

# Eight Functions of Generative AI in Career Guidance: Evidence from Italian Practitioners

Leonardo Evangelista

orientamento.it | l.evangelista@orientamento.it | ORCID: 0009-0009-7855-4023

Working paper, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20088024

---

## Abstract

**Background.** The integration of generative AI tools into career guidance practice raises fundamental questions about how practitioners redistribute their cognitive labour across the core tasks of the guidance process. While survey-based research has begun to map adoption rates and perceived utility, the specific task-level practices of practitioners remain underexplored.

**Aim.** This paper analyses how Italian career guidance practitioners use generative AI tools across the eight functional categories identified in a broader empirical study: Author/Editor, Intelligent Search Engine, Coherence Analyst, Super-Consultant, Sparring Partner, Practitioner Supervisor, Practitioner Trainer, and Intervention Designer. It aims to document the breadth, distribution, and qualitative character of AI use across these functions.

**Method.** The analysis draws on nine semi-structured in-depth interviews with career guidance practitioners from Northern Italy, conducted as part of a mixed-methods empirical study (n=81 questionnaire respondents). All interviews were fully transcribed. Activities described by interviewees were coded and assigned to one of the eight functional categories. A total of 74 coded activities were identified across the nine transcripts.

**Findings.** Functions 1 (Author/Editor) and 3 (Coherence Analyst) show universal adoption (9/9 practitioners) and together account for 59% of all coded activities (43/74). Function 2 (Intelligent Search Engine) is used by 5/9 practitioners. Functions 4 (Super-Consultant) and 6 (Practitioner Supervisor) show selective adoption (4/9 and 5/9 respectively) but generate qualitatively rich accounts. Functions 7 (Practitioner Trainer) and 8 (Intervention Designer) remain marginal. Two usage profiles emerge: intensive users (Op2, Op4, Op9, with 11-15 activities each) who combine textual production with genuinely consultative functions; and minimal users (Op1, Op3, Op5, Op6, with 3-6 activities each) who concentrate on Functions 1 and 3.

**Keywords:** *generative artificial intelligence, career guidance, career counselling, AI functions, co-pilot, co-thinking, practitioner practice, Italy*

---

## 1. Introduction

Research on generative AI in professional practice has increasingly moved beyond questions of adoption towards questions of use: not merely whether practitioners use AI tools, but how, for what tasks, and with what consequences for the structure of professional work. Career guidance is a

particularly instructive case. The guidance process involves a structured sequence of tasks, ranging from the production of application documents to complex processes of competence assessment, occupational matching, and decision support, each of which makes different demands on the practitioner's expertise and cognitive engagement.

This paper analyses the task-level use of generative AI tools by Italian career guidance practitioners, drawing on nine in-depth interviews conducted as part of a broader mixed-methods empirical study (Evangelista, 2026). The analysis is organised around a taxonomy of eight functions developed from an examination of what generative AI tools are technically capable of in a guidance context, and tested against the practitioners' own accounts of their practice.

The eight functions are: (1) Author/Editor, covering the production and revision of application documents; (2) Intelligent Search Engine, covering targeted retrieval and integrated synthesis of occupational, sectoral, and labour market information; (3) Coherence Analyst, covering the matching of competence profiles to occupational requirements; (4) Super-Consultant, covering decision support for complex professional and career choices; (5) Sparring Partner, covering the simulation of selection interviews; (6) Practitioner Supervisor, covering the reflective review of the practitioner's own work; (7) Practitioner Trainer, covering the development of the practitioner's professional competencies; and (8) Intervention Designer, covering the design of guidance materials and instruments.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 situates the analysis within relevant literature. Section 3 describes the methodology. Section 4 presents the distribution of coded activities across functions and practitioners. Sections 5 through 12 examine each function in turn, with reference to practitioners' direct testimony. Section 13 discusses the implications of the findings.

## 2. Background

Pandya and Wang (2024), in a scoping review of 101 publications on AI in career development, identify a double-edged dynamic: AI tools streamline career development processes and extend the reach of services, while simultaneously generating concerns about job insecurity, algorithmic bias, data privacy, and over-reliance on automated outputs. Bankins et al. (2024), in a systematic interdisciplinary review of AI across career stages, map these dynamics from school through to established workers, noting that AI literacy for practising professionals remains significantly underresearched.

