psychology international

MDPI

Article

Understanding HRIS Adoption: A Psychosocial Perspective on Managerial Engagement and System Effectiveness

Fadi Sofi [1], Anas Al-Fattal [2,*] and Ip-Shing Fan [3]

[1] Business Management Department, London School of Administration, Vintage House, London SE1 7TL, UK; fadisofi@hotmail.com
[2] Business Department, University of Minnesota Crookston, Crookston, MN 56716, USA
[3] Digital Aviation Research and Technology Centre, Cranfield University, Bedford MK43 0AL, UK; i.s.fan@cranfield.ac.uk
* Correspondence: aalfatta@umn.edu

Abstract

Human Resource Information Systems (HRISs) have become integral to contemporary organizational life, yet their successful adoption remains uneven and poorly understood. Existing models often focus on cognitive or technical determinants, overlooking how emotional and social factors shape user behavior in real-world settings. This study explores HRIS adoption through a psychosocial lens, centering the experiences of business line managers, key users who are often excluded from HRIS design, training, and research. Drawing on 25 qualitative interviews across five large UK-based organizations, this paper identifies six emergent themes related to interpersonal trust, role identity, leadership influence, organizational culture, emotional resistance, and the gap between expected usefulness and daily utility. Findings reveal that approaches which account for user emotions, perceived role clarity, and social context offer a more complete understanding of HRIS adoption than those based solely on intention or usability. By highlighting the role of interpersonal dynamics and subjective experience, this study challenges dominant technology adoption models and contributes to more human-centered perspectives in HRIS research and practice. This paper concludes by offering theoretical implications and practical guidance for designing HRIS strategies that reflect the psychosocial realities of implementation across diverse organizational environments.

Keywords: Human Resource Information Systems (HRISs); psychosocial factors; managerial engagement; technology adoption; organizational behavior; organizational psychology; digital transformation

check for updates

Academic Editor: Antonio Hernández-Mendo

Received: 14 May 2025
Revised: 26 June 2025
Accepted: 27 June 2025
Published: 4 July 2025

Citation: Sofi, F., Al-Fattal, A., & Fan, I.-S. (2025). Understanding HRIS Adoption: A Psychosocial Perspective on Managerial Engagement and System Effectiveness. *Psychology International*, *7*(3), 57. https://doi.org/10.3390/psycholint7030057

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

In an era marked by rapid digital transformation, organizations are increasingly reliant on technological systems to manage complex human capital processes. Among these, Human Resource Information Systems (HRISs), which refer to integrated software platforms used to collect, store, manage, and analyze employee data and HR processes across the organization (Maamari & Osta, 2021), have become foundational to HR operations, offering tools for data management, performance tracking, and strategic workforce planning (Kavanagh & Johnson, 2017). These systems are often positioned as enablers of efficiency, transparency, and evidence-based decision-making, particularly in large organizations where the scale and complexity of HR activities demand integrated solutions (Anitha & Aruna, 2015; Mane, 2016).

Yet, despite widespread implementation, many organizations report uneven adoption and limited strategic integration of HRIS. While system functionality and usability are commonly cited as barriers (Srivastava et al., 2020; Menant et al., 2021), emerging research suggests that technical adequacy alone cannot account for the variability in outcomes (Sofi, 2023). Instead, psychosocial and behavioral factors, e.g., resistance to change, interpersonal trust, perceived role clarity, and leadership behavior, play a critical role in shaping how HRIS is received and embedded into everyday practice (Gutierrez-Gutierrez et al., 2018; Hall, 2020; Asfahani, 2021; Hagan, 2021).

This is particularly salient in the case of business line managers, who often serve as frontline users of HRIS. Their engagement with the system is not merely a technical act but a socially and psychologically mediated process, influenced by organizational culture, individual identity, and social norms (Kou et al., 2022). Despite this, dominant technology adoption models such as TAM (Davis, 1986), TAM2 (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000), TAM3 (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008), TPB (Ajzen, 2011), and UTAUT (Venkatesh et al., 2003) tend to foreground individual cognition and intention, while underplaying the broader relational and contextual dynamics that condition technology uses (Basu, 2022). By focusing on these experiential and relational aspects, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of HRIS effectiveness, one that moves beyond usability and implementation metrics, to explore how line managers interpret, adapt to, or resist system demands. In doing so, it addresses a notable gap in the literature and speaks to broader debates around technology adoption, user agency, and the psychosocial climate of digital transformation (Fischer & Riedl, 2020).

This paper responds to that gap by adopting a psychosocial perspective, shifting from predominantly cognitive frameworks to a more holistic understanding of HRISs as a socially embedded and emotionally experienced technology. By centering users' lived experiences, this paper offers a deep interpretation of HRIS adoption that accounts for both system-related and organizational dynamics. The objective of this study is to examine how psychosocial factors, including identity alignment, leadership modeling, trust in HR, and perceived role conflict, shape line managers' engagement with HRISs. In doing so, this study contributes to both theory and practice by challenging dominant adoption paradigms and highlighting new avenues for user-centered HRIS implementation. The central research question guiding this inquiry is as follows: *how do psychosocial and behavioral factors shape HRIS adoption and effectiveness from the perspective of business line managers*?

2. Literature Review

2.1. From Technology to Psychosocial Adoption

Much of the foundational research on HRIS adoption has been shaped by technology acceptance models that emphasize individual cognition and rational decision-making. Early models such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1986), and its successors TAM2 and TAM3 (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Venkatesh & Bala, 2008), focused on perceived usefulness and ease of use as key drivers of intention and behavior. These were later extended through frameworks such as the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) (Venkatesh et al., 2003) and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 2011), which incorporated social influence and perceived behavioral control.

Although valuable in predicting user intention, these models have been criticized for underestimating the emotional and contextual complexities of real-world technology use (Ammenwerth, 2019; Shachak et al., 2019). In particular, they tend to overlook how adoption is mediated by social identity, affective trust, and the user's position within broader organizational systems (Basu, 2022; Fischer & Riedl, 2020). This critique has gained traction as research shifts toward more situated perspectives, recognizing that system

uptake is often influenced by institutional norms, cultural fit, and relational dynamics rather than discrete cognitive evaluations alone (Laumer et al., 2016; Alkhwaldi et al., 2023).

