INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION (IJRSI)
ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

HR Analytics and People Analytics: Applications, Challenges, and Future Research Directions

Samuel Asante

School of Business and Economics, Universiti Putra Malaysia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1306000424

Received: 01 July 2026; Accepted: 06 July 2026; Published: 16 July 2026

ABSTRACT

People analytics the label has largely displaced the older "HR analytics," though the two still get used interchangeably is no longer a fringe interest within human resource management. It has become one of the field's most argued-about developments. This narrative review works through peer-reviewed research published mostly between 2015 and 2025 to ask three things: where in the HR function analytics has actually taken hold, what keeps getting in its way, and what researchers still owe the field. Talent acquisition, retention modelling, and workforce planning show the clearest gains; engagement, wellbeing, and learning applications are newer and less settled. Adoption overall is patchy. Bad or fragmented data, thin analytical capability inside HR teams, internal resistance, and a set of escalating ethical and legal threats—among them algorithmic bias in automated CV and résumé screening, and worker-surveillance practices that breach employee privacy—together explain a familiar pattern in this literature the field promises more than it has yet shown. The paper ends by laying out where research needs to go: firmer theory, causal evidence rather than correlational snapshots, governance frameworks built for algorithmic and AI-enabled HRM, more attention to how employees themselves experience being analysed, and work outside the usual large-firm, Western settings small businesses and developing economies chief among them.

Keywords: HR analytics, people analytics, workforce analytics, human resource management, evidence-based management, algorithmic HRM

HR Analytics and People Analytics: Applications, Challenges, and Future Research Directions

Few things have shifted how people talk about human resource management (HRM) as much as the arrival of analytics. It started as scattered experimentation with workforce metrics and has since hardened into something closer to a recognized organizational capability dedicated teams, commercial platforms, a fast-growing body of scholarship behind it (Margherita, 2022; Qamar & Samad, 2022). The pitch is easy to follow. HR had spent decades being told it leaned on intuition and habit for decisions with real financial weight who gets hired, who gets paid what, who gets kept (Rasmussen & Ulrich, 2015). If marketing and finance could run on data, the argument went, why not people management too?

The gap between that promise and what has actually been shown, though, has never really closed. Marler and Boudreau (2017), in the review most people in this field still cite first, found surprisingly little rigorous evidence that analytics improves organizational outcomes. Angrave et al. (2016) put it more bluntly, warning that HR was "set to fail" the big-data challenge unless it built up analytical capability and a more strategic posture. Nearly ten years on, systematic reviews are still describing that same gap between claim and demonstration (Alam et al., 2025; McCartney & Fu, 2022b). Meanwhile the ethical worries surveillance, algorithmic bias, employee privacy that used to sit at the margins of this conversation have moved to its centre (Edwards et al., 2024; Giermindl et al., 2022; Tursunbayeva et al., 2022).

This paper takes stock of the field at a point where both the opportunities and the tensions have become sharper. Three questions structure it. Where is HR analytics actually being applied, and what does the evidence say once you look past the pitch? What keeps limiting its adoption and impact? And where should research go from here? Two audiences have a stake in the answers. Scholarship on people analytics has grown fast but unevenly, scattered across HRM, information systems, ethics, and data-science journals that rarely cite each other (Kaushal et al., 2023; Tursunbayeva et al., 2018), so the field needs some consolidation. And for practitioners the stakes are more concrete: organizations are pouring money into analytics capability, and what separates the investments that pay off from the ones that quietly die usually comes down to exactly the obstacles this literature has documented (Fernandez & Gallardo-Gallardo, 2021; Shet et al., 2021).

The paper is organized as follows. The next section works through the conceptual terrain including the contested question of what separates "HR analytics" from "people analytics" and traces how the field got here. After that comes a review of where analytics is actually applied, then the recurring challenges, then a research agenda. A short section on practical implications sits before the conclusion.

