The Relevant Human Resource Professional in Relation to Artificial Intelligence—Constructing Human Agency[1]

Anna Launberg[2]
Senior lecturer, Mälardalen University, School of Business Society and Engineering, Sweden

Eva Lindell
Associate professor, Mälardalen University, School of Business Society and Engineering, Sweden

ABSTRACT

As artificial intelligence (AI) is introduced in knowledge work, boundaries of professional agency change. Human resources management professionals in Sweden have historically been struggling with claiming relevance in organizations. Through a qualitative analysis of articles from Swedish HR magazines, this study explores how the relevant HR professional is discursively constructed in relation to the increasing use of AI, and the ramifications of these constructions for the agency of HR professionals. The study shows that the HR professional is left to reconcile conflicting portrayals of herself—as both more and less biased than AI—and contradictory expectations to both fearlessly embrace and question AI. The relevant HR professional is thus one who successfully navigates these tensions, operating within the boundaries of agency shaped by these opposing constructions. This research contributes to the algorithmic HRM literature and the literature on AI and agency.

KEYWORDS

agency / artificial intelligence / discourse analysis / discursive psychology / human resource management

Introduction

This article studies the expectations human resources (HR) professionals face as artificial intelligence (AI) is introduced in their work. HR specialists have for decades struggled to gain recognition and increased relevance in organizations. Criticized for being too bureaucratic and not contributing to organizational performance, the relevance of the HR profession has been challenged throughout its history, pushing HR professionals to continuously engage in the construction of a relevant professional identity (Wright 2008). Previous research in Sweden has shown that structural power asymmetries, gendered norms, and a lack of symbolic legitimacy have contributed to a persistent sense of insufficiency and hindered the HR profession's strategic recognition (Berglund 2002). These struggles to claim relevance within the HR field can be understood as discursive representations. For instance, Mahadevan and Schmitz (2020), building on Foucault's (1980) notion of power as rooted in legitimized knowledge, suggested that 'the roles and responsibilities that HR can successfully claim in practice depend on how successfully HR legitimizes its claim to a certain power via knowledge' (p. 517). The changing adoption of professional labels of being 'business partners' or 'strategic advisors' displays this discursive struggle of claiming relevance, rather than indicating changes in the HRM professional work per se (Wright 2008).

[1] You can find this text and its DOI at https://tidsskrift.dk/njwls/index.
[2] Corresponding author: Anna Launberg. E-mail: anna.launberg@mdu.se.

Over the past few years, HRM has been described as a function particularly well suited for AI-powered optimization and streamlining (Johnson et al. 2020; Prikshat et al. 2023), as new technology is expected to yield significant benefits through its predictive and analytic capabilities when integrated into HR work (Giermindl et al. 2022). As has been discussed previously in this journal, the Nordic countries are advanced in relation to digitalization and are therefore interesting cases for studies on digital implementation (Komp-Leukkunen & Poli 2024) such as AI. In Sweden, the widespread and integrated use of digital tools and e-services across society, paired with a strong infrastructure support, indicate confidence in the introduction of new digital technologies (Internetstiftelsen 2025). Furthermore, the Nordic labor markets are known to both support change, including digital one, and provide institutional stability due to high union presence and wide coverage of collective agreements (Alsos & Dølvik 2021). Additionally, the Nordic countries' HR work is characterized by collaboration and co-determination, reflecting strong labor regulations and non-hierarchical organizational structures (Häll 2024).

However, despite the similarities between the Nordic countries, the rates of algorithm-based HR processes and HR analytics are markedly lower in Sweden than the rest of the Nordics (Tengblad & Nord 2024). For a profession wanting to prove its contribution to organizational efficiency, the low rates of AI adoption are problematic for Swedish HRM. With the growing calls to leverage AI to enhance organizational productivity and efficiency, Swedish HR is therefore presently facing increasing expectations about AI implementation while most of the HR workforce still has limited familiarity with AI systems in their daily work. In light of these circumstances, there is an urgent need to better understand the potential consequences of AI for the relevance of the HR profession in Sweden (Tengblad & Nord 2024).

This study analyzes articles from Swedish HR magazines to explore how AI shapes new discursive constructions of HR professionals' agency. More specifically, drawing on the theoretical framework of discursive psychology (1987) and its view of language as performative, the study aims to examine how the HR professional is discursively constructed in HR magazines in relation to the increasing use of AI. In so doing, the article answers the question of how the ramifications of the discursive constructions of the relevant HR professional can be understood in relation to agency in a Swedish HR work context, thus advancing our understanding of the demands and expectations facing a key category of knowledge worker as AI is introduced.

Professional category and agency through discourse

Human interaction always involves negotiating how a situation is defined. This study focuses on how the HR professional is negotiated in the age of AI—that is, how professional identity is constructed. In discursive psychology, identity is seen as fluid and shaped through language, often referred to as 'categories' (Wetherell 1998). From this perspective, the individual is not a stable point of self-reference but a temporary, discursively assigned identity. HR specialists' ongoing categorization aims not only to create a coherent and stable image but also to sustain or enhance relevance, status, and legitimacy within organizations (Berglund 2002). Applying a theoretical perspective where the use of discourse is understood as performative with practical consequences

(Wetherell & Potter 1988)—meaning that talk and text don't merely represent the social world but actively construct it—this article demonstrates how the discursively constructed professional category of the 'relevant HR professional in the time of AI' results in specific constructions of agency.

The concept of human agency has long concerned the social sciences, despite lacking a clear, unified definition. Potentially helpful in identifying 'the mediating process between social constraint and individual choice' (Reed 1988, p. 34), human agency implies sense of action and is associated with having influence on one's own life and work (Eteläpelto et al. 2013), as well as discretionary power (Claydon & Doyle 1996). Seeck and Parzefall (2008) propose the broad definition of agency as the capacity of humans to make choices and impose them on the world. Alternatively, agency can be explored as 'the way in which people are understood as relatively active or passive beings' (Madill & Doherty 1994, p. 262). Leaning on this latter definition, the concern with agency in this study is on how it is constructed through language in a social context.

For the HR professional, the sense of agency can thus be understood as constructed within language and embedded in historical, cultural, and technological development in society (Madill & Doherty 1994). This approach helps in recognizing the centrality of agency as an aspect of the relevance of one's category in the organization: the matter of having agency connects to the perception of space for professional action.

In HR literature, agency has been discussed, for example, in relation to the individualization of HRM practices (Lelebina & Gand 2018), the institutional pressures that help shape HRM (Boon et al. 2009) and ethical behavior among HR managers (Wilcox 2012). Existing research highlights challenges faced by knowledge workers as AI use grows, including the risk that HRM professionals may uncritically accept algorithmic assessments and recommendations (Timmons 2020), and, conversely, the risk of overly critical attitudes in relation to, and even avoidance of, algorithmic decisions. The latter has in the literature been described as 'algorithmic aversion', a costly phenomenon that might hinder progress that would have been possible through use of superior technology (Dietvorst et al. 2015; Jussupow et al. 2020).

In relation to AI, human agency stands out as a critical issue, with expert views split on whether AI will reduce the human ability of free choice, or if it this ability can be retained (Anderson & Rainie 2023). This question is key as the professional identity of HR professionals is being challenged by the influx of AI-powered HR tools taking over tasks significant for managing relationships between managers, employees, and trade unions; the HR workers as a professional category with agency relevant for organizational success is again being put into question.

