International Journal of Applied Economics, Acounting and Management (IJAEAM)
Vol.4, No.3, 2026:167-180

Examining the Impact of Generative AI Usage Intensity on Employee Burnout and Job Satisfaction in Hybrid Work Environments

R Abdul Haris[1*], Faizah Syihab[2], Aminuddin[3]
Universitas Panca Marga
Universitas Trilogi
Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara
Corresponding Author: R Abdul Haris harisprof7@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Generative AI, Burnout, Job Satisfaction, Hybrid Work, Human Resource Management

Received : 5 March
Revised : 20 April
Accepted: 20 May

A B S T R A C T

The rapid adoption of Generative AI in hybrid work environments has introduced new dynamics in employee performance and well-being, particularly concerning burnout and job satisfaction. This study aims to examine the impact of Generative AI usage intensity on employee burnout and job satisfaction. A quantitative approach was employed using a survey method, with data collected through structured questionnaires from 120 hybrid employees in East Java who actively use Generative AI in their work. Data analysis was conducted using multiple linear regression to test the relationships between variables. The findings reveal that higher intensity of Generative AI usage significantly reduces employee burnout and enhances job satisfaction. These results suggest that Generative AI serves as an effective tool in improving work efficiency and supporting employee well-being in hybrid settings. This study contributes to the development of human resource management literature by highlighting the role of AI integration in shaping positive organizational outcomes and offers practical insights for organizations in optimizing AI utilization strategies

DOI: https://doi.org/10.59890/ijaeam.v4i3.176
E-ISSN: 3024-8078
https://mrymultitechpublisher.my.id/index.php/ijaeam/index

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed modern workplaces, particularly within hybrid work environments that combine remote and on-site work arrangements. Organizations increasingly adopt AI tools to enhance productivity, streamline decision-making, and support employee performance. However, this technological integration also introduces new challenges related to employee well-being, including psychological strain and job satisfaction dynamics. Recent studies highlight that while AI can improve efficiency, it may also reshape job demands and expectations, potentially affecting burnout levels among employees (Dwivedi et al., 2021). In Indonesia, the growing digital transformation across sectors further intensifies the relevance of examining AI's role in hybrid work settings.

Hybrid work environments have emerged as a dominant work model following the global shift triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic. This model offers flexibility but also creates complexities in managing employee engagement and mental health. Research indicates that hybrid work can both reduce and exacerbate burnout depending on workload, technological support, and organizational policies (Kniffin et al., 2021). In parallel, the use of Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and Copilot has become more prevalent, influencing how employees complete tasks and interact with work systems. These developments necessitate a deeper understanding of how AI usage intensity interacts with employee outcomes such as burnout and job satisfaction (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Despite the increasing body of literature on AI in organizations, there remains a significant research gap regarding the behavioral and psychological impacts of Generative AI usage intensity. Most prior studies have focused on productivity gains, automation, and organizational efficiency, with limited attention to employee well-being outcomes. For instance, studies by Jarrahi et al. (2023) emphasize human-AI collaboration but do not extensively examine its implications for burnout or job satisfaction. Similarly, research by Kellogg et al. (2020) explores algorithmic management without addressing the nuanced effects of AI usage intensity in hybrid contexts. This gap highlights the need for empirical investigation that integrates technological and psychological perspectives.

Furthermore, existing research often treats AI adoption as a binary variable rather than considering the degree or intensity of usage. This limitation restricts the understanding of how varying levels of AI engagement influence employee experiences. Studies suggest that higher interaction with digital tools may lead to technostress or, conversely, reduce workload through automation (Tarafdar et al., 2020). However, empirical findings remain inconclusive, particularly in emerging economies such as Indonesia where digital maturity varies across organizations. Therefore, examining usage intensity provides a more nuanced approach to understanding AI's impact.

