AI and Worker Well-Being:
Differential Impacts Across Generational Cohorts and Genders

Voraprapa Nakavachara*
Faculty of Economics, Chulalongkorn University
13 November 2025

This paper investigates the relationship between AI use and worker well-being outcomes—mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health and safety—using microdata from the OECD AI Surveys across seven countries. The results reveal that AI users are significantly more likely to report improvements across all three outcomes, with effects ranging from 8.9% to 21.3%. However, these benefits vary by generation and gender. Generation Y (1981–1996) shows the strongest gains across all dimensions, while Generation X (1965–1980) reports moderate improvements in mental health and job enjoyment. In contrast, Generation Z (1997–2012) benefits only in job enjoyment. As digital natives already familiar with technology, Gen Z workers may not receive additional gains in mental or physical health from AI, though they still experience increased enjoyment from using it. Baby Boomers (born before 1965) experience limited benefits, as they may not find these tools as engaging or useful. Women report stronger mental health gains, whereas men report greater improvements in physical health. These findings suggest that AI's workplace impact is uneven and shaped by demographic factors, career stage, and the nature of workers' roles.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Worker Well-Being, Generational Differences, Gender Differences, OECD Countries

*Contact Email: Voraprapa.n@chula.ac.th

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming how tasks are performed, decisions are made, and jobs are structured across industries. While much of the existing research focuses on AI's economic effects—such as productivity gains, labor market shifts, and job displacement (Brynjolfsson et al., 2025; Frey & Osborne, 2017; Noy & Zhang, 2023)—its implications for workers' psychological and physical well-being remain less understood. Yet well-being outcomes—including mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health and safety—are critical not only for individual quality of life but also for long-term organizational performance. Early evidence is mixed: some studies highlight benefits such as reduced physical strain and improved mental health (Giuntella et al., 2025), while others point to increased stress and burnout, particularly among those less confident in adapting to new technologies (Kim & Lee, 2024). These contrasting findings point to the need for more thorough analyses of AI's effects on worker well-being.

This paper examines the relationship between AI use and three key dimensions of worker well-being—mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health and safety. Using microdata from the OECD AI Surveys of Employers and Workers across seven OECD countries, we estimate the overall associations between AI use and well-being outcomes, and explore how these vary across demographic subgroups. Specifically, we investigate differences by generational cohort—reflecting variations in digital nativity, career stage, and adaptability—and by gender, given potential differences in occupational roles and task exposure.

This study contributes to the growing literature on AI and society in three ways. First, it offers cross-national evidence on how AI adoption relates to workers' perceived mental and physical well-being. Second, it disaggregates these associations by generational cohort, recognizing the differing experiences of Generation Z (1997–2012), Generation Y (1981–1996), Generation X (1965–1980), and Baby Boomers (born before 1965). Third, it examines gender-based differences to better understand how AI may interact with existing labor market structures.

The findings show that AI users are significantly more likely to report improvements across all three well-being outcomes, with estimated effects ranging from 8.9% to 21.3%. However, the magnitude and nature of these benefits vary across demographic groups. Generation Y experiences the most substantial gains across all dimensions, followed by moderate improvements for Generation X. Generation Z reports benefits only in job enjoyment—likely because, as digital natives, they are already familiar with technology, limiting AI's additional impact on mental or physical health. Baby Boomers (born before 1965) report limited benefits, possibly due to lower engagement with or interest in AI tools. Gender differences also emerge. Women report greater mental health improvements, while men experience stronger gains in physical well-being. These patterns underscore that AI's workplace effects are not uniform, but are shaped by career stage, technological familiarity, job roles, and gendered labor dynamics.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature and presents the conceptual framework. Section 3 describes the data and methodology. Section 4 reports the empirical results, including subgroup analyses by generation and gender. Section 5 concludes with a discussion of key findings and implications.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

2.1 How AI May Improve Worker Well-Being

Emerging research suggests that AI can enhance worker well-being by reshaping job demands and improving the overall work environment. A central mechanism is the automation of tasks that are repetitive, physically demanding, or hazardous. For example, longitudinal evidence from Germany finds that AI exposure is associated with improvements in self-rated health and health satisfaction (Giuntella et al., 2025). Nazareno & Schiff (2021) report that workers facing automation risk have lower stress. In manufacturing settings, AI has been shown to alleviate physical strain and contribute to better mental health outcomes by reducing workers' exposure to physically taxing labor (Wei & Li, 2022). As tedious or dangerous tasks are automated, workers often report higher levels of engagement and job satisfaction. In addition to task substitution, AI also functions as an augmentative tool that improves efficiency and reduces cognitive load. This frees up workers' time for more meaningful, complex, or strategic responsibilities, thereby enhancing their sense of autonomy and fulfillment (OECD, 2023b; Johnson et al., 2020). Overall, AI's potential to reallocate effort away from repetitive tasks toward higher-value work suggests a range of pathways through which it may positively influence mental health, physical well-being, and job enjoyment.

2.2 How AI May Diminish Worker Well-Being

Despite its potential benefits, AI can also undermine worker well-being, particularly when it disrupts workers' sense of competence, autonomy, or psychological safety. A growing body of research highlights how AI-related job anxiety is often fueled by fears of skill devaluation and the erosion of control over work processes. For instance, Méndez-Suárez et al. (2026) find that workers frequently perceive AI as a threat to their skill relevance and autonomy, leading to concerns about obsolescence and the need for constant reskilling. These perceived threats can contribute to heightened anxiety and depression (Johnson et al., 2020).

AI adoption may also exacerbate stress and burnout, particularly among workers with lower technological confidence. Kim and Lee (2024) report that individuals less adept at adapting to new tools experience higher psychological strain when AI is introduced. Moreover, the OECD (2023a) identifies older and lower-skilled workers as especially vulnerable to the adverse effects of AI, citing lower digital readiness and greater resistance to change. Such disparities suggest that without adequate support and training, AI integration may deepen existing inequalities and harm the well-being of specific worker groups.

2.3 Why Generational Differences May Arise

Generational differences in how AI affects worker well-being are shaped by variations in technological acceptance, job roles, and career stage. Workers born after 1980 are generally more adaptable and open to adopting new technologies like AI (Wei & Li, 2022). However, the benefits of AI are not necessarily greater for this group. In manufacturing, older workers—particularly

those born before 1980—tend to experience greater mental health improvements, as AI often replaces physically demanding, repetitive, or hazardous tasks, significantly easing their workload.

At the same time, AI adoption may pose psychological challenges for older workers. According to Méndez-Suárez et al. (2026), AI can threaten their long-held workplace status or devalue tacit knowledge accumulated over decades, making them feel vulnerable or displaced. These dynamics highlight how both career stage and perceptions of technological change contribute to generational variation in how AI use influences worker well-being.

