

EDITORIAL

Reimagining Workplace Learning: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Ecosystems, and Emerging Talent Development Practices

Alfonso Bustos¹, Javier L. Crespo², Wilsa Ramos³

¹ Barcelona School of Management-Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain

² Universidad Internacional de La Rioja -UNIR, Spain

³ University of Brasilia, Brazil

ABSTRACT

This editorial introduction presents the special issue *Reimagining Workplace Learning: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Ecosystems, and Emerging Talent Development Practices*, published in Digital Education Review. The special issue brings together ten original contributions that examine, from empirical, conceptual, and systematic review perspectives, the intersection of artificial intelligence, digital platforms, and workplace learning. We contextualize the conditions that prompted this special issue, articulate three structuring theoretical tensions that cut across all contributions—efficiency versus well-being, technological universalism versus cultural specificity, and automation versus human agency—and situate each manuscript within the broader conversation they collectively advance. The editorial concludes with a forward-looking research agenda that emerges from the gaps and open questions identified across the corpus.

KEYWORDS: workplace learning; artificial intelligence; digital learning ecosystems; talent development; algorithmic psychological safety; learner agency; personalization.

1 THE MOMENT: WHY NOW AND WHY THIS MATTERS

We have been discussing the future of work for over a decade. However, something has changed qualitatively in the last two or three years: that future is no longer a projection but the present we are navigating. The data from the World Economic Forum's *Future of Jobs Report 2025* speaks volumes: 39% of current skills will become obsolete by 2030, and organizations estimate that 41% of their employees will require significant upskilling or reskilling in the immediate future (World Economic Forum, 2025). This is not merely a technical skills gap: it is also a matter of social equity and digital justice. The scale of this figure is difficult to grasp. We are not facing a marginal adjustment to corporate training catalogues; we are facing a structural reconfiguration of the relationship among work, learning, and technology (Bustos, 2019).

This reconfiguration is corroborated by a broader strand of scholarship. AI has been shown to dissolve geographical and temporal boundaries and to shift the evaluative emphasis from hours invested to outcomes delivered (Jordán Guzmán, 2025), to enable the delocalization of in-person work and the emergence of more flexible employment arrangements (Blasco Jover, 2024), and to operate as a technology for research, prediction, and teaching that reorients education toward personalization (Rama, 2023). Sandoval-Obando (2018) frames this as a still-pending shift from analog to digital learning paradigms. At the same time, automation is not merely displacing traditional roles but generating new ones in emerging sectors, creating urgent reskilling demands (Pandolfi & Villagra, 2025), while increasing datafication is itself constructing new competency requirements (Salvador et al., 2020) within a systemic gap that calls for greater flexibility in higher education (Pernías Peco, 2017). Read together, this literature reveals a recursive pattern: each technological advance generates new learning demands that, in turn, reshape work itself, perpetuating the cycle.

Artificial intelligence—and in particular generative AI—has accelerated this process to the point that it challenges conventional pedagogical and organizational models. Not because technology is a pedagogical solution (it is not), but because it radically alters the conditions under which knowledge is produced, managed, and transferred within organizations. As we have argued in various forums and throughout our careers—both in academia and in executive practice at multinational companies—the real question is not whether AI will transform learning at work—it already is—but rather in what direction and with what consequences for the people who are learning. That question, in our view, is the most important one we can ask ourselves today as scholars of education and organizational learning.

The dichotomy between an AI-first approach—which subordinates training design to what technology can do—and a learner-first approach—which starts with the learner's needs, agency, and well-being and then determines AI's role—is not a rhetorical debate. It has direct practical implications for how learning ecosystems are designed, how intelligence is distributed within organizations, and how training success is measured. This special issue of *Digital Education Review* is part of that debate and engages with it through the rigor of scientific research and the diversity of perspectives that enrich it.

