PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE (PRJSS)
ISSN Online : Open Access Scholarly Journal

Artificial Intelligence And The Transformation of Labor Markets

Sabu P J

Associate Professor Economics, St.Thomas College, Thrissur, Kerala, India.

Article information
Received: 8th March 2026
Received in revised form: 25th March 2026
Accepted: 13th April 2026
Available online: 20th April 2026

Volume: 1
Issue: 1
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19641430

Abstract

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, particularly generative AI and large language models, has reignited debates about the future of work and the potential for widespread labor market disruption. This article examines the socioeconomic implications of AI-driven automation through the lens of political economy and labor sociology. Drawing on recent empirical studies, industry reports, and historical analyses of technological transitions, the article evaluates competing claims about the scale and nature of anticipated job displacement. It argues that while AI differs from previous automation technologies in its capacity to perform cognitive and creative tasks, the distributional consequences of AI adoption will be shaped primarily by institutional factors—including labor market regulation, education policy, and corporate governance structures—rather than by the technology itself. The article concludes by assessing policy proposals including universal basic income, portable benefits, retraining programs, and AI taxation as mechanisms for managing the transition.

Keywords: - Artificial intelligence, Automation, Future of work, Labor markets, Technological unemployment, Universal basic income

Introduction

The question of whether machines will replace human workers is as old as industrialization itself. From the Luddite uprisings of the early nineteenth century to Keynes's (1930) prediction of 'technological unemployment,' each wave of technological innovation has provoked anxieties about the displacement of human labor. Yet history has consistently demonstrated that while specific occupations may be destroyed, new forms of work emerge, and aggregate employment has generally recovered and expanded (Mokyr, Vickers, and Ziebarth 2015). The question confronting contemporary societies is whether artificial intelligence represents a continuation of this historical pattern or a qualitative rupture.

The emergence of generative AI systems exemplified by large language models capable of producing human-quality text, code, images, and analysis has sharpened this question considerably. Unlike previous automation technologies, which primarily affected routine manual and cognitive tasks, generative AI demonstrates competence across a broad range of non-routine cognitive activities that were previously considered the exclusive domain of educated professionals (Eloundou et al. 2023). Goldman Sachs estimated that generative AI could expose 300 million full-time jobs globally to automation, with two-thirds of US occupations having at least some tasks amenable to AI substitution (Hatzius et al. 2023). The International Monetary Fund projected that AI would affect approximately 40 percent of jobs worldwide, with advanced economies facing the highest exposure (Georgieva 2024).

This article examines the social implications of AI-driven labor market transformation through an interdisciplinary lens, drawing on labor economics, sociology of work, and political economy. It argues that the critical question is not whether AI will transform labor markets it almost certainly will but how the costs and benefits of that transformation will be distributed across society. The article demonstrates that technological determinism, whether optimistic or pessimistic, obscures the central role of institutional design and political choice in shaping outcomes.

Historical Context: Technology and Labor in Perspective

Historical analysis provides essential context for evaluating contemporary AI anxieties. The first Industrial Revolution displaced artisanal textile workers but eventually generated far more employment in factories, transportation, and new service industries. However, the transition was neither smooth nor painless: the first generation of displaced workers experienced decades of wage stagnation, deteriorating working conditions, and social dislocation before the benefits of industrialization were broadly shared (Allen 2009). Polanyi's (1944) concept of the 'double movement'—in which market expansion provokes protective countermovements from society—captures the political dynamics of this adjustment process.

The twentieth century's technological transformations followed a broadly similar pattern. Mechanization of agriculture displaced millions of farm workers, but the expansion of manufacturing and services absorbed the surplus labor. Automation of manufacturing in the late twentieth century eliminated many routine production jobs but coincided with the growth of knowledge-economy employment (Autor, Levy, and Murnane 2003). Crucially, the distribution of gains from these transitions was mediated by institutional factors: strong unions, progressive taxation, public education, and social insurance programs helped ensure that productivity gains were widely shared during the post-war decades, while the erosion of these institutions after 1980 contributed to rising inequality (Piketty 2014; Acemoglu and Restrepo 2020).

The Nature of AI-Driven Displacement: Tasks, Not Jobs

A foundational insight in the contemporary literature is that automation displaces tasks, not jobs (Autor, Levy, and Murnane 2003; Acemoglu and Restrepo 2019). Most occupations comprise a bundle of tasks, some of which are more amenable to automation than others. The net employment effect depends on the balance between the displacement effect (automation substituting for human labor in specific tasks) and the productivity effect (automation increasing output and potentially creating new tasks and occupations). Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) formalized this framework, arguing that the overall impact of automation on employment depends on the rate at which new tasks are created relative to the rate at which existing tasks are automated.

Eloundou et al. (2023) applied this framework specifically to large language models (LLMs), finding that approximately 80 percent of the US workforce could have at least 10 percent of their work tasks affected by LLMs, while approximately 19 percent could see at least 50 percent of their tasks affected. Importantly, exposure was highest among higher-income, more educated workers—a reversal of previous automation patterns that predominantly affected lower-skilled workers. Occupations with high exposure included interpreters, writers, tax preparers, mathematicians, and web designers, while occupations requiring physical dexterity, outdoor work, or hands-on care were less exposed.

