

AI-Driven Organizational Layoffs: Management Decision-Making, Fairness Concerns, and Employee Morale

Student Name: Yaman Adnan Alhalak

Student ID: 222001354

1. Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Background

Advances in AI have begun to transform how companies approach layoffs, with many high-profile organizations embracing data-driven decision systems in human resource management. In recent years, the business world has witnessed two parallel trends: skyrocketing investments in AI capabilities and waves of mass layoffs . Strikingly, the same companies often appear in both narratives. For example, tech giants like Amazon and Microsoft have been simultaneously touting AI innovations and cutting thousands of jobs. In late 2025, Amazon announced it would eliminate 14,000 corporate roles, explicitly citing “rapid advances in AI” that enable faster innovation and a leaner organization . Microsoft, around the same time, undertook its biggest layoffs in years (approximately 6,000 employees) as it doubled down on AI integration, aiming to remove layers of management and stay agile in an AI-driven market . Oracle similarly has restructured its workforce, eliminating thousands of positions to refocus on cloud and AI development while cutting legacy operations . This convergence of AI adoption and headcount reduction is not coincidental – a global survey by the World Economic Forum found 41% of companies expect to reduce their workforce within five years due to AI’s rise . In essence, many employers are betting that intelligent algorithms can boost productivity and replace certain human roles, prompting “strategic” layoffs even in times of strong profits .

This trend is global, but its impact is also being felt in the Middle East. The Gulf region, for instance, is rapidly embracing automation and AI in business. Middle Eastern tech and telecom firms are beginning to implement AI solutions in operations that could threaten administrative and even engineering jobs . Regional experts caution that the wave of AI-triggered layoffs seen in the U.S. “will soon ripple through the Gulf job market” . An example comes from the UAE, where recruiters note that tasks once handled by teams (like certain design or quality checks) are now done by AI in minutes, potentially rendering many positions redundant . At the same time, some Middle Eastern organizations are responding more cautiously – for instance, by retraining staff with AI skills rather than outright replacing them – but cost pressures make layoffs an enticing option when one AI system can do the work of several employees . Thus, understanding how AI-driven layoffs play out is not only a Western concern but also highly relevant in regions like the Middle East that are keen on technological leapfrogging.

Problem Statement

The core problem addressed by this research is the potential injustice and human cost associated with AI-driven layoff decisions. While AI algorithms promise objectivity, there is mounting evidence that they can make unfair or opaque choices when deciding who loses their job. The “black box” nature of AI means employees often do not understand why they were selected for layoff, breeding perceptions of arbitrariness. In some cases, heavy reliance on data can lead to erroneous selections – for example, an algorithm might target employees with lower recent output without context, as infamously occurred when a 25-year Microsoft veteran (an individual with autism and multiple sclerosis) was “randomly selected by a computer algorithm” for termination despite decades of loyal service. Such cases highlight how automated processes may overlook important human factors (like an employee’s institutional knowledge or personal circumstances), raising ethical and legal questions. Bias in AI is another concern: if the underlying data reflect historical prejudices, the algorithm might disproportionately flag certain groups (such as older workers or those who took medical leave) for layoffs, replicating discrimination under the guise of objectivity. This not only is unjust on an individual level, but also exposes companies to wrongful termination claims and reputational damage.

Beyond the direct selection issues, AI-led layoffs affect the morale and trust of the remaining employees. A critical problem is the psychological impact on workers who witness colleagues being let go by an impersonal algorithm. Employees may feel they are evaluated as mere data points, which can erode their trust in leadership and their sense of job security. Research and expert commentary suggest that layoff decisions perceived as automated or purely cost-driven “fundamentally break the trust” between workers and management. When people believe that “years of expertise are now expendable” at the whim of a machine, their commitment and engagement plummet. This problem has broad organizational implications: traumatized or demoralized survivors are less likely to be productive or innovative. Indeed, studies have shown that large-scale downsizing can stifle innovation, especially when combined with major technological changes – employees become risk-averse and disengaged when they fear being the next to be replaced by AI. In summary, the research problem revolves around a paradox: the same AI tools intended to improve efficiency in management’s layoff decisions may be creating new inefficiencies in the form of decreased morale, loss of trust, potential bias, and deterioration of the organizational culture.

