1

From Automation to Augmentation: Generative AI, Cognitive Labour, and the Reconfiguration of Economic Inequality

Prof.(Dr)Jaimol James
Professor
Department of Economics
St Dominic's College, Kanjirapally
jaimoljames@sdck.in

Abstract

Over the past few years, the development of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly machine learning and deep learning, has revolutionised human-computer interaction, allowing users to interact with machines as though they were human. Generative AI consists of systems, such as natural language models and auto-generative image generators, that generate new content in response to user cues. Compared to repetitive manual labour, cognitive labour includes activities that require one to observe, make sense of, and judge based on various sources of information. Along with summarising, drafting, and proposing sequences, present-day generative models can generate coherent, human-like text and images and aid in their creation. The other category is synthesising information in several documents and inputs, verbal and nonverbal. Gen models boast of a swollen ability to facilitate these undertakings, using both internal and external information. These activities play an important role in the overall work of the economy, and much of this work supplements that of the generative systems, suggesting that such models can increase cognitive work when other types of work remain constant. The growing popularity of generative AI is an indicator of a new technology-driven cycle of productivity growth. This loop has increased the demand for skills associated with cognitive labour, such as handling textual and multimodal materials, which require higher education and specialisation in occupations. The innovation waves that initially influenced sectors such as heavy industry and transport before spreading through the economy characterised past productivity growth cycles dating back to the late nineteenth century and extending into the 1990s. The present generation of generative AI is comparable to past productive stages and will depend on the historical association of such technologies with cognitive labour. The late-nineteenth-century adoption of electric power, for example, has dramatically changed the dynamics of work, making it less manual and more *clerical, a trend that has only progressed with the emergence of personal computing and the greater role of cognitive labour in society today.*

Keywords: *Generative AI, cognitive labour, economic inequality, skill-biased technological change, automation and augmentation, labour markets, sectoral impacts, policy and governance.*

1. Introduction

The generation of artificial intelligence (GenAI) has played a role in supplementing, rather than replacing, the cognitive ability and labour required to understand, structure, and communicate information, despite the many waves of technology and speculation about the potential mass replacement of human labour. These abilities continue to be the sources of economic value creation, wealth generation, and business competition among individuals and businesses, as well as between communities. Increased access to generative AI expands economic opportunities, including skill demand, productivity, wages, and hours worked, particularly among professionals who already benefit from globalisation, the knowledge economy, and the internet (Capraro et al., 2024).

Cognitive labour involves skills that require timely and efficient performance, which are only possible through training, education, and experience. Cognitive labour may be contrasted with repetitive robotic labour that performs mediating rather than comprehending tasks in simple production processes, numerical sequences, or algorithms that require manual operations. In developed economies, certain economically valuable activities are not automated; the corresponding inputs are heterogeneous, and technology adoption is not uniform, leading to inequality and unequal productivity growth.

2. The New Generative AI and Cognitive Labour.

The recent emergence of generative artificial intelligence is a turning point in the history of cognition-enhancing technology, whose possible impact on work and inequality may be enormous. Generative artificial intelligence systems like DALL-E, ChatGPT, and Midjourney can generate high-quality, diverse images from basic prompts, thereby automating a wide range of tasks across the economy. Generative AI satisfies some of the characteristics typically associated with cognitive labour: it can produce knowledge outputs, leverages specialised and domain-specific skills, and assists rather than merely replacing human labour. In that regard, the rise of generative AI can shed light on how the financial impact of automation continues to evolve.

The hybrid of generative AI and cognitive labour is situated within the extended history of technological transformations of work. Technological revolutions tend to interact with the labour market; new machines and tools are created that initially displace jobs created prior to the invention, and ultimately enter high-skill, high-wage occupations as demand and supply increase. Technologies in past revolutions tended to automate physical jobs and then augment cognitive jobs. The present generation also seems to be entirely bypassing the former stage, and to be concentrating on high-skill, high-wage labour, and on supplementing, rather than replacing, human labour. (Capraro et al., 2024)

2.1. Generative AI and Cognitive Labour Definitions.

Generative AI is the type of system that is capable of producing text, images, sound, and other media with only a few simple prompts. These models do not always produce accurate and appropriate content, but can scale to match content created by humans. There are several varieties of generative AI, including those based on foundation models (large-scale systems that have been pretrained on general data, which are then finetuned to particular tasks), diffusion models (systems that are trained to generate content based on corrupted examples), or other architectures (some of which can not generate content of high quality and like a human person). ChatGPT, DALL-E, and audio sample generators are considered the most popular systems in the modern world. Significant Interfaces are chatbots, internet search engines, in-process software development tools and various generative editors. The most prevalent advantage of this technology is task augmentation, which helps people complete existing tasks more quickly or with higher quality (Capraro et al., 2024). Generative AI is primarily used to enhance cognitive work, including writing, programming, image editing, content generation, and thinking, thereby improving productivity and reducing the economic gains from education and training.

Cognitive labour includes activities and tasks in the processing of knowledge. Cognitive labour is not limited to any specific economic activity, as opposed to a narrow definition of knowledge work as the creation of information goods (Davenport, 2005); however, all economic activities in which a handling of knowledge is an important component of the material created qualify as cognitively based labour. This knowledge can be of all sorts: information (what is available), impression (what is sensed), idea (what is conceived), belief (what certain facts are taken to be) and judgment (what is considered right or wrong). Cognitive labour generates and converts knowledge into more advanced and practical forms through six categories of manipulative operations: recording, structuring, evaluating, determining, transforming, and formatting. Cognitive labour is the opposite of the so-called routine labour, which is based on predetermined patterns of action that necessitate following a very limited number of knowledge principles (Woodruff et al., 2023).

Table 1: Cognitive vs routine labour

Dimension	Cognitive labour	Routine/robotic labour
Nature of tasks	Knowledge processing, judgment, problem-solving	Predetermined, repetitive, rule-based
Key operations	Recording, structuring, evaluating, determining, transforming, formatting	Fixed sequences, simple manual or algorithmic steps
Skill requirement	Higher education, training, and experience	Low to medium, easily trainable
Automation risk	Mostly augmentation	High substitution risk

2.2. The history of automation and skill requirements.

Automation is a process of technical cycles, existing since the beginning of the industrial revolution, which reappears in patterns of dispersion of within-productiveness and in the redistribution of tasks. The acceleration effect of these cycles and the resultant changes in skill demand, i.e., linking repetitive to generic skill deficits, indicate the shortcomings of historical analogies. The comparative stability of both formal education attainment and degree-specialised higher education, and the rest of the demand for glass-ceilinged capabilities, even with the introduction of generative technology, also points to significant differences from past eras. At the same time, the continuous re-skilling of specialised and generic skills across the education, job, and task domains underscores the importance of a complex approach to technology (Das et al., 2020). The ability of such generative models is unique among previous automation technologies, which, rather than replacing completion jobs, enhance human capabilities by enabling them to perform more tasks. Examples of how generative models can produce more advanced outputs include automating and augmenting the invention process. Any extra effort regarding either the substance or the structure of the product yields a larger output with more comprehensive specifications. In addition, these actions are usually governed by expertise and performed by professionals trained to do so. Therefore, generative models enable engagement in a greater number of tasks, although the complexity and the need for substantial training to make significant contributions are prohibitive (R. Frank et al., 2019).

3. Mediating Processes between Generative AI and Economic Inequality.

Although generative AI can contribute to improving a wide variety of tasks in cognitive labour, existing disparities in education, occupation, geography, and sector can determine which employees can benefit from increased productivity. Several theoretical mechanisms suggest that, despite being part of an augmentation framework, generative AI may even exacerbate economic inequality rather than reduce it.

The former is based on the skill-biased technological change literature and assumes that generative AI mainly redistributes demand toward more specific skills and credentialed workers. Although AI capability and educational level are correlated, the use of generative systems is expanding people's ability to automate complex jobs that were once believed to require an advanced degree. Therefore, occupations that require college degrees would be transferred to less-educated employees. This kind of task reallocation from more- to less-credentialed jobs may result in wage decreases and fewer employment opportunities, particularly for Bachelor's and Associate degree holders, if such jobs are moved to lower-skill entrants and the number of credentialed workers increases. The demands in the occupations affected by generative models may thus be displaced by models that follow the common industry skills trend.

The second mechanism takes into account the complementarity-substitution difference between worker activity and shows that generative models are complementary, not substitutive, models of professional activity. Much of the earlier automation literature focuses on activities that can be substituted, but scholars are beginning to recognise that automation is also augmenting many activities. Generative models, such as ChatGPT, can generate new content for a blog post, a term chapter, or a research article, but they are not as helpful as they may seem and are often outdated. For white-collar employees, AI may assist with numerous tasks, such as drafting, editing, summarising, and analysing, while removing others, increasing overall productivity and the possibility of tasks involving less-dominant ones.

Table 2: Generative AI mechanisms and inequality

Mechanism	Short description	Possible effect on inequality
Skill-biased technological change.	Demand shifts towards specialised, credentialed skills	Wage gaps, credential premium, mid-skill squeeze
Task reallocation	Complex tasks shift from highly educated workers to lower-educated workers using AI tools.	Deskilling, wage compression for graduates
Complementarity vs substitution	Some tasks augmented, some replaced	Gains concentrated where augmentation dominates
Geographic/sectoral dispersion	Adoption is higher in digital, high-productivity regions and sectors	Regional and sectoral inequality in productivity and income

The third mechanism emphasises the geographic and sectoral dissemination of the exposure to generative AI. Precursor generative systems were incorporated into data-heavy industries such as advertising, media, technology, and software, which are highly productive. Generative modelling has been applied to the digital industries through rich text-based content, to industries where digital information already exists, and to technical areas such as engineering science, computer-aided design, and circuit design. Beyond these areas, there are fewer generative applications, and productivity is likely to stagnate. Industries in which generative models have an effect are a declining share of the overall labour supply, and productivity gains accumulate in higher-value-added, knowledge-intensive economic relations.

3.1. Technological change and redistribution of tasks based on skills.

Technological advancements in the past 30 years have been associated with increasing economic, social, and spatial inequality in most nations. Several studies indicate that skills influence job tasks. Employees are continually updating their skills to retain their value in the labour market. New technologies also create new professional roles. Studies by Das et al. (2020) and R. Frank et al. (2019) revealed certain trends in economic inequality due to Artificial Intelligence. Time lags. In the illustration of trends, focus on the long-run evolution of the division of labour and the skills demanded by hundreds of occupations across countries over hundreds of years. In the near future, AI is likely to disrupt the inner workings of labour markets significantly. The most probable situation is an augmentation regime, in which mid-skill employees can be hired to handle large portions of knowledge work.

Skill-biased technological change foresaw the growth in the demand for skilled labour as a result of the emergence of new technology. It leads to wage variations, occupational mobility, and the shifting of highly skilled labour to other sectors. In knowledge-intensive economies, employees who are usually advanced-degree holders (PhD, M.D., MBA, etc.) earn high wages. The Bologna process restructured undergraduate and master's degree training in most parts of the world. AI-enhanced generative techniques have been documented to increase outputs across various industries. The economic analysis of AI-enhanced cognitive tasks demonstrates that it follows the skill-based technological change trends predicted in the literature.

3.2. Complementarity and substitution in the workplace.

Generative AI is becoming a significant concern in the professional economy and in the types of work being done. Similar to any technology, it has augmenting impacts on the productivity of human workers and substituting impacts where human labour is no longer required. Generally, labour demand for augmented tasks is likely to rise, whereas the demand for replaced tasks is likely to fall. A close examination of works typically reinforced by generative models paints a clearer picture of gains and losses than earlier research on the effects of automation. It appears that, in most professional industries, white-collar job tasks are simply less replaceable than other job opportunities, which means that the demand for these tasks is also increasing, as are the generative tools themselves. However, there are also reports of job and wage losses in certain regions, with extensive coverage of workers' experiences across eight distinct occupations within three large market segments (Hemmer et al., 2024).

3.3. Geographic and industry differences.

The economic impact of generative AI systems exhibits extreme geographic and sectoral dispersion (R. Frank et al., 2019). Some areas and sectors seem to be benefiting greatly from augmented cognitive labour, while others face only slight impacts, economic losses, or emigration. Regions that have not experienced high exposure to generative AI can even experience lost productivity or transition to non-cognitive production. Such differentials may be associated with the talent pools, infrastructure, cost of living and policy environments (Capraro et al., 2024).

4. Qualitative data and Methodological issues.

The chapter adopts a qualitative, conceptual design that synthesises available empirical research and theoretical input on generative AI, cognitive labour, and economic inequality. The analysis does not involve the use of primary data; instead, it draws on recent literature to discuss how AI is transforming occupational work, skill requirements, and labour market distributional performance.

The issue of AI and its implications on the economy has come into the limelight again with the advent of artificial intelligence (AI) tools, including ChatGPT. One of the most debated topics is whether generative AI will completely replace or augment the jobs of highly educated professionals in knowledge-based professions, and how this will ultimately affect socioeconomic inequality. The key hypothesis on which this discussion will proceed is that generative AI tools are used more or less as labour-enhancing technology, offering possibilities that were previously not present in digital systems and that can help increase the productivity and incomes of workers preoccupied with complex cognitive tasks.

Viewed through the prism of the information-technology (IT) and productivity cycle, generative AI is in an initial stage of augmentation, characteristic of secular economic growth, growing specialisation, and rising educational levels. Based on the evidence reviewed, generative-AI-amenable activities seem to be prevalent in cognitive-labour occupations. Traditional digital aids, such as typing interfaces and search engines, have always been used to supplement office work. In contrast, generative systems are unique in that they can generate entire drafts, outlines, or analytical work that fulfils augmentation tasks formerly impossible. There are also case studies on individual cognitive-labour jobs that indicate that, regardless of these developments, the essence of most professional jobs is being augmented rather than fully automated (Capraro et al., 2024).

4.1. Labour market results: Wages, Employment, and Hours.

The current level of extreme economic inequality has an all-too-familiar prehistory dating back to the invention of productivity-enhancing general-purpose information and communications technology. The advent of modern technologies and organisations based on the mass-production model was directly related to increasing inequality in both Europe and the United States in the first and second Industrial Revolutions. However, even allocation of wealth and income continued to be very generous in most of the developed economies during the major part of the previous century, and the policies by which wealth and income distribution would be diminished were actually broadly supported not only by the general population but also by a significant number of the policy-making elites. Based on the historical trends presented above, even the most vetted connections and causal claims between technological progress and inequality that emerged from extensive study of preceding episodes, including many peer-reviewed scientific reports that provide rich explanatory descriptions, can still be useful for understanding how generative AI will impact modern democracies.

It has three patterns of economic behaviour in the post-major and general-purpose technological revolution. To begin with, there is considerable dispersion between firms and between sectors, with high within-firm and between-sector advantages that normally occur in the immediate aftermath of the introduction of new technologies into the economy and disappear after very long durations; they disappear altogether. Second, there appears to be a period of exceptionally low economic inequality in developed economies at the point of an overall acceleration in the productivity of generative AI, which is also consistent with previous historical mechanisms (M. Fossen et al., 2022). Third, a considerable decline in the high level of centralisation of research activity, and a significant re-shuffling of key competencies that span multiple skilled positions and are sometimes multi-skilled, also seem to define the current economy and stage. All these historically situated behavioural dimensions can now be traced to specific bottom theories (N. Kausik, 2022).

4.2. Dispersion, productivity and firm performance.

The advent of generative AI has led people to focus on the productivity gains of these large, powerful models. Initial evidence indicates that firms' productivity grows with increased exposure to generative AI. The closest, and most precise, measurement of productivity, output per worker, increases sharply, as does a more expansive measure of efficiency that includes output and capital. Generative AI thus seems to have novel effects on aggregate output. However, the effects of the economy on a global scale may be obscure: firm-level data are widely available, but the effects of exposure vary substantially by productivity and efficiency (Bughin, 2023).

One major emphasis of the literature on technological change and the changing economic inequality is how far alterations in a production process can replay the distribution of underlying productivity/output differentials. Generative AI can cause shifts in demand across tasks within a firm, significantly alter the labour-capital balance within any given task, and potentially even create entirely new types of work not previously at the production possibilities frontier. The firm-level environments allow more precise identification of these reallocation processes and, in the context of assessing the task structure, answer the broader question of how the norms and regulatory frameworks governing labour markets may need to change in the presence of Generative AI.

Empirical evidence before the introduction of generative AI suggested at least two ways in which the implementation of a new, firm-wide technology may result in dispersion of cross-firm productivity. The adoption of technology was observed to influence the firm's task structure (i.e., the distribution of time across various types of activities with different skill levels) and, more importantly, to significantly affect the distribution of productivity growth across tasks within the firm. Already, increased exposure to generative AI is associated with fewer layers of management and a more strategic orientation to the decentralisation of skills based on strategy, communications, and policy.