Brynjolfsson, Li, and Raymond (2023) provided early empirical evidence of AI's productivity effects, studying the deployment of a generative AI assistant for customer service agents. They found that access to AI increased worker productivity by 14 percent on average, with the largest gains accruing to less experienced and lower-skilled workers. This finding suggests that AI may have an equalizing effect within occupations, compressing the skill distribution by disproportionately augmenting the capabilities of less proficient workers. Whether this translates into more equal labor market outcomes at the macro level depends on whether firms use AI to augment workers or replace them.

Distributional Consequences and Inequality

The distributional implications of AI adoption are a central concern. Autor (2015) argued that automation has been a major driver of labor market polarization—the hollowing out of middle-skill, middle-wage occupations and the growth of both high-skill and low-skill employment. AI threatens to extend this polarization upward, potentially displacing professional and managerial workers who have thus far been relatively insulated from automation (Susskind and Susskind 2015). If the gains from AI-driven productivity accrue primarily to capital owners and highly skilled AI specialists, the result could be a significant acceleration of income and wealth inequality.

Korinek and Juelfs (2022) modeled the macroeconomic effects of transformative AI and found that without policy intervention, AI could produce enormous aggregate wealth gains while simultaneously reducing wages for large segments of the workforce. They argued that the concentration of AI development among a small number of technology companies amplifies this risk, as the rents from AI innovation are captured by a narrow corporate and geographic elite. The geographic concentration of AI development in a few global hubs—Silicon Valley, Beijing, London—raises additional concerns about spatial inequality both within and between nations (Muro, Whiton, and Maxim 2019).

Gender and racial dimensions add further complexity. Historical patterns suggest that automation disproportionately affects workers from marginalized groups, who are overrepresented in routine occupations and underrepresented in the occupations and firms developing AI (West, Whittaker, and Crawford 2019). The AI workforce itself is notably homogeneous: women constitute only 22 percent of AI professionals globally, and racial minorities are similarly underrepresented (World Economic Forum 2023). This underrepresentation shapes both who benefits from AI innovation and whose needs and concerns are reflected in AI system design.

AI and the Global South: Development Implications

The implications of AI for developing economies merit particular attention. The traditional development model—in which low-income countries leverage cheap labor to attract manufacturing investment and climb the value chain—may be undermined by AI-driven automation of manufacturing and service outsourcing (Rodrik 2016). If AI enables reshoring

of manufacturing to high-income countries through robotic production, the pathway to industrialization that lifted East Asian economies may be foreclosed for countries in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

Conversely, AI offers potential development opportunities. Agrawal, Gans, and Goldfarb (2019) argued that AI reduces the cost of prediction, which could enhance decision-making in sectors like agriculture, healthcare, and education in resource-constrained settings. Mobile-based AI applications for crop disease detection, medical diagnosis, and adaptive learning have shown promise in pilot programs across developing countries (Owoyemi et al. 2020). However, realizing these benefits requires investments in digital infrastructure, data governance, and human capital that many developing countries currently lack.

Policy Responses: Managing the Transition

A range of policy proposals have been advanced to manage the labor market effects of AI. Universal basic income (UBI) has received renewed attention as a mechanism for providing economic security in an era of potentially widespread displacement. Proponents argue that UBI would provide a floor of economic security, support entrepreneurship and care work, and reduce the administrative complexity of means-tested programs (Van Parijs and Vanderborght 2017). Critics counter that UBI is fiscally unsustainable at meaningful levels, may reduce labor supply, and does not address the non-economic dimensions of work including identity, purpose, and social connection (Sage and Diamond 2017).

Education and retraining programs are frequently proposed but face significant challenges. The evidence on the effectiveness of government retraining programs for displaced workers is mixed, with many programs showing limited effects on employment and earnings (Heckman, LaLonde, and Smith 1999). The pace of AI advancement may outstrip the capacity of educational institutions to adapt curricula, and the skills required to work alongside AI systems are themselves evolving rapidly. Lifelong learning systems that integrate formal education, employer-based training, and modular credentialing may be more responsive than traditional educational structures (OECD 2019).

Taxation of AI and automation has been proposed by figures including Bill Gates, who advocated a 'robot tax' to slow the pace of labor displacement and fund transition programs (Delaney 2017). Abbott and Bogenschneider (2018) argued that current tax systems inadvertently subsidize automation by taxing labor more heavily than capital, and that equalizing the tax treatment of human and machine labor could slow inefficient automation while generating revenue for adjustment programs. More broadly, corporate governance reforms that give workers greater voice in automation decisions through board representation, collective bargaining, or mandatory consultation requirements could help ensure that the deployment of AI reflects a broader set of stakeholder interests (Acemoglu 2021).