2.4 Why Gender Differences May Arise

Gender-based differences in the impact of AI on worker well-being are often linked to occupational segregation and varying perceptions of technological competence. Women and men tend to be distributed unevenly across job roles, which shapes the types of AI tools they are exposed to and how these tools are used in their work. This occupational sorting can result in differing levels of technological interaction, task automation, and perceived benefits from AI adoption.

Perceptions of technological competence also differ by gender. Humlum and Vestergaard (2025) document a consistent gender gap in the use of generative AI tools like ChatGPT, with women reporting lower familiarity and confidence. Similarly, Otis et al. (2024) find that this gap persists across regions, sectors, and occupations.

Moreover, Lakomý et al. (2025) find that female workers—especially those with lower education levels or in manual jobs—are more likely to hold negative attitudes toward digitalization. These attitudes may stem from concerns about job security, skill obsolescence, or lack of adequate support for reskilling, all of which can moderate the positive effects of AI on well-being.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

The relationship between AI use and worker well-being is shaped by two countervailing forces. On one hand, AI can enhance well-being by reducing physical strain, automating routine tasks, and improving efficiency—freeing time for more meaningful responsibilities. On the other hand, it may undermine well-being by increasing stress, eroding autonomy, devaluing skills, and generating job insecurity. These mechanisms are not mutually exclusive and may operate concurrently within the same workplace or workforce.

This study conceptualizes AI's impact on worker well-being as the net result of opposing forces—benefits from task relief and efficiency, versus costs from stress and insecurity. We empirically assess which influence prevails by examining the relationship between worker's use of AI and self-reported improvements in mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health across workers in seven OECD countries.

We further examine that these effects are not uniform across demographic groups. Generational differences may arise due to varying levels of digital nativity, technological adaptability, and career stage. For example, younger workers may adopt AI more readily but experience fewer marginal benefits, while older workers may face greater adjustment costs or perceive AI as a threat to their expertise. Similarly, gendered patterns of occupational roles and technology perceptions may shape how male and female workers experience the benefits or drawbacks of AI.

Together, this framework guides our empirical analysis, which investigates both the average effects of AI use and its heterogeneity across generational and gender lines.

3. Data and Methodology

3.1 Data

We utilize microdata from the OECD AI Surveys of Employers and Workers (OECD, 2023a), which are part of the OECD program on AI in Work, Innovation, Productivity and Skills. The surveys were conducted between mid-January and mid-February 2022, covering workers and firms in the manufacturing and financial and insurance sectors across Austria, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

For this paper, we focus on the workers' dataset, which captures detailed information on workers' characteristics, how they are associated with AI, and how they feel about AI. Specifically, we analyze how workers' use of AI is associated with their perceived mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health in the workplace.

Three survey questions are central to our analysis:[1]

1. "How do you think AI has changed your mental health and well-being in the workplace?" — (Improved mental health)

2. "How do you think AI has changed how much you enjoy your job?" — (Improved job enjoyment)

3. "How do you think AI has changed your physical health and safety in the workplace?" — (Improved physical health)

[1] Note that the specific wording asked to non-AI users is slightly different, as they do not personally use AI. They are asked: "How do you think AI has changed the mental health and well-being of workers in your company?", "How do you think AI has changed how much workers in your company enjoy their job?", and "How do you think AI has changed the physical health and safety of workers in your company?" For the purpose of this study, we combine AI users and non-AI users to conduct the empirical analyses.

We examine whether being an AI user (i.e., workers who report using AI in their work) is associated with higher likelihoods of reporting improvements in these three outcomes, compared to non-AI users.

Furthermore, we explore heterogeneity in effects across demographic subgroups. In particular, we assess whether the relationship between AI use and perceived well-being varies by generation—defined as Generation Z (born 1997–2012), Generation Y (1981–1996), Generation X (1965–1980), and Baby Boomers (born 1964 or earlier)—and by gender.

Table 1 presents the summary statistics of the data sample.[2] Overall, 73.16% of the workers in the sample are AI users. Approximately 52.07% report that AI has improved their mental health, 58.76% report improved job enjoyment, and 54.99% report improved physical health and safety in relation to AI in the workplace. Around 62.39% of respondents hold a bachelor's degree or higher, and 59.27% are male. Regarding employment status, 91.29% report working full-time, while 34.32% express being satisfied with their jobs. In terms of industry composition, 44.57% of respondents work in the manufacturing sector, while the remainder are in finance and insurance.

By generation, 11.93% of respondents belong to Generation Z (1997–2012), 48.27% to Generation Y (1981–1996), 32.64% to Generation X (1965–1980), and 7.16% to Baby Boomers or older (born 1964 or earlier). Regarding country representation, 11.83% of the sample are from Austria, 11.53% from Canada, 14.74% from Germany, 9.94% from Ireland, 14.36% from the United Kingdom, 17.42% from the United States, and 16.18% from France.

Table 2 provides similar summary statistics but disaggregates the sample by generation, with Panel A presenting data for Generation Z, Panel B for Generation Y, Panel C for Generation X, and Panel D for Baby Boomers and older workers.

Comparing across generations, younger cohorts are more likely to use AI in their work. Specifically, 81.61% of Generation Z workers report using AI, followed by 78.34% among Generation Y, 67.33% among Generation X, and 50.72% among Baby Boomers or older. This pattern reflects the higher digital adoption and technological familiarity among younger workers.

Similarly, younger generations are more likely to report positive well-being outcomes associated with AI use. The shares of workers reporting improved mental health, improved job enjoyment, and improved physical health and safety are 56.61%, 63.22%, and 58.91% for Generation Z, and 56.53%, 64.77%, and 60.44% for Generation Y, respectively. In contrast, the corresponding shares decline to 46.32%, 50.42%, and 47.79% for Generation X, and 40.67%, 48.80%, and 44.50% for Baby Boomers or older. These differences suggest that perceptions of AI's benefits to well-being tend to diminish with age.

[2] We include only workers employed in companies that report adopting AI. Workers in companies that do not adopt AI are excluded from the analysis.

In terms of job satisfaction, Generation Z workers appear the most satisfied (46.55%), whereas Generation X workers report the lowest level of job satisfaction (27.84%). The figures for Generation Y and Baby Boomers or older are 35.94% and 32.54%, respectively.

Table 3 contrasts the summary statistics of male and female workers. The results indicate that male workers are more likely to be AI users (77.80%) compared to female workers (66.33%). In terms of perceived well-being outcomes, male workers are also more likely to report that AI has improved their mental health (57.20% vs. 44.61%), job enjoyment (62.81% vs. 52.86%), and physical health and safety (60.84% vs. 46.46%).

