

Artificial Intelligence Anxiety and Employee Engagement in the Indian Real Estate Sector

The Mediating Role of Perceived Job Insecurity and the Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support

¹Nidhish Singh

¹Business and Management

¹Larsen & Toubro

Abstract—Survey Integration Note

The survey provides organization-specific evidence from the participating real-estate organization employees concerning health and well-being, workplace safety, manager and team support, psychological safety, belonging, fairness, meaningful work, learning, work-life balance, wellness support, communication and employer recommendation.

Preliminary Survey Snapshot (n = 59)

Positive (Agree + Indicator Valid n Mean / 5 Strongly Agree) I think this is a safe

59	4.31	91.5%
----	------	-------

place to work. I receive good support from my

59	4.07	83.1%
----	------	-------

team members/colleagues. My immediate manager/supervisor

59	4.10	79.7%
----	------	-------

supports me when I need help. I feel a sense of belonging at the organization 59 3.97 79.7% Realty. I am able to balance my work and

59	3.47	55.9%
----	------	-------

personal/family commitments. The health and wellness support the

59	3.64	62.7%
----	------	-------

organisation provides meets my needs. There is open and honest two-way 59 3.61 66.1% communication. I receive regular communication from 59 3.54 61.0% my manager about

management updates. Abstract Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming organizational processes, occupational roles, skill requirements and employee expectations. Although AI has the potential to improve productivity and create new employment opportunities, its increasing use may also generate employee concerns regarding job replacement, skill obsolescence, career continuity and employment security. These concerns are particularly relevant in knowledge-intensive and technology-enabled sectors such as real estate, where artificial intelligence, data analytics, automation, digital platforms and intelligent decision-support systems are increasingly influencing organizational activities. The present study develops and proposes an empirical model examining the

relationship between Artificial Intelligence Anxiety (AIA) and Employee Engagement (EE) among employees in the Indian real estate sector. Specifically, the study investigates Perceived Job Insecurity (PJI) as a mediating mechanism and Perceived Organizational Support (POS) as a moderating resource. The theoretical foundation integrates Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, Conservation of Resources (COR) theory and Organizational Support Theory. The proposed model suggests that AI anxiety increases perceived job insecurity, which subsequently reduces employee engagement. Perceived organizational support is expected to weaken the positive relationship between AI anxiety and perceived job insecurity and consequently buffer the negative indirect effect of AI anxiety on employee engagement. Data will be collected using established measurement instruments for AI anxiety, job insecurity, perceived organizational support and employee engagement. Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), preferably using SmartPLS, will be employed to assess the measurement and structural models, including mediation, moderation and moderated mediation. The proposed study contributes to the emerging literature on the human consequences of AI by moving beyond technology adoption and productivity perspectives and examining the psychological pathway through which AI-related concerns influence employee engagement.

Index Terms—Artificial Intelligence Anxiety, Employee Engagement, Perceived Job Insecurity, Perceived Organizational Support, Artificial Intelligence, Real Estate, JD-R Theory, Structural Equation Modelling, SmartPLS, India

I. Introduction Artificial Intelligence (AI) has moved from being primarily a technological

innovation to becoming an important organizational and workforce transformation mechanism. AI-enabled systems are increasingly being used for data analysis, customer relationship management, marketing, forecasting, recruitment, financial analysis, property valuation, lead generation, predictive analytics, workflow automation and decision support. Consequently, AI is not merely changing the technologies organizations use; it is also changing the nature of work, required competencies and employees' perceptions of their future roles. The magnitude of this transformation is illustrated by the World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report 2025. Based on the perspectives of more than 1,000 employers representing more than 14 million workers, the report estimates that structural labour-market transformation could

affect approximately 22% of existing jobs by 2030. It projects the creation of approximately 170 million new roles and displacement of approximately 92 million roles, resulting in a projected net increase of 78 million jobs. These figures create an important distinction between employment transformation and individual employment security. Although AI may create more jobs overall than it displaces, individual employees may nevertheless perceive their own occupations, skills or positions as vulnerable. Consequently, aggregate labour-market forecasts cannot fully explain how employees psychologically experience technological transformation. AI-related employee anxiety is therefore becoming an important organizational phenomenon. Recent research has demonstrated that anxiety concerning AI-based job replacement and the requirement to learn new technologies can negatively influence employees' work-related attitudes. For example, recent empirical research involving 430 employees found that job-replacement anxiety and AI-learning anxiety were negatively associated with work passion, partly through emotional exhaustion. The Indian context is particularly significant because AI adoption is occurring rapidly across organizational environments. Indian organizations are increasingly investing in AI capabilities, while employees are simultaneously expected to develop new technological competencies. This creates a potentially important psychological tension: employees may recognize the productivity benefits of AI while

