



ACADEMIA Tech Frontiers Journal

DOI: 10.63056

AI and the Future of Work: Redefining Skills, Employment, and Human–Machine Collaboration

Muhammad Daniyal ^a

^a Department of Management Sciences, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

daniyal123@gmail.com

Article Info:

Received: May 08, 2025

Revised: May 22, 2025

Accepted: June 12, 2025

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Daniyal

ABSTRACT

The quickened advancement of the Fake Insights (AI) is changing long term of work, challenging the customary worldview of business, and reevaluating the concept of skills and human-machines interaction. When AI advances are seen as a promising opportunity to attain productivity, advancement, and efficiency, they moreover raise questions approximately work uprooting, disparity, and the readiness of laborers to grasp unused shapes of substances. This paper talks about the two-fold impact of AI on the labor constrain, agreeing to which AI is modifying the labor markets, as well as influencing the request of cognitive, social, and specialized skills, and making novel ways of human-machine participation. The paper investigates the openings and challenges of AI in creating long haul work situations, based on later writing, reports, and cases around the globe. It states that rather than substituting human labor with AI, it'll upgrade human capacities, which can require reskilling, non-discriminatory arrangements, moral integration systems. The work is profitable to the current talk on the trade-offs between innovative progression and social supportability by giving understanding of the ways in which social orders can oversee the changing flow of work within the age of AI.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Future of Work, Human–Machine Collaboration, Reskilling, Automation, Employment, Digital Transformation, Workforce Adaptation

INTRODUCTION

One of the foremost radical mechanical changes of the 21 st century is the developing pace of Fake Insights (AI) integration into work environments. Machine learning and computerization are quick changing the way labor is organized, carried out and compensated in areas such as the fabricating division conjointly in benefit segments like analytics that are run through AI. The impacts of AI on employments are muddled and multidimensional and may both make trust of proficiency and extending openings as well as lead to concerns of displacement and disparity. Innovative insurgencies just like the computerized insurgency or the Mechanical Transformation within the past were known to smash the existing work design but offered modern roads of development and financial development. AI, though, is subjectively distinctive since it isn't only substituting routinized forms; in expansion, it can don't as it were hack and spit like people, giving cognitive and choice making forms customarily seen as uniquely human. This troublesome capacity makes AI a challenge and a driver of the redefinition of the exceptionally concept of work. The longer term of work within the time of AI cannot be seen as a story of the substitution of people by machines. On the other hand, it must be deciphered in terms of increase, in which the human creative ability, compassion, and basic considering overlap with machine execution and computing capacity. AI advances proceed to be presented in choice making, prescient analytics in wellbeing care, calculations in gig economy stages, and so forward. This merging has driven to a few genuine talks about concerning control, responsibility and the part of human labor within the future. Will AI offer



assistance individuals realize their possibilities and bring forward unused conceivable outcomes to work together and be imaginative, or will it increase disparities by pushing powerless bunches of the labor constrain out of the work? These are a few of the central questions that are raised within the talk about almost the ethics, approaches, and social suggestions of AI entering the work environment.

The changing skills environment is one of the concerning topics. The inherent human qualities—such as problem-solving, communication, flexibility, and moral judgment—become increasingly valuable when regular tasks are automated.

Meanwhile, technical literacy and digital competence turns out as the necessary conditions of engagement in the AI-powered economy. The role of reskilling and upskilling therefore is important in equipping the workers to the future and the education systems are now under pressure to redesign the curricula to meet the current technological realities. The capacity of societies to adjust to such changes will be a determinant of whether the changes resulting out of AI-driven changes will lead to inclusive developments or increase inequalities.

Furthermore, the emergence of AI means the appearance of new patterns of human machine co-operation. In contrast to the previous technological transformations, which focused on substitution, the AI era is more focused on complement, of human and machines performing the same tasks simultaneously. In more industrial areas like healthcare, customer care and creative fields, AI systems increase efficiency but depend on human management, decision-making, and compassion. The hybrid model questions the conventional organizational formations and demands a revision in the workplace cultures, management strategies and policy frameworks. In the meantime, it also brings up the concept of ethical boundaries that are required to make AI systems accountable, impartial, and human-centered.