Hughes et al. (2024), in a Jisc-funded study on large language models in higher education careers provision, find that generative AI tools remain under-used in careers services relative to other sectors. Their survey data show that careers professionals are cautiously open to AI-assisted support for bounded, information-based tasks, but consistently resistant to AI involvement in personalised, relational, or long-term guidance. This distinction between tasks for which AI is seen as appropriate and tasks for which it is not resonates directly with the functional taxonomy developed in this paper.

The Italian context adds specificity. The national career guidance system is characterised by institutional diversity: public employment centres (Centri per l'Impiego), private outplacement firms, university orientation services, and third-sector organisations operate under different structural conditions, with varying time constraints, client profiles, and professional cultures. However, the interview sample analysed in this paper does not include practitioners working directly inside public employment centres; it mainly covers practitioners working in private employment agencies, training agencies, HR firms, and freelance practice. This diversity shapes the conditions under which practitioners encounter and adopt generative AI, and produces variation in usage patterns that the present analysis seeks to document.

### 3. Methodology

The data presented in this paper derive from nine semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted as part of a larger mixed-methods study on generative AI integration in Italian career guidance practice (Evangelista, 2026). The broader study employed three instruments: an online questionnaire (n=81 practitioners), nine in-depth interviews, and a post-interview quantitative evaluation questionnaire administered to seven of the nine interviewees.

The nine interviewees were recruited through purposive sampling, with two selection criteria: active practice of career guidance counselling, and existing use of generative AI tools in their professional practice. Recruitment relied on the author's professional network and on voluntary responses to calls circulated via LinkedIn and email. All were practitioners from Northern Italy. Interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes, were conducted remotely, audio-recorded with participants' consent, fully transcribed, reviewed, and anonymised. The interview guide included a specific section inviting practitioners to describe their use of generative AI tools in their daily practice, task by task.

All activities described by interviewees were extracted from the transcripts and coded against the eight-function taxonomy. The taxonomy was developed by the author from a task analysis of career guidance practice and an examination of the capabilities of generative AI tools described in technical and professional sources, as presented in Chapter 1 of the full study. Coding was conducted by the author. The full coded dataset (74 activities, 9 interviewees) is available in the supplementary materials of the full volume. In this paper, interviewees are referred to as Op1 through Op9. All quotations are translated from Italian by the author.

### 4. Distribution of Activities across Functions and Practitioners

The systematic coding of all nine interview transcripts produced 74 activities distributed across the eight functions. Table 1 shows the distribution by practitioner and function.

*Table 1. Distribution of coded activities by practitioner and function (number of citations).*

Op.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Tot.
Op1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Op2	3	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	12
Op3	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
Op4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
Op5	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	5
Op6	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Op7	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	9
Op8	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	8
Op9	3	5	3	0	1	1	1	1	15
<b>Tot.</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>74</b>

*Legend: 1=Author/Editor; 2=Intelligent Search Engine; 3=Coherence Analyst; 4=Super-Consultant; 5=Sparring Partner; 6=Practitioner Supervisor; 7=Practitioner Trainer; 8=Intervention Designer.*

Functions 1 and 3 show universal adoption (9/9 practitioners) and together account for 59% of all coded activities (43/74). Function 2 is present in 5/9 practitioners. Functions 4 through 8 show progressively more selective adoption. Two usage profiles are identifiable. Intensive users (Op2, Op4, Op9) generate 11-15 activities each and use both textual production functions and genuinely consultative ones. Lower-intensity users (Op1, Op3, Op5, Op6) generate 3-7 activities each and concentrate on Functions 1 and 3. Op7 and Op8 occupy an intermediate position.

These patterns suggest that the integration of generative AI into guidance practice proceeds through a common entry point (document production and competence matching) and differentiates thereafter according to the practitioner's professional orientation, institutional context, and willingness to extend AI use into the relational and reflective dimensions of practice.

## **5. Function 1: Author/Editor (27 citations, 9/9 practitioners)**

This function covers the production, reformulation, and revision of application documents: CVs, cover letters, LinkedIn profiles, competence reports, and bilanci di competenze. It is the most frequently cited function (36% of all coded activities) and the only one used by all nine practitioners.