Male workers also tend to exhibit characteristics associated with higher labor-market attachment and job satisfaction. They are more likely to have at least a college education (64.66% vs. 59.09%), to work full-time (95.08% vs. 85.77%), and to be satisfied with their jobs (38.46% vs. 28.28%). Moreover, a larger proportion of male workers are employed in the manufacturing sector compared to female workers (49.80% vs. 36.95%).

3.2 Methodology

In this paper, we utilize the following empirical model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ai\_user_i + \beta_2' x_i + manuf_i + \theta_g + \lambda_s + \gamma_c + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

where y_i is a binary dependent variable that equals 1 if worker i reports (i) improved mental health, (ii) improved job enjoyment, or (iii) improved physical health and safety, in association with AI in the workplace. For each of these outcomes, the original survey responses include six options: "improved a lot," "improved a little," "worsened a little," "worsened a lot," "no effect," and "don't know." We recode $y_i = 1$ if the respondent answered "improved a lot" or "improved a little," and $y_i = 0$ otherwise. Separate regressions are estimated for each dependent variable: (i) improved mental health, (ii) improved job enjoyment, and (iii) improved physical health and safety.

We focus on the key independent variable, ai_user_i, which indicates whether the worker uses AI in their job. It equals 1 if the respondent reports using AI at work and 0 otherwise. From the existing literature, the coefficient β_1 could be either positive or negative. Giuntella, König, and Stella (2025) find no significant deterioration in workers' mental health due to AI exposure in Germany and even suggest improvements through reduced physical strain. In contrast, Kim and Lee (2024) report that AI adoption can increase stress and burnout, particularly among workers with low self-efficacy in adapting to new technologies. These contrasting findings underscore the need for cross-country evidence on how AI exposure affects workers' mental health and well-being—a gap this study seeks to address using OECD data.

The vector x_i includes individual-level characteristics: Education: a dummy variable equal to 1 if the worker holds a bachelor's degree or higher; Gender: a dummy equal to 1 for male; and Employment type: a dummy equal to 1 if the worker is employed full-time.

To account for potential endogeneity arising from omitted variable bias—for instance, if more satisfied workers are also more likely to report positive effects of AI—we include a control for overall job satisfaction in the full specification. This variable is derived from the question "How satisfied are you with your job?" with responses ranging from "very satisfied," "somewhat satisfied," "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," "somewhat dissatisfied," to "very dissatisfied." We recode this variable as 1 if the worker answers "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied," and 0 otherwise.

$Manuf_i$ is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the worker is employed in the manufacturing sector (as opposed to finance and insurance). θ_g represents generation dummies—Generation Z (1997–2012), Generation Y (1981–1996), Generation X (1965–1980), and Baby Boomers or older (born 1964 or earlier). λ_s denotes firm-size dummies, and γ_c captures country fixed effects. The error term is represented by ε_i, and standard errors are clustered at the country level.

Our empirical analysis begins with a Linear Probability Model (LPM), and we subsequently estimate probit and logit versions of the model to verify that the results are not driven by model choice. After presenting the full-sample results, we turn to subgroup analyses. We estimate Equation (1) for each generation— Generation Z (1997–2012), Generation Y (1981–1996), Generation X (1965–1980), and Baby Boomers or older (born 1964 or earlier)—to see whether workers of different ages respond differently to AI use. In addition, we run separate regressions for male and female workers to uncover any gender differences in the perceived impacts of AI.

4. Results

4.1 Main Results

Tables 4, 5, and 6 report the main regression results for the three outcomes: improved mental health, improved job enjoyment, and improved physical health and safety. Table 4 presents the Linear Probability Model (LPM) estimates, while Tables 5 and 6 show the marginal effects obtained from the probit and logit models, respectively. Across all specifications and outcomes, the coefficient on AI User is positive, sizable, and statistically significant.

Under the LPM (Table 4), AI users are 12.8 percentage points more likely to report improved mental health, 21.3 percentage points more likely to report improved job enjoyment, and 9.18 percentage points more likely to report improved physical health relative to non-users. These effects are highly consistent across nonlinear specifications. The probit marginal effects (Table 5) are 12.4%, 19.7%, and 9.0%, respectively, while the logit estimates (Table 6) show nearly identical magnitudes of 12.4%, 19.4%, and 8.92%.

When overall job satisfaction is included as an additional control variable, the coefficients on AI use remain positive, statistically significant, and relatively stable in magnitude. In the LPM, the effects become 11.3 percentage points for improved mental health, 20.0 percentage points for improved job enjoyment, and 8.00 percentage points for improved physical health. The probit results similarly yield marginal effects of 10.9%, 18.3%, and 7.85%, and the logit estimates closely align at 10.9%, 18.1%, and 7.73%, respectively.

Job satisfaction itself emerges as one of the strongest predictors of perceived well-being changes related to AI. Workers who report being satisfied with their jobs are 19.0–19.4% more likely to report improved mental health, 17.7–17.9% more likely to report improved job enjoyment, and 15.4–15.6% more likely to report improved physical health across the three model specifications. These results suggest that although job satisfaction captures important underlying attitudes toward work, AI usage continues to exhibit a robust and independently positive association with workers' perceptions of mental, physical, and enjoyment-related outcomes.

For all subsequent subgroup analyses—those estimated separately by generation and by gender—we rely on the full specification that includes job satisfaction as part of the independent variables, given its strong predictive power and its role in capturing underlying attitudes toward work.

Education is also strongly associated with positive perceptions of AI. Workers with at least a bachelor's degree are between 7.49–9.96% more likely to report improved mental health, 12.1–14.8% more likely to report improved enjoyment, and 10.5–12.5% more likely to report improved physical health across all models.

Gender differences appear in some models. Male workers are significantly more likely than female workers to report improvements in mental and physical health. For instance, in the LPM, men are 7.62–9.41% more likely to report improved mental health and 7.77–9.21% more likely to report improved physical health. These patterns are robust across the probit and logit models.

Differences across industries are less pronounced. The manufacturing dummy is not statistically significant for mental health and job enjoyment but shows a strong and positive association with improved physical health (between 15.4–17.0% across all models), perhaps reflecting more tangible safety benefits of AI in physical production environments.

Overall, the main results provide strong evidence that AI use is positively associated with workers' perceptions of mental well-being, job enjoyment, and physical health, even after controlling for demographic characteristics, job characteristics, job satisfaction, firm size, and country fixed effects.

4.2 Results by Generation

Tables 7, 8, and 9 present the regression results by generational cohort—Generation Z (1997–2012), Generation Y (1981–1996), Generation X (1965–1980), and Baby Boomers or older (born 1964 or earlier)—using the LPM, probit (marginal effects), and logit (marginal effects), respectively. Across all models, clear generational differences emerge in how workers perceive the well-being effects of AI use.

For Generation Z, AI use does not significantly predict improved mental health or improved physical health in any model. The only consistent and statistically significant outcome is improved job enjoyment, with magnitudes ranging from 14.1–15.2% across specifications. A plausible explanation is that Gen Z workers—many of whom are first-jobbers, junior staff, or in early career entry-level positions—are already digital natives, with 81.61% reporting AI use. Their familiarity

with technology may limit the incremental impact of AI on mental or physical strain, while still enhancing job enjoyment through novelty or task efficiency.

For Generation Y, the effects of AI are the strongest, most consistent, and statistically significant across all three well-being outcomes. In the LPM, AI users in this cohort are 17.4% more likely to report improved mental health, 21.9% more likely to report improved job enjoyment, and 13.1% more likely to report improved physical health. The probit and logit models yield slightly smaller but still similar magnitudes—around 16.3–16.4% for mental health, 18.9–19.2% for job enjoyment, and 12.1–12.3% for physical health. These results suggest that Gen Y workers, many of whom occupy roles such as managers, supervisors, mid-level professionals, and heads of unit, may be in positions where AI tools tangibly reshape workflows, reduce routine burdens, and improve both psychological and physical aspects of their work, as well as contribute directly to higher job enjoyment.

Among Generation X workers, AI use is also associated with improved mental health and job enjoyment, but not with physical health. In the LPM, using AI increases the likelihood of improved mental health by 7.03% and improved job enjoyment by 20.8%. The probit and logit models show very similar effects (6.58–6.88% for mental health and 19.5–19.6% for job enjoyment). Gen X workers—often senior supervisors, senior managers, highly experienced specialists, or members of the C-suite—appear to benefit from AI in areas related to emotional and job-related satisfaction, although the absence of significant effects on physical health may reflect differences in job tasks or lower adaptability relative to Gen Y.

For Baby Boomers or older workers, the estimated effects of AI are largely statistically insignificant for job enjoyment and physical health. There is some evidence of improved mental health, with effects ranging from 10.7–10.8% across models, but these results are not consistently strong. This pattern aligns with expectations that older workers—typically in late-career roles, pre-retirement positions, advisory capacities, or board-level functions—may experience fewer direct gains in job enjoyment from AI adoption, as they may not find these tools as engaging or useful. The lack of physical health benefits, similar to Gen X, may reflect differences in job tasks or lower adaptability to new technologies relative to younger cohorts such as Generation Y.

Taken together, the results indicate that the positive association between AI use and worker well-being is strongest for Generation Y, followed by Generation X. Generation Z experiences benefits mainly in job enjoyment, consistent with their digital-native background and early-career roles. In contrast, Baby Boomers exhibit improvements only in mental health, with no significant gains in job enjoyment or physical health. Overall, these generational patterns underscore that workers' career stages, technological familiarity, and job responsibilities substantially influence how AI use translates into mental, physical, and job-related well-being.

4.3 Results by Gender

Tables 10, 11, and 12 present the regression estimates by gender, using the LPM, probit (marginal effects), and logit (marginal effects), respectively. Across both male and female subsamples, AI

use remains positively associated with improved mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health, although the magnitudes vary between them.

For male workers, AI use is associated with a 9.71% increase in the likelihood of reporting improved mental health, a 20.3% increase in job enjoyment, and an 8.89% increase in physical health under the LPM (Table 10). The probit and logit models produce very similar marginal effects, reinforcing the robustness of these findings.

For female workers, AI usage is also positively and significantly associated with improved mental health (11.9% in the LPM) and job enjoyment (19.3% in the LPM). However, the estimated effect on physical health is smaller and statistically insignificant in some specifications. This suggests that female workers may perceive fewer physical health improvements from AI compared to male workers, possibly reflecting differences in job types, task exposures, or the kinds of AI applications integrated into their workflows.

Comparing magnitudes across genders, female workers report a larger mental health benefit, whereas male workers report a larger physical health benefit. The relative magnitudes for job enjoyment vary slightly across models but are broadly comparable for men and women.

Across all specifications, education and job satisfaction remain strong predictors of well-being outcomes for both genders. Having a bachelor's degree or higher increases the likelihood of reporting improved outcomes by approximately 7.33–13.1%, while job satisfaction consistently predicts improvements of around 13.0–24.2% across mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health.

Overall, the gender-specific results indicate that both men and women benefit from AI usage across all well-being dimensions. However, the perceived mental health gains are stronger for women, whereas the perceived physical health improvements are larger and more robust among men. These differences suggest that the ways AI reshapes workplace experiences may vary across occupational roles, task environments, and gendered patterns of work, implying that AI's well-being impacts are partly shaped by existing job structures and gendered divisions of labor.

4.4 Discussion

Overall, the empirical evidence shows a clear and robust positive association between AI use and workers' perceived well-being across mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health. These patterns hold across all model specifications.

The subgroup analyses reveal substantial differences in these relationships. Across generational cohorts, Generation Y emerges as the group experiencing the strongest and most comprehensive benefits, reporting significant improvements in all three outcomes. Generation X also reports positive effects—particularly in mental health and job enjoyment—though the benefits are smaller than for Generation Y. Generation Z, despite being the most intensive AI users, experiences gains primarily in job enjoyment, suggesting that digital-native workers may not experience additional mental or physical relief from AI tools but may still find them engaging or enjoyable in their workplace. For Baby Boomers, the benefits are limited to modest improvements in mental health,

with no evidence of gains in job enjoyment or physical safety, consistent with lower usage rates and potential adjustment costs among older workers.

Gender-specific analyses further highlight differentiated impacts. Both men and women benefit from AI use across all well-being dimensions, but the magnitudes vary: women report stronger improvements in mental health, while men report larger and more robust gains in physical health. These patterns likely reflect structural differences in job roles, occupational environments, and the kinds of tasks where AI is most integrated.

5. Conclusion

This study provides cross-country evidence on how workplace AI use relates to workers' perceived well-being across mental health, job enjoyment, and physical health and safety in seven OECD economies. Using worker-level data from the OECD AI Surveys of Employers and Workers, the analysis reveals a consistent and robust positive association between AI use and all three well-being dimensions. These findings remain stable across linear and nonlinear models. The results suggest that AI tools are generally perceived as enhancing both the emotional and physical aspects of workers' experiences.

The results also uncover meaningful heterogeneity across demographic groups. Generation Y benefits most strongly and consistently from AI use, with significant gains across mental, physical, and job-related outcomes. Generation X also experiences improvements, though to a lesser extent, while Generation Z—despite being digital natives and frequent AI users—reports benefits primarily in job enjoyment rather than in mental or physical health. For Baby Boomers, the effects are limited and concentrated in mental health, reflecting differences in both AI exposure and adaptability across career stages. Gender differences follow a similar pattern of differentiated impacts: women report stronger mental health improvements, whereas men perceive greater physical health benefits. These variations indicate that AI's effects on well-being are shaped by workers' roles, responsibilities, and technological familiarity, as well as broader gendered and generational patterns in the labor market.

