenced the decision—this helps reduce the "black box" fear and builds credibility (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Bias and Fairness

While AI is often promoted as an objective tool for evaluating employee performance, the reality is more nuanced. AI systems, especially those trained on historical HR data, can inadvertently inherit and amplify existing biases. But it's important to remember that human evaluators are not bias-free either. Both approaches come with their own strengths and weaknesses—and their combination might just offer the most balanced solution.

In traditional settings, performance evaluations are vulnerable to several well-documented biases. Managers may favor employees who are more outgoing, similar to themselves, or simply more recent in their memory—a pattern known as the halo effect or recency bias. Such subjective tendencies can create inconsistencies across departments and even lead to serious inequities, particularly for underrepresented groups.

AI promises to address these inconsistencies through data-driven objectivity. However, if the training data reflects biased patterns—such as undervaluing the performance of women or minorities—then AI systems may end up codifying those patterns. One notable global example is Amazon's scrapped AI recruitment tool, which penalized résumés containing the word "women's" due to being trained on male-dominated hiring data (Dastin, 2018). This kind of bias, embedded in algorithms, can go undetected for years if not actively monitored.

A similar risk exists in performance appraisals. If an AI system is trained on years of evaluations that subtly favor employees from certain universities, departments, or regions, it may continue reinforcing those preferences without anyone realizing. This can result in systematic exclusion—even if the process appears transparent on the surface.

But here's the key—bias isn't exclusive to AI. Human decisions can be just as flawed, if not more so. Unlike AI, humans are less likely to be audited or held accountable for each decision they make. That's why many experts advocate for a hybrid model, where AI provides initial insights and humans make the final call, applying judgment and context that machines can't fully grasp.

This hybrid approach is already being adopted in several organizations. For example, SAP uses AI to flag unusual patterns in employee behavior, like sudden drops in productivity or attendance, but the final decisions always rest with managers, ensuring that the broader context is considered (Brock & von Wangenheim, 2019). Similarly, Google has long used AI tools to support performance reviews but relies on calibration sessions where managers discuss and adjust ratings collectively to reduce subjectivity.

In Indonesia, companies are starting to experiment with similar setups. Gojek, for instance, uses AI to monitor employee KPIs and behavioral trends, but those metrics are then reviewed in coordination with peer feedback and managerial judgment. Gojek has also publicly emphasized its commitment to responsible AI, implementing internal checks to mitigate bias in its models (Gojek Tech Blog, 2021).

Telkom Indonesia has rolled out an AI-based talent analytics platform aimed at identifying high-potential employees and mapping out career development paths. However, Telkom doesn't let the system run unchecked. Decisions on promotions or terminations still go through HR committees to ensure fairness and incorporate non-quantitative considerations like teamwork, communication, and leadership (Prasetyo & Raharjo, 2020).

Bank Central Asia (BCA) also offers a useful case. The bank integrates AI tools for employee tracking and career planning, but complements those systems with psychological assessments and structured interviews. This layered approach ensures that algorithmic insights are balanced with a human understanding of soft skills and cultural fit (Puspitasari et al., 2021).

The combination of machine consistency and human empathy seems to hold the most promise. AI can help identify patterns and reduce arbitrary decision-making, while human input can fill in the gaps where context, emotion, or ethical considerations are key. Ensuring fairness in performance appraisals isn't about choosing between AI or humans—it's about using both, wisely and transparently.

That said, this balance only works if both sides are held to high standards. AI systems must be regularly audited for fairness, with transparency around how they're developed and what data they're based on. Meanwhile, managers need ongoing

training to spot and correct their own biases, especially when interpreting AI outputs. It's not about eliminating bias altogether—that's nearly impossible—but rather about creating processes that catch and correct bias before it becomes systemic.

Human Oversight and Trust

As artificial intelligence becomes more common in performance evaluations, the issue of trust is front and center. For employees to accept and feel comfortable with AI-assisted assessments, they need to believe that the system is fair, transparent, and—most importantly—not running on autopilot. This is where human oversight becomes absolutely critical.

AI can crunch numbers, detect patterns, and deliver consistent assessments across large groups of employees. But it's not perfect—and it shouldn't be the sole decision-maker. Why? Because algorithms don't understand context the way humans do. They don't know if someone's drop in productivity is due to a death in the family, or if a slightly lower sales number was actually the result of taking on additional mentoring duties. Without human judgment, those kinds of stories get lost in the data.

