ChatGPT

Social and Cultural Adaptations to Labor Shocks – Automation's Long Historical Arc and the AI Wave

From Fields to Factories (Agrarian Exodus, 1870–1930)

Technological Jolt: The late 19th to early 20th century brought a seismic shift from agrarian labor to industrial manufacturing. In the United States, for example, over half of workers were farmers in 1870, but by 1930 only about one-fifth remained in agriculture [1] [2]. Mechanized farming technologies (e.g. the mechanical reaper and early tractors) dramatically raised agricultural productivity, enabling a smaller rural workforce to feed the population. Surplus rural labor flooded into booming industrial cities, drawn by factory jobs in textiles, steel, railroads, and other burgeoning industries. This *agrarian exodus* was part of a broader Second Industrial Revolution that saw steam power, rail transport, and mechanized production transform economies in Europe and North America. The upheaval was profound: millions left subsistence farming for waged work, and by World War I many nations had crossed a tipping point where more people made a living in towns and factories than on farms (the U.S. became majority-urban by 1920) [3] [4].

Institutional Adaptation: Societies did not transition smoothly at first – the early factory system was notorious for harsh conditions (long hours, child labor, unsafe mills). But over time, new institutions arose to buffer and shape this shift. **Mass education** expanded rapidly to prepare a literate, disciplined workforce: in the U.S., public high school enrollment surged from under 20% of teens in 1910 to over 70% by 1940 [5]. Compulsory schooling laws and "land-grant" colleges (in the U.S.) spread skills needed for an industrial age. **Labor laws and social insurance** also began taking root. For instance, by the late 1800s, Germany's Chancellor Otto von Bismarck had introduced the first national social insurance programs (old-age pensions, accident insurance), recognizing that a wage-dependent urban class needed protection against market risks. Other countries followed in the early 20th century with rudimentary pensions, workers' compensation for injuries, and limits on child labor. Labor unions emerged as another key institution, organizing industrial workers to demand better wages and hours. The labor movement's rallying cry – "eight hours for work, eight hours for rest, eight hours for what we will" – reflected a push to **redesign time** in the new economy. By the end of this epoch, the 8-hour workday was gaining legal recognition (the U.S. mandated a 8-hour day for railroad workers in 1916 and for most industries by the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act). Factory whistle routines and time clocks imposed a stricter **temporal structure** on daily life than agrarian seasons did, yet they eventually yielded to more humane schedules through persistent social struggle.

Cultural Dividends and Narratives: Culturally, the shift from independent farm life to regimented factory life was wrenching but transformative. **Work ethic and identity** underwent a redefinition. In agrarian communities, hard work was visible in one's crops and land, closely tied to personal virtue. Industrialization "degraded" the qualitative experience of work – a factory hand's contribution was harder to distinguish, and craftsmen lost autonomy as mass production replaced skilled trades [6] [7]. As one economic history analysis notes, it became "more difficult for others to know the quality and intensity of one's work" when factory labor or assembly lines obscured individual output [6]. In response, social respect and status markers shifted **from work to consumption**: the emerging urban middle-class and even workers began to

seek **prestige through consumer goods** and lifestyles [7] [8]. This era saw the birth of a modern consumer culture – for example, the proliferation of affordable "durable goods" (ready-made clothing, home appliances, Model T cars by the 1910s) allowed people to display success through possessions. The *Protestant ethic* of frugality gave way to a new narrative that equated material consumption with achievement and self-worth [6] [8].

At the same time, **urbanization** created new social networks and norms. Millions living in close quarters in cities led to the rise of working-class neighborhoods, ethnic enclaves, and industrial "mill towns" with their own cultures. **Collective identity** as an industrial *working class* emerged, fueling broader cultural narratives about class and progress. Where Jeffersonian America had idealized the yeoman farmer, the early 20th-century imagination shifted to celebrate inventors, captains of industry, and the urban *striver*. Yet there was also anxiety: the dislocations of this period sparked social critiques (e.g. Marxist and socialist movements, populist agrarian rebellions against "robber barons") and literary reflections on the alienation of factory life. Overall, by 1930 society had begun to adapt to the new reality: institutional supports (schools, unions, nascent welfare policies) were in place, and culturally a **modern industrial ethos** – valuing productivity, clock-time discipline, and rising standards of living – had taken root.

Mechanised Industry and the Invention of Leisure (1880–1945)

Technological Jolt: The period from roughly 1880 to World War II was characterized by *rapid mechanization of industry and the spread of electrification*, ushering in what some call the Second Industrial Revolution's later phase. Key technologies – **electric power, the internal combustion engine, assembly line manufacturing, telephones and radio** – revolutionized both production and daily life. Factory output and productivity soared as machines increasingly took over heavy labor: by the early 20th century, continuous-process manufacturing and the **moving assembly line** (perfected by Henry Ford in 1913) enabled mass production of goods at unprecedented scale. This era also saw the birth of entirely new industries (automobiles, aviation, chemical engineering) that further absorbed labor from traditional crafts. Crucially, mechanization was not limited to factories – it also made new inroads into agriculture (tractors began to replace horse-drawn plows in the 1920s), foreshadowing a second wave of agrarian job loss after WWII. But the immediate societal shock of 1880–1945 was felt in **urban industrial centers** where mechanised factories now dominated work.

Institutional Adaptation: As industrial productivity climbed, society responded with novel arrangements to distribute the gains and mitigate the strains. One of the most consequential shifts was the **shortening of the work week and the "invention" of broad leisure time** for the working class. In the late 19th century, labor in advanced economies was still gruelingly long – often 60–70 hours per week in 1870 [9]. Multiple forces (union campaigns, progressive reformers, even enlightened industrialists like Ford) drove hours down. By the 1920s, the *typical schedule* in U.S. manufacturing had fallen to about **8 hours a day, 6 days a week (48 hours)**, and by 1940 the norm was **8 hours, 5 days (around 40 hours)** with a full two-day weekend [10]. This standardization of the **8-hour day/40-hour week** was a landmark institutional reform, effectively redesigning time by introducing *widespread weekends* and evenings off for workers. As historian Dora Costa summarized, between the 1880s and 1920 the workday plummeted from ~10 hours to 8, and by 1940 Saturday had largely been eliminated as a workday [10] [11]. In addition to hours limits, **paid time off** slowly spread; by mid-century, many countries had begun to mandate annual paid vacations and national holidays for workers [12] – a concept that scarcely existed for laborers a few generations prior.

Parallel to time reforms, this epoch witnessed the **institutionalization of social insurance on a broader scale**. The shocks of the Great Depression (1929–39) were a catalyst: facing mass unemployment and destitution, governments introduced sweeping protections. In the United States, the **Social Security Act of 1935** established old-age pensions and unemployment insurance; similarly, many European nations expanded welfare programs (Britain's 1911 National Insurance Act for health/unemployment, for example) and laid plans for post-war welfare states. **Public education** also continued to advance – secondary schooling became common by the 1930s, and higher education began expanding after WWII (with programs like the U.S. GI Bill in 1944, which foreshadowed mass college enrollment in the next era). Another innovation was the concept of **"overtime" pay** (extra wages for hours beyond the standard workweek), creating financial incentives to limit excessive hours. All these adaptations – shorter workweeks, social safety nets, and educational expansion – were responses to an industrial society reaching high productivity. They acknowledged that with machines doing more, **workers could share the productivity dividend through more free time and security**, rather than just more output.

Cultural Dividends and Narratives: With time *away* from work becoming a normal part of life, the first half of the 20th century saw a flourishing of **mass leisure culture** and a reframing of work's role in life. Commentators of the era spoke of an "invention of leisure" for the working classes, who now had Saturday afternoons or Sundays off regularly. New cultural institutions sprang up: **movie theaters, radio broadcasts (1920s onward), spectator sports, amusement parks, and later, early television (by the 1930s)**. The idea that a *dignified life* includes recreation and rest gained social acceptance. Importantly, this did not mean a rejection of the work ethic – rather, the **work ethic was balanced by a new appreciation of leisure as a reward of progress**. In 1930, the economist John Maynard Keynes famously imagined that by centuries' end, people might work only 15 hours a week and devote the rest of time to enjoyment and creative pursuits – reflecting widespread optimism that mechanization would liberate humans from drudgery. While Keynes' vision overshot, the trend he highlighted was real: in many early-industrialized countries, **average working hours dropped by roughly half from 1870 to the mid-20th century** [9] [13], and leisure became an expected part of life. By 1940 in the U.S., even factory workers often enjoyed both a Saturday and Sunday off [10], a radical change from a few decades prior.

With this *time affluence* came evolving narratives of identity and worth. **Shifting ideas of the "good life"** emerged: where 19th-century morality frowned on idleness, 20th-century culture increasingly valorized hobbies, family time, and personal development outside work. The interwar period in particular saw the rise of consumerism as a form of leisure and identity – **being a savvy consumer and enjoying new entertainment** became part of one's self-image. Advertising and Hollywood fed these narratives, celebrating the modern individual who works efficiently on the job and revels in comforts and amusements off the job. Notably, a **new social narrative around leisure as a social equalizer** took shape. The concept of the *weekend* was democratized – by the 1920s a clerk, a factory operative, and a millionaire might all spend Sunday at the same baseball game or cinema. Some scholars argue this period cultivated a sense that **one's worth need not derive solely from labor**; one could also be a **"good citizen" or "well-rounded person"** through family life, civic involvement, or cultural pursuits. For example, participation in clubs, unions, or community organizations became common ways to gain **social status** and camaraderie outside the workplace.