Review Approach

This is a narrative review, which fits a literature this scattered across disciplines and this argumentative in its core debates (Tursunbayeva et al., 2018). It synthesizes 49 peer-reviewed works, drawn mainly from the 2015–2025 window and identified through searches of two academic databases, Scopus and Web of Science, using combinations of the terms HR analytics, people analytics, workforce analytics, human capital analytics, and talent analytics. Sources were retained where they met three criteria: publication in a peer-reviewed journal, direct relevance to the application, adoption, or governance of HR or people analytics, and either empirical evidence or a substantive conceptual contribution; purely promotional vendor material and non-refereed practitioner commentary were excluded. Within that pool, systematic and bibliometric reviews were prioritized Alam et al. (2025), Garcia-Arroyo and Osca (2021), Margherita (2022), and Qamar and Samad (2022) among them alongside influential conceptual and empirical work and recent research on AI and algorithmic HRM. A small number of foundational pieces published before 2015 are cited where later debates still lean on them. None of this claims the exhaustiveness of a formal systematic review; the goal here is interpretive pull together what the field actually knows, flag what's still contested, and point at what nobody has looked at yet.

Conceptual Foundations

Defining HR Analytics and People Analytics

Terminology here has never really settled. HR analytics, people analytics, workforce analytics, human capital analytics, talent analytics all of these circulate with overlapping and sometimes contradictory meanings (Tursunbayeva et al., 2018). The definition that most of the field has converged on comes from Marler and Boudreau (2017), who describe HR analytics as an HR practice, enabled by information technology, that uses descriptive, visual, and statistical analysis of HR-related data process data, human capital data, organizational performance, external benchmarks to establish business impact and support data-driven decisions. Two things in that definition matter. First, analytics is not the same as reporting; it points at decisions, not just dashboards. Second, it isn't confined to whatever sits in the HR information system it links people data to business data specifically to make an impact case.

The drift from "HR analytics" to "people analytics" as the preferred term is itself telling. Tursunbayeva et al. (2018) trace that shift and read it as a broadening away from analytics as a service HR provides for itself, and toward analytics aimed at the whole workforce, pulling in data well beyond HR records: communication metadata, collaboration-platform activity, sensor data. Leonardi and Contractor (2018) push the expansion furthest, arguing the real analytical frontier is relational the patterns of interaction between employees rather than anything about individuals in isolation. Most scholars, in practice, still treat the two terms as near-synonyms (McCartney & Fu, 2022b), and this paper does the same while flagging that the distinction exists.

It's also worth separating out analytical maturity as its own axis. Descriptive analytics summarizes what already happened; predictive analytics estimates what's likely to happen; prescriptive analytics recommends a course of action (Margherita, 2022). Practice studies keep finding the same thing: most organizations sit at the descriptive end, and genuinely predictive or prescriptive work is confined to a small group of analytically advanced firms (Belizón et al., 2024; Rigamonti et al., 2024). Maturity models like the one from Rigamonti et al. (2024) treat movement along that continuum as something that depends on more than technique governance, data infrastructure, and stakeholder buy-in all have to move together.

Evolution of the Field

Trying to manage people with numbers is not a new idea; it goes back to industrial-organizational psychology and mid-twentieth-century attempts to bring scientific method to workforce efficiency (Gal et al., 2020). What changed in the 2000s and 2010s was the combination of cheap computing, enterprise HR systems that had by then accumulated real volumes of employee data, and a broader managerial appetite for evidence-based decisions (Ulrich & Dulebohn, 2015; van den Heuvel & Bondarouk, 2017). Corporate examples Google's Project Oxygen most famously, plus the wider "Moneyball" framing gave the movement cultural traction, and a wave of practitioner writing promised analytics would finally win HR a seat at the strategic table (Rasmussen & Ulrich, 2015).

Academic interest caught up. Bibliometric work shows publications accelerating sharply from around 2016, with the field settling around themes of adoption, capability, value demonstration, and more recently ethics and AI (Kaushal et al., 2023; Qamar & Samad, 2022; Yoon et al., 2024). A 2018 special issue of *Human Resource Management* marked something of a consolidation, bringing together work on analytics capability, credibility, and strategy execution (Huselid, 2018; Kryscynski et al., 2018; Levenson, 2018; Minbaeva, 2018). The most recent stretch has been shaped by machine learning and generative AI, which have widened what's technically possible while sharpening long-running worries about transparency and fairness (Heidemann et al., 2024; Meijerink et al., 2021; Tambe et al., 2019). This history matters for what follows a lot of the field's present-day problems are simply inherited from how fast and how practice-driven its early growth was.

