

Article

# Examining the impact of generative artificial intelligence on work dynamics

David Richard Lozie\*, Robina Omosa, Sara Hesami, Shenjuti Zaman, Mahsa Kajbaf, Amina Raza Malik

School of Business, Trent University, Durham GTA, Oshawa L1J 5Y1, Ontario, Canada

\* Corresponding author: David Richard Lozie, [davidlozie@trentu.ca](mailto:davidlozie@trentu.ca)

## CITATION

Lozie DR, Omosa R, Hesami S, et al. (2024). Examining the impact of generative artificial intelligence on work dynamics. *Human Resources Management and Services*. 6(2): 3420.  
<https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms.v6i2.3420>

## ARTICLE INFO

Received: 2 February 2024

Accepted: 23 April 2024

Available online: 7 May 2024

## COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2024 by author(s).  
*Human Resources Management and Services* is published by PiscoMed Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Abstract:** The main purpose of this paper was to examine the impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) on employee well-being and work dynamics. Using qualitative methodology, three semi-structured interviews were conducted to investigate the implications of generative AI on employee outcomes such as efficiency, job satisfaction, ethical considerations, and work-life balance. The findings highlighted the potential benefits and risks associated with generative AI implementation in the workplace. The study contributed to the literature by adopting a qualitative approach, allowing in-depth exploration of individual experiences with generative AI in the workplace. The study discussed the implications for employers, employees, and society.

**Keywords:** employee well-being; generative AI; human resource management; work dynamics

## 1. Introduction

Global organizations are navigating a significant technological shift known as the fourth industrial revolution. Schwab (2017) is driven by the swift evolution of artificially intelligent (AI) technologies. AI, a cluster of interconnected technologies for advanced problem-solving (Walsh et al., 2019), includes generative AI, a subset crafting original content based on textual prompts (Stanford University, 2023). This technological transformation, labeled the second machine age (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014) or the algorithmic age (Danaher et al., 2017), is reshaping the nature of work by integrating AI, including machine learning and natural language processing, into various facets of organizational functioning. The implications of this shift extend beyond current narrow AI applications, like image classification, signaling a profound impact on work dynamics (Boden, 2016).

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools and digital platforms, or at least tools and platforms that claim “intelligent status” have become an indispensable part of business organizations and society over the past decade. This stems from AI algorithms’ ability to automate business processes, extract knowledge from big data, provide predictions and recommendations, and have superior analytical and computational capabilities compared to human beings (von Krogh et al., 2023).

There is existing literature on how technology adoption impacts worker productivity and work dynamics. Many of the studies, particularly those focused on information technologies, find evidence that IT complements higher-skill workers (Akerman et al., 2015). Bartel et al. (2007) show that firms that adopt IT tend to use more skilled labour and increase worker skill requirements. Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) study the diffusion of robots and find that the negative employment effects of

robots are most pronounced for workers in blue-collar occupations and those with less than a college education.

The objective of this paper is to examine the effects of generative artificial intelligence on work dynamics. This study makes several contributions. Firstly, this research seeks to build on the current growing literature by adopting a qualitative lens to analyze the practical implications of generative AI. While existing studies provide theoretical frameworks, a qualitative approach allows for a more in-depth exploration of individual experiences. The principal rationale is to uncover not only the gain in efficiency with generative AI but also the challenges and ethical considerations that accompany the integration of generative AI into diverse professional work dynamics. Secondly, this study considers the practical impacts of generative AI across diverse professional domains and aims to shed light on the experiences of individuals working in different work settings. Thirdly, as the integration of generative AI tools becomes increasingly prevalent, understanding how these technologies influence various aspects of work dynamics is crucial. Through qualitative interviews, this study delves into the motivations, challenges, and outcomes associated with the adoption of generative AI, providing a nuanced understanding of its effects on efficiency, job satisfaction, and ethical considerations. Our curiosity drives us toward the optimum possibilities for finding answers to the following research questions: *To what extent can generative artificial intelligence contribute to employee well-being? What are the potential risks and hazards associated with its implementation in the workplace, especially considering the impact on mental health and job security?*

## **2. Literature review**

AI in the field of human resource management (HRM) is here to stay. Schmidt et al. (2020) define AI in organisations as the ability of organisations to use data, methods, technology, processes, and people in a way that creates new possibilities for automation, decision-making, and collaboration for achieving organisational objectives that would not be possible by conventional means. This definition includes not only data and methods but also the people and processes required to orchestrate and leverage AI into action (Enholm et al., 2021). Notably, the antecedents of AI adoption generally include personal, technical, organizational, and environmental subsystems, whereby a greater understanding of artificial intelligence for HRM has a direct impact on the culture of an organization and the treatment of employees, thus, enhancing employee relations (Yu et al., 2022).

