

Emerging Technologies and Innovation: A Structured Literature Review of Organizational, Economic, Educational, Sustainability, and Governance Impacts

¹Megat Muhammad Ridzuan*, ¹Muhammad Bin Amran, ¹Muhammad Faris Ezany, ²Muhammad Iqbal Mustakim Zainun, ²Siti Nursaadah Zolkifli, ²Nurul Fatiehah Assyikin Mohd Syukri, ²Nabila Arshad, ²Mohamad Ali Hakim Mohd Khalid, ²Farah Nur Aliah Abdul Halim, ²Puteri Umaira Haslizam

¹Fakulti Kecerdasan Buatan dan Keselamatan Siber, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Hang Tuah Jaya, 76100 Durian Tunggal, Melaka, Malaysia

²Business Technology Section, Universiti Kuala Lumpur, Malaysian Spanish Institute Kulim Hi-Tech Park, 09000 Kulim, Kedah, Malaysia.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800846>

Received: 02 September 2026; Accepted: 07 September 2026; Published: 18 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines how emerging digital technologies shape innovation across organizational, economic, educational, sustainability, and governance contexts. The manuscript is redesigned as a structured integrative literature review rather than a case study. A bounded review corpus was reconstructed from 17 sources identified during preliminary scoping, followed by bibliographic verification and targeted supplementation for underrepresented domains. One unverifiable record was excluded and six peer-reviewed studies were added, producing a final analytical corpus of 22 substantive studies published from 2021 to 2025, together with one methodological guide. The synthesis is organized around six themes: technological drivers of innovation; organizational and leadership enablers; economic and business-model outcomes; educational transformation; sustainability; and ethical and regulatory challenges. The evidence indicates that artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, big data, blockchain, and metaverse technologies can expand innovation capacity, but their effects are conditional on complementary organizational capabilities, data quality, skills, governance, and institutional context. Evidence is strongest for AI-enabled innovation, digital transformation, and IoT-supported efficiency, while blockchain and metaverse research remains comparatively less mature and more context-specific. Education 4.0 studies emphasize active learning and digital technologies, but rigorous evidence of long-term learning outcomes remains limited. Sustainability benefits are plausible but must be assessed against energy, infrastructure, security, and lifecycle costs. The review contributes an integrated framework that treats technology as an innovation enabler whose value depends on organizational, social, and governance conditions rather than as an automatic source of performance gains.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Internet of Things; Blockchain; Big Data; Business Model Innovation; Education 4.0; Sustainability; AI Governance.

INTRODUCTION

Innovation is more than the adoption of a new technology. It is a process through which ideas, capabilities, and resources are transformed into new or improved products, services, processes, organizational arrangements, or business models. This distinction matters because technology is an artifact or capability, whereas innovation concerns the creation and implementation of value in a specific social and organizational context (Blok, 2021). Strategic technology and innovation management therefore requires attention to both technological opportunities and the individual, organizational, and institutional mechanisms that convert those opportunities into outcomes (Palmié et al., 2023).

The rapid diffusion of Industry 4.0 technologies has intensified this relationship. Prior reviews show that artificial intelligence (AI), connected systems, automation, and data-intensive technologies can affect productivity, organizational design, sustainability, and policy, but the evidence is distributed across disciplines and levels of analysis (Cannavacciuolo et al., 2023). AI research, for example, links adoption to economic, technological, and social antecedents and to competitive, organizational, and innovation outcomes (Mariani et al., 2023). Internet of Things (IoT) technologies support tracking, monitoring, optimization, and design evolution in circular and resource-efficient business models, while also introducing interoperability, security, and investment constraints (Ding et al., 2023). Blockchain can alter transaction structures and value creation through decentralization, transparency, and new forms of coordination, although the maturity and generalizability of blockchain-based business models remain uneven (Taherdoost & Madanchian, 2023). Big data, cloud computing, robotics, and IoT adoption have also been associated with innovation-related revenues in European firms, but outcomes differ substantially across countries and institutional settings (Vărzaru & Bocean, 2024).