In response, scholars have begun to explore more holistic, psychosocial interpretations of HRIS engagement, emphasizing not only usability but also how systems interact with users' professional identities, perceived roles, and emotional states (Menant et al., 2021; Kou et al., 2022; Panjaitan, 2023). These developments signal a critical move beyond the idea of technology as a static artifact, toward viewing it as a socially and psychologically constructed process shaped by the beliefs, experiences, and environments of those who use it (Bailey et al., 2022; Bensaid, 2023).

2.2. Organizational Context and Social Norms

Beyond individual psychology, HRIS adoption is deeply embedded in the broader social and cultural context of the organization. The way systems are introduced, supported, and modeled by leadership shapes the psychosocial climate in which users interpret and engage with technology (Sofi, 2023). These organizational factors are often subtle and taken for granted; they create social norms and expectations that condition behavioral responses.

Leadership behavior, in particular, plays a critical role in establishing whether HRISs are perceived as a legitimate and valued part of the work environment. When leaders use the system themselves, speak positively about its benefits, and provide support during transition phases, users are more likely to view engagement as both expected and meaningful (Al-Fattal et al., 2024; Hagan, 2021; Srivastava et al., 2020). Conversely, inconsistent or indifferent leadership messaging often leads to confusion and passive resistance, eroding motivation and perceived behavioral control. Organizational culture also influences adoption by shaping how users perceive change, authority, and autonomy. In rigid or hierarchical cultures, an HRIS may be seen as a surveillance tool or a mechanism of top–down control. In more collaborative environments, it may be embraced as an enabler of transparency and self-management (Fischer & Riedl, 2020; Laumer et al., 2016).

Social modeling and peer behavior further amplify or reduce user engagement. When colleagues are seen actively using an HRIS, it reinforces the norm that the system is part of everyday work. In contrast, when users observe that others are bypassing or avoiding the system without consequence, they are less likely to internalize its importance. This underscores the relational nature of technology use; decisions are not made in isolation but in response to perceived expectations and group behavior (Alkhwaldi et al., 2023; Memon et al., 2022).

Finally, organizational memory, the accumulation of past experiences with system introduction, can condition how new technologies are received. Where previous implementations have been rushed, under-resourced, or abandoned, users may approach an HRIS with anticipatory skepticism, rooted in a learned belief that the system will either fail or fade out (Shirish & Batuekueno, 2021; Ramadhani et al., 2024). These perceptions are often reinforced by emotional cues, such as frustration or cynicism, which spread through informal communication channels.

2.3. Gaps in the Literature and Study Contribution

While existing research has offered valuable insights into the technical and strategic dimensions of HRIS adoption, there remains a notable gap in studies that focuses on the psychosocial and individual experiences of users, particularly those in non-HR roles who are nevertheless central to system implementation. Much of the current literature is dominated by survey-based studies applying generalized adoption models, which often abstract the phenomenon from the emotional, cultural, and identity-based realities of organizational life (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Ammenwerth, 2019; Alkhwaldi et al., 2023).

These frameworks, though helpful for predicting intention to use, tend to underplay affective responses, role ambiguity, and trust dynamics, all of which have emerged as significant factors in recent conceptual and qualitative work (Fischer & Riedl, 2020; Kou et al., 2022; Sofi, 2023). As a result, there is limited understanding of how HRISs are perceived and interpreted by users who experience conflicting role demands, emotional strain, or organizational misalignment. This is particularly true for business line managers, who often operate at the intersection of strategic direction and daily operations are underrepresented in HRIS adoption studies.

While models such as TAM, TAM2, and UTAUT have provided valuable insights into system adoption, they prioritize individual cognitive evaluations (e.g., perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use) over the complex interplay of emotional and relational factors in the workplace (Davis, 1986; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Venkatesh et al., 2003). These models tend to underplay the significance of organizational identity, interpersonal trust, and leadership influence, which are factors increasingly recognized as critical in shaping technology engagement in real-world settings (Strohmeier, 2007; Sofi, 2023). As such, there is a need for alternative approaches that consider how psychological, cultural, and social dimensions influence HRIS use. A psychosocial lens allows researchers to move beyond binary notions of acceptance or rejection and explore the meanings and emotions attached to system use, particularly among frontline users like line managers who often mediate between system design and organizational expectations.

This study addresses these gaps by adopting a qualitative, interpretivist approach to examine how business line managers in large UK-based organizations experience and engage with HRISs. Drawing on in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, it explores how psychosocial and behavioral factors, including trust, identity, emotional response, and perceived fit, mediate the adoption and perceived effectiveness of HRISs. In doing so, it contributes to a more detailed understanding of technology adoption as a psychologically situated and socially negotiated process.

This review highlights a persistent over-reliance on cognitive technology adoption models within HRIS research, often at the expense of emotional, relational, and organizational dynamics that shape real-world usage. To address this gap, the present study adopts a psychosocial perspective focused on business line managers, which is an often-overlooked user group in HRIS implementation. The purpose of this research is to explore how psychosocial and behavioral factors such as trust, leadership modeling, identity tension, and perceived role alignment influence managerial engagement with HRISs. Accordingly, the central research question guiding the study is as follows: *how do psychosocial and behavioral factors shape HRIS adoption and effectiveness from the perspective of business line managers*?

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design situated within an interpretivist paradigm, which assumes that reality is socially constructed and best understood by exploring how individuals assign meaning to their experiences (Pervin & Mokhtar, 2022). This approach is particularly well suited to research questions that seek to examine data-rich, context-dependent experiences, such as how line managers navigate the adoption of HRISs within complex organizational environments.