Long term of work is further complicated by the degree of impact of AI that's worldwide. In spite of the fact that economies within the created world might appreciate efficiency and accessibility of gifted specialists, the creating nations confront the chance of being cleared out behind since of destitute framework, disparity in instruction and difference in get to to innovation. The universal collaboration, unification of approaches, and break even with conveyance of assets are thus required to avoid the assist polarization of the world. Too, neighborhood social points of view on work, mechanical certainty and governance structures decide the patterns of AI appropriation totally different locales. It is these relevant parameters that push the thought that long-standing time of work isn't a one-size-fits-all worldwide story but a changing, shifted handle, which is molded by nearby, financial, and social substances. The paper has included esteem to the academic and arrangement talk by looking at how AI is changing the concept of work, abilities, and human-machines collaboration. It states that on the one hand, AI will posture a danger of relocation and disparity, but on the other hand, this range can bring transformative openings to improve and be comprehensive, given there are cognizant endeavors to adjust to the unused conditions. The ponder, based on the examination of later articles and case thinks about, recognizes instruction, reskilling, moral administration, and cross-sector collaboration as the key components of the improvement of a reasonable future of work.

Objectives

1. To examine how AI is transforming employment arrangements, skills and human machine cooperation patterns.
2. To explore the issues and possibilities of AI in inclusive development, reskilling, and ethical management of future employment.

Research Questions

1. What is the future of AI in changing the nature of work, skills, and employment in various industries and regions?
2. So what measures and solutions are required so that AI-based alterations to the future of work are conducive to inclusivity, moral responsibility and long-term human-machine co-existence?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and future of work literature has grown considerably through the popularity of the topic among scholars and policy-makers concerned with how this technological transformation will transform the functioning of labor markets, skills, and human-machine relationships. According to scholars, AI is not merely an upgraded version of technologies in the workplace but a paradigm shift, which can break the social, economic, and organizational systems (Susskind, 2020). Similar to the previous technological revolutions that brought change to the industrial age, like the mechanization of agriculture or the automatization of manufacturing, AI brings opportunities of efficiency and threats of exclusion. Nevertheless, competing directly with the intellectual work of humans unlike the previous waves, its ability to carry out intellectual tasks and decision-making processes puts it in a distinct competition with the limits of automation and the future role of human resourcefulness and agency (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014).



The question of the AI effects on employment is one of the main debates in the literature. Other scholars take a displacement point of view, which means that there is a danger of mass job loss when AI systems automate common and even semi-complex tasks. The existing research approximates that the millions of jobs in sectors like transportation, customer service, and data processing may be substituted with intelligent systems, with low and middle-level workers being disproportionately displaced (Frey and Osborne, 2017). This is in line with the fact that Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) call it the great decoupling because technological innovation is increasing faster than the labor markets can adjust and people are structurally unemployed, and inequality is growing. Other researchers are however more optimistic in their augmentation perspective, which states that some types of jobs will be eliminated, but new ones will be created in fields related to the creation, operation, and control of AI technologies (Arntz et al., 2016). To illustrate, jobs that involve human empathy, an ethical decision-making process, or advanced problem-solving are deemed comparatively inaccessible to automation, and AI could allow employees not to perform monotonous jobs, allowing them to concentrate on creative and strategic aspects of their work (Bakhshi et al., 2017). This ambivalence highlights the unpredictable nature of the trend of AI as it moves forward, and the perspectives of the future of employment are not only optimistic but also gloomy.

The issue of skills holds a considerable section of the academic debate, and the researchers tend to come to the conclusion that incessant reskilling and upskilling are necessary. With the replacement of repetitive and calculating work by AI, human employees will be forced to learn the techniques that will not be antagonistic, but complementary of machine capabilities (Autor, 2015). According to reports by scientific institutions, including the World Economic Forum (2020), critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and emotional intelligence are becoming more and more a priority among employers, along with technical data science, machine learning, and software engineering skills. According to scholars, this demand necessitates a redefinition of education systems, no longer rote-based, but flexible, interdisciplinary and lifelong learning systems (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2017). There are also disparities in access to reskilling opportunities that are brought into the limelight of the literature as the marginalized populations, informal workers and people in developing economies have considerable obstacles to mastering the skills required to engage the labor markets powered by AI (ILO, 2019). The problem of unequal access highlights more practical issues regarding social equity and the danger of contributing to the inequity in the world.