AI in HR work

HR work includes recruitment, staffing, performance management, training, work environment management, and union negotiations (Noe et al. 2015). A growing literature on algorithmic HRM (Meijerink et al. 2021) studies how AI is implemented and used in this work; AI is increasingly deployed to improve efficiency across the employee lifecycle—supporting recruitment, training, and performance through data-driven methods (Espegren & Hugosson 2023; Giermindl et al. 2022), aiding in tasks like CV screening, inclusive recruitment, and decision-making. Predictive AI forecasts outcomes and

optimizes workforce analytics, while generative AI enables human-like interactions via tools, for example, ChatGPT and interview bots. AI also supports employee selection, development, salary suggestions (Baakeel 2020; Bursell & Roumbanis 2024; Mehrabad & Brojeny 2007; Strohmeier & Piazza 2015), and turnover risk evaluation (Vrontis et al. 2022). In recruitment, AI can screen applications, conduct assessments, schedule interviews, and tailor onboarding. Chatbots handle routine HR queries, while advanced systems assist with drafting policies and job descriptions, provide behavioral analytics and automate repetitive tasks. AI's ability to generate insights and support decision-making is often seen as its most valuable contribution to HRM; data can be analyzed to identify patterns related to resources, processes, and performance (Gal et al. 2020). In this study, AI refers to such machine learning technologies for prediction and decision-making, and generative tools for creating new content.

HR professionals occupy a unique position, serving both executive management and employees, while also promoting innovation (Ulrich et al. 2012). These dual objectives of HR make AI adoption particularly complex; they are to support employee welfare and empowerment, while also advancing managerial and organizational efficiency. The algorithmic HRM literature has attended to some of these challenges, for example, how the use of AI-driven, data-based decision-making raises concerns about fairness and transparency, especially among HR professionals wary of its ethical implications (Gal et al. 2020; Greasley & Thomas 2020). Concerns persist about bias in AI systems trained on historical data, which may reflect majority/minority patterns and reinforce exclusion (Malik et al. 2022). Despite such risks (Gal et al. 2020; Giermindl et al. 2022), the pursuit of objectivity and predictive accuracy continues to drive AI integration in HR (Giermindl et al. 2022).

Empirical material

Data collection

Professional HR magazines target HRM professionals and are often written by journalists with a specific interest in the field, or by former HR practitioners. In line with discursive psychology, we do not perceive trade media accounts as products of single authors, but rather as products created and consumed by a collective. The magazines involve owners, editors, writers, and readers—HR professionals, union members, students—as well as referenced experts, consultants, managers, and academics, all contributing to the factual constructions within the texts. Further, there are the wider collectives referred to, and interviewed, for example, experts, consultants, managers, and academics, all of whom are part of the factual constructions in the empirical texts. By these collectives, factual constructions are established through categorizations of AI consultants or HR managers—which are drawn upon to construct a certain phenomenon as factual, desirable, questionable, right, or wrong (Potter 1996). Membership to each category is associated with an *entitlement* to certain knowledge claims; category members are treated as unquestionably knowledgeable in a certain context, and their statements are therefore seen as more factual than if uttered from someone not belonging to the category in question.

The choice of selecting Swedish magazines stems from our particular interest in the Swedish context for reasons elaborated on previously: relatively slow progression of AI adoption in HR despite high rates of general involvement of the population in digital life. For this study, the five most widely published HR magazines in Sweden were selected (see Table 1).

Table 1. Overview of kinds of HR magazines

Appendix 1	**Information in Swedish**	**English translation**
Name	**Personal & Ledarskap**	**Personnel & Leadership**
Number of articles analyzed: 11 published between 211202-250204		
Number of issues per year: 4-6. Scope of readers per issue: 23 000 Web: https://personalledarskap.se/om-oss/		
Owner	SHCUT Media AB	SHCUT Media AB
Name	**HR People**	**HR People**
Number of articles analyzed: 20 published between 180621-240613		
Number of issues per year: 4. Scope of readers per issue: 4500 Web: https://hrpeople.se		
Owner	HR-föreningen	The HR association
Name	**Akavia Aspekt**	**Akavia Aspect**
Number of articles analyzed: 18 published between 201204-241210		
Number of issues per year: 6. Scope of readers per issue: 140 000. Web: https://www.akaviaaspekt.se		
Owner	Fackförbundet Akavia	Union Akavia
Name	**Chefstidningen**	**The Chief Newspaper**
Number of articles analyzed: 9 published between 191016-241118		
Number of issues per year: 8. Scope of readers per issue: 22 000. Web: https://chefstidningen.se		
Owner	SACO, Sveriges akademikers centralorganisation	the Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations
Name	**Akademikern**	**The Academic**
Number of articles analyzed: 4 published between 200430-230207		
Number of issues per year: 4. Scope of readers per issue: 80 000. Web: https://akademikern.se		
Owner	Fackförbundet SSR	Union SSR

All five magazines are available online and were searched with the criteria 'AI' and 'artificial intelligence' in Swedish. No date restrictions were added. The search resulted in 62 articles (see Appendix 1). The first article was published in 2018 and the last in 2025 (the searches took place February 2023--March 2025).

Analytical process

Discursive psychology, the approach followed in this study, is not only a theoretical framework but also encompasses specific methodological sensibilities and methods for qualitative data analysis (Jorgensen & Philips 2002). In the analysis, we employ tools

developed by Potter (1996) to analyze both the epistemological and action orientations of descriptions, that is, both how the facticity of claims in the magazines has been worked up, and what actions these claims perform. These tools, including category entitlement (already explicated in the previous section), out-there-ness, and particular use of pronouns, will be explained in more detail after the coding process has been laid out.

Coding process

We approached our data inductively using the coding software NVivo. In the first round of coding, we identified themes in relation to which AI was discussed and framed. Going back and forth between single quotes and the full context of the article, we made sure to grasp both the details of language and their meanings in the specific contexts. In this process, both authors read and searched for linguistic patterns individually, then met on several occasions to discuss our impressions. Together, we settled on six linguistic patterns in the first round which showed how the empirical material discursively constructed AI in relation to the HR professional.

In the second round of coding, we went through all marked extracts again, this time noting how the HR professional was constructed: what they are like and what they should be like. With this focus, the second round generated six linguistic patterns (relating to, rather than being refinements of, the previous six), several of them closely interconnected. In the final step, we grouped the extracts from the second round, abstracting them to identify four different constructions of the HR professional: two constructions of what the HR professional is like in her capacity as human in relation to AI ('The HR professional is less biased than AI' and 'The HR professional is more biased than AI'), and two constructions of the HR professional as a relevant professional in the time of AI ('The relevant HR professional is skeptical and not naïve in the time of AI' and 'The relevant HR professional stays ahead without fear in the time of AI'). Table 2 provides an overview of the analytic process.