The research was conducted across five large UK-based organizations, spanning sectors including manufacturing, finance, public administration, and professional services. These organizations were selected for their scale and structural complexity, factors known to shape both the challenges and opportunities of system implementation (Mane, 2016; Mohrman & Lawler, 2003). In total, 25 participants were selected through purposive sampling, a strategy commonly used in qualitative research to identify information-rich

cases relevant to the research aim (Patton, 2002; Pervin & Mokhtar, 2022). The sample focused on business line managers who regularly interacted with HRISs but did not occupy formal HR roles, thus offering perspectives from a position that is operationally central but often underrepresented in HRIS research (López-Cotarelo, 2018). Additionally, to provide a fuller contextual understanding of the sample, a summary table of participant demographics, including gender, age, department, and HRIS experience, has been included at the beginning of the Findings Section (see Table 1).

Data were gathered using semi-structured interviews, a method that balances the structure of pre-designed questions with the flexibility to follow emergent lines of inquiry (Grønmo, 2023). This format was particularly appropriate given this study's interest in capturing both cognitive and affective responses to HRIS use. Question design was informed by key themes in the HRIS literature, including system functionality, user trust, leadership support, and role clarity (Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016; Strohmeier, 2007; Sofi, 2023). The interview protocol was developed by the researchers based on these thematic areas, rather than adapted from existing instruments. The flexible format allowed for probing emergent issues while ensuring consistency across participants. Interview prompts explored key psychosocial dimensions, including trust, leadership, identity, perceived control, and organizational culture. No standardized evaluation scales were used, in keeping with the qualitative and exploratory nature of this study. Interviews lasted between 45 and 75 min and were conducted either in person or via video conferencing. All interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and anonymized during analysis. Data collection took place in February and May 2023, following participant consent and scheduling. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee, and all participants provided informed consent prior to data collection.

Thematic analysis was used to interpret the data, following Braun and Clarke's (2013) six-phase model: familiarization with data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing up findings. Thematic analysis was selected for its flexibility and its ability to reveal both explicit and latent patterns within qualitative narratives (Al-Fattal & Singh, 2025). Coding was both inductive and deductive, allowing themes to emerge organically while being informed by the study's psychosocial framing. Particular attention was given to how participants spoke about power, legitimacy, role clarity, and emotional engagement. Initial codes were clustered into broader categories based on conceptual similarity, such as emotional tone or perceived system fit. These clusters were refined through iterative team discussions, leading to six final themes that best captured the psychosocial dimensions of HRIS use. The entire analysis, including coding and theme development, was conducted manually without the use of qualitative software, allowing for close interpretive engagement with the data. To ensure rigor, peer debriefing was used, and an audit trail was maintained throughout the process. Coding was conducted manually, without software, to allow for deeper engagement with the transcripts. Data saturation (Francis et al., 2009) was achieved after repeated reviews of the data showed that the final three interviews yielded no new codes, categories, or significant conceptual insights, confirming that the existing themes sufficiently captured the full range of participant perspectives.

4. Findings

This section presents the findings from 25 interviews with business line managers drawn from five large UK-based organizations. Participants represented a range of departments, including operations, finance, development, IT, and marketing. All participants regularly engaged with the organization's HRIS platforms as part of their managerial roles. Their positioning offered a valuable lens into how HRISs are interpreted and used

in operational contexts. Table 1 below summarizes participant demographics, including gender, age, department, and HRIS experience.

Table 1. Participant demographics.

P#	Gender	Age	Department	Years of HRIS Experience
P1	M	39	Service	8
P2	F	44	Finance	20
P3	M	35	Finance	4
P4	M	41	Finance	3
P5	M	52	Business Development	10
P6	M	36	Operation	4
P7	F	43	Marketing	10
P8	M	43	IT	3
P9	F	37	Procurement	7
P10	F	44	Development	15
P11	F	48	Programming	15
P12	F	38	Development	14
P13	F	42	Operations	17
P14	F	38	Operations	8
P15	M	35	System Development	5
P16	M	49	Programming	19
P17	F	50	Business	15
P18	F	40	Business	8
P19	M	40	Data Management	16
P20	F	41	Security	20
P21	F	34	Product Development	10
P22	M	28	Operations	6
P23	F	44	Operations	5
P24	F	48	Awareness and Education	10
P25	F	39	Health and Safety	5

Thematic analysis was used to identify patterns in participants' experiences, with a focus on psychosocial and organizational factors such as trust, leadership, identity, and system alignment. To provide both breadth and depth of insight, the findings report participant counts (how many individuals raised an issue) and mention frequency (how often the issue arose across all transcripts). While thematic analysis is primarily qualitative, combining these measures adds interpretive clarity and helps differentiate widely shared patterns from those that were particularly emphasized or emotionally salient (Braun & Clarke, 2013). An overview of the six emergent themes, along with frequency counts, is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of emergent psychosocial themes identified from interviews, with participant count and mention frequency.

Theme	Description	Participant Count (n = 25)	Mentions
1. Perceived Credibility and Affective Trust	Users' trust in HRIS accuracy, data security, and alignment with organizational values	17	31
2. Role Clarity and Identity Tensions	Ambiguity around HR responsibilities and tensions with professional identity	15	28
3. Leadership Support and Influence	Impact of leadership involvement, advocacy, or indifference on adoption	19	33

Table 2. *Cont.*

Theme	Description	Participant Count (n = 25)	Mentions
4. Cultural and Organizational Fit	How HRISs align (or misalign) with existing norms, workflows, and organizational culture	16	29
5. Resistance and Psychological Friction	Emotional and cognitive barriers to HRIS use, including skepticism or change fatigue	14	22
6. Perceived Usefulness vs. Daily Utility	Perception of HRISs as beneficial conceptually but difficult or unnecessary in practice	13	20

4.1. Theme 1: Perceived Credibility and Affective Trust in HRISs

A central theme across interviews was the degree to which business line managers trusted HRISs, not only regarding data accuracy but also as a credible and meaningful system. Seventeen participants raised this issue, with 31 references across the dataset, highlighting both cognitive and emotional dimensions of engagement. Participants described dissonance when HRIS outputs conflicted with their situational awareness or lived experience. Several recounted discomfort when system reports contradicted interpersonal observations. As Participant 7 noted, "*I get reports from HRIS that don't always match what I see on the ground. Then I have to question what's more accurate. . . my experience or the numbers?*" These moments triggered skepticism and internal questioning, reflecting a struggle between system authority and experiential knowledge.

Beyond accuracy, emotional confidence in the system's intent and usability emerged as vital. When systems felt unclear or overly generic, participants struggled to feel secure using them. Participant 12 explained, "*It's not just whether the data is right. It's whether the system helps me make sense of it. If it feels clunky or generic, I start questioning the whole thing.*" Such breakdowns in coherence led to disengagement. A subset of participants (n = 6) also linked mistrust to concerns about transparency. Uncertainty about how data would be used, or by whom, sparked unease. Participant 19 remarked, "*No one really explained what happens to the information we put in. That makes you wary. . . what's it being used for, and by whom?*" This speaks to broader anxieties around surveillance, agency, and organizational communication. Five participants framed trust relationally, grounded not only in the system itself but also in those who manage it. As Participant 3 said, "*If I trust the people who manage the system, I'm more likely to trust the system itself.*" These insights reinforce that trust in HRISs is co-constructed through interpersonal and organizational dynamics, not simply through technical functionality.

4.2. Theme 2: Role Clarity and Identity Tensions

A second major theme centered on the psychosocial strain created by ambiguity around participants' roles in relation to HRISs. While most managers acknowledged that the system was part of their daily workflow, many questioned the boundaries of their responsibility and authority in using it. This theme was raised by 15 out of 25 participants and referenced 28 times across the interviews.

At the heart of this theme was a recurring identity tension, where participants struggled to reconcile their core professional identity as business line managers with the perceived encroachment of HR-related responsibilities. This cognitive discomfort was particularly evident when participants were asked to carry out administrative tasks that they felt belonged to the HR function. Participant 8 explained, "*Sometimes I'm expected to manage*

absence reports or performance updates through the system, but I'm not HR. . . I don't always know what the expectations are."

This ambiguity appeared to disrupt role clarity, a key component of psychological well-being and job satisfaction. When participants were unclear about what was expected of them, or when system tasks felt misaligned with their sense of purpose, frustration and disengagement followed. Several participants (n = 11) expressed role conflict, where system expectations clashed with their managerial identity. Participant 16 put it succinctly: "*I wasn't trained in HR. I'm a team leader. But now I'm supposed to log data, approve leave, follow workflows. . . it feels like I'm being nudged into a role I didn't sign up for.*"

Others (n = 9) described this shift not just as a functional burden but as a psychological intrusion, where HRISs implicitly redefined what it meant to be a manager. Participant 11 noted, "*It's like the system assumes I'm on board with this whole digital transformation, but no one asked how it affects what I do—or how I see my role.*" These reflections suggest that adoption is not only a technical or behavioral outcome but also a matter of role alignment and identity affirmation. A smaller group (n = 5) described coping strategies for navigating this ambiguity, such as seeking clarification from HR or redefining the system as a shared resource rather than a control mechanism. While these responses indicate a degree of psychosocial adaptation, they also underscore the ongoing negotiation of identity, autonomy, and perceived role legitimacy in system use.

4.3. Theme 3: Leadership Support and Influence

A third prominent theme was the impact of leadership behaviors on participants' willingness to engage with HRISs. This theme was raised by 19 of 25. While an HRIS is often positioned as a neutral, organization-wide tool, participants emphasized that their level of engagement was significantly shaped by how their leaders introduced, modeled, and supported its use. Participants described social modeling as a key mechanism. Participant 6 reflected, "*When my manager uses it properly and talks about it in meetings, it feels like part of the job. When they don't, it feels optional.*" This highlights the mechanism of norm-setting, where leadership cues shape perceptions of relevance and legitimacy.

Instrumental support, such as time, resources, and emotional encouragement, was equally critical. Where this was absent, participants described feelings of overwhelm or helplessness. Participant 14 noted, "*There's an expectation to use the system, but no time or space to learn it properly. You're on your own.*" These conditions eroded users' perceived behavioral control, a known predictor of motivation and uptake (Ajzen, 2011). Inconsistent messaging from leadership created ambiguity. Participant 2 explained, "*One day it's a priority, the next it's forgotten. . . That kind of inconsistency makes you question if it's worth the effort.*" It also disrupted motivational clarity, with emotional consequences ranging from frustration to disengagement. A smaller subset of participants (n = 4) described leaders who acted as mentors, helping normalize uncertainty and reduce anxiety. Participant 21 noted, "*My manager said, 'We're all learning this. . . ask questions, make mistakes. . . it's okay.' That helped a lot.*" Such reassurance fostered safety and facilitated adaptation by framing HRIS adoption as a collective and evolving process.

4.4. Theme 4: Cultural and Organizational Fit

A fourth key theme related to how well the HRIS aligned with the broader organizational culture and the shared psychosocial norms of the workplace. Raised by 16 of 25 participants and referenced 29 times across the dataset, this theme revealed that adoption was strongly shaped by whether the system felt congruent with the values, habits, and communication styles of the organization.

Participants often described the HRIS as an external imposition, something designed elsewhere, introduced through generic processes, and lacking resonance with the everyday rhythms of their teams. For many, this created a sense of cultural dissonance, where system expectations clashed with established norms. Participant 5 noted, "*Our organization prides itself on flexibility and informal communication. . . HRIS is rigid. . . It feels like it was built for a totally different environment.*" This mismatch triggered not just operational friction but also psychosocial resistance, a feeling that the system did not "*belong*" (Participant 14) in their cultural setting.

Others described the system as violating the organization's implicit values or undermining long-standing interpersonal dynamics. Participant 10 reflected, "*We've always had a strong people culture. . . HRIS made things feel transactional. It took the human side out of it.*" This response reflects a disruption in value congruence, where technology use is not only a technical adaptation but a negotiation of identity, belonging, and meaning. Participants also commented on the emotional tone surrounding HRIS implementation. In organizations where new technologies were generally viewed with suspicion, or where previous change efforts had failed, the HRIS was often met with anticipatory cynicism. Participant 13 explained, "*We've had so many systems rolled out with big promises that went nowhere. This felt like more of the same.*" Such attitudes are psychosocial rooted in learned skepticism, a product of organizational memory and repeated disappointment.

4.5. Theme 5: Resistance and Psychological Friction

A fifth theme captured the underlying emotional and psychological tensions participants experienced in relation to HRIS adoption. Although many used the system out of necessity, 14 of the 25 participants expressed feelings of resistance, discomfort, or frustration. The theme appeared 22 times across the interviews, signaling a recurring undercurrent of psychological friction that shaped participants' engagement.

For some, this resistance was rooted in affective responses such as irritation, confusion, or anxiety when using the system. Participant 9 admitted: "*Every time I log in, I feel like I have to brace myself. . . It's not intuitive. . . and I'm always worried I'll click the wrong thing.*" This response reflects anticipatory cognitive strain, the mental effort required to prepare for a system that is perceived as demanding or punishing. Others reported emotional fatigue from the accumulation of minor usability issues, reflecting the psychosocial concept of micro-frustrations. Participant 15 shared, "*It's not one big thing. . . it's a dozen little things that just wear you down.*" These cumulative irritations contributed to low-level resistance, where participants complied with system requirements but did so mechanically, without internal motivation or ownership.

Six participants described deeper emotional uncertainty, shaped by concerns about being monitored or evaluated through the system. Participant 20 explained: "*You're not sure who's watching. . . or how the data will be used. . . That makes it hard to be honest or to trust it.*" This uncertainty created psychosocial defensiveness, prompting behaviors such as minimal data input, avoidance, or double-checking alternative sources. Five participants also spoke of the emotional labor involved in supporting their teams through the system's rollout, particularly those who held informal leadership or mentoring roles. Participant 1 reflected, "*My team comes to me for help, but I'm struggling too. . . There's pressure to appear confident, even when you're not.*" This burden added a layer of emotional stress, especially when organizational support was limited.

4.6. Theme 6: Perceived Usefulness vs. Daily Utility

The final theme concerned the psychosocial disconnect between how participants viewed the HRIS conceptually and how they experienced it in everyday practice. While 13

of 25 participants acknowledged the system's intended usefulness, their actual engagement reflected a more skeptical stance. This theme appeared 20 times in the dataset, often surfacing through subtle contrasts between stated acceptance and underlying frustration.

Participants frequently articulated what might be described as expectancy–value dissonance. They recognized the value of the HRIS in theory but struggled to see its benefits in daily workflow. Participant 18 noted, "*I get why it exists…. It's meant to streamline things… But most days, it just slows me down.*" This cognitive appraisal, where effort and output feel misaligned, often led to diminished intrinsic motivation. For many, the issue was not the system's overall functionality but the lack of contextual sensitivity in how it operated. Several participants described the HRIS as disconnected from the "*messiness*" of real organizational life. Participant 4 explained: "*It's a bit too clean… Real decisions aren't made in tidy boxes or dropdowns. Are they?*" This reflects a form of cognitive incongruence, where the system's structure fails to align with how users naturally process or represent work-related decisions.

Some participants (n = 5) also reported feeling constrained by the system, particularly when it offered limited flexibility for details or judgments. These moments often triggered perceived loss of control, a known barrier to technology acceptance. As Participant 22 put it, "*Sometimes I know what I want to say or record, but the system won't let me say it that way… It's like it decides what counts and what doesn't.*" At the same time, a few participants acknowledged that the system's usefulness became more evident over time or in specific contexts. Participant 23 shared, "*When it works, it works well… especially for audits or big-picture reporting… It's just not always helpful in the day-to-day.*" This suggests a gap between instrumental value and immediate task relevance, where psychosocial utility is judged not just by outcomes but by moment-to-moment fitting with users' needs.

5. Discussion

This study explores how psychosocial and behavioral factors influence HRIS adoption and its perceived effectiveness among business line managers in large UK-based organizations. Responding to a well-documented gap in the literature, this research moves beyond traditional models focused on usability or intention to adopt and instead investigates how users psychologically and socially engage with HRISs within their organizational ecosystems. This study employed a qualitative, interpretivist approach, privileging the lived experiences of users whose voices are often marginalized in HRIS research. The analysis surfaced six interrelated themes that reflect a complex interplay of affective trust, role identity, leadership signaling, cultural alignment, emotional friction, and perceived system value. These six dimensions and their interrelation are visually synthesized in Figure 1, which presents this study's proposed model of psychosocial factors shaping HRIS adoption and engagement. The themes reveal that HRIS adoption is not simply a matter of technical adequacy or rational planning; rather, it is a psychologically situated and socially negotiated process, and it is shaped by how users interpret the system's purpose, relevance, and fit with their everyday realities. By framing HRISs as a site of meaning-making, where psychosocial constructs such as identity, control, and emotional response are activated, this study challenges reductionist interpretations of system use and opens up new possibilities for thinking about engagement as a dynamic, relational phenomenon.

The themes that emerged offer a textured picture of HRIS adoption as a psychosocially situated experience, shaped by trust, identity, and affective response. Rather than positioning the HRIS as a neutral tool, participants described their interactions with the system as involving both cognitive and emotional negotiation. These interactions reflected underlying psychosocial needs, such as role clarity, perceived control, and relational trust, which were either supported or disrupted by the system.



Figure 1. Psychosocial factors in HRIS adoption.

The first theme, perceived credibility and affective trust, illustrates that users' belief in the reliability of the system is not reducible to data accuracy alone. Participants described moments of cognitive dissonance when system outputs conflicted with experiential knowledge, and such dissonance often led to emotional detachment. In many cases, trust in the HRIS was filtered through relational dynamics, echoing prior research suggesting that system acceptance is often mediated by trust in the people and structures surrounding the system (Fischer & Riedl, 2020). This reinforces a broader understanding of trust as an affective, socially mediated construct (Saeedi & Al-Fattal, 2025; Hall, 2020; Hagan, 2021). It also supports the argument that HRIS adoption is embedded in broader organizational dynamics, echoing Gutierrez-Gutierrez et al. (2018), who highlight that relational trust—not just technical soundness—underpins successful integration of digital systems. Such insights expand on traditional adoption models like TAM and UTAUT, where trust is often under-theorized or narrowly defined.

Themes two and three, role clarity and identity tensions and leadership support and influence, highlight the role of self-concept and social modeling in shaping adoption. Participants resisted not just functional burdens but also the psychological friction of being pushed into roles that conflicted with their identity. This aligns with identity-based theories in organizational behavior, suggesting that when new technologies challenge users' core understanding of their role, they may resist not out of apathy but out of a need to defend psychosocial coherence (Sofi, 2023; Nach, 2015). Similarly, leadership was understood not just as an implementation factor but as a psychosocial anchor offering permission, reassurance, and normative clarity during periods of change (Geenen & Muehlfeld, 2020). The presence or absence of this leadership modeling significantly influenced perceived behavioral control and emotional engagement (Molino et al., 2021). This reinforces limitations of dominant models like TAM and TPB (Ajzen, 2011), which emphasize rational

intention but often underplay how deeply self-concept and perceived social norms shape user engagement with new systems.

Themes four and five, cultural and organizational fit and resistance and psychological friction, further demonstrate that emotional responses to HRISs are entangled with broader organizational narratives. Resistance, in this context, should not be interpreted as a deficit or irrational barrier, but rather as an expression of underlying psychosocial strain, including fear of surveillance, role ambiguity, and accumulated frustration (Noutsa Fobang et al., 2019; Fernandez & Gallardo-Gallardo, 2021). These findings affirm that emotional and identity-based dimensions are central to how users construct meaning in relation to technology (Safaa & Faridi, 2020). This interpretation aligns with Hall (2020), who emphasizes that resistance often signals unresolved tensions within organizational culture rather than individual noncompliance.

The final theme of perceived usefulness versus daily utility underscores a disconnect between abstract benefits and lived experience. Participants articulated what might be termed expectancy–value incongruence, where the theoretical promise of the HRIS did not align with the practical demands of their work. This finding resonates with existing critiques of adoption models that conflate intention with sustained engagement (Bailey et al., 2022; Basu, 2022; Menant et al., 2021). This disconnect reflects a core limitation in TAM (Davis, 1986), where perceived usefulness is treated as a generalized belief rather than a context-sensitive evaluation. Participants' responses suggest that usefulness is not a fixed cognition but a dynamic, affective judgment shaped by momentary alignment with role expectations and organizational culture. This aligns with Basu's (2022) critique of rational-choice models, emphasizing the need to incorporate psychological and relational dimensions into frameworks of sustained technology use. This also further supports the need for adoption frameworks that incorporate moment-to-moment psychosocial fit.

The findings from this study offer important theoretical contributions to the literature on HRIS adoption, particularly by expanding the conceptual terrain beyond established technology acceptance models. Frameworks such as TAM (Davis, 1986), UTAUT (Venkatesh et al., 2003), and TPB (Ajzen, 2011) have long provided a foundation for understanding user intentions, emphasizing factors such as perceived usefulness, ease of use, and behavioral control. However, as previous critiques have pointed out (Ammenwerth, 2019; Shachak et al., 2019; Basu, 2022), these models tend to underplay the psychological, emotional, and relational dynamics that surface in real organizational settings. This study responds to that gap by emphasizing the psychosocial experience of adoption. It shows that trust in HRISs is not simply a matter of system reliability but an affective response shaped by users' perceptions of legitimacy, transparency, and alignment with their values. Similarly, resistance emerges not only from cognitive evaluations of utility but also from emotional strain, identity conflict, and cultural dissonance. These findings support calls for more context-sensitive, psychosocially grounded models of technology adoption.

In particular, this study suggests that HRIS adoption operates along a continuum of engagement, ranging from mechanical compliance to cognitive adjustment and to reflective ownership. Rather than following a fixed path from intention to behavior, engagement emerged as contingent, adaptive, and shaped by leadership, identity, and emotional labor. Moreover, this study contributes to the growing stream of literature that views technology not as a neutral tool but as a psychologically meaningful artifact. In doing so, it supports relational and interpretive approaches to HRISs (Bailey et al., 2022; Sofi, 2023), offering a perspective that is attuned to the human, rather than merely functional, dimensions of system use. These insights encourage a shift away from monolithic adoption metrics toward a more detailed, layered understanding of HRIS effectiveness. In doing so, the study

contributes not only to HRIS scholarship but also to broader debates within organizational psychology, human resource management, and technology studies.

The findings suggest that HRIS adoption among business line managers is best understood not as a linear decision process but as a psychosocial negotiation shaped by emotional states, identity alignment, social norms, and relational trust. Rather than relying solely on established cognitive models of adoption, this study supports a more fluid and dynamic conceptualization of engagement, one that unfolds across a continuum of interaction, from passive compliance to reflective ownership. At one end, managers adopt HRISs out of obligation, often experiencing emotional friction and perceived misalignment with their role. At the other, adoption is marked by internalized trust, perceived value, and psychosocial coherence between system demands and professional identity. These insights point toward a model of HRIS engagement that is contingent, situational, and socially mediated, requiring researchers and practitioners alike to consider how individual perceptions are embedded within wider organizational climates and interpersonal networks.

The findings of this study carry several practical implications for HR leaders, system designers, and organizational decision-makers. First, adoption strategies should move beyond technical training to include psychological onboarding, where users are supported in understanding how the system aligns with their roles, values, and professional identities. Leaders must recognize the symbolic and relational dimensions of HRIS use; visible endorsement, empathy toward user challenges, and consistent reinforcement of its strategic value can significantly shape adoption outcomes. Designers, in turn, should prioritize systems that offer contextual flexibility and psychological coherence. Organizations also need to cultivate a climate of psychosocial safety, where users can express uncertainties, challenge misalignments, and co-construct meaning around new technologies.

Finally, while this study did not set out to conduct a systematic comparative analysis across organizational types, qualitative differences emerged in how the HRIS was experienced across sectors and structural settings. Participants from public-sector organizations, which tended to operate under more hierarchical and bureaucratic models, often emphasized rigid procedural norms, low autonomy, and a heightened sensitivity to surveillance and control. In contrast, those from private-sector or flatter organizations reported more fluid communication and decentralized decision-making but also noted greater ambiguity in system expectations and accountability. These contextual narratives shaped both emotional responses and behavioral engagement with the HRIS, reinforcing prior findings that HRIS adoption is mediated by organizational structure and managerial positioning (Mane, 2016; Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016; López-Cotarelo, 2018). Although not central to the study's analytic design, these emergent contrasts point to a valuable direction for future research: a comparative examination of how organizational form, e.g., public vs. private, hierarchical vs. flat, mediates the psychological and cultural reception of HR technologies.

6. Conclusions

This study has examined the psychosocial and behavioral factors that shape the adoption and perceived effectiveness of HRISs among business line managers. By moving beyond traditional models that focus predominantly on technical usability or cognitive intention, this research focuses on the detailed relation between individual psychology, organizational culture, and social dynamics (Hall, 2020). The findings underscore that successful HRIS integration depends not only on the system's features but also on how users interpret and internalize their roles, negotiate expectations, and navigate interpersonal trust and identity within the organizational context. Across the six emergent themes, a consistent pattern was observed; psychological experiences, ranging from perceived autonomy and role clarity to emotional resistance and cultural fit, profoundly influence how line managers

engage with HRISs in practice. Importantly, these insights challenge the assumption that technological functionality is sufficient to ensure adoption or impact. Rather, they suggest that HRISs are socially situated and that their use is shaped by broader organizational climates and relational processes.

While this study provides a deep understanding of HRIS adoption from a psychosocial perspective, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the qualitative design, although rich in detail and context, restricts the generalizability of findings to other organizational settings. Future research could complement this approach with quantitative methods to strengthen external validity. Second, the focus on business line managers may overlook important insights from other key stakeholders such as HR professionals, IT personnel, and senior executives. Including a broader range of perspectives in future studies could offer a more comprehensive view of HRIS engagement. Third, the dynamic nature of organizational behavior suggests that psychosocial factors may evolve over time. Longitudinal research could capture how these factors shift during different phases of system implementation and organizational change. Fourth, while organizational culture emerged as a salient influence, this study was not designed to offer a systematic comparison between organizational types, such as public versus private or hierarchical versus flat structures. Fifth, the national context, limited to UK-based organizations, may constrain the transferability of findings to other institutional and cultural environments. These directions offer meaningful opportunities to build on this work and further explore the complex relationship between human psychology and behavior and digital systems in the workplace. Future research might explore specific questions such as the following: How do psychosocial responses to HRISs differ across organizational sectors or structures? What patterns emerge when user adaptation is studied longitudinally through different phases of implementation? Addressing these could involve cross-sectional surveys or longitudinal qualitative case studies to enrich understanding across contexts. Although the findings are grounded in UK-based organizations, the psychosocial processes explored, such as trust, identity tension, and leadership influence, are likely to resonate across cultural and institutional settings, offering conceptual transferability to broader contexts.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, F.S. and A.A.-F.; methodology, F.S. and A.A.-F.; software, F.S.; validation, F.S., A.A.-F. and I.-S.F.; formal analysis, F.S.; investigation, F.S.; resources, A.A.-F. and F.S.; data curation, F.S.; writing—original draft preparation, F.S. and A.A.-F.; writing—review and editing, A.A.-F. and I.-S.F.; visualization, F.S.; supervision, I.-S.F. and A.A.-F.; project administration, F.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board of University of Cranfield (CURES/18109/2023, approve date 28 March 2023).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The datasets presented in this article are not readily available because they were collected as part of a PhD research project, and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Cranfield University does not permit the public or third-party sharing of these data. Requests to access the datasets should be directed to the Research Office at Cranfield University via email at researchoffice@cranfield.ac.uk.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology & Health*, *26*(9), 1113–1127. [CrossRef]

Al-Fattal, A., Lundbohm, R., & Walker, E. G., II. (2024). Are undergraduate students prepared to lead in virtual environments? An examination of students' preparedness for future leadership roles. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. *Ahead-of-print*. [CrossRef]

Al-Fattal, A., & Singh, J. (2025). Comparative reflections on human-driven and generative artificial intelligence-assisted thematic analysis: A collaborative autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *24*. [CrossRef]

Alkhwaldi, A. F., Alobidyeen, B., Abdulmuhsin, A. A., & Al-Okaily, M. (2023). Investigating the antecedents of HRIS adoption in public sector organizations: Integration of UTAUT and TTF. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *31*(7), 3251–3274. [CrossRef]

Ammenwerth, E. (2019). Technology acceptance models in health informatics: TAM and UTAUT. In P. Scott (Ed.), *Applied interdisciplinary theory in health informatics* (pp. 64–71). IOS Press. [CrossRef]

Anitha, J., & Aruna, M. (2015). Transformation towards Human Resource Information Systems. *Journal of Management and Development Studies*, *26*, 30–50. [CrossRef]

Asfahani, A. M. (2021). The complementary relationship between human resources accounting and human resources information system. *Open Journal of Accounting*, *10*(02), 30. [CrossRef]

Bailey, D. E., Faraj, S., Hinds, P. J., Leonardi, P. M., & von Krogh, G. (2022). We are all theorists of technology now: A relational perspective on emerging technology and organizing. *Organization Science*, *33*(1), 1–18. [CrossRef]

Basu, S. (2022). Three decades of social construction of technology: Dynamic yet fuzzy? The methodological conundrum. *Social Epistemology*, *37*(3), 259–275. [CrossRef]

Bensaid, M. N. (2023). Antecedents of Human Resource Information System adoption: A qualitative study in French context. *Journal of Digitovation and Information System*, *3*(1), 16–31. [CrossRef]

Bondarouk, T., & Brewster, C. (2016). Conceptualising the future of HRM and technology research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(21), 2652–2671. [CrossRef]

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

Davis, F. D. (1986). *A technology acceptance model for empirically testing new end-user information systems: Theory and results* [Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology].

