CA24167 - Disruptive Innovation and Exponential HRM: Crafting Next-Gen Employee Experience, Workplace, Job Market (HUMAN-IT)

TASK DELIVERY REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Deliverable D2.1

Deliverable name: Scientific Review Paper on Next-Gen Employee Experience, using Structured Literature Review (SLR) and scoping review methods, multiple scientific databases, compound keyword search strategy

Date of report: 30/10/2026

Mapping the Implications of Exponential Technologies on Employee Experience Across Organizational, Workplace, and Employee Levels: A Bibliometric and Thematic Review

Authors:
HEFFERNAN Margaret, Dublin City University, Ireland, Task 1 Co-leader;
DENIZ Nurcan, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye, Task 1 Co-leader;
TURSUNBAYEVA Aizhan, Università Degli Studi Di Napoli Parthenope, Italy, WG2 Vice-Leader;
LAZAZZARA Alessandra, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy; WG2 Leader

Reviewers:
AZZOPARDI Rose Marie, University of Malta, Malta;
MARCUS Justin, Koç University, Türkiye

cost

Funded by the European Union

DELIVERABLE 2.1 CONTRIBUTORS

Bibliometric Analysis:

1. DENIZ Nurcan, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye
2. DRISHTI Elvisa, University "Luigj Gurakuqi", Albania
3. HEFFERNAN Margaret, Dublin City University, Ireland
4. LAZAZZARA Alessandra, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
5. NDOKA Ervisa, University of Tirana, Albania
6. TURSUNBAYEVA Aizhan, Università Degli Studi Di Napoli Parthenope, Italy
7. ULAJ Gentjan, University of New York Tirana, Albania
8. ZA Stefano, Università di Chieti-Pescara, Italy

Coders in Bibliometric Analysis:

1. DENIZ Nurcan, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye
2. DRISHTI Elvisa, University "Luigj Gurakuqi", Albania
3. HEFFERNAN Margaret, Dublin City University, Ireland
4. NDOKA Ervisa, University of Tirana, Albania
5. ULAJ Gentjan, University of New York Tirana, Albania

Additional Reviewers in Bibliometric Review:

1. BORICI Albana, University of Shkodra "Luigj Gurakuqi", Albania
2. KASNAK Ebru, Afyonkarahisar Health Sciences University, Türkiye
3. MARCUS Justin, Koç University, Türkiye
4. O'LEARY Olivia, University College Cork, Ireland
5. SHABA Emanuela, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
6. SIMÕES Luis Miguel, Universidade Europeia, Portugal
7. SOUSA Inês, Iscte - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Portugal

Thematic Analysis:

1. ARGILOVSKI Aleksandar, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia
2. DENIZ Nurcan, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye
3. HEFFERNAN Margaret, Dublin City University, Ireland
4. LAZAZZARA Alessandra, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
5. TURSUNBAYEVA Aizhan, Università Degli Studi Di Napoli Parthenope, Italy

Coders in Thematic Analysis:

1. ARGILOVSKI Aleksandar, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia
2. BENDARAVIČIENĖ Rita, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania
3. BOLUKBAŞ Mehmet, Aydin Adnan Menderes University, Türkiye
4. BORICI Albana, University of Shkodra "Luigj Gurakuqi", Albania
5. DENIZ Nurcan, Nurcan Deniz, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye
6. GHANBARI Amirhossein, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
7. HEFFERNAN Margaret, Dublin City University, Ireland
8. KAPLAN Ahmet, Aydin Adnan Menderes University, Türkiye
9. KASNAK Ebru, Afyonkarahisar Health Sciences University, Türkiye
10. LAZAZZARA Alessandra, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
11. MATOŠKOVÁ Jana, Univerzita Tomase Bati Ve Zline, Czechia
12. NDOKA Ervisa, University of Tirana, Albania
13. O'LEARY Olivia, University College Cork, Ireland
14. OLIVEIRA Eduardo, Universidade do Porto, Portugal
15. SHABA Emanuela, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy
16. SIMÕES Luis Miguel, Universidade Europeia, Portugal