Taken together, the findings highlight that while AI use in the workplace is broadly associated with improved well-being, these benefits are not evenly distributed across workers. Understanding which groups gain the most—and which stand to gain less—is critical for policymakers, employers, and organizational leaders seeking to ensure that the integration of AI contributes positively to workplace experiences. Designing AI deployment strategies that account for workers' needs, skills, and career stages may help broaden the distribution of benefits and mitigate disparities in how AI reshapes work.

Future research could extend this analysis by examining longitudinal impacts of AI adoption, distinguishing between different types of AI tools (including generative AI), and exploring organizational factors that moderate the relationship between AI use and worker well-being. Such work would deepen our understanding of the social and economic implications of AI in the workplace and help inform more inclusive technology governance in an era of rapid technological change.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the author used NotebookLM to help screen the literature and GPT 5.1 to improve the readability and language in the writing of the manuscript. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and took full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2025). Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 140(2), 889–942.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280.

Giuntella, O., Konig, J., & Stella, L. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the wellbeing of workers. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 20087.

Humlum, A., & Vestergaard, E. (2025). The unequal adoption of ChatGPT exacerbates existing inequalities among workers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(1).

Johnson, A., Dey, S., Nguyen, H., Groth, M., Joyce, S., Tan, L., Glozier, N. & Harvey, S. (2020). A review and agenda for examining how technology-driven changes at work will impact workplace mental health and employee well-being. *Australian Journal of Management*, 45(3), 402–424.

Kim, B.-J., & Lee, J. (2024). The mental health implications of artificial intelligence adoption: The crucial role of self-efficacy. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1).

Lakomý, M., Šácha, J., & Vystrčil, F. (2025). Attitudes of European older workers towards digitalisation from the ecological perspective. *Information, Communication & Society.*

Méndez-Suárez, M., Ćukušić, M., & Ninčević-Pašalić, I. (2026). AI FoMO (fear of missing out) in the workplace. *Technology in Society*, 84, 103052.

Nazareno, L., & Schiff, D. S. (2021). The impact of automation and artificial intelligence on worker well-being. *Technology in Society*, 67, 101679.

Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192.

OECD (2023a). The impact of AI on the workplace: Main findings from the OECD AI surveys of employers and workers. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 288.

OECD (2023b). OECD Employment Outlook 2023: Artificial Intelligence and the Labour Market. OECD Publishing.

Otis, N. G., Delecourt, S., Cranney, K., & Koning, R. (2024). Global evidence on gender gaps and generative AI. Boston, MA, USA: Harvard Business School.

Wei, W., & Li, L. (2022). The impact of artificial intelligence on the mental health of manufacturing workers: The mediating role of overtime work and the work environment. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10.

Table 1: Summary Statistics (All Observations)

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	2,917	0.5207	0.4997	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	2,917	0.5876	0.4924	0	1
Improved Physical Health	2,917	0.5499	0.4976	0	1
AI User	2,917	0.7316	0.4432	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	2,917	0.6239	0.4845	0	1
Male	2,917	0.5927	0.4914	0	1
Full-time	2,917	0.9129	0.2820	0	1
Job Satisfied	2,917	0.3432	0.4748	0	1
Manufacturing	2,917	0.4457	0.4971	0	1

Variable		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Generation	Gen Z (1997-2012)	348	11.93	11.93
	Gen Y (1981-1996)	1,408	48.27	60.2
	Gen X (1965-1980)	952	32.64	92.84
	Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	209	7.16	100
Country	Austria	345	11.83	11.83
	Canada	453	15.53	27.36
	Germany	430	14.74	42.1
	Ireland	290	9.94	52.04
	UK	419	14.36	66.4
	USA	508	17.42	83.82
	France	472	16.18	100

Table 2: Summary Statistics (by Generation)

Panel A: Gen Z (1997-2012)

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	348	0.5661	0.4963	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	348	0.6322	0.4829	0	1
Improved Physical Health	348	0.5891	0.4927	0	1
AI User	348	0.8161	0.3880	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	348	0.6121	0.4880	0	1
Male	348	0.6063	0.4893	0	1
Full-time	348	0.8477	0.3598	0	1
Job Satisfied	348	0.4655	0.4995	0	1
Manufacturing	348	0.3851	0.4873	0	1

Panel B: Gen Y (1981-1996)

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	1,408	0.5653	0.4959	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	1,408	0.6477	0.4778	0	1
Improved Physical Health	1,408	0.6044	0.4892	0	1
AI User	1,408	0.7834	0.4121	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	1,408	0.6903	0.4625	0	1
Male	1,408	0.5952	0.4910	0	1
Full-time	1,408	0.9219	0.2685	0	1
Job Satisfied	1,408	0.3594	0.4800	0	1
Manufacturing	1,408	0.4332	0.4957	0	1

Panel C: Gen X (1965-1980)

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	952	0.4632	0.4989	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	952	0.5042	0.5002	0	1
Improved Physical Health	952	0.4779	0.4998	0	1
AI User	952	0.6733	0.4692	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	952	0.5651	0.4960	0	1
Male	952	0.5830	0.4933	0	1
Full-time	952	0.9317	0.2524	0	1
Job Satisfied	952	0.2784	0.4484	0	1
Manufacturing	952	0.4842	0.5000	0	1

Panel D: Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	209	0.4067	0.4924	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	209	0.4880	0.5011	0	1
Improved Physical Health	209	0.4450	0.4982	0	1
AI User	209	0.5072	0.5011	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	209	0.4641	0.4999	0	1
Male	209	0.5981	0.4915	0	1
Full-time	209	0.8756	0.3308	0	1
Job Satisfied	209	0.3254	0.4696	0	1
Manufacturing	209	0.4545	0.4991	0	1

Table 3: Summary Statistics (by Gender)

Panel A: Male Observations

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	1,729	0.5720	0.4949	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	1,729	0.6281	0.4834	0	1
Improved Physical Health	1,729	0.6084	0.4882	0	1
AI User	1,729	0.7785	0.4154	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	1,729	0.6466	0.4782	0	1
Full-time	1,729	0.9508	0.2163	0	1
Job Satisfied	1,729	0.3846	0.4866	0	1
Manufacturing	1,729	0.4980	0.5001	0	1

Panel B: Female Observations

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Improved Mental Health	1,188	0.4461	0.4973	0	1
Improved Job Enjoyment	1,188	0.5286	0.4994	0	1
Improved Physical Health	1,188	0.4646	0.4990	0	1
AI User	1,188	0.6633	0.4728	0	1
Bachelor or Higher	1,188	0.5909	0.4919	0	1
Full-time	1,188	0.8577	0.3495	0	1
Job Satisfied	1,188	0.2828	0.4506	0	1
Manufacturing	1,188	0.3695	0.4829	0	1