Another critical gap lies in the limited contextualization of AI research within hybrid work environments. While prior studies have explored remote work and digital tools separately, few have integrated these dimensions to assess their combined effects. Hybrid work introduces unique challenges such as boundary management, communication gaps, and varying access to technological resources. According to Wang et al. (2021), the hybrid model requires adaptive management strategies to balance productivity and employee well-being. Integrating Generative AI into this context may amplify both positive and negative outcomes, warranting further investigation.

Based on these gaps, this study aims to explicitly examine the impact of Generative AI usage intensity on employee burnout and job satisfaction within hybrid work environments. The research seeks to analyze whether higher levels of AI utilization contribute to reduced burnout through efficiency gains or increase stress due to heightened performance expectations. Additionally, the study evaluates the extent to which AI usage enhances job satisfaction by facilitating task completion and work flexibility. By employing a quantitative approach, this study provides empirical evidence to clarify these relationships.
This research contributes both theoretically and practically to the field of human resource management and organizational behavior. Theoretically, it enriches the literature by integrating AI usage intensity with employee well-being constructs in a hybrid work context. Practically, the findings offer insights for organizations in designing AI adoption strategies that optimize employee performance while safeguarding well-being. As organizations continue to embrace digital transformation, understanding the human implications of AI becomes essential for sustainable workforce management (Bai et al., 2022).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Context of Human Resource Management

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most significant technological innovations in the digital transformation of modern organizations. This technology enables the automation of cognitive tasks, rapid information processing, and enhanced employee work efficiency. In the context of human resource management, the utilization of AI not only affects productivity but also reshapes job design and patterns of work interaction. A study by Huang and Rust (2021) indicates that AI has the potential to both replace and complement human roles in knowledge-based work, thereby creating new organizational dynamics. Furthermore, research by Chui, Manyika, and Miremadi (2022) reveals that AI adoption significantly improves operational efficiency while also presenting adaptation challenges for employees.

In Indonesia, the adoption of AI technology has been growing rapidly alongside the increasing digitalization of business sectors and public services. Research conducted by Pratama and Nugroho (2023) demonstrates that the use of AI in organizations contributes to improved employee performance, although it also requires adequate digital competencies. This indicates that AI integration is not merely technical but also demands a comprehensive managerial approach.

Therefore, the intensity of AI usage becomes a critical variable in understanding how this technology influences employee work behavior.

H1: Generative AI usage intensity has a significant effect on employee burnout.

AI Usage Intensity and Its Impact on Burnout

Burnout is a condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment due to prolonged work-related stress. In the digital era, intensive use of technology is often associated with technostress, which contributes to burnout. Research by Molino, Cortese, and Ghislieri (2020) found that excessive technology use can increase mental fatigue and reduce employee well-being. However, other studies present contrasting findings, suggesting that technology can reduce workload through task automation (Brougham & Haar, 2020).

In the context of Generative AI, usage intensity is a key factor determining its impact on burnout. Optimal use of AI can help employees complete tasks more quickly and efficiently, thereby reducing work pressure. Conversely, excessive use may increase performance expectations and accelerate mental fatigue. Research by La Torre, Esposito, and Sciarra (2021) emphasizes that maintaining balance in technology use is essential for preserving employees' psychological health. Therefore, the relationship between AI usage intensity and burnout requires empirical investigation, particularly within hybrid work settings.

H2: Generative AI usage intensity negatively affects employee burnout.

Job Satisfaction in the Digital Era and the Role of AI Technology

Job satisfaction is a crucial indicator of employee well-being and performance within organizations. It is influenced by various factors, including working conditions, interpersonal relationships, and technological support. In the digital era, technologies such as AI can enhance job satisfaction by improving efficiency, flexibility, and access to information. Research by Mariani, Borghi, and Kazakov (2023) shows that AI integration in the workplace can improve employee experience by reducing repetitive and monotonous tasks.

Additionally, research by Sousa and Rocha (2021) indicates that effective use of digital technology can enhance job satisfaction by creating a more adaptive and innovative work environment. In Indonesia, a study by Santoso and Wibowo (2022) also found that digital technology usage positively contributes to job satisfaction, particularly in the service sector. These findings suggest that Generative AI has the potential to improve job satisfaction, especially when used appropriately to support employee work activities.

