Appendix A

Experiment Pretest – Qualitative Evaluation

We conducted a qualitative evaluation with eight market experts to ensure our experiment was structured correctly. All panelists received an appraisal worksheet to assess the quality of the instrument through six judgment criteria: realism, clarity, technical language, grammar, fatigue, and qualification check. From the feedback received, it was possible to adjust a few items: (a) reduce the vignette length to prevent fatigue and attrition, (b) insert the concept of delegation (before the dependent variable question) to avoid misunderstandings regarding question wording or conceptualizations, (c) substitute the qualification check by a question to assess the degree of familiarity with AI tools of participants, and (d) insert the vignette in the *task complexity* manipulation section, so that participants could read the instructions and assess the job applicant information at the same time.

Quality Pretest Criteria	**Panelists**							
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
Realism	100%	100%	75% *e*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The vignette and the information about applicants reproduce a realistic business context.								
Clarity	50% *a*	100%	50% *f*	100%	75% *i*	100%	100%	100%
The texts and questions are written clearly and without ambiguity.								
Technical Language	25% *b*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The technical terms used are common knowledge.								
Grammar	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75% *j*	100%
Texts are free from grammatical or spelling errors.								
Fatigue	75% *c*	75% *d*	75% *g*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The size of the questionnaire is adequate to avoid fatigue.								
Qualification Check	100%	100%	100%	75% h	100%	100%	100%	75% k
The initial qualifying question is suitable for assessing the respondent's knowledge of autonomous decision making.								

Observations:

a. "The first questions were challenging to understand (difficult concepts)".
b. "I found it challenging to understand the wording of the delegation section".
c. "The density of the sections causes more fatigue than the survey size".
d. "The small font size makes reading on a cell phone tiring".
e. "Since just a few variables were presented to analyze, I do not think this task is complex".
f. "I found it difficult to understand the wording of the delegation section".
g. "I found it challenging to answer the form in the ten minutes estimated".
h. "Participants would be better qualified through a scale measuring their degree of familiarity with AI use".
i. "I found it difficult to understand the wording of the delegation section".
j. "In the gender section, there are words written in different fonts and sizes".

Table A.1

Sample Descriptives of Study 1

Market Sector	**%**	**Education Level**	**%**
Technology	23.1	Master's Degree	46.2
Education	12.4	Bachelor's Degree	44.6
Business Administration	9.1	PhD	5.9
Finance and Insurance	9.1	Other	2.7
Consulting	6.5	High School	0.5
Healthcare	6.5		
Retail	4.3	**Job Title**	**%**
Government	3.8	Manager	22.7
Legal Services	2.7	Specialist	14.0
Manufacturing	2.7	Director	11.3
Marketing & Advertising	2.7	Supervisor	10.8
Professional Business Services	2.7	Consultant	10.8
Real Estate	2.2	Coordinator	8.1
Construction	2.2	Analyst	8.1
Arts & Entertainment	1.6	Other	7.5
Nonprofit	1.6	Assistant	3.8
Hospitality	1.6	Technician	2.2
Banking	1.1		
Consumer Goods	1.1	**Familiarity with AI**	**%**
Energy	0.5	Intermediate User	55.4
Engineering	0.5	Basic User	23.1
Fashion & Apparel	0.5	Advanced User	18.3
Logistics	0.5	Beginner	3.2
Utilities	0.5	Expert	0.0
Pharmaceuticals	0.5		
		Gender	%
Age	**Years**	Female	57.5
Mean	35.2	Male	41.4
Standard Deviation	10.7	Other	1.1

Note. The sample comprised 186 participants.

Table A.2

Introductory Vignette, Experimental Manipulation, and Questionnaire

Every day, decision makers of different business units, across several industries, must make decisions that can affect organizational strategies, processes, or even individuals in the workplace (e.g., promoting people, discontinuing products, exploring new market niches, sharing bonuses, to specify a few).

More recently, advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have enabled companies to invest in AI-based applications to automate corporate decision making, in order to improve decision accuracy, speed, and effectiveness. Currently, AI-based apps can act as decision makers (i.e., autonomous agents), since they can perform cognitive functions as humans due to their learning and adjustment capabilities.

Considering this context, imagine that you work for an organization that has recently adopted AI applications to improve corporate decision making. Since the company has expanded its market share, this growth has made it possible to hire new professionals in different business units. As a decision maker, you must hire a new professional for your department from a list of job applicants gathered from the market. Your department, besides you, is formed by two female and two male professionals, and one of the job requirements is to visit a subsidiary twice a month, which could also be attended through virtual meetings. The average salary for this job position is $72k/year. To select the best candidate, you will find below a summary of the characteristics that compose each applicant's profile.

Before performing the hiring decision assigned to you, would you be willing to fully delegate this task to AI (yes/no)? This means that AI would decide on your behalf. Please, provide a reason why. (QUESTION VALID ONLY FOR STUDY 2)

Random Assignment: Low Complexity (control)

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Item	Applicant 1	Applicant 2	Applicant 3
Age	*28*	*30*	*38*
Gender	*Female*	*Male*	*Female*
Education level	*High school*	*High school*	*Postgraduate*
Expertise	*High*	*High*	*Very High*
Travel facility	*Yes*	*Yes*	*No*
Expected salary	*$48k/year*	*$76k/year*	*$ 116k/Year*

After carefully analyzing the information on the job candidates at your disposal to make the requested hiring decision, please inform us of your three preferred hiring options (from the best to the worst), based on your analysis (e.g., applicant 3, applicant 1, and so on).