Table 4: Main Regression Results (Linear Probability Model)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Mental Health	(3) Improved Job Enjoyment	(4) Improved Job Enjoyment	(5) Improved Physical Health	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.128***	0.113***	0.213***	0.200***	0.0918***	0.0800***
	(0.0271)	(0.0302)	(0.0311)	(0.0317)	(0.0206)	(0.0211)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0996***	0.0765**	0.148***	0.127***	0.125***	0.106***
	(0.0266)	(0.0279)	(0.0238)	(0.0210)	(0.0232)	(0.0201)
Male	0.0941**	0.0762*	0.0538	0.0376	0.0921**	0.0777**
	(0.0333)	(0.0321)	(0.0309)	(0.0312)	(0.0248)	(0.0235)
Full-time	0.0327	0.0235	0.0470	0.0386	0.0429	0.0355
	(0.0308)	(0.0301)	(0.0342)	(0.0318)	(0.0332)	(0.0331)
Job Satisfied		0.194***		0.177***		0.156***
		(0.0133)		(0.0173)		(0.0130)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0136	0.0315	0.0231	0.0394	0.0215	0.0359
	(0.0361)	(0.0322)	(0.0368)	(0.0332)	(0.0392)	(0.0347)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	-0.0458	-0.0209	-0.0640	-0.0413	-0.0720	-0.0520
	(0.0446)	(0.0396)	(0.0440)	(0.0421)	(0.0457)	(0.0432)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0662	-0.0543	-0.0202	-0.00933	-0.0607	-0.0511
	(0.0473)	(0.0446)	(0.0801)	(0.0812)	(0.0401)	(0.0383)
Manufacturing	0.0175	0.0329	0.0237	0.0378	0.157***	0.170***
	(0.0254)	(0.0257)	(0.0242)	(0.0224)	(0.0246)	(0.0241)
Constant	0.293***	0.235***	0.259***	0.206***	0.226***	0.179**
	(0.0482)	(0.0466)	(0.0490)	(0.0522)	(0.0561)	(0.0543)
Observations	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917
R-squared	0.092	0.123	0.131	0.158	0.116	0.136
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	All	All	All	All	All	All

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: Main Regression Results (Probit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Mental Health	(3) Improved Job Enjoyment	(4) Improved Job Enjoyment	(5) Improved Physical Health	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.124***	0.109***	0.197***	0.183***	0.0900***	0.0785***
	(0.0265)	(0.0293)	(0.0277)	(0.0279)	(0.0205)	(0.0206)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0978***	0.0749***	0.142***	0.122***	0.123***	0.105***
	(0.0262)	(0.0268)	(0.0233)	(0.0202)	(0.0234)	(0.0199)
Male	0.0933***	0.0752**	0.0549*	0.0390	0.0894***	0.0748***
	(0.0327)	(0.0315)	(0.0318)	(0.0317)	(0.0249)	(0.0236)
Full-time	0.0350	0.0256	0.0440	0.0351	0.0438	0.0373
	(0.0317)	(0.0304)	(0.0338)	(0.0312)	(0.0320)	(0.0323)
Job Satisfied		0.191***		0.179***		0.155***
		(0.0136)		(0.0181)		(0.0134)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0150	0.0341	0.0264	0.0449	0.0226	0.0382
	(0.0371)	(0.0335)	(0.0370)	(0.0329)	(0.0395)	(0.0355)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	-0.0445	-0.0190	-0.0603	-0.0351	-0.0703	-0.0490
	(0.0451)	(0.0403)	(0.0449)	(0.0432)	(0.0464)	(0.0443)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0648	-0.0512	-0.0164	-0.00313	-0.0581	-0.0466
	(0.0484)	(0.0447)	(0.0780)	(0.0780)	(0.0410)	(0.0398)
Manufacturing	0.0171	0.0313	0.0210	0.0343	0.154***	0.166***
	(0.0260)	(0.0263)	(0.0246)	(0.0229)	(0.0241)	(0.0240)
Observations	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	All	All	All	All	All	All

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 6: Main Regression Results (Logit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Mental Health	(3) Improved Job Enjoyment	(4) Improved Job Enjoyment	(5) Improved Physical Health	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.124***	0.109***	0.194***	0.181***	0.0892***	0.0773***
	(0.0266)	(0.0296)	(0.0271)	(0.0279)	(0.0202)	(0.0204)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0979***	0.0755***	0.141***	0.121***	0.123***	0.105***
	(0.0258)	(0.0266)	(0.0228)	(0.0197)	(0.0231)	(0.0199)
Male	0.0925***	0.0749**	0.0533*	0.0378	0.0896***	0.0751***
	(0.0325)	(0.0315)	(0.0310)	(0.0313)	(0.0244)	(0.0232)
Full-time	0.0344	0.0244	0.0456	0.0361	0.0443	0.0369
	(0.0316)	(0.0304)	(0.0334)	(0.0310)	(0.0331)	(0.0331)
Job Satisfied		0.190***		0.179***		0.154***
		(0.0136)		(0.0188)		(0.0135)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0146	0.0331	0.0246	0.0420	0.0222	0.0366
	(0.0370)	(0.0332)	(0.0375)	(0.0340)	(0.0396)	(0.0355)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	-0.0450	-0.0191	-0.0622	-0.0374	-0.0713	-0.0509
	(0.0450)	(0.0401)	(0.0449)	(0.0437)	(0.0460)	(0.0437)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0660	-0.0529	-0.0177	-0.00538	-0.0586	-0.0484
	(0.0483)	(0.0452)	(0.0795)	(0.0806)	(0.0418)	(0.0397)
Manufacturing	0.0175	0.0319	0.0219	0.0345	0.156***	0.167***
	(0.0259)	(0.0264)	(0.0245)	(0.0231)	(0.0240)	(0.0239)
Observations	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917	2,917
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	All	All	All	All	All	All

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 7: Regression Results by Generation (Linear Probability Model)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health	(7) Improved Mental Health	(8) Improved Job Enjoyment	(9) Improved Physical Health	(10) Improved Mental Health	(11) Improved Job Enjoyment	(12) Improved Physical Health
AI User	-0.0137	0.152**	-0.0100	0.174**	0.219***	0.131***	0.0703*	0.208***	0.0421	0.107*	0.109	0.0555
	(0.0671)	(0.0510)	(0.0704)	(0.0492)	(0.0416)	(0.0281)	(0.0353)	(0.0352)	(0.0371)	(0.0515)	(0.0801)	(0.0572)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0542	0.120**	0.0336	0.0533*	0.137***	0.0879**	0.134**	0.124**	0.159***	-0.0724	0.0875	0.0246
	(0.0511)	(0.0331)	(0.0279)	(0.0235)	(0.0226)	(0.0321)	(0.0375)	(0.0468)	(0.0355)	(0.0782)	(0.0616)	(0.0638)
Male	0.0320	0.0164	0.144**	0.112*	0.0685	0.105**	0.0410	0.0405	0.0198	0.0739	-0.0366	0.0377
	(0.0542)	(0.0472)	(0.0500)	(0.0474)	(0.0396)	(0.0392)	(0.0438)	(0.0467)	(0.0339)	(0.0508)	(0.0488)	(0.0342)
Full-time	-0.0168	-0.0104	-0.00112	0.00840	0.0242	0.0789*	0.0748	0.0817	0.0449	-0.0382	-0.0167	-0.140
	(0.0719)	(0.0952)	(0.0817)	(0.0437)	(0.0260)	(0.0382)	(0.0703)	(0.0775)	(0.0406)	(0.0784)	(0.0860)	(0.0975)
Job Satisfied	0.0991	0.0410	0.0461	0.238***	0.192***	0.170***	0.166***	0.203***	0.173***	0.146*	0.170**	0.115
	(0.0564)	(0.0501)	(0.0629)	(0.0259)	(0.0168)	(0.0239)	(0.0234)	(0.0230)	(0.0346)	(0.0630)	(0.0644)	(0.0820)
Manufacturing	-0.0548	0.0158	0.0433	0.0128	0.0270	0.122**	0.0802*	0.0567	0.265***	0.126	0.0489	0.281**
	(0.0579)	(0.0333)	(0.0862)	(0.0338)	(0.0226)	(0.0344)	(0.0387)	(0.0372)	(0.0249)	(0.0863)	(0.0845)	(0.0868)
Constant	0.555***	0.392***	0.436**	0.184*	0.289***	0.125*	0.172	-0.00806	0.147	0.155	0.158*	0.0970
	(0.0932)	(0.0868)	(0.130)	(0.0769)	(0.0604)	(0.0539)	(0.0946)	(0.123)	(0.0954)	(0.134)	(0.0808)	(0.162)
Observations	348	348	348	1,408	1,408	1,408	952	952	952	209	209	209
R-squared	0.056	0.089	0.062	0.158	0.161	0.133	0.128	0.192	0.196	0.122	0.180	0.165
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen X	Gen X	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 8: Regression Results by Generation (Probit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health	(7) Improved Mental Health	(8) Improved Job Enjoyment	(9) Improved Physical Health	(10) Improved Mental Health	(11) Improved Job Enjoyment	(12) Improved Physical Health
AI User	-0.0115	0.145***	-0.0108	0.164***	0.192***	0.123***	0.0658*	0.196***	0.0438	0.108**	0.110	0.0528
	(0.0637)	(0.0467)	(0.0712)	(0.0456)	(0.0350)	(0.0257)	(0.0351)	(0.0348)	(0.0385)	(0.0497)	(0.0729)	(0.0545)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0540	0.118***	0.0331	0.0527**	0.128***	0.0863***	0.132***	0.120***	0.159***	-0.0758	0.0876	0.0227
	(0.0491)	(0.0290)	(0.0283)	(0.0226)	(0.0220)	(0.0308)	(0.0344)	(0.0449)	(0.0321)	(0.0782)	(0.0572)	(0.0629)
Male	0.0332	0.0160	0.143***	0.109**	0.0714*	0.100***	0.0412	0.0375	0.0176	0.0759	-0.0372	0.0357
	(0.0528)	(0.0445)	(0.0461)	(0.0452)	(0.0381)	(0.0373)	(0.0435)	(0.0466)	(0.0327)	(0.0495)	(0.0454)	(0.0335)
Full-time	-0.0120	-0.0104	0.00141	0.00904	0.0183	0.0747**	0.0854	0.0894	0.0610	-0.0380	-0.0103	-0.151
	(0.0706)	(0.0914)	(0.0771)	(0.0430)	(0.0224)	(0.0349)	(0.0786)	(0.0804)	(0.0444)	(0.0876)	(0.0766)	(0.103)
Job Satisfied	0.0973*	0.0409	0.0440	0.235***	0.198***	0.173***	0.162***	0.200***	0.168***	0.143**	0.162***	0.115
	(0.0540)	(0.0472)	(0.0611)	(0.0259)	(0.0175)	(0.0220)	(0.0218)	(0.0258)	(0.0321)	(0.0601)	(0.0560)	(0.0819)
Manufacturing	-0.0533	0.0161	0.0422	0.00970	0.0228	0.117***	0.0794**	0.0548	0.255***	0.129	0.0503	0.278***
	(0.0558)	(0.0329)	(0.0841)	(0.0343)	(0.0236)	(0.0344)	(0.0397)	(0.0376)	(0.0213)	(0.0825)	(0.0827)	(0.0779)
Observations	348	348	348	1,408	1,408	1,408	952	952	952	205	209	205
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen X	Gen X	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 9: Regression Results by Generation (Logit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health	(7) Improved Mental Health	(8) Improved Job Enjoyment	(9) Improved Physical Health	(10) Improved Mental Health	(11) Improved Job Enjoyment	(12) Improved Physical Health
AI User	-0.0141	0.141***	-0.00980	0.163***	0.189***	0.121***	0.0688*	0.195***	0.0434	0.108**	0.112	0.0550
	(0.0640)	(0.0457)	(0.0694)	(0.0463)	(0.0342)	(0.0261)	(0.0351)	(0.0357)	(0.0368)	(0.0486)	(0.0728)	(0.0549)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0535	0.119***	0.0326	0.0517**	0.126***	0.0856***	0.133***	0.120***	0.161***	-0.0736	0.0879	0.0219
	(0.0491)	(0.0291)	(0.0280)	(0.0224)	(0.0215)	(0.0308)	(0.0345)	(0.0445)	(0.0333)	(0.0790)	(0.0566)	(0.0627)
Male	0.0316	0.0149	0.141***	0.109**	0.0684*	0.0994***	0.0406	0.0394	0.0195	0.0733	-0.0381	0.0368
	(0.0529)	(0.0466)	(0.0464)	(0.0449)	(0.0378)	(0.0367)	(0.0435)	(0.0458)	(0.0325)	(0.0499)	(0.0463)	(0.0352)
Full-time	-0.0168	-0.00836	0.00207	0.00930	0.0208	0.0751**	0.0847	0.0906	0.0567	-0.0449	-0.0166	-0.152
	(0.0696)	(0.0904)	(0.0775)	(0.0430)	(0.0233)	(0.0359)	(0.0802)	(0.0816)	(0.0459)	(0.0856)	(0.0765)	(0.101)
Job Satisfied	0.0983*	0.0406	0.0451	0.234***	0.200***	0.172***	0.162***	0.200***	0.168***	0.141**	0.164***	0.110
	(0.0537)	(0.0479)	(0.0615)	(0.0262)	(0.0183)	(0.0223)	(0.0219)	(0.0259)	(0.0320)	(0.0601)	(0.0565)	(0.0801)
Manufacturing	-0.0544	0.0167	0.0442	0.00997	0.0217	0.119***	0.0808**	0.0557	0.254***	0.127	0.0473	0.275***
	(0.0561)	(0.0330)	(0.0836)	(0.0341)	(0.0230)	(0.0345)	(0.0388)	(0.0374)	(0.0206)	(0.0840)	(0.0840)	(0.0801)
Observations	348	348	348	1,408	1,408	1,408	952	952	952	205	209	205
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Z	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen Y	Gen X	Gen X	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers	Baby Boomers

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 10: Regression Results by Gender (Linear Probability Model)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.0971**	0.203***	0.0889**	0.119**	0.193***	0.0698
	(0.0271)	(0.0461)	(0.0320)	(0.0464)	(0.0355)	(0.0384)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0794*	0.120***	0.123***	0.0699*	0.131***	0.0738**
	(0.0343)	(0.0231)	(0.0269)	(0.0319)	(0.0330)	(0.0237)
Full-time	-0.0484	0.0368	0.0423	0.0606	0.0356	0.0390
	(0.0663)	(0.0624)	(0.0914)	(0.0489)	(0.0332)	(0.0425)
Job Satisfied	0.161***	0.168***	0.130***	0.242***	0.187***	0.187***
	(0.0207)	(0.0310)	(0.0208)	(0.0181)	(0.0368)	(0.0382)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0792*	0.0692	0.0357	-0.0149	-0.0143	0.0345
	(0.0407)	(0.0511)	(0.0395)	(0.0252)	(0.0244)	(0.0487)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	-0.00313	-0.0146	-0.0812	-0.0186	-0.0801	-0.00874
	(0.0416)	(0.0511)	(0.0487)	(0.0373)	(0.0464)	(0.0482)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0353	-0.0289	-0.0774	-0.0554	0.0248	-0.00335
	(0.0502)	(0.0933)	(0.0497)	(0.0315)	(0.0474)	(0.0453)
Manufacturing	-0.00450	0.00657	0.123***	0.0933*	0.0902**	0.252***
	(0.0279)	(0.0261)	(0.0271)	(0.0387)	(0.0274)	(0.0411)
Constant	0.319***	0.152	0.250**	0.308**	0.359***	0.211**
	(0.0380)	(0.0993)	(0.0730)	(0.0918)	(0.0608)	(0.0784)
Observations	1,729	1,729	1,729	1,188	1,188	1,188
R-squared	0.125	0.177	0.128	0.121	0.133	0.134
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 11: Regression Results by Gender (Probit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.0907***	0.178***	0.0836***	0.118***	0.186***	0.0705*
	(0.0258)	(0.0385)	(0.0290)	(0.0449)	(0.0318)	(0.0393)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0777**	0.115***	0.119***	0.0689**	0.127***	0.0733***
	(0.0332)	(0.0240)	(0.0273)	(0.0315)	(0.0310)	(0.0235)
Full-time	-0.0468	0.0337	0.0416	0.0646	0.0342	0.0429
	(0.0668)	(0.0603)	(0.0884)	(0.0513)	(0.0332)	(0.0433)
Job Satisfied	0.161***	0.170***	0.132***	0.231***	0.187***	0.182***
	(0.0192)	(0.0273)	(0.0220)	(0.0167)	(0.0370)	(0.0361)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0844*	0.0787	0.0419	-0.0131	-0.0140	0.0352
	(0.0451)	(0.0494)	(0.0425)	(0.0244)	(0.0236)	(0.0456)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	0.00260	-0.00447	-0.0734	-0.0173	-0.0784*	-0.00876
	(0.0441)	(0.0516)	(0.0505)	(0.0362)	(0.0468)	(0.0449)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0290	-0.0172	-0.0698	-0.0544*	0.0236	-0.00226
	(0.0491)	(0.0868)	(0.0500)	(0.0321)	(0.0447)	(0.0449)
Manufacturing	-0.00628	0.00173	0.121***	0.0925**	0.0901***	0.243***
	(0.0289)	(0.0261)	(0.0262)	(0.0384)	(0.0277)	(0.0379)
Observations	1,729	1,729	1,729	1,188	1,188	1,188
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 12: Regression Results by Gender (Logit Model: Marginal Effects)

VARIABLES	(1) Improved Mental Health	(2) Improved Job Enjoyment	(3) Improved Physical Health	(4) Improved Mental Health	(5) Improved Job Enjoyment	(6) Improved Physical Health
AI User	0.0898***	0.174***	0.0814***	0.118***	0.184***	0.0700*
	(0.0258)	(0.0381)	(0.0292)	(0.0452)	(0.0314)	(0.0384)
Bachelor or Higher	0.0768**	0.112***	0.119***	0.0699**	0.129***	0.0752***
	(0.0334)	(0.0242)	(0.0271)	(0.0312)	(0.0305)	(0.0231)
Full-time	-0.0477	0.0336	0.0439	0.0633	0.0338	0.0407
	(0.0689)	(0.0584)	(0.0912)	(0.0520)	(0.0328)	(0.0442)
Job Satisfied	0.161***	0.171***	0.131***	0.228***	0.187***	0.182***
	(0.0195)	(0.0280)	(0.0225)	(0.0161)	(0.0371)	(0.0360)
generation = 2, Gen Y (1981-1996)	0.0829*	0.0756	0.0367	-0.0142	-0.0163	0.0344
	(0.0444)	(0.0509)	(0.0420)	(0.0252)	(0.0236)	(0.0486)
generation = 3, Gen X (1965-1980)	0.00173	-0.00652	-0.0785	-0.0182	-0.0818*	-0.0100
	(0.0435)	(0.0525)	(0.0488)	(0.0364)	(0.0465)	(0.0475)
generation = 4, Baby Boomers (1964 & Older)	-0.0308	-0.0193	-0.0742	-0.0555*	0.0238	-0.00153
	(0.0498)	(0.0904)	(0.0500)	(0.0319)	(0.0450)	(0.0461)
Manufacturing	-0.00611	0.00152	0.122***	0.0930**	0.0907***	0.242***
	(0.0287)	(0.0271)	(0.0260)	(0.0378)	(0.0270)	(0.0376)
Observations	1,729	1,729	1,729	1,188	1,188	1,188
Company Size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1