### **2.1. The integration of generative AI in HRM**

Since its invention, the adoption of artificial intelligence tools has been slow to gain widespread momentum in the HR space, but generative AI technologies that can create content from disparate sources and quickly summarize multiple data sets, offer the HRM discipline several compelling capabilities (Bedard et al., 2023).

## **2.2. Types of generative artificial intelligence for HRM**

There are various types of generative artificial intelligence for HRM, from ChatGPT by OpenAI to Bard AI by Google (Kaur and Gandolfi). Below, we elaborate on the most commonly used generative AI in the workplace (Kanodia, 2023).

**ChatGPT:** This generative AI is a realistic one that generates human-like text responses in the form of conversation. It utilizes a chat interface and incorporates the history of its conversation with a user to provide interactive and fine-tuned text responses. From crafting job descriptions and developing personalized career development plans to providing employee self-service (Navarra, 2023), ChatGPT takes centre stage in this aspect of human resources and work dynamics.

**Dall-E:** Dall-E, another groundbreaking AI tool from OpenAI, generates realistic images and art from simple textual prompts. DALL-E uses a state-of-the-art deep learning model to produce high-quality, detailed images (Zhou and Nabus, 2023) that can be used by HR to communicate safety policies, safe working rules, or hazard warning signs with graphics. The potential of DALL-E is exciting, as it opens up new possibilities for creativity and artistic expression for employee training and safety in the workplace.

**Bard:** Followed by the implementation of GPT into Microsoft's Bing, Google unveiled its own generative AI chatbot, Google Bard. It provides results based on more natural language queries and context instead of just keywords (Kanodia, 2023). For predictive analytics in strategic HR, Google Bard helps to improve predictive hiring by analyzing job-related documents and identifying the essential skills and qualifications required for a job position. It can also predict whether an employee is trying to leave a company based on their behaviour and past interactions (Pocket HRMS, 2023).

The integration of generative AI into work has been impressive. For example, employees' work on processes such as job description creation and intelligent search can now be augmented using data-driven insights and generative AI that transform HR processes and empower HR professionals to innovate and focus on higher-value work (Goldstein, 2023). Bailey (2023) explains that as a language-based application, generative AI represents a significant advancement that provides HR professionals with the opportunity to "interact" with AI in a way we have never seen before—for example, through chatbots like ChatGPT. Leveraged responsibly, it can significantly augment the employee and candidate experience, specifically enabling organizations to identify, attract, and retain the best talent effectively while supporting diverse workforce growth (Oganezi and Lozie, 2017). The concepts of generative AI underscore the need for HR professionals to understand and adapt to the changing AI landscape, particularly the transformative and disruptive potentials of generative AI on HRM planning, practices, processes, platforms, and productivity (Budhwar et al., 2023).

Knoblich and Rogelberg (2023) provide a thorough study on how ChatGPT impacts employment relations, employee well-being, and engagement. It is generally established that trust is a central factor in the employee-employer relationship (Yadav et al., 2022), and Knoblich and Rogelberg (2023) opine that employment relations are likely to be moderated through the use of ChatGPT interfaces inasmuch as employees

view the technology as an appropriate, leveraged, capable, and trusted resource. Research provides the limitations of ChatGPT in this regard. For example, Marr (2023a) reveals that generative AI like ChatGPT lacks common sense in the sense that while it can generate human-like responses and has access to a large amount of information, it does not possess human-level common sense, and the artificial brainbox also lacks the background knowledge humans have. This implies that ChatGPT will oftentimes provide nonsensical or inaccurate responses to certain questions in human resources or in finding solutions in employer-employee situations, as it is assumed to do.

Marr (2023b) describes AI as lacking emotional intelligence in that aspect; although it can generate responses that seem empathetic, it does not possess true emotional intelligence and is unable to detect subtle emotional cues or respond appropriately to complex emotional situations, which are practically opposed to the purpose of the employee assistance program (EAP) of an organization's HR department in contemporary times. Therefore, emotional intelligence cannot be artificial, and vice versa. Additionally, the integration of ChatGPT into the workplace may also negatively affect employee well-being. For instance, the integration of ChatGPT may increase anxiety for employees concerned about job insecurity (OpenAI, 2023).

The current literature highlights the positive and negative impacts of integrating AI into work. However, we still have little insight into employees' experiences of using generative AI in the workplace. Our knowledge remains limited about how pertinent the convergence and usage of generative AI tools for effective work dynamics are. What are the motivations for using generative AI at work and its impact on employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, leisure, well-being, etc.? Are there ethical implications of generative AI usage in professions with concerns for job security? This study aims to address these gaps through empirical research.

### **3. Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative approach to analyze the real-life impacts of generative AI across various industries. By focusing on the experiences of general employees, we aim to delve into their perceptions and feelings about AI integration in their work. This approach, rooted in the principles outlined by van Manen (1977), allows for a deeper understanding of the social implications of AI in the workplace.

#### **3.1. Data collection process**

We employed three semi-structured interviews for in-depth exploration, aligning with Glaser's (2002) perspective that such interviews are ideal for developing theories in exploratory research. The demographics of these participants are mentioned in **Table 1**. Sample interview questions include: What prompted you to start using a generative AI tool like ChatGPT? Was this decision influenced by your supervisor or management? How does the use of generative AI impact your efficiency and productivity? How has the introduction of AI tools affected your job satisfaction and morale? Have you experienced any challenges or concerns related to job security due to the integration of AI tools?

**Table 1.** Demographic profiles of interviewees.

Interviewee	Age range	Education level	Position title	Job tenure	Industry	Gender	Location	Employment status
1	36–40 years	Master’s degree	Principal software developer	More than 10 years	Entertainment and architecture industry	Male	Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Full-time
2	20–25 years	Bachelor’s degree	Senior data engineer	1–2 years	Bank	Male	Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Full-time
3	26–30 years	Bachelor’s degree	Ad ops specialist	3–5 years	Digital marketing agency	Male	Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Full-time

These interviews, conducted via Zoom, typically lasted between 45 min and an hour. Each session was recorded with verbal consent obtained at the start and transcribed verbatim. Additionally, participants provided electronic consent to meet the institution’s REB approval requirements. Our interviewees, chosen from our networks for convenience, provided insights during online and in-person conversations. We ensured ethical compliance by obtaining consent and maintaining transparency throughout the process. Researchers often utilize snowball and network sampling methods in field research, as highlighted by Collis and Hussey (2003) and Sommer et al. (2010). This approach is particularly effective due to the challenges in accessing individuals who precisely match the study criteria, a difficulty noted by Marshall and Rossman (2011). We ensured ethical compliance by obtaining consent and maintaining transparency throughout the process.

### 3.1.1. Participants’ overview

The first participant (P1) in our study was involved in software development within the entertainment and architecture industries, focusing on tasks like programming and software architecture at a public company. The second participant (P2), a senior data engineer at a leading Canadian bank, worked with ETL pipelines and machine learning models. They were researching generative AI applications, with experience in both professional and academic settings. The third participant (P3), an ad operations specialist in a digital marketing agency, played a crucial role in ad placement and audience targeting, offering insights into generative AI’s impact on digital marketing.

### 3.1.2. Justification of the sample size

It is a practical reality that sample size is not always determined based on noble scientific goals (Lenth, 2001). Studies have proven that sample-size problems are context-dependent. We considered the smallest effect size that is theoretically interesting. The significance of increasing the sample size to account for the effects or impact of the use of generative AI on employee well-being and work dynamics in context depends on practical, realistic, and ethical criteria, especially in a study involving human respondents where sample size is a critical issue for scope and ethical reasons. In an oversized experiment, an unnecessary number of respondents would be potentially exposed to risks (Lenth, 2001), such as breaching non-disclosure clauses in their employment contracts or their respective professional codes in the current jet age. Based on the design of the study, we aim to eliminate such risks.

This study is also planned to reduce or evade possible high non-response rates, noting that definitive success is achieved by asking concrete questions and testing out concrete examples on a sizeable sample size (Shetty, 2024). Also, in pursuit of substantial qualitative insights from a specific audience type, standards demand that the first objective when carrying out qualitative research be to ensure the few right respondents are invited to participate in the study through in-depth interviews, focus groups, and ethnographic research, which are the most productive methodologies used in qualitative studies, each method being unique in the information it can provide and the setting it can be used in (Shetty, 2024).

Lastly, this study prioritizes quality over quantity and adopts the principle of saturation. Data saturation is a data adequacy point where no new information can be obtained from participants in qualitative research (Sarfo et al., 2021). Agreeably, a sample size should be large enough to sufficiently describe the phenomenon of interest and address the research question at hand. However, a large sample size risks having repetitive data or responses void of additional perspectives or information. To avoid a point of diminishing returns with larger samples of more data that doesn't necessarily lead to more information, the authors determine that fewer respondents' opinions are sufficient to constitute the analysis framework. The sample size respondents for the study are professionals in tech who meet the study design criteria, consisting of active and available high-quality participants whom the authors believe, based on the study scope, are more suitable than a larger size pulled from a large population that falls within broad parameters (Shetty, 2024).

## **4. Research findings**

Below, we present our research findings.

### **4.1. Familiarity and usage of generative AI tools**

Participant 1 shared, *"I've been using AI tools for almost a year now. I started with image generative AI tools and later shifted to Chat GPT, using it approximately three times a week."* Participant 2 had several years of experience with AI tools, utilizing them for both work-related challenges and personal curiosity. The third interviewee employed generative AI tools in reporting and daily tasks, albeit with regulatory limitations on direct use.

### **4.2. Motivation for using generative AI**

The first participant's motivation for using generative AI stems from personal initiative, independent of any influence from their supervisor or organization. Participant 2, expressed, *"My motivation stems from both personal curiosity and the practical challenges I face in my work. The versatility of AI tools allows me to address specific needs while satisfying my intellectual curiosity."* This individual was driven by personal curiosity and work-related challenges and needs. The third interviewee was motivated by the potential industry impact, its use in reporting, and daily tasks.

### **4.3. Impact on efficiency**

The first participant mentioned that *“Generative AI is useful for quick tasks but needs improvement, especially with accuracy and manual adjustments.”* This individual found AI tools useful for quick tasks but acknowledged the need for improvement, particularly in terms of accuracy and the necessity for manual adjustments. Participant 2 reported, *“Generative AI has had a positive impact on my mental workload. It facilitates faster problem-solving, allowing me to focus more on significant tasks. It’s become an integral part of my workflow.”* These individuals reported a positive impact on mental workload, faster problem-solving, and increased focus on significant tasks. The third participant noted the streamlining of legwork processes and the reduction of obsolete tasks.

### **4.4. Supervisor and management discussions**

The first participant discussed the adoption of AI tools within their company, noting a general welcoming of AI tools with acknowledgement of their limitations. The second participant discussed limitations due to client data restrictions, security concerns, cost considerations, and experimentation with different tools. The third participant stated, *“In our organization, there has been an open conversation about AI tools. Management not only encourages their use but has gone a step further by developing internal AI tools tailored for our specific needs.”* This individual had open conversations about AI tools, with encouragement from management and the development of internal AI tools for employees.

### **4.5. Job satisfaction and morale**

The first participant reported no significant impact on job satisfaction or morale, acknowledging AI’s limitations in a tech-heavy industry. The second participant stated, *“I’ve experienced a positive impact on my job satisfaction, particularly in managing my workload more efficiently. It has allowed me to concentrate on tasks that truly matter.”* This individual noted a positive impact on mental workload, job satisfaction, and focus on significant tasks. The third interviewee reported no direct impact on job satisfaction but acknowledged considerations for ease of work.

### **4.6. Impact on task engagement and job role**

The first participant reported minimal impact on task engagement and job role, noting that generative AI is at an early stage with limited significance in day-to-day work. The second interviewee did not explicitly mention this aspect. The third interviewee noted the streamlining of legwork processes and the reduction of obsolete tasks.

### **4.7. Challenges or concerns regarding job security**

The first participant mentioned concerns over job security and the internal management of AI tools for data control. The second interviewee initially had concerns about job replacement but shifted their perspective towards increased productivity. Similarly, the third participant initially had concerns about job security but recognized certain irreplaceable roles. More specifically, they stated, *“There were initial concerns*

*about job security, particularly with the recognition of certain irreplaceable roles. However, as I see it now, the threat of job replacement by AI is not imminent.”*

#### **4.8. Work-life balance and leisure time**

The first participant reports no current impact on work-life balance but speculates on future changes as AI evolves. The second participant reported a positive impact on work-life balance, stating, *“The positive impact on my work-life balance has been significant. It allows me to time-box my tasks, creating a clear separation between work and personal time.”* This individual can time-box and separate work from personal time. The third participant reported no direct impact on work-life balance but noted a reduction in research time.

#### **4.9. Instances of AI content adjustment and correction**

The first participant stated that the output produced by the generative AI tools needed to be adjusted and corrected. This individual especially noted this adjustment with the generated Python code. The second participant took an iterative approach to refining AI-generated answers, sharing, *“I take an iterative approach to refining AI-generated answers. Testing and adapting are crucial for achieving the perfect solution to the challenges I encounter.”* This individual emphasized testing and adapting for the perfect solution. The third interviewee noted the training requirements for AI tools, the recognition of mistakes, and the learning process for AI tools.

#### **4.10. Ethical implications of generative AI usage**

The first participant expressed concerns about job replacement, salary impact, data privacy, consent, and bias in AI. The second participant considered the ethical implications of using generative AI. More specifically, they stated, *“Ethical considerations play a crucial role in my use of generative AI. I’m mindful of data privacy, bias, and security concerns, ensuring responsible and ethical usage.”* This individual had concerns about data privacy, bias, and security. The third participant highlighted the unfairness of equal access to generative AI.

#### **4.11. Impact on authenticity and originality in work**

The third participant emphasized that *“while not explicitly mentioned, maintaining authenticity and originality is vital in our work. Generative AI serves a purpose but is not a direct replacement for the creative input and expertise that humans bring to the table.”* However, the other two participants reported no significant impact on work authenticity.

#### **4.12. Recommendations from participants for positive AI integration in organizations**

The first participant recommended viewing *generative AI as a tool and cautioned against overuse in communication to maintain genuineness.* The second participant emphasized the importance of training, awareness, and security measures for organizations integrating AI tools. More specifically, they stated, *“For organizations integrating AI tools, my recommendations include a strong emphasis on training,*



*awareness, and robust security measures. These factors are pivotal for successful and responsible integration.”* The third interviewee suggested implementation levels based on the nature of work and cautioned in financial and data-sensitive areas.

#### **4.13. Future outlook of generative AI**

Participant 1 expected more everyday use of generative AI, foreseeing its more significant role in daily tools and activities. Participant 2 held a positive view of AI's future in the workplace, acknowledging its inevitable presence. Participant 3, focusing on the AI integration process, stressed the importance of continuous learning and careful implementation, recognizing AI's significant potential impact on work aspects.

Overall, the first participant highlighted the generative AI field's fast-paced growth and competitive landscape. The second participant shared a positive vision for the future of work, coupled with good wishes for the audience's success and well-being. Meanwhile, the third participant underscored the captivating aspects of AI, focusing on the importance of careful implementation, ongoing learning, and adaptability in integrating AI.

### **5. Discussion**

This empirical research contributed to our existing knowledge of the impact of generative AI on work dynamics. The implications of generative AI on workplace well-being are significant, particularly in enhancing job satisfaction, increased efficiency, and improved work-life balance. However, ethical considerations are paramount due to biases in machine learning algorithms, which can impact employee well-being. Human intervention remains essential in AI usage to maintain productivity and monitor AI systems. Continuous employee education aligns with technological advancements, contributing to career growth and economic development, which is crucial. Embracing generative AI is crucial for organizational competitiveness, necessitating a deep understanding and effective use of AI for industry-specific data analysis and strategy. Overall, the findings complement existing literature, offering insights into generative AI's impact on employee well-being and work dynamics and suggesting practical solutions for integrating AI technology in the workplace.

Loring (2018) and Loten (2017) argue that repetitive, unproductive, and mundane jobs can be eliminated with the use of AI to improve efficiency. A recent survey indicated that AI has changed 82% of how work is performed and the requisite knowledge and skills (Hupfer, 2020). Our findings revealed that generative AI is still at an early stage with limited significance in day-to-day work. For some, however, generative AI was an essential component in reducing routine and obsolete tasks and streamlining processes. While AI had not explicitly impacted their task engagement, it had contributed to streamlining processes and reducing obsolete tasks, thereby enhancing efficiency in certain aspects of their job. The findings regarding the familiarity and usage of generative AI tools were consistent with the existing literature (Bailey, 2023) which agrees that generative AI provides professionals with vast resources to use AI in their work for continual efficiency and productivity.

The findings revealed that organizations are adopting AI tools and acknowledging their limitations. Management has revolved around limitations due to

client data restrictions, security concerns, and cost considerations. It also highlighted the active experimentation with different tools to find the best fit for their needs. Most organizations have been having an open conversation about AI tools. Management not only encourages their use but is also developing internally tailored AI tools, which is perceived as a collaborative effort to enhance efficiency.

There are ethical implications to using generative AI, with concerns about data privacy, bias, and security (Yapo and Weiss, 2018). Consistent with the current research, generative models, particularly those configured on personal data, pose privacy risks (Somdip, 2023). Our findings reveal that, in most instances, one needs to adjust and make corrections. Additionally, an iterative approach needs to be taken to refine AI-generated answers, testing, and adapting for the perfect solution. There are training requirements for AI tools, recognition of mistakes, and learning algorithms for AI tools. These findings are consistent with the arguments of Ashraf (2022) and McKendrick and Thurai (2022), who suggest that data needs to be controlled by humans to rectify AI's errors and give accurate results. While AI tools are often perceived as superior to humans, they still require human oversight to avoid errors in their outputs (McKendrick and Thurai, 2022).

Some of this study's findings contradict existing literature; hence, it bridges the gap. Frey and Osborne (2017) pointed out the risk of losing job enthusiasm with the continued use of AI. Additionally, Brougham and Haar (2020) argued that generative AI has generated fear, resulted in high employee turnover, and reduced total commitment to work. Holford (2019), Arslan et al. (2021), and Rampersad (2020) have also raised similar concerns about job security. However, in this research, the participants' use and familiarity with generative AI did not influence their commitment and loyalty to the organization. Our findings provided insight into the participants' experience with job security concerns, highlighting the importance of internal management of AI tools for data control. Employees did not view AI as a threat but as a tool that enhances productivity and complements skills.

Generative AI has both negative and positive effects on employee morale and productivity if not properly managed (Shrinivaas, 2021). Our findings revealed that there is a positive impact of AI on work, particularly in terms of managing workloads more efficiently and allowing focus on significant tasks.

The study's findings on work-life balance indicate no current impact from generative AI, with varied expectations about future changes. While some of the participants saw a positive influence, particularly in reducing work time and delineating work-personal life boundaries, others, more skeptical about technology, noted no significant change in work-life balance. This reflects a broader debate in existing literature about technology's impact on productivity. As Rhomberg (2022) noted, the "productivity paradox" suggests that increased technology doesn't necessarily lead to proportional productivity gains, potentially affecting both personal life and work efficiency.

Our findings have implications for employers, employees, and society. Employers should ethically utilize generative AI, recognizing that some human roles are irreplaceable. It's essential to balance AI's productivity benefits with the need for effective data management and respect for job security. Employees should advocate

for regulations overseeing generative AI use. Integrating human interaction into AI training becomes a valuable skill as AI accelerates processes. Employers must protect employees' legal rights, ensuring their job security and well-being aren't compromised by AI deployment. Addressing societal fears about AI involves tackling issues like data harvesting and privacy. While some platforms prioritize security, others may compromise user data. Therefore, a collaborative effort is needed among organizations, society, and government to establish ethical guidelines for AI use, promote responsible deployment, and mitigate negative societal concerns.

## **6. Conclusion**

The era of generative AI has seamlessly integrated into our work and personal lives. Integrating humans and technology requires strategic and operational decisions tailored to the business environment. Our research indicates that AI is currently not seen as a threat and is unlikely to be in the near future. Generative AI is embraced as a beneficial tool, simplifying lives and being warmly incorporated into various systems. This positive reception can be further leveraged, considering AI's potential to influence all aspects of life, including work and personal needs.

## **7. Limitations of the study and suggestions for further study**

Although the sample size is small, this study seeks to generate and contribute concepts to the principles of strategic human resource management in contemporary times wherein generative artificial intelligence has come to stay and is evolving even faster. There is insufficient literature that investigates the effects of a synergy of generative AI and employee well-being practices in organizations. Additionally, pragmatic human resources that include employee well-being agendas and work dynamics in most corporate cultures are still traditional. Another limitation was the measurability of employee well-being. This is sometimes not a tangible aspect, and relating it to the use of AI creates a dynamic and complex environment to measure its success or failure. Data security was paramount in the study and utilization of the information obtained, which required guided utilization of information, which restricted the availability of complete information.

Thus, further thorough studies could investigate the significant effects of the synergy of evolving generative artificial intelligence technologies and corporate strategic culture on revolutionized work dynamics, employee well-being, performance, and work-life balance through a quantitative study to test some hypotheses that can be drawn from this qualitative study. Also, scholars may attempt to collate a substantial data sample size that consists of ideally selected respondents based on set criteria, devoid of invalidating repetitive responses and non-defaulting on respondents' professional codes or choices of privacy. Significantly, further studies would increase the globally needed literature on the emerging niche of tech-driven strategic human resource management practices for employees.

**Author contributions:** Conceptualization, ARM; literature review, DRL; methodology, SZ and DRL, software, ARM; validation, SH, RO, and SZ; formal analysis, RO; investigation, RO, SZ, and SH; resources, DRL, RO, SH, SZ, MK, and

RMM; data curation, SH; writing—original draft preparation, DRL, RO, SH, SZ, and MK; writing—review and editing, DRL; supervision, ARM; project administration, ARM. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). The wrong kind of AI? Artificial intelligence and the future of labor demand. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.3386/w25682> (accessed on 7 December 2023).
- Akerman, A., Gaarder, I., & Mogstad, M. (2015). The Skill Complementarity of Broadband Internet \*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(4), 1781–1824. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv028>
- Arslan, A., Cooper, C., Khan, Z., Golgeci, I., & Ali, I. (2021). Artificial intelligence and human workers interaction at team level: a conceptual assessment of the challenges and potential HRM strategies. *International Journal of Manpower*, 43(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-01-2021-0052>
- Ashraf, A. (2022). Why artificial intelligence requires human intervention. Available online: <https://www.royalcyber.com/blogs/ai-systems-need-human-intervention/> (accessed on 21 November 2023).
- Bailey J. (2023). From automation to reinvention: How AI is shifting the nature of work. Available online: <https://www.vestigopartners.com/news/2023/4/5/from-automation-to-reinvention-how-ai-is-shifting-the-nature-of-work> (accessed on 22 October 2023)
- Bartel, A., Ichniowski, C., & Shaw, K. (2007). How Does Information Technology Affect Productivity? Plant-Level Comparisons of Product Innovation, Process Improvement, and Worker Skills. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4), 1721–1758. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2007.122.4.1721>
- Bedard, J., Lavoie, K., Laverdiere, R, et. al. (2023). How generative AI will transform HR. Available online: <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2023/transforming-human-resources-using-generative-ai> (accessed on 22 October 2023).
- Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its Nature and Future*. Oxford University Press.
- Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2020). Technological disruption and employment: The influence on job insecurity and turnover intentions: A multi-country study. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 161, 120276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120276>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Budhwar, P., Chowdhury, S., Wood, G., et al. (2023). Human resource management in the age of generative artificial intelligence: Perspectives and research directions on ChatGPT. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33(3), 606–659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12524>
- Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2003). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Danaher, J., Hogan, M. J., Noone, C., et al. (2017). Algorithmic governance: Developing a research agenda through the power of collective intelligence. *Big Data & Society*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717726554>
- Enholm, I. M., Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Business Value: a Literature Review. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 24(5), 1709–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10186-w>
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerization? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
- Glaser, B. G. (2002). Conceptualization: On Theory and Theorizing Using Grounded Theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690200100203>
- Goldstein, J. (2023). New IBM study reveals how AI is changing work and what HR leaders should do about it. Available online: <https://www.ibm.com/blog/new-ibm-study-reveals-how-ai-is-changing-work-and-what-hr-leaders-should-do-about-it/> (accessed on 29 October 2023).
- Holford, W. D. (2019). The future of human creative knowledge work within the digital economy. *Futures*, 105, 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.10.002>

- Hupfer S. (2020). Talent and workforce effects in the age of AI. Available online: <https://resources.experfy.com/future-of-work/talent-and-workforce-effects-in-the-age-of-ai/> (accessed on 27 November 2023).
- Kanodia, A. (2023). What is generative AI? Everything you need to know. Available online: <https://www.webcluesinfotech.com/what-is-generative-ai-everything-you-need-to-know> (accessed on 22 October, 2023).
- Kaur, M., & Gandolfi, F. (2023). Artificial intelligence in human resource management—Challenges and future research recommendations. Available online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372230471> (accessed on 10 November 2023).
- Lenth, R. V. (2001). Some Practical Guidelines for Effective Sample Size Determination. *The American Statistician*, 55(3), 187–193. <https://doi.org/10.1198/000313001317098149>
- Loring, E. (2018). How AI will help sales representatives. Available online: <https://readwrite.com/2018/09/27/how-ai-will-help-sales-representatives/> (accessed on 28 November 2023).
- Loten, A. (2017). AI to drive job growth by 2020: Gartner. Available online: <https://blogs.wsj.com/cio/2017/12/15/ai-to-drive-job-growth-by-2020-gartner/> (accessed on 15 December 2017).
- Marr, B. (2023). The top 10 limitations of ChatGPT. Available online: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2023/03/03/the-top-10-limitations-of-chatgpt/?sh=569e9d508f35> (accessed on 26 October 2023).
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research*, 5th ed. SAGE Publications.
- McKendrick, J. & Thurai, A. (2022). AI isn't ready to make unsupervised decisions. Available online: <https://hbr.org/2022/09/ai-isnt-ready-to-make-unsupervised-decisions> (accessed on 20 November 2023).
- Navarra, K. (2023). ChatGPT and HR: A primer for HR professionals. Available online: <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/technology/pages/chatgpt-hr-primer-ai-workplace.aspx> (accessed on 22 October 2023).
- Oganezi, B. U., Lozie, D. R. (2017). Employee retention strategy and performance of commercial banks in Ebonyi state, Nigeria. *FUNAI Journal of Accounting, Business & Finance (Fujabf)*. 1(1), 279–287.
- OpenAI. (2023). Research: GPT-4. Available online: <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4> (accessed on 25 October 2023).
- Pocket HRMS. (2023). Advantages of Google bard AI in HR. Available online: <https://www.pockethrms.com/blog/google-bard-ai-in-hr/> (accessed on 29 October 2023).
- Rampersad, G. (2020). Robot will take your job: Innovation for an era of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 68–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.019>
- Rhomberg, C. (2022). Why hasn't all this technology given us more leisure time? Available online: <https://www.uipath.com/blog/digital-transformation/what-happened-four-hour-workw> (accessed on 27 November 2023).
- Sarfo, J. O., Gbordzoe, N. I., Debrah, T. P., et al. (2021). Qualitative research designs, sample size and saturation: is enough always enough? *Journal of Advocacy, Research and Education*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.13187/jare.2021.3.60>
- Schmidt, P., Biessmann, F., & Teubner, T. (2020). Transparency and trust in artificial intelligence systems. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 29(4), 260–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2020.1819094>
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*, 1st ed. World Economic Forum.
- Shetty, S. (2024). Determining sample size for qualitative research: What is the magical number? Available online: <https://interq-research.com/determining-sample-size-for-qualitative-research-what-is-the-magical-number> (accessed on 20 December 2023).
- Shrinivaas K., Sudarmani, B., & Gopinathan, N. (2021). A study on the implementation of AI in an organization and its effects on employee morale. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)*. 12(6): 5109–5112.
- Somdip, D. (2023). Which ethical implications of generative ai should companies focus on? Available online: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2023/10/17/which-ethical-implications-of-generative-ai-should-companies-focus-on/?sh=7cafe792239f> (accessed on 20 November 2023).
- Sommer, C. A., Ward, J. E., & Scofield, T. (2010). Metaphoric Stories in Supervision of Internship: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(4), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00052.x>
- Stanford University. (2023). Generative AI: perspectives from Stanford HAI. Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. Available online: [https://hai.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2023-03/Generative\\_AI\\_HAI\\_Perspectives.pdf](https://hai.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2023-03/Generative_AI_HAI_Perspectives.pdf) (accessed on 19 October 2023).
- van Manen, M. (1977). Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(3), 205–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1977.11075533>

- von Krogh, G., Roberson, Q., & Gruber, M. (2023). Recognizing and Utilizing Novel Research Opportunities with Artificial Intelligence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 66(2), 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2023.4002>
- Walsh, T., Levy, N., Bell, G., et al. (2019). The effective and ethical development of artificial intelligence. Available online: [acola.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/hs4\\_artificial-intelligence-report.pdf](https://www.acola.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/hs4_artificial-intelligence-report.pdf) (accessed on 10 November 2023).
- Yadav, R., Chaudhary, N. S., Kumar, D., & Saini, D. (2022). Mediating and moderating variables of employee relations and sustainable organizations: a systematic literature review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(7), 3023–3050. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-12-2021-3091>
- Yapo, A., & Weiss, J. (2018). Ethical implications of bias in machine learning. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*; 3–6 January 2018; Hilton Waikoloa Village, Hawaii, USA. pp. 5365–5372. <https://doi.org/10.24251/hicss.2018.668>
- Yu, X., Xu, S., & Ashton, M. (2022). Antecedents and outcomes of artificial intelligence adoption and application in the workplace: the socio-technical system theory perspective. *Information Technology & People*, 36(1), 454–474. <https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-04-2021-0254>
- Zhou, K. Q., & Nabus, H. (2023). The Ethical Implications of DALL-E: Opportunities and Challenges. *Mesopotamian Journal of Computer Science*, 2023, 17–23. <https://doi.org/10.58496/mjcs/2023/003>