This trajectory also reflects a logic of maturity that extends beyond technological adoption. In a recent paper, Bustos (2026) has proposed that organizations are transitioning—or should transition—from a stage of *GenAI Awareness* to a model of *Distributed AI*: one in which artificial intelligence ceases to operate as a one-off or episodic tool and becomes continuously integrated throughout the workflow, distributing cognitive tasks between people and systems while preserving human responsibility for context, judgment, trust, and decision-making. This transition—from “command and execute” to “collaborate and iterate”—is not merely

an organizational metaphor; it is a hypothesis about how on-the-job learning should be designed so that AI enhances human capabilities rather than replacing them or reducing them to the execution of algorithmic recommendations. The papers in this special issue, from different perspectives and contexts, offer evidence and frameworks for evaluating this hypothesis.

The special issue also arrives at a time of significant regulatory maturity. The entry into force of the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Regulation (European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2024) establishes a regulatory framework that directly affects AI systems used in performance evaluation, talent management, and adaptive learning contexts. The research presented in this issue cannot—and should not—be read in isolation from this legal framework, which translates what were until recently merely ethical recommendations into concrete obligations. Article 4 of the Regulation—in force since February 2, 2025—establishes a legal obligation for AI literacy for all providers and operators of AI systems in the EU, applicable regardless of the system's risk level and subject to fines of up to €15 million or 3% of global turnover. This obligation transforms AI-related workplace learning from an aspirational objective into a regulatory mandate with immediate compliance implications. At the same time, Annex III of the Regulation classifies AI systems used in employment decisions—including recruitment, performance evaluation, task assignment, and employee monitoring—as high-risk, which directly affects the LMS, LXP, and TMP ecosystems analyzed in several of the papers in this special issue. On May 7, 2026, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU reached a provisional agreement on the Digital Omnibus on AI (European Commission, 2025; COM(2025) 836), the first amendment to the Regulation since its adoption, which extends the compliance deadline for high-risk systems listed in Annex III from August 2, 2026, to December 2, 2027. The AI literacy requirement of Article 4, however, has not been modified and remains fully in force. This special issue is therefore published at the very moment when its governing regulatory framework is itself being reconfigured—adding a dimension of timeliness that extends beyond scientific interest alone. One of the most valuable contributions of this special issue is precisely to challenge a narrow, tool-centric definition of AI literacy. As the systematic review on leadership competencies discussed in Section 3.4 suggests, technical-operational know-how accounts for a comparatively modest share of the competencies required to work effectively alongside AI; the AI literacy mandated by Article 4 is therefore unlikely to be discharged through tool training alone, and should instead be understood as encompassing judgment, contextual reasoning, and decision-making under uncertainty.

2 THE TENSIONS UNDERLYING THE SPECIAL ISSUE

A cross-cutting reading of the ten articles that make up this special issue reveals three fundamental tensions that run through all the contributions like an implicit thread. These tensions are not something to be fully resolved; rather, they are managed, and research plays a role in making them visible and helping to turn them into productive forces.

2.1 Efficiency versus well-being

AI can demonstrably improve the personalization of learning, the completion rate of training programs, and the transfer of skills to the workplace. The empirical studies in this special issue provide solid evidence of this. However, that same AI can, if implemented without proper safeguards, become a mechanism of algorithmic surveillance that erodes workers' psychological safety, reduces their willingness to experiment and acknowledge their own gaps—a sine qua non of genuine learning—and generates what the emerging literature calls the panoptic effect: behavioral modification based on the perception of being constantly evaluated (Kim et al., 2025). This tension is not a flaw in AI as a technology; it is a foreseeable and avoidable consequence of the governance models under which it is deployed.

2.2 Technological Universalism versus Cultural Specificity

Large AI systems are mainly developed using data from the Global North and then marketed as universal solutions. This dynamic has consequences that go beyond technical efficiency: it entails the export of cultural biases, the erasure of non-dominant identities, and the homogenization of learning processes. One of the most distinctive studies in this issue accurately documents this phenomenon in the context of arts education in Kuwait, coining the concept of *Algorithmic Orientalism* to describe the visual distortions that stereotype or erase local cultural heritage, and to foreground cultural resistance and ethical data governance as core dimensions of AI literacy. But this problem is not exclusive to non-Western contexts: it also arises when recommendation algorithms ignore the organizational, sectoral, or linguistic specificities of learners.

