

Human-Centered Design and HR Tech Adoption: Putting Employees First

Park Ji Hyun, Jabulani Khumalo

Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea

University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Corresponding E-mail: park.hyun@interviauniversity.com

Abstract

The increasing adoption of human resource technology has transformed recruitment, onboarding, performance management, employee engagement, learning, workforce analytics, and organizational decision-making. Despite these developments, the success of human resource technology depends not only on technical capabilities but also on how effectively digital systems address employees' needs, expectations, accessibility requirements, and workplace experiences. This paper examines human-centered design as a strategic approach to improving HR technology adoption by placing employees at the center of system development, implementation, and continuous improvement. It explores the integration of artificial intelligence, machine learning, advanced data analytics, participatory design, usability evaluation, and employee feedback to develop accessible, transparent, inclusive, and trustworthy HR technology solutions. The proposed research framework combines employee-centered requirements analysis, iterative prototyping, usability testing, organizational readiness assessment, and post-implementation evaluation to investigate the relationship between perceived usefulness, ease of use, trust, employee autonomy, and sustained technology adoption. A mixed-method experimental design is presented to compare a conventional technology implementation approach with a human-centered implementation approach using usability, task completion, adoption intention, employee satisfaction, perceived fairness, and productivity-related indicators. Because no empirical dataset or completed experimental measurements are available for this manuscript, the results section defines the analyses required and distinguishes anticipated outcomes from verified findings. The paper also examines challenges associated with algorithmic bias, employee surveillance, privacy, accessibility, resistance to change, and the responsible use of AI in employment-related decisions. The study argues that employee-centered HR technology requires continuous collaboration between employees, HR professionals, designers, technology providers, and organizational leaders. By integrating human-centered design with responsible artificial intelligence and evidence-based evaluation, organizations can improve the usability, acceptance, and perceived legitimacy of digital HR systems while supporting employee well-being and sustainable organizational performance.

Keywords: human-centered design, HR technology, employee experience, technology adoption, artificial intelligence, machine learning, advanced data analytics, employee engagement, digital transformation, responsible AI

I. Introduction

Human resource technology has become an essential component of modern organizational management, influencing how employees interact with employers throughout their professional lives[1]. Digital recruitment platforms, employee self-service portals, learning management systems, performance evaluation tools, payroll applications, and workforce analytics platforms have changed the way organizations manage people and administrative processes. Artificial intelligence has further expanded these capabilities through automated candidate screening, personalized learning recommendations, conversational HR assistants, and predictive workforce analytics. However, the availability of sophisticated technology does not guarantee a positive employee experience. Systems that are difficult to navigate, poorly integrated, inaccessible, or perceived as intrusive can create frustration, reduce trust, and discourage employees from using the very tools intended to improve their work.

Human-centered design offers an alternative to technology development approaches that prioritize technical functionality or administrative efficiency without sufficiently considering the people who use the resulting systems. It emphasizes understanding users' needs, involving stakeholders in design decisions, testing solutions in realistic contexts, and improving systems through iterative feedback. In the HR environment, this approach requires attention to differences in employees' roles, digital literacy, language, disability-related requirements, work arrangements, and access to technology. A system designed for office-based employees may not adequately serve manufacturing workers, healthcare personnel, field staff, or employees who primarily access organizational services through mobile devices. Understanding these differences is necessary to ensure that HR technology supports the full workforce rather than only the most visible user groups. Technology adoption is also a behavioral and organizational process rather than a purely technical event. Employees may avoid a new system because they perceive it as unnecessarily complicated, believe it offers little personal benefit, distrust the way their information will be used, or fear that automated decisions will negatively affect their careers. In contrast, employees may be more willing to adopt a system when they understand its purpose, can complete tasks efficiently, receive appropriate support, and believe that the organization respects their privacy and autonomy[2]. These factors demonstrate why adoption should be assessed through a combination of actual usage, perceived usefulness, satisfaction, trust, and the ability to complete meaningful tasks rather than through installation rates or login counts alone.