Applications of HR Analytics and People Analytics

Reviews of this field keep landing on roughly the same map of application areas: talent acquisition, performance and retention, learning and development, engagement and wellbeing, and strategic workforce planning (Garcia-Arroyo & Osca, 2021; Lee & Lee, 2024; Margherita, 2022). The next sections take each in turn what analytics is used for there, and what the evidence actually says about whether it works.

Talent Acquisition and Recruitment

Recruitment has probably been the single most productive area for analytics, partly because hiring throws off abundant, well-structured data and produces outcomes you can observe on a reasonable timeline. Analytics gets used to evaluate sourcing channels, forecast applicant flow, screen candidates, and predict post-hire performance and retention (Garg et al., 2022; Pessach et al., 2020). Pessach et al. (2020) show the more advanced end of this combining machine learning with mathematical programming to build a prescriptive recruitment system that optimizes hiring decisions against predicted employee outcomes. Natural language processing has also found its way into résumé screening and job-posting language, cutting down tasks that used to eat up a lot of recruiter time (Garg et al., 2022).

But this is also where the field's most visible failures have shown up. Amazon's abandoned résumé-screening algorithm which learned to penalize signals of female gender because it trained on historical hiring data is by now the standard example of analytics systematizing bias instead of removing it (Tambe et al., 2019). Newman et al. (2020) add a behavioural wrinkle worth taking seriously: even when the tools perform well technically, candidates and employees often experience algorithm-driven decisions as reductive and procedurally unfair. Accuracy alone doesn't buy legitimacy. Recruitment analytics, in other words, is a fairly clean example of the field's general condition real efficiency gains sitting alongside fairness and acceptance questions nobody has fully resolved.

Performance Management and Employee Retention

Turnover prediction is probably the most commonly reported people-analytics use case in the literature (Lee & Lee, 2024; Margherita, 2022). Voluntary departures are expensive and the outcome variable is unambiguous, which makes attrition modelling a relatively easy way for an organization to demonstrate analytical value quickly: models trained on demographic, performance, compensation, and engagement data flag people or teams at elevated risk, and managers get a chance to intervene before someone resigns (Garcia-Arroyo & Osca, 2021). Analytics has reshaped performance management too, supporting more continuous measurement, cross-unit calibration of ratings, and identifying what actually distinguishes high performers (Hamilton & Sodeman, 2020; Leonardi & Contractor, 2018).

The organizational-level evidence is thinner, though it's growing. McCartney and Fu (2022a) built and tested a model of why, how, and when HR analytics affects organizational performance, and found that impact hinges on whether analytical output actually gets translated into evidence-based management practice not on the sophistication of the analytics itself. Thakur et al. (2024) report something similar: HR analytics contributes to firm performance partly by boosting creative problem-solving capability, which again points to changed managerial behaviour as the real mechanism. Both findings push against treating predictive accuracy as an end in itself a beautifully calibrated attrition model that no manager acts on creates nothing, which is presumably why frameworks of people-analytics effectiveness put stakeholder uptake right alongside analytical quality (Ellmer & Reichel, 2021; Fu et al., 2023; Peeters et al., 2020).

Learning, Development, and Career Management

Within human resource development, analytics gets used to check which training investments actually produce measurable improvement, to personalize learning paths, and to map skills against where the organization thinks it's headed (Lee & Lee, 2024; Yoon et al., 2024). Tursunbayeva et al. (2022) point out that analytics can finally help answer which programmes work and how development budgets should be allocated a question the training-evaluation literature has wanted to answer for decades and only recently had the data to attempt. Lee and Lee (2024), reviewing the literature from a human-resource-development angle, sort applications into individual development, career development, organizational development, and performance management, and argue that HRD professionals who build up analytical fluency stand to gain both credibility and strategic weight. Compared with recruitment and retention, though, this area is still thin empirically claims about personalized, data-driven learning rest more on vendor marketing than on independent evaluation (Yoon et al., 2024).