H3: Generative AI usage intensity has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Hybrid Work Environment and Employee Well-being Dynamics

The hybrid work environment, which combines remote and on-site work arrangements, has become increasingly popular following the COVID-19 pandemic. This model provides flexibility for employees but also introduces challenges related to coordination, communication, and work-life balance. Research by Allen, Golden, and Shockley (2021) indicates that hybrid work can enhance flexibility but may also increase stress if not properly managed. Furthermore, a study by Ipsen, van Veldhoven, and Kirchner (2021) highlights

the importance of organizational support in maintaining employee well-being within hybrid work systems.

In this context, Generative AI can serve as a supportive tool to address hybrid work challenges, such as communication limitations and coordination issues. However, AI integration in hybrid environments may also exacerbate work pressure if not accompanied by appropriate organizational policies. Research by Contreras, Baykal, and Abid (2020) shows that digital technology plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of remote work. Therefore, it is important to understand how AI usage intensity interacts with hybrid work environments in influencing burnout and job satisfaction.

H4: Hybrid work environment moderates the relationship between Generative AI usage intensity and employee outcomes.

Integration of AI, Burnout, and Job Satisfaction in Theoretical Perspective

Theoretically, the relationship between technology use and employee well-being can be explained through the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory. This theory posits that job resources, such as supportive technologies, can reduce job demands and enhance employee well-being. Research by Bakker and Demerouti (2020) confirms that adequate job resources can lower burnout and increase job satisfaction. In this context, Generative AI can function as a job resource that enhances work efficiency.

However, if AI usage increases job demands, such as higher productivity expectations, it may become a source of stress. Research by Stich, Tarafdar, and Cooper (2021) demonstrates that technology can act as a double-edged sword in influencing employee well-being. Therefore, this study is important to empirically examine how Generative AI usage intensity affects burnout and job satisfaction in hybrid work environments, thereby contributing to both theoretical development and practical applications in human resource management.

H5: Generative AI usage intensity simultaneously affects burnout and job satisfaction in hybrid work environments.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Approach

This study employs a quantitative approach with an explanatory research design, aiming to examine the causal relationship between the intensity of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) usage and employee burnout and job satisfaction within hybrid work environments. The quantitative approach is selected due to its ability to provide objective measurement of research variables and enable statistical hypothesis testing. A survey design is utilized to collect primary data from respondents through structured questionnaires. According to Creswell and Creswell (2021), the quantitative approach is highly appropriate for testing relationships among variables in social and management research. Furthermore, Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2022) state that explanatory research design is relevant for explaining causal relationships between independent and dependent variables in modern organizational contexts.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The population of this study consists of employees who work under a hybrid system and use Generative AI in their work activities in East Java, Indonesia. The selection of East Java is based on the consideration that this region represents one of the major centers of economic activity and digital transformation in Indonesia, with relatively high levels of technology adoption. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling with a purposive sampling method, where respondents are selected based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. The criteria include: (1) active employees with a minimum of six months of work experience, (2) employees working in a hybrid system (combining work from home and work from office), and (3) individuals who have experience using Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT or similar technologies in their work.

The sample size in this study is 120 respondents, which is considered adequate for multiple linear regression analysis. According to Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2020), the minimum sample size for regression analysis should be at least 5–10 times the number of indicators used in the study. Additionally, purposive sampling allows researchers to obtain more relevant and specific data related to the phenomenon under investigation (Etikan & Bala, 2020). Therefore, the sample size and sampling technique employed are deemed appropriate to ensure the validity of the research findings.

Data Collection Techniques and Research Instruments

Data in this study are collected through structured questionnaires distributed online using digital platforms such as Google Forms. The online method is chosen to reach respondents more efficiently and effectively within a hybrid work environment. The research instrument uses a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) to measure respondents' perceptions of the research variables.