This paper examines how human-centered design can improve HR technology adoption while integrating artificial intelligence and machine learning for advanced data analytics. Its objectives are to identify the design principles that influence employee acceptance, develop a framework linking user experience with sustained adoption, examine the responsible application of AI in HR systems, and propose an experimental method for evaluating employee-centered implementation strategies[3]. The central proposition is that technology adoption becomes more sustainable when employees participate in design and implementation decisions and when organizations measure both operational outcomes and human consequences. The paper consequently treats employee experience, fairness, accessibility, privacy, and organizational effectiveness as interconnected dimensions of successful HR technology adoption.

II. Human-centered design in human resource technology

Human-centered design begins with a detailed understanding of the people who will use a system and the situations in which they will use it. In HR technology, this involves examining the tasks employees need to complete, the difficulties they encounter in existing processes, the information they require, and the circumstances that influence their access to digital services. Interviews, contextual observation, surveys, journey mapping, and task analysis can help designers identify problems that may not be visible through technical requirements alone. For example, employees may struggle with a leave-management application not because the underlying workflow is incorrect but because approval status is difficult to find, policy explanations are unclear, or the interface assumes familiarity with organizational terminology.

Employee participation is a central principle of this approach. Rather than relying exclusively on managers, HR specialists, or technology vendors to define requirements, organizations should involve employees from different departments, seniority levels, work locations, and accessibility needs. Participatory workshops can help reveal differences in expectations and identify features that matter most to particular groups[4]. Employees can review early prototypes, explain confusing workflows, and suggest improvements before expensive system changes become necessary. Meaningful participation also requires transparency about how feedback will be used; consultation is unlikely to build trust when employees believe that their contributions are collected but ignored.

Iterative design translates employee insights into prototypes that can be tested and refined. A development team might create a simplified onboarding interface, observe employees completing common tasks, identify points of confusion, and revise the interface before broader deployment. This process reduces reliance on assumptions and enables design decisions to be supported by observable evidence. Usability testing should evaluate not only whether employees eventually complete a task but also the time required, the number of errors, the assistance needed, and the user's confidence in the result. Testing should include representative users and realistic scenarios so that the final system is not optimized solely for technology professionals or highly experienced employees. Human-centered design also extends beyond the interface to the entire service experience[5]. An employee may interact with an HR portal, a chatbot, a manager, a payroll administrator, and a support desk while completing a single request. If these channels provide inconsistent information or require employees to repeat the same details, a visually attractive interface will not resolve the underlying problem. Organizations should therefore examine end-to-end workflows, system integration, information clarity, and the availability of human assistance. Successful design connects digital functionality with the organizational processes and support structures that determine whether employees can achieve their goals efficiently and confidently.

III. HR technology adoption and employee experience

HR technology adoption is influenced by employees' beliefs about the usefulness, usability, reliability, and relevance of a digital system. Perceived usefulness concerns whether employees believe the technology helps them accomplish meaningful tasks, while perceived

ease of use concerns the effort required to learn and operate it. These factors can influence adoption intention, but they do not fully explain employee behavior. Access to appropriate devices, organizational policies, manager expectations, training, system reliability, and compatibility with existing workflows can also determine whether employees actually use the technology. An adoption strategy should therefore examine individual perceptions alongside organizational conditions. Employee experience is shaped by the interactions people have with HR processes throughout their employment[6]. Recruitment and onboarding establish early expectations, while performance management, learning opportunities, benefits administration, and internal mobility influence longer-term perceptions of the organization. Technology can improve these experiences by making information easier to access, reducing repetitive administrative work, and providing timely guidance. However, poorly designed automation can have the opposite effect when employees cannot understand a decision, correct an inaccurate record, or reach a human representative. Employee experience should consequently be evaluated across the full lifecycle rather than through a single satisfaction survey conducted immediately after implementation.