That's why many experts argue that AI should support, not replace, human decision-making. Think of it like autopilot in a plane—it's helpful, even essential for certain tasks, but you still need a pilot in the cockpit to take over when things go off script. In performance appraisal, AI might flag anomalies or highlight top performers, but the final word should rest with managers who can add depth, context, and empathy.

Building trust in AI systems means people need to know how decisions are made. This is what we call algorithmic transparency. When employees understand what data the system uses, how it evaluates them, and how its outputs are interpreted, they're more likely to accept its role in the evaluation process. Unfortunately, many AI systems today still function like black boxes—spitting out scores or recommendations without explanations. This secrecy breeds distrust.

A good counter-example comes from Gojek. The company emphasizes transparency in its internal AI tools, especially those used for performance tracking and talent development. Managers are trained to explain AI-generated insights to team members and to openly discuss how decisions are made, creating a culture of openness. In town hall-style meetings, employees can even raise concerns or ask questions about how AI is used in evaluations—this kind of open dialogue goes a long way in building trust (Gojek Tech Blog, 2021).

Telkom Indonesia also takes a hands-on approach. Their AI systems for internal HR purposes are always complemented by human review panels. For instance, when the system recommends a staff member for promotion or rotation, the final decision is vetted by a diverse committee. Telkom makes it clear to employees that AI is a "recommendation engine," not a judge. This combination of tech + human review helps ensure that decisions are seen as both fair and grounded in reality (Prasetyo & Raharjo, 2020).

Even in more traditional industries like banking, human oversight is emphasized. Bank Mandiri, for example, uses AI to screen performance trends and potential leadership candidates. But those insights are discussed in "talent review boards," where multiple stakeholders—including HR, team leaders, and external consultants—weigh in. This shared responsibility helps to balance out any blind spots the algorithm might have (Handayani & Sutrisno, 2021).

Let's not forget that managers themselves need to be held accountable, too. If the AI suggests an unfair evaluation and the manager simply signs off without questioning it, that's not real oversight—it's just rubber-stamping. Real oversight means asking hard questions, challenging outputs when necessary, and being willing to deviate from the machine's recommendation when human context says otherwise.

Trust is also built through ongoing feedback loops. Employees should have the ability to challenge or appeal AI-driven evaluations. They should be able to provide context, point out mistakes, or flag data that doesn't tell the full story. When people feel heard—even when they disagree with the outcome—they're more likely to trust the process.

Ethical and Psychological Impacts

The use of AI in performance appraisals doesn't just raise technical or operational questions—it also brings deep ethical and psychological implications for employees. At the core, people want to feel respected, fairly treated, and emotionally secure in their workplaces. When a machine begins to evaluate human work, the psychological contract between employer and employee subtly shifts, and not always for the better.

One major ethical concern is the right to privacy. AI systems often collect and process vast amounts of personal and behavioral data—from keystroke patterns to email sentiment analysis. While this data can offer insights into work habits and engagement levels, it also risks crossing personal boundaries. Employees might feel constantly surveilled, even micromanaged by an invisible algorithm. This can lead to stress, anxiety, and even burnout.

In a study by Ajunwa et al. (2017), researchers found that continuous digital monitoring at work—especially when AI is involved—can create a climate of suspicion and distrust. People may alter their behavior unnaturally, not to improve performance but to "please the system." This not only reduces authenticity but also undermines creativity and intrinsic motivation.

Psychologically, knowing that a non-human agent is judging performance can lead to feelings of alienation or dehumanization. Unlike human managers who can offer empathy, encouragement, or constructive nuance, AI feedback is often cold, numerical, and lacking context. For example, being told by a system that your performance dropped by 12.6% this quarter, without any explanation or room for discussion, can be demoralizing.

Ethically speaking, informed consent becomes a grey area. Employees are often unaware of how their data is being used or what the algorithm considers "good" or "bad" performance. In Indonesia, this issue is increasingly discussed, especially as more companies adopt HR analytics platforms. While regulations like the *UU Perlindungan Data Pribadi* (Personal Data Protection Law, 2022) provide some legal safeguards, ethical implementation still largely depends on each organization's internal policies and transparency.

