The Automation Paradox: A Critical Review of Technological Innovation, Labor Displacement, and Social Inequality

Olivia Taylor[1]

[1]Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

olivia.taylor00@protonmail.com[1]

Abstract

The accelerating pace of automation and artificial intelligence (AI) is profoundly transforming global labor markets, with far-reaching consequences for work, employment structures, and social inequality. This review critically examines the current state of research and emerging trends in 2025 concerning the intersection of technological change and socioeconomic disparities. As automation continues to displace routine and manual labor, new forms of employment particularly in the gig and platform economies are proliferating. However, these shifts often exacerbate job insecurity and reduce access to stable, well-paying positions. The resulting skill-based job polarization has disproportionately impacted low-income, marginalized, and geographically isolated communities, who face structural barriers to upskilling and digital inclusion. The review explores how the uneven distribution of the economic benefits of automation is contributing to widening wage gaps and deepening structural inequalities across lines of class, gender, race, and region. Technological innovation, while promising increased productivity and efficiency, often concentrates rewards among highly skilled workers and tech capital holders, leaving vulnerable populations at greater risk of exclusion. In response, various policy interventions have been proposed and implemented with mixed results. These include government- and industry-led reskilling and upskilling programs**,** universal basic income (UBI) trials, and efforts to regulate platform labor to secure fair wages and protections. The review evaluates these strategies through a critical lens, emphasizing the need for inclusive frameworks that prioritize equity and participation in technological governance. Emerging research calls for a human-centered and intersectional approach to automation one that balances innovation with social justice. The paper argues for robust, forward-looking social safety nets, collaborative policymaking, and ethical AI development to ensure that the benefits of automation are shared broadly. Ultimately, this review underscores the urgency of shaping a more inclusive and resilient future of work in the face of rapid technological transformation.

Keywords: Automation, Labor Market Transformation, Job Polarization, Economic Inequality

Article Number: JSSHR04-009
IOARP Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
Volume 4, Issue 2 December 2025
Date Published: 15 January 2026
Copyright @ IOARP LTD – International Organization for Academic Research Publishing, City Views House, 5 Union Street, Manchester, M12 4JD, United Kingdom.
www.ioarp.org

1. Introduction

The global landscape of work is undergoing a profound transformation driven by rapid advances in automation, AI, and digital technologies. By 2025, these changes have moved from speculative forecasts to lived realities, affecting industries, labor markets, and the daily experiences of workers across the globe (Susskind, 2020). From self-checkout kiosks in retail to AI-powered decision-making in recruitment and logistics, automation has altered the demand for labor, reshaped skill requirements, and challenged traditional employment relationships (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014). While these innovations promise increased efficiency, cost savings, and economic growth, they also raise serious concerns about unemployment, job polarization, and the widening of social and economic inequalities (Frey and Osborne, 2017).

Automation has not affected all sectors or workers equally. High-skill, high-income roles particularly those requiring advanced technical, analytical, or creative competencies are generally complemented by new technologies, leading to productivity gains and higher wages. In contrast, many middle-skill jobs, especially those involving routine or repetitive tasks, have been rendered vulnerable to displacement or devaluation (Autor and Dorn, 2013). Low-skill workers, often in service sectors such as retail, hospitality, and transportation, face rising precarity due to the spread of gig platforms and algorithmic management (De Stefano, 2016). This uneven distribution of technological impact has led to what economists describe as "labor market bifurcation" a growing divide between high-paying knowledge work and low-wage, insecure jobs (Goos, Manning and Salomons, 2014).

The gig and platform economy, exemplified by companies such as Uber, Amazon, and Deliveroo, has further complicated the future of work. These platforms offer flexibility and access to income-generating opportunities but often lack traditional labor protections such as job security, benefits, and collective bargaining rights. As work becomes increasingly fragmented and mediated by algorithms, workers face new forms of control, surveillance, and exploitation, raising ethical and regulatory concerns (Zuboff, 2019).

Moreover, automation intersects with existing social inequalities, reinforcing disparities along lines of gender, race, class, and geography. Women and racial minorities, who are disproportionately employed in lower-paid, routine-intensive occupations, are more susceptible to job displacement (Chiacchio, Petropoulos and Pichler, 2018). Workers in developing countries and rural areas face additional challenges in accessing the digital infrastructure, education, and support needed to transition to new forms of employment. This intersectional lens reveals that the automation divide is not just about skills or education but also about access, opportunity, and power (Eubanks, 2018).