Trust is particularly important when HR technology processes personal information or influences decisions affecting employment opportunities[7]. Employees may be concerned about how performance data, attendance records, communications, or learning activity are collected and interpreted. Such concerns become more significant when AI systems generate performance predictions, recommend candidates for promotion, or identify employees considered at risk of leaving. Organizations should explain what data is collected, why it is required, who can access it, how long it is retained, and whether it influences consequential decisions. Clear governance, meaningful opportunities to challenge errors, and appropriate human review can help establish conditions for responsible adoption. Sustained adoption requires ongoing support rather than a one-time launch. Initial training may help employees learn basic functions, but continued engagement depends on whether the system remains useful as workflows, policies, and user needs evolve. Organizations should provide accessible documentation, responsive support channels, refresher training, and regular opportunities for feedback. They should also distinguish between non-adoption caused by lack of training and non-adoption caused by genuine design deficiencies. When employees repeatedly avoid a feature because it does not meet their needs, additional training alone may increase frustration without addressing the underlying problem. Adoption management should combine communication, learning support, technical improvement, and organizational accountability[8].

IV. Artificial intelligence and machine learning for advanced data analytics

Artificial intelligence and machine learning can support human-centered HR technology by identifying patterns in employee feedback, analyzing usability data, and helping organizations understand where digital services create unnecessary friction. Natural language processing can categorize comments from surveys and support requests, allowing designers to identify recurring concerns about navigation, accessibility, response times, or confusing policies. Supervised classification can assist in organizing feedback into predefined themes, while clustering methods may reveal groups of related problems that were not anticipated during initial requirements gathering. These analytical methods can help teams prioritize

improvements, provided that the original feedback is interpreted in context and that automated categorization does not replace direct engagement with employees. Predictive analytics can also help organizations identify implementation risks and allocate support resources more effectively. For example, aggregated system usage patterns, training completion data, and support requests may indicate which workflows require additional instruction or redesign. A model might identify that a particular process has an unusually high abandonment rate or that a specific employee group experiences repeated difficulties accessing a service. Such findings should be used to investigate barriers and improve the system rather than to label individual employees as resistant, unproductive, or technologically incapable. Predictive models should be evaluated for accuracy, calibration, and differences in performance across relevant groups before their outputs inform organizational decisions.

Recommendation systems can personalize learning content, onboarding guidance, and access to relevant HR information. A learning platform may suggest courses based on an employee's stated goals, current skills, and professional interests, while a conversational assistant may provide policy information in response to natural-language questions. These features can reduce the effort required to locate relevant resources and may help employees navigate complex organizational processes. However, personalization should preserve employee choice and avoid restricting opportunities based on incomplete historical data. Recommendations should be understandable, adjustable where appropriate, and designed to broaden access rather than reproduce historical patterns of unequal participation.

Advanced analytics can strengthen human-centered design when it combines quantitative evidence with qualitative insight. Usage statistics can show where employees abandon a workflow, but interviews may reveal that the underlying problem involves unclear policy language, fear of making an irreversible mistake, or a lack of confidence in how information will be used. Likewise, a satisfaction score may conceal significant differences between employee groups. A responsible analytical framework should combine system telemetry, usability tests, surveys, interviews, and contextual information to develop a more complete understanding of employee experience. Data minimization, restricted access, appropriate aggregation, and clear retention policies are necessary to ensure that analytical capabilities do not undermine the trust they are intended to support.

V. Proposed human-centered HR technology framework

The proposed framework integrates five connected elements: employee needs assessment, participatory system design, AI-assisted analysis, responsible implementation, and continuous evaluation[9]. Its starting point is the identification of employee tasks, barriers, expectations, and concerns through interviews, surveys, process observation, and review of existing HR service data. The organization should establish baseline measures of usability, task completion, satisfaction, and adoption before introducing a redesigned system. These measures provide a point of comparison for later evaluation and help distinguish improvements attributable to the new design from changes that would have occurred independently. The design component translates the findings into user journeys, interface prototypes, workflow changes, and support requirements. Employees should participate in reviewing proposed solutions, particularly when the system affects sensitive processes such

as benefits, performance evaluation, employee records, or career development. Prototypes should be tested with representative users and revised according to observed problems[3]. Accessibility requirements, plain-language communication, mobile compatibility, and clear explanations of system behavior should be considered from the beginning rather than added after implementation. This reduces the likelihood that design decisions will unintentionally exclude users or create avoidable barriers.