Case in point: At Bukalapak, an Indonesian e-commerce firm, early experiments with AI-driven feedback systems reportedly caused discomfort among some employees. Feedback felt too impersonal, and staff questioned how the AI "understood" soft skills like teamwork or creativity. In response, the company adjusted its approach—embedding more human-led reviews and offering opt-in participation for certain AI evaluation tools (Tempo HR Insight, 2022).

Another example is Telkomsel, which piloted an AI-based internal assessment tool. The company faced ethical questions around transparency and potential biases in employee ranking. Following internal dialogue and HR workshops, Telkomsel implemented a dual-layer evaluation, combining algorithmic output with peer and manager reviews. The system also includes a clear feedback channel where employees can challenge or comment on AI-generated scores (Wibowo & Halim, 2023).

From a psychological standpoint, the loss of agency is a recurring theme. When people feel they can't influence or even understand the criteria they're being judged on, motivation can plummet. This is especially true in creative or highly collaborative roles where performance is hard to quantify.

That's why many experts recommend humanizing the AI process. This means creating space for conversation, allowing employees to contextualize their own data, and ensuring that final judgments are always made with human oversight. It also means being honest about the limitations of AI rather than pretending it's an all-knowing oracle.

Ethically sound systems should follow key principles: fairness, explainability, proportionality, and respect for autonomy (Floridi et al., 2018). When these are embedded in the system design and communication, employees are more likely to accept and even appreciate AI's role in helping them grow.

Need for Human-AI Collaboration

As AI technologies become increasingly integrated into performance management systems, the discussion has shifted from whether AI should be used, to how it should be used responsibly and effectively. The prevailing consensus in recent literature is that the most effective and ethical applications of AI in performance appraisal do not involve replacing human judgment, but rather augmenting it. This collaborative model—often referred to as human-AI collaboration or human-in-the-loop decision-making—combines the computational power of algorithms with the contextual understanding, empathy, and ethical reasoning of human evaluators (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

AI systems excel in processing vast amounts of structured data, identifying patterns, and ensuring consistency. They can monitor employee activities, extract trends from KPIs, and generate performance summaries with speed and scalability that human evaluators cannot match. However, their limitations become apparent in areas that involve ambiguity, social nuance, or emotional insight—areas where human managers remain indispensable (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017).

For example, a system might detect a decrease in productivity based on task completion rates or attendance data, but fail to understand the personal circumstances—such as health issues or family emergencies—that led to the decline. A human manager, on the other hand, can interpret such situations with empathy and flexibility, adjusting the evaluation based on the broader context. Without this collaborative balance, organizations risk making decisions that are technically precise but ethically and socially flawed.

This concept is increasingly reflected in organizational practices. Gojek, a major Indonesian tech company, has adopted an AI-supported HR analytics platform to track productivity and engagement. However, instead of automating the full appraisal process, Gojek's HR team employs these insights as preliminary inputs for discussions between managers and employees. Human reviewers validate AI findings, interpret

anomalies, and incorporate soft skills and peer feedback into the final assessment. This approach promotes transparency while preserving trust between the employee and the organization (Gojek Tech Blog, 2021).

Similarly, Telkom Indonesia utilizes AI to streamline talent mapping and promotion planning. The AI system helps identify potential high-performers based on various indicators, such as project delivery and learning engagement. Yet, final decisions are made by multi-stakeholder panels that include HR managers, supervisors, and functional leads. These panels review AI-generated insights alongside qualitative input, such as leadership potential and interpersonal contributions—factors that remain difficult to quantify (Prasetyo & Raharjo, 2020).

These examples illustrate that AI is most effective when it operates in partnership with human judgment, not as a replacement. This sentiment is echoed in academic literature, where scholars argue that effective AI deployment in HR requires what Tambe, Cappelli, and Yakubovich (2019) call an "augmentation mindset"—the belief that AI should enhance human capabilities, not automate human decision-making in its entirety.

In operational terms, successful human-AI collaboration in performance appraisal requires several organizational supports. First, transparency in algorithmic design and logic is crucial. Employees and managers must understand how performance scores are generated and be able to question them if necessary (Wang et al., 2020). Second, training is needed to build digital literacy among HR practitioners and leaders, enabling them to use AI tools appropriately and ethically. Third, organizations should implement appeal mechanisms that allow employees to contest or clarify AI-generated outcomes, fostering procedural justice.