In response to these challenges, governments, educational institutions, labor unions, and civil society organizations have initiated a range of policy and social interventions. These include upskilling and reskilling programs, digital literacy initiatives, proposals for Universal Basic Income (UBI), and regulatory reforms aimed at protecting gig workers and ensuring fair wages (Broecke, S., 2023). However, the effectiveness of these responses remains uneven and often insufficient in addressing the systemic drivers of inequality (Berg et al., 2018).

This review aims to synthesize current research and debates on the relationship between automation, work, and inequality as of 2025. It draws on interdisciplinary perspectives from sociology, economics, labor studies, and political science to explore four key dimensions: (1) The impact of automation on labor demand and employment structures, (2) The role of digital platforms in reshaping work conditions, (3) The sociopolitical implications of rising inequality and workforce polarization, and (4) Policy and institutional responses to promote a more equitable transition.

Ultimately, this paper argues that the future of work is not technologically determined but socially and politically constructed. Ensuring a just and inclusive transition requires deliberate policy choices,

corporate responsibility, and public engagement that center equity, dignity, and human well-being in the design of work and technology (Susskind, 2020).

2. Automation and Labor Market Dynamics

The integration of automation and AI into the workplace has profoundly reshaped global labor markets, altering the demand for skills, the nature of tasks, and employment patterns across industries. This transformation is not merely technological but also social and economic, as it influences who is employed, how they are employed, and under what conditions (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2020; Frey and Osborne, 2017). By 2025, these dynamics have become central to policy debates and academic inquiry, especially in the context of rising inequality and economic uncertainty (Susskind, 2020).

2.1. Job Displacement and Task Automation

One of the most visible impacts of automation is the displacement of routine and repetitive tasks, both manual and cognitive. Machines, robots, and AI systems now perform many tasks that were once the domain of human workers, such as data entry, assembly-line manufacturing, warehouse sorting, and customer service via chatbots (Chiacchio, Petropoulos and Pichler, 2018). This process, often termed "technological substitution**,"** has led to significant job losses in sectors like retail, logistics, and manufacturing. However, automation typically targets tasks not entire occupations (Autor, 2015). Many jobs are transformed rather than eliminated, leading to a reconfiguration of work where humans increasingly collaborate with machines (Bessen, 2019). This shift underscores the need for task-based labor analysis, focusing on how automation alters the composition of tasks within jobs rather than simply counting job losses.

2.2. Job Creation and Demand for New Skills

While automation eliminates some roles, it also creates new ones especially in technology, engineering, data science, and digital services. The rise of AI ethics officers, robotics technicians, cloud computing specialists, and cybersecurity analysts illustrates the expanding frontier of work in the digital age (Broecke, S., 2023). These emerging roles typically demand higher levels of education, adaptability**,** and digital literacy, contributing to what scholars term **"**skill-biased technological change" (SBTC) (Acemoglu and Autor, 2011). However, this new labor demand often fails to absorb displaced workers due to skills mismatch. Workers laid off from routine jobs may lack the qualifications required for newly created roles, resulting in structural unemployment and underemployment, especially in older or lower-educated populations (Arntz, Gregory and Zierahn, 2016).

2.3. Labor Market Polarization

Automation contributes to a phenomenon known as labor market polarization the simultaneous growth of high-wage, high-skill jobs and low-wage, low-skill jobs, with a decline in middle-skill employment (Goos, Manning and Salomons, 2014). This "hollowing out" of the middle class has been observed in both advanced and emerging economies. Middle-income occupations, such as administrative assistants, bank tellers, and factory workers, are particularly vulnerable to automation, while demand grows for professionals and personal service workers. This polarization is not just economic; it has social and political consequences, including eroding social cohesion, reducing upward mobility, and fueling populist movements in regions suffering from industrial decline.

2.4. Sectoral Impacts: Case Examples

- **Manufacturing:** Once the backbone of industrial economies, manufacturing has seen extensive automation through industrial robots and smart factories. While some countries like Germany have maintained manufacturing employment by integrating humans and machines (Industry 4.0), others have experienced steep declines (Graetz and Michaels, 2018).