Random Assignment: High Complexity (treatment)

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Item	*Applicant 1*	*Applicant 2*	*Applicant 3*	*Aplicant 4*	*Aplicant 5*	*Aplicant 6*
Age	*28*	*45*	*38*	*50*	*36*	*30*
Gender	*Female*	*Male*	*Female*	*Male*	*Male*	*Female*
Marital status	*Single*	*Married*	*Married*	*Divorced*	*Single*	*Divorced*
No. of children	*0*	*2*	*2*	*3*	*0*	*1*
Education level	*High school*	*High school*	*Postgraduate*	*Graduate*	*Postgraduate*	*Graduate*
Expertise	*Average*	*High*	*Very high*	*Very high*	*High*	*High*
Soft skills	*High*	*Very high*	*High*	*Outstanding*	*Very high*	*Outstanding*
Experience abroad	*No*	*Yes*	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*	*No*
Languages spoken	*1*	*2*	*3*	*3*	*1*	*2*
Travel facility	*Yes*	*Yes*	*No*	*No*	*Yes*	*Yes*
Expected salary	*$48k/year*	*$70k/year*	*$118k/year*	*$132k/year*	*$88k/year*	*$76k/year*
Last job duration	*2 years*	*9 years*	*10 years*	*12 years*	*4 years*	*5 years*
Availability	*immediate*	*immediate*	*1 week*	*1 week*	*immediate*	*1 week*

Random Assignment: High Complexity (treatment)

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Item	*Applicant 7*	*Applicant 8*	*Applicant 9*	*Aplicant 10*	*Aplicant 11*	*Aplicant 12*
Age	*32*	*42*	*36*	*48*	*34*	*29*
Gender	*Female*	*Male*	*Female*	*Male*	*Male*	*Female*
Marital status	*Single*	*Married*	*Divorced*	*Divorced*	*Single*	*Divorced*
No. of children	*0*	*1*	*4*	*2*	*0*	*2*
Education level	*High School*	*Graduate*	*Postgraduate*	*Graduate*	*High School*	*Graduate*
Expertise	*Good*	*High*	*Very High*	*Good*	*High*	*High*
Soft skills	*High*	*Very High*	*High*	*Outstanding*	*Very High*	*Outstanding*
Experience abroad	*Yes*	*Yes*	*No*	*No*	*Yes*	*Yes*
Languages spoken	*2*	*2*	*1*	*1*	*2*	*1*
Travel facility	*Yes*	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*	*Yes*	*Yes*
Expected salary	*$ 54k/Year*	*$ 62k/Year*	*$ 45k/Year*	*$ 90k/Year*	*$ 82k/Year*	*$ 72k/Year*
Last job duration	*3 Years*	*5 Years*	*4 Years*	*7 Years*	*3 Years*	*3 Years*
Availability	*Immediate*	*10 Days*	*1 Week*	*2 Weeks*	*3 Days*	*Immediate*

After carefully analyzing the information on the job candidates at your disposal to make the requested hiring decision, please inform us of your three preferred hiring options (from the best to the worst), based on your analysis (e.g., applicant 3, applicant 1, and so on).

Manipulation Checks

How complex have you found making this hiring decision? (Far too simple → Far too complex).

In your opinion, how realistic is this hiring decision-making scenario? (Far too little → Far too much).

Intention to Delegate Decisions to AI

Autonomous decision making means that AI-based applications can perform decision-making tasks as independent agents, without human supervision. This implies that humans must be willing to assign decision-making authority to AI, transfer decision power, grant decision control, or even empower AI to make a decision, thereby authorizing it to act on their behalf and abdicating involvement in the decision task execution. Examples of AI artifacts used for recruiting purposes are HireVue, Pymetrics, Xref, Eightfold, Jobvite, and ChatGPT, among others.

When considering the decision to hire a job applicant, we would like to know your intention regarding allowing AI to make the hiring decision on your behalf, thereby transferring control of the decision-making process to it. Thus, please state the degree to which you agree with the following statements:

If I could transfer decision-making power to AI to find a solution for the hiring issue, I predict I would do it.
Considering I had the opportunity to grant decision control to AI to decide which applicant is the best choice, I would do it.
Given that I could empower AI to perform this decision task, I would do it.
Presuming I had the opportunity to concede decision authority to AI to find the best hiring option, I foresee that I would do it.
If I had the opportunity to grant AI decision-making authority to perform this hiring task, I would do it.

Motivation for Cognitive Effort

Now, we would like to know your motivation to exert cognitive effort to make this hiring decision. Thus, you would say that:

Right now, I would really enjoy making this hiring decision that involves coming up with solutions to problems.
Right now, I would rather do something that requires little thought than undertake this hiring decision task, which is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. (R)
Right now, I would like to avoid making this hiring decision where there is a likely chance I will have to think in depth. (R)
Right now, I would prefer complex to simple problems.
Right now, I would like to be responsible for handling this hiring decision task that requires a lot of thinking.