Meanwhile, within workplaces the **narrative of scientific efficiency** took hold (Taylorism and time-and-motion studies) – a double-edged cultural development. On one hand, workers were subject to stricter measurement of output; on the other, the idea that efficiency improvements could *justify higher wages or shorter hours* gained traction. By WWII, President Franklin D. Roosevelt could assert that Americans

deserved “free time” and recreation as fruits of economic progress, a statement reflecting how ingrained the *right to leisure* had become in the cultural landscape. In summary, 1880–1945 was an era when mechanization vastly boosted productivity and society responded by **institutionalizing free time and security**, yielding a culture that embraced leisure, **tempered the work-centric identity**, and propagated new markers of status (from the radio one owned to the leisure activities one pursued) beyond just one’s occupation.

Agricultural Mechanisation’s Second Round and the Post-War Service Surge (1945–1970)

Technological Jolt: The post–World War II decades brought a *second round of mechanization in agriculture* that virtually completed the long decline of farm labor in advanced economies, as well as a dramatic structural shift toward service-sector employment. From 1945 to 1970, **farm productivity exploded** due to widespread adoption of tractors, combine harvesters, chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and improved plant breeds (the early “Green Revolution”). In the United States, for instance, animal draft power disappeared almost entirely in this period – by 1970, *tractors and machines had fully replaced horses* and manual labor for most farm tasks [14]. Crop yields and output rose, and the number of farms plummeted. This drove a **“massive migration out of farming”**, as described by USDA historians [14] [15]. The farm population, already shrunken, fell even further: where about 17% of the U.S. labor force still worked in agriculture in 1945, that share fell to just 5% by 1970 [16] [17]. Similar patterns occurred across Western Europe – rural communities emptied out or mechanized, and farming became a highly capital-intensive, low-employment sector. Many rural youth who might have been farmhands in an earlier era instead found work in factories, offices, or the burgeoning service industries of cities.

At the same time, **industrial employment hit its peak and then plateaued/declined as services surged**. The immediate post-war decades were an era of unprecedented economic growth (the “Golden Age of Capitalism”), which expanded **white-collar and service jobs** in both the public and private sectors. By the 1960s, advanced economies were clearly becoming *post-industrial*: in the United States, service industries already employed well over half the workforce, overtaking manufacturing as the dominant sector [18] [19]. One analysis of U.S. labor share notes that *since World War II, the share of private employment in goods-producing sectors steadily declined from nearly 50% in 1945 to well under 30% by the late 1970s*, while service employment kept rising [19] [20]. In other words, the majority of new jobs were now in offices, retail shops, hospitals, schools, government bureaus, and other service domains – a trend mirrored in other OECD countries. Driving this was a combination of **rising incomes fueling demand for services** (education, healthcare, entertainment, finance) and ongoing productivity gains in manufacturing that limited factory job growth. Many historians label this period the start of the *“post-industrial society”* – a term popularized by sociologist Daniel Bell – as economies shifted emphasis from producing material goods to managing information and providing services.

Institutional Adaptation: Society responded to these post-war labor shocks through ambitious institution-building and policy innovations. A hallmark of this era was the construction of the modern **welfare state and social insurance regime**, particularly in Western Europe. After WWII, countries like the UK, France, Germany (and later others) rolled out comprehensive social security systems: **universal healthcare (e.g. Britain’s NHS in 1948), expanded pensions, unemployment benefits, housing assistance**, and more. The guiding philosophy was that a wealthy, technologically advanced society could and should guarantee a baseline of economic security for all citizens. This not only cushioned workers against dislocations (like a

farmer displaced by mechanization or a redundant factory hand), but also facilitated labor mobility – people could leave declining sectors knowing safety nets existed. In the U.S., social insurance also broadened (Social Security expanded coverage in the 1950s; Medicare and Medicaid were introduced in 1965 to insure the elderly and poor for healthcare). These policies recognized that as employment shifted to new sectors, the old support systems (family farms, local charities) were insufficient; **state institutions stepped in to manage economic risk** at scale.

Another critical adaptation was a **revolution in education and training**. The post-war period saw **massive investment in human capital**: high school graduation became near-universal in many Western countries, and **college enrollment ballooned**, especially in the 1960s. Government policies like the GI Bill in the U.S. (which funded college for millions of veterans) and the expansion of public universities worldwide reflected a strategy to prepare the workforce for knowledge-oriented and service jobs. For example, college attendance in the U.S. roughly doubled between 1940 and 1970, and by 1970 over half of U.S. young adults had at least some college education, compared to under 15% in 1945 (a trend seen similarly in Canada and parts of Europe). This **education surge** was an institutional answer to automation and sectoral shift: rather than a workforce of physical laborers, economies would need **"knowledge workers"** and service professionals – and so educational systems were retooled to produce managers, engineers, teachers, nurses, and clerks instead of farmers and factory operatives.

The nature of **work-time and employment contracts** also evolved. While the 40-hour week remained standard, **paid vacation and paid sick leave entitlements expanded** significantly in these decades, especially in Europe. Many countries went from virtually no mandated paid leave pre-WWII to several weeks by the 1960s, embedding the expectation of leisure and rest into law. The concept of **retirement as a life stage** solidified as well – with public pensions in place, people over ~65 increasingly exited the labor force to enjoy "golden years," something rare before. This meant the temporal structure of life became more segmented: youth in prolonged education, adulthood working a stable career, and old age in retirement – a structure enabled by policy and prosperity.

Finally, new **corporate practices and industrial relations systems** were instituted. In many OECD nations, the post-war social contract with labor involved stable long-term employment, **collective bargaining agreements that secured rising wages**, and sometimes co-determination schemes (e.g. worker representation on company boards in Germany). These were adaptations to maintain social stability in the face of rapid productivity growth and sectoral reallocation. The overall outcome was the creation of a broad middle class: many blue-collar manufacturing workers enjoyed steady income growth and job security, even as the economy pivoted to services and knowledge roles.

Cultural Dividends and Narratives: Culturally, the post-war era was characterized by confidence in progress and a reframing of work's place in achieving the *"good life."* The broad prosperity and technological optimism of 1945–1970 fostered narratives of the **"Affluent Society"** (to quote economist John Kenneth Galbraith). In this narrative, basic material needs were largely met in rich countries, and society's focus could shift to quality of life, education, and self-fulfillment. **Work ethic** certainly remained strong – this was the age of the **"Organization Man,"** as William Whyte dubbed the diligent corporate employee of the 1950s who dedicated himself to his company. Being employed in a stable job, whether as a factory worker at GM or a middle manager at IBM, was a source of pride and identity. However, unlike earlier eras where sheer hard toil was the core virtue, mid-20th-century work culture emphasized **loyalty, teamwork, and career advancement** within large organizations. A person's **social status** became closely linked to their professional role and the *credentials* behind it: educational attainment and the prestige of one's occupation

turned into key markers of identity. For example, the post-war expansion of professional and managerial roles created a class of *white-collar* workers who saw themselves as distinct from the blue-collar proletariat – giving rise to new class identities (the *suburban middle class*, the *technocrat*, etc.).

At the same time, with mass higher education and leisure, **new cultural narratives of self-expression and personal growth** started to percolate, setting the stage for the countercultural 1960s. It's notable that by the late 1960s, some youth in advanced economies began questioning the primacy of work in life – the early rumblings of a "post-work" sentiment. But broadly, the culture of this era balanced *work and leisure* with a sense of societal flourishing: people celebrated the fact that modern conveniences (washing machines, cars) and shorter hours freed them for family and community activities. The concept of the **"weekend"** outing, the summer vacation, and hobbies as core to one's identity took firm root. For instance, being a good family man who could take the kids on a summer road trip became a badge of honor alongside one's job title.

Ideas of identity and worth evolved accordingly. In agricultural times, identity was tied to land and kin; in early industry, to one's trade or factory. By the post-war years, identity often centered on one's role as a **provider and consumer in a mass society**. The suburbanization of many Western countries epitomized this: a man might identify as a Ford engineer (work identity), a homeowner in the suburbs (consumer identity), and a Little League coach or PTA member (civic identity) – all parts of a new, multi-faceted self. Women's identities were also in flux – while many women left wartime factory work to return to domestic roles in the 1950s, the growing service sector quietly pulled more women into paid work (teaching, clerical, nursing). By the 1960s, second-wave feminism was questioning the idea that a woman's worth lay only in unpaid domestic labor, foreshadowing greater female workforce participation and new cultural norms around gender and work in the next epoch.

In summary, the period 1945–1970 reaped the **cultural dividends of high mechanization and productivity**: rising mass prosperity, time for leisure and family, and the notion that society could afford to invest in every individual's education and well-being. The social narrative was optimistic – many believed technology had inaugurated an era of ever-increasing abundance in which *collective provision* (through welfare states) and *individual achievement* (through education and career) could go hand in hand. Work remained central but was now seen as something that should *enable* a fuller life (via decent pay, free time, and social mobility), not consume life entirely. This set the stage for the more complex renegotiations of work and identity that would come with the knowledge economy.

Office Automation and the Rise of the Knowledge Worker (1970–2000)

Technological Jolt: The late 20th century brought the *computer revolution*, automating many office and cognitive tasks and cementing the transition to a **knowledge-based economy**. From the 1970s through 2000, a suite of technologies – **mainframe and personal computers, data processing software, telecommunications (fax, email), and eventually the early Internet – transformed the white-collar workplace**. Routine clerical work (typing pools, filing, basic bookkeeping) that once employed legions could increasingly be done by databases and spreadsheets. Factory floors, too, saw early robotics and numerical control machines reducing certain manufacturing jobs. The *information technology (IT) boom* accelerated in the 1980s and 90s: computers went from specialized tools in large firms to ubiquitous equipment on every office desk by the end of the 20th century. This wave of **office automation** was as significant for clerical

and administrative labor as the mechanization of the loom had been for artisans. Many traditional middle-skill jobs (secretaries, bank tellers, travel agents) began to decline or evolve due to ATMs, word processors, and enterprise software. At the same time, *entirely new occupations* emerged around managing and developing information systems – from computer programmers and IT technicians to analysts and consultants.