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence represents a transformative technology with the potential to reshape labor markets as profoundly as the Industrial Revolution. However, the specific outcomes of this transformation are not predetermined by the technology itself. They will be shaped by the institutional frameworks, policy choices, and power dynamics that govern the deployment of AI in the economy. The historical record demonstrates that societies that invested in broad-based education, strong labor market institutions, and robust social protection were better able to manage technological transitions and distribute their benefits widely.

The current moment demands a similar commitment to institutional innovation. Rather than debating whether AI will destroy or create jobs—a question whose answer depends entirely on human choices policymakers, firms, and civil society should focus on building the institutional infrastructure needed to ensure that AI-driven productivity gains are broadly shared. This requires not only investment in education and social protection but also a fundamental reconsideration of how the ownership of and returns from AI-generated wealth are distributed. The alternative a laissez-faire approach that allows market forces alone to determine the distribution of AI's benefits risks producing levels of inequality that threaten social cohesion and democratic governance.

References

Abbott, Ryan, and Bret Bogenschneider. 2018. "Should Robots Pay Taxes? Tax Policy in the Age of Automation." Harvard Law & Policy Review 12: 145–75.

Acemoglu, Daron. 2021. "Harms of AI." NBER Working Paper 29247. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Acemoglu, Daron, and Pascual Restrepo. 2019. "Automation and New Tasks: How Technology Displaces and Reinstates Labor." Journal of Economic Perspectives 33 (2): 3–30.

Acemoglu, Daron, and Pascual Restrepo. 2020. "Robots and Jobs: Evidence from US Labor Markets." Journal of Political Economy 128 (6): 2188–244.

Agrawal, Ajay, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb. 2019. "Economic Policy for Artificial Intelligence." Innovation Policy and the Economy 19: 139–59.

Allen, Robert C. 2009. The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Autor, David H. 2015. "Why Are There Still So Many Jobs? The History and Future of Workplace Automation." Journal of Economic Perspectives 29 (3): 3–30.

Autor, David H., Frank Levy, and Richard J. Murnane. 2003. "The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration." Quarterly Journal of Economics 118 (4): 1279–333.

Brynjolfsson, Erik, Danielle Li, and Lindsey R. Raymond. 2023. "Generative AI at Work." NBER Working Paper 31161. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Delaney, Kevin J. 2017. "The Robot That Takes Your Job Should Pay Taxes, Says Bill Gates." Quartz, February 17.
Eloundou, Tyna, Sam Manning, Pamela Mishkin, and Daniel Rock. 2023. "GPTs Are GPTs: An Early Look at the Labor Market Impact Potential of Large Language Models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10130.
Georgieva, Kristalina. 2024. "AI Will Transform the Global Economy. Let's Make Sure It Benefits Humanity." IMF Blog, January 14.
Hatzius, Jan, Joseph Briggs, Devesh Kodnani, and Giovanni Pierdomenico. 2023. "The Potentially Large Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Economic Growth." Goldman Sachs Economics Research, March 26.
Heckman, James J., Robert J. LaLonde, and Jeffrey A. Smith. 1999. "The Economics and Econometrics of Active Labor Market Programs." In Handbook of Labor Economics, vol. 3A, edited by Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, 1865–2097. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Keynes, John Maynard. 1930. "Economic Possibilities for Our Grandchildren." In Essays in Persuasion, 321–32. London: Macmillan.
Korinek, Anton, and Megan Juelfs. 2022. "Preparing for the (Non-Existent?) Future of Work." In The Oxford Handbook of AI Governance, edited by Justin Bullock et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mokyr, Joel, Chris Vickers, and Nicolas L. Ziebarth. 2015. "The History of Technological Anxiety and the Future of Economic Growth: Is This Time Different?" Journal of Economic Perspectives 29 (3): 31–50.
Muro, Mark, Jacob Whiton, and Robert Maxim. 2019. "What Jobs Are Affected by AI? Better-Paid, Better-Educated Workers Face the Most Exposure." Brookings Institution, November 20.
OECD. 2019. OECD Employment Outlook 2019: The Future of Work. Paris: OECD Publishing.
Piketty, Thomas. 2014. Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Polanyi, Karl. 1944. The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.
Rodrik, Dani. 2016. "Premature Deindustrialization." Journal of Economic Growth 21 (1): 1–33.
Sage, Daniel, and Patrick Diamond. 2017. Europe's New Social Reality: The Case Against Universal Basic Income. London: Policy Network.
Susskind, Richard, and Daniel Susskind. 2015. The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Owoyemi, Ayomide, Joanne Owoyemi, Adebayo Osiyemi, and Andy Boyd. 2020. "Artificial Intelligence for Healthcare in Africa." Frontiers in Digital Health 2: 6.
Van Parijs, Philippe, and Yannick Vanderborght. 2017. Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
West, Sarah Myers, Meredith Whittaker, and Kate Crawford. 2019. Discriminating Systems: Gender, Race, and Power in AI. New York: AI Now Institute.
World Economic Forum. 2023. Global Gender Gap Report 2023. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS