ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF WORK: A HUMAN-CENTERED PERSPECTIVE FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

YAPAY ZEKÂ VE ÇALIŞMANIN GELECEĞİ: SOSYAL BİLİMLERDEN İNSAN MERKEZLİ BİR BAKIŞ

Cumali KILIÇ

139

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Yıl: 2026, Sayfa: 1-24

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

DOI: 10.35379/cusosbil.1696733

Geliş Received: **10.05.2025**
Kabul Accepted **04.11.2025**

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF WORK: A HUMAN-CENTERED PERSPECTIVE FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

YAPAY ZEKÂ VE ÇALIŞMANIN GELECEĞİ: SOSYAL BİLİMLERDEN İNSAN MERKEZLİ BİR BAKIŞ

Cumali KILIÇ [1]

Keywords:
Artificial Intelligence
Future of Work
Human-Centered Design
Algorithmic Management
Digital Inequality

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Yapay Zekâ
İşin Geleceği
İnsan Merkezli Tasarım
Algoritmik Yönetim
Dijital Eşitsizlik

ABSTRACT

This study examines the transformative impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on the future of work from a human-centered, interdisciplinary perspective. Drawing on insights from sociology, ethics, education and organizational behavior studies, it highlights how AI reshapes job roles, skills, workplace dynamics and labor identities. The paper emphasizes that AI is not a neutral or inevitable force but a socio-technical system shaped by power, culture and policy. Key challenges include algorithmic management, digital exclusion, emotional labor and a lack of ethical opacity. To address these issues, the study advocates for policies that prioritize transparency, inclusivity and human agency through educational reform, robust labor protections and ethical AI governance. Furthermore, the paper underscores that social scientists should not remain mere observers of these processes but can act as active agents in shaping a fair and equitable integration of AI into work life. Developed within a conceptual framework, this study offers guidance for future research and policymaking, highlighting the necessity of interdisciplinary collaboration to ensure that AI not only enhances efficiency but also promotes justice, well-being, and sustainability.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, yapay zekânın (YZ) çalışma hayatı üzerindeki dönüştürücü etkilerini insan merkezli ve disiplinlerarası bir bakış açısıyla incelemektedir. Sosyoloji, etik, eğitim ve örgütsel davranış alanlarından yararlanarak, YZ'nin iş rolleri, beceriler, işyeri dinamikleri ve emek kimliklerini nasıl yeniden şekillendirdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışma, YZ'nin tarafsız veya kaçınılmaz bir güç değil; aksine iktidar, kültür ve politika tarafından biçimlendirilen sosyo-teknik bir sistem olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, YZ dönüşümünde karşılaşılabilecek başlıca zorluklar arasında algoritmik yönetim, dijital dışlanma, duygusal emek ve etik şeffaflık eksikliği yer almaktadır. Bu sorunları aşmak adına ise çalışmada, eğitim reformu, güçlü iş gücü korumaları ve etik YZ yönetişimi aracılığıyla şeffaflık, kapsayıcılık ve insan iradesini önceleyen politikaların geliştirilmesi savunulmaktadır. Ayrıca, çalışmada sosyal bilimcilerin yalnızca gözlemci olarak bir rol oynamadığı, aynı zamanda adil bir YZ entegrasyonunu şekillendiren aktif aktörler olarak rol alabilecekleri sunulmaktadır. Kavramsal bir çerçevede hazırlanan bu çalışma, gelecekteki araştırmalar ve politikalar için bir çerçeve sunmakta; YZ'nin verimliliği artırırken aynı zamanda adalet, refah ve sürdürülebilirliği de teşvik etmesini sağlamak için disiplinlerarası iş birliğinin gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

[1] Assistant Prof., Mardin Artuklu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, cumalikilic@artuklu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-1564-1938

Alıntılamak için/Cite as: Kılıç C. (2026) Artificial Intelligence And The Future Of Work: A Human-Centered Perspective From The Social Sciences, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, s.1-24

INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies is reshaping the nature of work at an unprecedented pace. From the automation of routine tasks to the augmentation of decision-making, AI is not only altering operational models but also challenging traditional notions of labor, employment and human agency in organizational contexts (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Chui et al., 2016). While much of the discourse has focused on economic efficiency and technological capability, there is a growing need to critically assess the societal and human-centered implications of AI-driven transformations.

Examples from daily life already illustrate these tensions. Automated hiring systems, for instance, streamline recruitment processes but have also been shown to reproduce biases against marginalized groups. Similarly, AI-powered productivity trackers and monitoring systems increase efficiency in remote work but raise concerns about privacy and worker autonomy. In education, AI tools promise personalized learning experiences, yet they simultaneously risk deepening digital divides among students with unequal access to technology. These developments highlight that AI's role in the workplace cannot be evaluated solely in terms of performance; it must also be assessed in light of its impact on fairness, dignity and inclusion.

The future of work in the context of AI has sparked extensive scholarly discourse in the social sciences, focusing on how AI impacts organizational structures, employee relationships and socio-economic dynamics. A human-centered perspective, grounded in social science principles, is essential for understanding the multifaceted influence of AI on work environments, ensuring that technological advancements enhance rather than hinder human welfare and career trajectories.

Furthermore, the adoption of AI carries significant implications for labor markets. Research indicates that employees often view AI integration as a threat, potentially leading to heightened job insecurity (Cao & Song, 2024). Such perceptions can lead to negative career behaviors, where employees may seek alternative employment options out of fear of redundancy (Presbitero & Teng-Calleja, 2022). Therefore, a socio-technical approach that recognizes the interplay between technology and human factors is vital to developing effective strategies for AI integration, promoting workforce stability and employee well-being (Yu et al., 2022).

Moreover, it is vital to ensure that AI reinforces rather than replaces human capabilities. Yu et al. (2022), advocate for understanding AI adoption through the lens of socio-technical systems theory, emphasizing strategies that enhance workplace experiences and organizational competitiveness. This human-centered design philosophy aligns with the principles of Human-Centered Explainable AI (HCXAI), which prioritizes accessibility and comprehension in AI system design (Ehsan & Riedl, 2020). By concentrating on human needs, organizations can nurture environments where technology complements human input, fostering a more collaborative and productive workforce.

Lifelong learning emerges as a crucial response to the challenges posed by AI in the workplace. Poquet and Laat (2021) discuss for continuous education to prepare the workforce for evolving tasks shaped by AI technologies. This view is supported by Aghaziarati and Darbani (2023), who stress the need for proactive measures that ensure all employees have opportunities to engage with and adapt to AI-driven transformations, thereby promoting social equity in the workplace. Such considerations are essential in framing policies that uphold fairness and inclusivity as AI becomes more prevalent.

AI's integration into the workplace has also reshaped decision-making processes. Bokhari and Myeong (2023) emphasize the significant effects of AI on decision-making within smart cities, particularly due to its interplay with IoT and governance. Also, Kılıç (2024) underlines the importance of integrating human resource management policies for sustainable smart cities. This relationship highlights the need for social science researchers to explore AI applications comprehensively, taking into account both direct and indirect effects on decision-making frameworks. An understanding of AI's use that aligns with human values and needs suggests a critical intersection of technology and social understanding (Taheri, 2023).

In sum, integrating AI into the workplace presents both opportunities and challenges that require a human-centered lens. This paper adopts such an approach, rooted in social science traditions, to explore the implications of AI for the future of work. It aims to bridge the gap between technological innovation and human experience by highlighting how AI affects not only employment structures but also the social and psychological fabric of work life (Susskind, 2020; Daugherty & Wilson, 2018). In this context, the following sections will first outline the theoretical foundations of a human-centered perspective, then examine the transformative effects of AI on work and finally discuss the human implications, policy considerations and interdisciplinary insights that can guide more equitable and sustainable integration of AI into the workplace.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Understanding the transformative role of AI in the workplace requires grounding in several theoretical frameworks from the social sciences. This section draws on human-centered design theory, sociological perspectives on labor and philosophical reflections on technology to establish a foundation for analyzing AI's broader implications.

Human-Centered Design and Technology

At its core, a human-centered approach emphasizes designing systems that align with human values, needs and capabilities. Human-centered design (HCD) challenges purely technical or efficiency-driven implementations of AI by emphasizing empathy, contextual awareness and inclusivity (Norman, 2013). This perspective is particularly relevant in workplace settings, where AI systems must adapt to diverse human workflows, cognitive limitations and ethical concerns.

Human-Centered Design (HCD) represents a fundamental shift in design philosophy that prioritizes the needs, capabilities and preferences of users throughout the development process. It bridges the gap between user experience and functional requirements, thereby enhancing the usability and overall effectiveness of systems. At its foundation, HCD insists that the user must be at the center of design considerations. Liu and Sang (2024) articulate that HCD is essential in the context of the Internet of Things (IoT), emphasizing that it enables more empathetic interactions between individuals and technological solutions. This centralization of the user not only ensures that actual needs are met but also fosters a design environment that evolves with changing expectations and advancements.

The HCD framework has also gained traction as a counterbalance to techno-determinism, promoting systems that empower people rather than displace workers. Bannon (2011) argues that a truly human-centered technological future must account for how people experience and interpret new technologies, not merely how they function or perform. In this sense, AI integration should enhance human agency, not undermine it.

