



AI'S DUAL IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Anurag Srivastava Lal Bahadur Shastri Girls College of Management

ABSTRACT Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its rapid integration into modern workplaces present a complex duality, impacting both organizational productivity and employee quality of work life (QWL). While AI tools promise significant gains in efficiency through task automation and augmented decision-making, they also introduce potential drawbacks, including job-related stress, reduced autonomy, and work alienation. This mixed-methods study empirically investigates this dichotomy by examining the effects of AI implementation in a large, multinational technology firm. Quantitative analysis of employee performance metrics and survey data is triangulated with qualitative interviews to capture the nuanced experiences of employees. Our findings suggest that AI's impact is not monolithic; successful outcomes for both productivity and QWL are contingent upon a supportive organizational culture, comprehensive training, and strategic implementation that prioritizes augmentation over automation. The study provides critical insights for managers and policymakers seeking to leverage AI's benefits while safeguarding employee well-being.

KEYWORDS : Employee Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Human-Centric AI Strategy, Augmentation Versus Automation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The proliferation of Artificial Intelligence technologies, particularly in the form of generative AI, predictive analytics, and automated workflows, has redefined the landscape of work. Organizations are increasingly adopting AI to drive efficiency, reduce costs, and enhance strategic decision-making. Initial studies, including those by the St. Louis Federal Reserve and the Nielsen Norman Group, suggest significant productivity gains across various roles, from software development to customer support.

However, this technological revolution raises significant concerns regarding its impact on the human workforce. The potential for job displacement, increased work intensity, constant digital monitoring, and the blurring of work-life boundaries pose a threat to employees' quality of work life (QWL). Existing research often presents conflicting perspectives: some studies highlight the positive aspects of AI in automating mundane tasks and promoting job satisfaction, while others point to negative psychological effects, such as increased stress, loneliness, and alienation.

This research aims to reconcile these disparate findings by investigating the core mechanisms through which AI influences both productivity and QWL within a single organizational context. We hypothesize that the nature of AI implementation – specifically, whether it augments human capabilities or primarily automates tasks – serves as a critical moderating variable influencing the final outcome.

2. Literature Review AI and Productivity

Research on AI and productivity often focuses on measurable outcomes, such as time savings, output volume, and error reduction. The “optimist's perspective” posits that AI acts as a force multiplier, automating repetitive tasks and allowing employees to focus on higher-value, creative work. This leads to a more dynamic and productive workforce. Conversely, the “doomsayer's perspective” raises concerns about job displacement, particularly in entry-level and knowledge-intensive occupations.

AI and Quality of Work Life (QWL)

The impact of AI on employee well-being is multifaceted. Potential benefits include reduced tedium, greater engagement, and enhanced professional development through personalized learning. However, negative impacts are also documented, including technostress from increased monitoring, feelings of loneliness and anxiety from reduced human interaction, and decreased autonomy as AI systems dictate workflows. The perception of job security is a significant factor, with fear of replacement by automation negatively affecting job satisfaction.

The Moderating Role of Implementation

The existing literature suggests that the context and strategy of AI implementation are crucial. Organizational support, communication, and comprehensive training are identified as key factors influencing how employees perceive and adapt to AI. However, more empirical evidence is needed to precisely define the interplay between

implementation strategy, employee perception, productivity, and QWL outcomes.

3. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative data from surveys and company records with qualitative data from semi-structured interviews. This design allows for a robust analysis of both the measurable and the nuanced, experiential aspects of AI's impact.

Participants and Setting

The study was conducted within a large, multinational technology company with offices in five countries. A total of 100 employees were randomly selected from departments with varying levels of AI tool integration, including customer support, software development, and project management. A sub-sample of 25 employees, stratified by role and AI usage, participated in the qualitative interviews.

Quantitative Measures

- o **Productivity:** Employee performance data, such as task completion times, efficiency scores, and project output, were collected from company records over a six-month period.
- o **QWL:** A survey was administered to all 100 participants, measuring job satisfaction, perceived autonomy, work-related stress (using the Effort-Reward Imbalance model), job security, and technostress.
- o **AI Implementation:** A sub-scale measured participants' perceptions of AI tool integration, training effectiveness, and the degree to which AI was perceived as augmenting their role versus automating it.

Qualitative Interviews

Semi-structured interviews explored employees' lived experiences with AI, including how AI affected their daily tasks, emotional responses, relationships with colleagues, and perceptions of their long-term career prospects within the company.

Analysis

- o **Quantitative:** Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the direct relationships between AI usage, productivity, and QWL. A moderation analysis was performed to test the hypothesis that implementation strategy (augmentation versus automation) influences these relationships.
- o **Qualitative:** Interview transcripts were analysed using thematic analysis to identify recurring themes and deeper insights into employees' experiences.