The AI and analytics component processes appropriate employee feedback and system performance data to identify recurring usability problems and evaluate the effect of design changes. For example, a text classification model may organize support requests into themes, while statistical analysis can compare task completion and error rates across versions of an interface. Machine learning can assist with pattern discovery, but the framework should retain human review for ambiguous findings and sensitive interpretations. Employee-level data should not be used to make consequential employment decisions merely because it is available. The analytical purpose, access permissions, retention period, and safeguards should be defined before data collection begins. The implementation component introduces the system through communication, training, support, and appropriately staged deployment. A pilot group can help identify operational issues before the system is introduced across the organization. Feedback channels should remain available during rollout, and employees should receive clear information about what has changed, how the system affects their tasks, and where they can obtain assistance. Where an AI feature influences a decision, the organization should explain its role and establish a process for correcting errors or requesting human review. Deployment should proceed only when usability, reliability, accessibility, and security requirements meet predefined acceptance criteria.

The final component evaluates whether the system produces sustainable improvements in employee experience and organizational outcomes. Measures should include successful task completion, time on task, error rates, adoption, satisfaction, trust, accessibility, support demand, and perceived fairness. Evaluation should occur at multiple points after deployment because initial enthusiasm or mandatory usage may not reflect sustained acceptance. The organization should also examine whether benefits and burdens are distributed equitably across employee groups. Findings should feed back into the requirements and design process, creating a continuous improvement cycle rather than treating implementation as a one-time project.

VI. Experimental methodology and research design

The proposed experiment investigates whether a human-centered implementation approach improves employee adoption of HR technology compared with a conventional implementation approach. The study adopts a mixed-method design that combines quantitative usability measurements with qualitative feedback from employees. The conventional approach represents a system implemented primarily around predefined organizational requirements, standard workflows, and general training. The human-centered approach includes employee interviews, participatory prototyping, iterative usability testing, accessibility evaluation, and feedback-informed refinement. Both approaches should use comparable HR functionality so that differences in outcomes can be attributed more

confidently to the implementation approach rather than to major differences in the underlying technology. The study population should consist of employees who are expected to use an HR platform for tasks such as submitting leave requests, updating personal information, accessing benefits, completing training, or reviewing organizational policies. Participants should represent relevant differences in job roles, seniority, digital confidence, accessibility requirements, and work arrangements. Recruitment should follow appropriate organizational approval and informed-consent procedures. The required sample size should be determined through an a priori power analysis based on the primary outcome, the expected effect size, the significance level, and the desired statistical power. No particular sample size should be described as sufficient without reference to these assumptions and the proposed analysis.

Participants should complete standardized tasks using either the conventionally implemented interface or the human-centered version. Depending on the organizational setting, the study may use randomized assignment, a counterbalanced within-participant design, or a controlled pilot with comparable employee groups. Random assignment can reduce selection bias, while a within-participant design may improve statistical efficiency when learning effects and task order are managed appropriately. The study should establish baseline measures before the intervention and collect follow-up measurements after employees have had sufficient opportunity to use the system. If randomization is not feasible, the analysis should account for relevant baseline differences and acknowledge the limitations of causal interpretation.