Human-Centered AI (HCAI) lies at the intersection of artificial intelligence and human-centered design, fostering systems that accommodate user needs while maintaining high levels of human engagement and control. Hall et al. (2024) highlight this by advocating for HCAI in nuclear operations, where human collaboration with AI systems is crucial to ensuring interactions remain transparent and accessible. Similarly, Shneiderman (2022) emphasizes that expanding the technology-centered scope of artificial intelligence toward HCAI can significantly improve technology's alignment with human values and needs. These frameworks lay essential groundwork for addressing societal challenges, including accessibility and equitable distribution of technological benefits (Sigfrids et al., 2023).

Moreover, user-centered approaches like User-Centered Design (UCD) must evolve to meet the complexities of emerging technologies. These approaches are no longer only about satisfying functional requirements but also about recognizing and addressing users' emotional and psychological needs. Zoltowski et al. (2012) emphasize the importance of engaging users throughout the design process, while Khamaisi et al. (2021), in their exploration of augmented reality and collaborative robotics, underlines the need for careful assessment of human factors affecting user experience and trust in advanced systems.

Crucially, at this point, the integration of dignity within design parameters must not be overlooked. Talhouk et al. (2019) argue for embedding dignity into humanitarian technologies, aligning technological development with ethical considerations and a deep respect for users' humanity. Their work underscores the relevance of ethical design particularly in crisis settings, ensuring individuals are treated with compassion and their agency is preserved even under difficult conditions.

On the other hand, when looking at practical applications, the absence of human-centered design principles in AI integration often leads to serious practical problems. For example, several recruitment platforms using automated screening algorithms have rejected qualified candidates simply because their resumes did not match pre-set keyword patterns. In such cases, the design prioritizes efficiency over fairness, overlooking human context and judgment. Similarly, customer service chatbots deployed without user-testing frequently frustrate customers by providing irrelevant or repetitive answers, leading to dissatisfaction rather than improved service. These examples illustrate that when systems are designed without empathy, inclusivity, and real user input, the result is not only inefficiency but also a loss of trust in technological solutions.

In conclusion, human-centered design and its extensions—such as HCAI and UCD—underscore a pivotal evolution in how we conceptualize the interaction between humans and AI systems. Emphasizing empathy, ethical responsibility and user engagement fosters a technological future that not only enhances performance but also respects and uplifts human experience. Addressing these dimensions demands an interdisciplinary commitment to design systems that are inclusive, transparent and genuinely aligned with societal values.

Sociological Perspectives on Work and Identity

Sociology has examined the changing nature of work in relation to technological innovation. From Marx's critiques of alienation under industrial capitalism to post-industrial theories of knowledge work, labor has consistently been shaped by prevailing technological paradigms (Braverman, 1974; Bell, 1973). Today, artificial intelligence (AI) represents a new inflection point in this historical trajectory—one that challenges not only employment structures, but also individual identities, workplace relationships and socio-cultural belonging.

Contemporary scholars highlight how AI disrupts occupational identity, professional autonomy and traditional skill hierarchies. Tasks once considered uniquely human—such as judgment, pattern recognition and communication—are now increasingly mediated or even executed by algorithmic systems (De Stefano, 2015). This phenomenon raises concerns about de-skilling, erosion of meaning in work and deepening power asymmetries between workers and technologies. Moreover, as AI assumes routine and even creative functions, the role of social interaction, empathy and contextual understanding becomes more salient in preserving what is distinctly human in work life (Sennett, 2008).

Sociological perspectives on work and identity offer a multifaceted understanding of how individuals both shape and are shaped by their labor environments. Work is not merely a means of income; it is a critical arena where social relationships, power dynamics and personal identities intersect. Through diverse sociological frameworks, researchers can explore the complex interplay between social structures, lived experience and identity construction in professional contexts.

The concept of workplace identity has been approached from various analytical angles. For instance, Strangleman (2012) emphasizes the importance of visualizing labor landscapes to understand how spatial contexts influence the meanings attached to work. His analysis suggests that the environments in which work occurs contribute to the formation of occupational identity and the symbolic significance of labor. Such sociological explorations enrich our comprehension of work beyond economic or functional metrics, revealing its embeddedness in spatial and cultural narratives.

Symbolic interactionism provides another powerful lens through which to examine how identities are shaped through ongoing social interactions in the workplace. According to Dennis and Smith (2015), this framework helps illuminate how occupational roles, social

expectations and relational experiences influence the evolution of individual identities. It also reveals how meaning-making processes at work reinforce or challenge broader professional and organizational norms.

The complexity of identity construction becomes especially evident in contexts of marginalization and displacement (Alwi et al., 2024). Building on this perspective, Ramos and Ochoa (2024) introduce the concept of identity networks, which highlights the interdependence of personal, professional and social identities. Their research suggests that interconnected identity layers significantly impact individual well-being and resilience in the workplace. Recognizing the fluid and overlapping nature of these identities helps reveal the broader psychosocial implications of work experiences. Additionally, Woodward and Jenkings (2011) offer insight into how occupational identities are shaped within institutional cultures. In their study of military personnel, they demonstrate how service members articulate personal narratives within the collective ethos of military life. These findings have broader relevance for understanding how individuals negotiate identity within strong organizational cultures or tightly regulated professional environments.

Practical experiences also illustrate how sociological concerns about identity and work are reshaped by AI. In recruitment processes, algorithmic screening tools often reproduce existing biases, disproportionately excluding women or minority candidates and thereby reinforcing structural inequalities. In platform-based gig work, drivers and couriers are evaluated through opaque rating systems, where a few negative scores may lead to loss of income or deactivation, creating insecurity and eroding trust. Within organizations, employees may feel their professional identities undermined when algorithmic systems take over tasks previously associated with expertise and judgment, such as performance evaluations or risk assessments. These cases show that AI does not simply reorganize tasks—it alters how individuals construct meaning, seek recognition, and negotiate belonging in their professional lives.

In conclusion, sociological approaches to work and identity illuminate the complex, dynamic relationship between labor and self. By engaging with visual, interactionist and network-based frameworks, scholars can uncover how occupational identities are constructed, contested and transformed—particularly in the face of disruptive technologies like AI. These insights are essential for designing more inclusive and context-aware policies and practices that account for the emotional, symbolic and social dimensions of work.

Posthumanism and the Ethics of AI

Posthumanist theory offers a critical lens for interpreting the evolving relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) and the workplace by questioning the boundaries between human and machine. Rather than treating AI as a tool external to human experience, posthumanism explores how human subjectivity and labor are being redefined through entanglement with intelligent systems (Hayles, 1999). This perspective is especially relevant as AI technologies increasingly infiltrate daily work environments, from decision-making processes to emotional surveillance and predictive algorithms.

Posthumanism and the ethics of AI represent a crucial intersection of philosophy, technology and social responsibility. By moving beyond traditional human-centered paradigms, posthumanist thinking challenges foundational assumptions about identity, morality and agency. It broadens ethical inquiry to include non-human entities, advocating for more holistic models of accountability and interaction in technological ecosystems. As AI systems become more pervasive across diverse sectors, this shift calls for a re-examination of ethical principles that guide their development and use.

Central to posthumanist critique is a rejection of anthropocentrism, the tendency to prioritize human experiences and interests above all else. In this context, Ferris and Shepley (2013) propose a systems-oriented, human-centered approach to technology design that enhances both the efficacy and ethical impact of technologies in healthcare settings. This model aligns with posthumanist principles by acknowledging the broader social and systemic implications of technology beyond immediate user utility. It emphasizes the necessity of ethical design practices that are responsive to both human and non-human relationships.

The ethical landscape is further complicated by the inclusion of non-human sentient beings. Mancini (2017) advocates for an animal-centered framework within the emerging field of Animal-Computer Interaction (ACI), urging designers to consider the rights and welfare of animals when designing interactive systems. This expansion of ethical scope exemplifies posthumanist sensibilities by challenging the anthropocentric limits of design ethics and recognizing a shared responsibility toward all sentient actors in technological ecosystems.

While posthumanist theory critiques anthropocentrism, it does not negate the importance of ethically conscious design for human users. Human-centered design (HCD), as articulated by Lee et al. (2025), plays a critical role in structuring AI technologies that are responsive to users' real-world contexts. By emphasizing empathy, transparency and inclusivity, HCD fosters AI systems that support human needs rather than exploit. Similarly, Melles et al. (2020) underscore the importance of integrating ethical design principles to address health disparities, ensuring that AI applications promote collective well-being rather than reinforce social inequalities.

Incorporating cognitive science into design ethics is also essential. Oviatt (2006) argues that understanding cognitive load and behavioral patterns is key to ensuring that AI augments rather than overwhelming human decision-making processes. Aligning AI interfaces with natural human cognitive abilities enhances usability, reduces user strain and reinforces individual agency—an ethical imperative in high-stakes domains such as healthcare.

Moreover, posthumanist thinking brings into focus the commodification of human behavior in AI-driven workplaces. As intelligent systems increasingly monitor productivity, predict emotional states and influence hiring decisions, the workplace becomes a site of data extraction and algorithmic governance (Zuboff, 2019). These dynamic demands new ethical frameworks—such as care ethics, data justice and digital humanism—that prioritize dignity, autonomy and transparency in the face of AI-driven change (van Wynsberghe, 2013).