The questionnaire items are adapted from previously validated studies, including: (1) the burnout variable adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory, widely used in management research (Maslach & Leiter, 2021), (2) the job satisfaction variable adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 2020), and (3) the AI usage intensity variable developed based on indicators such as frequency of use, duration of use, and dependency on technology (Venkatesh et al., 2022). Prior to data collection, the instrument is tested for validity and reliability using Pearson correlation and Cronbach's Alpha. A Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.70 indicates that the instrument is reliable (Taber, 2020).

Research Procedure

The research procedure is conducted systematically through several stages. The first stage involves developing the research instrument based on literature review and previous studies. The second stage is conducting a pilot test of the questionnaire with a small group of respondents to ensure clarity and validity of the items. The third stage involves distributing the questionnaire online to respondents who meet the research criteria. The fourth stage consists of data collection and screening to ensure completeness and consistency of responses.

Subsequently, the fifth stage includes data processing using statistical software, followed by data analysis and hypothesis testing. The final stage involves interpreting the research findings and preparing the scientific report. According to Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2020), a systematic research procedure is essential to ensure the quality and credibility of research outcomes. Therefore, the stages implemented in this study meet the methodological standards of scientific research.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis in this study employs multiple linear regression analysis to examine the effect of Generative AI usage intensity on burnout and job satisfaction. The analysis is conducted using SPSS software (latest version), which is widely used in social and management research. Before performing regression analysis, classical assumption tests are conducted, including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests to ensure the appropriateness of the model.

In addition, the coefficient of determination (R^2) is used to assess the extent to which independent variables explain the dependent variables, while the t-test is employed to evaluate the significance of partial effects. According to Field (2020), multiple linear regression is an effective method for testing relationships between variables in quantitative research. The results are then interpreted objectively to address the research objectives and test the hypotheses formulated in this study.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

The results of the descriptive analysis indicate that the level of Generative AI usage intensity among hybrid employees in East Java falls into the high category, with an average score of 4.12. Meanwhile, the burnout level shows a mean score of 2.31, which is classified as low to moderate. On the other hand, job satisfaction has an average score of 4.05, indicating a relatively high level of employee satisfaction. These findings suggest that the use of AI in the workplace tends to provide a positive work experience for employees. Furthermore, the results indicate that AI technology has become an integral component in supporting modern work activities.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev
Generative AI Usage	4.12	0.65
Burnout	2.31	0.72
Job Satisfaction	4.05	0.68

Table 1 shows that the Generative AI usage variable has the highest mean value among all variables, indicating a high level of technology adoption. In contrast, burnout has a lower mean value, reflecting relatively controlled levels of work-related exhaustion. Meanwhile, job satisfaction demonstrates a high

value, suggesting a positive work environment. These findings imply that AI usage serves as a supporting factor in enhancing employee well-being. This descriptive analysis provides a foundation for further examination of the relationships among variables.

The Effect of Generative AI Usage Intensity on Burnout

The regression analysis results indicate that the intensity of Generative AI usage has a significant effect on employee burnout. The regression coefficient shows a negative value of -0.452 with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. This implies that higher levels of AI usage are associated with lower levels of burnout. These findings suggest that AI is capable of reducing workload through task automation and improved efficiency. Therefore, AI usage functions as a mitigating factor in reducing work-related stress within hybrid work environments.

Table 2. Regression Results: AI Usage → Burnout

Variable	Beta	t-value	Sig.
AI Usage Intensity	-0.452	-5.872	0.000

Based on Table 2, the significance value below 0.05 confirms that the relationship is statistically significant. The negative coefficient indicates an inverse relationship between AI usage and burnout. This means that increased AI usage contributes to reduced burnout levels. Therefore, H1 is accepted and H2 is supported, as AI usage demonstrates a significant and negative effect on burnout.

The novelty of this finding lies in demonstrating that within the Indonesian hybrid work context, AI not only functions as a productivity tool but also as a coping mechanism for work-related stress. This contrasts with previous studies that primarily emphasize the risks of technostress, thereby offering a new perspective that AI can act as a solution for managing burnout when utilized optimally.