### **5.1 CV optimisation and ATS alignment**

Op7 describes the dominant approach concisely:

*"I use AI for CV and LinkedIn profile optimisation, to make them effective with ATS systems. I stress that this is not about 'inventing' things in the CV, but about highlighting the personal characteristics that are relevant to a specific job advertisement, finding the most appropriate keywords."*

Op2 describes a more complex process that combines multiple source documents:

*"Together with the competence assessment I also have the CV examined; I use all the tools I have, including any assessments already completed. I put together the European CV and the competence assessment and ask it to insert professional achievements according to the challenge/action/result formula, and ask it to create a much more complete CV with a more developed storytelling dimension."*

### **5.2 LinkedIn profiles and tone of voice**

Op2 emphasises the importance of stylistic personalisation:

*"The professional profiles you read on LinkedIn are often quite uninspiring. Much better storytelling comes out when you change not so much the content, but the tone of voice. Writing the CV of a 25-year-old is one thing; writing the CV of a 50-year-old manager is another."*

Op3 maintains a clear boundary between AI revision and authentic authorship:

*"I use AI only for revision; they can perhaps have their tone of voice improved, their errors corrected and so on, but the first draft must always be written by hand, because the message must have the person's own tone of voice."*

### **5.3 Competence assessment reports**

Op1 uses AI for the most routine cases:

*"For the more repetitive cases, those with very basic profiles, where the competence report is a sort of repetition of the CV, if I give the CV to AI and ask it to produce a competence report, AI manages to produce something good, acceptable, and it saves me some working time."*

Op3 emphasises the time saving in the drafting phase:

*"The advantage is that writing the report would take me a huge amount of time; instead, AI writes it for me. Instead of spending a day's work on it (we are talking about roughly twenty pages of report), with AI it takes me two or three hours maximum."*

The Author/Editor function represents the most consolidated integration of AI into guidance practice: all nine practitioners use it, the time savings are concrete and universally recognised, and the practitioner's role shifts from drafter to director and quality controller. The distinction Op3 draws between AI revision and AI authorship, with human first-draft as a non-negotiable principle, captures a boundary that several practitioners maintain.

## **6. Function 2: Intelligent Search Engine (13 citations, 5/9 practitioners)**

This function covers targeted retrieval and integrated synthesis of information about occupations, labour market sectors, training opportunities, and specific companies. Unlike conventional search engines, which return lists of pages that the practitioner must then read and assemble, generative AI tools produce an integrated, contextualised response: a qualitative step that Op9 and Op2 both note explicitly. It is used by 5/9 practitioners and accounts for 18% of coded activities.

Op1 describes a selective use determined by the limits of existing expertise:

*"We are in an area oriented towards metalworking, but occasionally someone arrives with a slightly more particular profile, a bit more senior. With AI I manage to find training courses, to find slightly more specific profiles and also job vacancies. For those sectors and professional profiles that I know well, I do not use it for the moment."*

Op9 highlights the advantage over conventional search:

*"I used it as if it were a very efficient search engine compared to Google: you save time, you ask what you want and you receive a much more immediate answer."*

Op2 demonstrates a more strategically sophisticated use, in preparation for specific selection interviews:

*"If my client has to attend an interview with a company, I ask AI to research the company, the market, the competitors, the SWOT analysis and so on. [...] I also ask it to explain its reasoning: Give me the references. Tell me where you found this. And sometimes it produces studies I did not know. I read them and think: Wow! I would never have found them on my own."*

The Intelligent Search Engine function extends the practitioner's informational reach, particularly for less familiar sectors or profiles. Its selective adoption (5/9) suggests that practitioners with well-consolidated sector knowledge have less incentive to use AI for this function.

## **7. Function 3: Coherence Analyst (16 citations, 9/9 practitioners)**

This function covers the matching of a client's competence profile to occupational requirements, the identification of transferable competences, and the analysis of gaps between current profile and target occupations. It is used by all nine practitioners and accounts for 22% of coded activities.

### 7.1 Occupational matching

Op3 describes the benefit for less familiar professional areas:

*"I know professional roles in my sector fairly well, but thanks to AI I can also identify different roles, something else the person could do in the sector or outside it. So I manage to be much more precise."*

Op2 emphasises the granularity that AI makes possible:

*"AI can break down a single job title into sub-professions. For example, it does not just say: Be a programmer, but: Be a programmer in this specific language, because from what I can see you have significant potential in that area."*

Op9, a junior practitioner with less than two years of experience, describes AI as compensating for limited occupational knowledge:

*"I have verified that with ChatGPT my competence assessments come out better; bear in mind that I have no specific training in competence assessment, I learned to do them as a self-taught practitioner. I inserted a description of a person's competences and asked what work they could do. This is a great help for me because I have limited knowledge of the labour market and of all the occupations that exist. It is especially useful for complex cases, for example a client who for twenty years was a metalworker and now wants to change sector completely."*

### 7.2 Gap analysis and annunci

Op3 uses AI to systematically evaluate the distance between a client's profile and a specific job advertisement:

*"With job advertisements, if I upload the competence assessment to AI, the response to the advertisement will be much more effective. The first question I ask AI is: What does this person already have and what is missing? And then also: How can they improve their profile?"*

Op9 highlights the value for career change:

*"I use it for competence assessments where I get a lot of help, especially when the person intends to change sector. In that case it is very useful for identifying transferable competences and then possible compensatory interventions, meaning training courses."*

The Coherence Analyst function, alongside the Author/Editor function, constitutes the stable core of AI integration in guidance practice. Its universal adoption reflects the fact that competence-to-occupation matching is both central to guidance work and, in its initial mapping phase, well suited to AI capabilities. Practitioners consistently position AI as expanding their reach into unfamiliar occupational territories while retaining their own judgement as the final arbiter.

## 8. Function 4: Super-Consultant (4 citations, 4/9 practitioners)

This function covers decision support for complex professional choices, including career change, self-employment, and business planning. It is used by 4/9 practitioners and accounts for 5% of coded activities, but generates qualitatively significant testimony.

Op2 describes a case of entrepreneurial counselling:

*"He wanted to open a laundry, a laundry and cleaning service. We gave the idea to Monday [a version of ChatGPT]. It is practically a complete consultancy in fifteen minutes: it tells you how many similar businesses there are, how his would position itself relative to others, what the difficulties of entering that market would be. It produced a business plan for opening the laundry."*

Op7 describes the exploration of a niche creative professional profile:

*"Together, thanks to AI, we explored how this competence [ZBrush/3D modelling] could be transformed into a professional activity, and we also developed some spontaneous applications. During the research we discovered that there are museums that use miniatures of places or temporary set designs: a concrete opportunity to propose oneself with personalised creations."*

The Super-Consultant function reveals the capacity of generative AI to support genuinely exploratory consultative processes, particularly for niche or non-standard profiles where the practitioner's existing knowledge is insufficient and where the space of possibilities needs to be opened before it can be evaluated. Its selective adoption suggests that not all practitioners are yet comfortable using AI in this more open-ended consultative mode.

## **9. Function 5: Sparring Partner (4 citations, 4/9 practitioners)**

This function covers the simulation of selection interviews, including the generation of interview questions, the provision of feedback on practice responses, and, in one case, the simulation of written examination preparation.

Op2 describes a structured simulation process:

*"I have simulations of interviews done. I give AI the job description, the LinkedIn profile of the person who will conduct the interview, and I say: Create a 30-minute interview with questions that go in depth to understand whether I am interesting for this job. I have the questions and answers simulated [referring to the client]. I also get an evaluation of how effective the response is and therefore how to improve it."*

Op4 highlights the pedagogical value of a non-judgemental interlocutor:

*"Job interview simulations, including vocal practice with ChatGPT at the vocal level, involve clients enormously. The client immediately feels the benefit of not being judged, of being able to make mistakes, and of having ideas for how to respond."*

Op5 uses AI to generate the questions for the simulation rather than to conduct it:

*"I get AI to prepare questions for the interview practice that I then conduct with my client, starting from a job advertisement. Obviously I already have my own material for all the questions, but GPT is also very useful."*

Op9 extends the function to academic examination preparation:

*"Something I did in the presence of a client a few weeks ago was to create an examination simulation. Specifically, this client of mine is doing a course to become a*

*personal trainer. He has a theoretical anatomy exam at the end of the year. So I had GPT prepare five different examination papers. It took me half an hour."*

The Sparring Partner function illustrates the capacity of AI to serve as a safe practice environment: the absence of judgement, noted explicitly by Op4, is pedagogically significant. The extension to examination preparation (Op9) indicates that the function is not limited to job search contexts.

## **10. Function 6: Practitioner Supervisor (5 citations, 5/9 practitioners)**

This function covers the use of AI as a source of external perspective on the practitioner's own work: reviewing competence assessments, identifying blind spots, and providing metacognitive feedback. For practitioners working in professional isolation, it represents a genuinely novel form of supervision.