2.3 Automation versus Human Agency

Who decides what to learn when algorithms recommend, sequence, evaluate, and predict? This question runs through all the works in this special issue, with varying degrees of depth. The notion of learning resilience—the capacity to learn, unlearn, and relearn in the face of changing contexts—which several authors in this issue use as a central construct—only makes sense if it is anchored in a learner with real agency, not in a passive recipient of algorithmic recommendations. Distributed AI—intelligence that does not reside in a single centralized system but is distributed among people, tools, and contexts—can be a powerful lever for expanding that agency, but only if pedagogical and organizational design positions it as an end rather than a means of optimization.

3 THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS SPECIAL ISSUE: A COHESIVE READING

The ten articles comprising this special issue are organized into five thematic strands that reflect the structure of the original Call for Papers. However, as editors, we propose a reading that transcends that structure, presenting the papers as a dialogue with internal coherence

3.1 Artificial Intelligence in Workplace Learning

The first theme brings together the articles that most directly address AI's impact on training processes in organizational contexts. Arzuaga Mejía et al. present the special issue's most ambitious empirical study: a short-panel longitudinal design involving 750 workers from Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela, examining the effect of AI-based personalization on motivation, learning resilience, and perceived

productivity. Their results show significant increases across all three dimensions (18%, 22%, and 14%, respectively), and they candidly identify the risks of information overload and technological dependence. This contribution emphasizes the importance of the psychological and instructional mechanisms that mediate the relationship between technology and outcomes, rather than focusing solely on the technology itself.

Di Salvo offers a systematic review notable for its methodological transparency. His three-pillar model—AI for personalization, digital ecosystems as infrastructure, and emerging practices such as microlearning and gamification—provides a highly useful integrative framework for learning and development (L&D) professionals. His warning about the effects of the digital divide and cultural resistance to change aligns directly with the concerns running throughout this special issue.

The study by Márquez et al. on the CLEM (Corporate Learning Experience Model) is a distinctive contribution that explicitly integrates user experience (UX) principles into the design of corporate learning ecosystems. The model proposes a person-centered training architecture that combines AI-driven personalization, microlearning, gamification, and predictive analytics. The pilot study's results are promising, though the authors acknowledge that ROI projections depend on specific organizational conditions that may not always be met. The pilot also reports a projected ROI in the order of several thousand percent—a figure that, while striking as an indicator of the model's potential economic and pedagogical sustainability, should be interpreted with the methodological caution the authors themselves urge, pending replication at scale.

This section concludes with Olalere's study on psychological safety in the algorithmic work environment, introducing the concept of Algorithmic Psychological Safety (APS) as a conceptual framework to examine the risks that AI may pose to the well-being of workers and their willingness to learn. It is the issue's most critical voice and, at the same time, its most constructive: it proposes a risk assessment tool, design principles for safe AI-mediated learning environments, and a phased implementation model that anticipates the most common errors in deploying these technologies. Its concept of transparency-by-design as a non-negotiable requirement for the responsible adoption of AI deserves particular attention.

3.2 Digital Platforms and Learning Ecosystems

Jarudin and Dedi present the most technical paper in the issue, and precisely for that reason, one of the most essential for practice. Their quasi-experimental design evaluates three AI modules—collaborative filtering, decision trees, and neural networks—across three distinct platform architectures (LMS, LXP, and TMP), with 450 employees from multinational companies in Indonesia. The quantitative results are robust: users receiving AI recommendations achieved 22 percentile points higher active usage than the controls, and the module completion rate rose from 62% to 82%. Beyond the numbers, the study offers something the literature often overlooks: a validated production architecture featuring microservices, transparent recommendation interfaces, and model retraining pipelines, which can serve as a reference for real-world implementations.