Employee Engagement, Experience, and Wellbeing

A newer strand of work concerns measuring and managing employee experience itself. Continuous listening programmes, pulse surveys, sentiment analysis of open-text feedback, and more controversially passive data pulled from communication and collaboration platforms are all used to monitor engagement and catch problems early (Giermindl et al., 2022; Tursunbayeva et al., 2018). Organizational network analysis takes this further, looking at collaboration patterns to spot overload, isolation, and informal influence in ways attribute-based data simply can't (Leonardi & Contractor, 2018). Interest in wellbeing analytics picked up sharply during and after COVID-19, as remote work both generated more digital traces of employee behaviour and cut managers off from the informal, in-person visibility they used to have into how people were actually coping (Minbaeva, 2021).

This is also where insight and surveillance sit closest together. Giermindl et al. (2022) lay out the risks: monitoring that erodes trust, metrics that change behaviour in ways nobody intended, inferences drawn about people's inner states from data they never volunteered for that purpose. Chatterjee et al. (2022), working from a privacy-calculus perspective, show empirically that employees do weigh the benefits of analytics against how much privacy risk they perceive and that ignoring that calculation threatens the very engagement these systems are supposed to protect. Engagement and wellbeing analytics is where the case for treating ethical governance as inseparable from technical practice is clearest.

Strategic Workforce Planning and Organizational Decision Making

At the most aggregated level, analytics feeds strategic workforce planning forecasting headcount and skill needs, modelling the workforce implications of different business scenarios, optimizing organizational design

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

(Huselid, 2018; Levenson, 2018). Levenson (2018) argues that this is exactly where workforce analytics earns its distinctive value: diagnosing whether an organization's talent and structure can actually execute its strategy, rather than tuning individual HR processes in isolation. Boudreau and Cascio (2017) make a related point human capital analytics only pays off once findings get translated into terms that decision-makers outside HR can act on. Case evidence backs this up: studies of analytically mature organizations describe teams working on business problems safety, productivity, customer outcomes with workforce data as one input among several, not producing HR reports for an HR audience (Belizón et al., 2024; Cayrat & Boxall, 2022; McCartney & Fu, 2022a). Zhou et al. (2021) offer firm-level quantitative support for this, finding that HRM digitalization is related to firm performance contingently, in interaction with other organizational conditions.

Challenges

If the applications literature explains why analytics is appealing, the challenges literature explains why the results have been so uneven. Recent systematic reviews sort the obstacles into recurring clusters around data, skills, organizational politics, and ethics (Alam et al., 2025; Fernandez & Gallardo-Gallardo, 2021). This section works through each cluster, then adds a fifth that cuts across all of them: the persistent gap between what analytics claims and what it has demonstrated.

Data Quality, Integration, and Governance

The most basic constraint on people analytics is simply the state of the data. HR data tends to be fragmented across systems, defined differently between units, incomplete, and out of date (Alam et al., 2025; van den Heuvel & Bondarouk, 2017). Even something as basic as "turnover" or "performance" can be calculated differently across divisions of the same company, which undermines comparability before the analysis has even started (Hamilton & Sodeman, 2020). Integration makes it worse demonstrating business impact means joining people data to operational and financial systems that were never built to talk to each other, which takes sustained investment in architecture and governance (Minbaeva, 2018; Shet et al., 2021). Strohmeier et al. (2022) show, using a configurational approach, that advanced data and advanced analysis only produce success together, not separately meaning sophisticated technique cannot compensate for bad data. Governance adds a regulatory layer on top: under regimes like the EU's General Data Protection Regulation, mishandling employee data carries real financial penalties, so data governance is a matter of legal exposure as much as analytical housekeeping (Tursunbayeva et al., 2022).