Besides transforming skills and job, AI is also catalyzing new types of human-machine partnership that has become commonly known as one of the main characteristics of the future of work. Instead of direct substitution of humans with machines, as it is emphasized by many scholars, hybrid systems have been created where machine intelligence and human judgment are combined in joint tasks (Shetakofsky, 2017). In other areas of life, including healthcare, AI can be used in diagnostics to analyze large volumes of data, yet human doctors remain essential in outcome interpretation, ethical choice, and compassionate care provision (Topol, 2019). Likewise, AI applications can create design solutions or generate drafts in the creative industry, but the human component makes it unique, contextual, and culturally relevant (Florida, 2019). Such a collaborative model is based on the idea that instead of eliminating the necessity, AI should enhance human abilities and be seen as a way to expand them. Nevertheless, in this view, accountability and control are also questioned because, in the case of errors, there can be a lack of responsibility because an algorithmic decision-making has been made. According to scholars, to achieve successful human-machine collaboration, trust, transparency, and formulation of clear ethical principles have to be established to regulate such relationships (Cave and Dignum, 2019).

Another notable theme in the literature is ethical and governance issues. One of the most pressing issues with the growing role of AI technologies in mediating work is surveillance and data privacy, algorithmic bias, and concentration of technological power (Zuboff, 2019). Research cautions that artificial intelligence applied to hiring, reviewing performance, and surveillance at work could replicate or even enhance existing prejudices at the detriment of marginalized populations and enshrine disparities (Barocas and Selbst, 2016). Another implication of algorithmic management, identified by scholars, is in gig economy platforms where workers are faced with non-transparent, AI-driven systems that determine pay, hours, and work, and with few or no recourse or transparency (De Stefano, 2016). This has caused controversy on worker autonomy, dignity and rights in the AI mediated work environments. On the policy level, it is acknowledged that there is a need to establish regulatory frameworks in order to balance the elements of innovation and ethical responsibility (European Commission, 2021). The literature recommends that the dangers of exploitation, inequality, and social dislocation are likely to overshadow the advantages of AI integration unless there is a strong governance.

An increasing body of research also discusses the international aspects of the effects of AI on work by highlighting that the future of work is not global but regional. The economies that are developed have more advanced digital infrastructure and educational systems and might be in a better position to take advantage of the potential of AI, whereas developing countries have the issue of low access or limited access, technological reliance, and brain drain (UNCTAD, 2021). Such uneven distribution of resources invites a repeat of the digital divide, in which inequalities of the world are cemented instead of being mitigated by the new technological



change. The case studies of China, the United States, or the European Union show that different countries have different solutions to the balance between innovation and regulation (Lee, 2018). According to researchers, the global community should collaborate to share the benefits of AI equally and avoid polarization of the international labor market (OECD, 2020). Moreover, although some cultures view AI as a progress and others with distrust and fear, technology and the workplace attitude do impact the integration as well (Susskind, 2020). The contradictory nature of the AI-directed change is also identified in literature. On the one hand, it will be able to ensure efficiency, creativity, and the ability to solve problems in ways unseen before; on the other, it will also lead to a sense of uncertainty, vulnerability, and disruption. Researchers emphasize the fact that the future of AI in the workplace is not fixed but depends on human choices, policies, and structures of the institution (Frey and Rahbari, 2021).

The challenge of AI in achieving inclusive growth or increasing inequality will be determined mostly by the response rate of the governments, organizations, and societies to the challenge. There are those who have sounded critical warnings that the discourse on AI and work should go beyond what is technically possible and begin to raise the issues of justice, equity, and sustainability (Eubanks, 2018). The future of work, as such, is not only a technological problem but also a socio-technological change within the framework of which innovation is connected with cultural, ethical, and political aspects.

Collectively, the AI body of literature and the future of work imply a complex, contradictory, and promising field. The key themes that determine scholarly arguments include employment displacement and augmentation, redefining skills, human-machine collaboration, governance, and inequality in the world. Although the revolutionary potential of AI is widely acknowledged, the research is typically categorical when discussing proactive adaption strategies, including inclusive and ethical policies, reskilling programs, and education reforms.. These arguments point to the future of work in the era of AI not being predestination, but it depends upon conscious human action, systemic governance, and the readiness to bring technological innovation to the larger objectives of social sustainability and human well-being.