Purpose of the Experiment: "*Please indicate what this research is about, according to your opinion".*

Demographics: *age, gender, education level, market sector, job title, and familiarity with AI.*

Table A.3

Scale Reliability and Internal Consistency

STUDY 1 (N = 184)				
Latent Variable	**raw_alpha**	**No. of items**		
MOCE	.90	5		
IDAI	.96	5		
Item	**α if item deleted**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median inter-item r**
MOCE_1	.88	3.93	1.02	0.65
MOCE_2	.89	3.46	1.17	0.66
MOCE_3	.88	3.65	1.15	0.62
MOCE_4	.88	3.42	1.11	0.66
MOCE_5	.87	3.58	1.12	0.64
IDAI_1	.94	3.07	1.26	0.80
IDAI_2	.94	2.99	1.34	0.81
IDAI_3	.94	2.82	1.37	0.80
IDAI_4	.94	2.92	1.28	0.79
IDAI_5	.95	2.78	1.32	0.81

Note. MOCE = Motivation for Cognitive Effort, IDAI = Intention to Delegate Decisions to AI.

Cronbach's alpha for the five-item MOCE and IDAI scales for both studies was > .70, indicating good internal consistency. Examination of item-level statistics showed that deleting any single item would not substantially increase the reliability. All items presented satisfactory item–total correlations (median inter-item r), supporting the inclusion of all items.

Table A.4

Results for *T*-Tests

STUDY 1 (N = 186)									
Variable	**Group**	**n**	***M***	***SD***	***t***	***df***	***p***	**Cohen's *d***	**95% *CI***
TCOM	0	91	2.67	0.91	-6.31	184	< .001 ***	-0.93	[-1.23, -0.62]
	1	95	3.51	0.90					
MOCE	0	91	3.59	0.88	-0.23	184	.818	-0.03	[-0.32, 0.25]
	1	95	3.62	1.01					
IDAI	0	91	2.71	1.16	-2.29	184	.023*	-0.34	[-0.63, -0.05]
	1	95	3.11	1.23					
Age	0	91	35.51	10.37	0.33	184	.743	0.05	[-0.24, 0.34]
	1	95	34.99	11.04					

Note. Data analysis conducted with SPSS.

Group 0 = control group exposed to low complexity, Group 1 = treatment group exposed to high complexity, n = sample size, *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation, *t* = Student's t-test statistic, *df* = degrees of freedom. Cohen's *d* = standardized mean difference between two groups, TCOM = Task Complexity, MOCE = Motivation for Cognitive Effort, IDAI = Intention to Delegate Decisions to AI.

**p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

Table A.5

Results for Crosstabulation

STUDY 1								
Variable	**Group**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Total**
GEND	0	55	35	1	-	-	-	91
		51.4%	45.5%	50.0%				48.9%
	1	52	42	1				95
		48.6%	54.5%	50.0%				51.1%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (2) = 0.64, p = .728							
EDUC	0	-	0	45	42	4	0	91
			0.0%	54.2%	48.8%	36.4%	0.0%	48.9%
	1		1	38	44	7	5	95
			100.0%	45.8%	51.2%	63.6%	100.0%	51.1%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (4) = 7.37, p = .117							
FAMI	0	4	23	51	13	-	-	91
		66.7%	53.5%	49.5%	38.2%			48.9%
	1	2	20	52	21			95
		33.3%	46.5%	50.5%	61.8%			51.1%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (3) = 2.68, p = .443							

Note. Data analysis conducted with SPSS.

Group 0 = control group exposed to low complexity, Group 1 = treatment group exposed to high complexity, GEND = Gender, EDUC = Education Level, FAMI = Familiarity with AI. Pearson χ^2 = Pearson's chi-square.

**p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

Table A.6

Sample Equivalence Test

Dependent Variable: Motivation for Cognitive Effort				
Effect	***F***	***p***	**η^2 p**	**Interpretation**
X	1.64	.202	.01	The treatment group did not significantly differ from the control group
Year	5.54	.019*	.02	The year in which the data was collected influenced the value of motivation for cognitive effort
X * Year	2.56	.111	.01	The effect of the treatment did not change between years
The model is significant ($F(3, 316) = 3.12$, $p = .026$, $R^2 = .03$), but this mainly reflects the 'Year' effect.				
Dependent Variable: Intention to Delegate Decision to AI				
Effect	***F***	***p***	**η^2 p**	**Interpretation**
X	7.06	.008**	.02	The treatment group differed significantly from the control group
Year	1.63	.203	.01	The year in which the data was collected did not influence the value of the intention to delegate decisions to AI
X * Year	0.01	.927	.00	The effect of treatment did not change between years
The model is significant ($F(3, 316) = 3.05$, $p = .029$, $R^2 = .03$), but this mainly reflects the 'X' effect.				

Note. η^2 p = partial eta squared. X = Task Complexity Manipulation.
**p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

Preliminary ANOVAs were conducted to test the equivalence of the samples across experimental conditions (X) and data collection years (YEAR) for 'motivation for cognitive effort' and 'intention to delegate decisions to AI'. Overall, these results suggest that the samples were largely comparable across years and conditions, with only minor differences that explain less than 3% of the variance. Anyway, when merging the datasets of Studies 1 and 2, we included a temporal control ('year') to account for temporal differences, thereby preventing biases introduced by contextual changes.

