Algorithmic Bias in ERP Software Customization: Ethical Considerations

Shanmugam Sivagurunathan
Assistant Professor
Department of Computer Science and Applications,
Gandhigram Rural Institute (Deemed to be University),
Gandhigram, India
Email: svgrnth@gmail.com

Sudhaman Parthasarathy
Professor of Data Science
Department of Applied Mathematics and Computational Science
Thiagarajar College of Engineering, Madurai, India
Email: parthatce@gmail.com
(Corresponding Author)

Abstract

Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software customization plays a pivotal role in tailoring business processes to organizational needs. However, algorithmic bias embedded in customization tools can propagate ethical challenges, disproportionately disadvantaging certain user groups or reinforcing systemic inequities. This paper explores the origins of such biases in ERP software, examining their impact on decision-making, organizational fairness, and inclusivity. It further discusses the roadmap for identifying, mitigating, and auditing biases through ethical guidelines, transparent practices, and stakeholder collaboration. By addressing the interplay between technology and ethics, this study underscores the importance of responsible customization to foster equitable and unbiased enterprise solutions.

Keywords: *Data bias, Algorithmic bias, ERP, Customization, Business process.*

1. Introduction

When application software consistently mistreats some users, this is known as algorithmic bias. Machine-learning-based models with algorithmic bias can have unfair, unequal, and unjust outcomes. However, this research has been mostly anecdotal and scattered. In a recent study (Parthasarathy and Padmapriya, 2023), the first author investigated ERP software customization algorithm design biases in models, data, and approaches. This study also uses the k-nearest neighbors (KNN) algorithm to customize the ERP software using artificial intelligence. Based on Parthasarathy and Padmapriya's (2023) research, we identified the ethical considerations that functional and technical consultants must consider when recommending the right level of software customization to customers for successful ERP implementation. To the best of our knowledge, the ethics of algorithmic customization of enterprise resource planning (ERP) software, particularly when AI is included, has not been studied. In this study, we strive to comprehend the ethical implications of algorithmic bias while customizing ERP software.

ERP software meets the varying needs of businesses worldwide. It has many industry standard features. Most ERP systems require customization to fit their business operations

into the system. Conceptual frameworks from previous research studies were used to customize ERP software (Luo and Strong, 2004; Light, 2005; Mahmood, 2020; Febrianto and Soediantono, 2022; Yathiraju, 2022; Wang, 2022). ERP vendors use frameworks suggested in previous studies to build customized ERP software applications. The only algorithm identified in the ERP literature that quantifies the degree of ERP software customization is prioritized requirements customization estimation (PRCE) developed by Parthasarathy and Daneva (2016). Despite not using artificial intelligence, the PRCE algorithm can still be biased by data inputs or algorithm alterations at certain phases, as observed by Parthasarathy and Padmapriya (2023).

The concept of "ERP customization" pertains to the alterations carried out by the ERP software implementation team to meet the specific demands of customers that are not explicitly or implicitly catered to by the ERP system (Light, 2005). Parthasarathy and Sharma (2016) define the concept of "degree of customization" by referring to the level of customer demands that cannot be met by the standard attributes of the chosen ERP package, thereby requiring the modification of the ERP product to meet these specific requirements. Although ERP vendors provide package releases with universally compatible interfaces, it is still necessary to customize the software to achieve optimal alignment between business processes and IT.

The contemporary business landscape has witnessed a significant accumulation of voluminous data, thereby compelling ERP vendors to leverage artificial intelligence (AI), specifically machine learning (ML), to proffer ERP customization alternatives that align with the requirements of their customers. The AI-assisted customization process enables the functional and technical consultants of the ERP vendor to expeditiously assess the ERP software customization requirements of the customer organization. Thus, ERP deployment requires AI-driven algorithms, particularly machine learning. AI algorithms can help ERP consultants customize ERP software, but they also create hazards such as algorithmic bias. A customized ERP software system may fail if prejudice is not addressed. To discover and resolve prejudice in AI systems, one must examine their data and algorithms, and integrate equitable issues into their design and deployment.

ERP software has become the backbone of modern enterprises, streamlining complex workflows and enabling data-driven decision-making. Customization is often necessary to adapt these systems to the specific requirements of an organization. However, the algorithms that underpin these customizations may inadvertently introduce biases, shaping outcomes in unintended ways. Such biases can manifest in areas like workforce management, supply chain operations, and financial forecasting, with potentially far-reaching consequences for organizational equity and efficiency. The ethical challenges posed by algorithmic bias in ERP customization are significant. Biased outcomes can lead to unequal resource allocation, reinforce systemic inequities, or marginalize certain user groups. For instance, automated hiring modules might unintentionally discriminate against diverse talent pools, while supply chain algorithms could prioritize certain vendors over others based on skewed criteria. Addressing these biases is critical to fostering fairness and ensuring that ERP systems support, rather than undermine, organizational goals and values.