- **Retail and Service Sectors:** Self-checkout kiosks, automated inventory systems, and AI-driven recommendation engines have changed the nature of retail work. In e-commerce, warehouse automation through robotics and AI-driven logistics has reduced human labor needs (Frey and Osborne, 2017).
- **Healthcare:** Though less affected by job loss, automation is transforming healthcare through diagnostic AI, robotic surgery, and electronic health records, changing the roles of doctors, nurses, and technicians (Topol, 2019).
- **Transportation:** Autonomous vehicles and drone technologies are poised to disrupt logistics, delivery, and public transit. While widespread adoption remains pending regulatory and technical hurdles, pilot projects are already affecting employment expectations in the sector (Litman, 2021).

2.5. The Global Dimension

The effects of automation vary widely between countries and regions. High-income nations often have greater capacity to adopt advanced technologies and upskill workers, while developing economies face dual challenges: limited technological infrastructure and high vulnerability of labor-intensive industries. The "automation gap" between the Global North and South may exacerbate global inequality unless accompanied by inclusive investment and international cooperation. Moreover, global supply chains are becoming more digitized and automated, reducing the offshoring advantage for labor-abundant developing nations. This could lead to reshoring the return of production to high-income countries further marginalizing low-wage economies unless they adapt quickly (Rodrik, 2018).

3. Dimensions of Inequality

The impact of automation is not distributed evenly across societies. While some individuals and communities benefit from technological innovation, others are disproportionately burdened by job displacement, skill mismatch, and declining work conditions (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2020). These disparities are rooted not only in economic structures but also in longstanding social inequalities. As of 2025, automation is intensifying existing divides across economic, social, geographic, and digital dimensions, raising urgent questions of fairness, access, and systemic reform (Eubanks, 2018).

3.1. Economic Inequality: Wage Gaps and Job Polarization

Automation has played a pivotal role in driving job polarization, marked by the simultaneous growth of high-wage, high-skill occupations such as data scientists and software engineers and low-wage, low-skill service roles like warehouse workers and delivery personnel (Goos, Manning and Salomons, 2014), alongside the decline of stable, middle-income jobs. This structural shift has significantly widened the income gap between individuals equipped with advanced digital and cognitive skills and those without (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014). High-skill workers are typically complemented by technology, resulting in productivity enhancements and substantial earnings growth. In contrast, low- and middle-skill workers often perform tasks that are easily automated, exposing them to stagnant wages, heightened job insecurity (Frey and Osborne, 2017), or complete displacement from the labor market. Consequently, income inequality has intensified in many economies. In the absence of strong redistributive policies such as progressive taxation, living wages, or robust social protection systems automation threatens to further concentrate wealth and economic power in the hands of capital owners and technology elites, thereby exacerbating existing social and economic disparities.

3.2. Social Inequality: Race, Gender, and Class-Based Disparities

The rise of automation intersects with and intensifies existing structural inequalities related to race, gender, and class (Eubanks, 2018)**,** compounding long-standing historical disadvantages. In terms of gender, women are disproportionately employed in routine-intensive and clerical roles positions

particularly vulnerable to automation. At the same time, they remain significantly underrepresented in STEM disciplines and digital leadership, limiting their access to emerging, high-growth career paths (Chowdhury et al., 2021). Racial and ethnic disparities also persist, particularly in countries such as the United States, Brazil, and South Africa, where marginalized communities often experience higher rates of job precarity and are systematically excluded from tech-driven opportunities due to unequal access to quality education, professional networks, and ongoing hiring discrimination. Class-based barriers further restrict mobility, as lower-income individuals frequently lack the financial resources and flexible time necessary to pursue retraining, upskilling, or career shifts, thereby reinforcing cycles of poverty and labor market marginalization. These disparities are rooted in deeper structural issues embedded within education systems, labor market practices, and institutional biases. Rather than mitigating these inequities, automation risks amplifying them unless accompanied by intentional, equity-focused interventions that address the root causes of exclusion.

3.3. Geographic Inequality: Urban-Rural and Global North–South Divides

The geography of automation adoption reveals stark and growing inequalities, both within and across nations. Urban areas with stronger digital infrastructure, thriving tech ecosystems, and proximity to higher education institutions are far better positioned to attract investment and high-skill employment in sectors such as artificial intelligence, software development, and finance. In contrast, rural regions often rely on labor-intensive industries like agriculture and manufacturing, which are more vulnerable to automation and less equipped to undergo economic transformation. On a global scale, an "automation gap" is emerging between advanced economies and the Global South. Wealthier nations possess the financial and institutional capacity to invest in innovation, workforce reskilling, and comprehensive social safety nets. Meanwhile, many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) struggle with weak digital infrastructure, limited funding for human capital development, and a continued dependence on low-cost labor (Rodrik, 2018) and manufacturing exports. These constraints hinder their ability to adapt to rapid technological change. Moreover, automation threatens to reshape global production chains through reshoring, where previously outsourced manufacturing jobs return to high-income countries via robotics and AI posing a serious risk to industrial growth and employment in LMICs. Without deliberate global cooperation and targeted investments in inclusive digital development, automation may reinforce geographic and economic divides rather than bridge them.

3.4. The Digital Divide

Access to digital tools and skills has become a fundamental determinant of opportunity in the modern labor market, yet the digital divide continues to persist (Broecke, S., 2023) along lines of income, education, age, and geography. This divide manifests in several interrelated dimensions. First, the access divide reflects the reality that many low-income households and rural communities still lack reliable internet connections, digital devices, and the foundational digital literacy necessary to engage meaningfully with technology. Second, the usage divide highlights disparities in how technology is employed; while some individuals use digital tools for learning, productivity, and career advancement, others primarily use them for entertainment, often due to limited digital competencies or support. Third, the outcome divides reveal that individuals with advanced digital skills are positioned to reap the greatest benefits from the digital economy, securing higher-paying jobs and more flexible work, while those without such skills face increasing marginalization. Bridging these divides requires more than infrastructure it demands strategic investment in inclusive digital education, the provision of affordable tools, and targeted support for marginalized groups to ensure equitable participation in the evolving technological landscape.

3.5. Intergenerational and Temporal Inequality

Automation also has intergenerational consequences. Younger generations entering the workforce face:

- Fewer entry-level jobs due to automation and AI

- Pressure to acquire rapidly evolving technical skills
- Greater job precarity and non-traditional employment pathways (e.g., gig work)

At the same time, older workers are often more vulnerable to displacement due to outdated skills and limited adaptability, with fewer years remaining in the workforce to recoup investments in retraining (Broecke, S., 2023).

Without proactive measures, automation may entrench inequalities over time, passing structural disadvantages from one generation to the next.

The accelerating integration of automation and artificial intelligence into the global economy has triggered a profound transformation in the nature of work, presenting both opportunities and challenges. While these technologies offer significant potential for boosting productivity, innovation, and economic growth, they also risk deepening existing inequalities if not carefully managed. This review has highlighted the multifaceted impact of automation across various dimensions economic, social, geographic, and digital emphasizing how it disproportionately affects low- and middle-skill workers, women, marginalized racial and ethnic groups, and communities in the Global South. Automation tends to benefit those with advanced skills, access to technology, and institutional support, while displacing others into precarious, low-wage, or temporary work. The resulting labor market polarization and growing income disparities underscore the urgent need for coordinated responses from governments, corporations, and civil society.

Looking ahead, several critical areas must shape future efforts to ensure a just and inclusive transition. First, education and workforce development systems must shift toward lifelong learning and continuous reskilling, particularly in digital and cognitive competencies. Second, the design and deployment of technologies should prioritize human-centered approaches that augment rather than replace workers, while ensuring algorithmic accountability and transparency. Third, social protection systems must be expanded and modernized to support workers affected by automation, including gig and platform workers who often fall outside traditional labor laws. Fourth, investments in digital infrastructure and digital literacy are essential to closing the digital divide, particularly in rural areas and the Global South. Additionally, international cooperation is needed to develop fair global frameworks that guide technological deployment, taxation, and cross-border workforce strategies.

Ultimately, the future of work will be defined not only by the capabilities of machines, but by the collective decisions societies make about how these technologies are used. If guided by inclusive values and robust policies, automation can lead to shared prosperity, greater equity, and improved quality of life. However, if left unchecked, it risks entrenching social divisions and economic insecurity. The choices made today by policymakers, educators, employers, and communities will shape the world of work for generations to come. It is imperative to act now to build a future that is not only more technologically advanced, but also more just, inclusive, and human-centered.