Table A.7

Sample Descriptives of Study 2

Market Sector	**%**	**Education Level**	**%**
Technology	22.2	Bachelor's degree	50.0
Education	11.7	Master's degree	42.2
Healthcare	10.1	PhD	5.6
Finance & Insurance	9.8	Other	1.6
Business Administration	7.0	High School	0.6
Retail	4.7		
Consulting	4.4	**Job Title**	**%**
Legal Services	3.2	Manager	30.9
Manufacturing	3.2	Director	11.3
Professional Business Services	3.2	Specialist	11.3
Government	2.8	Supervisor	9.7
Arts and Entertainment	2.5	Consultant	9.1
Construction	2.5	Other	8.1
Nonprofit	2.5	Analyst	6.6
Marketing & Advertising	2.2	Coordinator	5.9
Real Estate	1.6	Assistant	3.8
Hospitality	1.3	Technician	3.4
Pharmaceuticals	1.3		
Consumer Goods	0.9	**Familiarity with AI**	**%**
Transportation	0.9	Intermediate User	33.2
Banking	0.6	Advanced User	30.0
Energy	0.6	Expert	20.6
Engineering	0.3	Basic User	15.0
Fashion and Apparel	0.3	Beginner	2.2
Logistics	0.3		
Utilities	0.3	**Gender**	%
General Services	0.3	Female	50.9
Telecommunications	0.3	Male	47.8
		Other	1.3
Age	**Years**		
Mean	39.2		
Standard Deviation	12.4		

Note. The sample comprised 320 participants.

Table A.8
Scale Reliability and Internal Consistency

STUDY 2 (N = 320)				
Latent Variable	**raw_alpha**	**No. of items**		
MOCE	.84	5		
IDAI	.97	5		
Item	**α if item deleted**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median inter-item r**
MOCE_1	.81	3.94	1.01	0.54
MOCE_2	.80	3.67	1.19	0.51
MOCE_3	.80	3.83	1.76	0.51
MOCE_4	.85	3.38	1.18	0.57
MOCE_5	79	3.73	1.10	0.46
IDAI_1	.96	2.94	1.33	0.86
IDAI_2	.96	2.86	1.40	0.86
IDAI_3	.96	2.79	1.41	0.87
IDAI_4	.96	2.83	1.38	0.85
IDAI_5	.96	2.75	1.38	0.87

Note. MOCE = Motivation for Cognitive Effort, IDAI = Intention to Delegate Decisions to AI.

Cronbach's alpha for the five-item MOCE and IDAI scales for both studies was > .70, indicating good internal consistency. Examination of item-level statistics showed that deleting any single item would not substantially increase the reliability. All items presented satisfactory item–total correlations (median inter-item r), supporting the inclusion of all items.

Table A.9

Results for *T*-Tests

STUDY 2 (N = 320)									
Variable	**Group**	**n**	***M***	***SD***	***t***	***df***	***p***	**Cohen's *d***	**95% *CI***
TCOM	0	160	2.73	1.04	-7.89	318	< .001 ***	-0.88	[-1.11, -0.65]
	1	160	3.61	0.96					
MOCE	0	160	3.76	0.83	1.08	318	.280	0.12	[-0.10, 0.34]
	1	160	3.65	0.95					
IDAI	0	160	2.64	1.26	-2.74	318	.006**	-0.31	[-0.53, -0.09]
	1	160	3.03	1.32					
Age	0	160	39.36	12.68	0.42	318	.672	0.05	[-0.17, 0.27]
	1	160	38.77	12.09					

Note. Data analysis conducted with SPSS.

Group 0 = control group exposed to low complexity, Group 1 = treatment group exposed to high complexity, n = sample size, *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation, *t* = Student's t-test statistic, *df* = degrees of freedom. Cohen's *d* = standardized mean difference between two groups, TCOM = Task Complexity, MOCE = Motivation for Cognitive Effort, IDAI = Intention to Delegate Decisions to AI.

**p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

Table A.10

Results for Crosstabulation

STUDY 2								
Variable	**Group**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Total**
GEND	0	82	75	3	-	-	-	160
		50.3%	49.0%	75.0%				50.0%
	1	81	78	1				160
		49.7%	51.0%	25.0%				50%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (2) = 1.07, p = .587							
EDUC	0	-	0	87	64	9	0	160
			0.0%	54.4%	47.4%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
	1		2	73	71	9	5	160
			100.0%	45.6%	52.6%	50.0%	100.0%	50%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (4) = 8.59, p = .072							
FAMI	0	4	25	51	44	36	-	160
		57.1%	52.1%	49.5%	45.8%	54.5%		50.0%
	1	3	23	52	51	30		160
		42.9%	47.9%	50.5%	54.2%	45.5%		50%
Pearson χ^2	χ^2 (4) = 1.45, p = .836							

Note. Data analysis conducted with SPSS.

Group 0 = control group exposed to low complexity, Group 1 = treatment group exposed to high complexity, GEND = Gender, EDUC = Education Level, FAMI = Familiarity with AI. Pearson χ^2 = Pearson's chi-square.