METHODOLOGY

In order to summarize and critically analyze the body of institutional and scholarly research on artificial intelligence (AI) and its implications for the nature of labor in the future, this study uses a qualitative, narrative review technique. The decision to use a narrative review stems from its ability to synthesize many sources, track conceptual advancements, and identify points of agreement and disagreement in academic discussions (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). Because AI and work are multifaceted, including technological, economic, social, and ethical aspects, a strictly quantitative or methodical approach would not adequately convey the complexities of the problems. Or maybe, this approach prioritizes contextualization, translation, and profundity to offer a intensive get a handle on of the wonders. The establishment of the consider plan is auxiliary information collecting, which is determined from books, arrangement papers, peer-reviewed diary articles, and trustworthy organization distributions. Scholarly databases counting Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Researcher were the most source distinguishing proof devices. Reports from the European Commission, World Financial Gathering, Worldwide Work Organization, and Organization for Financial Co-operation and Improvement were too included. "Fake insights and work," "AI and work," "mechanization and abilities," "human-machine collaboration," "algorithmic administration," and "future of work" were among the carefully chosen catchphrases utilized within the look approach. Boolean administrators and channels were utilized to sharpen looks and ensure that they were relevant to the study's objectives. In spite of the fact that foundational works distributed prior were moreover included when they advertised basic hypothetical experiences, such as Susskind's (2020) examination of post-work social orders and Brynjolfsson and McAfee's (2014) talk of mechanical disturbance, the survey centered on sources published between 2010 and 2024 to reflect the foremost later talks about. Significance to the themes of work, aptitudes, and human-machine collaboration; reliability and logical meticulousness; and commitment to existing dialogs with respect to morals, governance, and disparity in AI-driven moves were the three fundamental criteria utilized within the choice of sources. Commentaries without an experimental or hypothetical establishment were too precluded, as were thinks about that given fair specialized experiences into AI advance with no clear interface to labor or work-related issues. Intrigue sources that included perspectives from computer science, financial matters, humanism, and organizational ponders were favored since they captured the multifaceted character of AI's affect on the work environment. Utilizing Braun and Clarke's (2006) subject investigation worldview as a direct, a topical union procedure was utilized to analyze the information. Sources were inspected a few times after the dataset was gathered in arrange to discover repetitive topics, clashes, and systems. Key highlights such business uprooting and increase, changing expertise needs, human-machine participation models, moral and administration issues, and around the world disparities in AI selection were utilized to orchestrate these topics. This strategy made it conceivable to distinguish patterns whereas permitting for varying perspectives, creating a reasonable



representation of scholastic understanding and contradiction. . By consistently challenging assumptions and setting discoveries inside bigger socio-political and specialized settings, reflexivity was protected all through the method (Nowell et al., 2017). In this way, the topical examination acted as a connect between the objectives of the investigate and the incoherent body of writing, empowering a coherent union that guides the investigation and talk about that takes after. Triangulation of sources was utilized to make strides legitimacy and unwavering quality by comparing comes about from industry reports, approach papers, and academic investigate (Patton, 2015). This made it less likely that one teach viewpoint would be abused and ensured that a run of suppositions would be spoken to within the discoveries come to. Furthermore, emanant subjects may be refined and particular elucidation maintained a strategic distance from much obliged to the nonstop perusing and reanalysis of the information. The methods were also made transparent by clearly defining the search strategies, the selection criteria and the analytical tools that were used to analyze the results, thus making it possible to be replicated by other researchers.

As a whole, the chosen methodology allows a critical, in-depth, and flexible approach towards the literature analysis, which aligns with the purpose of the study to investigate the ethical, governance, and worldwide nature of human-machine cooperation and evaluate the revolutionary nature of AI in the field of employment and skills. The study establishes AI as a highly socio-technical phenomenon whose impacts on how nature of work will be in the future are not only worthy of academic but also governmental attention.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The connection between artificial intelligence and the future of employment is complicated and multidimensional, dependent on both the political choice, re-organization of the economy, technological progress, and cultural standards. Displacement of workers, ethical issues, and the increased inequality are quite alarming, although much of the AI buzz is dedicated to the fact that it will allow people to become more productive, efficient, and creative. This is why, a critical assessment should put AI in the context of both enabling and disruptive forces: which are affected by institutional preparedness, governance structures, and values in the society.