cost
Funded by the European Union

17. SOUSA Inês, Iscte - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Portugal
18. TCHANTURIA Nino, Georgian International University, Georgia
19. TEVDORADZE Sopiko, Georgian International University GIU, Georgia
20. TURSUNBAYEVA Aizhan, Università Degli Studi Di Napoli Parthenope, Italy
21. WINTER Hannah Lotte, Militärakademie (MILAK) an der ETH Zürich, Switzerland

Inter-Coder Consistency Check:

1. CONTIERO Rachele, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy

cost
Funded by the European Union

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document has been prepared with the support of COST Action CA24167 HUMAN-IT. We express our sincere gratitude to all members of Working Group 2 for their valuable contributions, constructive feedback and active involvement in developing this deliverable. Their participation in the online plenary meetings held on 6 February, 8 May and 16 October 2026, the Annual Meeting in Lecce on 24–25 June 2026, and the WG2 Meeting in Bucharest on 29–30 September 2026 supported the development of the review, the discussion and refinement of emerging findings, and the identification of priorities for subsequent activities.

We particularly thank the Task 2 co-leaders, Andri Georgiadou (Nottingham University Business School, UK) and Ilenia Bua (LIUC University, Italy), and the Task 3 co-leaders, Virginia Hernanz Martín (Universidad de Alcalá, Spain) and Magdalena Marczewska (University of Warsaw, Poland), for their feedback and support in connecting the review's findings with the next stages of WG2's work. Their input helped clarify how this knowledge base can inform mindset and awareness initiatives, education and competence-building activities, and future empirical investigations through surveys and case studies.

We also thank the participants in the research seminar hosted by the DCU Institute for Business and Society and OBAIR: Decent & Sustainable Work Research Group on 1 September 2026, at which Prof. Alessandra Lazazzara presented preliminary findings during her Short-Term Scientific Mission. Our thanks also extend to the participants at the ItAIS2026 Conference, held in Viterbo, Italy, on 23–24 October 2026, where Prof. Margaret Heffernan presented the bibliometric review with support from a Dissemination Conference Grant. We are grateful for the constructive comments and engaging discussions following both presentations, which provided valuable feedback for the further development of this work.

cost

Funded by the European Union

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This HUMAN-IT Working Group 2 report examines how exponential technologies shape employee experience across organisational, workplace and individual levels. Within this review, employee experience is operationalised through two dimensions: employee well-being and inclusion. Well-being encompasses psychological, physical and social dimensions; inclusion concerns employees' ability to participate, contribute and be authentic at work. The central finding is that consequences for employee experience are rarely uniformly positive or negative. They depend on how technologies are designed, implemented and managed, and how employees interpret and respond to the changes they generate.

Research questions and review approach

The report addresses two complementary research questions. The first examines **how the relationship between exponential technologies and employee experience, particularly well-being and inclusion, has been explored in the literature** (RQ1). The second investigates **how these technologies shape employee well-being and inclusion across organisational, workplace and individual levels, and through which mechanisms and conditions** (RQ2).

These questions are addressed through two interconnected studies**. Study 1 provides a bibliometric review of 613 empirical journal articles**, mapping the development of the field, its main research streams, thematic areas and knowledge gaps. Building on this overview, **Study 2 presents an in-depth thematic analysis of 194 studies**, synthesising their findings to explain how exponential technologies shape employee experience across the three levels. Both studies draw on a Scopus search conducted on 16 April 2026, restricted to English-language empirical articles published in ABS-ranked journals.