Comprehending the ethical implications of algorithmic bias in ERP customization is essential to building trust in technology and promoting responsible innovation. By identifying potential sources of bias and implementing robust mitigation strategies, organizations can align their technological decisions with principles of fairness, accountability, and inclusivity. This alignment not only safeguards against reputational risks but also strengthens the foundation of ethical enterprise practices in an increasingly automated and interconnected world.

2. Background

A number of prior studies have proposed theoretical frameworks for the rationale behind the customization of ERP software, with a focus on the realization of benefits. Additionally, these studies have suggested both qualitative and quantitative methods for estimating the benefits of customization. Parthasarathy and Daneva (2016) proposed the PRCE algorithm as the sole existing research that employs an algorithm for the quantitative estimation of ERP software customization. Customer specifications are categorized into three tiers: applications, processes, and designs. The PRCE algorithm uses an ordinal scale that spans from zero to six to align individual customer requirements with their corresponding ERP features. The absence of a customer requirement is indicated by a score of zero, whereas a score of six denotes the integration of the customer requirement as a standard attribute in the ERP software. Parthasarathy and Padmapriya (2023) conducted a recent study that sheds light on the potential for algorithmic bias to arise during the execution of the PRCE algorithm, as concisely summarized here.

The PRCE algorithm (Parthasarathy and Daneva, 2016) employs ordinal-scale evaluations provided by members of the ERP project team to determine the minimum level of customization. The selection of the threshold value at '5' is not necessarily the minimum requirement to meet customer specifications, as certain projects may be deemed satisfactory with a lower threshold value. The PRCE algorithm incorporates configuration management, which has the potential to reduce the level of customization. Nevertheless, achieving a one-to-one correspondence may not always be feasible and certain prerequisites may undergo modifications over time. In instances of this nature, it is necessary to re-evaluate the computation used to estimate the upper and lower limits of customization degrees, a task that is not feasible in practical settings.

Parthasarathy and Padmapriya (2023) conducted a study that proposed an AI-based version of the PRCE ERP customization algorithm, referred to as the "KNN-ERP" algorithm, which employs k-nearest neighbors. The study also detected plausible algorithmic partiality in the KNN-ERP software personalization algorithm, which is based on artificial intelligence. If trained on an ERP dataset with incomplete and inconsistent requirements, the KNN-ERP method may demonstrate an algorithmic bias. This can lead to a prejudice. Algorithm feature selection, especially if biased, might affect predictions (Nishant et a. 2023) Anonymity can lead to data loss and distortion, which can damage machine-learning models and algorithms. Anonymity requirements decrease the KNN-ERP performance. The ERP dataset used for training and anonymization determined the deterioration of the model. The KNN-ERP customization technique uses the Euclidean distance, which is the most commonly used similarity measure in KNN. In unbalanced datasets, the KNN-ERP customization technique may produce biased results.

Based on Townson's (2023) work on algorithmic bias and our decade-long research on ERP software customization, we propose a three-step ethical ERP software customization procedure. This approach applies to whether an AI-enabled algorithm can be used for customized reasoning. Vendors and consultants must maintain algorithm impartiality during ERP adoption. This can be achieved by carefully selecting the inputs and covering their critical properties. The selection method must be neutral to avoid bias in data. The fairness assessments of the final algorithm must consider configuration management, changing requirements, and threshold values. ERP providers and consultants should periodically evaluate output fairness, which is the extent of ERP software alteration assessed by algorithms. Biassed algorithms can influence the experimental results.
Given that even competent models might produce unfavorable results when given different inputs, ERP consultants should learn how to recognize bias in customization algorithms.

ERP vendors must aggressively address bias and injustice to enable fair operation across diverse populations. Algorithm designers working with ERP customization vendors can improve, expand, inspect, and make necessary changes to produce fairer, diversified, and unbiased results. The customization of ERP software entails the modification of the system to cater to the distinct requirements and expectations of a particular entity. The ethical aspects associated with ERP software customization necessitate a critical examination of algorithmic bias. Algorithmic bias is a widespread phenomenon whereby algorithms employed in ERP systems to automate decision-making processes produce biased outcomes that hinder certain groups or perpetuate existing social inequalities (Davidson et al. 2024). The presence of partiality can be ascribed to various elements, such as biased training data, defective algorithmic design, or the influence of societal prejudices.

3. Ethical implications of algorithmic bias in ERP software customization

Algorithmic bias can have significant ethical implications in ERP software customization. The following are the essential factors to consider.

Training Dataset: ERP systems depend on data to make well-informed decisions. If the training data utilized for the development or customization of algorithms is biased, it has the potential to sustain or intensify pre-existing biases. It is imperative to guarantee that the data employed for customization are inclusive, comprehensive, and devoid of any prejudiced or partial components.

Explainable AI: It is imperative that tailored ERP systems exhibit transparency and offer justification for their decision-making processes. It is crucial for organizations to have the capacity to comprehend and explicate the operations of algorithms along with the underlying reasoning behind the specific decisions rendered. The level of transparency in the system facilitates the identification and resolution of potential bias.

Software Walkthrough and Auditing: It recommended that organizations conduct periodic audits and monitor their tailored ERP systems to detect and address any occurrences of algorithmic bias. This entails evaluating the consequences of the choices implemented by the system and determining the existence of discriminatory tendencies or prejudices.

Iterative User Feedback: It imperative for individuals utilizing ERP systems to possess a mechanism that enables them to provide feedback regarding decisions executed by the system. This feedback has the potential to facilitate the identification of biases and enhance customization. Furthermore, it is imperative for organizations to establish a system of accountability for the decisions made by the system and assume responsibility for any potential biases that may emerge.

Ethical Design and Development: It imperative for organizations to prioritize ethical considerations while undertaking the customization process. The measures to be taken to address potential biases in the design and development of the ERP system include the involvement of a diverse and inclusive team, performance of impact assessments to assess the effects of such biases, and implementation of safeguards to counteract them.

Mitigating Algorithmic Bias: Organizations can utilize diverse methodologies to alleviate algorithmic bias, including the utilization of debiasing algorithms, conducting bias testing, and implementing fairness-aware machine learning approaches. The aforementioned techniques aim to mitigate or eradicate partialities in the decision-making procedures of the system.

ERP implementation considers these ethical factors to reduce algorithmic bias in customized ERP systems. The above practice encourages fairness, equality, and common

responsibility while increasing technology trust and reliability. In the contemporary era of artificial intelligence, it is imperative that project managers overseeing ERP possess the requisite competencies, expertise, and technological acumen to effectively identify and capitalize on prospects for enhancing the integration of machine learning applications during customization while also ensuring judicious utilization of these tools to generate equitable outcomes and enhance operational efficacy within the organization. This study lays the groundwork for incorporating dynamic managerial abilities into machine learning-driven applications to help ERP adoption confront algorithmic biases.

3.1 Discussion

Algorithmic bias in ERP software customization presents profound ethical implications that impact organizations, individuals, and society at large. As organizations increasingly rely on ERP systems to manage complex processes, these systems play a pivotal role in decision-making across human resources, finance, supply chain, and customer relationship management. However, the algorithms that enable ERP functionalities are not inherently neutral. They are shaped by the data they process, the assumptions of their designers, and the contexts in which they operate. When these factors are biased, the resulting customizations can lead to outcomes that disproportionately disadvantage certain groups or perpetuate systemic inequities.

One critical ethical concern is the potential for algorithmic bias to exacerbate inequalities in the workplace. For instance, biased algorithms in hiring modules can filter out qualified candidates from underrepresented groups due to historical inequities reflected in training data. Similarly, performance evaluation tools might disproportionately favor employees from certain demographic backgrounds if the metrics used are not representative or inclusive. These biases not only impact individual careers but also undermine diversity and inclusion efforts within organizations, leading to ethical dilemmas that challenge the fairness and equity of automated decision-making processes (Thais et al. 2023).

The customization of ERP software also raises questions about transparency and accountability. Algorithms embedded in these systems often operate as “black boxes,” making it difficult for stakeholders to understand how decisions are made. When biases emerge, organizations may struggle to identify their root causes or to hold the responsible parties accountable. This opacity can erode trust among employees and stakeholders, particularly when decisions perceived as unfair are implemented without clear justification. Ethical principles demand that organizations prioritize transparency in their use of ERP systems, ensuring that stakeholders can scrutinize the algorithms and understand the rationale behind automated decisions (Fazil et a. 2024).

Beyond the workplace, biased ERP customizations can have broader societal implications. For example, supply chain modules may prioritize certain vendors based on biased criteria, inadvertently disadvantaging small or minority-owned businesses. Such practices can reinforce systemic economic inequalities and hinder efforts to promote fair competition. Similarly, customer relationship management tools might target or exclude specific demographic groups based on biased data, perpetuating stereotypes or discriminatory practices. These outcomes extend the ethical challenges of algorithmic bias beyond organizational boundaries, highlighting the interconnectedness of technological decisions and societal values. A significant ethical consideration is the role of data in shaping algorithmic outcomes. ERP systems rely heavily on historical data to inform their algorithms, yet this data often reflects the biases and inequalities of the past. For instance, sales forecasting tools might disadvantage products targeted at marginalized communities if historical sales data is skewed. Ethically responsible customization of ERP systems requires not only awareness of these issues but also proactive efforts to address them, such as implementing bias-detection tools and ensuring diverse representation in data sets.

The ethical implications of algorithmic bias in ERP customization are further compounded by the global nature of these systems. Multinational organizations often implement ERP systems across diverse cultural and regulatory contexts, yet algorithms designed in one region may not account for the social and legal norms of another. For example, a performance evaluation metric developed in one country might fail to consider cultural differences in work styles, leading to biased assessments when applied globally. This misalignment raises ethical concerns about cultural sensitivity and fairness, underscoring the need for organizations to adapt their ERP customizations to the local contexts in which they operate. The lack of ethical oversight in ERP customization processes also poses challenges. Many organizations prioritize efficiency and cost savings over ethical considerations when customizing their systems. This approach can lead to the implementation of algorithms that prioritize organizational goals without adequately addressing their potential impact on stakeholders. Ethical oversight mechanisms, such as interdisciplinary review committees or guidelines for ethical customization, are essential to ensuring that the benefits of ERP systems are not achieved at the expense of fairness and inclusivity.

Mitigating the ethical implications of algorithmic bias in ERP customization requires a multi-faceted approach. Organizations must invest in training and resources to enhance the ethical awareness of those involved in system design and customization. By fostering a culture of ethical responsibility, organizations can encourage employees to critically examine the potential biases and consequences of their technological decisions. Collaboration with external experts, including ethicists and social scientists, can also provide valuable perspectives on the ethical dimensions of ERP customization. Regulation and governance play a crucial role in addressing the ethical challenges of algorithmic bias. Governments and industry bodies must establish standards and guidelines for the ethical use of algorithms in ERP systems. These regulations should emphasize transparency, fairness, and accountability, providing organizations with a framework for responsible customization. Compliance with such standards not only protects organizations from legal and reputational risks but also reinforces their commitment to ethical practices.

Technological solutions can also contribute to mitigating algorithmic bias in ERP systems. Advances in machine learning and artificial intelligence have enabled the development of tools for detecting and correcting biases in algorithms. By integrating these tools into the customization process, organizations can identify and address potential biases before they impact decision-making. However, these solutions must be implemented thoughtfully, with continuous monitoring and validation to ensure their effectiveness. Ultimately, addressing the ethical implications of algorithmic bias in ERP software customization is not merely a technical challenge but a moral imperative. Organizations must recognize that their technological decisions have profound implications for fairness, equity, and social justice. By prioritizing ethical considerations in the customization of ERP systems, organizations can not only enhance their operational efficiency but also contribute to a more equitable and inclusive society. This commitment to ethical responsibility is essential to building trust in technology and ensuring that its benefits are shared equitably among all stakeholders.

4. Conclusions

In the contemporary landscape of artificial intelligence, the integration of machine learning within ERP systems has emerged as a transformative approach to enhancing organizational processes and decision-making capabilities. However, the dual promise and peril of such advanced technologies highlight the importance of a balanced and ethical deployment. This research underscores the pivotal role of ERP project managers in navigating this dynamic domain by equipping themselves with the requisite competencies, technical acumen, and a strong ethical foundation to mitigate algorithmic biases. Such

preparedness not only enhances the functionality and fairness of ERP customizations but also ensures that the systems serve their intended purpose of promoting inclusivity and efficiency.

The findings emphasize the necessity of embedding dynamic managerial competencies in machine learning-driven ERP customizations. Managers must possess the ability to adapt swiftly to evolving technological trends and to critically evaluate the potential impacts of machine learning applications on diverse organizational stakeholders. By fostering a deep understanding of algorithmic mechanisms and their inherent biases, project managers can make informed decisions that align with both organizational goals and ethical imperatives. This dual focus is critical for leveraging the power of AI-driven tools to address the challenges of algorithmic partiality and ensure equitable outcomes.

The integration of machine learning applications in ERP customization presents an unparalleled opportunity to optimize processes and enhance decision-making capabilities. Yet, this integration must be approached with prudence. Algorithmic biases, if left unaddressed, can lead to unfair outcomes, diminished stakeholder trust, and a misalignment between organizational values and technological advancements. The research highlights the importance of developing frameworks and best practices that guide the ethical incorporation of machine learning in ERP systems. These frameworks should prioritize transparency, fairness, and accountability while fostering a culture of continuous learning and ethical vigilance among ERP project teams.

Furthermore, the research provides a foundation for addressing the fundamental challenges of algorithmic partiality through the lens of dynamic managerial competencies. It highlights the need for organizations to invest in training programs that enhance the skill sets of their project managers, enabling them to navigate the complexities of AI-driven ERP deployments effectively. Collaboration with interdisciplinary experts, including ethicists, data scientists, and social scientists, is also crucial for ensuring that machine learning applications are tailored to meet the unique needs of each organization while upholding ethical standards. In conclusion, the incorporation of machine learning applications during ERP customization represents a critical frontier in the quest for organizational efficiency and fairness. By equipping ERP project managers with the competencies to responsibly navigate this frontier, organizations can harness the transformative potential of AI while safeguarding against its ethical pitfalls. This research lays a vital groundwork for future studies and practical implementations aimed at resolving algorithmic biases, fostering equitable outcomes, and reinforcing the ethical integrity of AI-driven ERP systems. In doing so, it calls for a concerted effort among stakeholders to ensure that technology remains a tool for progress, equity, and innovation in the contemporary era of artificial intelligence.

References

Davidson, M., Parnell, J., & Davenport, S. (2024). A cognitive bias awareness matrix for enhancing ERP Decision-Making in entrepreneurial firms. Journal of Ethics in Entrepreneurship and Technology. https://doi.org/10.1108/jeet-05-2024-0011.

Fazil, A., Hakimi, M., & Shahidzay, A. (2024). A comprehensive review of bias in ai algorithms. Nusantara Hasana Journal.

Febrianto, T., & Soediantono, D. (2022). Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Implementation Suggestion to the Defense Industry: A Literature Review. Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research, 3(3), 1-16.

Light, B. (2005).Going beyond 'misfit' as a reason for ERP package customisation. Computers in industry, 56(6), 606-619.

Luo, W., & Strong, D. M. (2004).A framework for evaluating ERP implementation choices. IEEE transactions on Engineering Management, 51(3), 322-333.

Mahmood, F., Khan, A. Z., & Bokhari, R. H. (2020). ERP issues and challenges: a research synthesis. Kybernetes, 49(3), 629-659.

Nishant, R., Schneckenberg, D., & Ravishankar, M. (2023). The formal rationality of artificial intelligence based algorithms and the problem of bias. Journal of Information Technology, 39, 19 - 40.

Parthasarathy, S., Padmapriya, S.T. (2023) "Understanding Algorithm Bias in Artificial Intelligence-enabled ERP Software Customization", Journal of Ethics in Entrepreneurship and Technology http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEET-04-2023-0006

Parthasarathy,S., Maya Daneva, (2016) "An approach to estimation of degree of customization for ERP implementation using prioritized requirements", Journal of Systems and Software, Vol. 117, pp. 471–487.

Parthasarathy,S., Srinarayan Sharma, (2016) "Efficiency analysis of ERP packages-Customization Perspective", Computers in Industry - An International Journal, Vol 82, pp. 19–27.

Thais, S., Shumway, H., & Saragih, A. (2023). Algorithmic bias: Looking beyond data bias to ensure algorithmic accountability and equity. MIT Science Policy Review. https://doi.org/10.38105/spr.5lwvw66ssy.

Townson, S. (January 2023) "Manage AI Bias Instead of Trying to Eliminate It", MIT Sloan Management Review, 1-4.

Wang, W. T., Luo, M. C., & Chang, Y. M. (2022).Exploring the Relationship between Conflict Management and Transformational Leadership Behaviors for the Success of ERP Customization. Information Systems Management, 39(2), 177-200.

Yathiraju, N. (2022). Investigating the use of an Artificial Intelligence Model in an ERP Cloud-Based System. International Journal of Electrical, Electronics and Computers, 7(2), 1-26.