Although ethical frameworks for AI emphasize transparency, fairness, and accountability, ensuring compliance in practice remains highly challenging. One reason is the opacity of many AI systems: organizations themselves may not fully understand how algorithms reach decisions, making it difficult to verify adherence to ethical guidelines. In addition, the absence of standardized global regulations allows companies to selectively interpret or even ignore ethical commitments. Even where principles are publicly declared, monitoring mechanisms and enforcement tools are often weak or nonexistent. As a result, compliance tends to rely heavily on voluntary self-regulation, which creates significant gaps between stated ethical principles and actual practices.

In conclusion, the integration of posthumanist perspectives into AI ethics invites a fundamental rethinking of the values and responsibilities embedded in technological design. By including non-human entities in ethical considerations, promoting inclusive design practices and aligning AI systems with both cognitive and social realities, stakeholders can foster an ethical AI landscape. This approach not only challenges traditional norms but also paves the way for a technological future that is equitable, participatory and responsive to the complexity of human and non-human interactions alike. These theoretical perspectives provide the foundation for analyzing how AI concretely transforms work structures, skills, and inequalities, as explored in the next section.

TRANSFORMATIVE EFFECTS OF AI ON WORK

The integration of AI technologies into workplaces is not merely a technical enhancement—it represents a structural shift in how work is organized, performed and valued. This section explores how AI is reshaping labor markets, redefining occupational boundaries and creating new forms of digital labor, while also deepening existing inequalities and introducing novel ethical concerns.

Changing Skill Demands and Job Profiles

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into organizational processes has significantly accelerated demand for hybrid skill sets that blend technical proficiency with human-centered competencies such as creativity, emotional intelligence and complex problem-solving

(World Economic Forum, 2023). As routine cognitive and manual tasks are increasingly automated, labor markets are becoming more polarized—dividing into high-skill and low-skill segments—with serious implications for equity and inclusion (Kılıç & Atilla, 2024; Autor, 2015). This transformation is especially challenging for workers in regions or industries where access to continuous learning opportunities is limited.

Jobs are not disappearing en masse; rather, they are being fundamentally reconfigured. Roles across diverse fields—such as healthcare, logistics and finance—are now enhanced by predictive analytics, robotics, or intelligent assistants. As a result, employees must adapt to working alongside AI systems, often shifting toward roles that emphasize oversight, coordination and interpretive judgment (Frey & Osborne, 2017). These changes raise critical questions about training systems, job design, worker autonomy and the long-term sustainability of employment models in an AI-augmented economy.

The changing nature of job profiles and skill requirements reflects not only the impact of emerging technologies but also broader socio-economic shifts. He et al. (2024) argue that the relentless pace of automation and digitalization across industries is driving the evolution of job roles, necessitating a workforce equipped with a balance of technical skills and soft competencies. These include critical thinking, collaboration and adaptability—traits that are increasingly essential as conventional job functions become obsolete or redefined (Tabar & Saberi, 2023).

In this context, the cultivation of 21st-century skills becomes paramount. Su et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of aligning educational practices with the competencies demanded by modern job markets, particularly those involving analytical thinking and effective communication. Widayana (2023) supports this view, highlighting the inadequacy of technical knowledge alone and stressing the need for innovation and lifelong learning capacities in a globalized economy.

The implications of these shifts extend into the domain of education and workforce development. Institutions face growing pressure to ensure that graduates are equipped not only with foundational knowledge but also with the critical skills needed to navigate complex and evolving work environments. Scholars have underscored the importance of curriculum design that emphasizes experiential learning, such as project-based approaches that bridge academic and real-world contexts (Brumberger & Lauer, 2019; Rafiq & Hashim, 2018). These methods can enhance students' engagement while cultivating essential workplace competencies (Aifan, 2021).

Beyond curriculum, the development of personal attributes—such as resilience, adaptability and intercultural awareness—has become a cornerstone of employability. Zaber et al. (2019) argue that technological disruption, demographic transitions and globalization require a reimagining of workforce strategies that foreground these capabilities. In a similar vein, Villar and Quirap (2023) point to the importance of intercultural competence and inclusive leadership in enhancing both job satisfaction and organizational performance in diverse and interconnected environments.

Recent global events have further accelerated this transformation. Eslit (2023) notes that the COVID-19 pandemic has fundamentally altered skill requirements and work modalities, intensifying the need for flexible, tech-savvy and innovation-oriented professionals. Moving forward, institutions must adopt lifelong learning frameworks and support continuous professional development to ensure workforce resilience in a rapidly changing world.

In conclusion, the transformation of job profiles and skill expectations reflects both technological disruption and broader social evolution. A coordinated response—centered on aligning education with labor market demands, promoting soft skill development and embedding flexibility and inclusivity into training models—is essential. As industries adapt to AI and global shifts, preparing the workforce for these changes is not just a necessity but a strategic imperative.

Remote Work, Monitoring and Algorithmic Management

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly accelerated the adoption of remote work technologies, many of which are underpinned by AI-based platforms. Virtual collaboration

tools, automated scheduling assistants and sentiment analysis systems have become normalized in contemporary corporate environments. However, these systems also introduce new mechanisms of surveillance and control. AI-enabled productivity trackers, facial recognition software and other monitoring tools can track employee performance in real time—often without clear or transparent governance frameworks (Mateescu & Nguyen, 2019).

These developments underscore the emergence of algorithmic management, a growing phenomenon in which managerial decisions—ranging from task allocation and evaluation to disciplinary action—are increasingly delegated to algorithmic systems (Levy, 2015). While such systems may offer increased efficiency and scalability, they also raise serious concerns regarding transparency, accountability and worker autonomy. Algorithmic decision-making tends to obscure the rationale behind performance assessments and managerial actions, thereby undermining procedural fairness and due process.

The gig economy, in particular, illustrates the unequal power dynamics that often characterize algorithmic management. In these environments, workers typically lack access to platforms' internal decision-making processes, making it difficult to contest unfair ratings, deactivations, or workload distributions. As Rosenblat and Stark (2016) note, this asymmetry reinforces imbalances between platform owners and laborers, contributing to a sense of disempowerment, stress and alienation among workers.

Beyond the gig economy, even in more traditional sectors, the expansion of algorithmic oversight has implications for job satisfaction, employee engagement and mental well-being. When AI systems shape the tempo and quality of work without space for human input, they risk eroding trust between employees and organizations. In these contexts, the promise of digital transformation must be tempered by robust ethical frameworks, participatory design approaches and clear boundaries on surveillance.

In summary, the shift toward AI-driven remote work and algorithmic management brings both opportunities and significant challenges. While these tools can enhance coordination and productivity in distributed workforces, they also risk exacerbating inequalities, reducing transparency and disempowering workers if left unchecked. A human-centered approach that foregrounds ethical governance, transparency and employee voice is essential for ensuring that these systems enhance rather than undermine the future of work.

Inequality, Displacement and Digital Exclusion

AI-driven transformation is unevenly distributed across socioeconomic and demographic groups. Individuals with higher levels of education, digital literacy and access to technological resources are more likely to benefit from AI augmentation. In contrast, low-income and marginalized populations face increased risks of displacement, deskilling and digital exclusion (Eubanks, 2018). These disparities reinforce and exacerbate existing structural inequalities, as automation tends to disproportionately affect repetitive, low-wage and precarious forms of labor. Moreover, algorithmic bias—often embedded in historical training data—can perpetuate discriminatory practices in hiring and performance evaluations, deepening inequities within workplaces (Barocas & Selbst, 2016).

Digital Exclusion and Structural Inequality

Digital exclusion refers to barriers that prevent individuals and communities from fully participating in the digital world. These barriers—ranging from lack of infrastructure to limited digital literacy—contribute significantly to persistent social inequalities. Fourman (2016) argues that the digital divide perpetuates cycles of deprivation, especially among disadvantaged groups, by limiting access to essential services, job opportunities and education.

Evidence from various global contexts supports this claim. In Moldova, Pisică (2022) demonstrates how digital preparedness during the COVID-19 pandemic directly impacted household access to economic opportunities. Similarly, Qiu et al. (2023) show how differences in digital access across Chinese regions are contributing to widening income gaps, revealing the critical role digital technology plays in shaping economic trajectories.

Displacement in the Digital Age

Digital technologies have also become key drivers of labor displacement. Chen et al. (2022) highlight that individuals lacking digital competencies are more vulnerable to

job loss in the face of AI-driven automation. This risk underscores the importance of digital skill development as a buffer against economic marginalization.

At the same time, displacement may open pathways for reinvention. Roundy and Bayer (2023) explore the rise of analog entrepreneurship as a creative response to technological disruption. Their work suggests that while some technologies become obsolete, others may be repurposed by individuals who adapt resourcefully to a changing economic environment. This regenerative potential reflects the dual nature of displacement: both a source of insecurity and a space for innovation.

Migrant Experiences and Digital Vulnerabilities

Digital exclusion presents distinct challenges for displaced migrants. Moran (2022) explores how migrants use digital media to navigate uncertain social and economic terrains during their migration journeys. While digital platforms offer support and connectivity, they also introduce new vulnerabilities related to surveillance and data misuse. These risks can further entrench existing inequalities and power imbalances.

Twigt (2018) offers a case study on Iraqi refugees in Jordan, showing how digital technologies shape not only access to resources but also social connections and identity formation. Although digital tools can offer critical lifelines, they may also intensify exposure to control, monitoring and structural exclusion, particularly when access is mediated by unequal systems.