The same technologies increasingly shape business models, education, and public governance. Metaverse research illustrates how incumbent firms can combine physical and virtual value propositions, but evidence based on a small number of cross-industry cases should not be generalized as if it represented a universal business pattern (Mancuso et al., 2023). Education 4.0 scholarship identifies AI, IoT, virtual laboratories, blockchain, and active learning as important elements of digital educational transformation, while also noting the concentration of evidence in higher education and engineering (de Souza & Debs, 2024). Ethical concerns have become equally important: systematic work on AI ethics identifies recurring issues associated with both system design and human-AI interaction, including fairness, transparency, privacy, accountability, and responsibility (Giarmoleo et al., 2024).

The literature is therefore broad but fragmented. Many studies describe individual technologies or contexts without clarifying how technological capabilities interact with organizational enablers, economic outcomes, educational practices, sustainability goals, and governance constraints. This review addresses that fragmentation by asking four research questions:

- RQ1: What technological capabilities of AI, IoT, big data, blockchain, and metaverse technologies are most consistently associated with innovation?
- RQ2: Which organizational, leadership, and institutional conditions enable or constrain the conversion of technology into innovation outcomes?
- RQ3: What economic, business-model, educational, and sustainability outcomes are reported, and how strong is the supporting evidence?
- RQ4: What ethical, regulatory, and methodological gaps remain unresolved across the reviewed domains?

By organizing evidence around these questions, the paper replaces technology-by-technology description with a comparative thematic synthesis. It also distinguishes robust findings from context-dependent claims and identifies where additional empirical research is needed.

REVIEW DESIGN AND METHODS

Review design and scope

The study adopts a structured integrative literature-review design. This design was selected because the objective is to compare and synthesize heterogeneous evidence across management, technology, education, sustainability, and governance rather than to estimate a pooled effect size. The approach follows the principle that a rigorous review should make its design choices, retrieval logic, selection criteria, and synthesis procedure explicit (Sauer & Seuring, 2023). The review does not claim exhaustive coverage of every publication on emerging technologies and innovation; instead, it reconstructs a transparent and auditable corpus suitable for critical synthesis. The review period was bounded to 2021-2025 in order to emphasize

current evidence on rapidly changing digital technologies. English-language scholarly publications were considered when they directly addressed at least one focal technology or a cross-cutting mechanism linking technology to innovation, business-model change, education, sustainability, ethics, or governance. Review articles, empirical studies, conceptual studies, and formal conference papers were eligible because the research questions span domains with different methodological traditions.

Corpus reconstruction, search strings, and screening

The corpus was developed in two stages. First, 17 sources identified during preliminary scoping were inventoried and checked against journal, publisher, and DOI metadata. Records with incomplete bibliographic information were corrected where verifiable. One record, originally listed only as “C. Halim et al., Journal of Technology Global,” could not be reliably matched to an identifiable publication and was excluded rather than retained as an unverifiable citation. Second, targeted supplementary searches were used to strengthen themes that were underrepresented in the preliminary corpus, especially AI-enabled innovation, IoT and circular business models, blockchain-based business models, AI ethics, AI-driven business-model innovation, and AI governance. Publisher indexes and open scholarly metadata services were used for discovery and verification, including ScienceDirect, MDPI, Wiley Online Library, SpringerLink, PubMed, and OpenAlex.

The targeted searches used combinations of the following reproducible strings: (“artificial intelligence” OR AI) AND innovation AND (organization* OR “business model”); (“Internet of Things” OR IoT) AND innovation AND (business OR sustainability OR “circular business model”); blockchain AND (“business model innovation” OR innovation); and (“artificial intelligence” AND ethics) OR (“AI governance”). Searches were limited to the review period and to English-language scholarly records. Because the study is a structured integrative review rather than a systematic review, these strings are reported to support transparency and replication but are not used to claim exhaustive retrieval of all matching records.

Table 1. Review protocol and selection logic

Element	Protocol used in this review
Purpose	Critical synthesis of the relationship between emerging technologies and innovation across organizational, economic, educational, sustainability, and governance contexts.
Period	2021-2025.
Initial corpus	17 scholarly records identified during preliminary scoping.
Supplementation	Targeted searches for underrepresented technology and governance themes; six additional peer-reviewed studies added.
Inclusion criteria	English; scholarly publication; verifiable bibliographic metadata; direct relevance to technology and innovation or a focal cross-cutting outcome; within the review period.
Exclusion criteria	Duplicate records; non-scholarly promotional material; weak topical relevance; unverifiable publication identity; sources outside the period unless methodologically necessary.
Screening	Title/abstract relevance check followed by full-record or full-text verification where available.
Quality appraisal	Methodological transparency, relevance to the research questions, evidentiary strength, bibliographic verifiability, and appropriateness of generalization.
Final corpus	22 substantive studies plus one methodological guide. Weaker descriptive sources were used only as contextual evidence and not as sole support for broad claims.

Quality assessment and synthesis procedure

Quality assessment was qualitative rather than a single numerical risk-of-bias score because the corpus includes systematic reviews, scoping reviews, survey research, conceptual analyses, qualitative studies, conference papers, and case-based work. Each source was assessed for methodological transparency, direct relevance to the research questions, strength of evidence, bibliographic verifiability, and the scope within which its conclusions could reasonably be generalized. Higher-weight evidence came from well-documented systematic or scoping reviews and empirical studies with explicit samples and analytic procedures. Descriptive or narrowly contextual sources were retained only where they added a distinct perspective and were not used as the sole basis for general claims.

The synthesis used thematic coding. Findings were grouped into six themes: (1) technological drivers of innovation; (2) organizational and leadership enablers; (3) economic and business-model outcomes; (4) educational transformation; (5) sustainability; and (6) ethical and regulatory challenges. Within each theme, studies were compared for convergence, disagreement, contextual variation, methodological limitations, and unresolved gaps. This procedure shifts the analysis from source-by-source paraphrase toward cross-study interpretation.

THEMATIC SYNTHESIS AND FINDINGS

Technological drivers of innovation: AI, IoT, big data, blockchain, and metaverse

Across the corpus, the strongest common finding is that emerging technologies expand the range of actions that organizations can perform, but they do not generate innovation automatically. AI contributes to innovation through prediction, pattern recognition, automation, personalization, and knowledge discovery. A large systematic review of AI and innovation research shows that adoption is influenced by economic, technological, and social conditions and that outcomes extend beyond product innovation to organizational and competitive effects (Mariani et al., 2023). More recent work on AI-driven business-model innovation similarly finds a rapidly expanding but fragmented field, with technology often studied more extensively than the organizational process through which business models actually change (Jorzik et al., 2024). The convergence between these studies suggests that AI should be treated as an enabling capability whose value depends on complementary resources and managerial choices, not as an independent causal driver.

IoT evidence is more operationally specific. IoT capabilities such as monitoring, tracking, optimization, and design evolution can support circular and service-oriented business models by making physical assets and resource flows more observable (Ding et al., 2023). However, these benefits are accompanied by cybersecurity exposure, interoperability problems, hardware and software energy consumption, and investment requirements. These constraints qualify overly positive claims about IoT-enabled sustainability. The same logic applies to big data and cloud technologies. Evidence from European firms associates several digital technologies with innovation-related turnover and process innovation, but the magnitude of the relationship varies across national economic and institutional conditions (Vărzaru & Bocean, 2024). Consequently, digital infrastructure and data availability appear necessary but insufficient; absorptive capacity and institutional context shape whether data-intensive technologies translate into measurable innovation outcomes.