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. [CrossRef]

Fischer, T., & Riedl, R. (2020). On the stress potential of an organisational climate of innovation: A survey study in Germany. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *41*(4), 805–826. [CrossRef]

Francis, J. J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, M. P., & Grimshaw, J. M. (2009). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology & Health*, *25*(10), 1229–1245. [CrossRef]

Geenen, N., & Muehlfeld, K. S. (2020). Interpersonal, intergroup, and interspecies identity as antecedents of resistance to change. In *Academy of management proceedings* (Vol. 2020, No. 1, p. 18016). Academy of Management. [CrossRef]

Grønmo, S. (2023). *Social research methods: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications Limited.

Gutierrez-Gutierrez, L. J., Barrales-Molina, V., & Kaynak, H. (2018). The role of human resource-related quality management practices in new product development: A dynamic capability perspective. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *38*(1), 43–66. [CrossRef]

Hagan, P. (2021). Organizational factors and HRIS implementation. *European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies*, *5*(1), 18–34.

Hall, J. A. (2020). *Relating through technology*. Cambridge University Press. [CrossRef]

Kavanagh, M. J., & Johnson, R. D. (2017). *Human Resource Information Systems: Basics, applications, and future directions* (4th ed.). Sage.

Kou, X., Kurdi-Nakra, H., & Pak, J. (2022). The framework of first-line manager's HR role identity: A multi-actor HR involvement perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, *32*(4), 100898. [CrossRef]

Laumer, S., Maier, C., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2016). Work routines as an object of resistance during information systems implementations: Theoretical foundation and empirical evidence. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *25*(4), 317–343. [CrossRef]

López-Cotarelo, J. (2018). Line managers and HRM: A managerial discretion perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *28*(2), 255–271. [CrossRef]

Maamari, B. E., & Osta, A. (2021). The effect of HRIS implementation success on job involvement, job satisfaction, and work engagement in SMEs. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *29*(5), 1269–1286. [CrossRef]

Mane, S. (2016). HRIS: Its role and importance in HR management. *International Journal of Research in Management & Business Studies*, *3*(1), 40–43.

Memon, K. R., Ghani, B., Hyder, S. I., Han, H., Zada, M., Ariza-Montes, A., & Arraño-Muñoz, M. (2022). Management of knowledge and competence through Human Resource Information System—A structured review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 944276. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Menant, L., Gilibert, D., & Sauvezon, C. (2021). The application of acceptance models to Human Resource Information Systems: A literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 659421. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Mohrman, S. A., & Lawler, E. E. (2003). Creating a strategic human resources organization: An assessment of trends and new directions. *Human Resource Management*, *42*(2), 111–127. [CrossRef]

Molino, M., Cortese, C. G., & Ghislieri, C. (2021). Technology acceptance and leadership 4.0: A quali-quantitative study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(20), 10845. [CrossRef]

Nach, H. (2015). Identity under challenge: Examining user's responses to computerized information systems. *Management Research Review*, *38*(7), 703–725. [CrossRef]

Noutsa Fobang, A., Fosso Wamba, S., & Kala Kamdjoug, J. R. (2019). Exploring factors affecting the adoption of HRIS in SMEs in a developing country: Evidence from Cameroon. In Y. Baghdadi, & A. Harfouche (Eds.), *ICT for a better life and a better world: The impact of Information and communication technologies on organizations and society* (pp. 281–295). Springer. [CrossRef]

Panjaitan, E. (2023). Implementing Human Resource Information System (HRIS) for efficient human resource management. *International Journal of Science and Society*, *5*(2), 128–139. [CrossRef]

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Pervin, N., & Mokhtar, M. (2022). The interpretivist research paradigm: A subjective notion of a social context. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *11*(2), 419–428. [CrossRef]

Ramadhani, W., Khuzaini, K., & Shaddiq, S. (2024). *Resistance to change: Human resources issues in the implementation of Industry 4.0 technology*. Islamic University of Kalimantan. [CrossRef]

Saeedi, A., & Al-Fattal, A. (2025). Examining trust in cryptocurrency investment: Insights from structural equation modeling. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, *210*, 123882. [CrossRef]

Safaa, D., & Faridi, M. (2020). The factors of acceptance and use of HRIS. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, *9*(1), 397–404. [CrossRef]

Shachak, A., Kuziemsky, C., & Petersen, C. (2019). Beyond TAM and UTAUT: Future directions for HIT implementation research. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *100*, 103315. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Shirish, A., & Batuekueno, L. (2021). Technology renewal, user resistance, user adoption: Status quo bias theory revisited. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *34*(5), 874–893. [CrossRef]

Sofi, F. (2023). *A framework to leverage human resources information system for business performance* [Doctoral dissertation, Cranfield University].

Srivastava, S., Bajaj, B., & Dev, S. (2020). Human Resource Information System adoption and implementation factors: A theoretical analysis. *International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals (IJHCITP)*, *11*(4), 80–98. [CrossRef]

Strohmeier, S. (2007). Research in e-HRM: Review and implications. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*(1), 19–37. [CrossRef]

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, *39*(2), 273–315. [CrossRef]

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, *46*(2), 186–204. [CrossRef]

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, *27*(3), 425–478. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.



https://dspace.org/

Understanding HRIS adoption: a psychosocial perspective on managerial engagement and system effectiveness

Sofi, Fadi; Al-Fattal, Anas; Fan, Ip-Shing

2025-09-01
MDPI
https://doi.org/10.3390/psycholint7030057
Sofi F, Al-Fattal A, Fan I-S. (2025) Understanding HRIS adoption: a psychosocial perspective on managerial engagement and system effectiveness. Psychology International, Volume 7, Issue 3, September 2025, Article number 57

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/