Key findings

In answer to RQ1, the bibliometric review shows a rapidly growing but fragmented field that remains largely organised around technologies rather than employee experience. Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly dominant. Psychological well-being is represented through constructs such as job satisfaction, engagement, stress and job insecurity. Physical well-being is more prominent in research on robotics, wearables and sensing technologies. Social well-being remains marginal, while inclusion does not emerge as a distinct research stream and appears mainly through fairness. Inclusion nevertheless extends beyond fairness to belonging, recognition, voice and meaningful participation.

cost

Funded by the European Union

In answer to RQ2, the thematic analysis shows that effects are predominantly conditional or mixed. Of the 194 studies, 43.3% reported conditional effects, depending on how technology reshapes work and the conditions surrounding implementation and use. A further 16.0% reported mixed effects, whereby the same technology simultaneously generates resources and new demands. Technologies can reduce workload and support learning while also increasing role conflict, insecurity or technostress. Benefits and adverse consequences can therefore coexist within the same workplace.

Employees are not passive recipients of technological change. Through learning, adaptation, job crafting, resistance, workarounds and co-design, they help reshape how technologies are used and how work is organised. Employee agency introduces a recursive element: employees' responses can feed back into workplace practices and organisational change.

An integrative multilevel process model

The model explains how technologies create, reduce and redistribute demands and resources across organisational, workplace and individual levels. Employees appraise these changes, evaluating their implications for security, control, fairness, usefulness and opportunity. These appraisals activate stress-related, motivational and adaptive mechanisms that shape psychological, physical, social and inclusion-related experiences. These states may subsequently influence downstream outcomes such as performance, innovation, retention or withdrawal. The relationships are conditioned by technology characteristics, organisational governance and leadership, workplace conditions and individual resources. The workplace is a key translation layer through which organisational decisions alter employees' everyday experience.

Priorities for organisations and practitioners

Equip managers to make deliberate work design decisions. Because managers and leaders shape job demands, resources and implementation choices, they are a key audience for intervention. Organisations should support them in assessing how technologies alter workload, task allocation, autonomy, feedback and human–technology collaboration, and in addressing demands while strengthening resources.

Protect and strengthen employee agency and autonomy. Involve workers in how technologies are implemented and used, including opportunities for participation and co-design. Their practical knowledge, learning and adaptive responses can help reshape technological systems and work practices. Attention to employee interpretations can also clarify why similar changes are experienced as opportunities by some and threats by others.

cost
Funded by the European Union

Develop AI literacy alongside confidence and coping resources. Training and awareness initiatives should combine knowledge with support for adaptation, learning and reskilling. Organisations should recognise the AI literacy paradox: greater knowledge of AI can increase anxiety and resistance. Initiatives should therefore address uncertainty and help employees build the resources needed to manage technological change.

Address the conditions surrounding implementation. Transparency, explainability, reliability and human control should be considered alongside leadership support, organisational culture, privacy governance and data protection. At the workplace level, autonomy, teamwork, social support, communication and training quality can shape employee experience. Interventions should be adapted to organisational and national contexts, including different stages of AI maturity.

Assess well-being and inclusion alongside organisational outcomes. Evaluation should extend beyond psychological well-being to physical and social well-being, and to inclusion. This means considering fatigue and safety alongside isolation, belonging, voice, participation and AI-related bias. Organisations should assess whether interventions change attitudes and practices over time, recognising that productivity or technology acceptance alone do not capture employee experience.

Research priorities and limitations

The review identifies a need for more integrated, multilevel research connecting organisational choices, workplace transformation and individual experience. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine how well-being and inclusion evolve and how employee responses reshape work over time. Social well-being, inclusion and under-represented geographical contexts warrant particular attention. Evaluating training, participation and work design interventions can strengthen the evidence available to practitioners.

The evidence is limited by the predominance of cross-sectional studies and the restriction to one database, English-language publications and ABS-ranked journals. The integrative process model is a cross-study synthesis of recurring relationships, rather than an aggregation of uniformly tested causal effects. It provides a foundation for research and practice while recognising that the strength of evidence varies across pathways.

cost
Funded by the European Union