Op2 describes the function explicitly:

*"When there is a competence assessment already completed with another consultant, I use AI because it is faster. I give the assessment to AI and ask it to expand on things I am not seeing from the questions I am asking. What am I not seeing? What is the pattern that I am not seeing relative to what you can see? Often very interesting responses come out. AI is a super-consultant of the consultant."*

Op3 frames it as a form of professional learning:

*"When I do a competence assessment I analyse it and make a Word file of analysis. Then I write to AI: I have analysed the assessment and for me the person is this and this; tell me what you think, whether there are aspects I have not considered. This is a way of learning for me, because working alone I have no one to supervise me. Now with AI I have a mentor who checks my work and says: Look, you missed this, it gives me a double check."*

Op4 uses the function for brainstorming on complex cases:

*"I do brainstorming with AI. For example, with reference to a specific candidate, I can ask: How could this person improve their competences? Or ask it to do a SWOT analysis, or ask for ideas for starting an entrepreneurial activity."*

Op8 uses it to generate follow-up tasks from session notes:

*"I tell GPT: These are my notes from the session, this is what we discussed. Produce concrete assignments for the person."*

Beyond technical supervision, the interviews document a further dimension of this function: the reduction of professional anxiety.

Op9, a junior practitioner with less than two years of experience, describes:

*"When the professional level is high I tend to use AI because I feel less secure, I know less about that profession, there is also an emotional dimension involved: I am young, and so in those cases I feel more confident if I rely on AI."*

Op4 describes a qualitatively different use, in cases involving emotionally distressing client situations:

*"Sometimes there are people with problems in front of which I feel embarrassed. For example, when they tell you about a serious condition, an illness of a certain kind,*

*and I do not know how to speak. I do not know how to use the language. It is difficult to get guidance from a colleague too, because when you talk to a colleague 90% of the time they say I had an uncle like that, but that is a different thing. I ask AI literally how to speak to this person, how to make them feel that our work has value, how not to let the emotion that comes through in the voice when something is being described show, when I see that this person is not well."*

Op4 then describes the effect of this interaction:

*"You can have a comforting yet serene and lucid dialogue with AI. You could do it with another human being, but with AI it gives me a security, new, a feeling I did not know, despite having friends since childhood. This sense of security is a completely new sensation that I cannot even describe well. I genuinely do not know how to describe it: it is precisely a feeling of support."*

The Practitioner Supervisor function addresses a structural gap in Italian career guidance practice: the limited availability of formal supervision, particularly for freelance practitioners and junior professionals. Its adoption by 5/9 practitioners, combined with the qualitative depth of the testimony, suggests that this function, though still selective, carries significant professional implications.

## **11. Function 7: Practitioner Trainer (3 citations, 3/9 practitioners)**

This function covers the use of AI as a device for the ongoing development of the practitioner's own professional competencies, whether in communication, methodology, or domain knowledge. It is marginal in quantitative terms but generates testimony of considerable interest.

Op3 uses AI to improve her own empathic communication:

*"I think AI has an enormous level of empathy and it can teach us. I use it to review certain responses and AI tells me: Here you were not very empathic. It helps me enormously."*

Op4 describes a systematic practice of stylistic learning through comparative prompting:

*"AI teaches you the nuances of language. It gets you used to being clear in what you want to communicate. I learned a lot using the style function in Claude: How would Oscar Wilde have said this, Einstein, Umberto Eco, and how do I usually say it? Because you can also upload your own style. And then AI is very useful for competence assessment. The official Lombardy model is extremely concise, and it was AI that helped me understand how to produce a good competence assessment while staying within the constraints of a rigid output format."*

Op9, self-taught in competence assessment, describes informal learning through practice:

*"I have verified that with ChatGPT my competence assessments come out better; bear in mind that I have no specific training in competence assessment, I learned to do them as a self-taught practitioner."*

The Practitioner Trainer function blurs the boundary between using AI and learning from it: the learning is not formal or intentional in all cases, but emerges from the practice of prompting, evaluating, and adapting AI outputs. This accords with theories of incidental learning in professional contexts.

## 12. Function 8: Intervention Designer (2 citations, 2/9 practitioners)

This function covers the design of guidance instruments, questionnaires, and structured activities for use in guidance sessions. It is the least frequently cited function (3% of coded activities) and is used by only 2/9 practitioners.