4. Corporate and Institutional Responsibility

As automation and AI transform the global workforce, the responsibility for ensuring equitable and ethical transitions does not rest solely on governments. Corporations, international institutions, labor unions, and educational bodies all play critical roles in shaping how technology is deployed and how its consequences are distributed. In 2025, growing public scrutiny and investor pressure have elevated expectations for corporate accountability and institutional action in mitigating labor displacement and addressing structural inequality (Berg et al., 2018).

4.1. Ethical Deployment of Automation and AI

Corporations play a central role in shaping the trajectory and impact of automation, as their choices regarding when and how to automate, redesign workflows, and support displaced workers have

profound implications for labor market outcomes (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2020). The concept of responsible automation emphasizes corporate accountability and ethical stewardship in the deployment of new technologies. This includes adopting human-centered design principles that aim to augment rather than replace human labor, thereby preserving jobs and enhancing worker capabilities. It also calls for greater transparency and accountability, particularly in algorithmic decision-making systems used for hiring, performance evaluation, and productivity monitoring areas where opaque technologies can perpetuate existing inequalities. Furthermore, ethical AI governance requires companies to establish robust internal policies and publicly disclose how artificial intelligence systems are developed, trained, and deployed, with explicit safeguards against reinforcing biases based on race, gender, or socioeconomic status. Although major tech firms like Google, Microsoft, and IBM have published AI ethics frameworks, critics argue that self-regulation is insufficient in the absence of enforceable legal standards and independent oversight mechanisms. As automation continues to reshape work, corporate responsibility will be critical to ensuring that technological progress is aligned with social equity and human well-being.

4.2. Corporate Role in Workforce Reskilling and Transition

Many leading corporations are investing in reskilling and upskilling programs to help workers adapt to the evolving demands of a technology-driven economy. For instance, Amazon's "Upskilling 2025" initiative has committed over $1.2 billion to train 300,000 employees for high-demand tech roles, reflecting a substantial corporate investment in workforce development. Similarly, companies like Siemens and Accenture have established internal learning academies that combine digital training platforms with mentorship and hands-on experience to support continuous learning. While these initiatives represent important steps toward preparing the workforce for the future, they often primarily benefit existing full-time employees and high-potential talent, overlooking more vulnerable segments of the labor force. Temporary, gig, and lower-wage workers frequently lack access to (Choudhury at el, 2020) these resources due to employment status, limited time flexibility, or geographic isolation. To address this imbalance, a more inclusive and equitable approach to workforce development is needed one that extends training, career mobility, and support services to displaced and marginalized populations. This requires collaborative efforts among corporations, public institutions, educational providers, and local communities to design programs that are accessible, affordable, and aligned with regional labor market needs.

4.3. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)

Public-private partnerships are increasingly recognized as essential mechanisms for aligning technological innovation with inclusive workforce development. By leveraging the strengths of both sectors, these collaborations aim to bridge skill gaps and promote equitable economic transitions (Broecke, S., 2023). Governments and corporations are working together on initiatives such as tech education programs embedded in public schools and universities, apprenticeship and work-integrated learning models that provide hands-on experience, and the establishment of regional job transition hubs in post-industrial or economically struggling communities. Additionally, support programs for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are being introduced to help smaller firms adopt automation technologies without resorting to labor cuts. However, for these partnerships to be truly effective and equitable, they must be locally tailored and inclusive, incorporating worker voices and community input into their design and implementation. Without such attention to local context and structural inequality, even well-intentioned initiatives risk reproducing or deepening existing social and economic divides.

4.4. Institutional Responses from Labor Unions and Civil Society

Although union membership has declined in many countries, labor organizations are actively redefining their roles in response to the challenges posed by automation and digital transformation. Unions are

increasingly advocating for worker-centric policies that reflect the realities of a rapidly evolving labor market. Key developments include the negotiation of "right to retrain" clauses in collective bargaining agreements, ensuring that workers displaced by automation have access to reskilling opportunities. Unions are also leading campaigns for platform worker protections, demanding minimum wage guarantees, access to benefits, and greater algorithmic transparency for workers employed via digital platforms. Beyond traditional labor advocacy, some unions and allied groups are promoting cooperative platforms and alternative business models that emphasize worker ownership, profit-sharing, and democratic governance as a counterbalance to corporate concentration. Meanwhile, civil society organizations and policy think tanks play a complementary role by monitoring corporate practices, shaping public discourse, and influencing legislation aimed at fostering an equitable digital transition. Together, these actors are reshaping labor advocacy for the digital age and pushing for structural reforms that prioritize both technological innovation and social justice.