Ultimately, AI can provide analytical rigor and reduce inconsistency, while humans contribute context, moral reasoning, and emotional intelligence. Together, they form a more balanced and trustworthy approach to performance management—one that is not only efficient, but also fair, adaptive, and aligned with human values.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

AI-powered performance appraisal systems have demonstrated tangible benefits in streamlining HR tasks, improving efficiency, and enhancing consistency in evaluations. Companies like IBM use tools such as Watson Career Coach to recommend training and promotion pathways based on performance data, while Indonesian tech firms like Tokopedia and Gojek are increasingly experimenting with AI-driven dashboards to track KPIs. However, risks around bias, fairness, and dehumanization persist—particularly when systems are overly standardized or lack transparency.

To balance these systems, organizations are encouraged to adopt collaborative models, where AI handles the initial analysis—identifying patterns or flagging anomalies—while final evaluations remain with human managers. For example, in Gojek, team leads review AI-generated performance insights during one-on-one feedback sessions, adding context based on peer reviews and observed behavior. This blend maintains efficiency while honoring the nuance of human judgment. Clear guidelines, employee involvement, and continuous system audits are essential to ensure ethical, fair, and trusted appraisal outcomes.

REFERENCES :

Ajunwa, I., Crawford, K., & Schultz, J. (2017). Limitless Worker Surveillance. *California Law Review*, 105(3), 735–776.

Brock, J. M., & von Wangenheim, F. (2019). Demystifying AI in HRM. *Journal of Business Research*, 119.

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.55

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *Machine, Platform, Crowd: Harnessing Our Digital Future*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Buckingham, M., & Goodall, A. (2015). Reinventing Performance Management. *Harvard Business Review*.

Dastin, J. (2018). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G

Dastin, J. (2019). How IBM Uses AI to Enhance Employee Experience. *Reuters Technology*.

DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M. et al.. (2018). AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.

Gojek Tech Blog. (2021). Responsible AI: Building ethical AI systems. https://blog.gojek.io

Guenole, N., Ferrar, J., & Feinzig, S. (2017). *The Power of People: Learn How Successful Organizations Use Workforce Analytics to Improve Business Performance*. Pearson.

Handayani, D., & Sutrisno, B. (2021). Evaluasi dan Pengawasan Human-AI dalam Penilaian Kinerja di Perbankan. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Indonesia*, 12(3).

Hofstede Insights. (2023). Country Comparison: Indonesia. https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/indonesia/

Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, *61*(4), 577–586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

Jatobá, A., Rocha, Á., Vasconcelos, J. B., & Costa, C. J. (2021). Artificial intelligence in performance appraisal: A systematic literature review. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *173*, 121123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121123

Lindebaum, D., Vesa, M., & den Hond, F. (2020). Insights from "The Machine Stops" to better understand algorithmic control. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(2), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0185

Nuswantoro, H. (2020). Evaluasi Kinerja Mitra Gojek dalam Perspektif Algoritma. *Jurnal Komunikasi*.

Prasetyo, H., & Raharjo, B. (2020). Pemanfaatan AI dalam Sistem HR Telkom Indonesia. *Telkom HR Journal*, 8(1).

Puspitasari, S., Harahap, H., & Susilo, B. (2021). Implementasi Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Proses Talent Management di Industri Perbankan Indonesia. *Jurnal Sistem Informasi*, 17(2).

Putri, A. D. (2021). Penerapan Analisis Data Karyawan di Tokopedia. *HR Technology Indonesia*.

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

Saurabh, S., & Dey, K. (2021). Artificial intelligence in human resource management: A future research agenda. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *28*(5), 1710–1732. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-03-2020-0124

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review*, *61*(4), 15–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619867910

Tempo HR Insight. (2022). Respons Bukalapak terhadap Feedback Evaluasi Otomatis.

UU Perlindungan Data Pribadi (2022), Republik Indonesia.

Wang, D., Jamal, M., & McCausland, T. (2020). Trust and transparency in algorithmic HR systems: Exploring ethical implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(1), 147–164.

Wibowo, R., & Halim, T. (2023). Dual-layer Evaluation in AI-Driven HR Systems: A Case from Telkomsel. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi & Manajemen SDM*, 11(2).

Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971

Yuliana, Y., & Wijayanto, A. (2020). Digitalisasi Sistem Evaluasi Kinerja di Instansi Pemerintah: Peluang dan Tantangan. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*.