Table 2. Coding scheme with examples of extracts

1st round	Examples of extracts	2nd round Categories	Categorization
AI and ethics	'offering advice and predictions based on historical data can easily be misleading. (...) AI recruitment programs have been criticized for reinforcing existing biases'. 'But one must not be naïve either. AI will demand a great deal from us'	must not be naïve; bias of AI	*The relevant HR professional is skeptical and not naïve in the time of AI.* *The relevant HR professional is less biased than AI*
AI and leadership	'There is a widespread fear surrounding the new situation, and that fear constitutes the greatest obstacle to successful AI implementation'.	Don't be afraid	*The relevant HR professional stays ahead without fear in the time of AI*

(Continued)

Table 2. *(Continued)*

AI as transformative force	'The implementation of AI-based technologies will profoundly transform modern society. And in the HR sector, this transformation has already begun'.	Be ready	*The relevant HR professional stays ahead without fear in the time of AI*
AI as decision support	'All data is then compiled and presented to the recruiter, who receives a list of top candidates. This reduces the risk of losing the most competent applicants early in the process'.	AI less biased than humans	*The HR professional is more biased than AI*
AI as more competent	'It's about giving everyone the same chance. No one receives any advantages when interacting with [the recruitment robot]. In a meeting between two people, however, both are usually eager to affirm one another'.	HR professionals are more biased than AI	*The HR professional is more biased than AI*
AI as requiring educated users	'To remain relevant, one must possess solid knowledge of AI; otherwise, it will be impossible to fulfill the HR role in the future (...)'.	Must not lag behind	*The relevant HR professional stays ahead without fear in the time of AI*

The four constructions were fairly evenly represented throughout the material. The extracts selected to be included in the findings section were those found to most clearly and succinctly construct the HR professional, generally meaning they contained linguistically rich claims and arguments in relation to the HR professional and AI. All extracts were carefully translated from Swedish to English by the authors. The only active change was altering full names to initials.

Analytical tools for discursive analysis

Potter (1996) claims that people tend to treat accounts of others as expressions of their stake, or interest, in the matter at hand; in other words, accounts are generally seen as self-serving. In our reading of the empirical material, it became apparent that the magazines display certain stakes about AI in HR work: the stakes of *maintaining the relevance of the HR professional in the time of AI*, and of *securing the up-to-datedness of HR practice in the time of AI*. These stakes are of central importance to understand the discursive constructions of the HR professional: the construction of the category of the HR professional relevant for their organizations in the time of AI.

Dilemmas of stake must be managed (Edwards & Potter 1992) to increase the perceived facticity of accounts. This is done through mobilization of various rhetorical

resources, such as the creation of out-there-ness, specific use of pronouns, and use of categories. Constructions of out-there-ness is a rhetorical device that can 'draw emphasis away from the nature or identity of the producer' (Potter 1996, p. 150). Constructing out-there-ness is therefore a way to place agency outside of oneself, for instance by referring to 'research', 'facts', or constructing impersonality (e.g., '*it is believed*…'). Pronouns can be used in specific ways to create accountability, for instance by creating a sense of we-ness (Blomberg 2016) or addressing a reader directly by using the pronoun 'you'. In our data, it should be noted that the interviewees in the magazine articles naturally mobilize rhetorical resources to enhance the credibility of statements as they handle their own dilemmas of stake during the interview. Our main interest, however, is how the articles represent these statements. Since it is the journalists and editors of the magazines who decide how to represent accounts, we understand the journalists' rendering and organizing of interviewees' statements to depend on the expected social outcome of these accounts. Thus, to what degree an interviewee will be granted the space in an article to leverage certain rhetorical resources to increase facticity of her statements is contingent on how well these rhetorical devices serve as tools to deal with the overarching dilemma of stake. Or, more precisely, an interviewee's effort to enhance the credibility of their statement is interesting to us for the purpose it serves in handling the dilemma of stake of the HR community, which include both the magazine and its readers.

Lastly, categories are a concept of two-fold importance to this study. First, we have paid attention to the use of category entitlement as a rhetorical device used to analyze how facticity around AI in HRM is constructed in the empirical material. Second, our concern with categories has not only to do with how they are drawn upon in the magazine articles to increase facticity. We are ultimately interested in category as a discursive construction that impacts action: how the magazine articles, through the accounts made, construct the relevant HR professional as a new category, to which only HR professionals able to help organizations thrive in the time of AI, can belong. Such belonging comes with entitlement to certain knowledge and abilities, and, as we will suggest, a potentially altered space for professional agency.

We are thus concerned with what Potter terms the double orientation of factual accounts in (1996), where the so-called epistemic orientation of a statement refers to the building up of its facticity through the use of rhetorical devices, while the action orientation refers to the action a statement accomplishes or contributes to achieving. Categories, in other words, are interesting to us both as rhetorical devices to work up credibility, and as linguistic constructions contributing to action—in this case the category of the relevant HR professional that enables, constrains or helps retain certain action.

By focusing on the action orientation of accounts, we suggest that entitlement to knowledgeability within a category also implies agency. For example, a physician categorized as a medical expert is seen not only as knowledgeable but also as empowered to act within a hospital. Similarly, an HR professional constructed as part of the category of relevant professionals is granted more than credible knowledgeability—she is seen as having specific agency. As the following findings will show, what an HR professional must—or must not—do to belong to this category, as constructed in HRM magazines, is not clear-cut.

Findings—discursive constructions of the HR professional in the AI era

This section presents four constructions of the HR professional found across our data and shows how they relate to agency. As will become evident, the constructions of the HR professional identified in the material and the tensions between them reflect familiar themes in the AI vs. Humans discourse (Dewandre 2020; Isaac et al. 2024; Silberg & Manyika 2019). However, despite the familiarity of these themes, they acquire situated meanings in the HR context, with specific significance for the HR professional. These meanings will be detailed in the Discussion, while the focus here is on presenting the constructions.

The relevant HR professional stays ahead without fear in the time of AI

When analyzing the claims directed to the HR professional—concerning her agency, abilities, and responsibilities—a recurring pattern of statements emerges about the importance to stay ahead of development in relation to AI to remain relevant in the profession.

This first extract comes from an interview with an AI educator:

> *Extract 1*
> – The training is about downplaying the fear, but also realizing that we need to learn. If you're going to be relevant, you have to have good knowledge of AI, otherwise you won't be able to fulfill your role in HR in the future, I don't think so.

Here, the HR professional is addressed as 'you' and 'we', meaning the reader of the article is directly addressed, as 'relevant' (or irrelevant). For the HR professional to be relevant, she has to be able to suppress any emotions of fear since, unless she acquires necessary knowledge of AI, she will soon lose the ability to fulfill her role in HR. This extract demonstrates how keeping up with change is represented not as an option, but as mandatory for the HR professional.

The next extract is from an interview with Sweden's HR association secretary general. Introduced with her title, she is categorized as both an expert within the field of HR and as having stake in the future of HR.

> *Extract 2*
> Because the HR departments have a special role to play when AI is introduced on a broad front. They should be involved and ensure that the technology is adapted to the people and not the other way around.
>
> – I don't just see AI as a tool to work with for us in HR in our own practice. You can also see that there is a greater need to ensure that employee experiences are taken into account when introducing AI into an organization.
>
> L.B., secretary general of Sweden's HR association, also sees a great need for training in the field.

> – For our part, it is important that HR stays well ahead of this major change. Otherwise, the risk is that the focus will primarily end up on the technology and not on people's needs, she says.

Here, the agency of the HR professional is put center stage, the HR profession must 'stay ahead' of change (and not simply follow). If HR doesn't stay ahead, the profession will lose relevance, as development will then be focused only on technology as opposed to humans (which is indicated as the major focus for HR). The responsibility for the HR professional is not only to stay ahead to proficiently use AI in her own practice but doing so for the sake of all employees in the organization.

The relevant HR professional is skeptical and not naive in the time of AI

On the other hand, accounts about need for HR professionals to espouse sound skepticism and risk awareness in relation to AI in order to stay relevant in the profession are present both in articles that focus on the perceived risks of AI in HR, and in those that report more evenly on risks and benefits.

One journalist report:

> *Extract 3*
> It is easy to become stressed by the development. Some get the impulse to jump into the AI pot hook, line and sinker. But slow down – many experts warn against rushing to introduce AI. Namely, there are risks: all AI is powered by data, and that data risks being leaked. If it's about sensitive details - such as medical record information and other private things - you have to be extra careful. And then what Amazon bitterly learned: an AI can easily become prejudiced.