Wijaya et al. provide the most comprehensive systematic review in this special issue (58 studies, 2014–2025). Their main contribution is the Convergent AI-Driven Talent Development Ecosystem Framework: an integrative framework that unites personalization, instructional design, ethical governance, and ecosystem collaboration. Their analysis of structural obstacles—algorithmic bias, data privacy, regulatory fragmentation, and the erosion of learner autonomy—offers an honest mapping of the challenges that persist in the literature, despite prevailing technological optimism.

3.3 Virtual Agents, Intelligent Assistants, and Agent-Based AI

The work by López-Molines and Alcantud-Díaz on using Gemini to develop pronunciation in English as a foreign language among future teachers captures the train-the-trainer dimension that is indispensable to any reflection on integrating AI into learning. Their analysis of the perceptions of 54 teacher education students reveals something that goes beyond the chatbot's technical utility: participants develop metacognitive and metalinguistic awareness of their own learning difficulties that they would have struggled to achieve through conventional means. The dimension of initial teacher education as an enabler—or inhibitor—of the responsible adoption of AI in educational and workplace contexts warrants systematic future research.

3.4 Competencies, Feedback, and Performance

Luciana's systematic review of leadership competencies in the era of generative AI offers a contribution that goes to the heart of the problem that defines this monograph: if AI transforms work, what kind of leadership do we need to manage it effectively? Based on 14 high-quality studies (2022–2025), the authors identify three competency dimensions: technical-operational, behavioral-adaptive, and strategic-analytical. Their most significant finding is that the latter two dimensions—the distinctively human ones—account for more than 80% of the competencies identified. Leadership in the GenAI era is not fundamentally a problem of technological literacy; it is a problem of ethical judgment, trust, and the capacity to manage uncertainty. Crucially, the competency matrix's main contribution lies not in specifying what leaders must know, but in how they should be trained—establishing learning objectives and the relative weighting that each competency dimension should receive within a leadership development curriculum.

3.5 Organizational Best Practices in Lifelong Learning and AI

Halili's work at Universiti Malaya proposes the AI PPT (People-Process-Technology) framework for preparing student talent for the future workforce, developed using the Fuzzy Delphi method with 20 experts. Its main contribution is addressing preparation for the AI-driven world of work starting in higher education, thereby closing the loop between initial training and continuous professional development. The Malaysian context—with national initiatives such as the Malaysia AI Talent Roadmap 2024–2030—offers a public policy case study that deserves attention beyond Southeast Asia.

Finally, the work on co-creation with generative AI in digital arts education in Kuwait is the most distinctive contribution in this special issue, and we deliberately present it last because its argument challenges the corpus as a whole. The 28 visual design students who worked with DALL·E 3 encountered not only an ideation tool but also a system that reproduced deep-seated cultural biases, rendered their heritage invisible, and posed a pedagogically fertile choice: counter-scripting—active resistance to dominant algorithmic narratives as an act of learning. Abdulmajid et al., remind us that AI is not neutral, that its training data carries a worldview inscribed on it, and that critical literacy about AI systems is as important—or more so—than the technical skill to use them.

4 THE PERSONALIZATION OF LEARNING: FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSTRUCT TO ALGORITHMIC PROMISE

No concept runs through this special issue with as much intensity as personalized learning. It appears in eight of the ten articles, in different contexts and with varying degrees of conceptual precision. This ubiquity is no accident: personalization is today the main selling point of AI-powered educational platforms, the promise used to justify multimillion-dollar investments in educational technology, and the regulatory horizon toward which organizations like UNESCO and the OECD are oriented. But it is also a concept with a long and complex theoretical history in educational psychology—a history that technological rhetoric tends to overlook or oversimplify. As editors of this issue, and drawing on our sociocultural-constructivist tradition, we believe it is necessary to pause and examine what is meant—or should be meant—by personalization in AI-mediated learning.