This era also saw globalization and deregulation, which, combined with technology, restructured labor markets. Manufacturing in advanced economies started to decline sharply as jobs were offshored or automated (the oft-cited loss of heavy industry jobs in the 1980s), while **service and knowledge sectors surged further**. By 2000, the typical OECD economy had upwards of two-thirds or more of employment in services, with **"knowledge-intensive" services (finance, education, healthcare, technology) as the fastest-growing segment**. The very term *"knowledge worker"* was coined by Peter Drucker (in 1959, and popularized in 1966) to describe this new class of workers who think for a living rather than produce tangible goods [21]. And indeed by the 1970s and 80s, it was evident that such workers were becoming the backbone of the economy. According to OECD analyses, by the early 1970s roughly **40% of the U.S. and Canadian workforce was already employed in "information sector" jobs** (broadly defined as jobs centered on information handling and knowledge generation), far higher than in prior decades [22] [23]. Other advanced countries lagged slightly in this transformation but followed the same trajectory [22] [23]. In short, the late 20th-century shock was the *automation of mental labor* and the ascendance of a workforce that dealt primarily with information, not manual production.

Institutional Adaptation: As before, social and policy institutions evolved – albeit with different emphases in this era. A key adaptation was the massive expansion of **higher education and continuous skills training** to feed the demand for knowledge workers. College graduation rates climbed steadily through the 1970s–1990s across the OECD. Fields like computer science, business management, and finance ballooned in enrollment. Governments and employers began promoting lifelong learning and worker retraining programs, anticipating that rapid technological change would require mid-career skill updates. For example, in the U.S., the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program (from 1974 onward) aimed to retrain workers displaced by globalization/automation for new occupations – an early recognition that transitions would be recurrent. Some European countries experimented with apprenticeship updates and vocational training expansions to integrate youth into changing labor markets.

The **social safety net** also morphed in response to new economic realities, though unevenly. While the immediate post-war welfare expansions plateaued, new policies addressed the changing composition of work. Notably, with rising female labor force participation (women entering the knowledge and service jobs in huge numbers by the 1980s), many countries introduced or expanded **parental leave, childcare support, and anti-discrimination laws**, adapting institutions to a dual-earner society. Unemployment insurance systems in some places were modified to account for structural unemployment from industrial decline – e.g. extended benefits or job placement services for communities hit by factory closures. However, the neoliberal turn of the 1980s also meant some **retrenchment of labor protections**: in the name of flexibility, policies in the US/UK and others made labor markets more fluid (easier hiring/firing), weakening unions and secure long-term employment guarantees. This was an adaptation to the fast-changing economy – it made it easier for industries to reallocate labor (e.g. tech firms scaling up, old manufacturing scaling down), though at the cost of job security.

Work-time and organization saw new experiments. The rigid 9-to-5, lifetime employment model began to soften for some. **Flexible work arrangements** started to appear – flexi-time schedules, part-time roles for

work-life balance, and the very early instances of **telecommuting** (enabled by home computers and dial-up internet in the 90s for some professionals). The concept of *work-life balance* gained currency as professionals often found themselves working long hours in the competitive global economy (e.g. the notorious 1980s culture of overwork on Wall Street or in Japanese corporations). In response, some companies tried initiatives like **compressed workweeks** or **sabbaticals** to prevent burnout, albeit on a limited scale.

Importantly, **institutional support for innovation and new industries** grew. Governments funded R&D (creating the internet itself via ARPANET, for instance), set up tech parks and incubators, and updated intellectual property regimes for the knowledge economy. Intellectual capital (patents, software) became a crucial asset, and institutions evolved around that (stronger patent laws, emergence of open-source licensing as a parallel institution for sharing software). The legal system had to catch up with everything from software contracts to the status of digital goods.

Cultural Dividends and Narratives: The rise of the knowledge economy fundamentally altered social narratives around work, merit, and success. **Education and cognitive skill** became lionized as the key to prosperity – giving birth to what some called a *"meritocratic"* culture (for better or worse). A person's worth was increasingly linked to their **educational credentials and knowledge**. The phrase "knowledge worker" itself often connoted a high-status role; society began to revere innovators (think of the cultural cachet of Silicon Valley entrepreneurs by the 1990s) and experts. Traditional manual labor, while still respected, lost cultural visibility and prestige relative to the new **tech and professional elite**. By the end of the 20th century, the social status markers had again shifted: **owning cutting-edge gadgets, having a college (or graduate) degree, working in a "fast-moving" industry** – these were badges of status, much as landownership had been in agrarian times or a secure factory job had been in mid-century. Even attire norms reflected this shift (the rise of business casual in tech vs. the factory uniform or formal suit).

The **work ethic** in this era took on a dual character. On one hand, there was a resurgence of work-as-passion or *workaholism* in certain circles – the idea of the hustling entrepreneur or the investment banker burning the midnight oil became cultural icons of the 1980s and 90s. These exemplified a narrative that *creative or ambitious work* could provide deep fulfillment and outsized rewards, hence one should pour one's time into it. On the other hand, a counter-narrative grew, critiquing meaningless corporate labor – by the late 1990s books like "The Bullshit Jobs" critique (coining a term later popularized) and movies like *Office Space* tapped into discontent with the impersonal, sometimes alienating nature of cubicle life and bureaucratic work. Thus, culturally there was an ambivalence: **excitement about innovation and doing mentally engaging work, but also an erosion of the simple pride that came from making tangible products**. Many knowledge workers grappled with questions of purpose ("what value am I really adding?"), especially as layers of abstraction grew in jobs.

Temporal structure of life also began to blur in this epoch. Unlike factory shifts that ended when the whistle blew, knowledge work often had no clear end-of-day – early cell phones, email, and laptops meant some professionals started to experience an "always-on" expectation even in the 1990s. While not yet as pronounced as it would become, this marked a *first break* from the strictly segmented work/leisure time of the mid-century.

In the broader culture, the late 20th century also saw rising individualism which affected attitudes toward work. The loosening of collective identities (fewer people in unions or church groups by 2000, for example) meant work became, for many, a more individualized pursuit of career goals. **Self-realization through**

career became a theme – "do what you love" and "find your passion" entered career advice vernacular. The archetype of the lifelong company man faded; instead, people started to anticipate multiple jobs or even career changes, and **entrepreneurial risk-taking** was more celebrated. By 2000, startup founders like Bill Gates or Steve Jobs were folk heroes, reflecting a cultural script that valorized innovation and *intellectual capital*.

However, there were also social costs and critiques. Rising inequality between those with knowledge skills and those without (the "digital divide") became evident. Those left behind in industrial towns that lost factories in the 1980s often felt culturally dislocated – a divide between a cosmopolitan, college-educated "knowledge class" and a struggling working class deepened in many societies. This seeded tensions and narratives of resentment that would become more apparent in the 21st century. Still, by the dawn of the 2000s, the prevailing ethos in advanced economies was that **technology and knowledge industries were the future**, and embracing them (through education, adaptability, and entrepreneurial spirit) was the path for individuals and nations. Work had morphed into something more **cognitive, fluid, and self-directed** – and culturally, success was now often defined by one's ability to navigate and thrive in the **information age**, rather than one's brawn or long service with one employer.

Digital Connectivity and Hybrid Work (2000–2024)

Technological Jolt: The first quarter of the 21st century has been defined by the explosion of **digital connectivity** – the internet's maturation, the rise of smartphones, and ubiquitous online platforms – which together have upended how and where work is done. Between 2000 and 2024, global internet users skyrocketed from roughly 6% of the world's population to over 60% [24]. This near-universal connectivity (at least in advanced economies) enabled new work modalities: email and instant messaging made communication instantaneous; broadband and cloud computing allowed collaboration across continents in real-time; online labor marketplaces and teleconferencing made remote work feasible at scale. By the 2010s, tools like Slack, Zoom, and cloud suites became standard office infrastructure. The **smartphone (2007 onwards)** further blurred work-life lines, putting email and work apps in everyone's pocket at all times. This culminated, unexpectedly, in a massive global experiment in remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic (2020–2021) – when lockdowns forced tens of millions to work from home, proving that many jobs can be done fully online. Coming out of the pandemic, a new norm of **hybrid work** has emerged: a flexible arrangement where knowledge workers split time between office and remote locations. Many companies and governments have instituted hybrid schedules (e.g. 3 days in-office, 2 remote), something almost unheard of before 2020.

Simultaneously, the digital revolution created entirely new kinds of work and workplaces. The **platform economy or gig economy** rose rapidly: companies like Uber, Lyft, Deliveroo, Mechanical Turk, Upwork, etc., turned millions into freelance contractors coordinated via apps. While not "employment" in the traditional sense, this has become a major way labor is organized – especially for on-demand services and micro-tasks. **Online content creation** also became a viable career: YouTubers, Twitch streamers, Instagram influencers, TikTok creators – collectively part of a new "creator economy" – monetize digital content and social media audiences, often outside the structure of any formal company. By the 2020s, high-speed connectivity and social platforms enabled entrepreneurial individuals to earn livelihoods (or at least supplementary income) as digital creators, a trend particularly popular among younger generations.

In summary, the tech jolt of 2000–2024 is the transition to an *always-connected, geographically untethered workforce*, with the internet enabling both *hyper-collaboration* across borders and *fragmentation* of work into

new flexible arrangements. Automation continued as well – advanced software and early AI systems (machine learning algorithms in the 2010s) began taking over some white-collar tasks (from algorithmic trading to basic journalism via AI). But the defining experience for most was being **"wired in" 24/7** and discovering that work could follow them anywhere – or conversely, that talent could be sourced anywhere.

Institutional Adaptation: Institutions have been scrambling to keep up with these fast-moving changes. A few notable adaptation efforts include:

- **Labor Regulation and Benefits:** The gig and platform work rise left many workers outside traditional labor protections (no guaranteed minimum wage, health benefits, etc., for "independent contractors"). In response, some jurisdictions have introduced new classifications or rules – for instance, California's controversial AB5 law (2019) sought to reclassify many gig workers as employees (though it faced pushback), and some European countries have considered creating a third status between employee and contractor. **Portable benefits** schemes have been discussed, where benefits like healthcare or retirement plans are tied to the worker (not the employer) to accommodate frequent job switching and gig work. A few places have instituted sectoral bargaining for platform workers or mandated certain protections (e.g. minimum pay for rideshare drivers in New York). Overall, however, institutional adaptation in labor law is *lagging* the pace of change, with ongoing debates on how to ensure social insurance coverage in an era of nontraditional employment.

- **Right to Disconnect:** Recognizing the **blurring of work and personal time** due to constant connectivity, several countries (France being an early example in 2017) enacted "right to disconnect" laws giving employees the legal right to ignore work communications outside work hours [25]. This is an institutional attempt to **redesign time boundaries** for the digital age, so that the gains of flexibility do not turn into a loss of all personal time. More companies also began codifying policies for off-hours or encouraging digital well-being to counteract burnout.

- **Remote Work Infrastructure:** Governments and firms invested in the infrastructure to make widespread remote/hybrid work possible. This includes expanding broadband access (many rural or underserved areas saw new investment in high-speed internet, especially after the pandemic highlighted its necessity), developing cybersecurity protocols for distributed work, and even rethinking urban design (if fewer people commute daily, cities have started repurposing office spaces and downtowns). Some countries created **"digital nomad visas"** to attract remote workers to reside (e.g. Estonia, Barbados), an unconventional policy acknowledging that work is no longer as tied to location.

- **Education and Credentialing:** With the digital economy evolving quickly, there's been growth in alternative credentialing and continuous learning models. Online courses (MOOCs), coding bootcamps, and professional certificates have supplemented traditional degrees as ways for workers to upskill for new tech-centric jobs. This era has seen institutions like universities partner with tech firms (e.g. offering specialized programs in data science, AI, cybersecurity) to provide the talent needed. Also, **credentialing is expanding beyond formal education** – for example, one's GitHub portfolio (showcasing open-source contributions) or online certifications (like AWS cloud certifications) have become quasi-credentials in the job market.

- **Hybrid Work Policies:** Many large employers and governments have formalized hybrid work as policy, allocating budgets for employees' home office setup or creating hoteling office spaces. Some governments issued guidelines for telework (like how to handle overtime, ergonomics, etc. remotely). A few forward-thinking companies moved to **"fully remote"** operations, prompting conversations about the need for new forms of team-building and corporate culture when colleagues rarely meet in person.

Despite these adaptations, many institutions have been reactive. The speed of digital change often outpaces legislation. Nonetheless, the broad trend is that institutions are grudgingly accommodating greater **flexibility and individualization** in work arrangements. Social insurance is slowly trending toward more universal or portable models (e.g. proposals for universal basic income were seriously floated in multiple countries during this period, pilot-tested in Finland and elsewhere, partly in anticipation of automation's disruptions).

Cultural Dividends and Narratives: The cultural landscape of work between 2000 and 2024 has been in flux, with competing narratives emerging:

On one hand, there is a narrative of **empowerment and freedom**. The ability to work from anywhere (a beach with wifi or one's rural hometown) and the plethora of new avenues for creative and freelance work have given rise to the **"digital nomad"** and **"hustle culture"** phenomena. Especially among younger cohorts, there's celebration of not being chained to a cubicle or a single employer. Many value *flexibility over stability*. Surveys find that flexibility in work hours and location often ranks as high as or higher than salary for job satisfaction among Millennials and Gen Z. The success of digital creators and influencers has also woven a cultural script that *authentic self-expression can be monetized* – essentially turning one's personality or passion into a career. As a result, **new aspirations** have gained prominence: for example, polls indicate a large share of Gen Z would like to be YouTubers or social media influencers [26] [27]. In a 2023 Adobe survey, one in three young Americans (18–30) said their dream job is to become an online content creator, motivated by desires for creativity, flexible hours, and autonomy [26] [28]. This reflects a cultural shift: many young people see the traditional 9–5 office path as less appealing than the promise of *independence and creative control* that the digital economy offers.

Hand in hand with this is a growing emphasis on **open and collaborative contributions** as a form of work identity. The open-source software movement is a prime example: thousands of programmers worldwide contribute free code to projects on GitHub, motivated by peer recognition, learning, and a sense of community purpose rather than direct pay [29]. Peer reputation in these online communities serves as a new status marker (being a maintainer of a popular open-source project brings prestige in tech circles). This ethos extends beyond code – Wikipedia contributors, designers sharing creative commons content, citizen scientists – all partake in what can be called a **post-commercial ethos of contribution**, where creating value for a community (often unpaid) becomes a source of pride and identity. In forums and developer networks, one's **civic or community contribution** can confer honor much as one's job title might.

On the other hand, there is a countervailing narrative of **disillusionment and disconnection from traditional work**. Despite all the tech and flexibility, global surveys suggest that people's engagement with their jobs is at worrying lows. Gallup's research in the 2020s finds that roughly **60–80% of employees worldwide are not engaged or actively disengaged at work**, meaning the majority feel little attachment or enthusiasm for their jobs [30]. In 2023, Gallup reported only about **21% of employees globally were engaged**, with the remainder "just there" or resentful, and Europe fared worst with a mere ~13–14%

engaged [31] [30]. This indicates a widespread *emotional distancing* from work. Public opinion surveys (like the World Values Survey and European Values Survey) provide context: as societies become richer and more secure, people tend to place relatively less importance on work in their lives compared to other values [32] [33]. Many Europeans, for instance, hold the attitude of "working to live, not living to work," prioritizing free time and personal well-being over career ambition [34]. While older generations often tied their identity to their profession, younger generations show more skepticism; terms like **"antiwork"** movements, **"quiet quitting"** (doing the bare minimum) and the drive for work-life balance reflect a cultural pushback against the stress and limited meaning some experience in modern jobs.

Several trends feed this disengagement. The **surfeit of meaningless or alienating jobs** – David Graeber's concept of "bullshit jobs" struck a chord, suggesting many white-collar roles feel purposeless. Additionally, *productivity gains not translating into better conditions* for workers (stagnant wages for many, precarious gig work) erodes the work ethic. And paradoxically, the digital "hustle" culture that glorifies constant work can lead to burnout, prompting people to question the rat race. Surveys by Gallup even quantify the toll: about **44% of employees globally reported feeling a lot of daily stress** in recent years [35] [36]. The COVID-19 pandemic also triggered many to re-evaluate life priorities, yielding phenomena like **"The Great Resignation"** where record numbers of people voluntarily quit jobs in 2021–2022 in search of more fulfilling or flexible alternatives.

Evolving Social Narratives: Amid these dynamics, social narratives around worth and contribution are indeed evolving. Beyond just jobs and consumption, new **markers of social status and identity** are emerging. For some, being an influencer or successful creator – measured in followers and online impact – is a status symbol. For others, especially those disenchanted with corporate life, **civic and community roles** are gaining value as alternatives. Volunteering, activism, or contributing to local projects can provide a sense of purpose that one's paycheck does not. We might call this a search for **"civic prestige"** – deriving esteem from being a good community member or a change-maker. For example, young people might brag not about their company's name but about a nonprofit they run, an open-source project they launched, or a social cause they champion. Culturally, there's a growing script that *betterment of society* or creative self-expression is more admirable than climbing a corporate ladder. This is visible in the popularity of initiatives like community hackathons, open science efforts, or climate activism among youth – arenas where contribution, not position, is the metric of respect.

Temporal and Work Ethic Shifts: The notion of the workday and career are arguably undergoing the biggest rethink since the industrial age. Hybrid work means the **dissolution of the strict weekday/ weekend divide** for many – one might handle personal tasks midday and compensate by finishing a report at 10pm, blurring "on" and "off" hours. Some love this flexibility; others feel it has led to a never-ending work cycle. This has sparked discussion of more radical time reforms, like the **four-day workweek**. Trials of a four-day week (32-hour week with 5 days' pay) in countries like Iceland, Spain, and a large study in the UK have shown promising results – workers report higher well-being and equal or higher productivity. By the early 2020s, momentum was building behind legislation or corporate policy to shorten the workweek, aiming to rebalance time in favor of leisure and reduce burnout. Such reforms hark back to earlier "time redesigns" (8-hour day, 5-day week), but now the drive is coming from knowledge workers seeking relief from digital overload and a reassertion that not all time should belong to employers.

Finally, the meaning of *"contribution"* is broadening. There's a tentative cultural movement toward recognizing forms of work that were historically undervalued: caregiving, community service, creative pursuits. Some thought leaders have floated ideas like **"civic credentialing"** – formally accrediting or

rewarding people for civic activities (for instance, a system where volunteering for community service or mentoring could earn social credits or public honors). While largely conceptual at this stage, it signals an awareness that as automation handles more production, what humans choose to value as "work" might shift from pure economic output to social contributions.

In essence, 2000–2024's cultural story is one of **experimentation and questioning**. We have unprecedented technological tools to reshape work to our liking, and segments of society are eagerly exploring that freedom (through remote work, side gigs, creative careers). Simultaneously, many are questioning the **centrality of paid work** to one's identity and seeking meaning elsewhere. The stage is set for a potential reimagining of work norms, as the next wave of automation – the AI revolution – accelerates.

Recurring Social Patterns Across Technological Transformations

Looking back across these five epochs of labor transformation, clear recurring patterns emerge in how societies adapt socially and culturally to major technological jolts:

- **Work Ethic and Value of Work:** Each transition provoked a crisis and reconfiguration of the work ethic. In agrarian-to-industrial shift, the old Protestant agrarian ethic was *transformed* rather than destroyed – hard work remained a virtue but showing it shifted from visible toil to the **proxy of consumption and material success** [6] [7]. In the early 20th century mechanization, the work ethic was moderated by acceptance that leisure was earned and even morally sound. Post-WWII, hard work was idealized within the framework of corporate loyalty and professionalism – but again in service of providing a comfortable life. By the late 20th century and into the 21st, we see a bifurcation: an *intensified* work ethic among some (the passion-driven or hustle culture mindset) versus a *skeptical* work ethic among others (the "quiet quitters" and those prioritizing work-life balance). **The common thread is that technological leaps often reduce the back-breaking necessity of labor, prompting society to renegotiate how much moral weight to give work itself.** Typically, after an initial period of clinging to older attitudes ("Labor omnia vincit" – work conquers all), a new equilibrium emerges that either sanctifies different kinds of work or allows more room for non-work pursuits. For instance, the concept of **"deserving leisure"** gained acceptance after industrial productivity rose, and now the concept of **"deserving purpose"** (that one's job should be meaningful or else one may look elsewhere for meaning) is taking hold as automation increases.

- **Temporal Structure – from Overwork to Reclaimed Time:** A striking recurring pattern is the shortening of working time with each major productivity leap, albeit with fits and starts. The shift to factories initially lengthened and rigidified hours (12+ hour days in early mills), but over decades hours fell dramatically [9] [13]. The early 20th century delivered the weekend; the mid-20th delivered paid vacations and secure retirements. Each time technology made it *possible* to produce more in less time, workers (through struggle or policy) eventually captured some of that gain as **time off**. This pattern is now repeating in demands for a four-day workweek or more remote flexibility – essentially, people seek to **rebalance time** when tech makes it feasible. Additionally, **life-stage structure** adjusted: the length of childhood education extended when farm kids weren't needed in fields; retirement expanded when machines and pensions enabled older workers to exit. Each epoch restructured the *rhythm of life*: from the daily schedule (farm sundown vs. factory clock, vs. flexible remote hours) to the multi-year career arc (lifelong one-job careers gave way to multiple careers or gig-based livelihoods). A constant is that **time discipline is initially imposed by new systems**

(factory whistle, 24/7 connectivity), often overshooting into overwork, and later society tempers it with humane limits (labor laws, disconnect rights). We see this pendulum in every era.

- **Social Status Markers:** Technologies that change work also change *who* and *what* is admired in society. In agrarian times, landownership and physical toil were often romanticized (the yeoman farmer as backbone of society). With industrial capitalism, wealth from industrialists and the urban bourgeoisie became high status, but for the working class, being a "good provider" by earning a stable factory wage was honorable. Consumption as a status marker emerged strongly in the early 20th century when factory workers could afford some mass-produced luxuries [7]. The mid-century knowledge shift made **education and white-collar professions** the status imprimatur – the term "white collar" itself was often associated with status relative to "blue collar." In the late 20th and early 21st, status markers diversified and democratized further: expertise and *innovation* (the tech entrepreneur, the skilled programmer), *creativity* (the successful artist or influencer), and even *social impact* (activists, philanthropists) gained prestige alongside or sometimes above traditional corporate or financial success. One recurring motif is that after each labor transformation, **previous status hierarchies get upended**. For example, skilled artisans lost status to factory owners in the 19th century; decades later, factory owners and managers ceded ultimate cultural status to the new class of technologists and financiers. We are likely on the cusp of another inversion: if AI and automation devalue many professional credentials, society may place more esteem on uniquely human contributions (art, original thought, community leadership) that machines can't replicate. Historically, **social honors eventually realign to whatever human labor or role remains scarce or values-driven in the new era** – e.g. when machines made manufactured goods abundant, *authentic craft goods* became luxury; when knowledge is automated, perhaps *human touch and empathy* become premium.

- **Institutional "Safety Valves" and Support:** Every wave of disruption led to new institutions that act as *safety valves* to release social pressures and support adaptation. The late 19th century saw unions and mutual aid societies; the early 20th, government welfare and education mandates; the mid-20th, expansive welfare states and social contracts with labor; the late 20th, attempts at retraining and portable benefits (though arguably incomplete). A pattern is that **institutions often lag the disruption** – crises (economic depressions, wars, mass unemployment) tend to force the institutional response. Yet, eventually there's a creative burst: societies invent the policies or programs needed for the new normal. For example, the invention of social security for the elderly corresponded to a time when older workers couldn't easily be absorbed in new industries. Now, facing the platform economy, we see early signs of new institutional thinking (talk of universal basic income or universal basic services, algorithmic accountability laws, etc.). Each era's institutions addressed the specific vulnerabilities created by the tech change: *physical insecurity* and injury risk in industrial work led to worker's comp; *income insecurity* in boom-bust economies led to unemployment insurance; *skill insecurity* in a tech-driven market leads to investment in re-skilling and education. The pattern is one of **problem → social innovation** in policy, albeit not without struggle.

- **Cultural Anxiety and Utopianism:** Not to be overlooked, a recurring social pattern is the oscillation between **fear and hope** that accompanies each wave. Typically, the onset of a new technology brings fear of widespread unemployment or moral decay (Luddite rebellions against mechanization, or 20th-century fears that radio/TV would make people lazy). At the same time, there's often utopian speculation – think of Keynes predicting a 15-hour workweek or 1960s futurists promising

automated plenty. Neither extreme pans out entirely; instead a mediated outcome arises. But this cycle of cultural anxiety vs. techno-optimism is itself a pattern. Eventually, as history shows, employment levels stabilized after each transformation (with new jobs in new sectors), but **the content of work and life adjusted** significantly. Thus, each era had to collectively process that fear (often via political movements or social narratives) and convert it into a new consensus (e.g. the post-war consensus that a welfare state can mitigate the rough edges of capitalism). We see an echo of this today with dire predictions of AI-induced mass joblessness on one side and visions of leisure and creativity on the other. If history is a guide, the outcome will likely be somewhere in between, shaped by how we respond.

In sum, across 150+ years of labor shocks, societies have repeatedly redefined the **ethic of work, the structure of time, and the sources of dignity and status**. While the technologies differed (steam engines to silicon chips), human adaptive patterns – *struggle followed by settlement* – have rhymed. People first resist or stress under the change, but gradually **culture and institutions evolve** so that, for most, life can regain stability and meaning under new conditions. Crucially, each transformation left a legacy: the concept of childhood free for schooling, the weekend, the social safety net, the notion of a creative fulfilling career – all were cultural innovations forged in response to technological upheaval. These legacies stack upon one another, meaning modern workers carry the fruits (compulsory education, labor rights, etc.) won in previous eras even as they face the next wave. This cumulative adaptation capacity is an encouraging sign as we turn to the wave now breaking – that of artificial intelligence – and how we might navigate it.

The Present AI Wave (2024–): Toward a Sixth Transformation

We stand at the cusp of what many consider a sixth major transformation: the age of **artificial intelligence (AI)**. With rapid advances in AI – from machine learning algorithms permeating services to recent breakthroughs in generative AI (large language models, etc.) – there is a growing sense that the nature of work could change as profoundly in the coming years as any time since the 19th century. This section examines early signs of social and cultural adaptation to AI-related labor shocks, extrapolating from both present trends and historical patterns. The focus is on how work norms, cultural scripts, and policy levers are already beginning to shift, and how these might diverge between advanced economies (OECD countries) and the Global South.

Disengagement from Current Work Norms: Cracks in the Foundation

One notable context for the AI wave is that it arrives at a time when many people are already **disengaged from the world of work** as it exists. Gallup's global surveys, as discussed, reveal chronically low engagement: about **77% of workers worldwide are not engaged or are actively disengaged in their jobs** [30]. In regions like Europe, only about one in seven workers feel committed and enthusiastic about their work [31]. Such data indicate a widespread *disillusionment with the work status quo*. When asked, large fractions of people (especially younger cohorts) express that work is "just a means to an end" rather than a central source of meaning. For instance, a European Values Survey found high percentages of Europeans would be happy to stop working if they won enough money – signaling that for many, work is not providing the non-monetary fulfillment it once might have. (In contrast, interestingly, some surveys show Americans slightly more likely than Europeans to say they'd continue working even if financially set [37], reflecting cultural differences in work centrality, but even in the U.S. that share has been dropping in recent decades.)

This disengagement matters for the AI transition because **public morale and attitudes set the stage for how new technology is embraced or resisted**. If people were universally finding deep purpose and identity in their jobs, the threat of AI automation would be purely a fear of job loss. But given many feel alienated, there is also *hope* in some quarters that AI could liberate them from drudgery. Surveys show increased interest in alternatives to traditional employment: for example, the idea of a **universal basic income (UBI)** gained notable public support in the late 2010s, partly because people perceive that stable, meaningful jobs might not be guaranteed in the future of AI and automation [38] [39]. Additionally, workforce sentiment surveys (e.g. by Gallup or Microsoft's Work Trend Index) often find that employees burdened by menial tasks would welcome AI assistance – *if* it frees them for more creative or interesting work or reduces their hours.

At the same time, trust in institutions to manage this shift is low. Labor force participation among youth has declined in some rich countries, and phenomena like Japan's "hikikomori" (young people retreating from work and society) or the West's "NEETs" (not in education, employment, or training) point to a subset that has effectively checked out of the formal labor system even before AI hits full force. All this suggests that **societies may be culturally primed for a re-evaluation of work's role**. The Protestant work ethic that dominated for centuries has been fading in secular, affluent societies – replaced by a more instrumental view of work (do it to pay the bills, but self-realization lies elsewhere). This could mean less psychological resistance to policies like reduced workweeks or more radical experiments during the AI era, since fewer people, relatively speaking, see full-time work as the core of their identity compared to past generations.

Gallup's latest **State of the Global Workplace** reports also highlight that low engagement correlates with higher stress and lower well-being [40] [35]. Over half of actively disengaged employees report high daily stress [30] [41]. This is essentially a crisis of work culture – many jobs are failing to meet human needs for purpose, connection, and manageable stress. As AI looms, an optimistic interpretation is that it *forces* society to confront this crisis: if many jobs can be automated, perhaps we can finally ask which aspects of work we *want to preserve* (e.g. camaraderie, creativity) and which we are happy to offload to machines (tedium, danger). The fact that current work norms are underwhelming to so many might lower resistance to such change. Alternatively, it could fuel anxiety – a disengaged workforce might also lack the will to proactively retrain or adapt, leading to resignation and social problems if not addressed.

In summary, public disengagement is the backdrop to the AI wave. It manifests as both a symptom (workers are burned out or bored by the way work is structured today) and a potential catalyst for change (hungry for a new paradigm, whether that's shorter weeks, more gig/entrepreneurial freedom, or non-work sources of meaning). Policymakers and business leaders are increasingly aware of this mood; for instance, some companies now emphasize their "mission" and societal values to attract younger talent who demand a sense of purpose. The AI wave will test whether those efforts are mere branding or if we truly restructure work to be more fulfilling when machines take more of the load.

Emerging Cultural Scripts in a Post-Work Trajectory

Even as mainstream culture still assumes a 40-hour workweek until retirement, at the margins new cultural scripts are emerging that normalize alternative models of contribution and identity. These scripts could become more prominent if AI accelerates a *post-work* or *less-work* society. A few noteworthy ones:

- **"Projectivity" and Open Source Ethos:** One script posits that people will define themselves by **projects** (creative, civic, entrepreneurial) rather than jobs. We already see this in the tech community

with open-source contributions. Software developers often gain stature by the projects they start or contribute to on their own time. This is a shift from identifying as, say, "a Google software engineer" to identifying as "creator of X library" or "maintainer of Y project." It's a more fluid, portfolio-based identity. The open-source ethos – where reputation is earned by quality of contributions and collaboration, not employer status – could extend to other domains. Imagine city planning where citizens collectively design improvements (with prestige to those who contribute great ideas), or science where citizen scientists co-author papers via crowd-sourced data. The internet and AI (which can handle coordination and analysis) provide the tools to enable many such project-based contributions by laypeople. A cultural script forming here is **"I am what I contribute,"** rather than "I am what my job title says." It's somewhat idealistic but visible in communities like Wikipedia, open design, open research, etc. Notably, these contributions often confer *civic prestige* – contributors earn respect, gratitude, and a sense of making a mark, even if monetary rewards are nil or secondary.

- **Digital Creator/Celebrity Economy:** Another script is the path of the **digital creator**, which has already been normalized for millions. As mentioned, surveys find huge interest among youth in becoming influencers or content creators [26]. This suggests a generation that sees *creative self-expression and building an audience* as a legitimate form of work (and indeed it can be lucrative for some). With AI potentially taking over many routine professional jobs, it's plausible that creative fields – entertainment, arts, original content – remain strongly human, and more people gravitate to them. We may see a society with far more part-time creators: e.g. someone might work 20 hours doing AI-assisted accounting and spend the rest of their week crafting videos or music for a niche online following, supplementing income via Patreon or NFTs or whatnot. The cultural narrative backing this is **"everyone can be a creator"** and that creative labor is more fulfilling and resilient to automation (since creativity is a human stronghold). This democratization of creativity blurs leisure and work; it turns hobbies into potential livelihoods. It also shifts status markers: number of followers or the uniqueness of one's creative output can trump a traditional CV. As AI gets better at routine tasks, human culture might place *supreme value on originality and personal voice* – essentially, the human touch that automated content lacks.

- **Community and Civic Engagement as Central:** A potential (and arguably desirable) cultural script is one where **civic engagement and care work become higher-status and more widely practiced**. If formal employment becomes more scarce or shorter in duration (say AI reduces the need for full-time jobs), people might invest their surplus time in their communities, families, and causes. Historically, involuntary idleness often had negative effects (unemployment has been linked with social problems), but that's in a context where idleness meant exclusion. In a scenario where society affirmatively values civic participation (perhaps even providing a stipend for it), we could see a renaissance of local governance, volunteerism, and caregiving. One can think of it as a modern "Great Society" ideal: if fewer people are needed in factories or offices, they can be building social capital – mentoring youth, helping the elderly, engaging in democratic deliberation. There are already glimmers: the popularity of community gardens, the Maker movement, and cooperative enterprises hint at people seeking meaning through collective action. The concept of **"civic prestige"** would mean someone is admired not for their job per se but for being a pillar of the community – whether that's an excellent volunteer firefighter, a beloved teacher (even if unpaid, like tutoring kids in coding), or a leader of a local environmental project. Technologically, AI could assist this by taking over administrative burdens, freeing humans to do the relational and creative heavy lifting in civic tasks.

In short, emerging cultural scripts revolve around **leveraging human uniqueness**: creativity, empathy, community-building – as opposed to the old script of maximizing productivity at all costs. They align with what many sociologists and futurists have theorized a post-work society could look like: more people engaged in creative arts, lifelong learning, caregiving, and civic duties, supported by the productivity of automation. We are not there yet broadly, but the seeds are present in how younger generations view career vs life. Many Gen Z surveys suggest they prioritize meaningful work and social impact, or alternatively, they prioritize *work as a means to support life passions*. Either way, the notion of working simply for work's sake is eroding.

It's important to note these scripts are somewhat class-dependent – those with financial stability have more freedom to pursue such paths, whereas those struggling may not. That's where policy comes in to even the playing field.

Policy Levers for an AI-transformed Society

Just as in past transformations, proactive policy will be crucial to steer the AI wave toward broad social benefit. A number of **policy levers** are being discussed or piloted:

- **AI Dividend or Fund for All:** Given the potentially enormous productivity gains from AI, economists and visionaries have proposed mechanisms to share these gains widely. One idea is an **"AI fund"** or dividend – essentially society taking a stake in AI-driven productivity. This could take form as a **universal basic income (UBI)** financed by taxes on AI-enabled profits, or as a **sovereign wealth fund** that holds equity in top AI firms and distributes returns to citizens [38] [39]. For example, investor Sam Altman has floated the idea of an American Equity Fund, where every citizen gets a slice of the economic pie of tech advancements. Another concept is a **data dividend** – since AI is trained on public data, some argue citizens should get paid for their data contributions when companies profit from AI models. While these ideas are nascent, they parallel how in past, resource booms led some places (like Norway with oil) to create funds that ensure the windfall benefits the public. An AI fund would recognize **AI as a "national resource"** whose benefits shouldn't accrue only to a few. The IMF in 2024 also highlighted that fiscal policy (tax and transfer) will be vital to offset AI-driven inequality, suggesting higher taxes on capital income and tech rents to fund stronger safety nets [42] [43]. In essence, some form of **wealth redistribution from AI winners to losers** is on the table – whether via direct payments, free public services (education, healthcare) funded by AI gains, or other creative schemes.

- **Workweek Reduction and Labor Laws:** The four-day workweek experiments, if they continue to show success, could translate into legislation making a 32-hour week the new standard (perhaps with overtime pay required beyond that). Some policymakers are already discussing this; for instance, bills for a shorter workweek have been introduced in countries like Spain, New Zealand, and in local governments. The rationale is that if AI and automation raise productivity per worker, society can afford to let workers spend fewer hours at work while maintaining output and pay – distributing work more evenly and improving quality of life. The early 20th century saw national laws eventually enshrine the 8-hour day; the 21st might see a legal redefinition of full-time as something less than 40 hours. **Right to disconnect** laws and remote work protections (so employees who work from home aren't exploited to work more) are also likely to expand, ensuring technology serves human schedules rather than enslaves them. These policies essentially aim to **"redesign time"** once

more, much like the weekend was a time redesign in a prior era – this time to counteract the potential of digital tech to elongate work availability.

- **Civic Credentialing and Service Programs:** To bolster the notion of civic engagement as valued work, governments might introduce **credentialing systems or service corps**. For instance, a national service program that isn't mandatory but highly encouraged, with participants getting educational credits, stipends, or preferential hiring for having served in community projects or care work. There could be formal certificates for civic achievement (similar to how we award military honors, but for peaceful civic deeds). Some nonprofit and educational groups are exploring ways to quantify and recognize skills gained through volunteering or community leadership (badges, micro-credentials). The goal is to create a **cultural and institutional equivalence** between time spent in civic work and time spent in paid work. In education, this might mean high schools and colleges giving credit for community project involvement, or companies counting volunteer experience in hiring decisions. On the policy side, something like an expanded AmeriCorps (in the U.S.) or EU Solidarity Corps with much larger slots could soak up young adults for a year or two of socially useful activity, paying them a living allowance – acting both as a employment buffer and a way to direct human energy to where it's needed (e.g., elder care, environmental resilience projects) regardless of market demand.

- **Training, Education, and "Civic Tech" Initiatives:** Another lever is heavy investment in **education reform** focusing on uniquely-human skills. If routine cognitive tasks are offloaded to AI, human education might pivot to creativity, critical thinking, interpersonal skills, and adaptability. Some have suggested integrating AI into education (each student with an AI tutor) while focusing teachers on mentoring and social learning. Lifelong learning accounts or training vouchers funded by government could allow mid-career workers to continually upgrade skills complementary to AI (for example, learning to work with AI tools effectively – *"AI literacy"* may become as fundamental as computer literacy). On the flip side, equipping citizens with *civic literacy* – understanding media, participating in governance – could be prioritized, to ensure an informed populace in the AI era. There's also policy talk of supporting sectors that provide *socially beneficial jobs* that AI can't easily do – for instance, subsidies for caregiving professions, reducing class sizes by hiring more teachers, etc., essentially **creating more human-centric jobs** to offset those automated. This parallels how past societies moved labor into services like health and education as other sectors automated. Government as an employer of last resort in caring and civic roles could be a policy response (a modern WPA but for caregiving and community building).

- **Regulating AI in the Workplace:** To ensure AI augments rather than simply displaces workers, some policies may mandate **impact assessments** or set conditions for AI deployment. For example, requiring companies to negotiate with worker representatives before implementing AI that could affect jobs (much as some countries require negotiations for mass layoffs). Or taxing excessive automation (the notion of a "robot tax," though controversial [44] [45]) to disincentivize replacing humans wholesale and to fund transition support. The IMF blog noted that while a direct AI tax isn't ideal, rebalancing tax codes to not favor capital over labor is important [46] [43]. Another approach is incentivizing **"human-in-the-loop"** models – e.g., giving companies credits or liability protections if AI is used under human supervision rather than fully autonomously. This could preserve more roles for human judgment and maintain employment while still getting productivity gains. Essentially, policy might try to slow the *pace* of automation to a socially manageable rate, as well as channel AI

innovation towards complementing workers (AI assisting doctors, not replacing them entirely; AI helping teachers personalize learning, not replacing teachers).

In practice, a combination of these levers will likely be needed. Some countries are already moving: for instance, **Ireland and Canada have begun national conversations on UBI** in light of automation; **Spain and Scotland have run four-day week pilots**; the **EU is crafting AI regulations** to govern algorithmic fairness at work (like the AI Act's provisions on high-risk uses including hiring algorithms). Importantly, these policies are not one-size-fits-all. OECD countries may have the wealth to fund UBI or large service programs, whereas developing countries might focus more on job creation and digital infrastructure to not be left behind by AI.

OECD vs. Global South: Divergent Adaptation Strategies

The impact of AI and feasible adaptations will differ greatly between advanced economies and the Global South, due to differences in economic structure, institutional capacity, and demographics:

OECD/Advanced Economies: These countries generally have aging populations, high labor costs, and well-established welfare states. For them, AI poses more of a challenge of **reallocation and inequality** than of basic job creation. Key strategies likely include:

- **Retrofitting Welfare States:** Advanced economies will build on their existing safety nets. Expect expansions in unemployment insurance (perhaps longer duration or covering more types of "gig" unemployment) and possibly movement toward **unconditional income supports** if job scarcity becomes acute. As one IMF analysis suggested, most countries have room to broaden the coverage & generosity of unemployment insurance and even consider wage insurance for displaced workers [47] [48]. Some Northern European models (like Denmark's flexicurity, which combines easy hiring/firing with strong unemployment benefits and retraining) might be emulated elsewhere to handle AI churn.

- **Upskilling and Transition Support:** OECD governments are already among the biggest investors in active labor market policies. This will ramp up – free or low-cost retraining in tech, incentives for STEM education, and mid-life career counseling will be standard. There may also be **strong pushes for AI literacy among the general public**, to reduce fear and help people use AI tools to enhance their productivity (much like computer literacy programs in the 1990s).

- **Reducing Work Hours and Sharing Work:** With higher productivity and stagnant labor demand, advanced countries might opt to reduce average working hours to distribute work among more people. This could involve not just 4-day weeks but encouraging job-sharing, part-time options with full benefits, and earlier retirement for those who choose (with flexible pension arrangements). It's essentially the policy of *work spreading*. Historically, France tried something akin (35-hour workweek law in 2000) – we may see more of that spirit, updated for AI.

- **Encouraging Innovation in Job Creation Sectors:** To avoid total AI dominance, OECD governments might identify sectors to grow that require human labor – e.g., the **"green economy"** (renewable energy projects, environmental remediation), **infrastructure rebuilds**, or **care economy** (elder care, child care) – and invest heavily there, creating millions of jobs that match unmet social needs. These jobs might be subsidized or public-sector. It's a bit of a pivot to a semi-planned approach: letting AI

boost overall efficiency in mature sectors, while actively expanding sectors where human touch is indispensable.

- **AI Governance and Ethical Use:** Advanced economies will likely be at the forefront of setting the rules for AI, since they host most AI developers. They'll frame standards to prevent worst abuses (like AI used to erode worker rights via constant surveillance or algorithmic firing without recourse). Already the **EU's AI Act** is trying to require transparency and human oversight in high-risk AI decisions (such as employment). Such governance can indirectly protect jobs and dignity.

In short, OECD adaptation will focus on **managing abundance** – using the wealth generated by AI to ensure it's widely shared, and keeping societies cohesive by preventing a permanent underclass. The challenge here is mostly political will, as the resources exist. It may involve more radical redistributive policies than seen in decades, essentially a new social contract where citizens receive dividends or reduced work expectations in exchange for the automation bounty.

Global South/Emerging Economies: These countries often have younger populations, lower labor costs, and larger informal sectors. Their situation is paradoxical: on one hand, fewer jobs are automated yet because many economies are not fully industrialized (e.g., agriculture still employs many, and manufacturing is often more labor-intensive). On the other hand, they risk **losing opportunities** – if rich countries reshore manufacturing with robots or use AI instead of outsourcing certain services, the development ladder could be pulled up. Key strategies for the Global South might include:

- **Industrial Policy to Leverage AI for Development:** Emerging economies will need to integrate AI to boost their productivity, but strategically. For instance, using AI in agriculture (smart irrigation, crop monitoring) to improve yields without necessarily displacing workers completely can improve food security and incomes. Or in healthcare, AI diagnostics could help compensate for doctor shortages. Essentially, the focus is on **AI as an augmenting tool to leapfrog gaps** (like how mobile phones let Africa skip landlines). Governments might partner with tech firms to deploy AI in critical sectors like education (personalized learning in understaffed schools) and finance (fintech AI reaching the unbanked). The priority is improving services and productivity *without* causing massive job loss in the near term.

- **Job Creation in Infrastructure and Green Projects:** Much of the Global South still needs to build infrastructure – from roads to renewable energy systems. These projects are labor-intensive and can absorb workforce for decades. International aid and climate finance could be directed to fund a *"green new deal"* in developing nations, employing people in climate adaptation (like building seawalls, reforestation, installing solar panels) – jobs which are local and not easily automated away. This achieves two goals: employment and resilience.

- **Education and Demographic Dividend:** With a large youth population, many developing countries see youth unemployment as a major issue. Embracing AI doesn't mean throwing people out of work when labor is abundant and cheap – rather, it means educating youth with *complementary* skills and using their human capital effectively. Education systems will need to improve foundational skills (literacy, numeracy) and digital skills so that young workers can be productive in an AI-infused economy. However, unlike advanced countries that may reduce working hours, the Global South focus might be on *creating enough formal jobs*. This could involve encouraging labor-intensive industries that AI can't fully replace yet (for example, parts of healthcare, tourism, creative

industries). Some countries may become hubs for what one might call **"human services"** – marketing themselves as destinations for healthcare tourism, education (universities attracting foreign students), entertainment, etc., which both earn income and employ locals.

- **Adapting Social Protection to Informality:** Most Global South workers are informal, without formal employer or stable income. Traditional Western-style social insurance doesn't reach them. But new approaches, possibly enabled by digital tech, can. For example, India has experimented with direct cash transfers to farmers, or M-Pesa mobile money in Kenya enables micro-insurance schemes. **Digital IDs and fintech** can allow governments to extend benefits or basic income floors even to those in informal gigs. The IMF noted innovative approaches using digital tech could expand coverage in countries with large informal sectors [49] [50]. One can imagine app-based gig workers being brought under some contributory scheme via the platforms. Essentially, the goal is to not leave billions vulnerable if AI upheaval affects commodity prices, low-skill manufacturing, etc., which can indirectly hurt livelihoods.

- **Global Cooperation and Preventing Brain Drain:** Developing countries will also rely on global policy – for instance, pushing for frameworks where AI's benefits (like breakthrough medical discoveries) are shared, not monopolized. They may also need to negotiate migration and talent policies: if AI causes job scarcities in the North, there might be pressure to send back migrants. But many families in the South rely on remittances; global dialogue will be needed to handle labor migration humanely in an AI world. Conversely, if AI drives growth mainly in tech hubs, developing countries risk brain drain of their skilled workers – they'll need policies to keep talent (like improving local working conditions for tech professionals, or diaspora engagement programs to have their expats contribute back).

In essence, the Global South's adaptation is about **catching up and carving a niche** in a changing global division of labor. They must avoid being just dumping grounds for technologies without reaping benefits. One encouraging factor is that AI tools can be relatively cheap once developed (an AI model can be replicated at low cost), so if knowledge transfer happens, developing countries could use very advanced tools without having had to invent them. However, much depends on access and equity – hence international bodies like the UN or World Bank might push for open access to certain AI for poorer nations, or at least concessional pricing.