simultaneously fearing that AI could reduce the future relevance of their existing skills or positions. The real-estate sector provides an especially interesting context for investigating this phenomenon. India's real-estate market continues to demonstrate strong activity and increasing integration with technology-enabled business models. JLL reported that India's office market recorded 21.5 million square feet of gross leasing in Q1 2026, representing the country's strongest first quarter on record. Colliers similarly reported Grade A office leasing of 18.3 million square feet across India's top seven cities during Q1 2026, representing 15% year-on-year growth. The growth of the real-estate ecosystem does not necessarily imply that individual employees feel secure about their future. Digital transformation, AI-enabled analytics, automation and changing skill requirements may simultaneously generate opportunities and uncertainty. This creates a compelling research problem: How does Artificial Intelligence Anxiety influence employee engagement when employees perceive AI as a potential threat to their employment security, and can organizational support buffer this effect? The present study addresses this question by developing an integrated model in which Artificial Intelligence Anxiety is the independent variable, Perceived Job Insecurity is the mediator, Employee Engagement is the dependent variable, and Perceived Organizational Support is the moderator.

II. Contemporary Context: AI, Employment and Indian Real Estate

2.1 Artificial Intelligence

The changing world of work AI-related transformation should not be understood solely as automation. AI may replace some tasks, augment others and create entirely new occupational activities. The World Economic Forum reports that AI and information-processing technologies are among the most important drivers of business transformation expected by employers through 2030. This creates a dual psychological response. Opportunity pathway AI can: reduce repetitive work; improve decision quality; increase productivity; support employees with information; create new roles; improve analytical capabilities; facilitate innovation. Threat pathway AI can also create: job replacement anxiety; skill obsolescence concerns; career uncertainty; performance pressure; technological overload; fear of replacement; uncertainty regarding future employability. The current research focuses primarily on this threat pathway.

III. Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Artificial Intelligence Anxiety refers to an individual's

Apprehension, fear, uncertainty or psychological discomfort associated with the use, consequences or increasing presence of AI. Wang and Wang's development of the Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale established a multidimensional approach for measuring anxiety associated with AI. Their work provided an important foundation for subsequent empirical research on AI-related psychological responses. Recent workplace research further suggests that AI anxiety can have multiple dimensions, particularly concerns related to job replacement and learning new technologies. A 2025 empirical study involving 430 employees found that both job-replacement anxiety and learning anxiety negatively influenced work passion. In the context of real estate, AI anxiety may emerge when employees believe that:

1. AI may perform some of their current tasks; 2. AI may reduce demand for certain roles; 3. their

current skills may become obsolete; 4. they may need to acquire new technological skills; 5. technologically skilled employees may receive greater career opportunities; 6. organizational AI implementation may change performance expectations. Thus, AI anxiety is conceptualized as an employee-level psychological response rather than as an objective characteristic of AI technology.

IV. Perceived Job Insecurity Perceived Job Insecurity refers to employees

subjective perceptions regarding the continuity and stability of their employment. Job insecurity is different from actual job loss. An employee can remain employed while simultaneously experiencing significant concerns about whether their job will continue in the future. This distinction is especially relevant to AI. An organization may not have announced layoffs, yet employees may perceive: "My job could eventually be automated."

This perception can influence psychological well-being, organizational attitudes and work behaviour. Jiang and Lavaysse's meta-analytic work demonstrates the broad significance of cognitive and affective job insecurity across organizational outcomes. The literature indicates that perceived employment uncertainty can represent an important psychological stressor. Within the present model, perceived job insecurity is proposed as the mechanism through which AI anxiety influences employee engagement.

V. Employee Engagement Employee Engagement represents a positive

fulfilling work-related psychological state characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Schaufeli and colleagues has become one of the most widely used approaches for measuring work engagement. Engaged employees generally demonstrate: energy; enthusiasm; involvement; persistence; concentration; dedication. From a JD-R perspective, employees are more likely to experience engagement when job resources are sufficient to meet or balance job demands. AI anxiety can therefore be conceptualized as a potentially important psychological demand, while organizational support can operate as a job resource.

VI. Perceived Organizational Support Perceived Organizational Support refers to employees

beliefs concerning the extent to which their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. The concept originates from Organizational Support Theory developed by Eisenberger and colleagues. Organizational support may become particularly important during technological transformation. Consider two organizations introducing the same AI system. Organization A AI introduced little communication no training fear of replacement. Organization B AI introduced employee consultation training reskilling career support. Although the technology is identical, employee perceptions may be substantially different. Therefore, POS may act as a psychological buffer against AI-induced insecurity. Recent research on AI-driven work environments similarly emphasizes the importance of organizational support, co-skilling and mechanisms for mitigating job insecurity.

VII. Theoretical Foundation 7.1 Job Demands–Resources Theory The

primary theoretical foundation of this study is the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory. JD-R theory proposes that every occupation contains job demands and job resources. Excessive demands may lead to strain, whereas resources can stimulate motivation and engagement. In the proposed model: Construct JD-R interpretation AI Anxiety Psychological/job demand Job Insecurity Strain mechanism Organizational Support Job resource Employee Engagement Motivational outcome The proposed process is: AI Anxiety Job Insecurity Reduced Engagement while: Organizational Support Resource/Buffer Reduced insecurity This makes JD-R theory highly appropriate for the research model.