Here, the HR professional is cautioned against rushing into AI use; the appropriate response is constructed as resisting feelings of stress and being mindful of the risks—for example, data leaks, biased algorithms—which the application of AI in HR work entails. The relevant HR professional is thus someone capable of such a measured, informed response, despite feeling stressed, to be compared with the less relevant HR professional who unreflectingly and uncritically follows 'the impulse to jump down in the AI pot hook, line and sinker'. The facticity of the statement is increased through the creation of out-there-ness in referring to the warnings of 'experts', thereby strengthening the claimed need for caution.

This is echoed in an article with the secretary general of the Swedish HR association:

> *Extract 4*
> The human must do what we do best and the machine what it does best. Imagine if it could even be that it is AI that can help us create better balance for ourselves, that we can work just as much and reduce stress and burnout as many monotonous tasks are taken over, giving us more time for other things. But you can't be naive either. AI will demand a lot from us. We really need to think about ethics and laws for it to be good.

Extract 4 is rhetorically organized in a manner that is repeated across numerous articles in the empirical material: AI is represented as a technology of great usefulness and promise in HR work, with a detailed description of what the benefits will be, followed by a sudden insistence on caution, a critical mind and reflection. Again, the human as a general category is addressed to do 'what we do best', creating a sense of we-ness with the reader. But more specifically, the relevant HR professional is here constructed as someone who can value the potential benefits of AI without being seduced by them.

In the following extract, an HR consultant, who also claims to be an expert in the use of HR tools containing AI, is interviewed:

> *Extract 5*
> But at the same time, he underlines, you must always have in the back of your mind not to trust the chatbot 100 percent.
>
> – You always need to verify whether the information is correct and relevant, and whether the result is as you had intended.
>
> […]
>
> – My biggest concern is that we let this happen without being committed. We need to discuss AI systematically, on a societal level. What will the development mean for business in the long term?

Here, the responsibility for the HR professional 'not to trust' AI is said to be 'underlined' by the expert. The HR professional is further constructed as a category with agency to verify AI-generated information. In the last section, the speaker uses a 'we' that not only includes the HR profession but also raises the question to a societal level. In the final section, 'the development for business in the long term' points to the relevance of the HR professional who makes use of her agency to influence development by being skeptical: by not trusting and by being fully committed to shape development of business not only now, but in the long term.

The HR professional is more biased than AI

In the quote below, 'R' is an AI-powered recruitment robot which has previously in the magazine article been described as free from bias.

> *Extract 6*
> In July, U-B [a municipal organization] hired a new digitization coordinator. It was the first time the robot R was used in sharp mode. H.I. is deputy personnel manager in U-B and satisfied with the process […].
>
> She sees no risk of discrimination. On the contrary, she sees a fairer process – R doesn't get tired, distracted, irritated, doesn't think about anything else during the interview and has no preconceived notions. The "human factor" is minimized.
>
> –The advantage is that you avoid prejudice when you postpone the personal contact. All candidates receive the same attention, she says.

But what is it like to meet a robot in a job interview? H.I. has of course tested it herself:

– I was comfortable after a minute, she says.

– There will be candidates who think it's great and those who think it feels a little scary.

How the robot treats people is of course very important for building trust. Measurements made in the development of R show that people rather tend to become a little more open and honest in their interviews. Precisely because it is not another person, says Å.E.K [CEO at a recruitment company which has participated in the development of R]."

Here, humans—in the context clearly comprising HR professionals—are constructed as inept at performing part of the recruitment process due to their humanness, which entails unwanted physiological and psychological states such as tiredness, distractedness, and prejudice. These human states are equated to the 'human factor', a term that carries negative connotations, as it refers to mistakes and errors that humans, unlike machines, make because of their unreliable minds and wavering abilities. 'Personal contact' between an HR professional and a job applicant is therefore constructed as carrying significant risk of generating discrimination as the HR professional belongs to the category of humans. Delaying such contact to a later point in the process by using the AI robot in the initial stages instead—that is, circumscribing the agency of the HR professional—is consequently constructed as beneficial.

Next is from an article dealing with the same recruitment robot.

Extract 7

– It is impossible to make objective assessments in the personal meeting. If we're going to do that, we need good tools and, ideally, we shouldn't be involved at all in the first stages, that's how crass it is. Research shows that recruitment decisions can be based on how a person shakes hands, whether they have tattoos or not, whether they wear too much or too little make-up, E.Ö.M. [name of company owner] says.

– Many things cause us to make fairly quick and sometimes unfounded decisions. We also know that our first impression colors us. It takes seven seconds to create an impression of a person, and it follows us into the process.

It is not just about opting out, but also about choosing those you like a little extra.

- For example, I favor people with the same interests as me. If someone says golf is fun and I think so too, I will automatically put them in a positive pile.

Here, the HR professional is similarly constructed as naturally subjective due to her human traits (beyond her being part of a professional category). Therefore, and once again, the absence of humans in certain phases of the recruitment process is described as a prerequisite for fair assessments of job applicants. Because the interviewee is the CEO of the company developing and manufacturing the robot, the journalist is unable to strengthen the interviewee's account by working up her category entitlement. Instead, the journalist is quoting (accurately or not) the interviewee's own attempts to enhance credibility by using the pronouns 'we', 'us', and 'I'. The opening claim of the impossibility of making 'objective assessments in the personal meeting' is followed of the

mobilization of 'we' and 'us' throughout the extract. This particular use of pronouns serves as a rhetorical resource intended to create a sense of we-ness that creates category entitlement (Blomberg 2016); in this way, the inability to be objective is portrayed not as a shortcoming of specific individuals, but as common to all, including HR professionals such as the readers of the article.

These extracts are thus examples from the empirical material where HR professionals are constructed as innately unfit to do certain key tasks because of their subjectivity. By pointing out the weak spots of traditional and current HR work practice, the magazines perform the action of presenting the professional field as one where there is an awareness of areas that could be enhanced by AI, and thus with an actionable plan moving forward without losing relevance. The HR professional constructed as relevant in this transformed field is then she who, realizing her own human bias, acquiesces some of her agency to AI in sensitive tasks, for example, recruitment.

The HR professional is less biased than AI

Alongside the construction of the human as inferior to AI, is a frequent mobilization of the human HR professional as a category possessing valuable abilities and attributes which AI lacks, implying that the relevance of humans remains unthreatened by AI. Dealing with the known flaws of AI use in recruitment, the extract below brings up a hiring effort at Amazon as an example of a process gone wrong due to the prejudice of AI:

> *Extract 8*
> …giving advice and forecasts based on historical data can easily lead to errors. Amazon shut down its matchmaking service several years ago because it mainly chose men for tech jobs, according to Reuters. Due to the fact that men are already more common than women in the tech industry, the AI program believed that men are preferred. Other AI recruitment programs have also been criticized for reinforcing existing prejudices.

Here, humans are implicitly portrayed as capable of thoughtful consideration and sound judgment, that is, the opposite of the mindless prejudice-prone AI described. The credibility of the statement about biased AI is enhanced by creating out-there-ness through construction of impersonality, achieved by using the passive form in a key sentence: 'Other AI-recruitment software programs *have [] been criticized* too' (italics added), and by reference to a credible news source like Reuters.

In another article, the journalist engages with a recruitment robot without other humans in the room. The company project leader enters and comments on the journalist's interaction with the robot:

> *Extract 9*
> – […] The robot can currently only collect data and create structure. We still don't know what happens when two humans meet so creating AI that reflects this complexity is a long journey […].