A distinct consideration is that **political stability** in the Global South could be tested if automation undermines sectors like garment manufacturing or call centers that currently provide mass employment. Governments may become more protectionist or demand that multinationals keep some human labor component. They could, for example, impose limits on automation in export processing zones to preserve jobs, though that risks losing business. Alternatively, they might double down on advantages humans have: creative industries (Nigeria's Nollywood, for example, is a huge employer and unlikely to be overtaken by AI soon), or specialized agriculture (organic, artisanal products) catering to niche markets.

Differential Outcomes: It's likely OECD countries will proceed faster with automation and mitigation policies, while Global South countries take a staggered approach – some automation but more emphasis on employment. This divergence could initially increase inequality between countries (rich countries enjoying AI productivity with cushioned populations, poor countries struggling to compete). However, longer term, if the right knowledge transfers and policies occur, AI could help the Global South leapfrog in areas like

healthcare and education, boosting human capital and eventually allowing shorter workweeks there too as prosperity rises.

In summation, segmented strategies boil down to **“manage surplus”** in the OECD vs **“manage scarcity”** in the Global South. The former can focus on distributing the fruits of AI (through time, income, and new forms of work), the latter must focus on securing fruits of any kind and using AI to solve pressing human development gaps while preserving employment. But both share the ultimate human goal: ensuring that automation improves human well-being. For OECD that might mean more leisure and self-actualization; for Global South, it means meeting basic needs and creating dignified livelihoods as populations grow.

Conclusion: Toward an Epistemic Shift

Bringing the discussion full circle, the long arc from agrarian toil to the AI age shows that while technology may upend the *tasks* we do, human society continuously rewrites the *meaning* of work and contribution. In each epoch, fears of dislocation were real, yet societies adapted – not without pain or conflict, but ultimately by reinventing norms and institutions: from the farm to the factory came public schools and the weekend; from the factory to the office came college education and creative autonomy; and now from the office to the algorithm may come a revaluation of how each person finds purpose, whether through work or beyond it.

As we stand on the brink of the AI era, history’s lesson is that **the story is not predetermined by technology**. Rather, social choices will determine whether AI becomes a tool of widespread prosperity and cultural renaissance, or one of exclusion and purposelessness. Recurring patterns suggest reason for cautious optimism: when faced with upheaval, societies have eventually chosen to **protect human well-being** – be it through labor laws, welfare, or new cultural ideals. The challenge now is unprecedented in scale (global and touching mental work), but we also have unprecedented knowledge and resources to tackle it.

Imagine a future a few decades hence, if we apply the best lessons: a world where the **farmer’s great-great-grandchildren** might spend only 20 hours a week on their formal job (assisted by AI), and use the rest of their time in community leadership, artistic creation, or caregiving – pursuits that technology, rather than replacing, *enables* by freeing time and providing tools. Their livelihood is supported partly by an AI dividend that society wisely instituted, ensuring the immense wealth generated by AI doesn’t pool in a few hands but funds education, healthcare, and a basic income for all. Their social status comes not from a job title – many traditional titles have faded – but from their reputation as, say, a brilliant open-source contributor (which millions see the benefit of) or a local civic hero improving lives in their town. Work in the traditional sense is just one thread in a rich tapestry of socially recognized activities.

Such a vision hews closely to the positive cultural scripts now emerging. It will take conscious effort and policy courage (AI dividends, four-day weeks, lifelong learning, global solidarity) to realize it. But it’s worth noting that over the long arc, each transformation did eventually yield **cultural dividends** that would astonish those at the start of the epoch: A 1870 farmer might be amazed to learn that by 1970 most of his descendants neither farmed nor toiled 12 hours daily, and a 1930 factory hand might be stunned that by 2020 many of her descendants work from home on flexible schedules. In that spirit, our present efforts could make life in 2070 or 2100 equally unrecognizable in its improved balance.

Crucially, avoiding the pitfalls (mass unemployment, loss of meaning) requires an **epistemic shift** – recognizing that the metrics of success in society may need to move away from GDP and hours worked to measures of well-being, creativity, and civic health. There are signs: New Zealand, for example, officially added wellness metrics to its national budget; conversations about universal basic income and four-day weeks, once fringe, are now mainstream in policy debates [38] [39] . This reflects a growing understanding that technology's bounty allows us to **rethink what progress means**.

In conclusion, the historical record gives a hopeful template: when faced with labor shocks, societies that invest in their people – through education, social support, and inclusion – not only weather the storm but emerge culturally richer. The AI wave, if guided by wisdom and compassion, can likewise be harnessed to reduce drudgery, expand leisure and creativity, and redefine contribution in more human-centric ways. It invites us to complete the long trajectory from obligatory toil to possibly the *"invention of purpose"* – a society where automation provides the basics and humans are free to pursue what they find meaningful, with social structures validating those pursuits. The outcome, as always, will depend on deliberate choices. The long arc of adaptation, however, bends toward an emancipation of human potential – a narrative that, with careful stewardship, the AI revolution can fulfill as the next chapter in humanity's story of work and beyond.

Sources:

- Wisman, Jon D., and Matthew Weiss (2013). *"Degraded Work, Declining Community, Rising Inequality, and the Transformation of the Protestant Ethic in America: 1870–1930."* American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 72(5), 1075-1105. [6] [7]

- Mintz, Steven (n.d.). *"Statistics: Trends in American Farming."* Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History. (Data on U.S. labor force in agriculture, 1860–1930) [1] [2]

- Giattino, Charlie, and Esteban Ortiz-Ospina (2020). *"Are we working more than ever? – Our World in Data."* (Historical working hours decline; Dora Costa quote on workweek changes) [10] [11]

- Gallup (2022). *"State of the Global Workplace: 2022 Report."* (Global and regional employee engagement statistics; Europe 14% engaged vs 21% global) [31]

- Stylus Media (2024). *"Gallup's State of the Workplace 2024: Global Workers Disengaged."* (Breakdown: 62% not engaged, 15% actively disengaged worldwide; only 13% engaged in Europe) [30] [35]

- OECD AI Policy Observatory / IMF (2024). *"Fiscal Policy Can Help Broaden the Gains of AI to Humanity"* by Era Dabla-Norris & Ruud de Mooij (IMF blog). (Recommendations: stronger safety nets, rebalancing taxes, differences for emerging markets with informality) [47] [49]

- Wikipedia (citing OECD 1981). *"Knowledge worker – Wikipedia."* (By 1970s, ~40% of US/Canada workforce in information sector, per OECD) [22] [23]

- MinnPost (Johnston, Louis, 2012). *"History lessons: Understanding the decline in manufacturing."* (Labor force by sector in US: agriculture fell from 70% in 1840 to 10% by 1950; services exceeded industry throughout history) [18] [19]

- Adobe (2023). *"How the influencer dream is shaping young people's goals."* (One-third of 18–30 year-olds in US want to be influencers; motivations: flexibility, creative expression) [26] [28]

- Noema Magazine (2022). *"Here's How To Share AI's Future Wealth."* (Discussion of predistribution vs redistribution, UBI vs UBC (universal basic capital) ideas for AI dividend) [38] [39]

- USDA Economic Research Service (Effland & Dimitri, 2005). *"Milestones in U.S. Farming and Farm Policy."* Amber Waves, June 2005. (By 1970, mechanization led to massive migration out of farming; farm share of population from 17% in 1945 to 5% in 1970) [14] [15]

---

[1] [2] [3] [4] Statistics: Trends in American Farming | Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History
https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-resources/teacher-resources/statistics-trends-american-farming

[5] High school movement - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_school_movement

[6] [7] [8] Degraded Work, Declining Community, Rising Inequality, and the Transformation of the Protestant Ethic in America: 1870-1930
https://ideas.repec.org/p/amu/wpaper/2011-08.html

[9] [10] [11] [12] [13] Are we working more than ever? - Our World in Data
https://ourworldindata.org/working-more-than-ever

[14] [15] [16] [17] Data Feature | Economic Research Service
http://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2005/june/data-feature

[18] [19] [20] History lessons: Understanding the decline in manufacturing - MinnPost
https://www.minnpost.com/macro-micro-minnesota/2012/02/history-lessons-understanding-decline-manufacturing/

[21] [22] [23] Knowledge worker - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_worker

[24] Internet - Our World in Data
https://ourworldindata.org/internet

[25] [30] [35] [36] [40] [41] Gallup's State of the Workplace 2024: Global Workers Disengaged
https://stylus.com/consumer-attitudes/gallup-s-state-of-the-workplace-2024-global-workers-disengaged

[26] [27] [28] How the influencer dream is shaping young people's goals - Adobe
https://www.adobe.com/express/learn/blog/wanting-to-be-influencer

[29] [PDF] Revisiting What Drives Contributors in Open Source - arXiv
https://arxiv.org/pdf/2101.10291

[31] [34] [37] Europe Gets Life Right, but Work Wrong
https://www.gallup.com/workplace/393794/europe-gets-life-right-work-wrong.aspx

[32] [33] More Work, Fewer Babies: What Does Workism Have to Do With Fertility? | Institute for Family Studies
https://ifstudies.org/report-brief/more-work-fewer-babies-what-does-workism-have-to-do-with-fertility

[38] Economic impacts of AI are nuanced; job disruption needs UBI
https://www.scottsantens.com/ai-will-rapidly-transform-the-labor-market-exacerbating-inequality-insecurity-and-poverty/

39 How Automation Could Undermine the Economy | by Leslie - Medium
https://medium.com/technology-hits/how-automation-could-undermine-the-economy-8665db7340fa

42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 Fiscal Policy Can Help Broaden the Gains of AI to Humanity
https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/06/17/fiscal-policy-can-help-broaden-the-gains-of-ai-to-humanity