**p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

Table A.11

Responses from 47 informants for Pro-Delegation Reasons

Informant	Complete Responses (raw data)
4	I can trust it.
4	The AI is known for its unbiased decision.
4	The AI is known for its fairness.
8	It would free me up time to do other things.
8	It would be accurate.
11	AI can digest and assimilate the qualifications of candidates. It can determine which prospective employees are viable based upon the prompt of parameters. Prescreening applications can provide a small pool of prospects. A second prompt of parameters can narrow the field further, until a final few meet all of the requirements of the position. An additional prompt can select the best candidate.
12	I think AI is perfectly capable of assessing how viable a job candidate would be.
13	AI could help me possibly assess information I may have missed from just natural data loss when processing information.
21	I trust AI to make decisions on my behalf.
23	Because AI can analyze vast volumes of data and spot patterns that I might miss, I would be willing to let it make this hiring decision in order to potentially make a more efficient and objective choice. Its capacity for learning might also guarantee a comprehensive assessment of applicants using uniform standards.
27	The AI is always very accurate and concise. All tasks normally delegated to AI turn out very well and neat.
30	AI is more accurate and objective in its evaluations.
30	AI is faster.
31	An AI can evaluate all candidates against the exact same qualifications, removing the potential for unconscious human bias to influence the outcome.
31	I would delegate this decision to AI to ensure a more objective and equitable hiring process.
36	I would be willing to delegate this hiring decision to AI because it can evaluate candidates objectively, minimizing human bias
36	AI can ensure that skills, experience, and qualifications are matched fairly to the job requirements.
36	AI can process large amounts of data efficiently.
42	AI can look unbiased at different factors to create an objective answer without personal preferences taking effect on the decision.
47	AI will have a wide scope of factors to consider before making a decision.
50	AI would make the hiring process quicker, and much easier. AI could analyze a person's employment history, education, and social media activity in less than 1 minute.
58	I currently delegate my initial screening decision to AI. It filters through over 500 resumes and gives me the best candidate and I have been highly impressed.
65	I feel that I can provide prompts to enable and ensure the AI selects the appropriate candidate from the applicants. I would also provide enough instructions to prevent a biased selection.
68	To make work easy and reduce the amount of time I would use in making the decision.
71	I think advancements in AI have brought it to the level of an expert human.
73	I also trust the AI to make an unbiased and correct decision.
73	I believe the AI could be programmed to make the correct hiring decision as if it were made by myself.
79	It would save time.
82	If AI is capable of performing this function as well as, or better than, a human, then it would only make business sense to delegate it to AI.

83	In a large-scale hiring effort driven by market expansion, the primary goal is accuracy in identifying the most qualified candidates from a high volume of applicants.
83	In a large-scale hiring effort driven by market expansion, the primary goal is speed in identifying the most qualified candidates from a high volume of applicants.
87	Delegating this hiring task to AI can be okay because it may increase decision accuracy and effectiveness by taking into account AI's learning and adjustment capabilities to process applicant data objectively. I have full confidence AI can accomplish just that.
88	Hiring is really time-consuming and my AI models are familiar with my needs.
89	I believe that AI will do the job without bias.
91	I am interested to see if AI makes the same decision as I would.
92	I would be willing to delegate the hiring decision to AI because AI can reduce unconscious bias.
92	I would be willing to delegate the hiring decision to AI with enough safeguards. This is because AI can evaluate applicants efficiently and at scale.
93	I feel confident in its ability to make the best decision.
99	I like that AI would remove personal prejudice and simply pick the best candidate.
100	I believe the AI is more intelligent and is more performing.
106	The business is growing and we are in need to have something that's objective.
108	I think AI has got to a point in its development that it can make a lot of these decisions better than humans. It also is probably going to be a lot less biased than a human could ever be.
109	With the new advancements in AI, they are capable in making sound decisions in various fields, so I would be willing to delegate this hiring decision.
110	Because AI is the future and hiring decisions must make these considerations.
111	I trust it.
111	I feel like it would do a good job.
112	I am confident that AI would find someone capable of doing the job.
117	Because I think AI has evolved to a place of being effective in this capacity.
119	This is because AI will evaluate the required qualifications and the suitable candidate for any position without biasness.
120	I would be willing to delegate this hiring decision to AI because it can identify the best candidates based on skills and qualifications without human bias, improving the accuracy of the selection.
120	AI can identify the best candidates based on skills and qualifications without human bias, improving the fairness of the selection.
120	I would be willing to delegate this hiring decision to AI because it can process large amounts of applicant data objectively.
122	It can reduce the impact of human bias and provide a more objective and consistent evaluation of all candidate.
123	I believe AI will eliminate human bias from the applicant review, ensuring the hiring decision is purely based on objective performance data and job related metrics for maximum organizational efficiency.
124	If push comes to shove and I am overly busy I would go with the AI.
124	The AI when given the proper perimeters and inputs it can easily go through a stack of resume and applications and find the best person for the job, though Ideally I would get to interview it's final choice just to double check.
129	I think the AI is capable of deciding which person will be competent.

Note. Some informants provided more than one reason.

