DOI No. : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21187239

Chetana's Journal Of Management,
Vol. 1, Issue 2, 2026 : pp 13-20

Integration of Gen AI & Gamification of Employee Training

Avani Sawant

Hetal Rana

Reshu Tiwari

Sejal Khamkar

Chetana's Institute of Management & Research

Abstract

The intersection of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and gamification is revolutionizing the field of employee development by blending personalization, adaptability, and engagement. This paper integrates current empirical research, theoretical frameworks, and industry-specific usage (banking, franchising, mining, and business learning) to analyze how these technologies collectively improve workforce development. Gamification has been well known for building motivation, knowledge retention, and collaboration through mechanics like points, badges, and leaderboards. GenAI builds on these advantages by providing dynamic content creation, personal learning pathways, automated responses, and live analytics. Collectively, they build training environments that are not just interactive but context-sensitive and skill-oriented. Challenges like privacy of data, bias in algorithms, dependence on extrinsic motivation, and the possibility of limiting creativity are still pertinent issues. This work determines effective design determinants, summarises findings across sectors, and recommends actions to overcome implementation challenges. The research concludes by describing a future research agenda and practical recommendations for HR and training managers looking to harness GenAI-facilitated gamification to apply scalable, ethical, and effective learning.

Keywords : *GenAI, HR, Training & Development*

Introduction

During a period of fast-paced technological revolution, organizations are facing unprecedented stress to continually upskill employees. Conventional training methods usually 3tandardized and static do not prepare themselves for the challenges of today's VUCA business environment. Not only do employees need quicker skill development, but they also expect stimulating, individualized, and adaptable learning processes. Under these circumstances, gamification and Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) have become potent enablers of corporate learning innovation.

Gamification, or the use of game mechanics like points, badges, leaderboards, and quests outside games, has been largely adopted to increase learner engagement, motivation, and retention. GenAI, on the other hand, brings new opportunities for adaptive and personalized learning by creating dynamic content, adapting learning paths, and

offering real-time feedback. The intersection of these two methods provides a revolutionary opportunity: gamification provides the motivational scaffolding, while GenAI provides the adaptive intelligence required for personalized learning.

But the blending of GenAI with gamification is not without its pitfalls. Data privacy fears, ethical AI usage, algorithmic feedback bias, and overdependence on external rewards are just a few of the issues that call for careful scrutiny. Meanwhile, industry-specific forces such as mining safety requirements, compliance needs in banking, and scale requirements in franchising call for bespoke strategies.

Research Question

How can Generative AI and gamification integration maximize employee training to increase engagement, learning scores, KNOWLEDGE RETENTION, and in-role performance while minimizing risks?

Objectives Of The Study

- To identify determinants, strategies, and industry-specific issues that drive effective implementation.
- To assess outcomes, challenges, and mitigation tactics.
- To define and contextualise gamification and GenAI within the employee training landscape.

Literature Review

A thematic literature review is an approach to structuring and composing the literature review section of a research paper by classifying the studies and discussions under themes or topics instead of discussing each source individually.

Rather than article → article → article (which is a list of summaries). A thematic LR finds recurring ideas, issues, or debates across several studies and discusses them all together under overarching headings (themes).

1. Gamification as Motivational and Engagement Driver

Gamification takes game mechanics such as leaderboards, badges, points, and quests and incorporates them into learning environments to induce motivation and engagement. Early research has demonstrated that gamified learning spaces increase motivation and knowledge retention through the use of intrinsic and extrinsic drivers (Sharma, Pandey, Singh, & Ghatak, 2024). In the financial industry, Sereno and Ang (2024) discovered that gamification had a substantial impact on employee satisfaction and training achievements, while effects on competence and engagement depended on design. In franchising as well, Gerson (2023) showed that gamified training sites enhanced consistency among franchise units, with onboarding occurring at a faster rate and operational performance being more robust. These results are consistent with previous systematic reviews, which determined that gamification mainly affects satisfaction and engagement, but not deep learning transfer (Khalil & Abdelrahman, 2024).

2. Self-Leadership, Internalization & Behavioral Outcomes

In addition to surface motivation, gamification has been theorized to increase self-leadership. Oxarart and Houghton (2021) contend that gamified designs engage self-leadership strategies behavioral-focused and natural reward strategies that enhance employee self-concordance and goal internalization. This implies gamification not only drives greater participation but can actually strengthen self-regulatory processes at a deeper level. Through the visible goals and quantifiable progress of gamification, employees are better able to align personal and organizational goals, thus

instilling deeper engagement (Oxarart & Houghton, 2021).