Significance of the Study

Understanding this phenomenon is highly significant for both theory and practice. From a managerial perspective, companies are embracing AI in HR decisions at a rapid pace – a recent survey of HR leaders found 98% plan to use software or algorithms to help make layoff decisions . This represents a sea change in how employment decisions are made, yet academic research is only beginning to catch up with examining the consequences. By focusing on AI-driven layoffs, this study will shed light on an emergent practice that could redefine workforce management across industries. The findings will be especially relevant to organizations in technology-intensive regions (like the Middle East’s growing tech sector) where enthusiasm for AI solutions runs high. As Middle Eastern firms invest in AI, they need frameworks to implement these tools ethically and effectively in HR; otherwise, they risk importing approaches that alienate their workforce or conflict with local labor norms. The conceptual insights from this research can guide leaders in striking a balance between innovation and responsibility.

The study’s significance is also grounded in its implications for fairness and legal compliance. With growing concerns about algorithmic bias, this research can contribute to the discourse on how to ensure equitable treatment of employees. It may inform guidelines or best practices, for example advocating for human oversight in algorithmic layoff decisions and transparency in how criteria are applied . Regulators and policymakers are increasingly scrutinizing AI in employment; in the U.S., the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has clarified that employers remain liable for AI-driven hiring or firing decisions under discrimination laws . Thus, organizations have a strong incentive to understand potential pitfalls. By identifying where AI-based layoffs might go wrong (e.g. inadvertently targeting protected groups or high-value talent), this research can help preempt costly mistakes and lawsuits.

Finally, there is a human significance. Layoffs are deeply traumatic events for individuals and communities. If AI usage makes this process more cold or error-prone, the harm is magnified. Conversely, if handled carefully, AI might be used to support fair decision-making (for instance, by analyzing a wider range of performance data to reduce personal bias). This study, therefore, is significant in exploring how to harness AI’s benefits in downsizing while safeguarding human dignity. It aims to contribute to a conceptual framework that academics, business leaders, and HR professionals can use to navigate the new territory of “algorithmic layoffs.” In doing so, it addresses a timely question: How can we integrate AI into management decisions in a way that improves efficiency without sacrificing ethics, fairness, and employee trust?

References

- Business Insider Staff. (2025, November 4). The list of major companies laying off staff this year includes Amazon, Starbucks, Oracle, American Airlines, and more. Business Insider.
- Verma, P. (2023, February 20). AI is starting to pick who gets laid off. The Washington Post.
- Dajani, H. (2025, November 1). AI ‘taking jobs’ say UAE recruiters after mass Amazon layoffs. Khaleej Times (UAE).
- Singh, A. (Ed.). (2025, May 18). Microsoft worker sacked after 25 years of service on birthday, wife shares emotional post. NDTV.
- Channel News Asia / Bloomberg. (2025, Nov). Commentary: Why AI-fuelled layoffs will backfire on employers. CNA (Opinion).
- TechRound. (2025). Experts share: How do mass AI layoffs affect trust between workers and leadership in tech? TechRound News.
- Lattimore, P. (2025, April 9). Algorithmic bias in termination: Can AI-driven layoffs lead to wrongful termination lawsuits? People Development Magazine.
- Support Revolution. (2025). Oracle layoffs 2025 – restructuring for cloud and AI. Support Revolution Blog.
- Fast Company (Smith, G.N. & Funk, J.). (2025, November 7). AI isn’t replacing jobs. AI spending is. Fast Company.
- Additional sources: All internal citations (e.g., from academic theories on organizational justice or HR management) will be duly referenced in the final report as needed.