Table B.12

Thematic Code Development with Frequency for Pro-Delegation Reasons

1st Order Concepts	Frequency	Informants
Confidence in AI having superior information processing and data analysis capabilities	17 (30%)	11, 12, 23, 36, 47, 71, 82, 91, 92, 93, 106, 109, 111, 112, 117, 120, 129
Confidence in AI making bias-free decisions	15 (26%)	4, 8, 27, 30, 31, 36, 42, 73, 83, 87, 89, 92, 119, 120, 123
Confidence in AI making prejudice-free decisions	5 (9%)	4, 31, 36, 99, 120
Confidence in the AI capability to expedite the hiring process	4 (7%)	30, 50, 68, 83
Confidence in the AI capacity to outperform humans	4 (7%)	13, 100, 108, 122
Expectation of having free time to do other tasks	4 (7%)	8, 79, 88, 124
Trust in AI	4 (7%)	4, 21, 110, 111
Belief that providing consistent human input can prevent AI from generating biased outcomes	2 (4%)	65, 73
Preference for humans making the final decision, with AI supporting the process	2 (4%)	58, 124

Note. Informants provided 57 pro-delegation reasons.

Table B.13

Final Thematic Code for Pro-Delegation Reasons

1st Order Concepts	2nd Order Themes	3rd Order Themes	Aggregate Dimensions
Preference for humans making the final decision, with AI supporting the process (4%)	Desire to remain in control	Agency issues	Individual Factors
Trust in AI (7%)	Efficacy belief	Personality traits	
Confidence in AI making bias-free decisions (26%)	Accuracy	Decision outputs	AI Factors
Confidence in AI making prejudice-free decisions (9%)	Fairness		
Belief that providing consistent human input can prevent AI from generating biased outcomes (4%)	Human input	Design	
Confidence in AI having superior information processing and data analysis capabilities (28%)	Performance		
Confidence in the capacity of AI to outperform humans (7%)	Performance		
Confidence in the AI capability to expedite the hiring process (7%)	Speed		
Expectation of having free time to do other tasks (7%)	Workload reduction	Organizational	Structural Factors

Note. Most pro-delegation reasons (81%) were related to AI technical factors.

Table B.14

Responses from 77 informants for Anti-Delegation Reasons

Informant	Complete Responses (raw data)
1	I believe that AI would do a great job, but I want to have an in-person interview before a decision is made.
2	It is important to truly evaluate the candidates in this process and not trust AI to just be able to complete it, since there is a human component that may be missed.
3	I think hiring decisions should remain a human decision. I think the interview process for the applicant would otherwise be soulless.
5	I do not want AI making the decision without any input from a human.
5	I do not believe AI is capable of doing this task effectively, efficiently, or competently at this time.
6	Because if it took a misstep I would be responsible.
7	I don't think the technology is completely there yet to make the best decision. I would use it for analysis and summarizing the interview though.
7	I'd still want to make the call.
9	I'm more comfortable personally interacting with people.
9	I prefer to delegate this responsibility to a person.
10	There are certain decisions that I trust to AI, but hiring someone is not one of those decisions. I trust AI for scheduling, and not much more.
14	I don't trust that AI is without mistakes yet. AI is still "learning".
14	I would want at least human review of the decision before trusting it completely blind.
15	I would not be willing to delegate this hiring decision to AI because I don't trust the AI to make a decision without supervision.
15	I would rather trust my own expertise and judgement.
15	I'm unsure how the AI bases its decision making on.
16	AI cannot meet and speak to a person face-to-face, or understand how I will get along with them.
17	Cause I would want to interview them myself.
17	Cause I would want to make the hiring decision myself.
17	AI can't take into consideration things like personality and emotion. All it is going to consider is who has the best skillset and that's it. I think personality is everything and you don't want to hire someone who is a terrible awful person.
18	I would be fine with the AI making recommendations and providing insights, but I would want to make the final decision.
19	AI can be helpful in narrowing down the best candidates to hire, but I would not feel comfortable giving AI full control on who we would hire. It just seems unethical and I would want to review these candidates and figure out who would be best. AI also just focuses on stats and info, which doesn't account for the team aspect, so having AI make a decision on who I work with would be a bad idea.
20	I find satisfaction in my role in the act of doing the thinking myself; I'm there for the paycheck, but I'm going to make the best of it and the best of it for me is working hard.
22	I feel human interaction is important when hiring someone. Personality, communication skills and overall traits are important as factual information about degrees and work history.
24	I want to prioritize a personal hire since this is an individual working on my team. They need to have better people skills vs what’s on their resume as a checklist.
25	AI does not have human intuition; it cannot detect "vibes" that humans pick up on. I don't think humans will ever be replaced in this aspect.
26	I would want to review the AIs choices or at least create a shortlist first. If the AI hasn't been tested it could be biased.