Blockchain receives less empirical attention than AI or IoT, despite being frequently included in broad discussions of emerging technology. Systematic review evidence indicates that blockchain can support new business models through decentralization, transparency, traceability, programmable transactions, and reduced reliance on intermediaries (Taherdoost & Madanchian, 2023). Yet the literature remains uneven across sectors, and many proposed benefits depend on governance design, network participation, regulatory clarity, and economic feasibility. The technology should therefore be discussed with greater analytical balance: it creates distinctive coordination mechanisms, but evidence of sustained performance advantage is not yet as mature as the evidence surrounding broader digital transformation.

Metaverse technologies represent an even earlier stage of business-model experimentation. The four cases analyzed by Mancuso et al. (2023), involving Gucci, Samsung, Hyundai, and Nike, show how incumbent

firms can create “phygital” combinations of physical and virtual value or develop fully virtual interactions around identity, community, and customer engagement. These examples are informative but bounded. They demonstrate possible mechanisms rather than population-level effects, and they should not be treated as a case study conducted by the present review. Their value lies in illustrating how new technological environments can alter value creation and capture, while their limitation is weak generalizability beyond the selected firms and platform conditions.

Organizational and leadership enablers

Technological opportunity becomes innovation only when organizations develop the capacity to select, integrate, and use it. Microfoundation research emphasizes that firm-level innovation outcomes emerge from the actions and interactions of organizational members, including autonomy, collaboration, motivation, and the alignment of strategic and operational decisions (Palmié et al., 2023). This perspective helps explain why identical technologies can produce very different outcomes across organizations. Leadership therefore matters less as a generic call for “supporting innovation” and more as a mechanism for allocating resources, defining decision rights, building psychological safety, coordinating experimentation, and integrating learning into routines.

Evidence on technology acquisition reinforces this conditional interpretation. Reviews of technology mergers and acquisitions report both positive and negative innovation effects (Suo et al., 2023). Acquisitions can provide access to external knowledge and technological resources, but integration problems, cultural incompatibility, and weak post-acquisition coordination can offset these gains. This is consistent with studies of entrepreneurship and information technology, which describe IT as a means to improve operations, market reach, customer interaction, and product development but rely mainly on qualitative secondary evidence (Sutrisno et al., 2023). Taken together, the literature rejects a simple “more technology equals more innovation” relationship. Organizational culture, complementary skills, integration capability, and the quality of managerial coordination mediate the effect.

Economic and business-model outcomes

The economic literature generally reports positive associations between digitalization and innovation performance, but causal certainty is limited. Vărzaru and Bocean (2024) find that AI, big data, cloud computing, robots, and IoT are associated with innovation-related turnover among European enterprises, while also showing heterogeneity across countries. This result is important because it shifts the discussion from technology presence to context-sensitive financial outcomes. By contrast, literature-based studies of entrepreneurial growth and marketing describe how IT can broaden market reach, support customer engagement, and enable new forms of value creation (Suherlan & Okombo, 2023; Sutrisno et al., 2023), but their designs provide weaker evidence for estimating the magnitude of these effects.

Business-model innovation is a recurring mechanism linking technology to economic outcomes. AI can reshape value propositions, internal processes, revenue logic, and customer relationships, although the AI-driven business-model literature remains conceptually fragmented (Jorzik et al., 2024). Blockchain can support new coordination and transaction arrangements (Taherdoost & Madanchian, 2023), while the metaverse creates new opportunities for virtual goods, communities, and combined physical-digital experiences (Mancuso et al., 2023).

Technology M&A provides another route to capability acquisition, but the inconsistent evidence on post-acquisition innovation (Suo et al., 2023) shows that access to technology does not guarantee successful commercialization. Across these studies, the most defensible conclusion is that emerging technologies enlarge the design space for business models; performance depends on execution, complementarity, customer acceptance, and institutional conditions.