The personalization of learning, as formulated by César Coll within the framework of sociocultural constructivism, is not a matter of technological adjustments to content or algorithmic recommendations for learning pathways. It is, above all, a matter of personal meaning and value: learning is personalized when the learner recognizes it as relevant to their identity, to their understanding of the world, and to their life and work plans (Coll, 2016). This definition places the locus of personalization on the learner, not on the system that provides it. From this perspective, AI can be a formidable tool in the service of personalization—if it expands the learner's capacity for self-awareness and for selecting and controlling their own learning processes—or it can become its opposite: an algorithmic curation system that simulates personalization while reducing the learner's real agency to the act of clicking on the next recommendation. A further risk, not yet systematically examined in this literature, is that AI-driven hyper-personalization may generate learning silos or 'filter bubbles' that narrow rather than diversify the range of perspectives to which employees are exposed—an outcome at odds with the relational, situated nature of workplace learning discussed below.

The distinction is more than semantic. In a recent high-impact paper in the field, Engel and Coll (2022) note that hybrid learning environments offer favorable conditions for personalization when they articulate strategies that promote and reinforce the personal meaning and value the learner attributes to what they learn. This involves not only adjusting the difficulty or sequence of content—the most common form of algorithmic personalization—but also giving the learner a voice, connecting learning to their prior experiences and contexts of application, and fostering metacognitive reflection. Current AI systems are, at best, effective in the first dimension and weak or absent in the remaining two.

This tension between algorithmic and psychologically grounded personalization appears explicitly or implicitly in several of the papers in this issue. Arzuaga Mejía et al. address it by identifying information overload as an adverse effect of recommendation systems: when the algorithm over-personalizes—adapting each piece of micro-content to the user's previous interaction patterns—it can paradoxically reduce the learner's autonomy by narrowing the space for exploration and discovery that enables transferable learning. Jarudin and Dedi provide empirical evidence on the effects of three personalization architectures (collaborative filtering, decision trees, neural networks), but their analysis of active learner engagement shows that improvements in usage metrics do not necessarily translate into improvements in learning.

Among the works in this issue, the CLEM model proposed by Márquez et al. most explicitly embraces the user-centered (UX) perspective as the foundation of personalization. Their commitment to integrating the employee's voice into the design of learning ecosystems—not only as a source of behavioral data but also as an active participant in the learning architecture—aligns with the direction indicated by the psychopedagogical tradition. However, the study also acknowledges that the success metrics used (completion rate, engagement, estimated ROI) are first-generation personalization metrics—necessary but insufficient for deep personalization in Coll's sense.

Wijaya et al.'s review of talent development ecosystems identifies the loss of learner autonomy as one of the five structural barriers to AI-driven personalization. Their diagnosis aligns with Huang et al. (2023), who conceptualize personalized HRM as the set of programs and practices that vary among individuals within the same organization. They also note that algorithmic personalization, when designed exclusively around historical behavioral patterns, tends to optimize for observable short-term performance rather than for the development of the ability to learn autonomously and sustainably throughout one's working life.

This limitation aligns with a finding that appears across the work on algorithmic psychological safety and in the work of López-Molines and Alcantud-Díaz on the use of chatbots in teacher training: AI systems that do not make their personalization logic visible—that do not offer learners a comprehensible explanation of why they make the suggestions they do—generate epistemic opacity. Learners do not learn with the system; they learn from what the system provides, without being able to interrogate it. This opacity is the opposite of the personalization advocated by educational psychology.

In a systematic review of the literature on AI and human resource development, Ekuma (2024), published in *Human Resource Development Review*, adds a dimension that the articles in this special issue only touch upon tangentially: personalization in on-the-job learning cannot be separated from the relational and organizational context in which that learning takes place. Recommendation algorithms are, by definition, individualizing: they identify patterns of individual behavior and propose content based on those patterns. But learning at work is fundamentally social and situated: it occurs through interaction with colleagues, in the resolution of real-world problems, and in the negotiation of the meaning that work practices hold within a community of practice. Personalization that ignores this relational dimension is not psychologically complete personalization; it is individualization.