VIII. Conservation of Resources Theory Conservation of Resources (COR)

theory proposes that individuals seek to obtain, retain and protect valued resources. Employment represents a major resource because it provides: income; social identity; career progression; status;

psychological stability; future opportunities. AI anxiety may create the perception that these resources could be threatened. Consequently: AI anxiety perceived resource threat job insecurity disengagement Organizational support may provide additional resources and reduce the likelihood of a resource- loss spiral.

IX. Organizational Support Theory Organizational Support Theory suggests that employees

develop general beliefs concerning how much their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Eisenberger et al. (1986) established perceived organizational support as an important organizational construct, while Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) synthesized its theoretical and empirical foundations. In the current study, organizational support is therefore expected to reduce the psychological threat associated with AI implementation.

X. Integrated Theoretical Model The study integrates three theoretical

perspectives. JOB DEMANDS–RESOURCES THEORY Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Perceived Job Insecurity Employee Engagement Perceived Organizational Support (Buffering Resource)

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT THEORY

XI. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development 11.1 AI Anxiety and Perceived Job Insecurity

AI anxiety reflects apprehension concerning the implications of AI. When employees perceive that AI can perform activities previously performed by humans, they may develop concerns regarding future employment. Recent research indicates that AI-related psychological responses can be associated with job insecurity. A 2025 study examining organizational AI adoption found that AI-use anxiety influenced the relationship between organizational AI adoption and job insecurity, demonstrating that employees' anxiety can shape their interpretation of AI-related organizational change. Therefore:

H1

Artificial Intelligence Anxiety has a significant positive relationship with Perceived Job Insecurity among employees in the Indian real-estate sector.

XII. Perceived Job Insecurity and Employee Engagement Job insecurity

represents a psychological demand that can consume employees' cognitive and emotional resources. Employees who are uncertain about their future employment may be less likely to invest sustained energy in their current work. From JD-R theory, prolonged job insecurity can function as a strain-producing condition that reduces motivational resources. Therefore:

H2 Perceived Job Insecurity has a significant negative relationship with Employee

Engagement.

XIII. AI Anxiety and Employee Engagement AI anxiety may directly reduce employee engagement

because anxiety consumes psychological resources that could otherwise be directed toward work. Employees concerned about AI replacement may: reduce discretionary effort; become psychologically withdrawn; experience lower enthusiasm; focus on career survival rather than organizational contribution; become less absorbed in their

current work. Recent research has demonstrated negative relationships between AI-related anxiety and positive work outcomes, including work passion. Therefore:

H3 Artificial Intelligence Anxiety has a significant negative relationship with Employee

Engagement.

XIV. Mediating Role of Perceived Job Insecurity AI anxiety may not reduce

engagement exclusively through a direct psychological effect. A more theoretically meaningful mechanism may be: AI anxiety "I may lose my job." Perceived Job Insecurity "I am uncertain about my future." Reduced Employee Engagement Thus, perceived job insecurity represents the psychological mechanism connecting AI anxiety with engagement.

H4 Perceived Job Insecurity mediates the relationship between Artificial Intelligence

Anxiety and Employee Engagement.

XV. Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support Organizational

support can provide employees with: training; reskilling; communication; supervisor support; career development; psychological reassurance; participation in AI implementation. Consequently, employees who perceive high organizational support may be less likely to interpret AI as a personal employment threat.

H5 Perceived Organizational Support negatively moderates the relationship between

Artificial Intelligence Anxiety and Perceived Job Insecurity, such that the relationship is weaker when Perceived Organizational Support is high.

XVI. Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement Organizational support may

directly enhance engagement by satisfying employees' psychological and socio-emotional needs. Supported employees may feel: valued; respected; secure; motivated; connected with their organization. Therefore:

H6

Perceived Organizational Support has a significant positive relationship with Employee Engagement.

XVII. Moderated Mediation The strongest contribution of the proposed

model lies in its moderated mediation pathway. The proposed mechanism is: AI Anxiety Job Insecurity Employee Engagement but the strength of the first relationship depends on: Organizational Support. Therefore:

H7 Perceived Organizational Support moderates the indirect relationship between Artificial

Intelligence Anxiety and Employee Engagement through Perceived Job Insecurity, such that the negative indirect effect is weaker when Perceived Organizational Support is high.

XVIII. Conceptual Framework The final conceptual framework is: PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

ARTIFICIAL PERCEIVED EMPLOYEE INTELLIGENCE JOB ENGAGEMENT ANXIETY INSECURITY

Direct Effect

XIX. Research Objectives The study has the following objectives

1. To examine the relationship between Artificial Intelligence Anxiety and Perceived Job

Insecurity. 2. To investigate the effect of Perceived Job Insecurity on Employee Engagement. 3. To examine the direct relationship between Artificial Intelligence Anxiety and Employee Engagement. 4. To determine whether Perceived Job Insecurity mediates the relationship between AI Anxiety and Employee Engagement. 5. To investigate whether Perceived Organizational Support moderates the relationship between AI Anxiety and Job Insecurity. 6. To examine the direct effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Engagement. 7. To test the moderated mediation effect of Organizational Support on the AI Anxiety–Job Insecurity– Employee Engagement relationship. 8. To develop an empirically validated framework explaining employee responses to AI- driven transformation in India's real-estate sector.

XX. Research Questions **RQ1 Does Artificial Intelligence Anxiety increase**

employees' perceptions of job insecurity? **RQ2 Does Perceived Job Insecurity reduce Employee Engagement?**

RQ3 Does AI Anxiety directly reduce Employee Engagement?

RQ4 Does Perceived Job Insecurity mediate the relationship between AI Anxiety and Employee Engagement?

RQ5 Does Perceived Organizational Support buffer the relationship between AI Anxiety and Perceived Job Insecurity?

RQ6 Does Organizational Support moderate the indirect effect of AI Anxiety on Employee Engagement?

XXI. Research Methodology **21.1 Research Design** The study will adopt a quantitative empirical

research design. A time-lagged design is recommended over a single-wave cross-sectional design because the proposed model contains causal-process language involving mediation. Recommended design Time 1 Artificial Intelligence Anxiety + demographics Time 2: approximately 2–3 weeks later Perceived Job Insecurity + Perceived Organizational Support Time 3: approximately 2–3 weeks later Employee Engagement This design reduces common-method bias and provides stronger temporal separation between predictor, mediator/moderator and outcome. If practical constraints prevent three-wave data collection, a single-wave survey may be used, but the manuscript should use cautious language concerning causality.

XXII. Target Population The target population comprises employees

working in the Indian real-estate sector, including employees of: real-estate developers; construction and development companies; property management organizations; real-estate consulting firms; brokerage organizations; facility-management organizations; commercial real-estate companies; residential real-estate companies; proptech- enabled real-estate organizations; real-estate investment/asset-management organizations. Potential job functions include: Human Resources; Sales; Marketing; Finance; Project Management; Customer Relationship Management; Business Development; Property Management; Operations; Legal; Procurement; IT/Digital; Administration.

XXIII. Sampling Strategy A combination of purposive and convenience sampling may be used

initially because there is no comprehensive public sampling frame containing all Indian real- estate employees. However, the study should attempt to obtain respondents from multiple organizations and functional areas.

XXIV. Questionnaire Design The questionnaire consists of approximately 37

substantive items, excluding demographic questions. A 5-point Likert scale is recommended: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

XXV. Measurement Instrument Section A – Artificial Intelligence Anxiety The AI Anxiety items

should be adapted from established AI-anxiety literature, particularly the Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale developed by Wang and Wang, with wording modified to refer specifically to the workplace. AI Anxiety – 10 items AIA1. I feel anxious about the increasing use of artificial intelligence in my workplace.

AIA2. I worry that AI may make some aspects of my current job unnecessary.

AIA3. I feel uneasy about the possibility of AI replacing human workers in my organization.

AIA4. I am concerned that my current skills may become less valuable because of AI.

AIA5. I feel worried about having to continuously learn new AI-related technologies.

AIA6. The rapid development of AI makes me uncertain about my future career.

AIA7. I feel stressed when I think about the impact AI may have on my job.

AIA8. I worry that employees who are more skilled in AI may replace employees with traditional skills.

AIA9. The introduction of AI creates uncertainty about my future role in the organization.

AIA10. I feel apprehensive about the consequences of AI for my employment.

Important methodological note These are adapted research items, not a claim that this exact 10- item workplace instrument has already been psychometrically validated in the Indian real-estate sector. The scale must therefore undergo pilot testing, reliability analysis and CFA/measurement- model assessment before being described as validated for this population.

XXVI. Perceived Job Insecurity Scale Adapted from established job

insecurity research, including Hellgren et al. (1999) and subsequent job- insecurity literature. PJI – 7 items PJI1. I feel uncertain about the future of my current job.

PJI2. I am concerned that I may lose my job in the future.

PJI3. I feel insecure about the long-term stability of my employment.

PJI4. I worry that technological changes may negatively affect my employment.

PJI5. I feel that my current position may become less secure because of AI.

PJI6. I am uncertain whether my current skills will continue to be sufficient for my job.

PJI7. I feel that my future employment opportunities within my organization are uncertain.

XXVII. Perceived Organizational Support The POS scale should be adapted

from Eisenberger et al. and the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support literature. POS – 8 items

POS1. My organization values my contribution to its success.

POS2. My organization cares about my well-being.

POS3. My organization provides support when I face difficulties at work.

POS4. My organization recognizes my efforts.

POS5. My organization is concerned about my career development.

POS6. My organization provides adequate opportunities to develop skills needed for technological change.

POS7. My organization would support me if AI changes the requirements of my job.

POS8. My organization provides adequate assistance when employees are required to learn new technologies. Items POS6–POS8 specifically contextualize organizational support around technological transformation. They should be evaluated during pilot testing to ensure that they do not unnecessarily alter the established POS construct.

XXVIII. Employee Engagement Employee engagement should preferably be

measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) or an appropriately licensed/authorized version. A short-form approach can be used to reduce questionnaire length. Recommended dimensions Vigour EE1. At my work, I feel full of energy. EE2. I feel strong and vigorous when I am working.

EE3. I can continue working for long periods when necessary.

Dedication EE4. I am enthusiastic about my job.

EE5. My job inspires me.

EE6. I am proud of the work that I do.

Absorption EE7. I am immersed in my work.

EE8. I feel happy when I am working intensely.

EE9. I become carried away when I am working.

EE10. I find it difficult to detach myself from my work.

Recommended approach For publication, use the official UWES instrument/version and its stated terms of use, rather than replacing the original scale with the adapted items above. The above items are included to show the intended construct structure and questionnaire architecture.

XXIX. Complete Questionnaire Structure Construct Code No. of items

Artificial Intelligence AIA Anxiety 10 Perceived Job Insecurity PJI 7 Perceived Organizational POS Support 8 Employee Engagement EE 10 Total substantive items 35 Add approximately 8–12 demographic/context questions. Thus, the final Google Forms questionnaire will contain approximately: 43–47 questions.

XXX. Control Variables The following variables should be collected

1. Age 2. Gender 3. Education 4. Total work experience 5. Organizational tenure 6. Job level 7.

Functional area 8. Organization size 9. Employment type 10. Frequency of AI use 11. Formal AI training received 12. Perceived exposure to AI These variables should not automatically be entered into every model. They should be theoretically justified and included when relevant.

XXXI. Measurement Model The proposed model consists of four latent

constructs: AIA 10 indicators PJI 7 indicators POS 8 indicators EE 10 indicators All constructs can initially be specified as reflective constructs.

XXXII. Measurement Model Assessment SmartPLS should be used to assess

Indicator reliability Outer loadings should preferably be:

0.708

Items with lower loadings should not automatically be deleted. Their theoretical relevance and effect on construct reliability/content validity must first be evaluated. Internal consistency reliability Report: Cronbach's alpha; rho_A; Composite Reliability. Recommended values:

0.70–0.95

Very high values may indicate item redundancy. Convergent validity Average Variance Extracted:

AVE 0.50

Discriminant validity Use: HTMT; Fornell-Larcker criterion; cross-loadings as supplementary evidence. HTMT values should generally be below accepted thresholds, with the precise criterion justified according to the methodological literature.

XXXIII. Structural Model After establishing measurement-model quality

evaluate:

1. collinearity; 2. path coefficients; 3. R^2 ; 4. f^2 ; 5. Q^2 /predictive relevance; 6. bootstrapped

confidence intervals; 7. indirect effects; 8. interaction effects; 9. moderated mediation.

XXXIV. Proposed SmartPLS Model The structural model should contain: POS

Moderates

AIA PJI EE

EE

Structural equations Equation 1 $PJI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 AIA + \beta_2 POS + \beta_3 (AIA \times POS) + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon$ Equation 2 $EE = \beta_0 + \beta_4 AIA + \beta_5 PJI + \beta_6 POS + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon$ The indirect effect is:

AIA PJI EE

The moderated mediation examines whether:

POS × AIA PJI

changes the size of the indirect effect.

XXXV. Moderation Analysis Create the interaction term: AIA × POS

The interaction should predict PJI. If the interaction is statistically significant, conduct simple-slope analysis at: low POS; mean POS; high POS. The expected pattern is: Low organizational support AI Anxiety strong increase in Job Insecurity High organizational support AI Anxiety weaker increase in Job Insecurity

XXXVI. Moderated Mediation The most important statistical test is the Index

of Moderated Mediation or an equivalent PLS-SEM procedure. Expected pattern: LOW POS AIA PJI EE Strong negative indirect effect HIGH POS AIA PJI EE Weaker negative indirect effect If the moderated mediation index is statistically significant and its bootstrap confidence interval excludes zero, H7 will be supported.

XXXVII. Common Method Bias Because questionnaire data are collected from

employees, common-method bias should be addressed. procedural remedies: anonymous responses; confidentiality statement; psychologically separating constructs; randomized item order where appropriate; time-lagged data collection; avoiding leading questions; using different scale formats where theoretically justified. Statistical checks may include: full collinearity VIF; marker-variable technique; Harman's single-factor test as a supplementary, not definitive, assessment. The manuscript should avoid claiming that Harman's single-factor test alone establishes absence of common-method bias.

XXXVIII. Data Analysis Sequence Step 1 Data cleaning using

Excel/SPSS. Step 2 Descriptive statistics.

Step 3 Demographic profile.

Step 4 Reliability analysis.

Step 5 Measurement model in SmartPLS.

Step 6 Convergent validity.

Step 7 Discriminant validity.

Step 8 Structural model.

Step 9 Direct effects.

Step 10 Mediation.

Step 11 Moderation.

Step 12 Moderated mediation.

Step 13 Predictive assessment.

Step 14 Robustness/sensitivity analysis.

XXXIX. Proposed Results Section Template Important: The following section**39.1 Respondent Profile Report: Variable Category Frequency Percentage**

Gender Male Actual Actual Female Actual Actual Age 18–30 Actual Actual 31–40 Actual Actual Education Graduate Actual Actual Postgraduate Actual Actual Tenure <3 years Actual Actual 3–5 years Actual Actual AI exposure Low Actual Actual Moderate Actual Actual High Actual Actual

XL. Measurement Model Results Template Construct Alpha rho_A CR AVE

AIA Actual Actual Actual Actual PJI Actual Actual Actual Actual POS Actual Actual Actual Actual EE
Actual Actual Actual Actual All values should be populated from the actual SmartPLS output.

XLI. Discriminant Validity Recommended reporting table: AIA PJI POS EE

AIA — Actual Actual Actual PJI — Actual Actual POS — Actual

EE —

Report HTMT values and confidence intervals.

XLII. Structural Model Results Template Hypothes Relations CI Decision is

hip β t p

H1 AIA PJI Actual Supporte d/Not supporte Actual Actual Actual d

H2 PJI EE Actual Supporte d/Not supporte Actual Actual Actual d

H3 AIA EE Actual Supporte d/Not supporte Actual Actual Actual d

H5 AIA×POS Actual Supporte PJI d/Not supporte Actual Actual Actual d

H6 POS EE Actual Supporte d/Not supporte Actual Actual Actual d

XLIII. Mediation Results Template Effect Bootstrap 95% CI Result β SE t

AIA PJI Actual Actual Actual Actual — PJI EE Actual Actual Actual Actual — AIA EE Actual
Actual Actual Actual — AIA PJI Actual Actual Actual Actual H4

XLIV. Moderation Results Template Interaction β t p Interpretation AIA ×

POS PJI Buffering/No Actual Actual Actual buffering A significant negative interaction would support the proposed buffering effect.

XLV. Theoretical Findings The proposed model expects that AI

anxiety will be positively associated with job insecurity. Employees who fear that AI may replace tasks, reduce the value of their skills or alter their roles are expected to report greater employment uncertainty. Job insecurity is subsequently expected to reduce engagement because uncertainty consumes psychological resources and reduces employees' ability or willingness to invest energy in their current work. The direct relationship between AI anxiety and engagement is also expected to be negative. Most importantly, the mediation pathway is expected to demonstrate that job insecurity explains part of the relationship between AI anxiety and engagement. Finally, organizational support is expected to weaken the AI anxiety–job insecurity relationship.

XLVI. Managerial Implications 46.1 AI implementation should be

accompanied by employee support Organizations should not treat AI implementation exclusively as a technology project. It should be treated as: Technology transformation + workforce transformation + psychological transformation.

46.2 AI training should be proactive Organizations should provide: AI literacy programmes; role-specific training; reskilling; upskilling; digital learning; career transition support. Training can reduce uncertainty by increasing employee competence and perceived control.

46.3 Transparent communication Employees should understand: why AI is being implemented; which tasks will change; which roles will evolve; what training will be available; how performance expectations will change; whether employment structures will change. Uncertainty is often amplified by poor communication.

46.4 Employee participation Organizations should involve employees in AI implementation through: consultations; pilot programmes; feedback mechanisms; AI committees; training needs assessments. Employee involvement may increase psychological ownership and reduce resistance.

46.5 Real-estate organizations need an AI-transition strategy Real-estate organizations should identify which jobs are: Automatable Routine data processing, repetitive reporting, basic documentation. Augmentable Property analytics, market analysis, customer relationship management. Human-centric Negotiation, relationship management, leadership, complex client interaction and strategic decision-making. This distinction can help employees understand that AI does not necessarily mean total job replacement.

XLVII. Contribution to Human Resource Management The proposed study offers several HR

implications. Recruitment Organizations may need employees possessing both domain knowledge and AI literacy. Training AI-related reskilling should become part of strategic HR planning. Performance Management Organizations should avoid creating excessive technology-driven performance pressure. Career Development Career pathways should incorporate AI-related competency development. Employee Relations HR should actively monitor employee anxiety during technological transitions. Employee Engagement Engagement strategies should incorporate technological-security perceptions rather than focusing only on traditional motivational factors.

XLVIII. Contribution to Real-Estate Management The study is particularly relevant because India's

real-estate industry is simultaneously experiencing strong market activity and technological transformation. The Q1 2026 office-market evidence reported by JLL demonstrates the continued strength of the sector, with 21.5 million sq. ft. of gross leasing. The managerial question therefore becomes not simply: "How much AI should a real-estate company adopt?" but: "How can a real-estate company adopt AI while maintaining employee confidence, security and engagement?"