The journalist then adds a personal reflection:

> The fact that AI will not take over the selection for the labor market for a long time, in any case, I find reassuring. After all, the question part of a human job interview only consists of 30 percent questions, the rest of the meeting is about social interaction and competence, among other things […].

And continues to report:

> T. [the robot] rounds off the interview with some small talk. Now a continued tour around the world awaits, the robot will be shown in, among other places, both the USA and China. So far, the interest has been great. T. will have many sisters. These will be adapted to the cultures where they will operate - because even open-minded robots are not yet free of factors such as physical appearance, behavior and dialect.

In the first part of extract 9, the project manager of the company which is co-developing the robot constructs the device as able to collect data and create structure, but as far from capable of partaking in, and mimicking, social interactions with humans. This is rendered credible by the category entitlement of the project manager; the fact that he, as a representative of the co-developing company, is represented as admitting to the shortcomings of the robot rather than trying to explain them away, increases the facticity of the statement.

The construction of the robot as deficient is then mobilized as the journalist makes a personal refection on the use of AI in recruitment, stating that she experiences the fact that the AI is 'not taking over the selection for the labor market' as 'reassuring'. However, in this article, the journalist's own practical experience of using the robot she is reporting on increases her category entitlement: she has tried the technology and therefore can have an informed opinion on AI-assisted recruitment in general.

In the third segment, the journalist appears to be reporting what has been stated by the interviewee, that is, the project manager. Here, the robot is not, as previously, constructed as deficient because of its inability to interact satisfactorily with humans. Rather, the robot is now specifically constructed as prejudiced regarding physical appearance, behavior, and accent.

These extracts are thus examples from the empirical material that construct AI as more biased than humans, and hence not (yet) fully safe for widespread application; it is even portrayed as dangerous (to humans) because of its potential risk for systematic negative impact. The HR professional is constructed, thanks to her human nature, as thoughtful, mindful and, importantly, innately incapable of larger-scale bias. In this way, the magazine articles accomplish the action of highlighting the indispensability of the human HR professional in HR work. Ultimately then, this construction of the relevant HR professional effectively acts to retain her agency.

Discussion: the HR professional in the time of AI

HR professionals are portrayed in HR magazines as flawed by bias and subjectivity, while also possessing uniquely human judgment and emotional capacities that AI cannot replicate. Similarly, AI is represented as simultaneously unbiased and as capable of large-scale, mindless prejudice. Further, to remain relevant, the HR professional is encouraged

to proactively engage in AI learning—not only to understand its use in HRM, but to anticipate its broader organizational impact. Staying relevant also requires embracing AI without fear, while demonstrating value by contributing to organizational efficiency—a role HR has historically been criticized for failing to fulfill (Wright 2008). Yet, the HR professional's relevance is at the same time framed as dependent on maintaining a healthy skepticism towards AI. She is thus left to reconcile conflicting portrayals of herself—as both more and less biased than AI—and contradictory expectations to both fearlessly embrace and question AI. The relevant HR professional, therefore, is one who successfully navigates these tensions, operating within the boundaries of agency shaped by these opposing constructions.

The conflicting representations of the relevant HR professional reflect broader societal discourses on AI, which frame it both as a driver of innovation and as a threat to human control. These tensions mirror familiar themes in AI vs. human debates, particularly around bias, which has received significant attention, studied in, for example, healthcare (Isaac et al. 2024); public sector decision-making (Alon-Barkat & Busuioc 2023), and managerial performance-rating (Carter & Liu 2025). HR professionals are hence far from the only type of knowledge worker facing contradictory representations of AI's (and their own) abilities. Yet, the altered space for agency carries specific meanings for the HR profession. First, for a professional category historically engaged in continuous efforts to position itself as relevant and legitimate, the question of AI is an existential one. Second, HR work is at the core an ethical activity, in the sense that it safeguards both the wellbeing and fair treatment of employees and candidates and the protection of sensitive employee information. Changed boundaries for the agency of HR professionals, therefore, will affect decision-making in delicate core tasks, for example, management support as well as employee empowerment. Next, we look more closely at the connection between this agency and the four constructions.

The space for agency

The contradictory discursive constructions of the relevant HR professional suggest new spaces for agency within the profession. To begin, the construction of the relevant HR professional as soundly skeptical of AI in HR, as well as the construction of the HR professional as less biased than AI, indicate a push for *retained* agency in terms of the attribution of value to human sensing, judgment and experience, questioning organizational use of AI, for example, challenging recommendations generated by AI or opposing the use of AI at all if suspected harmful or inadequate in a certain context. Aiming to avoid unethical and inappropriate use of AI, the HR professional is hence constructed as claiming this agency regardless of the structural arrangements of the organization, for example, established work processes in which AI is embedded, or management mandates and strategies regarding AI. Yet, how likely we are to actually see such agency being exercised in the case of HR work remains an open question; a perusal of the literature suggests that individual organizational members might be neither willing, able, nor sufficiently informed to pinpoint and raise ethical concerns regarding AI. First, disrupting settled workflows and strategic initiatives in an organization may require courage that simply might not be there; sensing that complaints would not be well received by management, employees oftentimes choose not to speak up (Miceli et al. 2009). Similarly,

moral courage might be lacking on managerial levels as well (Sekerka et al. 2009). In addition, means to rectify or oppose outcomes of AI decision making are not mandatory features and therefore not widely available (Fanni et al. 2023), effectively limiting the space for workers to act.

Second, as pointed out by Hagendorff (2020), there is in fact no ethics guideline specifying where decision-making performed by AI algorithms is superior or inferior to human decision routines, making it unclear when and what concerns should be raised when using AI.

Finally, research has shown that existing ethics guidelines concerning AI in fact do not have much of an impact on human decision-making in the development and application of the technology (Hagendorff 2020). There is thus reason to believe that retained agency as a social effect of the construction of the skeptical and risk-aware HR professional, ready to interrupt or improve, for example, established AI-driven recruitment practices, may materialize only to a limited extent.

Organizational cultures of weak moral courage and insufficient or poorly adopted guidelines are, however, not the only impediments to the strengthening, or retainment of, agency. Importantly, pulling in the direction of *decreased* agency is the construction, common throughout our data, of the human as more biased than AI. As shown in extracts 6 and 7, this construction involves the removal, or restriction, of human participation in work processes, for example, some stages of recruitment in the case of the HR professional; if AI performs certain tasks with less bias and more efficiently, the HR professional is not needed. Although preservation of human agency is discussed in AI development to ensure humans retain their freedom of choice rather than becoming subservient to algorithms (Ashok et al. 2022), discourses constructing human involvement as undesirable may effectively result in workers giving up part of their agency, on their own accord or in response to managerial demand influenced by such discourse. This potential effect on agency of the discourse about human inadequacy is particularly concerning considering how the black-box character of AI—resulting partly from the complexity of its advanced algorithms—on the most fundamental level already constitutes an impediment to human agency (Ashok et al. 2022; Jarrahi et al. 2021). Discursive constructions on human inferiority in relation to AI thus risk to further weaken human agency in AI use. This is a risk that needs to be mitigated to halt a development where, as suggested by Demetis and Lee (2018), humans are increasingly becoming the artefact shaped and used by algorithms, rather than the other way around.

The construction of the relevant HR professional as someone who stays ahead without fear in the AI transformation can, on the other hand, be read as a move toward greater agency—there is a sense of freedom in being encouraged to take charge of one's own professional learning. The crucial point, nonetheless, is that the relevant HR professional cannot opt out of courage and proactivity—they are prerequisites for survival in the time of AI. In this sense, this construction can be understood as effectively reducing agency, as the choice of a less proactive approach to AI would place the individual HR worker firmly outside the relevant category. Again, HR professionals are not alone in facing demands and expectations concerning AI competence; certainly, other knowledge workers are too. Yet, as members of a contested profession, the framing of HR professionals' need to stay ahead can be understood as a matter of existential urgency.

Belonging to the category of the relevant HR professional thus involves performing sensitive tasks while routinely engaging in both emotional self-policing (*be fearless*) and

second-guessing one's own judgment (*does my subjectivity make me unfit*) since it is never clear who, or what, is better suited to perform a certain task: an AI application or the worker herself (Hagendorff 2020)?

Conclusion

The present work has explored how the HR professional in Sweden—the one Nordic country that stands out for its notably low rates of algorithm-based HR processes and HR analytics (Tengblad & Nord 2024)—is discursively constructed as a category in relation to the increasing use of AI. More specifically, based on the view that agency refers to how individuals are perceived as more or less active participants in social contexts (Madill & Doherty 1994), the study has demonstrated how agency is discursively constructed within the professional category of the 'relevant HR professional in a time of AI'. By analyzing the linguistic framing of HR professionals in Sweden, the article highlights how specific constructions of agency emerge in response to technological change. This contributes to a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between technology and human agency in HR, and underscores the importance of critically examining how professional relevance is negotiated through language in times of digital transformation.

The study contributes to the algorithmic human resource management literature (Meijerink et al. 2021) as well as to the literature on AI and human agency, by studying the linguistic constructions directed toward, and consumed by, HR professionals, with attention to how the facticity of the constructions is worked up through the repeated use of different rhetorical devices (Potter 1996). In doing so, we have demonstrated how articles on AI in Swedish HR magazines are rhetorically organized to maintain the relevance of the HR professional in the time of AI, by emphasizing the necessity of uniquely human abilities in HR work, and to secure the up-to-datedness of HR practice, so as not to appear to be lagging behind as a professional area. Further, we have shown how the contradictory constructions of the HR professional's role reveal new and conflicting boundaries of agency within the profession, affecting decision-making on the sensitive matters that HR is concerned with. In light of this, Swedish HR professionals are navigating a discursive landscape shaped by both skepticism and growing pressure to adopt AI, despite limited practical experience—making it crucial to understand how such constructions may influence the profession's perceived relevance in organizations. The call for vigilance and skepticism toward AI in HR suggests a push for increased or retained agency, allowing HR professionals to question AI's organizational use. However, the literature suggests that individual organizational members may lack the courage or information to raise ethical concerns about AI, making the exercise of this agency uncertain. Further, insufficient guidelines and the construction of humans as more biased than AI can also restrict human participation in work processes, potentially reducing human agency. Additionally, human agency is also impeded by the black-box nature of AI. Finally, we have attended to the question of the expectations HR professionals face as AI is introduced. While many knowledge workers must continuously update their AI skills, this imperative takes on a particular significance for HR professionals, whose legitimacy as a professional group has historically been questioned, despite their key role in managing relationships between managers, employees, and trade unions. For a professional group with limited opportunities to promote or make their supportive

contributions visible in organizations, meeting the expectations needed to be included in a relevant professional category is a question of professional survival.

Limitations and future studies

This study is limited to the linguistic constructions aimed at and consumed by HR professionals in Sweden, and future studies should include other Nordic countries who have embraced algorithm-based HR processes and analytics to a greater extent, offering contrasting discursive environments and potentially different professional challenges.

Through the repeated rhetorical devices used to construct facticity in the magazine articles, the message consumed by the individual HR professional is demanding. To be the relevant HR professional, specific responses and behaviors are required: human superiority calls for skeptical alertness in regard to AI, while human inferiority, rather than triggering fear, should elicit excitement about the opportunities offered by AI to decrease human involvement, and a will to learn more about the technology. Future studies should therefore address HR professionals themselves and their attitudes and sentiments toward the future of the profession in relation to AI. While research on the attitudes and sentiments concerning AI among HR professional is still scant, some studies have for instance asserted that HR professionals and HR managers exhibit skepticism and ambivalence to quantitative data from HR analytics solutions as a basis for decisions (Angrave et al. 2016; Greasley & Thomas 2020). For instance, Greasley and Thomas (2020) have shown how the HR managers they studied 'felt compelled' to provide senior management with 'numbers' generated by HR tools containing AI even though they believed these quantitative data on their own were insufficient to explain what was happening in the organization. Further inquiries into such inconsistencies between HR professionals' sense of what is important for them to stay relevant in the future, and what they deem to be right professional conduct, is a promising path forward for research.

References

Alon-Barkat, S., & Busuioc, M. (2023). Human–AI interactions in public sector decision making:"automation bias" and "selective adherence" to algorithmic advice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *33*(1), 153–169.

Alsos, K., & Dølvik, J. E. (2021). *The future of work in the Nordic countries: Opportunities and challenges for the Nordic working life models*. Nordic Council of Ministers.

Anderson, J., & Rainie, L. (2023). The future of human agency. *Pew Research Center*.

Angrave, D., Charlwood, A., Kirkpatrick, I., Lawrence, M., & Stuart, M. (2016). HR and analytics: why HR is set to fail the big data challenge. *Human resource management journal*, *26*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12090

Ashok, M., Madan, R., Joha, A., & Sivarajah, U. (2022). Ethical framework for artificial intelligence and digital technologies. *International Journal of Information Management*, *62*, 102433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102433

Baakeel, O. A. (2020). The Impact of Human Resource Information Systems on Organizational Performance. *The International Journal of Business & Management*.

Berglund, J. (2002). *De otillräckliga: en studie av personalspecialisternas kamp för erkännande och status [The Insufficient: A Study of HR Specialists' Struggle for Recognition and Status]* Stockholm School of Economics].

Blomberg, H. (2016). Nurses' blogs as part of a political process–Professional identity as a rhetorical resource for negotiating responsibility and blame. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *13*, 82–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.07.001

Boon, C., Paauwe, J., Boselie, P., & Den Hartog, D. (2009). Institutional pressures and HRM: developing institutional fit. *Personnel Review*, *38*(5), 492–508. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480910978018

Bursell, M., & Roumbanis, L. (2024). After the algorithms: A study of meta-algorithmic judgments and diversity in the hiring process at a large multisite company. *Big Data & Society*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517231221

Carter, L., & Liu, D. (2025). How was my performance? Exploring the role of anchoring bias in AI-assisted decision making. *International Journal of Information Management*, *82*, 102875.

Claydon, T., & Doyle, M. (1996). Trusting me, trusting you? The ethics of employee empowerment. *Personnel Review*, *25*(6), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483489610148509

Demetis, D., & Lee, A. S. (2018). When humans using the IT artifact becomes IT using the human artifact. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *19*(10), 5. https://aisel.aisnet.org/jais

Dewandre, N. (2020). Big data: From modern fears to enlightened and vigilant embrace of new beginnings. *Big Data & Society*, *7*(2), 2053951720936708.

Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*(1), 114. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology* (Vol. 8). Sage.