The distinction between personalization and individualization is not minor. Personalizing learning—in the sense we have been discussing—involves considering the learner's uniqueness (their prior knowledge, motivations, and learning history), as well as their place within groups and practice-based contexts that give meaning to what they learn. Current AI systems are sophisticated in the first dimension and almost silent in the second. This limitation points directly to what Bustos (2026) has termed the challenge of cognitive orchestration for organizations: it is not merely a matter of people knowing how to use AI tools, but of intentionally designing how cognitive tasks are distributed between humans and systems, ensuring that people retain responsibility for what cannot be delegated without compromising judgment, context, trust, or accountability. Algorithmic personalization that does not take this dimension of cognitive orchestration into account is not, strictly speaking, personalization of learning: it is the individualized management of observable behavior.

Perhaps the central research tension this special issue leaves open is how to design workplace learning ecosystems that use AI to expand the learner's agency—their capacity to know themselves, choose, reflect, and connect formal learning with practice-based learning—rather than merely optimizing observable behavior. In organizational terms, the difference is what distinguishes an organization that uses intelligent tools from one that has become a learning system (Bustos, 2026).

5 THE CONTRIBUTION OF THIS SPECIAL ISSUE AND THE AGENDA IT OPENS

Together, the ten papers in this special issue present a plural and nuanced picture of the field's current state. They avoid both uncritical technological optimism and paralyzing pessimism. What holds more value are the

empirical evidence, the practical conceptual frameworks, and the intellectual honesty regarding the limits of what is known.

This special issue contributes to the field along at least three dimensions. First, it broadens the empirical base by including studies that extend beyond the dominant Anglo-Saxon context in the literature: Indonesia, Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, Spain, Kuwait, and Malaysia offer specificities that enrich—and sometimes complicate—the patterns identified in research from the Global North. Second, it introduces new constructs—Algorithmic Psychological Safety, learning resilience, and Algorithmic Orientalism—that have the potential to articulate a research agenda specific to the field of educational psychology and workplace learning in the age of AI. Third, it bridges the gap between research and practice: the frameworks, architectures, and tools proposed in several of the studies have real transfer potential to organizational contexts, a quality not always found in academic research.

At the same time, reading the collection allows us to clearly identify what the field does not yet know—or does not know well enough. Longitudinal research remains scarce: of the ten studies, only one uses a repeated-measures design. The transfer of learning to the workplace—the question of greatest interest to L&D professionals in organizations—remains largely unanswered. Research on the differential impact of AI on workers' skill levels, sectors, and digital vulnerability is still in its infancy. The constructs proposed by several of these studies—APS, learning resilience, and critical AI literacy—require validated measurement instruments and construct validity studies.

There is also a dimension that appears across the board yet deserves explicit attention on the future agenda: governance. The EU AI Regulation (European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2024) establishes specific obligations for high-risk systems, including those used in work performance evaluation. Translating this regulatory framework into principles for pedagogical and organizational design—grounded in what evidence, what audit protocols, and what mechanisms for worker participation—is a task that scientific research can and must help to underpin. The provisional agreement on the Digital Omnibus on AI (European Commission, 2025; agreement of May 7, 2026) sends an important signal in this regard: extending deadlines for high-risk systems until December 2027 does not reduce the urgency of research; rather, it amplifies it. Organizations now have an additional 16-month window to prepare for compliance, and research on workplace learning has the opportunity—and the responsibility—to provide the empirical frameworks to guide that preparation. Three research questions of particular interest arise: How is the AI literacy requirement of Article 4 operationalized in different organizational and sectoral contexts? What models for assessing the impact of high-risk AI systems on workers' learning and well-being are valid and reliable? How can human oversight mechanisms—required by the Regulation—be designed so that they do not erode the learner's agency but rather strengthen it?