Education and the Digital Divide

The digital divide has also had significant implications for education, particularly during the global shift to remote learning. Francis and Weller (2021) document how disparities in internet access have disproportionately affected Black and Hispanic students in the United States, limiting their ability to participate fully in online education. These access gaps contribute to long-term educational inequalities and, by extension, economic disadvantage.

Addressing this issue requires systemic interventions that prioritize not only infrastructure but also digital literacy, device availability and culturally responsive pedagogy. Equitable access to education in the digital age is essential to ensuring that emerging technologies do not deepen structural inequities but instead foster broader inclusion and opportunity.

In summary, the nexus of inequality, displacement and digital exclusion reflects the complex socio-economic challenges amplified by rapid technological advancement. These issues are interdependent: digital exclusion contributes to job displacement; displacement reinforces inequality; and all three intersect with education, migration and workforce access. A comprehensive response must address infrastructure, skills development, ethical policy and inclusive design. By doing so, societies can leverage digital technologies to promote resilience, social mobility and equity in the evolving future of work.

THE HUMAN PERSPECTIVE

While technological narratives often emphasize innovation, productivity and scalability, such accounts can obscure the deep human consequences of AI integration in the workplace. The transformation of work is not solely about machines replacing tasks, it is about how individuals experience, interpret and adapt to those changes. This section explores how AI affects worker identity, mental well-being and ethical agency, with particular attention to the emotional and relational dimensions of labor.

Identity, Purpose and Meaning of Work

Work is not merely an economic necessity; it is a vital source of personal identity, social connection and meaning (Gini, 1998). In the context of rapid technological transformation—particularly through AI—these elements of work are being reshaped in complex and sometimes unsettling ways. As AI systems automate or mediate essential workplace functions, workers may perceive their roles as fragmented or diminished. The erosion of control over one's tasks, the decline in skill relevance and increasing reliance on opaque algorithmic decisions can undermine professional identity and erode intrinsic motivation (Susskind, 2020).

This technological shift also redefines the criteria by which "value" in the workplace is assessed. Expertise, judgment and experience—traits historically associated with human capital—are now increasingly evaluated through metrics

driven by algorithmic logic. Such changes can produce anxiety and alienation, especially among mid-level knowledge workers whose identities are often anchored in cognitive labor and status (Berg, 2016). Human-centered work design must therefore preserve avenues for mastery, autonomy and recognition if it aims to foster sustainable and meaningful employment.

The identity, purpose and meaning of work are foundational themes in organizational studies, reflecting how individuals perceive their roles and how these perceptions influence their well-being and engagement. Dehing et al. (2013), in their study on undergraduate engineering students, reveal that reflective workplace learning is critical for clarifying emerging professional identities. Industry placements serve not only to develop technical skills but also to provide contexts in which students form a sense of who they are as future professionals.

Similar insights emerge from medical education. McKenzie et al. (2020) emphasize that early clinical exposure profoundly shapes how medical students construct their professional identities. Experiences rooted in learning, doing and belonging help cultivate a sense of purpose that goes beyond competence—anchoring future healthcare workers in values, responsibilities and a shared professional ethos.

Organizational culture plays a central role in supporting this sense of identity and belonging. Grittner (2023) argues that workplaces which reinforce personal identity foster psychological comfort, empowerment and engagement among employees. When workers feel seen and supported, their attachment to their roles—and to the organization—deepens, resulting in greater job satisfaction and performance.

This connection is also visible in practice-based professions such as nursing. Heldal et al. (2019) show how participation in safety initiatives helps nurses reconstruct professional identity, enhancing both role fulfillment and commitment to patient care. These findings reveal the symbiotic relationship between meaningful contribution and personal purpose in the workplace.

However, the rise of AI introduces new challenges. Mirbabaie et al. (2021) explore the concept of "AI identity threat," where employees feel their sense of role and relevance is undermined by emerging technologies. As AI systems begin to encroach upon tasks traditionally seen as human-centered, such as diagnosis or judgment, employees may struggle to maintain a coherent narrative of professional purpose.

The role of diversity in identity construction is equally vital. İzci and Kılıç (2025) suggest that employees are more engaged when they can freely express their gender, ethnic and cultural identities at work. A supportive and inclusive environment can strengthen motivation and create a greater sense of belonging. Tatum (2018) and Jaiswal and Dyaram (2019) reinforce this view, noting that employees who perceive their identities as recognized and valued report higher levels of satisfaction and well-being.

Beyond cultural and demographic identity, deeper philosophical and existential dimensions also shape work experiences. Sulphey (2020) highlights the influence of spirituality and long-term orientation in fostering workplace identity. Individuals who derive meaning from their roles—rooted in broader life purpose—demonstrate stronger organizational commitment and higher levels of performance.

In conclusion, the dimensions of identity, purpose and meaning are central to understanding employee experience in the age of AI. From professional development and inclusive culture to spiritual alignment and technological disruption, a wide range of factors shape how individuals locate themselves within work. As organizations evolve, emphasizing human-centered values, inclusive practices and opportunities for meaningful contribution will be essential not only for individual flourishing but also for building resilient, high-performing workplaces.

Emotional Labor and Human Capabilities

While AI can handle transactional and analytical functions, it remains limited in replicating the full spectrum of human emotional intelligence, empathy and contextual awareness (Crawford, 2021). In sectors like healthcare, education and social work, these capabilities are not supplementary—they are central. As AI systems take over logistical or

diagnostic tasks, the relational aspects of work become more pronounced, placing greater pressure on employees to perform emotional labor without corresponding support or compensation (Hochschild, 1983). This growing reliance on human emotional capacity risks reinforcing the undervaluation of caregiving and emotional work—often feminized and marginalized—particularly if AI adoption continues to prioritize technocratic and efficiency-centric values. A human-centered approach would instead recognize the unique strengths of empathy, creativity and ethical judgment as irreplaceable components of meaningful work.

Emotional labor, a term that captures the process of regulating one's emotions to meet organizational expectations, plays a pivotal role in many contemporary professions. Kruml and Geddes (2000) define emotional labor as a central function in service-oriented roles, where workers often rely on surface acting—faking emotions they do not genuinely feel—or deep acting—aligning internal emotions with expected displays. While such regulation is essential for effective performance and customer interaction, it can come at a cost. Grandey and Melloy (2017) emphasize that prolonged emotional labor, especially surface acting, contributes significantly to stress, burnout and psychological fatigue. This toll is particularly evident in professions that demand constant interpersonal engagement, such as healthcare.

Han et al., (2025) illustrates how nurses experiencing perceived overqualification may struggle with mindfulness and emotional expression due to the strain of emotional labor, emphasizing the importance of individual psychological resources in managing such demands. Emotional exhaustion among front-line workers is a recurring theme in this field. Kang et al. (2019) and Costakis et al. (2020) show that continuous emotional effort can erode job satisfaction and increase turnover intentions. Pandey (2018) further stresses the importance of recognizing emotional labor as a legitimate occupational requirement that significantly affects employee well-being and organizational outcomes.

Despite these challenges, emotional labor can also produce positive results when managed effectively. Humphrey et al. (2015) argue that when employees are granted autonomy to express genuine emotions, emotional labor can enhance job satisfaction, leadership effectiveness and overall workplace morale. This suggests that organizations should not only mitigate the negative consequences of emotional labor but also cultivate conditions that allow its positive aspects to flourish.

From a broader human capabilities perspective, emotional labor intersects with essential experiential dimensions of work life. Liu (2021) finds that emotional labor affects job engagement among university archivists by influencing burnout levels, underscoring the need to address emotional strain in role design. Hsieh and Guy (2008) advocate for integrating emotional labor into job descriptions and performance appraisals, asserting that such recognition improves both employee performance and public service delivery.

Managing emotional labor requires proactive organizational strategies. Pandey (2018) recommends that HR managers develop targeted interventions across recruitment, training and performance management processes to address the unique emotional demands of various roles. In parallel, Bowen (2021) highlights the importance of cultivating a service climate characterized by authenticity and justice. In such environments, employees are more likely to feel empowered to express their true emotions, enhancing their resilience and satisfaction while reducing the psychological toll of sustained emotional regulation.

In sum, emotional labor plays a critical role in shaping human capability, organizational culture and workplace well-being. As AI transforms technical and routine aspects of work, the uniquely human ability to empathize, connect and respond emotionally becomes even more valuable. Recognizing and supporting emotional labor is not only vital for sustaining performance and engagement but also essential for preserving the human essence of work in an increasingly automated world.

Psychological and Ethical Implications

The increasing presence of AI at work introduces new psychological and organizational risks that challenge traditional workplace norms. Surveillance technologies

and algorithmic evaluations create a sense of constant scrutiny and reduce perceived autonomy—conditions that are strongly linked to stress, burnout and disengagement (Moore, 2018). Employees may struggle to understand the criteria used to evaluate their performance or determine promotion and termination decisions, undermining trust in management processes and eroding psychological safety in the workplace.

These challenges are further compounded by ethical concerns. The opacity of many AI systems limits transparency and accountability, raising questions about fundamental rights such as privacy, fairness and informed consent. Nemitz (2018) notes that as workers become data subjects within algorithmically governed environments, it becomes necessary to move beyond purely technical standards of compliance. Ethical safeguards must be grounded in participatory governance structures, transparent algorithmic decision-making and meaningful avenues for recourse and human oversight.