4. RESULTS

Quantitative Findings

- **Productivity:** A significant positive correlation was found between the frequency of AI tool usage and employee productivity metrics ($r = 0.45, p < 0.001$). However, the impact was moderated by the perceived implementation strategy. Employees who viewed AI as an augmenting tool showed higher productivity gains (β

=0.38, $p < 0.01$) than those who saw it as a tool for automation ($\beta = 0.09, p > 0.05$).

- **QWL:** Overall, the relationship between AI usage and QWL was neutral. However, the moderation analysis revealed a clear divergence:
 - o **Augmentation Strategy:** Perceived AI augmentation was positively correlated with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.29, p < 0.05$) and autonomy ($\beta = 0.33, p < 0.01$), and negatively correlated with work-related stress ($\beta = -0.21, p < 0.05$).
 - o **Automation Strategy:** Perceived AI automation was negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.18, p < 0.05$) and significantly associated with higher technostress ($\beta = 0.42, p < 0.001$) and lower job security ($\beta = -0.31, p < 0.01$).
- **Training and Communication:** The availability of comprehensive AI training and transparent communication regarding AI's purpose were significant predictors of positive QWL outcomes, mediating the negative effects of automation-focused implementation ($\beta = 0.25, p < 0.05$).

Qualitative Findings

- **Augmentation as Empowerment:** Interviewees who experienced AI as an augmenting tool described feeling "empowered". A software developer noted, "AI handles the boilerplate code, freeing me to tackle the challenging architectural design." These employees reported a deeper sense of purpose and higher engagement.
- **Automation as Alienation:** Employees whose roles were heavily automated reported feeling "deskilled" and "disconnected". A customer support agent expressed, "My role has become about feeding the bot data. The human part is gone, and so is the satisfaction." This led to feelings of alienation and a perceived loss of value.
- **The Burden of Constant Monitoring:** Several interviewees reported that AI-driven performance monitoring increased their work-related stress. A project manager commented, "The system is always watching, tracking my every move. It's not about being more productive anymore; it's about not being caught slipping." This contributed to heightened anxiety and a feeling of being constantly surveilled.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study offer a nuanced perspective on AI's impact on the workplace, highlighting its inherent dichotomy. While AI undeniably offers potential for increased productivity, this benefit is not guaranteed and often comes at a cost to employee well-being, particularly when viewed as a tool for automation rather than augmentation.

Our research supports the notion that the strategy and context of AI implementation are paramount. Companies that prioritize a human-centric approach, focusing on how AI can augment employees' skills, are more likely to achieve positive outcomes in both productivity and QWL. In contrast, implementations that focus solely on automation without sufficient support, training, and clear communication can lead to significant negative consequences, including reduced job satisfaction, increased stress, and work alienation.

Limitations and Future Research

This study's limitations include its focus on a single technology firm, which may not be generalizable across all industries. Future research should replicate this study in other sectors and investigate the long-term effects of AI on career trajectories, skill requirements, and the psychosocial dynamics of human-AI collaboration.

Recommendations

For organizations, the path forward is clear:

1. **Prioritize Augmentation:** Design and implement AI systems to assist and empower employees, not to replace them.
2. **Invest in Training:** Provide comprehensive training programmes that focus on developing AI literacy and adapting new skills.
3. **Ensure Transparency:** Maintain open and transparent communication with employees about AI's purpose and how it will impact their roles.
4. **Balance Monitoring:** Be mindful of the psychological effects of constant surveillance and find a balance between performance tracking and employee trust.

By embracing a human-centric AI strategy, organizations can foster a workplace where technology serves to enhance, rather than diminish,

the human experience, leading to sustainable gains in both productivity and the quality of work life.

REFERENCES

1. Tiwari, Richa (2025). *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence in the Workplace and its Effect on the Digital Wellbeing of Employees*. ResearchGate. www.researchgate.net
2. *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Employment: Replacing Jobs or Enhancing Capabilities?*, Sage University Blog, 2025.
3. *The impact of Artificial Intelligence on productivity, distribution and growth*, OECD Report, 2024.
4. *The impact of AI on the workplace: Evidence from OECD case studies of AI implementation*, OECD Report, 2023.
5. Malik, N., Tripathi, S. N., Kar, A. K., & Gupta, S. (2021). *Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Employees working in Industry 4.0 Led Organizations*, ResearchGate. www.researchgate.net
6. Agarwal, Parul (2025). *Exploring the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Work-Life Balance and Well-being in the Digital Era*, Alochana Journal.
7. *The Impact of Generative AI on Work Productivity: Updated Findings from a US Survey*, St. Louis Fed Working Paper, 2025.
8. Carolin, J. J., (2025). *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Performance & Job Satisfaction: A Moderated Mediation Model*, IIRASET.