Op4 describes its use for competence mapping tools:

*"In guidance it is very useful for competence mapping: for example, I create questions or questionnaires that can help me go deeper."*

Op9 describes a more extended process of instrument development:

*"For example, in one case I created in back office an orientative questionnaire, non-diagnostic, because the client wanted to verify whether they had leadership qualities. It took me several days, but in the end I managed to produce a questionnaire divided into five sections with ten questions each, designed to investigate leadership, and I did that."*

The Intervention Designer function represents the most advanced integration of AI into professional practice: rather than using AI to support individual guidance tasks, the practitioner uses it to design the tools through which guidance is delivered. Its marginal adoption may reflect both the higher technical sophistication required and the more diffuse benefit, distributed across future sessions rather than immediately visible.

## 13. Discussion

The distribution of 74 coded activities across eight functions and nine practitioners reveals a clear structural pattern. Functions 1 and 3, document production and competence matching, constitute the stable entry point of AI integration in Italian career guidance practice. Their universal adoption and high share of total activities (59%) suggest that AI integration begins with tasks that are time-consuming, relatively structured, and easier to delegate or support through AI without deeply modifying the practitioner-client relationship.

The more selective adoption of Functions 4 through 8 reflects a different logic. These functions involve AI in genuinely consultative, reflective, or developmental processes, where the practitioner's professional judgement, relational attunement, and contextual knowledge remain central. Their adoption is differentiated by the practitioner's willingness to experiment with AI beyond bounded and structured tasks.

The contrast between intensive users (Op2, Op4, Op9) and minimal users (Op1, Op3, Op5, Op6) is instructive. Intensive users are not characterised by greater technical confidence alone; they are characterised by a different conceptual framing of what AI can be in a guidance relationship. Op2's formulation, 'a super-consultant of the consultant', Op3's formulation of AI as a mentor who checks her work, and Op9's description of AI as a source of security in professionally unfamiliar territory, all position AI as a cognitive partner rather than a tool. This distinction maps directly onto the co-pilot/co-thinking axis developed in the broader study.

The Practitioner Supervisor function (Function 6) deserves particular attention. Its adoption by 5/9 practitioners, combined with testimony describing AI as filling the structural absence of formal supervision for freelance and junior practitioners, suggests that this function addresses a genuine unmet need in Italian career guidance. The emotional dimension documented in Op4's testimony, where AI provides a space for processing the practitioner's own emotional responses to difficult

client situations, adds a dimension that goes beyond technical assistance and that has significant implications for professional wellbeing and ethics.

## 14. Connection to the Broader Study and Further Materials

This paper draws on material from: Evangelista, L. (2026). *Tra Mercurio e Virgilio: l'integrazione dell'intelligenza artificiale generativa nella consulenza di orientamento. Un'indagine empirica sugli operatori italiani*. Amazon KDP. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19855951>

The full study presents: a review of national and international literature on AI in guidance and professional practice; a survey of 81 Italian practitioners; nine in-depth interviews, including the full coded dataset of 74 activities; a post-interview quantitative evaluation questionnaire; and an extended analysis of the co-pilot/co-thinking distinction and of practitioners' metaphors for AI.

The full research volume (in Italian) is available at: <https://www.orientamento.it/intelligenza-artificiale-e-orientamento-professionale-una-ricerca-sugli-operatori-italiani/>

Additional materials related to this study, including an executive report, translated practitioner testimonies, and a paper on practitioner metaphors for AI, are freely available at: <https://www.orientamento.it/generative-ai-in-career-guidance-practice-evidence-from-italian-practitioners/>

The author welcomes correspondence from researchers working on related questions.

## References

Bankins, S., Jooss, S., Restubog, S. L. D., Marrone, M., Ocampo, A. C., & Shoss, M. (2024). Navigating career stages in the age of artificial intelligence: A systematic interdisciplinary review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 153, 104011.

Evangelista, L. (2026). *Tra Mercurio e Virgilio: l'integrazione dell'intelligenza artificiale generativa nella consulenza di orientamento. Un'indagine empirica sugli operatori italiani*. Amazon KDP. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19855951>

Hughes, D., Percy, C., & Tolond, C. (2024). LLMs for HE careers provision: A Jisc-funded study to scope careers chatbots incorporating the latest generative AI advancements in large language models for use within the higher education student support ecosystem. CareerChat UK / Arden University.

Pandya, S. S., & Wang, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence in career development: a scoping review. *Human Resource Development International*, 27(3), 324-344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2024.2336881>