Simultaneously, AI is reshaping the labor market by transforming skill demands and job profiles. As technological innovations and automation become embedded across various sectors, the structure and content of jobs are undergoing significant evolution. He et al. (2024) argue that this technological acceleration has prompted a redefinition of job roles, demanding not only technical expertise but also a broad range of soft skills including collaboration, problem-solving and critical thinking (Tabar & Saberi, 2023). This shift implies that workers must be agile and committed to continuous learning, as traditional job descriptions become outdated or obsolete in the face of new digital expectations.

Thus, this situation brings with it different problems. In here, another important human perspective is the way AI is used not only to transform work, but also to justify questionable practices in the labor market. As interest in AI grows, many individuals and organizations have begun marketing short courses or seminars promising "AI expertise," often at high cost but with little substantive content. Much of this knowledge could be freely accessed through publicly available AI tools, yet workers who feel pressured to "catch up" are persuaded to pay for superficial training. This dynamic illustrates how the discourse of AI can be exploited as an excuse for manipulation, creating new forms of inequality and frustration. It also raises ethical concerns about the commodification of knowledge and the risk of misleading workers under the guise of digital upskilling.

In this context, the importance of cultivating 21st-century skills has become a central concern in both policy and education. Su et al. (2015) emphasize the alignment of educational practices with labor market needs, particularly in fostering analytical and communicative competencies. Widayana (2023) further asserts that success in a globally interconnected job market depends on the ability to innovate and adapt—not merely on technical proficiency. This evolution places new responsibilities on educational institutions, which must now prepare students to thrive in a labor environment shaped by complexity and rapid change.

Curriculum design has become an important area of reform, as scholars emphasize the need for experiential learning models that promote engagement with real-world challenges. Brumberger and Lauer (2019) and Rafiq and Hashim (2018) argue for educational strategies that build critical skills in parallel with domain-specific knowledge, while Aifan (2021) suggests that project-based learning can help bridge the gap between theoretical instruction and practical application. These approaches can better prepare graduates for the unpredictable demands of the contemporary workplace.

Beyond technical and cognitive abilities, the importance of personal attributes such as adaptability and resilience is increasingly recognized. Zaber et al. (2019) point to the influence of demographic trends, technological disruption and globalization in driving the need for workforce development strategies that support these capabilities. Additionally, intercultural competence has become essential as organizations expand across national and cultural boundaries. Villar and Quirap (2023) emphasize that inclusive leadership and cultural awareness can improve job satisfaction, collaboration and innovation across diverse teams.

The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated changes in work modalities and skill expectations, bringing remote

work and digital fluency to the forefront. Eslit (2023) notes that this disruption has heightened the need for flexibility, innovation and digital proficiency. As a result, continuous professional development and lifelong learning must become foundational elements of workforce policy, ensuring that individuals can remain relevant in a rapidly evolving job market.

In conclusion, the convergence of AI integration and shifting labor market dynamics underscores the urgency of preparing both individuals and institutions for ongoing transformation. Addressing the psychological, ethical and structural challenges posed by AI requires not only transparency and accountability in technological design but also a reinvention of how we cultivate skills, design education and support human adaptability. A proactive, inclusive approach will be critical to navigating the future of work in a manner that safeguards well-being and ensures equitable access to opportunity.

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE FUTURE OF WORK

Artificial intelligence is not only a technological phenomenon but a profoundly social one. Its integration into the workplace affects institutions, norms, values and identities—making it a subject of inquiry well-suited to the social sciences. Disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science and management studies offer essential frameworks for interpreting the human consequences of AI and guiding more equitable futures.

Interdisciplinary Insight into Work Transformation

Social sciences help situate AI developments within broader structural and historical contexts. For instance, sociological research can reveal how AI interacts with class, race and gender dynamics in the workplace (Benjamin, 2019). Anthropological studies shed light on how local cultures and values shape the adoption and resistance to AI technologies in different labor environments (Suchman, 2007). Political science contributes to understanding governance mechanisms and regulatory frameworks, while organizational psychology explores the impact of AI on motivation, stress and leadership (Wirtz et al., 2020). These disciplines collectively challenge deterministic narratives that present AI as an inevitable or neutral force. Instead, they emphasize that technology is always co-constructed through political, economic and cultural forces (Jasanoff, 2004). As such, the future of work is not simply to be predicted—it must be deliberately designed with attention to inclusion, justice and well-being.

The interdisciplinary insights surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence into workplace transformation provide a multi-faceted understanding of both the opportunities and challenges this evolution presents (Gabsi, 2024). As AI technologies continue to permeate various industries, the necessity of collaboration across disciplines becomes increasingly evident to ensure responsible, ethical and sustainable implementation (Türkcan, 2025). A critical component of this effort is the human-centered approach, which advocates for the incorporation of diverse perspectives into technological design. Mazarakis et al. (2023) highlight five co-existing viewpoints on human-centered AI, ranging from deficit-oriented to protection-oriented perspectives, underscoring the diversity of ethical and practical considerations that must be acknowledged during development and deployment.

Interdisciplinary collaboration has also been linked to greater influence and innovation in AI research. Vlasceanu et al. (2021) show that organizations with high betweenness centrality in co-authorship networks tend to be more interdisciplinary and, consequently, their research achieves broader reach and citation. This suggests that combining disciplinary knowledge not only strengthens academic impact but also enhances the practical value of AI innovations by accounting for a wider array of real-world conditions.

The role of AI in promoting sustainable development further illustrates the value of interdisciplinary engagement. Kulkov et al. (2023) explore how AI can support sustainable supply chain management, particularly in the wake of disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Their findings underscore the importance of integrating expertise from environmental science, business and technology to optimize resource use and enhance

resilience. Similarly, in healthcare, Rony et al. (2024) advocate for collaborative partnerships between nurse practitioners and AI specialists to improve decision-making and patient care. Such cooperation is essential for ensuring that AI tools are not only clinically effective but also ethically and contextually aligned with frontline realities.

Ethical considerations form another domain where interdisciplinary input is essential. Saraiva (2024) calls for embedding ethical frameworks into AI systems through collaboration among moral philosophers, legal scholars and technologists. Addressing issues such as algorithmic bias, data privacy and informed consent requires a holistic understanding that no single discipline can provide. Buchanan et al. (2020) add that healthcare-specific dilemmas—such as maintaining patient safety and confidentiality—will demand robust policies developed with input from multiple professional domains to uphold ethical integrity in AI-supported clinical settings.

Workforce readiness and learning also benefit from cross-sectoral perspectives. Baako (2025) and Ulaş (2025) highlight the importance of integrating AI-related skills into technical and vocational education and training programs, reinforcing the need for interdisciplinary coordination among educators, industry stakeholders and policymakers. This alignment ensures that the evolving demands of the labor market are met through relevant and inclusive educational strategies.

Additionally, AI's intersection with environmental science demonstrates how interdisciplinary synergies can generate innovative responses to global challenges. Akter (2024) emphasizes the potential of combining AI with ecological and policy knowledge to create data-driven solutions for climate action, resource conservation and environmental monitoring.

In conclusion, the integration of AI into contemporary work and society cannot be effectively realized without the insights and cooperation of multiple disciplines. Social sciences, technical fields and applied professions each offer critical lenses through which to understand, design and govern AI technologies. Whether addressing ethical dilemmas, enhancing sustainability, or preparing future workers, interdisciplinary collaboration ensures that AI serves human and societal needs rather than exacerbating existing divides. The path forward depends not only on technological sophistication but also on our collective ability to engage across disciplines and co-create a future of work that is inclusive, just and deeply human.

The Role of Policy, Education and Ethical Infrastructure

Social science perspectives highlight the institutional conditions that will shape how artificial intelligence (AI) affects workers and workplaces. Educational systems must evolve to cultivate digital literacy, critical thinking and lifelong learning skills that prepare individuals not only to work with AI but to shape its trajectory in ways that are socially responsible and ethically grounded (Autor et al., 2020). Curricula must be designed to blend technical competence with humanistic awareness, ensuring that future professionals can engage with technology reflectively rather than passively. This shift in educational philosophy is essential for nurturing a workforce capable of not only navigating AI-rich environments but also influencing how those environments evolve.

Moreover, robust labor and ethical policies are required to ensure that AI integration does not erode workers' rights or exacerbate social inequalities. This includes implementing algorithmic transparency laws, developing strong worker data protection standards and adapting collective bargaining mechanisms to fit the realities of platform-based labor (De Stefano & Wouters, 2020). Ethics cannot be treated as an afterthought or confined to post-hoc audits; rather, it must be embedded from the outset in the design, development and deployment of AI systems. In this regard, social scientists play an indispensable role—not just as observers of technological change, but as active designers, educators and advocates working to shape a future of work that is technologically advanced yet deeply human.

The integration of AI into the workforce carries profound implications that demand strategic planning across policy, education and ethical domains. Effective policy development is paramount in guiding the responsible deployment of AI technologies. Patel and Ragolane (2024) point to substantial gains in administrative efficiency and personalized learning through AI,

particularly in educational settings. However, these benefits are accompanied by ethical risks, such as data privacy violations and algorithmic bias, which require comprehensive policy frameworks to mitigate. Siau and Wang (2020) argue that ethical and moral considerations must be central to AI governance, while Morley et al. (2019) underscore the difficulty of translating ethical principles into actionable practices. These findings highlight the need for collaboration between policymakers, technologists and ethicists to design policies that are both practically enforceable and normatively sound.