28	I would use it to help glean information, but there's also first-person information about the candidates only I can bring to the decision.
29	I would want to hire the person myself so I could gage whether they would be a good fit or not.
32	I would not be willing to fully delegate the hiring decision to AI because it involves assessing personal qualities, cultural fit, and growth potential, which AI may not fully understand or evaluate accurately.
33	I do not think that AI is reliable to the point where it would be appropriate for this decision. This is a high risk task that is not ready for AI tools to be the sole decision maker in.
34	AI may not understand some of the nuance in hiring and in human interviewing.
35	I would want to have some control in this hiring decision, to be able to judge not just the qualifications but the personality and fit of the individual.
37	I wouldn't delegate it to AI because hiring isn't just about data or qualifications. It's about finding someone who fits the team's values and work style, and that's something a person should decide.
38	I would always want final say in anything a 'clanker' is doing.
39	I wouldn't fully delegate it, but would let it assist. The final decision needs peer reviewed.
40	I want to be able to screen the applicants myself and have some sort of control.
41	I would want to share in the responsibility of choosing the person and seeing if we get along.
43	I would not think the outcome would be fair.
44	I would want to meet the candidate first. It is too much of a risk to hire the incorrect person.
45	I would agree to allow AI to help with the decision but I feel uncomfortable to have AI be the sole decision maker.
45	AI has been known to be biased and I want to be able to verify they have made a good choice.
46	I believe there are nuances to hiring beyond just meeting the skills required on paper. I think there are personality conflicts sometimes that you might notice in an interview and after speaking with someone. You will be able to tell if you have two candidates in front of you that are qualified and whether or not one would mesh with the team more than the other even if their skills match 95% instead of 100%. That last 5 could be taught or gained through experience. Having someone with a personality conflict on the team isn't worth having someone with 100% of the skills upfront.
48	Because hiring involves evaluating not only qualifications and experience but also human factors like motivation, teamwork, cultural fit and interpersonal skills which are aspects that AI cannot fully capture.
49	I would not give AI complete control over hiring. AI is helpful for sorting through job applications, but a person should make the final choice. Leaders have a duty to make choices that form their teams and affect what they do later.
49	Picking someone for a team is more than just looking at their skills. It also involves considering their emotional awareness, whether people can trust them, and if they will fit with the team's culture.
51	I would not mind incorporating the AI into helping guide the hiring decision but to give the AI full autonomy on making the decision would be too much. At the bare minimum, I would want to review the AI recommendations before there being a final decision.
52	I would see AI as more of a recruiter. I would not completely make that decision until I reviewed it.
53	I just dont fully trust AI at the time for those decisions.
53	It can assist but not make the final decision.
54	I think there should be a human reviewing job applications because AI would only process parts of the whole while a human would look at the bigger picture.
54	Sometimes intuition can help a human make a decision as well when presented with information.
54	I think if the applicant put forth the time and effort to create and submit an application, there should be the same effort from the hiring manager to thoroughly review it.
55	It should be used as a tool to assist in the process.
55	AI can be biased.
55	AI may not identify the best candidate using fair metrics.

56	I would not want AI to make a total decision on an individual based on what technology thinks so to say. This selection could be flawed.
57	Because hiring somebody takes some human connection and certain sensibilities that AI cannot pick up.
59	I wouldn't mind getting a second opinion, but don't think you should hire based completely on a non-human algorithm.
60	I don't trust AI to find the best person to meet the business's needs.
61	It is too important of a decision to rely on AI alone. I may use AI for information but I would want a human to make the final decision.
62	Because AI is not yet at that level of proficiency and is as prone to bias as a human.
63	Do not trust completely, there are still hallucinations.
64	I understand the part where this decision can partly be delegated to the AI, but giving it full authority would water down my preferences.
64	For a workplace, you may want a mixture of experience, efficiency and workplace culture and individual character. AI might not know all this.
66	There are nuances with making hiring decisions, like body language, voice inflections, communication skills that allow people to work better in groups, that AI would not be able to help with.
67	I don't believe the final decision should be handled by AI. It must involve a human being to be a complete decision.
69	I would want to have final sign off. I am not certain how the algorithm works and I would like to see its suggestion along with reviewing and making a choice as well.
70	I would want to maintain some level of control and accountability over the AI recommendation / decision.
72	I don't believe AI is capable of fairly evaluating the unique characteristics and skills more "unususal" job candidates have to offer
74	I want some level of control over the people that would be working in the my own department.
75	It is a decision that will affect real people, so it should be overseen by a real person.
76	I do not think they can accurately assess things like soft skills, body language, and other nonverbal cues that can reveal much about an applicant.
77	In addition to quantified or quantifiable metrics (e.g., performance), there are intangible and implicit characteristics that cannot be captured by AI. At workplace, the latter are more important. If we delegate to AI, we may miss out on better candidates.
78	Too worried items would get overlooked or not given the value that they should.
80	Human beings applying for a job deserve to be treated with care and respect. Delegating the hiring decision to AI goes against my belief of mutual respect.
81	Because hiring people is delicate.
81	Because AI will take decision only based upon qualifications and will not bee able to asses one on one qualities which a human can asses during interview.
84	I would be willing to allow a AI to help screen the candidates but still want to make sure I am a part of the decision making process. When it comes to hiring decisions there is just some stuff such as how they fit with the other team members.
85	I want to make sure I have input.
86	I would like the input of AI, but I think the final decision should be made by a human as it is a very important decision and sometimes, you can get a gut feeling from an interaction that is based on intuition and not just quantitative data that AI would be using to evaluate.
86	It is a very important decision.
90	Because hiring isn't just a cognitive process. It's about personality and finding the soft skills too. It has to be a fit for the culture of the workplace. And AI can't determine that.
94	I just think there are nuances about the process of hiring someone that the AI can't take into account.
95	I would not entirely delegate this hiring decision to AI, However, I would let AI assist in the hiring, but not delegate entire control. I would need to oversee this, only because there may be something that needs to be