Educational transformation and Education 4.0

Education 4.0 research shows a similar pattern of technological promise combined with uneven outcome evidence. A scoping review of 528 documents identifies AI, IoT, virtual laboratories, augmented and virtual reality, robotics, blockchain, blended learning, e-learning, and gamification as recurring components of Education 4.0 (de Souza & Debs, 2024). Its breadth provides strong evidence that these technologies and pedagogical approaches are prominent in the field, but the review also notes that research is concentrated in higher education and engineering and that a large share of the literature has limited citation impact. Thus, prevalence of a technology in the literature should not be interpreted as proof of educational effectiveness.

Other educational sources describe increased access to information, richer multimedia interaction, and greater flexibility in teaching and learning (Muradov, 2024; Murodov, 2023; Resuli, 2022). However, these studies are largely descriptive and provide less rigorous evidence on long-term learning outcomes, equity, teacher workload, or transfer of learning. Their contribution is therefore contextual rather than causal. A stronger synthesis is that digital tools can enable interactive, personalized, and flexible learning environments, but their educational value depends on pedagogy, teacher capability, student access, curriculum alignment, assessment design, and infrastructure. Blockchain is particularly underdeveloped within the education evidence: it is often listed as an Education 4.0 technology, yet direct studies of its learning impact are much less common than studies of AI, virtual environments, or blended learning.

Sustainability and green innovation

Sustainability research provides both organizational and technological evidence. Survey-based analysis of 283 Indian manufacturers indicates that green knowledge acquisition can strengthen green knowledge management and green technology innovation, which in turn supports environmental performance (Sahoo et al., 2023). This finding complements broader work connecting business innovation with the Sustainable Development Goals and the triple-bottom-line logic of people, planet, and prosperity (Azmat et al., 2023). Together, these studies suggest that sustainability-oriented innovation requires knowledge processes and resource commitment, not only cleaner technologies.

IoT research adds an operational pathway by showing how monitoring, tracking, and optimization can support circular business models and reduce resource consumption in specific applications (Ding et al., 2023). At the same time, the literature warns that devices, data transmission, storage, cybersecurity, and system upgrades create their own environmental and economic burdens. Public policy can influence this balance through research support, incentives, standards, and collaboration between industry and academic institutions (Mahardhani, 2023). The key implication is that sustainability claims should be evaluated over the technology lifecycle. Efficiency gains at the process level do not automatically establish net sustainability if rebound effects, infrastructure energy use, e-waste, or unequal access are ignored.

Ethical, societal, and regulatory challenges

Ethical and regulatory issues are not secondary to innovation; they shape whether adoption remains legitimate and sustainable. Wolff (2021) emphasizes that technological change can generate social benefits while also intensifying concerns about privacy, equity, private-sector power, governance, and conflict. In AI specifically, a systematic review of 309 articles identifies ethical concerns arising both from the design of AI systems and from human-AI interaction (Giarmoleo et al., 2024). Common concerns include bias and discrimination, opacity, privacy, responsibility, autonomy, and the distribution of benefits and harms. Governance research shows that organizations and regulators are still translating ethical principles into operational mechanisms. A recent systematic review identifies governance solutions at team, organizational, industry, national, and international levels, while noting persistent gaps in accountability, lifecycle coverage, and stakeholder responsibilities (Batoool et al., 2025). This is directly relevant to innovation management because trust, regulatory compliance, and the ability to demonstrate responsible use can determine whether a technological innovation is adopted, scaled, or rejected. The governance problem also differs by technology: AI raises fairness and explainability concerns; IoT expands cybersecurity and surveillance risks; blockchain introduces questions about accountability and governance of decentralized systems; and metaverse environments create

privacy, identity, and platform-power issues. The literature therefore supports embedding ethical and governance assessment at the design stage rather than treating it as a post-implementation correction.

Table 2. Cross-theme synthesis of evidence, limitations, and research gaps

Theme	Convergent evidence	Important qualification	Evidence limitation	Priority gap
Technology	AI, IoT, data analytics, blockchain, and metaverse technologies expand possible innovation mechanisms.	Value depends on skills, data, integration, governance, and context.	Maturity differs strongly by technology; blockchain and metaverse evidence is less developed.	Comparative multi-technology studies using common outcome measures.
Organization	Culture, autonomy, collaboration, leadership, and integration capability mediate innovation outcomes.	Technology acquisition can fail when post-adoption integration is weak.	Many studies are cross-sectional or conceptual.	Longitudinal and multi-level studies linking organizational mechanisms to measurable outcomes.
Economy/BMI	Digitalization can support innovation turnover and new value-creation/capture mechanisms.	Positive associations vary across countries, sectors, and business models.	Limited causal identification and inconsistent performance measures.	Causal and longitudinal evidence on productivity, profitability, and business-model renewal.
Education	Education 4.0 combines digital technologies with active and blended learning.	Technology prevalence does not prove learning effectiveness.	Evidence concentrated in higher education/engineering; many descriptive studies.	Long-term learning outcomes, equity, teacher capability, and K-12/humanities contexts.
Sustainability	Green knowledge, green technology, and IoT-enabled optimization can improve environmental performance.	Digital infrastructure also consumes energy and materials and creates security/e-waste burdens.	Net lifecycle effects are rarely measured.	Lifecycle, rebound-effect, and cross-sector sustainability assessment.
Ethics/Governance	Responsible innovation requires privacy, fairness, transparency, accountability, and governance mechanisms.	Principles are easier to state than to operationalize across the technology lifecycle.	Governance evidence remains fragmented across levels and jurisdictions.	Empirical evaluation of governance tools, audits, accountability models, and cross-border regulation.

DISCUSSION: CROSS-THEME INTERPRETATION AND RESEARCH GAPS

The cross-theme evidence supports a relational view of technological innovation. Technologies create new capabilities, but organizational and institutional conditions determine whether those capabilities become valuable innovations. This explains why the same technology can be associated with strong gains in one setting and limited impact in another. AI requires high-quality data, appropriate skills, governance, and redesigned workflows; IoT requires interoperable infrastructure and security; blockchain requires viable network governance and participant incentives; and metaverse strategies depend on platform adoption, community engagement, and customer willingness to participate. Technological capability and organizational capability are therefore complements rather than substitutes.

A second finding is that the evidence base is methodologically uneven. Systematic and scoping reviews provide broad maps of rapidly growing fields, but they often synthesize heterogeneous primary studies and cannot establish causal effects by themselves. Survey studies provide more direct empirical evidence but are commonly cross-sectional and context-specific. Case studies reveal mechanisms in depth but have limited generalizability. Descriptive and conceptual publications can identify plausible opportunities but should not support strong performance claims without corroborating evidence. This methodological variation explains some apparent disagreement in the literature and reinforces the need to match claims to the strength of the underlying design.

Third, technology-specific maturity differs. AI and broad digital-transformation research have developed substantial review literatures, while IoT has increasingly strong evidence in operational and circular-economy contexts. Blockchain is frequently named but still has fewer mature studies demonstrating sustained organizational outcomes across sectors. Metaverse evidence is particularly dependent on selected cases and fast-changing platform conditions. Balanced treatment therefore requires avoiding equal rhetorical emphasis when empirical maturity is unequal.

Finally, sustainability and ethics should be integrated into innovation assessment rather than appended as secondary considerations. A technology can improve operational efficiency while increasing energy demand, surveillance capacity, data exposure, or exclusion. Similarly, an AI application can improve decision speed while creating fairness or accountability problems. Responsible innovation requires organizations to evaluate economic, environmental, and social consequences together and to establish governance mechanisms before scaling deployment.

Evidence-Based Implications and Recommendations

For organizations, the evidence favors problem-led rather than technology-led innovation. Managers should begin with a defined operational, customer, educational, or sustainability problem and then assess whether a particular technology creates a superior solution. Investment decisions should include complementary capabilities such as data governance, workforce skills, integration architecture, cybersecurity, cross-functional ownership, and evaluation metrics. Pilot projects should be judged by measurable outcomes - for example, cycle time, innovation revenue, resource use, learning outcomes, or customer value - rather than by adoption alone.

For educational institutions, technology investment should be accompanied by pedagogical redesign and staff development. The Education 4.0 literature supports the use of digital and active learning approaches, but it also indicates a need for stronger evidence on learning quality, inclusion, and long-term outcomes (de Souza & Debs, 2024). Institutions should therefore evaluate whether technology improves learning objectives and access rather than assuming that increased digitalization is inherently educationally beneficial.

For policymakers and regulators, the findings support proportionate governance that protects rights and trust without treating all technologies or applications as equally risky. Policy tools can include clear accountability requirements, interoperability and security standards, research incentives, regulatory sandboxes, and collaboration among government, industry, and universities (Batool et al., 2025; Mahardhani, 2023; Wolff,

2021). For sustainability policy, technology incentives should incorporate lifecycle assessment and resource impacts, not only short-term efficiency gains.

For researchers, four priorities emerge: longitudinal studies that distinguish adoption from realized impact; multi-country and cross-sector comparisons that test institutional effects; technology-comparative designs that use common innovation and performance measures; and studies that integrate ethics and sustainability into the same empirical model as innovation outcomes. Blockchain, metaverse, educational equity, and operational AI-governance mechanisms warrant particular attention because their practical importance currently exceeds the maturity of the evidence base.

LIMITATIONS

This review has several limitations. First, it is a structured integrative review of a bounded and reconstructed corpus, not an exhaustive systematic review; studies outside the targeted search pathways may therefore be absent. Second, the 2021-2025 time window prioritizes current evidence but excludes older foundational work except where conceptually necessary. Third, the included studies use heterogeneous methods and outcome measures, preventing meaningful meta-analysis. Fourth, some educational and entrepreneurial sources are descriptive and have weaker methodological transparency than the systematic reviews and empirical studies in the corpus; they were therefore used cautiously as contextual evidence. Finally, publication and language restrictions may underrepresent findings from non-English sources or unpublished research. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the breadth and generalizability of the conclusions.

CONCLUSION

This review reconceptualizes the relationship between emerging technologies and innovation as a multi-level process rather than a catalogue of technological trends. AI, IoT, big data, blockchain, and metaverse technologies can support new products, processes, business models, educational practices, and sustainability strategies, but their effects are conditional on organizational capabilities, data and infrastructure quality, leadership, regulation, and social legitimacy.

The reviewed evidence is strongest where technology is connected to clearly specified mechanisms - such as AI-enabled knowledge and decision processes, IoT-enabled monitoring and optimization, or digitally enabled business-model redesign - and weaker where claims rely mainly on illustrative examples or broad technological enthusiasm.

The central contribution is an integrated synthesis across six themes. Innovation performance is shaped jointly by technological capability, organizational readiness, economic context, educational design, sustainability requirements, and ethical governance. This means that the strategic question is not simply which emerging technology should be adopted, but under what conditions a technology can create measurable value without generating unacceptable social, environmental, or governance costs. Future research should therefore move from adoption-focused studies toward longitudinal, comparative, and outcome-based designs that evaluate both benefits and trade-offs.

REFERENCES

1. Azmat, F., Lim, W. M., Moyeen, A., Voola, R., & Gupta, G. (2023). Convergence of business, innovation, and sustainability at the tipping point of the sustainable development goals. *Journal of Business Research*, 167, 114170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114170>
2. Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: A systematic literature review. *AI and Ethics*, 5, 3265–3279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00653-w>
3. Blok, V. (2021). What is innovation? Laying the ground for a philosophy of innovation. *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology*, 25(1), 72–96. <https://doi.org/10.5840/techné2020109129>

4. Cannavacciuolo, L., Ferraro, G., Ponsiglione, C., Primario, S., & Quinto, I. (2023). Technological innovation-enabling Industry 4.0 paradigm: A systematic literature review. *Technovation*, 124, 102733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102733>
5. de Souza, A. S. C., & Debs, L. (2024). Concepts, innovative technologies, learning approaches and trend topics in Education 4.0: A scoping literature review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100902>
6. Ding, S., Tukker, A., & Ward, H. (2023). Opportunities and risks of Internet of Things (IoT) technologies for circular business models: A literature review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 336, 117662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.117662>
7. Giarmoleo, F. V., Ferrero, I., Rocchi, M., & Pellegrini, M. M. (2024). What ethics can say on artificial intelligence: Insights from a systematic literature review. *Business and Society Review*, 129(2), 258–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12336>
8. Jorzik, P., Klein, S. P., Kanbach, D. K., & Kraus, S. (2024). AI-driven business model innovation: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 182, 114764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114764>
9. Mahardhani, A. J. (2023). The role of public policy in fostering technological innovation and sustainability. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, 1(2), 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.61100/adman.v1i2.22>
10. Mancuso, I., Messeni Petruzzelli, A., & Panniello, U. (2023). Digital business model innovation in metaverse: How to approach virtual economy opportunities. *Information Processing & Management*, 60(5), 103457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2023.103457>
11. Mariani, M. M., Machado, I., Magrelli, V., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Artificial intelligence in innovation research: A systematic review, conceptual framework, and future research directions. *Technovation*, 122, 102623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102623>
12. Muradov, O. (2024). Basic principles and rules of innovative pedagogical technologies in the educational process. *Models and Methods in Modern Science*, 3(1), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10512841>
13. Murodov, O. T. (2023). Innovative information technologies and new methods and tools for their application in today's education. *International Multidisciplinary Journal for Research & Development*, 10(12).
14. Palmié, M., Rüegger, S., & Parida, V. (2023). Microfoundations in the strategic management of technology and innovation: Definitions, systematic literature review, integrative framework, and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 154, 113351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113351>
15. Resuli, V. (2022, May). Innovation technology in education: Impact on student performance. In *Technology, innovation and industrial management (MakeLearn 2022)* (pp. 99–108).
16. Sahoo, S., Kumar, A., & Upadhyay, A. (2023). How do green knowledge management and green technology innovation impact corporate environmental performance? Understanding the role of green knowledge acquisition. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(1), 551–569. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3160>
17. Sauer, P. C., & Seuring, S. (2023). How to conduct systematic literature reviews in management research: A guide in 6 steps and 14 decisions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17, 1899–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00668-3>
18. Suherlan, S., & Okombo, M. O. (2023). Technological innovation in marketing and its effect on consumer behaviour. *Technology and Society Perspectives (TACIT)*, 1(2), 94–103. <https://doi.org/10.61100/tacit.v1i2.57>
19. Suo, L., Yang, K., & Ji, H. (2023). The impact of technological mergers and acquisitions on enterprise innovation: A review. *Sustainability*, 15(17), 12883. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712883>
20. Sutrisno, S., Kuraesin, A. D., Siminto, S., Irawansyah, I., & Ausat, A. M. A. (2023). The role of information technology in driving innovation and entrepreneurial business growth. *Jurnal Minfo Polgan*, 12(1), 586–597. <https://doi.org/10.33395/jmp.v12i1.12463>
21. Taherdoost, H., & Madanchian, M. (2023). Blockchain-based new business models: A systematic review. *Electronics*, 12(6), 1479. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12061479>

22. Vărzaru, A. A., & Bocean, C. G. (2024). Digital transformation and innovation: The influence of digital technologies on turnover from innovation activities and types of innovation. *Systems*, 12(9), 359. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12090359>
23. Wolff, J. (2021). How is technology changing the world, and how should the world change technology? *Global Perspectives*, 2(1), 27353. <https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2021.27353>