Education also plays a pivotal role in preparing the workforce to interact responsibly with AI. Schiff (2021) emphasizes that future professionals must be equipped with both technical competencies and ethical literacy to fully comprehend AI's societal implications. Lee et al. (2024) similarly advocate for embedding moral and social values in AI curricula to develop well-rounded practitioners. In higher education, Sullivan et al. (2023) suggest that student participation in policy-making enhances institutional responsiveness and ethical alignment. Patel and Ragolane (2024) further emphasize the importance of pairing investments in technological infrastructure with strategic policy design in higher education—an approach that can serve as a model for other regions and sectors.

Establishing ethical infrastructure is also critical for promoting trust and accountability in the deployment of AI systems in workplaces. Bradshaw et al. (2024) argue that trust in AI systems is essential for fostering effective human-AI collaboration, which requires transparency, clear ethical guidelines and mechanisms for accountability. These components form the backbone of an ethical infrastructure that not only supports organizational performance but also safeguards individual well-being. Nweke and Nweke (2024) demonstrate that consultative approaches—engaging workers directly in AI decision-making—can lead to greater ethical alignment, satisfaction and inclusivity within organizations. Practical tools for supporting ethical AI use, such as those reviewed by Morley et al. (2019), offer additional resources for translating principles into operational practices.

Together, these insights reinforce the importance of integrating policy development, education reform and ethical infrastructure to foster a responsible and sustainable future of work shaped by AI. The interdisciplinary contributions of educators, policymakers, engineers, ethicists and social scientists are essential to designing systems that are not only technologically efficient but also socially just and inclusive. As AI continues to transform workplaces across the globe, this collective, forward-looking approach will be vital for ensuring that technological progress serves both organizational goals and the broader public good.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the workplace represents more than a technological disruption—it constitutes a paradigmatic shift in how work is conceptualized, experienced and governed. As this study has emphasized, AI not only alters workflows and skill requirements but also redefines worker identities, reshapes power dynamics and amplifies ethical concerns.

Before turning to the implications, it is important to clarify that the findings of this study extend beyond the immediate operational benefits or challenges of AI adoption. While much discourse on AI emphasizes efficiency gains, cost reduction, and technical innovation, this research highlights that the integration of AI also transforms deeper dimensions of work—shaping how roles are defined, how authority is exercised, and how workers experience their identities within organizations. In this sense, AI functions not only as a tool but as a catalyst for social, cultural, and ethical reconfigurations of the workplace. Recognizing this broader scope is essential for interpreting the theoretical, managerial, and policy-related implications that follow.

Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, the diffusion of AI compels scholars to re-evaluate long-standing assumptions in labor sociology, organizational studies and ethics. Traditional notions of skill and expertise are being challenged by algorithmic decision-making, while concepts such as autonomy, agency and authority are increasingly mediated through non-human systems. This evolution necessitates updated frameworks that account for algorithmic

governance as a managerial control mechanism, the expansion of emotional labor in digital settings and the entanglement of human and machine subjectivities. This evolution necessitates an updated analytical framework that accommodates:

- Algorithmic governance as a new form of managerial control;
- Symbolic and emotional labor in digital and posthuman work contexts;
- Technological entanglement, where human and machine subjectivities co-evolve.

In particular, posthumanist theory offers critical insight into the relational and ethical dimensions of AI integration, emphasizing that these technologies are not developed in isolation but emerge from and reinforce existing power structures. AI should therefore be understood less as a neutral or purely technical tool and more as a socio-technical construct that mirrors institutional hierarchies, cultural biases and economic interests. From this perspective, the social sciences must interrogate the epistemologies, power relations and inequalities embedded within AI's design and application, recognizing how technology both reflects and reshapes labor identities and organizational norms.

Managerial and Organizational Implications

For organizations, these transformations are not abstract. In customer service, for instance, AI chatbots can handle basic interactions, but employees often face more emotionally complex customer issues that technology cannot resolve. This dual workload—delegating routine queries to AI while intensifying human responsibility for sensitive cases—illustrates the importance of recognizing and rewarding human contributions that remain irreplaceable. Similarly, in logistics and transportation, AI-based tracking systems increase efficiency but also enable continuous surveillance of workers, raising questions about autonomy, trust and fairness. This includes:

- Engaging employees in the co-design of AI systems to ensure usability, relevance and fairness;
- Ensuring transparency in algorithmic decision-making processes to preserve procedural justice;
- Redesigning job roles to emphasize complementarity between human judgment and machine efficiency;
- Investing in emotional intelligence and soft skills training to bolster human capabilities where AI cannot substitute.

Moreover, emotional labor must be re-evaluated as a critical, often invisible component of AI-augmented work. Organizations should develop metrics and rewards that recognize relational and affective contributions—particularly in service, care and education sectors where empathy and human connection remain irreplaceable.

Policy and Societal Implications

Policy implications are equally significant. Governments and institutions face the challenge of designing regulatory frameworks that ensure ethical AI adoption while protecting workers. For example, in contexts where ride-hailing platforms rely on opaque algorithmic ratings, policy interventions are needed to guarantee transparency, appeal mechanisms and basic labor protections. In education, policies that promote equal access to AI-based learning tools are critical to preventing the deepening of digital inequalities. These examples demonstrate that policy responses must not only regulate technology but also actively safeguard human dignity and social equity. Priorities include:

- Establishing enforceable standards for algorithmic transparency, worker data rights and informed consent;
- Adapting labor protections and collective bargaining mechanisms to platform-based and AI-mediated employment;
- Redressing digital divides through infrastructure development, universal access and inclusive skill-building initiatives;
- Embedding ethics by design into AI development processes, ensuring value alignment from the outset rather than as an afterthought.

Crucially, education systems must evolve to equip learners not just with technical skills, but with the critical thinking,

civic awareness and interdisciplinary literacy needed to shape AI responsibly. Lifelong learning, flexible upskilling pathways and culturally responsive curricula will be central to building a workforce that is resilient, adaptable and ethically grounded.

CONCLUSION

This study has critically examined the transformative role of artificial intelligence (AI) in reshaping the future of work through a human-centered and interdisciplinary lens. Drawing from social sciences, the paper has illuminated how AI technologies are not neutral tools but socio-technical systems that interact with power structures, labor dynamics and identity formation. The findings underscore that AI impacts not only operational processes and productivity metrics but also the psychological, ethical and emotional dimensions of work.

The adoption of AI in organizational contexts raises complex challenges related to algorithmic transparency, emotional labor, professional autonomy and inclusivity. As AI automates cognitive and routine tasks, human workers are increasingly called upon to perform nuanced functions requiring empathy, creativity and ethical judgment—roles for which AI remains limited. In response, this paper advocates for a human-centered approach that values these irreplaceable human capacities, while calling for policies and organizational practices that ensure transparency, justice and participation.

The findings underscore that while AI can increase efficiency and create new opportunities, it also generates risks related to transparency, fairness and emotional well-being. For example, workers subject to algorithmic management may face job insecurity and stress, while employees in education and healthcare sectors shoulder increased emotional labor as AI assumes technical or logistical responsibilities. These cases highlight the importance of ensuring that AI complements, rather than undermines, uniquely human capabilities such as empathy, judgment and creativity.

To address these challenges, several directions are clear:

- **For policymakers:** Enforce transparency and accountability in algorithmic systems, establish protections for workers exposed to platform-based AI management and ensure universal access to digital infrastructure and lifelong learning opportunities.
- **For organizations:** Involve employees in the design and implementation of AI tools, recognize emotional and relational labor as central to performance and align technology with human well-being rather than only efficiency metrics.
- **For education systems:** Update curricula to emphasize not only technical competencies but also critical thinking, inclusivity and ethical awareness, preparing future workers to engage responsibly with AI-driven environments.

Ultimately, the future of work shaped by AI is not predetermined but socially constructed. Through deliberate institutional choices, inclusive governance and human-centered design, AI can serve not only as a driver of productivity but also as a catalyst for justice, well-being and sustainability.

Moreover, the paper emphasizes that the future of work is not a technological inevitability but a social construct shaped by institutional decisions, cultural values and governance structures. Interdisciplinary engagement is essential to steer this transformation toward equity, well-being and sustainability. Education, policy and workplace design must work in concert to build systems that are not only efficient but also inclusive and empowering.

While this paper provides a comprehensive conceptual overview, it is limited by the absence of empirical data. The insights presented are grounded in secondary literature and theoretical synthesis rather than original field research. This conceptual nature, while rich in analytical depth, restricts the ability to test specific hypotheses or offer context-specific recommendations. Furthermore, the study focuses primarily on general workplace contexts, which may limit applicability to specific sectors such as manufacturing, creative industries, or informal labor markets.

Future research should aim to empirically investigate how AI technologies are being integrated across diverse sectors and geographic contexts. Longitudinal studies examining the psychosocial and behavioral impacts of algorithmic

systems on workers would offer valuable insights into the evolving relationship between human and machine. There is also a need for in-depth qualitative research that explores the lived experiences of workers adapting to AI-mediated environments, especially in underrepresented or precarious labor groups.

Additionally, interdisciplinary methodologies that blend computational modeling with sociological or ethnographic approaches could illuminate the dynamic and often unintended consequences of AI adoption. Research should also explore participatory design models where workers co-create the tools that govern their labor, ensuring democratic input into technological change. Finally, studies focusing on how AI intersects with global labor migration, gendered work patterns and post-pandemic work modalities would deepen our understanding of equity and inclusion in the future of work.