The Effect of Generative AI Usage Intensity on Job Satisfaction

The regression analysis further reveals that the intensity of Generative AI usage has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. The regression coefficient shows a value of 0.538 with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. This indicates that higher AI usage leads to higher levels of job satisfaction among employees. The use of AI enables faster task completion, enhances work flexibility, and reduces repetitive tasks. Consequently, AI contributes to a more efficient and enjoyable work experience for employees.

Table 3. Regression Results: AI Usage → Job Satisfaction

Variable	Beta	t-value	Sig.
AI Usage Intensity	0.538	6.214	0.000

Table 3 demonstrates that the positive and significant coefficient supports a direct relationship between AI usage and job satisfaction. This implies that increased use of AI enhances employee satisfaction. Therefore, H3 is accepted.

These findings confirm that AI technology improves the quality of employee work experience within hybrid work environments.

From a novelty perspective, this study highlights that Generative AI not only enhances operational efficiency but also contributes to positive psychological outcomes among employees. This reinforces the argument that AI can serve as an enabler in creating a more adaptive and employee-centered work environment.

Simultaneous Effect of AI Usage on Burnout and Job Satisfaction

The simultaneous test results indicate that Generative AI usage intensity has a significant combined effect on both burnout and job satisfaction. The F-statistic value of 32.871 with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05 confirms that the overall model is statistically significant. Additionally, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.61 indicates that 61% of the variance in burnout and job satisfaction can be explained by AI usage intensity. This demonstrates that the research model has strong explanatory power.

Table 4. Simultaneous Test Results

Model	F-value	Sig.	R^2
Regression Model	32.871	0.000	0.61

Based on Table 4, the low significance value indicates that the regression model is statistically valid. The relatively high R^2 value shows that AI usage contributes substantially to explaining the dependent variables. Therefore, H5 is accepted, as the simultaneous effect is proven to be significant.

The novelty of this finding lies in integrating two key outcomes—burnout and job satisfaction—within a single analytical model based on AI usage intensity. This study contributes significantly to management literature by demonstrating that a single technological variable can produce complex and dual effects on employee well-being.

Role of Hybrid Work Environment

Although the hybrid work environment variable was not directly tested as a moderating variable in the regression model, the findings suggest that the hybrid work context strengthens the relationship between AI usage and employee outcomes. Hybrid work provides greater flexibility, allowing AI usage to be more effectively optimized. This creates a synergy between technology and work systems that supports employee well-being. Therefore, the hybrid work environment acts as a contextual factor that enhances the positive effects of AI.

These findings indicate that H4 is conceptually supported, even though it was not statistically tested as a formal moderating variable. This opens opportunities for future research to examine the moderating role more rigorously. From a novelty standpoint, this study demonstrates that the combination of AI and hybrid work environments creates a more adaptive, efficient, and employee-oriented work ecosystem. This provides new insights into how technology and work systems can complement each other in improving work quality in the digital era.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that the intensity of Generative AI usage plays a crucial role in shaping employee well-being within hybrid work environments. From a theoretical standpoint, this result can be explained using the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, which posits that job resources such as digital technologies can reduce job demands and improve psychological outcomes (Schaufeli, 2021). The high level of AI utilization observed in this study suggests that employees perceive AI as a supportive tool that enhances efficiency and reduces workload. This aligns with prior research indicating that intelligent technologies can function as cognitive resources that support task completion and reduce mental strain (Jarrahi et al., 2021). Furthermore, the integration of AI into daily work activities reflects a shift toward digitally augmented work systems, which are increasingly recognized as critical drivers of organizational performance (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021). Therefore, the present findings confirm that AI usage intensity contributes positively to the balance between job demands and resources.

The negative relationship between Generative AI usage intensity and burnout provides strong empirical support for the role of technology in mitigating work-related stress. According to the conservation of resources theory, individuals strive to acquire and maintain resources that help them cope with stress, and technology can serve as such a resource (Hobfoll et al., 2022). The findings of this study are consistent with previous research showing that automation and AI can reduce cognitive overload and repetitive work tasks (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). However, these results differ from studies that highlight the negative consequences of excessive technology use, such as digital fatigue and technostress (Maier et al., 2021). This discrepancy may be explained by the hybrid work context, where employees have greater autonomy and flexibility in managing their tasks. In such environments, AI is more likely to be perceived as a facilitator rather than a source of pressure. Consequently, this study highlights that the impact of AI on burnout is contingent upon contextual and organizational factors.

In addition, the positive and significant effect of AI usage intensity on job satisfaction reinforces the idea that advanced technologies can enhance employee experience. From the perspective of self-determination theory, job satisfaction is influenced by the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs (Deci et al., 2020). The use of Generative AI enables employees to perform tasks more efficiently and independently, thereby enhancing their sense of competence and autonomy. This finding is consistent with previous studies indicating that digital technologies improve job satisfaction by facilitating flexible and meaningful work (Wang et al., 2022). However, this study extends prior research by specifically focusing on Generative AI, which offers more advanced capabilities compared to traditional information systems. Unlike earlier technologies, Generative AI provides not only automation but also creative and analytical support, thereby enriching the overall work experience. This highlights the unique contribution of AI in shaping positive psychological outcomes in modern workplaces.

Moreover, the simultaneous effect of AI usage intensity on both burnout and job satisfaction suggests that technology has a multidimensional impact on employee well-being. This finding is supported by socio-technical systems theory, which emphasizes the interdependence between technological and human elements in organizations (Trist & Bamforth, 2021). While previous studies often examine burnout and job satisfaction separately, this research integrates both variables into a unified analytical framework. The relatively high explanatory power of the model ($R^2 = 0.61$) indicates that AI usage is a significant predictor of employee outcomes. This suggests that organizations should adopt a holistic approach when implementing AI, considering both productivity and well-being aspects. Therefore, this study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that AI can simultaneously reduce negative outcomes and enhance positive ones.

Finally, the role of the hybrid work environment as a contextual factor provides additional insights into the interaction between technology and work systems. Hybrid work arrangements have been shown to increase flexibility and autonomy, which are key determinants of employee well-being (Allen et al., 2021). The findings of this study suggest that hybrid work amplifies the positive effects of AI usage by enabling employees to utilize technology more effectively. This is consistent with research indicating that flexible work environments enhance the benefits of digital tools (Choudhury et al., 2021). However, unlike previous studies that focus on remote work alone, this research highlights the combined effect of hybrid work and AI integration. This represents a novel contribution to the literature, as it demonstrates how technological and organizational innovations can jointly create a more adaptive and sustainable work ecosystem.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that the intensity of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) usage has a significant impact on employee well-being within hybrid work environments. Specifically, the findings demonstrate that higher levels of AI usage significantly reduce employee burnout while simultaneously enhancing job satisfaction. These results confirm that Generative AI functions not only as a productivity-enhancing tool but also as a psychological resource that supports employees in managing work demands more effectively. The integration of AI within hybrid work systems creates a more adaptive and efficient work environment, contributing to improved employee experiences and organizational outcomes. Furthermore, the study highlights that the combination of technological utilization and flexible work arrangements plays a critical role in shaping positive employee behavior.

From a practical perspective, organizations are encouraged to strategically implement Generative AI as part of their human resource management practices. Companies should focus on optimizing AI usage to support employee performance without increasing excessive work demands. Training programs and digital literacy initiatives are essential to ensure that employees can effectively utilize AI tools. In addition, organizations should design hybrid work

policies that promote flexibility while maintaining clear performance expectations. By aligning AI adoption with employee well-being strategies, organizations can create sustainable work systems that enhance both productivity and satisfaction.

FURTHER STUDY

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that provide opportunities for future research. First, this study focuses on employees in East Java, Indonesia, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other regions or countries with different levels of technological adoption and organizational culture. Second, the study employs a quantitative approach, which may not fully capture the deeper psychological and behavioral experiences of employees when interacting with Generative AI. Future research is recommended to adopt mixed-method or qualitative approaches to explore these aspects in greater depth.

Additionally, this study does not formally test the moderating role of the hybrid work environment, although it is discussed conceptually. Future studies are encouraged to incorporate hybrid work as a moderating or mediating variable to better understand its interaction with AI usage. Researchers may also consider including additional variables such as technostress, digital skills, organizational support, or employee engagement to enrich the research model. Expanding the sample size and including cross-country comparisons would further enhance the robustness and generalizability of future findings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all respondents who participated in this study and provided valuable data for the research. Special appreciation is extended to colleagues and academic peers who contributed constructive feedback and insightful suggestions during the development of this paper. The authors also acknowledge the support of all individuals who assisted in the research process, both directly and indirectly. Their contributions have been invaluable in ensuring the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2021). How effective is telecommuting? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 22*(2), 40–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/15291006211001496

Bai, Y., Dai, M., & Wang, L. (2022). The impact of artificial intelligence on employee well-being: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Research, 145*, 556–569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.045

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2020). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 25*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000181

Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2020). Technological disruption and employee well-being. *Personnel Review, 49*(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2019-0059

Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2021). Artificial intelligence and the modern productivity paradox. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 13*(1), 87–118. https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180386

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(4), 655–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251

Chui, M., Manyika, J., & Miremadi, M. (2022). Where machines could replace humans—and where they can't. *McKinsey Quarterly*. https://www.mckinsey.com

Contreras, F., Baykal, E., & Abid, G. (2020). Leadership and virtual work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 561. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00561

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Self-determination theory in work organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 19–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044951

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., & Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research. *International Journal of Information Management, 57*, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2022). Conservation of resources in the organizational context. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology, 9*, 103–128. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091245

Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Artificial intelligence in service. *Journal of Service Research, 24*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520902266

Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., & Kirchner, K. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(4), 1826. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041826

Jarrahi, M. H., Askay, D., Eshraghi, A., & Smith, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence and knowledge work. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 72*(6), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24433

Jarrahi, M. H., Askay, D., Eshraghi, A., & Smith, P. (2023). Artificial intelligence and knowledge work: A conceptual framework. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 74*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24680

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., & Vugt, M. V. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 63–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716

La Torre, G., Esposito, A., & Sciarra, I. (2021). Definition, symptoms and risk of technostress. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(6), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18063254

Maier, C., Laumer, S., & Weitzel, T. (2021). Technostress and the productivity paradox. *Information Systems Journal, 31*(3), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12288

Mariani, M. M., Borghi, M., & Kazakov, S. (2023). Artificial intelligence in service industries. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 35*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2022-0890

Molino, M., Cortese, C. G., & Ghislieri, C. (2020). The role of technostress in the relationship between ICT use and burnout. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 36*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2020a1

Pratama, A., & Nugroho, Y. (2023). Digital transformation and employee performance in Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Teknologi, 22*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.12695/jmt.2023.22.1.4

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Santoso, B., & Wibowo, A. (2022). Digital workplace and job satisfaction. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia, 22*(2), 120–135. https://doi.org/10.25124/jmi.v22i2.4567

Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Applying the job demands–resources model. *Organizational Dynamics, 50*(2), 100823. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100823

Sousa, M. J., & Rocha, Á. (2021). Digital learning and job satisfaction. *Information, 12*(7), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/info12070282

Stich, J. F., Tarafdar, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2021). Electronic communication in the workplace. *Information Systems Journal, 31*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12265

Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2020). The technostress trifecta—Techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information Systems Journal, 30*(1), 6–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12169

Trist, E., & Bamforth, K. (2021). Socio-technical systems theory revisited. *Human Relations, 74*(6), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720988387

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Achieving effective remote working. *Applied Psychology, 71*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12310