One of the most famous arguments available in literature is the displacement vs augmentation dichotomy. The number of jobs that can be fully automated in industrialized countries is nearly 50 percent, as researchers such as Frey and Osborne (2017) predict. This is particularly in the case of ordinary, low and middle-level jobs. This theory is however later questioned by other researchers who believe that AI often restructures employment by separating them between man and machines as opposed to just eradicating them (Arntz, Gregory, and Zierahn, 2016). AI-powered diagnostic systems/contract analysis applications, such as, reduce the number of repetitive tasks of the legal and healthcare field, but simultaneously enhance the necessity of control, moral judgment, and human interaction.

This implies that the reshaping of skill hierarchies and occupational roles is a better way of understanding the effect that AI will have, not simply an increase or decrease in the number of jobs that people will possess. The issue is how societies are coping with this change; institutional and legislative responses will determine whether it will lead to reskilling and empowerment or deskilling and precarity.

Skill transformation is also one of the key foundations of this conversation. Although AI is exerting pressure on the most advanced digital skills, data literacy, and computing, it is also highlighting the relevance of socioemotional, ethical, and adaptive skills. According to the World Economic Forum (2023), since machines no longer have the ability to think critically, be creative, and emotionally intelligent, these aspects will remain crucial. Nevertheless, due to the disparities in resources and governmental purposes, reskilling and upskilling programs do not become equally distributed across the countries and sectors. At the same time that most impoverished countries cannot even provide the simplest form of digital education, developed countries spend much money on the systems of lifelong learning, and the threat of creating a division in the global workforces is quite real.

The resulting disparities could bring about a divided workforce with a minority thriving in the new high-skill, AI-enhanced jobs with most people standing stagnant or marginalized and thus increasing the digital divide. These variations are subjected to varying technique.

Another change that is taking place is collaboration between machines and human beings. AI is progressively becoming a colleague, aiding the decision-making process, trends detection, and optimization of processes instead of replacing human work. Concepts such as centaur work, in which human intuition and machine intelligence work together, have been trendy in diverse sectors such as manufacturing to banking (Wilson and Daugherty, 2018). There is conflict in these partnerships, though. As an illustration, algorithmic management systems that appear on the gig platforms often reduce the autonomy of the workers, exposing them to constant surveillance and obscured decision-making processes (Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin, 2020).



The irony is that, despite the fact that AI can lead to increased productivity, it can also lead to a reduction in human dignity by reducing employees to more of data points rather than living beings. One of the most significant challenges brought by this is whether AI is empowering human workers or placing them under the subordination of automated efficiency and control logics.

Ethical and governance challenges make this environment even more challenging. Associations in training data are also replicated by AI systems, which may lead to unfair employment practices, promotion, and surveillance (O'Neil, 2016). The issue of the lack of transparency in machine-learning algorithms makes these issues even worse and makes it difficult to hold responsible parties to account. Without well-developed legal practices, the work environment may become an experiment with the obfuscated algorithms that may threaten the rights of employees, their privacy, and fairness. Despite the fact that the discrepancies in global governance structures remain, some jurisdictions opting to adhere to the laissez-faire framework, emphasizing innovation over morality, the AI Act enacted by the European Union is an important move toward the regulation of high-risk AI systems (Floridi, 2021).

This legislative fragmentation makes the possibilities of collaborative governance even more difficult, as it entails not only the absence of equal protection of the workers but also contributes to the geopolitical competition in AI research.

The global nature of AI and employment is something that cannot be neglected. Although the debate on job security of middle classes is often aroused by the consideration of automation in the industrialized nations, in most emerging contexts, it is existential. With the developed economies re-shoring their manufacturing processes with AI efficiency, countries whose economies are based on cheap labor will find their economic base slowly washed away. The contact center industries and cloth industries in South Asia are examples of industries that risk being phased out by conversational AI and robot manufacturing (ILO, 2021). In the absence of aggressive transfer of technology, capacity-building, and equal development, this change may only end up giving more advantage to inequality in the world.

