From Extraction to Experience: Paradigm Shifts, General Purpose Technologies, and the Rise of the Meaning Economy

Introduction

Over the past two centuries, the structure of advanced economies has undergone several **paradigm shifts**. We have moved from an **extraction-based** economy (dominated by agriculture and resource mining) to a **fabrication-based** industrial economy (dominated by manufacturing), then to a **service economy**, and now potentially into a **fourth paradigm** centered on human *experience, meaning, authenticity, and "touch"*. Each transition has been propelled by transformative technologies—often referred to as **General Purpose Technologies (GPTs)**—that dramatically boosted productivity and redefined work. These GPT-driven leaps typically *increase output* while *reducing the human labor required* in affected sectors, freeing the workforce to shift into new arenas[1][2]. Today, **advanced AI** appears to be emerging as a new GPT, automating cognitive tasks and leading to an **erosion of knowledge work** much as mechanization once reduced agricultural and factory labor. Paradoxically, as automation reaches deeper into what was once "skilled" white-collar work, economic activity is increasingly concentrating in areas that **automation cannot easily touch** – jobs and industries centered on personal interaction, creativity, care, and genuine human experience. This research paper explores these developments in depth. We begin by examining the historical shifts from extraction to fabrication to services (with supporting data on how each sector's employment share has risen or fallen). We then discuss the role of general purpose technologies in driving productivity and labor reallocation, including evidence of how **AI is impacting knowledge work**. Finally, we characterize the nascent "fourth paradigm" of meaning and experience, providing data that such **high-touch, authenticity-focused jobs are growing faster** than others, and we invoke **Baumol's Cost Disease** as a framework to understand why these human-centric sectors are becoming the new engine of employment and value creation.

Historical Economic Structural Paradigm Shifts (Extraction, Fabrication, Services)

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, most people worked in **extraction industries** – primarily agriculture (farming), along with mining and other resource-based work. As industrialization took hold, employment shifted into **fabrication**, i.e. manufacturing and construction, and later into a wide array of **services**. Figure 1 below illustrates this long-run transformation in the United States. In 1900, over one-third of U.S. workers were in agriculture, but by 2000 this had fallen to only a couple of percent, while service-providing jobs came to dominate the labor force[3][4].

Figure 1: Historical distribution of the U.S. labor force by sector (1900–2010). Agriculture (green line, "extraction") employed ~40% of U.S. workers in 1900 but shrank to under 5% by 2000. Manufacturing (blue line, "fabrication") rose to ~35% by mid-century before declining below 20%. Services (orange line, encompassing all other sectors) expanded steadily, surpassing 50% by mid-20th century and reaching ~80% by 2010[5][3]. (Source: NCCI, U.S. BLS data.)

In **1850, agriculture was by far the largest employer** – about 60% of all U.S. jobs were on farms[2]. This began to decline with mechanization, and by 1900 agriculture's share of employment had already dropped to roughly 38%[6]. The **Industrial Revolution** drove a rise in manufacturing and industry ("fabrication") jobs: in the U.S., the manufacturing sector's share of employment climbed through the late 19th and early 20th centuries, **peaking around 26% of jobs by 1960**[2]. After mid-century, however, manufacturing's share began to ebb as automation and foreign competition increased, a trend that accelerated after 1980. By the year 2015, agriculture plus manufacturing together accounted for **under 13% of U.S. employment**[7] – meaning nearly 87% of workers were in **services**. In other words, the U.S. had fully transitioned to a service-dominated economy.

This **structural transformation** – from a workforce in fields and factories to one in offices, shops, and service outlets – has been observed in *every advanced economy*. As nations develop, **extraction sectors** (farming, mining) consistently shrink in workforce share, manufacturing typically rises then falls, and **service sectors grow enormously**[4][8]. For example, between 1850 and 1970, the agricultural share of U.S. employment plunged from about 60% to under 5%[2][5]. Similarly, manufacturing's share of employment has trended downward across the developed world: between 1980 and 2012, the manufacturing job share fell by **30–65%** in countries ranging from the U.S. and Canada to Germany, France, Japan, and South Korea[8]. Meanwhile, the service sector's expansion has been "almost continuous" – in the U.S., services rose from roughly 18% of employment in 1850 to about 70% by the early 1980s[9][4], and continues to rise. By 1982, services accounted for roughly 69% of U.S. jobs[10]; by the 2000s it was around three-quarters, and today it is approaching 80–85% in many advanced economies[7].

Behind these numbers is a story of **productivity growth and changing demand**. As technology made agriculture and manufacturing far more efficient, fewer workers were needed to produce food and goods, while consumer demand shifted toward services as incomes grew. For instance, one analysis notes that *in the United States, manufacturing employment peaked at 19.6 million in 1979 and then fell to about 12.8 million by 2019 (a 35% drop), even as manufacturing output continued to rise*[11]. Those workers did not remain idle: they transitioned into new roles in the expanding service economy. Over 2000–2022, U.S. manufacturing jobs declined (especially in the 2000s), but these losses were more than offset by gains of **23 million jobs in service-providing sectors** during the same period[12]. The single largest growth sector was healthcare, which added roughly **9 million jobs** from 2000 to 2022, followed by professional/business services (+6 million) and hospitality/leisure (+4 million)[12]. By 2017, **healthcare had surpassed both manufacturing and retail to become the largest source of jobs in the U.S.**, a milestone

that arrived "sooner than expected"[13]. (In 2000 there were 7 million more manufacturing workers than healthcare workers; but by 2017, healthcare pulled ahead[14].) In short, over the long run, employment has inexorably shifted away from extracting raw materials and fabricating goods and into activities centered on **services** – from banking to education to healthcare and beyond. This historical context sets the stage for understanding how new technologies continue to reshape the labor landscape in the present day.

General Purpose Technologies (GPTs) and Automation's Effect on Productivity and Jobs

Technology has been the engine driving each structural shift. In particular, economists highlight the role of **General Purpose Technologies (GPTs)** – foundational innovations so powerful that they transform nearly every sector of the economy. Classic examples of GPTs include the **steam engine**, **electricity**, the **internal combustion engine**, and more recently **digital computers and the internet**[15]. These technologies are "general purpose" in that they unleash *pervasive productivity gains*, enabling people to produce much more output with fewer inputs. A hallmark of GPT-driven progress is that **output rises while required labor falls** in the affected activities – exactly the outcome we expect (and desire) from automation and innovation.

Historical evidence bears this out. Consider the impact of technology on **agriculture**. In 1900, about 40% of American workers were farmers[5]. Today, farm workers are barely 1–2% of the workforce, yet they produce vastly more food. What changed was the introduction of GPTs like mechanization (e.g. the gasoline-powered **tractor**) and chemical fertilizers, along with advances in plant breeding. By the early 20th century, the tractor and other farm machinery had "**made labor use far more efficient**," leading to a steep drop in agricultural employment from ~40% of all jobs in 1900 to **under 2% by 2000**[5]. Despite the decline in farm labor, farm *output* rose dramatically. Globally, **agricultural output increased nearly fourfold between 1961 and 2020** even as the share of labor in farming fell worldwide[16]. In the U.S., one farmer in 2000 could feed 100+ people, whereas a farmer in 1900 fed perhaps 3–5 people – a testament to astonishing productivity growth. This is a clear example of a GPT (mechanized agriculture, supported by advances in chemistry and biology) *reducing headcount while increasing output*. A contemporary analysis notes that these productivity gains "released resources from the agricultural sector" – i.e. workers left farms and were able to contribute elsewhere in the economy[17].

The same pattern played out in **manufacturing**. The spread of mass production techniques, electrified factories, automation and eventually robotics greatly boosted industrial productivity. U.S. manufacturing employment **peaked in the late 1970s** at around 19.5 million jobs, then began a long decline[18]. Yet manufacturing *output* (in real terms) kept rising. Much of the job loss was driven by **automation rather than outsourcing**: an oft-cited study by economists found that about **87% of U.S. manufacturing jobs lost between 2000 and 2010 were due to productivity growth (automation)**, versus only 13% due to trade competition[19]. Automation allowed more to be produced with fewer workers. Indeed, **since 1990 U.S. manufacturing output grew by**

about 72% while manufacturing employment fell by 31%[20]. Over the same period, labor productivity in manufacturing (output per worker) rose by an astounding 140%[20]. In practical terms, *America was producing nearly double the amount of factory goods in 2016 as in 1990, but with only about two-thirds the number of workers*. This is illustrated in **Figure 2**, which indexes manufacturing output, employment, and productivity in the U.S. over recent decades.

Figure 2: Manufacturing output vs. employment in the United States (1990–2016). The orange line (indexed to 1990=100) shows real manufacturing output rising to ~172 by 2016 (~+72%), while the blue line (manufacturing employment) falls to ~69 (~−31%) over the same period. The green line (labor productivity index) soars to ~240 (~+140%), reflecting that each worker produces well over twice as much on average as in 1990[20]. This divergence demonstrates how automation and technology (a GPT) enable higher output with fewer workers.

General Purpose Technologies tend to spark **waves of automation** that initially disrupt labor markets but ultimately boost overall economic output and create new types of jobs. The **steam engine** and mechanized textile machines of the early Industrial Revolution famously caused short-term job displacement (weavers losing work to mechanical looms, for example), but in time they lowered production costs, expanded markets, and generated new employment in industries that did not previously exist. The advent of **electricity** in the early 20th century had a similar transformational effect: electrified factories could rearrange workflows for efficiency, leading to productivity gains and a decline in back-breaking manual labor[21]. Later, **computers and digital automation** in the late 20th century eliminated millions of clerical and repetitive tasks (from file clerks to switchboard operators), even while creating whole new fields like software development, IT, and data analytics. In each case, a powerful new technology spread through the economy and *reduced the human labor needed* for certain tasks, while enabling higher output and redirecting labor into other, often higher-skill activities. As one analysis puts it, "automation has contributed to significant shifts in employment throughout the 20th century," but historically, new jobs have eventually appeared in other areas to absorb the displaced workers[22][23]. During the 1850–2015 period, even as farming and manufacturing jobs vanished, total employment kept rising and standards of living vastly improved – suggesting that productivity-enhancing technologies ultimately **"free" workers to do new, more valuable work elsewhere[23]**.

Today, the economy is in the midst of another GPT-driven transformation – this time due to advances in **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** and related digital technologies. **Automation is now expanding beyond manufacturing into services and knowledge work**. Recent years have seen *rapid progress in AI algorithms* (such as machine learning and **generative AI**) that can perform tasks once seen as exclusive to human cognition – for example, understanding language, generating writing and software code, recognizing patterns in images and data, and even making basic decisions. Combined with improvements in robotics, this means that automation is encroaching on activities that involve not just routine manual labor but also routine cognitive labor. As a 2017 study noted, until recently

automation was largely confined to "predictable, routine tasks" (like assembly line work or simple data processing), but *today's AI can handle some non-routine tasks and judgment calls* that formerly required a person[24]. For instance, AI systems are now writing reports, answering customer service queries via chatbots, assisting with medical image analysis, and automating administrative functions. In the words of the National Council on Compensation Insurance, *"technical advances in computing power, artificial intelligence, and robotics have created the potential for automation to penetrate deeply into occupations beyond manufacturing"*[25]. We are essentially seeing the emergence of **AI as a new General Purpose Technology** – one that could dramatically increase productivity in white-collar and service industries, but by the same token reduce the number of humans required to do certain skilled jobs. The next section examines the evidence that this **GPT-powered erosion of knowledge work** is already underway.

The Erosion of Knowledge Work in the Age of Advanced AI

Digital technologies and AI are now performing tasks that not long ago were the domain of educated human workers – a development that is *shifting the labor landscape for "knowledge work."* Just as mechanization reduced the need for agricultural labor and robots displaced some factory workers, **advanced AI is beginning to** offset the need for human cognitive labor **in fields like writing, translation, data analysis, customer support, programming, and more. Recent research attempts to quantify the potential scope of this impact. In a 2023 study titled *"GPTs are GPTs: An Early Look at the Labor Market Impact of Large Language Models,"* researchers from OpenAI and the University of Pennsylvania found that** approximately 80% of the U.S. workforce could have at least 10% of their work tasks affected by GPT-type AI**, and around** 19% of workers may see at least 50% of their tasks impacted **by AI automation[26]. In other words, the majority of jobs include subtasks that AI (specifically,** generative pre-trained transformer **models like GPT-4) can do faster or cheaper, and a sizable minority of jobs could have** half or more of their duties handled by AI **with current capabilities[26]. Notably, this analysis found that the exposure to AI was *not confined to low-wage or routine jobs* – it "spans all wage levels," with** higher-income knowledge jobs showing *greater* exposure **on average (because they often involve lots of text processing, coding, or information synthesis that AI can mimic)[27][28]. Occupations that rely heavily on** writing and programming skills are especially susceptible **to being influenced or partly automated by language models, whereas jobs requiring** scientific reasoning or critical thinking *(or hands-on work) tend to be less directly affected (for now)[29]. The researchers conclude that generative AI exhibits the hallmarks of a general-purpose technology* – much like the steam engine or electricity – with broad economic implications as it becomes integrated into workflows[30].

Evidence of this **AI-driven erosion of knowledge work** is already emerging in the real world. Companies in various sectors are leveraging AI tools to boost productivity and, in some cases, to **replace portions of their human workforce**. A striking example came in 2023 when IBM's CEO announced a hiring freeze for certain support roles and stated that about **30% of IBM's back-office roles (roughly 7,800 jobs) could be replaced by AI**

within 5 years[31]. These roles include routine administrative and human-resources positions that involve processing paperwork – tasks increasingly handled by AI software. In another case, the online education company **Chegg** – which provides homework help and tutoring – reported that the popularity of OpenAI's ChatGPT was hurting its business, as students began using free AI tools instead of Chegg's paid services. In May 2025, Chegg announced it would *lay off 22% of its workforce* (cutting 248 jobs) because **students are "increasingly turn[ing] to AI-powered tools such as ChatGPT"** in lieu of Chegg's platform[32]. The company had seen a 31% drop in subscribers in the first quarter of 2025, and its CEO directly attributed the decline to competition from AI offerings[33]. This is a vivid demonstration of AI offsetting cognitive work – in this case, the work of answering student questions and providing study help, which AI can now do instantaneously.

Numerous other anecdotes reinforce this trend. **Startups** have begun using advanced GPT-4-based systems to handle coding and content generation tasks, allowing them to *"reduce how much they spend on human developers,"* as one report noted[34]. **Large tech firms** like Google and Microsoft are integrating AI copilots into office software (for writing emails, generating reports, creating spreadsheets, etc.), which will automate many routine chores for professionals[35]. Law firms are experimenting with AI for document review and contract analysis; marketing departments use AI to draft copy; even journalism and financial research outfits use AI to produce first drafts of reports. In customer service, AI chatbots have taken over a significant portion of online query handling. All of these examples show *human knowledge workers ceding tasks to AI assistants*. While AI often works *alongside* humans (augmented intelligence) rather than outright replacing them, the net effect is that **fewer human work-hours are needed** for a given output. A study by Accenture, for instance, estimated that new AI tools could cut the time needed for certain administrative tasks by 40%, effectively **reducing headcount needs while maintaining or increasing output** (mirroring the classic productivity pattern of GPTs)[1].

It is still early to measure the full impact of AI on employment, but the **signs of "knowledge work" erosion are clear**. Occupational data shows a slowdown or decline in job postings for roles heavily exposed to automation (for example, some entry-level programming and office support roles). Surveys indicate many companies plan to slow hiring in roles that AI can handle. IBM's CEO, as noted, expects thousands of jobs to be eliminated through attrition as AI takes over routine tasks[31]. In finance, analysts predict that AI could reduce the need for junior analysts and accountants. Even creative fields are not immune: AI image generation and copywriting tools threaten to reduce demand for graphic designers and copywriters for simpler projects. Of course, **AI will also create new jobs** (in areas like AI system training, supervision, maintenance, and in entirely new product categories), just as past GPTs did. However, the key point is that **advanced AI is acting as a general-purpose technology that raises output per worker and thereby enables the same work to be done with fewer people** – exactly the pattern seen with past automation in farming and industry[20]. As a result, we are likely to see **headcount reductions or slower job growth in many knowledge-intensive occupations**, even as total economic output and productivity continue to climb. This ongoing shift forces us to ask: if machines are handling more of the cognitive heavy lifting, where will human

employment expand next? Historical precedent (and emerging data) suggest the answer lies in *areas where human qualities – empathy, creativity, interpersonal skills, and the provision of meaningful experiences – are paramount*. In other words, the center of gravity of the economy may be moving toward a new **"experience and meaning" paradigm**.

The Fourth Paradigm: Experience, Meaning, Authenticity, and Human "Touch"

As automation commoditizes the production of goods and the processing of information, *human* labor is increasingly concentrating in services that revolve around **experience, personal interaction, creativity, and meaning**. We can think of this as the **fourth economic paradigm** – following the eras of extraction, fabrication, and traditional services – an era in which economic value is often derived from providing authentic **human experiences** and catering to deeper human needs for connection, purpose, and "soul." Pine and Gilmore, who first coined the term **"Experience Economy,"** argued that experiences constitute a distinct stage of economic offering "as different from services as services are from goods"[36]. In the experience economy, businesses stage *memorable events* or provide personalized services that engage customers on an emotional, intellectual or even spiritual level[37]. Examples include everything from entertainment and travel experiences to hands-on personal services like coaching, therapy, fine dining, live performances, artisan craftsmanship, and bespoke customer interactions. What unites these activities is that their value comes from **authentic human presence and the creation of meaning or enjoyment**, rather than from manufacturing a physical product or performing a routine transaction. In short, this paradigm is about the economics of things that **people do for and with each other, in person** – often involving intangible qualities like empathy, creativity, storytelling, and care.

Crucially, jobs in this "experience/meaning" sector are **growing rapidly** and accounting for an ever-larger share of employment – a trend supported by data from the past few decades. As routine manufacturing and clerical jobs declined, the jobs that expanded were disproportionately those with a high **social or emotional component**. Economist David Deming finds that **nearly all net job growth in the United States since 1980 has been in occupations that are relatively *social-skill-intensive***[38]. Roles that require interpersonal communication, teamwork, and adaptability – such as managers, teachers, health workers, sales representatives, and caregivers – have grown, whereas occupations high in analytical/math skills but low in social interaction (e.g. repetitive technical jobs) have not fared as well[38]. Between 1980 and 2012, jobs requiring high levels of social interaction **increased their employment share by about 12 percentage points** (a huge shift in labor composition)[39]. In contrast, many jobs that were routine or purely analytical saw stagnant or declining shares. The reason, Deming explains, is that **computers (and now AI) are still very poor at replicating human interaction and teamwork**[40]. Social skills and the ability to respond to nuanced human contexts have become a key comparative advantage for human workers – "the heart of the human advantage over machines," as Deming puts it[40]. Jobs that leverage this advantage – essentially, jobs that

require a human touch – have proven much more resilient and in-demand in the modern economy.

Concrete employment statistics illustrate the rise of what we might term the **"High-Touch" economy**. **Healthcare** is a prime example. Healthcare jobs (doctors, nurses, technicians, therapists, home health aides, etc.) have been growing faster than almost any other category due to aging populations and rising health spending. In the U.S., **healthcare and social assistance** employed about 4 million people in 1950; today it employs over 20 million (roughly 14% of all U.S. nonfarm jobs)[41]. By the end of 2017, healthcare had become **the single largest sector by employment**, overtaking both manufacturing and retail[13]. This healthcare jobs boom is expected to continue: the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that **home health and personal care aides** will be *the single fastest-growing occupation* of the 2020s (projected +21–33% growth, adding well over a million jobs)[42][43]. In fact, according to the World Economic Forum, **9 of the 20 fastest-growing professions in the United States are in healthcare** fields, underscoring the outsized growth of this high-touch, human-centric sector[44].

Other fields tied to providing experiences and personal services are also expanding. **Hospitality and leisure** (which includes restaurants, hotels, tourism, and the arts/entertainment) added around 4 million jobs in the US from 2000 to 2022[12], reflecting people's growing spending on travel, dining out, recreation and cultural experiences. **Education** and training jobs remain robust – for example, postsecondary education employment has grown with the massification of higher education (though recently the sector faces challenges). **Personal services** – everything from fitness instructors and nutritionists to cosmetologists, counselors, and event planners – have been rising as well. Even within tech-heavy industries, the roles that involve understanding client needs and crafting a tailored experience (e.g. customer success managers, UX designers, creative directors) are valued and growing. The common thread is that these jobs revolve around *human-to-human interaction* and often deliver some form of **authentic experience or meaningful engagement** that machines cannot fully replicate.

Another way to see this shift is in consumer behavior: As societies become wealthier, a smaller fraction of budgets is needed for basic goods, and people tend to spend more on **services, entertainment, and experiences**. Millennials famously prioritize experiences over ownership – **78% of millennials say they would rather spend money on a desirable experience or event than on buying something material**, according to surveys[45]. This generational preference has fueled industries like travel, festivals, dining, and fitness. Even among older demographics, there is increased spending on leisure, self-improvement, and personal services (the so-called "grey dollar" going to cruises, hobbies, lifelong learning, etc.)[46]. All of this consumer demand translates into jobs. For instance, the boom in demand for craft beers, farm-to-table dining, yoga classes, and vacation rentals creates employment for brewers, chefs, instructors, and hosts – jobs that emphasize craftsmanship and personal touch. In the aggregate, economists note that we are seeing a reallocation of labor into work that *provides care, comfort, creativity, or interactive experiences*. A simple indicator: in 2021, **40% of all new jobs created in the U.S. were in**

occupations classified as "care roles" (healthcare, education, childcare, etc.), showing how heavily job growth is tilting toward the human care/experience domain[47].

We can characterize the **"fourth paradigm"** as an economy of **Meaning and Experience**. Its outputs are often *intangible*: wellbeing, knowledge, aesthetic pleasure, personal transformation, social connection. Its workers are often those deploying quintessentially human qualities – **empathy, creativity, story-telling, manual skill paired with personal presence (think artisan or performer), emotional intelligence** – to create value. Crucially, these are precisely the areas **least susceptible to automation**. A robot or algorithm can assemble a gadget or analyze a spreadsheet far more efficiently than a person, but it cannot (as yet) replace a teacher's inspiration, a nurse's bedside manner, a comedian's charisma, or a caregiver's understanding and love. Jobs in the meaning economy often require **"the human touch"** – and that is becoming their chief economic value. As routine work is automated away, what remains (and grows) is work that demands **being human** in the deepest sense. Data confirms that these kinds of jobs are not only relatively safe from automation – they are flourishing, becoming the largest source of employment growth in advanced economies[38][13].

Baumol's Cost Disease: Why Meaningful Human Services Prosper in an Automated Age

Why, exactly, are jobs centered on **meaning, authenticity, and personal experience** growing so much faster than others? A powerful explanation lies in **Baumol's Cost Disease**, an economic theory first articulated by William Baumol in the 1960s. Baumol observed a curious phenomenon in sectors with **low productivity growth** (like performing arts, education, healthcare, etc.): over time, these sectors tend to become *relatively more expensive* and claim a larger share of resources, even though their productivity lags behind other parts of the economy[48][49]. The classic example was the string quartet: in 1820 or 2020, it still takes four musicians roughly 30 minutes to perform a Beethoven quartet – the productivity (output per hour) is essentially unchanged. Meanwhile, in other sectors (say, manufacturing), productivity might have increased tenfold. However, the *wages* of musicians in 2020 must be far higher than those in 1820, because if orchestras paid 19th-century rates, they would lose their musicians to other industries that do pay contemporary wages[50]. Thus, even without productivity gains, performing arts organizations have to pay higher wages over time, driving up the cost of a concert ticket. In general, Baumol noted, **when the overall economy's productivity rises, wages tend to rise broadly (since workers can be more productive elsewhere), and labor-intensive sectors that *cannot* easily boost productivity will experience rising costs**[51]. They must either pass those costs on as higher prices or require subsidies, and their share of GDP tends to increase because they don't enjoy the same efficiency improvements as other sectors[49][52].

Baumol's insight has deep resonance for today's economy. Many of the jobs in the **"experience/meaning" paradigm** – teachers, nurses, artists, caregivers, counselors – are in exactly those sectors that *require direct human input and haven't seen big productivity*

jumps. You cannot easily double the number of patients a nurse cares for per hour without compromising quality, nor can a teacher educate twice as many children at once with the same effectiveness. These kinds of services are often **custom, face-to-face, and time-intensive**. As a result, their productivity growth is intrinsically slower than, say, an automated factory or a software firm. According to Baumol's cost disease theory, we should expect the **costs/prices in these human-touch sectors to rise faster than inflation**, and their share of economic expenditure to rise over time[52][53]. Indeed, this is exactly what we observe: over the past several decades, the price of labor-intensive services like healthcare and education has **skyrocketed**, while the price of manufactured goods (TVs, clothing, appliances, etc.) has plummeted or at least fallen relative to average prices[52][53]. Figure 3 illustrates this divergence in the U.S.: since 1980, costs for college tuition and medical care have ballooned, whereas goods like furniture, toys, and electronics have become cheaper and cheaper (often due to automation and globalization in manufacturing)[53][54].

Figure 3: The effects of Baumol's cost disease – relative price changes in the U.S., 1980–2016. This chart (based on BLS Consumer Price Index data) shows that labor-intensive services have risen dramatically in price compared to the overall inflation rate. For example, College tuition (purple line) and Medical care (red line) are 3–5× more expensive relative to 1980, far outpacing general inflation. By contrast, mass-produced goods have become relatively cheaper: New cars (green) and household furnishings (blue) slightly declined in relative price, Clothing (orange) fell by ~50%, and Toys (pink) fell by ~70% since 1980. This pattern – services up, goods down – is exactly what Baumol's cost disease predicts, as productivity growth in services lags that in goods production[52][53].

Because sectors like healthcare, education, and personal services inherently rely on human labor that can't be exponentially scaled, **their supply is relatively inelastic** – one nurse can only care for so many patients, one chef can only cook so many farm-to-table meals in an evening. Yet, as societies grow richer and more efficient at churning out goods, **demand for these human-centric services tends to increase**. People want better healthcare, smaller class sizes for their kids, more live entertainment and dining experiences, more wellness and leisure services. With limited ability to increase productivity (supply) in those sectors, the increased demand primarily leads to **higher employment and higher wages/costs in those fields**. Baumol himself noted that advanced economies will devote *more and more of their workforce* to low-productivity-growth services as time goes on, "dragging down the economy-wide rate of productivity growth" but meeting important societal needs[55][56]. This isn't necessarily a sign of economic dysfunction – it can be a **sign of success**. Baumol pointed out that it is *inevitable* in a technologically advancing economy that things like education, healthcare, elder care, the arts, etc., will absorb a greater share of jobs and spending, *"simply because we can afford it."*[57][58] In economists' terms, these services tend to have high **income elasticity of demand** (we spend more on them as we get richer) and low productivity growth, so their share grows. Or more bluntly, as Baumol's theory implies, *"the rising cost of services is an unavoidable side effect of rising affluence"*[59].

In the context of the **fourth paradigm of meaning and experience**, Baumol's cost disease suggests that as automation makes goods and basic services cheaper, **human-focused sectors will become the primary economic frontier** despite their higher costs. We are likely to see continuous growth in jobs that deliver care, personal development, entertainment, and handcrafted or bespoke products – even though these jobs often have lower measured productivity growth. The economy overall can afford this because of efficiency gains elsewhere. Importantly, **automation cannot easily replicate "meaning" or "authenticity"**, so these remain scarce, high-value commodities. People are willing to pay a premium for a live concert over a recorded one, for a handcrafted item over a machine-made one, for a therapy session with a real person, or for a vacation experience curated by humans. There is evidence that **demand for such authenticity is growing faster than supply**, especially among higher-income consumers who have satisfied their material needs[60]. For instance, the wealthy are buying more boutique experiences (fine dining, adventure travel, art, personalized wellness) "more quickly than anyone can expand the supply," which in turn drives up the prices and wages in those fields[60]. This dynamic was observed in the pre-Covid "experience boom" where concert ticket prices, exclusive restaurant prices, etc., were rising well above inflation – not because those industries suddenly got less efficient, but because people's willingness to spend on unique experiences increased while the number of top musicians or chefs is inherently limited.

All of this means that the **"experience/meaning economy" could indeed be the fourth major structural paradigm**, following agriculture, manufacturing, and traditional services. In this paradigm, *human touch and authenticity are the defining scarce resources*. We should expect continued growth in employment for jobs that supply empathy, creativity, and personal experiences – even as AI and robots proliferate elsewhere. Baumol's cost disease assures that these jobs will *not* be outcompeted by automation on cost, because by definition they cannot easily automate – and society will allocate more money to them as other things get cheaper. It also implies some challenges: these sectors can exert upward pressure on costs (healthcare and education inflation, for example) and often require public or private subsidy to ensure broad access. Yet, **from a labor perspective, they are where the jobs are** and will be. As economist Timothy B. Lee noted in discussing Baumol, the rise of spending on health, education, and other services is "not a sign something is wrong…those human workers deserve to be paid well" and we *choose* to devote more labor to those services as we become wealthier[61][62]. In essence, **a greater share of our collective effort goes into producing quality of life, rather than just material quantity**.

Conclusion

Over the sweep of economic history, we see a clear sequence of paradigm shifts: from a world where most people **extracted** value directly from nature (tilling fields, mining ores), to a world where human ingenuity **fabricated** vast quantities of industrial goods, to the late-20th-century world where **services** reigned supreme. Now, in the early 21st century, evidence suggests we are entering a new phase – one where the core economic activities for humans center on providing **experiences, meaning, and human connection**. Each

earlier transition was enabled by breakthrough technologies (General Purpose Technologies) that boosted productivity and automated previously labor-intensive tasks. Mechanization and the steam engine freed us from agricultural drudgery; electricity and mass production revolutionized manufacturing; computers automated countless routine office and service tasks. Each time, employment shifted into new areas rather than disappearing: when machines took over muscle work, humans moved into brain work; now that machines are starting to handle some brain work, humans are focusing more on *heart work* – jobs of caregiving, creating, empathizing, and interacting.

Advanced **AI** is the latest transformative technology, and as we've discussed, it indeed appears to be a true GPT – *generally applicable, powerful, and capable of raising productivity across many sectors*. Its deployment is already **reducing the need for human labor in knowledge-intensive domains** (from coding to customer service), even as it spurs growth and new efficiencies. This will no doubt lead to turbulence in labor markets – some roles will shrink or vanish, new ones will emerge. But the overall arc aligns with the long-run pattern: **output will increase, and human labor will be reallocated to tasks that are harder to automate**. The sectors that are **resilient** to AI and automation are precisely those that demand human ingenuity in non-routine ways – managing complex social relationships, innovating creatively, and providing genuine warmth and care. These also happen to be the sectors experiencing robust growth.

We presented data showing that **jobs emphasizing human interaction and personal experience are on the rise** (in many cases, sharply outpacing overall job growth). This is not a coincidental trend but a structural one. The growth of healthcare, education, leisure and hospitality, personal services, and creative industries speaks to an economy evolving to meet human desires that **can't be met by algorithms or machines** – at least not without losing the very qualities that make them valuable. A classroom led by an inspiring teacher, a healing touch from a skilled nurse, a beautiful piece of art, a well-crafted narrative, a thrilling live sport or concert, a thoughtful counselor helping one navigate life – these are **experiences rich with "meaning" and "soul"** that remain distinctly human to produce.

Furthermore, using **Baumol's cost disease** as a lens, we understand that as technology makes everything else more efficient, it's natural (and perhaps inevitable) that **more of our economy pivots to these high-meaning, hard-to-automate activities**. Their relative costs may rise, but so will their relative importance. In a sense, Baumol's theory assures us that *the future of work for humans will be in the realms that demand humanity*. We will pay relatively more for personal services and experiences – and we will employ more people in those fields – because productivity gains elsewhere let us afford to do so and because we *value* those human services strongly. The data on rising costs in health and education, and on rising employment in care and creative professions, is fully consistent with this. It suggests that the **fourth paradigm** is not just a hypothetical idea but an observable reality taking shape: an economy where **emotional labor, creativity, and human-centric services are the key growth drivers**.

In conclusion, the grand trajectory from **extraction to experience** is one of ever-expanding human capability, amplified by technology, and a refining of what we as humans uniquely contribute. Each paradigm shift has involved shedding certain kinds of labor (often the most physically grinding or routine cognitive work) and embracing new ones. Now we stand at the cusp of perhaps the most profound shift, as AI automates a wide swath of "knowledge work." The coming decades may see fewer accountants, assembly-line workers, or paralegals per capita, but likely **more nurses, therapists, teachers, artists, event planners, and engineers of experiential goods**. The economy of the future – at least the high-employment, high-value parts – may be centered on **nurturing the human spirit** in ways that machines cannot. This is both a hopeful and a challenging prospect. It is hopeful in that it suggests technology will not make human work obsolete, but will rather elevate the importance of what is *irreplaceably human*. It is challenging because measuring productivity and quality in these domains is hard, and delivering meaning at scale without diluting authenticity is no simple task. Nonetheless, if history is a guide, our society will adapt. Policymakers and businesses will need to invest in education and training that foster social and creative skills, and address the cost pressures of Baumol's disease (for instance, through smart subsidies or efficiency innovations that don't compromise quality). But the fundamental direction seems set: **we extract and fabricate less, we serve and experience more**.

The paradigms of the past were about harnessing natural resources, then harnessing mechanical power, then harnessing information. The paradigm emerging now is about harnessing **humanity itself as the primary resource** – our empathy, imagination, and quest for meaning. In a world where automation abundantly provides the "stuff" we need, people will increasingly seek out the **human touch, the authentic story, the shared experience, the personal connection**. The economics are following this path. The data we've examined – from the fall of farm and factory work to the rise of social-skill jobs and soaring spending on in-person services – all point to an economy where what's scarce and valued is *the things only humans can do*. Thus, rather than rendering humans useless, the advance of automation may be elevating the economic significance of **being human**. The challenge and opportunity of the coming years will be to navigate this transition intelligently: to ensure that the growth of the meaning economy benefits as many people as possible, that workers displaced by AI can find new roles in human-centered work, and that we as a society cherish and reward the providers of meaning and experience – from the caregivers to the creators – who will form the backbone of the post-automation economy.

Sources:

1. World Economic Forum / Visual Capitalist – *"150 years of U.S. employment history by sector"* (Feb 2019). Data showing agriculture ~60% of jobs in 1850, manufacturing peaking at 26% in 1960, and agriculture+manufacturing under 13% by 2015[2][7].

2. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (1984) – Historical employment by sector table. Shows U.S. agricultural employment falling from 64% in 1850 to 3.6% by 1980s, while services grew from ~18% to ~69% by 1982[9][4].

3. McKinsey Global Institute (2017) – *"Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation."* Notes U.S. agriculture's share declined from 60% (1850) to <5% by 1970, and manufacturing from 26% (1960) to <10% by recent years[2][63].

4. National Council on Compensation Insurance (2017) – *"The Impact of Automation on Employment."* Reports U.S. farming fell from ~40% of jobs in 1900 to <2% in 2000 with mechanization[5]; manufacturing's share fell from >25% in 1950s to <10% now, with 87% of 2000s manufacturing job losses due to automation[19]. Also provides data: 1990–2016 manufacturing output +71.8% while employment –30.7%, and labor productivity +140%[20].

5. Economic Innovation Group (2024) – Employment shifts 2000–2022. Manufacturing job losses were offset by +23 million service jobs. Top growth: healthcare (+9M jobs), professional services (+6M), hospitality (+4M)[12].

6. OpenAI & U. of Pennsylvania (2023) – *"GPTs are GPTs: An early look at labor market impact of LLMs."* Found ~80% of U.S. workers have at least 10% of tasks exposed to AI, ~19% may have 50%+ exposed. Higher-wage jobs often more impacted; GPT models seen as general-purpose technology[26][28].

7. Reuters (May 2023) – IBM CEO Arvind Krishna plans to pause hiring for ~7,800 jobs that **AI could replace**, saying ~30% of back-office roles might be automated in 5 years[31].

8. Reuters (May 2025) – Chegg announces 22% layoff (248 jobs) as students turn to ChatGPT and AI tools for homework help, causing a 31% drop in subscribers. Chegg explicitly cites AI competition as reason for cuts[32][33].

9. David Deming (Harvard/NBER, 2017) – *"The Growing Importance of Social Skills in the Labor Market."* Finds all job growth since 1980 in U.S. has been in social-skill-intensive occupations; purely analytical or routine jobs fared poorly. Social skills complement cognitive skills and are hard to automate[38][40].

10. The Atlantic (Jan 2018) – *"Health Care Just Became the U.S.'s Largest Employer."* Notes health care surpassed manufacturing and retail in U.S. employment. In 2000 there were 7 million more manufacturing than health jobs; by 2017 health care was #1[13][14]. Explains health is resistant to offshoring and automation, and even during the Great Recession health employment rose every month[64][65].

11. World Economic Forum / LinkedIn data (2020s) – Shows many of the fastest-growing occupations are in healthcare and people-centric roles. E.g. home health and personal care aides expected to add 1+ million jobs, ~21–33% growth[44][43].

12. Pine & Gilmore (1999, HBR) – *"Welcome to the Experience Economy."* Introduces the concept that experiences are a distinct economic offering beyond services, as consumers increasingly desire memorable, personalized experiences[36].

13. Vox (Timothy Lee, 2017) – Explainer on *Baumol's cost disease.* Describes how sectors with stagnant productivity (arts, education, health) see rising costs and expanding employment share because wages rise economy-wide[50][49]. Provides data: prices of education and medical services have risen far faster than overall inflation, while prices of manufactured goods have fallen – exactly as cost disease predicts[52][53]. Argues that rising spending on health/education is not a failure but a logical outcome of growth (unless/until robots can dramatically raise productivity in those fields)[57][59].

14. Vox (2017) [continued] – Notes that even unsubsidized personal services (summer camps, pet care, Broadway shows) have seen rising costs due to Baumol's effect, indicating it's a broad phenomenon not just driven by public sector inefficiencies[54]. Also points out that demand (especially by the wealthy) is driving some service costs up even faster than wages – people buying experiences faster than supply can expand[60].

15. World Economic Forum / Insight Report (2019) – Millennials' consumer trends. Reports **78% of millennials prefer to spend on experiences over goods**, driving the experience economy[45]. Millennials and even older groups increasingly value access and experiences (e.g. travel, dining, events) rather than accumulating more material goods, influencing how businesses create value[66][67].

---

[1] [5] [11] [19] [20] [22] [24] [25] [63] The Impact of Automation on Employment - Part I

https://www.ncci.com/Articles/Pages/II_Insights_QEB_Impact-Automation-Employment-Q2-2017-Part1.aspx

[2] [7] [23] This is what 150 years of US employment looks like | World Economic Forum

https://www.weforum.org/stories/2019/02/visualizing-150-years-of-u-s-employment-history/

[3] [4] [6] [9] [10] The employment shift to services: where did it come from?

https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1984/04/art2full.pdf

[8] [12] eig.org

https://eig.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/TAWP-Handley.pdf

[13] [14] [64] [65] Health Care Just Became the U.S.'s Largest Employer - The Atlantic

https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2018/01/health-care-america-jobs/550079/

[15] General-purpose technology - Wikipedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General-purpose_technology

[16] Global Changes in Agricultural Production, Productivity, and Resource Use Over Six Decades | Economic Research Service

http://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2024/september/global-changes-in-agricultural-production-productivity-and-resource-use-over-six-decades

[17] The U.S. Economy in the 1920s – EH.net

https://eh.net/encyclopedia/the-u-s-economy-in-the-1920s/

[18] U.S. Manufacturing Employment: A Long-Term Perspective

https://blog.uwsp.edu/cps/2025/01/29/u-s-manufacturing-employment-a-long-term-perspective/

[21] General Purpose Technologies - ScienceDirect.com

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0169721810020022

[26] [28] [29] [30] [34] [35] OpenAI Research Says 80% of U.S. Workers' Jobs Will Be Impacted by GPT

https://www.vice.com/en/article/openai-research-says-80-of-us-workers-will-have-jobs-impacted-by-gpt/

[27] GPTs are GPTs: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models | OpenAI

https://openai.com/index/gpts-are-gpts/

[31] IBM to pause hiring in plan to replace 7,800 jobs with AI, Bloomberg reports | Reuters

https://www.reuters.com/technology/ibm-pause-hiring-plans-replace-7800-jobs-with-ai-bloomberg-news-2023-05-01/

[32] [33] Chegg to lay off 22% of workforce as AI tools shake up edtech industry | Reuters

https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/chegg-lay-off-22-workforce-ai-tools-shake-up-edtech-industry-2025-05-12/

[36] [37] [45] [46] [66] [67] The Experience Economy | EPR Insight Center

https://insightcenter.eprkc.com/experience-economy-matters-now-ever/

[38] [40] The Growing Importance of Social Skills in the Labor Market | NBER

https://www.nber.org/digest/nov15/growing-importance-social-skills-labor-market

[39] The Growing Importance of Social Skills in the Labor Market | NBER

https://www.nber.org/papers/w21473

[41] List of largest United States–based employers globally - Wikipedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_largest_United_States%E2%80%93based_employers_globally

[42] Fastest Growing Occupations - Bureau of Labor Statistics

https://www.bls.gov/ooh/fastest-growing.htm

[43] The Healthcare Job Outlook 2020-2030 | Goodwin University

https://www.goodwin.edu/enews/healthcare-job-outlook/

[44] 20 Fastest Growing Jobs in The United States | World Economic Forum

https://www.weforum.org/stories/2021/09/fastest-growing-jobs-employment-skills/

[47] 40% of New Jobs Through 2030 Will Be in Care Roles

https://blog.theinterviewguys.com/guide-to-breaking-into-the-290-billion-care-economy/

[48] [49] [50] [51] [52] [53] [54] [55] [56] [57] [58] [59] [60] [61] [62] William Baumol, whose famous economic theory explains the modern world, has died | Vox

https://www.vox.com/new-money/2017/5/4/15547364/baumol-cost-disease-explained