We conclude this presentation with the same conviction with which we began our reflection on the future of work more than a decade ago: the future of work is learning. But that learning can be transformative only if the learner—and not technology—is at the center of design. AI can be an extraordinary lever for redistributing intelligence within organizations, expanding access to development opportunities, and making the learning that occurs in the flow of daily work more visible. But that potential is realized only when clear pedagogical intent, explicit ethical governance, and leadership committed to learners' well-being are both declared and practiced. Overall, the papers in this special issue represent an important and thorough step forward in that direction.

Acknowledgements

This special issue would not have been possible without the intellectual generosity of the authors who responded to the call for papers, nor without the rigorous and committed work of the external reviewers who evaluated each contribution. We are grateful to the editorial team of *Digital Education Review* for their support and for their confidence in this project.

REFERENCES

- Blasco Jover, C. (2024). IA: dentro de la flexibilidad laboral y de un balance trabajo-vida [AI: Within labor flexibility and the work-life balance]. *Revista Justicia & Trabajo*, (4), 77–106. <https://revistas.colex.es/index.php/justiciaytrabajo/article/view/103>
- Bustos, A. (2019). Los desafíos de la formación profesional en el contexto de la transformación digital [The challenges of vocational training in the context of digital transformation]. *Inclusão Social*, 12(2), 27–28.
- Bustos, A. (2026). From GenAI Awareness to Distributed AI: HR's New Strategic Mandate to Transform Work. DCH Human Insights. *Future of Work*, 6, 14–18. <https://www.dchdirectivos.com>
- Coll, C. (2016). *La personalización del aprendizaje escolar. El qué, el por qué y el cómo de un reto insoslayable* [The personalization of school learning: The what, why, and how of an unavoidable challenge]. Fundació Jaume Bofill.
- Coll, C., Fauré, J., & Arriazu, R. (2022). Posicionamiento del alumnado de Educación Primaria y Secundaria ante la personalización del aprendizaje: construcción y validación de una escala [Primary and secondary school students' positioning regarding the personalization of learning: Construction and validation of a scale]. *Revista de Educación*, 395, 265–290. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2021-395-508>
- Ekuma, K. (2024). Artificial intelligence and automation in human resource development: A systematic review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 23(2), 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843231224009>
- Engel, A., & Coll, C. (2022). Entornos híbridos de enseñanza y aprendizaje para promover la personalización del aprendizaje [Hybrid teaching and learning environments to promote the personalization of learning]. RIED. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia, 25(1), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.5944/ried.25.1.31489>
- European Commission. (2025). *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 as regards the simplification of obligations for certain AI system operators (Digital Omnibus on AI)*. COM(2025) 836 final. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2025:836:FIN>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 13, 2024, laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. Official Journal of the European Union, L 2024/1689. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L_202401689
- Huang, X., Yang, F., Zheng, J., Feng, C., & Zhang, L. (2023). Personalized human resource management via HR analytics and artificial intelligence: Theory and implications. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 28(4), 598–610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2023.04.004>
- Jordán Guzmán, R. (2025). *La era de la Inteligencia Artificial y la Transformación del Trabajo* [The era of artificial intelligence and the transformation of work]. Contacto, (8), 186–196. <https://revistas.up.ac.pa/index.php/contacto/article/view/9570>
- Kim, B. J., Kim, M. J., & Lee, J. (2025). The dark side of artificial intelligence adoption: Linking artificial intelligence adoption to employee depression via psychological safety and ethical leadership. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 704. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05040-2>
- Lope Salvador, V., Mamaqi, X., & Vidal Bordes, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence: Theoretical, formative and communicative challenges of datification [author-supplied English title; please verify against the original-language title published in ICONO14]. *ICONO14. Revista Científica de Comunicación y Tecnologías Emergentes*, 18(1), 58–88. <https://doi.org/10.7195/ri14.v18i1.1434>
- Pandolfi, D., & Villagra, A. (2025). Inteligencia artificial y trabajo: Todo es caos bajo las estrellas [Artificial intelligence and work: It's all chaos under the stars]. *RevISTA*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.22305/revita-unpa.v3.n1.1177>
- Pernías Peco, P. A. (2017). Nuevos empleos, nuevas habilidades: ¿estamos preparando el talento para la Cuarta Revolución Industrial? [New jobs, new skills: Are we preparing talent for the Fourth Industrial Revolution?]. *ICE, Revista de Economía*. [issue number and page range to be verified]
- Rama, C. (2023). Nueva fase educativa digital con inteligencia artificial [A new digital educational phase with artificial intelligence]. *Perfiles Educativos*, 45(Especial), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.22201/issue.24486167e.2023.Especial.61688>
- Sandoval-Obando, E. (2018). Aprendizaje e inteligencia artificial en la era digital: implicancias socio-pedagógicas ¿reales o futuras? [Learning and artificial intelligence in the digital era: real or future socio-pedagogical implications?]. *Boletín Redipe*, 7(11), 155–171. <https://revista.redipe.org/index.php/1/article/view/626>
- Schwab, K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab/>
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *Future of Jobs Report 2025*. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/>