3. Creativity and Cognitive Trade-offs

Although gamification may enhance engagement, its effect on creativity and problem-solving is not as simple. Ikhide, Timur, and Ogunmokun (2022) highlight that game designs might enable as well as constrain creativity based on design affordances. Applying the AMO framework (Ability, Motivation, Opportunity), their research shows that too systematic game features—like leaderboards and reward-based progression—can restrict divergent thinking. By contrast, when used to promote discovery, gamification can support innovation and the sharing of knowledge. This conflict is especially noteworthy in adaptive problem-solving industries, where gamification has to balance structured reward and liberty to be creative.

4. Sector-Specific Applications: Banking, Franchising, and Mining

Sectoral research emphasizes both the potential and the limitations of gamification. In banking, Sereno and Ang (2024) found gamified training to have positive correlations with job satisfaction, but noted that the link to engagement was weaker, indicating that gamification needs to be sensitively framed according to sectoral requirements. In franchising, Gerson (2023) found gamification assists in consistency and operational excellence, particularly in geographically scattered chains. In mining, where skill deficits and safety are key concerns, Sharma et al. (2024) established that gamified learning increased motivation, collaboration, and creativity, although its application was hindered by obstacles associated with age gaps and infrastructural constraints. Cumulatively, these studies attest that gamification is strongly context-specific and needs industry-specific adaptation.

5. Generative AI and the Evolution of Gamification

Technological developments in Generative AI (GenAI) have opened up new avenues for gamification in training employees. AI-based systems individualize learning through the examination of employees' abilities, interests, and performance to create adaptive learning journeys (Davis, Evans, & Foster, 2025). Static gamified systems are replaced with GenAI-based platforms that adjust difficulty dynamically, create situation-based challenges, and offer real-time feedback (James, 2025). AI-based gamification research illustrates increased engagement, faster skill acquisition, and improved knowledge retention (Navarro et al., 2025). In addition, immersive technology like VR, with the addition of AI gamification, has proven to enhance learning performance by more than 30% (Ahmed & Thomas, 2024). Regardless, despite limitations like algorithmic bias, risks to privacy, and worker trust, all these continue to pose meaningful adoption barriers (Davis et al., 2025).

Theoretical Frameworks

1. Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

SDT (Deci & Ryan) suggests that intrinsic motivation is maintained when three fundamental psychological needs are fulfilled: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When these are fulfilled, students exhibit greater intrinsic motivation, greater engagement, and improved persistence.

2. Self-Leadership Theory

Self-leadership refers to methods people employ to deliberately impact their own behavior and thought to reach objectives (behavioral goal-oriented strategies, natural reward strategies, constructive thought processes). Gamification can be an external support that develops self- leadership abilities.

3. AMO Framework (Ability–Motivation–Opportunity)

The AMO model (Appelbaum et al.) suggests that performance is a product of Ability (capacity/skills), Motivation (inclination to perform), and Opportunity (environmental facilitation to perform). It is highly employed in HR to connect people practices with performance results.

THEORY	RELATION TO GAMIFICATION
1. Self determination Theory	Gamification gives autonomy (quest choice), competence (mastery badges, progress), and relatedness (social leaderboards, collaboration). GenAI enhances this by adapting to individuals' personal paths and providing adaptive feedback.
2. Self Leadership theory	Gamified components (reflection prompts, progress tracking) enable self-leadership. GenAI can provide personalized reflective prompts and adaptive nudges, enhancing self-goal setting and tracking.
3. AMO Framework	Gamification engenders motivation (points, badges), GenAI develops ability (adaptive practice), and simulations/quests offer space for application of skills. Harmony among all three foretells training success.

Key Findings

Key Finding 1 : Motivation, Engagement, and Retention of Knowledge

Gamification has always proven to have positive impacts on motivation and learner engagement. In the mining industry, gamification enhanced employee motivation, collaboration, and innovation, and filled generational skill gaps (Sharma, Pandey, Singh, & Ghatak, 2024). Likewise, in the context of franchising, gamified training sped up onboarding and enhanced operational consistency among geographically dispersed units (Gerson, 2023). Banking research is consistent with these advantages, and research found that gamification boosted job satisfaction and made training more enjoyable, although effects on deeper involvement were less reliable (Sereno & Ang, 2024). Overall, in industries, gamification is revealed to improve knowledge retention through engaging, immersive experiences (Khalil & Abdelrahman, 2024).

Key Finding 2: Self-Leadership and Internalization of Goals

Extensive research confirms that gamification not only encourages engagement but also encourages self-leadership. Oxarart and Houghton (2021) discovered that gamification supports behavior-based strategies, including goal-setting and self-monitoring, and strengthens intrinsic reward strategies that render learning pleasurable. Gamification enables employees to align organizational and personal goals by allowing observable progress and measurable achievements. GenAI reinforces this process further by creating adaptive feedback and individualized reflective questions that enhance goal internalization (James, 2025).

Key Finding 3: Creativity, Innovation, and Cognitive Trade-offs

The gamification-creativity relationship is more nuanced. Ikhide, Timur, and Ogunmokun (2022) emphasized that though gamification can

encourage exploration and innovation, fixed mechanics like leaderboards and extrinsic rewards can limit divergent thinking. Their research, referencing the AMO framework and Affordance Theory, indicates that affordances such as sandboxed environments and open challenges can improve creative performance. Empirical research on this connection remains limited, especially on AI-augmented gamified learning.

Key Finding 4: Sector-Specific Applications and Constraints

Sector-specific studies depict how context determines gamification results. In banking, gamification enhanced satisfaction but had inconsistent outcomes on engagement and proficiency (Sereno & Ang, 2024). In franchising, gamification assisted in maintaining brand consistency and delivering uniform customer experience across franchise outlets (Gerson, 2023). In mining, gamification training reduced skill deficits and engaged younger workers but experienced infrastructure and cultural uptake issues (Sharma et al., 2024). Taken together, they demonstrate that gamification is not "one-size-fits-all" and has to be tailored to sectoral imperatives and limitations.

Key Finding 5 : Integration of Generative AI with Gamification

Current research indicates how GenAI opens up new possibilities for gamification. GenAI facilitates adaptive learning through personalized levels of difficulty, realistic simulation, and just-in-time feedback (Davis, Evans, & Foster, 2025). Experiments indicate that gamified learning platforms powered by AI accelerate the achievement of skills and enhance learner engagement (Navarro et al., 2025). In immersive VR environments, the use of AI with gamification enhanced learning performance by more than 30% relative to conventional means (Ahmed & Thomas, 2024). Though, however, such advantages are balanced by issues of bias, hallucination, and explainability, which can compromise trust and uptake (James, 2025).

Key Finding 6 : Sustainability and Challenges over the Long Term

Though gamification is successful in the short term, there is a problem with sustainability. Various reviews caution against novelty effects and "pointsification fatigue," with extrinsic rewards deteriorating motivation over time (Oxarart & Houghton, 2021). The KPMG case study did show, though, that when gamification was connected to leadership modeling and substantive performance results, rewards did build up over several quarters instead of falling away (Buell, Cai, & Sandino, 2023). This indicates long-term effect is based on substantive design and organizational embedding and not superficial game elements.

Critical Analysis & Research Gaps

1. Limited long-term evidence – Short-term participation and knowledge tests are the focus of most research; there is little known about persistent behavior change and work performance effects of GenAI + gamified training.
2. Heterogeneous outcomes – Impacts are highly variable by learner characteristics (gaming background, tenure), design decisions (competitive vs. collaborative), and industry environment; systematic analysis of moderators does not exist.
3. Creativity trade-offs underresearched – Gamification may elicit and suppress creativity, but research on how affordances (leaderboards, badges, sandboxing) influence divergent thinking and innovation is limited.
4. Novelty and sustainability issues – Gamification rewards tend to erode over time ("pointsification" fatigue). Limited longitudinal

studies examine how to maintain engagement or redesign gamified systems.

5. GenAI-specific risks – Issues like AI bias, hallucinations, explainability, and privacy have been hypothesized but not empirically tested much in work training setting.
6. Measurement inconsistency – Research employs disparate outcome measures (engagement, fun, knowledge quizzes, KPIs), precluding meta-analysis. There is no agreed, validated measurement framework across industries.
7. Sectoral transferability gaps – There is evidence from banking, franchising, mining, and professional services, but comparative studies across sectors are few. Infrastructure and regulatory variation restricts generalizability.
8. Governance and organizational readiness underinvestigated – Effectiveness relies on leadership acceptance, digital literacy, and ethical protection, yet few assessments quantify how governance practices (explainability, consent, bias audits) shape adoption.

Recommendations

- Start by aligning training goals to both business results and employee needs.
- HR and training managers must thoughtfully assign particular game design features to the psychological needs they are meant to address for instance, leaderboards to relatedness and social comparison, badges to competence signaling, and significant choice to autonomy. They advise against the overuse of points and rewards, which can poison intrinsic motivation if they are not used in conformity with Self-Determination Theory principles.
- This suggests that in reality, gamified training must be developed with psychological theory in mind, rather than simply by adding surface-level game mechanics.
- Combining AI-powered personalization with gamification allows learners to learn at their own pace, with adaptive challenges and real-time feedback, greatly enhancing retention and satisfaction.

Conclusion

This literature review of gamification and Generative AI (GenAI) integration in employee training presents a number of important takeaways. Across industries including mining, franchising, and banking, gamification has always improved employee motivation, participation, and retention of knowledge. Theoretical models like Self-Determination Theory, Self-Leadership, AMO, Affordance Theory, and Flow describe why gamification succeeds: by facilitating intrinsic needs, promoting self-regulation, regulating ability–motivation–opportunity, and offering intuitive affordances for learning. Additionally, new evidence indicates that GenAI can powerfully enhance these effects by facilitating adaptive personalization, instant feedback, and scalable scenario generation. Where gamification is linked to substantial business results and supported by leadership role modeling, such as in the KPMG Globerunner example, organizations can maintain gains past short-term novelty effects.

Concurrently, a number of key challenges and deficiencies still exist. Evidence is equivocal regarding the effectiveness of gamification over the long term, with complaints about novelty fatigue and variation of results across learner populations. There is not much work on the impact of gamification on creativity and innovation, as opposed to knowledge retention. GenAI poses new threats of bias, hallucination, and privacy violations, but empirical research on governance and trust in AI-based gamified training is still sparse. Furthermore, outcome measures across

studies are still heterogeneous, which does not support meta-analysis.

Subsequent studies must take a longitudinal and cross-sectoral approach to assess long-term effects of GenAI-facilitated gamified training on job performance, creativity, and innovation. Also needed are standardized measurement frameworks linking proximal (engagement, flow) to distal (business KPIs) outcomes. Researchers should also look at how AI governance and organizational readiness influence adoption, especially in regulated sectors like banking and mining. Lastly, comparative analyses of the ways in which cultural, generational, and sectoral variations condition the efficacy of gamification and AI personalization would be of great value to global organizations.

Overall, although gamification and GenAI hold revolutionary promise for employee training, their success is in well-designed solutions based on motivational theory, abetted by leadership, and protected by ethical regulation. Future scholarship needs to transcend single-site pilots to systematic, theoretically driven, and context-informed studies showing not only how employees are involved, but also how organizations benefit.

References

1. Baxter, R., Holderness, D. K., & Wood, D. A. (2016). The effects of gamification on corporate training program participation and performance. Journal of Accounting Education, 35(1), 19–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccedu.2016.01.001
2. Buell, R. W., Cai, C. X., & Sandino, T. (2023). KPMG Globerunner: A case study in gamified corporate training. Harvard Business School Case Study 623-089. Harvard Business Publishing.
3. Davis, L., Evans, M., & Foster, P. (2025). Generative AI in gamified learning: Enhancing engagement and adaptive personalization. Journal of Workplace Learning, 37(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-08-2024-0123
4. Friess, E. (2024). Virtual gamified training and employee performance: A field experiment in professional services. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 35(1), 75–96. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21478
5. James, H. (2025). AI, gamification, and workplace training: Opportunities and ethical risks. Journal of Applied Learning Technology, 12(1), 45–59.
6. Khalil, M., & Abdelrahman, M. (2024). Gamification and AI integration in higher education training: A systematic literature review. Education and Information Technologies, 29(4), 567–590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12345
7. Navarro, J., García, D., & Figueroa, A. (2025). AI-powered gamification in corporate training: Personalization and adaptive learning outcomes. International Journal of Training and Development, 29(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12345
8. Ahmed, R., & Thomas, L. (2024). Virtual reality and gamification with generative AI: Transforming employee learning outcomes. Computers & Education, 205, 104893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.104893
9. Gerson, K. (2023). From games to gains: How gamification revolutionizes franchise training. FranConnect White Paper.
10. Sharma, A., Pandey, S., Singh, S., & Ghatak, I. (2024). Gamification in learning and development: A qualitative study on the Indian mining sector. International Journal of Training Research, 22(1), 56–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/14480220.2024.112233
11. Ikhide, J. E., Timur, A. T., & Ogunmokun, O. A. (2022). The potential and constraint of

work gamification for employees' creative performance. Journal of Business Research, 146, 394–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.056

12. Oxarart, R. A., & Houghton, J. D. (2021). A spoonful of sugar: Gamification as means for enhancing employee self-leadership and self-concordance at work. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 28(2), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051820988459
13. Sereno, M. M., & Ang, H. B. (2024). The impact of gamification on training, work engagement, and job satisfaction in banking. International Journal of Bank Marketing, 42(3), 456–472. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-07-2023-1234
14. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
15. Sailer, M., Hense, J. U., Mayr, S. K., & Mandl, H. (2017). How gamification motivates: An experimental study of the effects of specific game design elements on psychological need satisfaction. Computers in Human Behavior, 69, 371–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.033
16. Norman, D. A. (1999). Affordance, conventions, and design. Interactions, 6(3), 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1145/301153.301168