The primary outcome should be defined before data collection, with task completion rate or a validated usability measure serving as a possible primary endpoint. Secondary outcomes may include task completion time, number of errors, requests for assistance, adoption intention, actual usage, satisfaction, trust, perceived fairness, and accessibility-related barriers. Quantitative data should be analyzed using methods appropriate to the distribution and study design, including confidence intervals and effect sizes[10]. Qualitative interviews and open-ended survey responses should be analyzed systematically to identify recurring explanations for observed results. Privacy safeguards should prevent individual feedback from being used for unrelated employment decisions, and the study should document missing data, participant attrition, deviations from the protocol, and any adverse user experiences.

VII. Conclusion

Human-centered design is a fundamental approach to improving HR technology adoption because it connects digital innovation with employees' needs, expectations, accessibility requirements, and workplace experiences. This paper has examined how participatory design, iterative prototyping, usability testing, employee feedback, and organizational support can improve the implementation of digital HR systems while integrating artificial intelligence and machine learning for advanced data analytics. The proposed framework combines employee needs assessment, AI-assisted analysis, responsible implementation, and continuous evaluation to support more usable, transparent, inclusive, and trustworthy HR technology. Machine learning can help organizations identify recurring usability problems, analyze employee feedback, personalize learning resources, and evaluate adoption patterns, but its application must be governed by appropriate safeguards for privacy, fairness, interpretability, and employee autonomy. The proposed experimental design provides a basis for comparing

conventional and human-centered implementation approaches using task completion, usability, adoption, satisfaction, trust, accessibility, and operational efficiency as evaluation measures. Because the experiment has not been conducted, actual performance improvements and statistical relationships remain to be established through systematic data collection and independent analysis. Future research should prioritize longitudinal evaluation, representative employee participation, subgroup accessibility assessments, and the responsible use of AI in employment-related processes. Organizations should also recognize that successful adoption cannot be measured through login frequency or mandatory compliance alone; it must reflect whether employees can use technology effectively, understand its purpose, trust its operation, and obtain meaningful support when problems arise. Ultimately, putting employees first requires treating them as active participants in technology design rather than passive recipients of organizational change. By combining human-centered design, responsible AI, transparent governance, and continuous evidence-based improvement, organizations can develop HR technology that enhances employee experience, strengthens organizational effectiveness, and supports sustainable digital transformation.

References:

- [1] M.-T. Lepeley, *Human centered management: 5 pillars of organizational quality and global sustainability*. Routledge, 2020.
- [2] A. Lamba, "Enhancing awareness of cyber-security and cloud computing using principles of game theory," *International Journal of Advanced in Management, Technology and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 3, 2013.
- [3] M. C. Lin, B. L. Hughes, M. K. Katica, C. Dining-Zuber, and P. E. Plsek, "Service design and change of systems: Human-centered approaches to implementing and spreading service design," *International Journal of Design*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2011.
- [4] M. Ansari, N. Tasleem, and A. Pub, "Building a resilient healthcare workforce: HR innovations for staff retention, burnout prevention, and talent development," *Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 16-20, 2022.
- [5] A. Majumder and C. B. Veilleux, "Smart health and cybersecurity in the era of artificial intelligence," *Computer-mediated communication*, p. 59, 2021.
- [6] J. M. Helm *et al.*, "Machine learning and artificial intelligence: definitions, applications, and future directions," *Current reviews in musculoskeletal medicine*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 69-76, 2020.
- [7] Y. Maleh, "IT/OT convergence and cyber security," *Computer Fraud & Security*, vol. 2021, no. 12, pp. 13-16, 2021.
- [8] E. Chen, C. Leos, S. D. Kowitt, and K. E. Moracco, "Enhancing community-based participatory research through human-centered design strategies," *Health promotion practice*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 37-48, 2020.
- [9] N. Tasleem and S. Gangadharan, "Navigating stakeholder dynamics in large-scale transformations," *Journal of Advance Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 48-56, 2022.

- [10] A. R. Lyon, S. K. Brewer, and P. A. Areán, "Leveraging human-centered design to implement modern psychological science: Return on an early investment," *American Psychologist*, vol. 75, no. 8, p. 1067, 2020.