REIMAGINAR L'APRENTATGE EN EL TREBALL: INTEL·LIGÈNCIA ARTIFICIAL, ECOSISTEMES DIGITALS I NOVES PRÀCTIQUES DE DESENVOLUPAMENT DEL TALENT

Aquest article editorial presenta el monogràfic Reimagining Workplace Learning: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Ecosystems, i Emerging Talent Development Practices, publicat a Digital Education Review. Aquest número especial reuneix deu contribucions originals que examinen, des de perspectives empíriques, conceptuals i de revisió sistemàtica, la intersecció entre la intel·ligència artificial, les plataformes digitals i l'aprenentatge al lloc de treball. Contextualitzem les condicions que van motivar aquest monogràfic, articulem tres tensions teòriques estructurants que travessen el conjunt de les contribucions —eficiència versus benestar, universalisme tecnològic versus especificitat cultural, i automatització versus agència humana— i situem cada treball dins de la conversa més àmplia a què, en conjunt, contribueixen. L'editorial conclou amb una agenda de recerca de futur que emergeix de les llacunes i preguntes obertes identificades al conjunt del corpus.

PARAULES CLAU: aprenentatge a la feina; intel·ligència artificial; ecosistemes digitals d'aprenentatge; desenvolupament del talent; seguretat psicològica algorítmica; agència de l'aprenent; personalització de l'aprenentatge.

REIMAGINAR EL APRENDIZAJE EN EL TRABAJO: INTELIGENCIA ARTIFICIAL, ECOSISTEMAS DIGITALES Y NUEVAS PRÁCTICAS DE DESARROLLO DEL TALENTO

Este artículo editorial presenta el monográfico Reimagining Workplace Learning: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Ecosystems, and Emerging Talent Development Practices, publicado en Digital Education Review. Este número especial reúne diez contribuciones originales que examinan, desde perspectivas empíricas, conceptuales y de revisión sistemática, la intersección entre la inteligencia artificial, las plataformas digitales y el aprendizaje en el lugar de trabajo. Contextualizamos las condiciones que motivaron este monográfico, articulamos tres tensiones teóricas estructurantes que atraviesan el conjunto de las contribuciones —eficiencia versus bienestar, universalismo tecnológico versus especificidad cultural, y automatización versus agencia humana— y situamos cada trabajo dentro de la conversación más amplia a la que, en su conjunto, contribuyen. El editorial concluye con una agenda de investigación de futuro que emerge de las lagunas y preguntas abiertas identificadas en el conjunto del corpus.

KEYWORDS: aprendizaje en el trabajo; inteligencia artificial; ecosistemas digitales de aprendizaje; desarrollo del talento; seguridad psicológica algorítmica; agencia del aprendiz; personalización del aprendizaje.

The authors retain copyright and grant the journal the right of first publication. The texts will be published under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives License.