Analytical and Technical Skill Deficits

The second cluster is about people, not data. This field's earliest critics already flagged shortages of statistical, technical, and data-science capability inside HR functions as a central barrier (Angrave et al., 2016; Marler & Boudreau, 2017), and the deficit isn't purely technical. Kryscynski et al. (2018) found analytical ability predicts how well HR professionals perform, but the relevant competencies go beyond running models framing decision-relevant questions, reading results in business context, communicating findings persuasively all matter too (Falletta & Combs, 2021; Qamar & Samad, 2022). Fu et al. (2023) get at that last piece directly, showing that HR analysts do a kind of storytelling balancing act showcasing findings while also holding back overinterpretation and that this narrative work is central to whether the analytics ends up changing any decisions. Adoption research adds an individual layer: Hülter et al. (2024) find that what HR practitioners believe about machine learning how transparent it is, how fair shapes whether they're willing to adopt analytical tools at all. Skill gaps, then, bite twice: they limit what HR teams can produce, and separately, what they're prepared to use.

Organizational and Cultural Barriers

Analytics initiatives land inside organizations that already have histories, politics, and cultures, and those things push back. Resistance comes from managers who feel their judgement is being challenged, from employees who associate workforce data with monitoring and job insecurity, and from HR professionals whose sense of professional identity was built on interpersonal rather than quantitative skill (Shet et al., 2021; Vargas et al., 2018). Budget limits and weak executive sponsorship show up repeatedly in the adoption

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

literature analytics is competing for investment against functions with a longer track record of showing returns, and without visible commitment from senior leaders, initiatives tend to stall at the pilot stage (Alam et al., 2025; Fernandez & Gallardo-Gallardo, 2021). Ownership is also unsettled: reviews describe ongoing disagreement over whether analytics capability should sit inside HR, inside a central data function, or in some hybrid arrangement, and each option trades domain knowledge against technical depth (McCartney & Fu, 2022b; Rasmussen & Ulrich, 2015). Ellmer and Reichel (2021) offer a more useful framing than "resistance," though analytics outputs only gain traction when they line up epistemically with how decision-makers already reason about the business, which suggests cultural barriers aren't obstacles to clear away so much as conditions to design around.

Ethical, Legal, and Privacy Concerns

No challenge in this field has risen faster than ethics, and the concerns here are several, tangled together. Privacy is the most immediate one: people analytics runs on data about identifiable individuals, much of it collected for entirely different purposes, and the line between legitimate analysis and intrusive surveillance keeps moving (Chatterjee et al., 2022; Giermindl et al., 2022). Fairness is next models trained on historical data inherit historical discrimination, and algorithmic decisions can disadvantage protected groups in ways that are hard to spot and even harder to explain (Newman et al., 2020; Tambe et al., 2019). Transparency and accountability form a third strand: machine learning approaches that push for maximum predictive performance often trade away interpretability, and that trade-off bites especially hard in employment decisions people are legally entitled to contest (Heidemann et al., 2024). Leicht-Deobald et al. (2019) argue that algorithm-based HR decisions can threaten employees' personal integrity by replacing contextual moral judgement with standardized rules, and Gal et al. (2020) propose virtue ethics as a corrective, warning of a vicious cycle where algorithmic management erodes exactly the professional judgement that would be needed to keep it in check. Edwards et al. (2024) describe HR analytics as a field still finding its footing alongside these simmering ethical questions a fair summary of a literature where the normative thinking lags well behind what's technically possible. Some practical responses are emerging the ethical charters and review processes Tursunbayeva et al. (2022) recommend, the seven-step evidence-based and ethical analytics cycle from Falletta and Combs (2021) but hardly anyone has empirically evaluated whether these governance mechanisms actually work.