Hence, the global cooperation plays a key role in the formation of moral principles as well as ensuring equitable access to AI-based opportunities. Whether AI will transform the essence of employment in the world is not the issue, but whether the benefits will be distributed equally or will be concentrated in the countries that have higher technical potential.

The deeper philosophical question about the meaning and value of work in the era of AI is more general and is central to the concern of discussions. Some scholars state that automation is an opportunity to rethink human ambitions, shifting the focus away of material survival to innovation, compassion, and interacting with the community (Susskind, 2020).

Others warn against this optimism, citing long-standing power dynamics that might only replicate current disparities in the context of emerging technologies (Zuboff, 2019). Between these two extremes is probably where reality lies, with social decisions, political will, and group efforts influencing the results. In spite of the fact that work will proceed to exist, its meaning, conveyance, and substance are being renegotiated in ways that require basic cooperation. When combined, the inquire about appears that AI's commitment to the nature of labor within the future is subordinate instead of settled. In spite of the fact that the innovation can increment human potential, democratize information access, and make modern businesses, on the off chance that it isn't controlled, it moreover postures a risk to helpless specialists, compounds imbalance, and disintegrates respect. It is the duty of teach, teachers, and lawmakers to shape AI's future in ways that strike a adjust between independence and collaboration, productivity and balance, and inventiveness and morals. This calls for social changes that put human values at the cutting edge of innovation progression in expansion to administrative systems and reskilling programs. The stakes are tall since choices taken over the another ten a long time will either strengthen current divisions or advance a more comprehensive working environment of the longer term.

CONCLUSION

Rather than totally disposing of occupations, counterfeit insights is drastically changing the nature of work within the future by rethinking parts, competencies, and cooperation styles. The investigate highlights the require of proactive reskilling and comprehensive instruction frameworks by illustrating how AI at the same time produces potential for increase and dangers of uprooting. Participation between people and machines may increment efficiency, but it too presents ethical questions almost protection, independence, and respect. Worldwide contrasts in AI planning moreover appear how its points of interest are not decently shared, which might worsen financial holes in the event that reasonable administrative frameworks and universal collaboration are not executed. Within the end, the nature of labor within the AI period is socially created instead of mechanically set up. Administration, organization flexibility, and social choices will decide whether AI advances strengthening, value, and development or increments disparity and control. Appropriation of AI must be based



on morals, consideration, and human values in arrange to ensure that the change of work leads to a more maintainable and impartial future.

REFERENCES

1. Arntz, M., Gregory, T., & Zierahn, U. (2016). *The risk of automation for jobs in OECD countries: A comparative analysis*. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 189. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlz9h56dvq7-en>
2. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3>
3. Bessen, J. E. (2019). AI and jobs: The role of demand. *NBER Working Paper No. 24235*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w24235>
4. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
5. Brynjolfsson, E., & McElheran, K. (2019). The rapid adoption of data-driven decision-making. *American Economic Review*, 109(5), 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20191058>
6. Chui, M., Manyika, J., & Miremadi, M. (2016). Where machines could replace humans—and where they can't (yet). *McKinsey Quarterly*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/where-machines-could-replace-humans-and-where-they-cant-yet>
7. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
8. International Labour Organization. (2020). *Global employment trends for youth 2020: Technology and the future of jobs*. ILO. <https://www.ilo.org>
9. International Monetary Fund. (2021). *Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Assessing the potential and challenges*. IMF Staff Discussion Note. <https://www.imf.org>
10. Manyika, J., Lund, S., Chui, M., Bughin, J., Woetzel, J., Batra, P., Ko, R., & Sanghvi, S. (2017). *Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation*. McKinsey Global Institute. <https://www.mckinsey.com/mgi>
11. Ng, A. (2018). AI transformation playbook: How to lead your company into the AI era. *Landing AI*. <https://landing.ai/ai-transformation-playbook/>
12. Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2020). *The future of the professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts*. Oxford University Press.
13. World Economic Forum. (2020). *The future of jobs report 2020*. WEF. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2020>
14. Zhang, B., Dafoe, A., & Christiano, P. (2021). *Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence: Evidence from a survey of machine learning researchers*. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70, 1105–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12247>