This provides a practical contribution beyond conventional technology-adoption studies.

XLIX. Academic Contribution The study contributes to existing literature in four major ways. First It

extends AI research from technology adoption to employee psychological outcomes. Second It integrates AI anxiety and job insecurity within a single explanatory mechanism. Third It positions perceived organizational support as a buffering resource rather than merely an antecedent of employee attitudes. Fourth It applies this integrated model to the relatively underexplored context of the Indian real- estate sector.

L. Research Model's Novelty The proposed model can be summarized

as: AI Anxiety Job Insecurity Employee Engagement with: Organizational Support as a Buffer This is more theoretically informative than a simple: AI Employee Engagement model because it explains why AI-related anxiety may influence engagement and when that relationship is likely to be weaker.

Supplementary Empirical Context: the participating real-estate organization Health & Well-being Pulse Survey A total of 59 completed survey responses were available in the uploaded workbook. These responses constitute a preliminary organizational pulse sample.

Respondent Profile

Band / Tier

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Sr. Manager to T2	13	22.0%	Individual contributor (S to E		
11		18.6%						
Band)	Manager	8	13.6%	Tier 1	8	13.6%		
E Band	8	13.6%	HOD/ Lead /(T3 and above)	3	5.1%	Tier 2	2	3.4%
MEP DESINGER		1		1.7%				
PGET trainee	1	1.7%	Assistant Manager	1	1.7%			
GET		1		1.7%				
Tier 3	1	1.7%	S Band	1	1.7%			

Organizational Tenure

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Less than 1 year	18	30.5%	3-5 years	18	30.5%	More than 10 years	13
			22.0%	1-2 years	7	11.9%	6-10 years	3	5.1%	

Gender

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Man	35	59.3%	Woman	23	39.0%
Prefer not to say	1	1.7%						

Work Profile

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Project Site operation	35	59.3%	Corporate Function	12	20.3%	Engineering & Design	9	15.3%	Sales and Marketing	2	3.4%	Customer Expereice	1	1.7%
----------	-----------	------------	------------------------	----	-------	--------------------	----	-------	----------------------	---	-------	---------------------	---	------	--------------------	---	------

Age Group

Category	Frequency	Percentage	31-40	25	42.4%	41-50	15	25.4%	Under 30	15	25.4%	51-60	4	6.8%
----------	-----------	------------	-------	----	-------	-------	----	-------	----------	----	-------	-------	---	------

Survey Results

Survey item	Valid n	Mean	Positive %	Negative %	Overall, I would rate my current
59		3.76	67.8%	15.3%	
health and well- being positively. My workplace is clean and	59	4.03	76.3%	1.7%	hygienic. I think this is a
safe place to	59	4.31	91.5%	1.7%	work. My project/departme nt leadership

59 3.92 76.3% 8.5%

visibly prioritises health and safety. My immediate manager/supervi 59 4.10 79.7% 5.1% sor supports me when I need

help. My immediate manager/supervi

59 3.98 76.3% 6.8%

sor recognises my good work. My manager/supervi sor involves

59 3.71 71.2% 13.6%

people in decisions that affect them. I can raise concerns, mistakes, or bad

59 3.73 74.6% 15.3%

news without fear of negative consequences. I receive good support from my team 59 4.07 83.1% 6.8% members/colleag ues. My workload is

56 3.80 80.4% 7.1%

manageable I feel a sense of belonging at the organization 59 3.97 79.7% 3.4% Realty. People at my workplace genuinely care 58 3.72 63.8% 8.6% about each other. I am treated fairly at my workplace,

59 3.90 76.3% 3.4%

regardless of my role, gender, or background. I find my work

59 3.95 79.7% 5.1%

meaningful.

I have opportunities to learn and grow 59 3.83 71.2% 10.2% in my current role. I am able to balance my work and 59 3.47 55.9% 16.9% personal/family commitments. I am aware of the health and wellness programmes/ben 59 3.75 74.6% 10.2% efits the organisation offers. The health and wellness support the organisation 59 3.64 62.7% 11.9% provides meets my needs. I generally feel positive and

59 3.78 72.9% 10.2%

energetic about coming to work. There is open and honest two-

59 3.61 66.1% 11.9%

way communication. I receive regular communication from my

59 3.54 61.0% 16.9%

manager about management updates. I would recommend the participating real-estate organization to others 47 3.89 87.2% 12.8% as a great place to work.

Interpretation of Preliminary Survey Evidence

The pulse survey indicates a generally favorable workplace-support environment, particularly for physical safety, team support, immediate-manager support, belonging and meaningful work. These results are relevant to the broader logic of Perceived Organizational Support because employees' experiences of

managerial support, fairness, recognition, communication and well-being resources can shape whether organizational change is interpreted as supportive or threatening. At the same time, work-life balance, regular management communication, open two-way communication and the adequacy of health/wellness support show comparatively weaker positive ratings. These areas may represent practical resource gaps. In the context of future AI transformation, such gaps are important because insufficient communication or support may intensify uncertainty even when technology adoption itself is intended to improve productivity.

Open-ended Feedback Themes

1. Flexible work arrangements and improved work-life balance
2. Clearer and more timely communication on rewards, salary, policies and organizational
3. decisions
4. Greater fairness and benefits for contract/off-roll and lower-band employees
5. Mental-health, wellness, medical and preventive-health support
6. Recognition, appraisal transparency and career-development opportunities
7. Stronger HR accessibility, grievance redressal and psychologically safe leadership
8. Process clarity, delegation of authority and well-defined SOPs

Implications for the Proposed AI Research Model

The n=59 pulse survey cannot establish relationships among AIA, PJI, POS and EE because it does not contain the required validated construct measures. It therefore cannot support or reject H1-

H7, estimate mediation, test the AIA × POS interaction, or calculate an index of moderated

mediation. Its value is contextual: it identifies the existing support, communication and well-being climate in one real-estate organization and strengthens the practical rationale for measuring organizational support explicitly during AI-driven change.

LI. Future Research Future studies could investigate

1. AI literacy as a moderator. 2. AI self-efficacy as a mediator. 3. Transformational leadership as a

moderator. 4. Career resilience as a moderator. 5. Psychological safety as a mediator. 6. Technostress as an additional mechanism. 7. Trust in AI. 8. AI transparency. 9. Employee-AI collaboration.

10. AI readiness. 11. Organizational AI maturity. 12. Responsible AI practices. Longitudinal studies

could examine how employees' anxiety changes before, during and after AI implementation. Comparative studies could also examine: Real Estate vs Banking vs IT vs Manufacturing vs Education.

LII. Conclusion Artificial Intelligence is transforming the workplace, but its organizational

consequences cannot be evaluated exclusively through productivity, efficiency or technological adoption. The human consequences of AI are equally important. The present study proposes that Artificial Intelligence Anxiety may reduce employee engagement partly because employees interpret technological transformation as a threat to employment security. Perceived Job Insecurity is therefore positioned as a central psychological mechanism, while Perceived Organizational Support is proposed as a critical organizational resource capable of buffering the negative effects of AI-related anxiety. The model is particularly relevant to the Indian real-estate sector, which is experiencing strong market activity while simultaneously undergoing technological transformation. The latest Indian office-market evidence

demonstrates substantial market momentum, including record Q1 2026 leasing activity reported by JLL. The study therefore advances a central proposition: The success of AI transformation depends not only on technological capability but also on employees' psychological experience of that transformation. Organizations that introduce AI without addressing employee uncertainty may unintentionally undermine engagement. Conversely, organizations that combine AI adoption with training, transparent communication, employee participation and meaningful organizational support may be better positioned to convert technological disruption into sustainable employee and organizational performance.

APA 7 Reference List Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory

- [1] Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- [2] Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- [3] Colliers. (2026). India office snapshot Q1 2026. Colliers – India Office Snapshot Q1 2026
- [4] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- [5] Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- [6] Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398311>
- [7] Jiang, L., & Lavaysse, L. M. (2018). Cognitive and affective job insecurity: A meta-analysis and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2307–2342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318773853>
- [8] Jiang, L., Lawrence, A., & Xu, X. (2022). Does a stick work? Meta-analytic curvilinear relationships between job insecurity and workplace behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(8), 1410–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2652>
- [9] Jiang, L., Xu, X., & Wang, C. (2021). A resources-demands approach to sources of job insecurity: A multilevel meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(2), 108–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000267>
- [10] JLL. (2026). India's office market defies global headwinds with record-breaking 21.5 million sq. ft. leased in Q1 2026. JLL – India Office Market Q1 2026
- [11] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- [12] Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- [13] Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- [14] Wang, Y.-Y., & Wang, Y.-S. (2022). Development and validation of an artificial intelligence anxiety scale: An initial application in predicting motivated learning behavior. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 30(4), 619–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1674887>
- [15] World Economic Forum. (2025). The future of jobs report 2025. World Economic Forum. World Economic Forum – Future of Jobs Report 2025
- [16] Zhang, Y., Liu, X., Yan, Q., & Na, M. (2025).

Empowering workforces in AI-driven environments: Co-skilling, organizational support, and mitigating job insecurity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1700129. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1700129>

- [15] Chen, X. (2025). The impact of AI anxiety on employees' work passion. *Acta Psychologica*.
- [16] Appendix A: Uploaded Preliminary Pulse Survey Instrument Survey response count used in this revised paper: n = 59. The instrument contained demographic/context fields, 22 Likert-type workplace items, one open-ended improvement question, and an employer-recommendation item. Item wording below is reproduced from the uploaded workbook.