The Evidence Gap

The last challenge is about the field's own claims. Marler and Boudreau (2017) could find only a handful of rigorous studies actually connecting HR analytics to organizational performance, and while the empirical base has grown since then, later reviews keep reaching a similar verdict long on promise, short on demonstrated impact (McCartney & Fu, 2022b; Qamar & Samad, 2022). Part of this is methodological: organizations that publish successful cases are self-selecting, within-firm projects hit confidentiality walls before publication, and cross-sectional survey designs dominate the literature, leaving causal questions unanswered (McCartney & Fu, 2022b). Part of it is conceptual inconsistent definitions and measures of "analytics" itself make it hard for evidence to accumulate across studies (Tursunbayeva et al., 2018). The upshot is a credibility problem with real practical bite: HR leaders asking for investment in analytics capability are being asked to show returns that the research base can't yet reliably back up (Boudreau & Cascio, 2017; Minbaeva, 2018).

Future Research Directions

The challenges above point fairly directly toward a research agenda. Five directions stand out, each answering a gap the current literature leaves open.

Strengthening Theoretical Foundations

People analytics research is still theoretically thin. A lot of published work is descriptive or written for practitioners, and the studies that do engage theory tend to borrow eclectically resource-based view here, dynamic capabilities there, technology acceptance, institutional theory without much cumulative integration (Margherita, 2022; Qamar & Samad, 2022). Future work should move past documenting adoption and start explaining it: what mechanisms actually build analytical capability, legitimate it, and turn it into decisions? Useful starting points include capability perspectives that treat analytics as an organizational routine rather than a piece of technology (Minbaeva, 2018), the epistemic-alignment lens Ellmer and Reichel (2021) developed, and process theories that trace analytical insight through the organizational work required to actually act on it (Belizón et al., 2024; Fu et al., 2023). Some conceptual housekeeping would help too distinguishing analytics as technology, practice, capability, and occupation would discipline measurement across studies (Tursunbayeva et al., 2018).

Establishing Causal Evidence of Impact

More cross-sectional surveys won't close the evidence gap. What the field needs is longitudinal work that tracks organizations as their analytics capability matures, quasi-experimental designs that exploit staged rollouts of analytical tools, and multi-level research connecting analytics use to team and individual outcomes, not just firm performance (Marler & Boudreau, 2017; McCartney & Fu, 2022a). Mediating mechanisms deserve particular attention existing evidence suggests impact runs through changed managerial decision-making and problem-solving rather than directly from analytical sophistication (McCartney & Fu, 2022a; Thakur et al., 2024), and that claim is worth replicating across different contexts. Failure deserves study too. Published cases skew heavily toward success stories, but the stalled and abandoned initiatives probably hold the clearest lessons about where the boundary conditions actually sit (Cayrat & Boxall, 2022; McCartney & Fu, 2022b). Partnerships that give researchers access to within-firm projects, with real confidentiality protections, would relieve one of the field's tightest constraints.

Ethics, Governance, and Employee-Centred Analytics

Ethical scholarship on people analytics has matured conceptually but stayed empirically thin. We still don't know much about how organizations actually govern analytics day to day whether ethical charters, review boards, and algorithmic audits change anything in practice, or how governance requirements interact with emerging AI-at-work regulation (Edwards et al., 2024; Tursunbayeva et al., 2022). There's also a perspective gap: this literature is written almost entirely from the organization's point of view, with employees showing up mainly as data subjects. Research is needed on how being analysed actually feels from the employee side, when people judge that legitimate, and what conditions make monitoring erode trust versus preserve it (Chatterjee et al., 2022; Giermindl et al., 2022). Concepts like procedural justice (Newman et al., 2020) and personal integrity (Leicht-Deobald et al., 2019) give this work theoretical footing. A genuinely employee-centred people analytics where workers share in both the governance and the benefits of workforce data remains more of a design aspiration than something anyone has actually studied empirically (Gal et al., 2020).

Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic HRM

Machine learning, and lately generative AI, have opened up a research frontier the analytics literature is only starting to absorb. Meijerink et al. (2021) frame algorithmic HRM as its own phenomenon software taking over decisions people used to make raising questions about accountability and what happens to the HR professional's role. Priorities here include the trade-off between predictive performance and transparency in employment models, which Heidemann et al. (2024) show can be softened but not eliminated; the conditions under which human oversight of algorithmic recommendations is real rather than nominal (Tambe et al., 2019); and the individual-level beliefs that govern whether practitioners adopt machine learning tools at all (Hülter et al., 2024). Generative AI raises still more questions how it's being used to draft HR communications and synthesize workforce insight, what it does to the skill profile the analytics function needs none of which has received serious scholarly attention yet (Kaushal et al., 2023).