In sum, this paper contributes to the growing discourse on AI and labor by centering human values, ethical design and social responsibility. As organizations and societies continue to navigate the integration of AI, it is imperative that these transitions are informed not only by innovation imperatives but also by a commitment to human dignity, institutional fairness and collective well-being.

REFERENCES

Aghaziarati, S., & Darbani, S. (2023). Ai and the future of work: Adapting to change while ensuring social equity. *Aitechbesosci*, 1(2), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.aitech.1.2.1

Aifan, H. (2021). Implementing a project-based collaborative learning approach using powerpoint to improve students' 21st- century skills. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 19(3), 258-273. https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530211030642

Akter, M. (2024). Interdisciplinary insights: integrating artificial intelligence with environmental science for sustainable solutions. *JAIGS*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.60087/jaigs.v1i1.28

Alwi, S., Mukhlis, M., Siregar, Z., Iqbal, M., & Fithra, H. (2024). Community psychology and the acceptance of rohingya refugees in aceh: local identity, humanitarian needs, and islamic law. *Hikmatuna Journal for Integrative Islamic Studies*, 10(1), 15-27. https://doi.org/10.28918/hikmatuna.v10i1.6899

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

Autor, D., Mindell, D., & Reynolds, E. (2020). *The Work of the Future: Building Better Jobs in an Age of Intelligent Machines*. MIT Work of the Future Initiative. https://workofthefuture.mit.edu/research-post/the-work-of-the-future-building-better-jobs-in-an-age-of-intelligent-machines/

Baako, I. (2025). A bibliometric investigation of artificial intelligence in technical and vocational education training (ai-tvet): Trends and insights for a decade. *Research Square (Preprint)*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6431518/v1

Bannon, L. J. (2011). Reimagining HCI: Toward a more human-centered perspective. *Interactions*, 18(4), 50–57. https://doi.org/10.1145/1978822.1978833

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2477899

Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. Basic Books.

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity.

Berg, J. (2016). Income security in the on-demand economy: Findings and policy lessons from a survey of crowdworkers. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 543–576.

Bokhari, S., & Myeong, S. (2023). The impact of ai applications on smart decision-making in smart cities as mediated by the internet of things and smart governance. *Ieee Access*, 11, 120827-120844. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2023.3327174

Bowen, D. (2021). A human experience (hx) perspective on emotional labor and service: building a service climate on a foundation of authenticity and justice. *Journal of Service Management Research*, 5(4), 229-240. https://doi.org/10.15358/2511-8676-2021-4-229

Bradshaw, J., Bunch, L., Prietula, M., Queen, E., Uszok, A., & Venable, K. (2024). From bench to bedside: Implementing ai ethics as policies for ai trustworthiness. *AAAI-SS*, 4(1), 102-105. https://doi.org/10.1609/aaaiss.v4i1.31778

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. Monthly Review Press.

Brumberger, E., & Lauer, C. (2019). A day in the life: Personas of professional communicators at work. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 50(3), 308-335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281619868723

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Buchanan, C., Howitt, M., Wilson, R., Booth, R., Risling, T., & Bamford, M. (2020). Predicted influences of artificial intelligence on the domains of nursing: Scoping review. *Jmir Nursing*, 3(1), e23939. https://doi.org/10.2196/23939

Cao, J., & Song, Z. (2024). An incoming threat: the influence of automation potential on job insecurity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 17(1), 116-135. https://doi.org/10.1108/apjba-07-2022-0328

Chen, N., Li, Z., & Tang, B. (2022). Can digital skill protect against job displacement risk caused by artificial intelligence? Empirical evidence from 701 detailed occupations. *Plos One*, 17(11), e0277280. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277280

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

Costakis, H., Gruhlke, H., & Su, Y. (2020). Implications of emotional labor on work outcomes of service workers in not-for-profit human service organizations. *Human Services Organizations Management Leadership & Governance*, 45(1), 29-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2020.1818157

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Daugherty, P. R., & Wilson, H. J. (2018). *Human + Machine: Reimagining Work in the Age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.

De Stefano, V. (2015). The rise of the "just-in-time workforce": On-demand work, crowdwork, and labor protection in the gig economy. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 471–504.

De Stefano, V., & Wouters, M. (2020). AI and digital tools in workplace management and evaluation: In search of a human-centered approach. *European Labour Law Journal*, 11(1), 18–35.

Dehing, A., Jochems, W., & Baartman, L. (2013). The development of engineering students professional identity during workplace learning in industry: A study in Dutch bachelor education. *Engineering Education*, 8(1), 42-64. https://doi.org/10.11120/ened.2013.00007

Dennis, A., & Smith, G. (2015). Interactionism, symbolic. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)*, 352-356. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.32079-7

Ehsan, U., & Riedl, M. (2020). Human-centered explainable ai: Towards a reflective sociotechnical approach. *Arxiv.org (preprint)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2002.01092

Eslit, E. (2023). The future is now: how colleges and universities can prepare students for the jobs of 2030 and beyond. *Preprints.org (preprint)*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202309.1288.v1

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Ferris, T., & Shepley, M. (2013). The design of neonatal incubators: A systems-oriented, human-centered approach. *Journal of Perinatology*, 33(S1), S24-S31. https://doi.org/10.1038/jp.2013.11

Fourman, M. (2016). Measuring the broadband access divide. *CTD '16: Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development*. https://doi.org/10.1145/2909609.2909616

Francis, D., & Weller, C. (2021). Economic inequality, the digital divide, and remote learning during covid-19. *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 49(1), 41-60. https://doi.org/10.1177/00346446211017797

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerization? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019

Gabsi, A. E. H. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence in industry 4.0: Insights, challenges, and future prospects-A literature review. *Annals of Operations Research*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-024-06012-6

Gini, A. (1998). Work, Identity and Self: How We Are Formed by the Work We Do. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(7), 707–714.

Grandey, A., & Melloy, R. (2017). The state of the heart: emotional labor as emotion regulation reviewed and revised. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 407-422. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000067

Grittner, A. (2023). Carefully curated/for heart and soul: Sensing place identity in sex workplaces. *Sexes*, 4(4), 473-492. https://doi.org/10.3390/sexes4040031

Hall, A., Murray, P., Boring, R., & Agarwal, V. (2024). Human-centered and explainable artificial intelligence in nuclear operations. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 68(1), 1563-1568. https://doi.org/10.1177/10711813241276463

Han, Y., Su, A., Xuli, Y., Lv, Y., & Jing, F. (2025). The mediating role of perceived overqualification in the relationship between emotional labor and mindfulness among nurses in china. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1519192

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press.

He, W., Zhang, B., & Zhang, J. (2024). The impact of technology on the labor market: an analysis of the changing landscape, *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Financial Innovation and Economic Development (ICFIED 2024),* 498-504. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-408-2_56

Heldal, F., Kongsvik, T., & Håland, E. (2019). Advancing the status of nursing: reconstructing professional nursing identity through patient safety work. *BMC Health Services Research*, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4222-y

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. University of California Press.

Hsieh, C., & Guy, M. (2008). Performance outcomes. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 29(1), 41-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x08326767

Humphrey, R., Ashforth, B., & Diefendorff, J. (2015). The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(6), 749-769. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2019

İzci, Y., & Kılıç, C. (2025). Exploring the impact of social climate on job satisfaction: A comprehensive analysis. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences/ Uluslararasi Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16(59). https://doi.org/10.70736/ijoess.551

Jaiswal, A., & Dyaram, L. (2019). Perceived diversity and employee well-being: mediating role of inclusion. *Personnel Review*, 49(5), 1121-1139. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-12-2018-0511

Jasanoff, S. (2004). *States of Knowledge: The Co-production of Science and the Social Order*. Routledge.

Kang, D., Yang, J., Choi, W., Ham, S., Kang, S., & Lee, W. (2019). Anxiety, depression and sleep disturbance among customer-facing workers. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 34(48). https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2019.34.e313

Khamaisi, R., Prati, E., Peruzzini, M., Raffaeli, R., & Pellicciari, M. (2021). Ux in ar-supported industrial human–robot collaborative tasks: A systematic review. *Applied Sciences*, 11(21), 10448. https://doi.org/10.3390/app112110448

Kılıç, C. (2024). Sustainable human development and human resource management strategies in building sustainable cities. *Kent Akademisi*, 17(Sürdürülebilir İnsani Kalkınma ve Kent), 153-173. https://doi.org/10.35674/kent.1501835

Kılıç, C., & Atilla, G. (2024). The changing nature of the workforce: A qualitative exploration across selected countries. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences/ Uluslararasi Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(56). https://doi.org/10.35826/ijoess.4449

Kruml, S., & Geddes, D. (2000). Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14(1), 8-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318900141002

Kulkov, I., Kulkova, J., Rohrbeck, R., Menvielle, L., Kaartemo, V., & Makkonen, H. (2023). Artificial intelligence - driven sustainable development: Examining organizational, technical, and processing approaches to achieving global goals. *Sustainable Development*, 32(3), 2253-2267. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2773

Lee, J., Hong, M., & Cho, J. (2024). Development of a content framework of artificial intelligence integrated education considering ethical factors. *International Journal on Advanced Science Engineering and Information Technology*, 14(1), 205-213. https://doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.14.1.19558