Espegren, Y., & Hugosson, M. (2023). HR analytics-as-practice: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, *12*(5), 83–111. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-11-2022-0345

Eteläpelto, A., Vähäsantanen, K., Hökkä, P., & Paloniemi, S. (2013). What is agency? Conceptualizing professional agency at work. *Educational Research Review*, *10*, 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.05.001

Fanni, R., Steinkogler, V. E., Zampedri, G., & Pierson, J. (2023). Enhancing human agency through redress in Artificial Intelligence Systems. *AI & Society*, *38*(2), 537–547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01454-7

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault* (pp. 78–108). Pantheon Books.

Gal, U., Jensen, T. B., & Stein, M.-K. (2020). Breaking the vicious cycle of algorithmic management: A virtue ethics approach to people analytics. *Information and Organization*, *30*(2), 100301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2020.100301

Giermindl, L. M., Strich, F., Christ, O., Leicht-Deobald, U., & Redzepi, A. (2022). The dark sides of people analytics: Reviewing the perils for organisations and employees. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *31*(3), 410–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927213

Greasley, K., & Thomas, P. (2020). HR analytics: The onto-epistemology and politics of metricised HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *30*(4), 494–507. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12283

Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. *Minds and Machines*, *30*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8

Häll, A. (2024). Lost in translation: The human resource business partner in a Scandinavian context. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *15*(1). https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9673-6084

Isaac, M. S., Wang, R. J.-H., Napper, L. E., & Marsh, J. K. (2024). To err is human: Bias salience can help overcome resistance to medical AI. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *161*, 108402.

Jarrahi, M. H., Newlands, G., Lee, M. K., Wolf, C. T., Kinder, E., & Sutherland, W. (2021). Algorithmic management in a work context. *Big Data & Society*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211020332

Johnson, R. D., Stone, D. L., & Lukaszewski, K. M. (2020). The benefits of eHRM and AI for talent acquisition. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *7*(1), 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-02-2020-0013

Jorgensen, M. W., & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. SAGE publications.

Jussupow, E., Benbasat, I., & Heinzl, A. (2020). Why are we averse towards algorithms? A comprehensive literature review on algorithm aversion. ECIS 2020 Proceedings,

Komp-Leukkunen, K., & Poli, A. (2024). An introduction to digitalizing work in the Nordics. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *14*(S12). https://doi.org/10.18291/njwls.145237

Lelebina, O., & Gand, S. (2018). Beyond "Hero-based" management: Revisiting HRM practices for managing collective expertise. *Relations Industrielles*, *73*(1), 39–66. https://doi.org/10.7202/1044426ar

Madill, A., & Doherty, K. (1994). 'So you did what you wanted then': Discourse analysis, personal agency, and psychotherapy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *4*(4), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2450040406

Mahadevan, J., & Schmitz, A. P. (2020). HRM as an ongoing struggle for legitimacy: A critical discourse analysis of HR managers as "employee-experience designers". *Baltic Journal of Management*, *15*(4), 515–532. https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-10-2018-0368

Malik, A., Thevisuthan, P., & De Sliva, T. (2022). Artificial intelligence, employee engagement, experience, and HRM. In *Strategic human resource management and employment relations: An international perspective* (pp. 171–184). Springer.

Mehrabad, M. S., & Brojeny, M. F. (2007). The development of an expert system for effective selection and appointment of the jobs applicants in human resource management. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *53*(2), 306–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2007.06.023

Meijerink, J., Boons, M., Keegan, A., & Marler, J. (2021). Algorithmic human resource management: Synthesizing developments and cross-disciplinary insights on digital HRM. In (Vol. 32, pp. 2545–2562): Taylor & Francis.

Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., & Dworkin, T. M. (2009). A word to the wise: How managers and policy-makers can encourage employees to report wrongdoing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *86*, 379–396. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9853-6

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2015). *Human Resources Management. 9th edition*. Mc Graw Hill Education.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage.

Prikshat, V., Islam, M., Patel, P., Malik, A., Budhwar, P., & Gupta, S. (2023). AI-Augmented HRM: Literature review and a proposed multilevel framework for future research. *Technological fFrecasting and Social Change*, *193*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122645

Reed, M. I. (1988). The problem of human agency in organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, *9*(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068800900

Seeck, H., & Parzefall, M. R. (2008). Employee agency: Challenges and opportunities for psychological contract theory. *Personnel Review*, *37*(5), 473–489. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480810891637

Sekerka, L. E., Bagozzi, R. P., & Charnigo, R. (2009). Facing ethical challenges in the workplace: Conceptualizing and measuring professional moral courage. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *89*, 565–579. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-0017-5

Silberg, J., & Manyika, J. (2019). Notes from the AI frontier: Tackling bias in AI (and in humans). *McKinsey Global Institute*, *1*(6), 1–31.

Strohmeier, S., & Piazza, F. (2015). Artificial intelligence techniques in human resource management—A conceptual exploration. In *Intelligent Techniques in Engineering Management: Theory and Applications* (pp. 149–172). Springer.

Tengblad, S., & Nord, D. (2024). *Betyder AI alls inte? [Does AI mean nothing at all?]*.

Timmons, K. C. (2020). Pre-Employment personality tests, algorithmic bias, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Penn St. L. Rev.*, *125*, 389.

Ulrich, D., Younger, J., Brockbank, W., & Ulrich, M. (2012). HR talent and the new HR competencies. *Strategic HR Review*, *11*(4), 217–222. https://doi.org/10.1108/14754391211234940

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. In *Artificial intelligence and International HRM* (pp. 172–201).

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3), 387–412. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0957926598009003005

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*, *1688183*.

Wilcox, T. (2012). Human resource management in a compartmentalized world: Whither moral agency? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *111*, 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1440-1

Wright, C. (2008). Reinventing human resource management: Business partners, internal consultants and the limits to professionalization. *Human Relations*, *61*(8), 1063–1086. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094860

Appedix 1. Overview of articles included as empirical material

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
Personal & Ledarskap (P&L)	2023	HR managers must watch out for the pitfalls of AI	Recruitment, ethical oversight, bias prevention	Algorithmic AI & machine learning (CV screening, chatbots, decision-support tools)
P&L	2023	How AI creates a more creative and efficient Swedish work life	Workforce transformation, talent acquisition, upskilling, employee productivity	Predictive AI, automation tools, generative AI & decision-support systems
P&L	2022	A digital HR strategy is inevitable	Talent retention, organizational development	Foundational digital tools & early-stage AI adoption
P&L	2022	Gävle municipality recruits with the help of a robot	Recruitment, candidate screening, bias reduction	Generative AI & avatar-based interview tools
P&L	2022	High time to start the AI journey	Strategic workforce planning, AI competence development, organizational transformation	Predictive AI & automation tools (e.g., chatbots, inventory optimization)
P&L	2022	Artificial intelligence is part of business development	Workforce planning, organizational development	Process automation & predictive analytics
P&L	2021	HR is best suited to scrutinize the algorithms	Recruitment, organizational development	Algorithmic AI & text analysis tools
P&L	2021	We are facing an AI transformation	Organizational transformation, HR analytics, competence development	Machine learning & decision-support AI
P&L	2025	Sweden falls behind in the technology development	Digital transformation, HR innovation	Foundational digital tools & early-stage AI adoption
P&L	2023	TNG solves recruitment with an AI avatar	Recruitment, bias reduction, candidate experience	Generative AI & avatar-based interview tools

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
P&L	2023	Soon seven out of ten employers will recruit with AI	Recruitment, bias reduction, candidate matching	Algorithmic AI & assistive recruitment tools
P&L	2022	Self-driven learning facilitates change	Learning & development, change management, employee empowerment	Adaptive learning systems & AI-driven learning platforms
P&L	2023	The future is automatic	Workflow optimization, administrative efficiency, digital HR operations, recrutiment	Robotic Process Automation (RPA), intelligent automation, assistive AI (e.g. Chat GPT)
HR People (HRP)	2022	The digital transformation gives win-win effects	Strategic HR, employee experience, operational efficiency	Integrated digital ecosystems & predictive analytics
HRP	2022	50 percent of all employees will have outdated knowledge in five years	Competence development, upskilling/reskilling, future workforce planning	Skills analytics & AI-driven learning diagnostics
HRP	2020	Reason and emotion	Negotiation, leadership communication	Human-centered AI & behavioral insight tools
HRP	2021	Trend 2022 - competence and AI in focus	Talent development, internal mobility, skills analysis	Algorithmic AI & decision-support tools
HRP	2021	Smart facts	HR analytics, employee retention, cost analysis	Algorithmic AI & data visualization tools
HRP	2020	Second chance	Talent acquisition, diversity hiring, integration strategy	Algorithmic AI & inclusive recruitment tools
HRP	2020	How do you measure stress	Employee wellbeing, stress monitoring, health analytics	Wearable AI & biometric data analysis
HRP	2020	Six ethical traps	Recruitment, onboarding, performance review, organizational ethics	Algorithmic AI & decision-support tools

(Continued)

Appedix 1 *(Continued)*

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
HRP	2020	AI accelerates the pace	HR efficiency, digital transformation	Algorithmic AI & automation tool
HRP	2019	Flying start	Organizational change, leadership development, HR strategy	Foundational digital tools & early-stage AI adoption
HRP	2018	Future anxiety	Future workforce planning, skills development, generational insights	Predictive AI & workforce analytics
HRP	2018	New visions	Organizational development, leadership strategy, HR transformation	Foundational digital tools & early-stage AI adoption
HRP	2018	10 digital steps	Change management	Foundational digital tools & early-stage AI adoption
HRP	2019	HR in transition	Organizational change, leadership development, digital transformation	Strategic AI & cultural transformation tools
HRP	2023	The expert: AI is a digital companion	People management, administrative automation, ethical recruitment	Generative AI & assistive AI (e.g., ChatGPT, DALL·E, Midjourney)
HRP	2021	"HR must lead the way and be good at AI"	Strategic leadership, digital transformation, ethical AI implementation	Algorithmic AI & automation (including chatbots and data-driven tools)
HRP	2019	The time of the robots	Administrative tasks, recruitment, strategic HR	Process automation & decision-support AI
HRP	2023	Gen Z focus for the future	Talent attraction, employer branding, learning & development	Educational & immersive tech (e.g., AI and VR for learning)
Chefstidningen	2024	AI can help you find the right candidate	Recruitment, job ad optimization, candidate screening, internal mobility	Algorithmic AI & assistive AI tools (e.g., chatbots, language models, behavioral analysis)

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
Chefstidningen	2024	Managers don't have time to think about AI development	HR digitalization, administrative automation, strategic HR development	Algorithmic AI & process automation tools
Chefstidningen	2024	See AI as a force for positive change	Administrative automation, strategic HR, employee experience, organizational development	Process automation & decision-support A
Chefstidningen	2023	The HR specialist–like having a little assistant on your shoulder	Task support, communication, interview preparation, productivity enhancement	Generative AI & assistive AI (e.g., ChatGPT)
Chefstidningen	2023	New AI will write better job ads	Job ad creation, inclusive recruitment communication, employer branding	Algorithmic AI & natural language processing
Chefstidningen	2023	AI will silence the meeting chatterbox	Administrative automation, strategic HR, employee experience, organizational development	Process automation & decision-support AI
Chefstidningen	2022	Here, robots will handle job interviews	Recruitment, job ad optimization, candidate screening, internal mobility	Algorithmic and assistive AI (e.g., chatbots, language models, behavioral analysis)
Chefstidningen	2022	AI is a tool that requires human maintenance and supervision	HR digitalization, administrative automation, strategic HR development	Algorithmic AI & process automation tools
Chefstidningen	2019	Time to let the robots take over recruitment	Recruitment, job ad optimization, candidate screening, internal mobility	Algorithmic AI & assistive AI tools (e.g., chatbots, language models, behavioral analysis)
Akavia	2024	Deepfake–when AI becomes the fraudster's best tool	Recruitment Security, Employee Awareness, Identity Verification	Generative AI, Deepfake Technology, AI Detection Tools

(Continued)

Appedix 1 *(Continued)*

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
Akavia	2024	AI chat provides support during conflicts	Conflict Resolution, Leadership Support, Culture Development	Custom Chatbots, Language-Based AI, Conversational AI
Akavia	2024	This is what an HR-consultant in the region does and earns	HR Generalist Support, Work Environment Management, Leadership Coaching	AI Education, Future-Oriented Tools (mentioned indirectly via AI in healthcare and training)
Akavia	2024	Changing tracks mid-life	HR-IT Integration, Sustainable HR Development, Career Transition Support	Human Resource Information Systems
Akavia	2024	How your career opportunities are affected by AI	Career Development, Leadership Readiness, Workforce Transformation	Generative AI, AI-Augmented Roles, Cognitive Automation
Akavia	2024	How digital workplace surveillance can work	Employee Monitoring, Workplace Ethics, Data Governance	Surveillance Analytics, Behavioral Tracking, Productivity Monitoring Tools
Akavia	2023	The trend shift: Traditional paths to jobs are decreasing	Employer Branding, Candidate Experience	Social Media Algorithms
Akavia	2023	Few workplaces are ready for AI	Skills Development, Organizational Strategy	Generative AI, Deep Learning Systems
Akavia	2023	How avatars recruit candidates	Recruitment, Interview Automation, Talent Screening	Structured Interview Bots, AI Screening Tools
Akavia	2023	AI – your next recruiter	Recruitment Innovation, Inclusive Hiring	Social AI Robots, Predictive AI, Assistive Interview Tech
Akavia	2022	Skills and abilities you need in the future workplace	Future Skills Planning, Workforce Upskilling	Predictive Workforce Analytics

Magazine	Year of publication	Article title translated in English	Kind of HR work described in the publication	Kind of AI described in the publication
Akavia	2022	Future competencies	Strategic Workforce Planning, Talent Development	AI-Driven Change without specific AI named
Akavia	2022	Race against time in the staffing industry	Talent Deployment, Staffing Efficiency	Automation Tools, Digital Matching Platforms
Akavia	2022	Are you being monitored at work	Employee Monitoring, Digital Policy Development	Surveillance AI, Behavioral Analytics
Akavia	2021	Strengthened HR role after the pandemic	Strategic HR Leadership, Organizational Development, Talent Management	Process Automation
Akavia	2021	Personality texts give a misleading picture in recruitment	Recruitment & selection	AI-Assisted Screening, Predictive Assessment Tools
Akavia	2021	How AI will affect leadership	Change Management, Upskilling	Decision Support AI
Akavia	2021	Successful leadership	Employee Wellbeing, Psychosocial Work Environment	AI-Accelerated Change (contextual)
Akademikern	2023	How the work environment is affected by working with AI	Work environment, HR digitalization, administrative automation, strategic HR development	Algorithmic AI & process automation tools
Akademikern	2021	The HR world is taking a new shape	Talent development, HR strategy	Learning tech, Process automation
Akademikern	2021	HR plays an important role when AI is introduced in the workplace	HR strategy, Talent development, Recruitment	Learning tech, Process automation, Assistive AI
Akademikern	2020	Successful investment in digital events	Employee engagement, Learning & development	Learning tech