Context, Contingency, and Underexplored Settings

Finally, the empirical base here is narrow in context. Research concentrates on large firms in North America and Western Europe, leaving small and medium enterprises, public and non-profit organizations, and developing economies largely unexamined despite good reasons to think adoption dynamics differ across these settings (Alam et al., 2025; Garcia-Arroyo & Osca, 2021). Data scarcity, resource constraints, institutional environment, and labour-market conditions all plausibly change both how feasible and how valuable analytics is, yet contingency-focused research is still rare (Zhou et al., 2021). Cross-national comparative work would help too, showing how different privacy regimes and employment-law traditions shape what people analytics can legitimately do a question that only gets more important as regulation of workplace AI diverges across jurisdictions (Tursunbayeva et al., 2022). Sector-specific studies healthcare against manufacturing against knowledge-intensive services, say would test how far findings from one industry actually travel to another (Cayrat & Boxall, 2022).

Practical Implications

A few things follow for practice. Organizations should sequence their investment realistically reliable data infrastructure and shared definitions have to come before sophisticated modelling, and trying to skip ahead tends to produce analyses nobody can trust or compare (Minbaeva, 2018; Strohmeier et al., 2022). Capability building should target the whole analytical value chain framing the right questions, doing the analysis, telling the story rather than just technical skill, since the evidence suggests impact depends on whether insights actually change any decisions (Fu et al., 2023; Kryscynski et al., 2018; McCartney & Fu, 2022a). Ethical governance needs to be built in from the start, not bolted on afterward: clear communication about what data gets collected and why, meaningful consent where that's feasible, fairness audits on any model used in employment decisions, clear accountability for algorithmic outcomes these are increasingly legal-compliance issues as much as trust issues (Falletta & Combs, 2021; Tursunbayeva et al., 2022). And senior sponsorship matters more than most of the technical choices: analytics initiatives tied to business problems executives already care about, framed in the language of those problems, are simply far more likely to survive the ordinary competition for organizational attention and budget (Alam et al., 2025; Boudreau & Cascio, 2017; Levenson, 2018).

CONCLUSION

A decade after scholars first warned HR risked failing the big-data challenge, the honest verdict on HR analytics and people analytics is neither the triumph its advocates promised nor the fad its critics predicted. Analytics has become a durable part of contemporary HRM, with real applications across recruitment, retention, development, engagement, and workforce planning, and with growing if still incomplete evidence that it contributes to organizational performance. But the field's core tension hasn't gone anywhere: capability keeps outrunning both evidence and governance. Data is messier than the models built on it assume. Analytical skill is scarce exactly where it's needed most. Organizational adoption is fragile. And the ethical stakes of analysing people at scale have only grown as the underlying technology has gotten more powerful. For research, the way forward runs through stronger theory, causal evidence, employee-centred perspectives, and serious engagement with algorithmic and AI-enabled HRM. For practice, it runs through patient investment in data, skills, and trust. The organizations and scholars willing to take both the promise and the problems seriously rather than picking a side between enthusiasm and scepticism are the ones most likely to shape what this field becomes next.

REFERENCES

1. Alam, S., Dong, Z., Kularatne, I., & Rashid, M. S. (2025). Exploring approaches to overcome challenges in adopting human resource analytics through stakeholder engagement. Management Review Quarterly, 76(1), 729--787. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00491-y
2. 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
3. Belizón, M. J., Majarín, D., & Aguado, D. (2024). Human resources analytics in practice: A knowledge discovery process. European Management Review, 21(3), 659--677. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12605
4. Boudreau, J., & Cascio, W. (2017). Human capital analytics: Why are we not there? Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 4(2), 119--126. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-03-2017-0021