Lee, Y., Choi, H., & Lee, S. (2025). Development of personas and journey maps for artificial intelligence agents supporting the use of health big data: Human-centered design approach. *Jmir Formative Research*, 9, e67272. https://doi.org/10.2196/67272

Levy, K. E. C. (2015). The contexts of control: Information, power, and truck-driving work. *The Information Society*, 31(2), 160–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2015.998105

Liu, C. (2021). The effect of emotional labor on job engagement of university archivists: the mediating role of job burnout. *International Journal of New Developments in Education*, 3(5). https://doi.org/10.25236/ijnde.2021.030509

Liu, Z., & Sang, G. (2024). Research on iot design strategies based on hcd in smart city development. *Proceedings of the 5th Management Science Informatization and Economic Innovation Development Conference, MSIEID 2023*. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.8-12-2023.2344472

Mateescu, A., & Nguyen, A. (2019). Algorithmic management in the workplace. *Data & Society Report*. https://datasociety.net/library/algorithmic-management-in-the-workplace/

Mazarakis, A., Bernhard-Skala, C., Braun, M., & Peters, I. (2023). What is critical for human-centered ai at work? – Toward an interdisciplinary theory. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1257057

McKenzie, S., Burgess, A., & Mellis, C. (2020). A taste of real medicine: Third year medical students' report experiences of early workplace encounters. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 11, 717-725. https://doi.org/10.2147/amep.s230946

Melles, M., Albayrak, A., & Goossens, R. (2020). Innovating health care: key characteristics of human-centered design. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 33(Supplement_1), 37-44. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzaa127

Mirbabaie, M., Brünker, F., Frick, N., & Stieglitz, S. (2021). The rise of artificial intelligence – Understanding the ai identity threat at the workplace. *Electronic Markets*, 32(1), 73-99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-021-00496-x

Moore, P. V. (2018). *The Quantified Self in Precarity: Work, Technology and What Counts*. Routledge.

Moran, C. (2022). The 'connected migrant': A scoping review. *Convergence the International Journal of Research Into*

New Media Technologies, 29(2), 288-307. https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565221090480

Morley, J., Floridi, L., Kinsey, L., & Elhalal, A. (2019). From what to how: An initial review of publicly available ai ethics tools, methods and research to translate principles into practices. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 26(4), 2141-2168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-019-00165-5

Nemitz, P. (2018). Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31, 505–540.

Norman, D. A. (2013). *The Design of Everyday Things* (Revised and expanded edition). Basic Books.

Nweke, G., & Nweke, O. (2024). Empowering the workforce in the ai era: lessons from the uk's consultative approach for a global legal framework. *Beijing Law Review*, 15(01), 219-230. https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2024.151014

Oviatt, S. (2006). Human-centered design meets cognitive load theory. *MM '06: Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 871-880. https://doi.org/10.1145/1180639.1180831

Pandey, J. (2018). Managing emotional labor for service employees: An hrm-based approach. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 26(4), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1108/hrmid-04-2017-0072

Patel, S., & Ragolane, M. (2024). The implementation of artificial intelligence in south african higher education institutions: Opportunities and challenges. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 9, 51-65. https://doi.org/10.47577/teh.v9i.11452

Pisică, R. (2022). Digital divide and the opportunity dimension of economic inequality: the case of the republic of moldova. *International Journal of Management Knowledge and Learning*, 11. https://doi.org/10.53615/2232-5697.11.167-175

Poquet, O., & Laat, M. (2021). Developing capabilities: Lifelong learning in the age of ai. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1695-1708. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13123

Presbitero, A., & Teng-Calleja, M. (2022). Job attitudes and career behaviors relating to employees' perceived incorporation of artificial intelligence in the workplace: A career self-management perspective. *Personnel Review*, 52(4), 1169-1187. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-02-2021-0103

Qiu, Y., He, N., Yan, C., & Rao, Q. (2023). Whether the digital divide widens the income gap between china's regions?. *Plos One*, 18(2), e0273334. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273334

Rafiq, K., & Hashim, H. (2018). Augmented reality game (arg), 21st century skills and esl classroom. *Journal of Educational and Learning Studies*, 1(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.32698/0232

Ramos, M., & Ochoa, N. (2024). Identity networks as a new frontier: conceptualizing, mapping, and analyzing identity structures and their impact on well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1177/01902725241292328

Rony, M., Numan, S., Johra, F., Akter, K., Akter, F., Debnath, M., … & Parvin, M. (2024). Perceptions and attitudes of nurse practitioners toward artificial intelligence adoption in health care. *Health Science Reports*, 7(8). https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.70006

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 3758–3784.

Roundy, P., & Bayer, M. (2023). Life after digital displacement: analog entrepreneurship and the revitalization of legacy technologies. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 26(1), 191-211. https://doi.org/10.1108/jrme-08-2022-0100

Saraiva, L. (2024). Moral agency and responsibility in ai systems. *International Journal of Philosophy*, 3(1), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.47941/ijp.1867

Schiff, D. (2021). Education for ai, not ai for education: the role of education and ethics in national ai policy strategies. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(3), 527-563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00270-2

Sennett, R. (2008). *The Craftsman*. Yale University Press.

Shneiderman, B. (2022). *Human-centered ai*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192845290.001.0001

Siau, K., & Wang, W. (2020). Artificial intelligence (ai) ethics. *Journal of Database Management*, 31(2), 74-87. https://doi.org/10.4018/jdm.2020040105

Sigfrids, A., Leikas, J., Salo-Pöntinen, H., & Koskimies, E. (2023). Human-centricity in ai governance: A systemic approach. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.976887

Strangleman, T. (2012). Picturing work in an industrial landscape: visualising labour, place and space. *Sociological Research Online*, 17(2), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.2683

Su, R., Golubovich, J., & Robbins, S. (2015). Bridging science and practice: Toward a standard, evidence-based framework of 21st century skills. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 289-294. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.36

Suchman, L. (2007). *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). Chatgpt in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1).

Sulphey, M. (2020). Can spirituality and long-term orientation relate to workplace identity? An examination using sem. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 41(9/10), 1038-1057. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijssp-06-2020-0211

Susskind, D. (2020). *A World Without Work: Technology, Automation, and How We Should Respond*. Metropolitan Books.

Tabar, S., & Saberi, S. (2023). Beyond traditional pathways: Innovations in career counseling for the 21st century. *KMAN Counsel and Psych Nexus*, 1(1), 151-158. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.psychnexus.1.1.17

Taheri, M. (2023). Shaping the future together: the inaugural vision for ai and tech in behavioral and social sciences. *Aitechbesosci*, 1(1), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.aitech.1.1.1

Talhouk, R., Montague, K., Garbett, A., Araújo-Soares, V., Akik, C., Ghattas, H., … & Balaam, M. (2019). A call for embedding dignity in humanitarian technologies. *C&T '19: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities*, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1145/3328320.3328373

Tatum, A. (2018). Workplace climate and satisfaction in sexual minority populations: An application of social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 65(5), 618-628. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000292

Türkcan, B. (2025). Sürdürülebilir kalkinmada yapay zekanin rolü: Amaçlar için etkin politika formasyonu. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 34(Uygarlığın Dönüşümü-Sosyal Bilimlerin Bakışıyla Yapay Zekâ), 125-141.

Twigt, M. (2018). The mediation of hope: digital technologies and affective affordances within iraqi refugee households in jordan. *Social Media + Society*, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118764426

Ulaş, M. (2025). Akademisyenlerin yapay zekâ teknolojilerini kullanma motivasyonlari üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 34(Uygarlığın Dönüşümü-Sosyal Bilimlerin Bakışıyla Yapay Zekâ), 142-159.

van Wynsberghe, A. (2013). Designing robots for care: Care centered value-sensitive design. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 19(2), 407–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-011-9343-6

Villar, J., & Quirap, E. (2023). The mediating role of intercultural competence on the relationship between the 21st-century leadership skills and teachers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 136(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp10013611120235623

Vlasceanu, M., Dudík, M., & Momennejad, I. (2021). Interdisciplinarity, gender diversity, and network structure predict the centrality of ai organizations. *PsyArXiv Preprints*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/dp3ef

Widayana, G. (2023). The influence of technical skills and 21st century skills on the job readiness of vocational students. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Vocational Education and Technology, IConVET 2022, 6 October 2022, Singaraja, Bali, Indonesia*. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.6-10-2022.2327433

Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Sturm, B. J. (2020). The dark sides of artificial intelligence: An integrated AI governance framework for public administration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 818-829. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1749851

Woodward, R., & Jenkings, K. (2011). Military identities in the situated accounts of british military personnel. *Sociology*, 45(2), 252-268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038510394016

World Economic Forum. (2023). *Future of Jobs Report 2023*. https://www.weforum.org/reports/future-of-jobs-report-2023

Yu, X., Xu, S., & Ashton, M. (2022). Antecedents and outcomes of artificial intelligence adoption and application in the workplace: The socio-technical system theory perspective. *Information Technology and People*, 36(1), 454-474. https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-04-2021-0254

Zaber, M., Karoly, L., & Whipkey, K. (2019). *Reimagining the workforce development and employment system for the 21st century and beyond*. Research Report. https://doi.org/10.7249/rr2768

Zoltowski, C., Oakes, W., & Cardella, M. (2012). Students' ways of experiencing human-centered design. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 101(1), 28-59. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2012.tb00040.x

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.