	addressed from a human standpoint or point of view. At this point AI would not be able to determine which decision to make.
96	I think there are levels of nuance that AI agents do not possess. They also don't know how to evaluate a candidate beyond whatever data they were trained on, which I also have no idea about.
97	I would not be willing to fully delegate this hiring decision to AI because it lacks the human capacity to assess intangible qualities like character team fit and potential which are crucial for a long term strategic hire.
98	I think AI should be able to act as a tool to help me weed out candidates who may not be as qualified and perhaps even in the decision making process but at the end of the day the final decision should be made by a human.
101	AI can predict how an individual will perform but without face-to-face interactions with the perspective hire, it might choose someone not suited to your particular unit/department.
102	It does not account for a person's emotional intelligence or their fit with the team.
103	Too many variables that the AI does not take into account such as how much positive energy the person has.
104	While AI can fundamentally accelerate decision making by taking into account huge amounts of information, the automated decision making process does not take into account human factors related to job performance, including the abilities to work with others, communicate successfully, or not lie on data submitted to the ATS.
105	I prefer human to delegate this hiring decision.
107	I would not want AI to make any decisions on my behalf. I'd like to work alongside AI, but I want to have the final decision.
113	I don't feel the tech is trustworthy at this time.
113	I would consider AI's opinion.
114	I feel like while the AI model would help me understand the role better.
114	I feel like hiring someone also includes an interview type procedure in person as well.
115	I would not fully delegate this task to AI, although I would have no problem delegating it and then reviewing the AI's decision and results. I would then want to prompt the AI for its rationale in outline form as a stepwise explanation as to how it arrived at its final decision.
116	At this stage of development in AI tech, I think that human oversight, and QC checks to ensure nonbiased selections are required. I also think that an AI will not be able to as easily discern who is genuine and who is pretending to have the qualifications and soft skills that may be required for the job.
118	I don't trust AI to make a nuanced hiring decision.
121	It would be very useful and helpful to include AI in the hiring process, for selecting candidates to interview, and evaluating them objectively. However, the decision about which person to actually hire has to be done by people, so they can know who they are hiring and why.
125	I believe AI is limited compared to human decision-making.
126	I'd use it as a support tool, at best.
126	There are factors, still, that only humans understand.
127	I am open to AI's help in deciding, but the final decision needs to be up to me.
127	If AI decision gets it wrong the repercussions would be costly and I would get the blame in any case.
128	I believe human touch is still required to make a good hiring decision.
130	Due to the limitation of AI in identifying soft skills and human behaviors.

Note. Some informants provided more than one reason.

Table B.15

Thematic Code Development with Frequency for Anti-Delegation Reasons

1st Order Concepts	Frequency	Informants
Preference for humans making the final decision, with AI supporting the process	36 (33%)	5, 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, 26, 28, 33, 35, 38, 39, 45, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 61, 64, 67, 69, 70, 84, 86, 95, 98, 107, 113, 114, 115, 121, 126, 127
AI's limited contextual understanding (decreased emotional intelligence and sensemaking)	26 (24%)	2, 25, 32, 34, 46, 48, 49, 57, 64, 66, 72, 76, 77, 78, 81, 90, 94, 96, 97, 102, 103, 104, 116, 125, 126, 130
Preference for humans leading the hiring task	10 (9%)	3, 9, 16, 17, 37, 54, 56, 75, 105, 128
Preference for personal contact (interviews)	8 (7%)	1, 9, 17, 22, 24, 44, 101, 114
Preference to make one's own decision	8 (7%)	7, 15, 17, 20, 29, 40, 74, 85
Uncertainty about AI competence in performing a hiring task	8 (7%)	5, 10, 14, 53, 60, 63, 113, 118
Uncertainty regarding the AI decision being bias-free	3 (3%)	45, 55, 62
Concern with the managerial attention given to the hiring process	2 (2%)	54, 80
Concerns about outcome repercussions and accountability	2 (2%)	6, 127
Uncertainty regarding the AI decision being prejudice-free	2 (2%)	43, 55
Hiring people is a sensitive issue	1 (1%)	81
Hiring people is an important decision	1 (1%)	86
Preference for sharing decision-making accountability	1 (1%)	41
Uncertainty about how AI makes the decision	1 (1%)	15

Note. Informants provided 109 anti-delegation reasons.

Table B.16

Final Thematic Code for Anti-Delegation Reasons

1st Order Concepts	2nd Order Themes	3rd Order Themes	Aggregate Dimensions
Preference for sharing decision-making accountability (1%)	Equitable decision making	Agency issues	Individual Factors
Preference for humans making the final decision, with AI supporting the process (33%)	Desire to remain in control		
Preference for humans leading the hiring task (9%)	Human agency		
Uncertainty about AI competence in performing a hiring task (7%)	Negative perception	Psychological aspects	
Preference to make one's own decision (7%)	Moral obligation		
Concern with the managerial attention given to the hiring process (2%)	Perceived responsibility		
Preference for personal contact (interviews) (7%)	Face-to-face interaction	Personality traits	
Hiring people is an important decision (1%)	Importance	Nature of the task	Task Factors
Hiring people is a sensitive issue (1%)	Subjectivity		
Concerns about outcome repercussions and accountability (2%)	Decision cost	Decision outputs	AI Factors
Uncertainty regarding the AI decision being bias-free (3%)	Outcome accuracy		
Uncertainty regarding the AI decision being prejudice-free (2%)	Outcome fairness		
Uncertainty about how AI makes the decision (1%)	Black-box nature (opacity)	Design	
AI's limited contextual understanding (decreased emotional intelligence and sensemaking) (24%)	Subjective reasoning		

Note. Most anti-delegation reasons (66%) were related to individual factors.