5. Cayrat, C., & Boxall, P. (2022). Exploring the phenomenon of HR analytics: A study of challenges, risks and impacts in 40 large companies. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 9(4), 572--590. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-08-2021-0238
6. Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., Vrontis, D., & Siachou, E. (2022). Examining the dark side of human resource analytics: An empirical investigation using the privacy calculus approach. International Journal of Manpower, 43(1), 52--74. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-02-2021-0087
7. Edwards, M. R., Charlwood, A., Guenole, N., & Marler, J. (2024). HR analytics: An emerging field finding its place in the world alongside simmering ethical challenges. Human Resource Management Journal, 34(2), 326--336. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12435
8. Ellmer, M., & Reichel, A. (2021). Staying close to business: The role of epistemic alignment in rendering HR analytics outputs relevant to decision-makers. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 32(12), 2622--2642.
9. Falletta, S. V., & Combs, W. L. (2021). The HR analytics cycle: A seven-step process for building evidence-based and ethical HR analytics capabilities. Journal of Work-Applied Management, 13(1), 51--68. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-03-2020-0020
10. Fernandez, V., & Gallardo-Gallardo, E. (2021). Tackling the HR digitalization challenge: Key factors and barriers to HR analytics adoption. Competitiveness Review, 31(1), 162--187. https://doi.org/10.1108/CR-12-2019-0163
11. Fu, N., Keegan, A., & McCartney, S. (2023). The duality of HR analysts' storytelling: Showcasing and curbing. Human Resource Management Journal, 33(2), 261--286. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12466
12. 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), Article 100301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2020.100301
13. Garcia-Arroyo, J., & Osca, A. (2021). Big data contributions to human resource management: A systematic review. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 32(20), 4337--4362. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1674357
14. Garg, S., Sinha, S., Kar, A. K., & Mani, M. (2022). A review of machine learning applications in human resource management. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 71(5), 1590--1610. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-08-2020-0427
15. 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
16. Hamilton, R. H., & Sodeman, W. A. (2020). The questions we ask: Opportunities and challenges for using big data analytics to strategically manage human capital resources. Business Horizons, 63(1), 85--95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.10.001
17. Heidemann, A., Hülter, S. M., & Tekieli, M. (2024). Machine learning with real-world HR data: Mitigating the trade-off between predictive performance and transparency. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 35(14), 2343--2366. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2335515
18. Hülter, S. M., Ertel, C., & Heidemann, A. (2024). Exploring the individual adoption of human resource analytics: Behavioural beliefs and the role of machine learning characteristics. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 208, Article 123709. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123709
19. Huselid, M. A. (2018). The science and practice of workforce analytics: Introduction to the HRM special issue. Human Resource Management, 57(3), 679--684. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21916
20. Kaushal, N., Kaurav, R. P. S., Sivathanu, B., & Kaushik, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence and HRM: Identifying future research agenda using systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. Management Review Quarterly, 73(2), 455--493. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00249-2
21. Kryscynski, D., Reeves, C., Stice-Lusvardi, R., Ulrich, M., & Russell, G. (2018). Analytical abilities and the performance of HR professionals. Human Resource Management, 57(3), 715--738. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21854
22. Lee, J. Y., & Lee, Y. (2024). Integrative literature review on people analytics and implications from the perspective of human resource development. Human Resource Development Review, 23(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843231217181

23. Leicht-Deobald, U., Busch, T., Schank, C., Weibel, A., Schafheitle, S., Wildhaber, I., & Kasper, G. (2019). The challenges of algorithm-based HR decision-making for personal integrity. Journal of Business Ethics, 160(2), 377--392. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04204-w
24. Leonardi, P., & Contractor, N. (2018). Better people analytics. Harvard Business Review, 96(6), 70--81.
25. Levenson, A. (2018). Using workforce analytics to improve strategy execution. Human Resource Management, 57(3), 685--700. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21850
26. Margherita, A. (2022). Human resources analytics: A systematization of research topics and directions for future research. Human Resource Management Review, 32(2), Article 100795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100795
27. Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28(1), 3--26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699