4.5. International Institutional Responsibility

Global institutions such as the International Labour Organization (ILO)**,** the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) , and the World Economic Forum (WEF) are playing a pivotal role in shaping international discourse and developing guidelines for responsible automation. These bodies have advocated for the creation of global frameworks that govern ethical artificial intelligence, promote digital labor standards, and address the socio-economic disruptions associated with technological change. Central to their recommendations are calls for cross-border cooperation on issues such as taxation and wealth redistribution**,** aimed at mitigating the impact of automation-driven job displacement. Additionally, they emphasize the need to support low- and middle-income countries in building digital infrastructure, enhancing workforce skills, and navigating the complexities of technological transitions. Despite these efforts, a major challenge remains: enforcement mechanisms are weak, and many of the proposed frameworks lack binding commitments or regulatory power. As a result, the global governance of automation is still in a nascent stage, with fragmented initiatives and uneven national implementation. There is a pressing need for a more coordinated multilateral approach, backed by stronger accountability measures, to ensure that automation serves the interests of workers and societies worldwide rather than exacerbating existing inequalities (UNCTAD, 2021).

5. Conclusion

The accelerating advance of automation and artificial intelligence has ushered in a period of profound economic and social transformation. This review has examined how automation reshapes labor markets, reinforces existing inequalities, and creates new socio-political challenges across the global economy. While technological innovation offers significant opportunities for productivity gains, economic growth, and new forms of work, its benefits have not been equitably distributed. The most vulnerable low- and middle-skill workers, marginalized communities, rural populations, and labor-dependent developing economies are disproportionately exposed to job displacement, precarious work conditions, and digital exclusion. Rather than being a neutral process, the trajectory of automation is shaped by political choices, corporate strategies, institutional designs, and cultural values. The review emphasizes that managing the social implications of automation requires more than technical fixes or piecemeal reforms. It demands systemic, inclusive, and forward-looking approaches involving collaborative action across governments, corporations, civil society, and international organizations. Equity, human-centered innovation, and ethical governance must become guiding principles for just a digital future

References

Acemoglu, D. and Autor, D. (2011) 'Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings', *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 4B, pp. 1043–1171.

Acemoglu, D. and Restrepo, P. (2020) 'Robots and jobs: Evidence from US labor markets', *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(6), pp. 2188–2244.

Arntz, M., Gregory, T. and Zierahn, U. (2016) 'The risk of automation for jobs in OECD countries: A comparative analysis', OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 189. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Autor, D. H. and Dorn, D. (2013) 'The growth of low-skill service jobs and the polarization of the US labor market', *American Economic Review*, 103(5), pp. 1553–1597.

Autor, D. H. (2015) 'Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), pp. 3–30.

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U. and Silberman, M. S. (2018) *Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Bessen, J. E. (2019) *AI and Jobs: The Role of Demand*. NBER Working Paper No. 24235.

Broecke, S., 2023. Artificial intelligence and the labour market: Introduction. *OECD Employment Outlook*, p.93.

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

Chiacchio, F., Petropoulos, G. and Pichler, D. (2018) 'The impact of industrial robots on EU employment and wages: A local labour market approach', *Bruegel Working Paper* 2018/02.

Choudhury, P. and Larson, B. Z. (2020) 'Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility', *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3), pp. 399–418.

De Stefano, V. (2016) 'The rise of the "just-in-time workforce": On-demand work, crowdwork and labour protection in the "gig-economy"', *Conditions of Work and Employment Series*, No. 71, ILO.

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

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

Goos, M., Manning, A. and Salomons, A. (2014) 'Explaining job polarization: Routine-biased technological change and offshoring', *American Economic Review*, 104(8), pp. 2509–2526.

Graetz, G. and Michaels, G. (2018) 'Robots at work', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100(5), pp. 753–768.

Litman, T. (2021) *Autonomous Vehicle Implementation Predictions: Implications for Transport Planning*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

Rodrik, D. (2018) 'New technologies, global value chains, and the developing economies', NBER Working Paper No. 25164.

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

Topol, E. (2019) *Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again*. New York: Basic Books.

UNCTAD (2021) *Technology and Innovation Report 2021: Catching Technological Waves – Innovation with Equity*. Geneva: United Nations.WEF (2020) *The Future of Jobs Report 2020*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

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