4.3. Information issues and inferences.

Workers: It is difficult to gauge how workers are exposed to generative AI, as there is limited information on AI use. Traditional methods estimate exposure using generative-model-type tools in job adverts or firm descriptions. These tools are not only still emerging, but also AI adoption is endogenous. The latest studies capitalise on the launch of ChatGPT at the end of 2022 as an exogenous shock and focus on jobs that involve extensive text use. Advertisements featuring ChatGPT have increased significantly since its launch. Similar to other generative-AI applications, ChatGPT notes that exposure provides workers with access to large-language models and ensures consistency over time. The instruments of the natural-experiment estimation allow examination of the causal effect of text-based generative-AI exposure on labour-market outcomes (Capraro et al., 2024). Other robustness tests test the impacts of the landing stage, conditioning on other technology trends; select only non-AI jobs; and place a place-based demand shifter on regional legislation affecting gas-power prices.

5. Policy Implications and Governance.

The discussion in the above sections can inform practical policy and governance implications across three key areas: the education and retraining paradigm, the design of social protections and safety nets, and the taxation, competition, and regulation of the labour market. As mentioned above, in most applications, generative AI systems will augment, not replace, cognitive labour. Some of the principles of an augmentation regime, including the need for high-level cognitive abilities, the necessity of lifelong learning, and the tendency toward labour-market transitions, will certainly increase in the near future. Generative AI should also disrupt the labour market, though at the cost of a net increase in productivity and aggregate demand. Anticipating these possibilities would help alleviate frictions during transitions and facilitate sustained social and economic gains.

Generally speaking, education and training programs are expected to be aware of the increasing need for higher-level cognitive skills, adopt lifelong learning models, and support various knowledge transitions (Capraro et al., 2024).

Policymakers should tailor educational programs that emphasise high-level, higher-order cognitive and technical skills to supplement the generative systems. Future research on the critical skills needed to leverage generative models across fields could inform curriculum design. Another valuable point of reference is the sustained productivity and employment output of the 2000s generation of automation. A longer-run approach to adaptation to generative AI is clearer in investment in skills, education, and training toward growth sectors and high-growth firms and towards emerging knowledge, technologies, and capabilities. The new AI cycle, with its generative-training phase, successfully obsolesces vast portions of existing knowledge of office and productivity software and conditions a shift in non-routine knowledge work. The preservation and development of co-evolving neighbouring higher-level functions, which will remain productive regardless of the domain of use, therefore constitute a strong long-term approach.

5.1. Paradigms of education and retraining.

The education and retraining frameworks, such as curriculum, modes of delivery, and time dedication, should shift to the necessary skills required in an augmentation regime (Capraro et al., 2024). The lifelong learning systems must be able to transform the rapidly changing economy and its dynamic skill requirements. The short-term upskilling modular programs, with a particular focus on specific skills gaps, are preferred to long-term, deep retraining programs focused on pre-automation requirements. On-the-job training is more relevant when provided as soon as possible, but not when provided too far in advance, before a worker commences a job. The design, target, and delivery decisions of the program focus on the first and best-potential skill gaps, on the ones that are the most closely linked in terms of productivity increase, on those that augmentation will most probably influence, and on those that, in case acquired, will most probably result in hiring and role migration and displacement.

5.2. In the augmentation regime, social protection and safety nets.

The most frequent type of job displacement is the shift to a plethora of jobs affected by generative AI, even jobs that demand cognitive abilities. It is the most pervasive technology of the Internet age and has an impact on economic inequality. Most countries have low unemployment insurance coverage for displaced workers. Even though welfare systems have existed long before the industrial society, depending on the nature of the welfare system, policymakers continue to face a dilemma in trying to influence employees' work and family choices, especially those who frequently change jobs, either during leave or when changing jobs. Universal welfare programs are identified as having a significant impact on all forms of switchers. The most appropriate programs are unemployment insurance and universal programs, which best suit the socioeconomic situation (Capraro et al., 2024) and (Nippani, 2020).

5.3. Taxation, competition, and labour market.

The unambiguous force with which AI is going to disrupt labour markets brings to mind the previous industrial revolutions, but also raises even more profound concerns because the current policies, programs, and protections that many regarded as critical are now less efficient or applicable. The formal lifelong retraining programs and traditional systems of education first appear ill-adapted to a world in which human workers are a necessary evil and are expected to demonstrate competencies continuously. An encompassing ecosystem of low-cost, pervasive, and nearly real-time methods for learning new abilities, including DIY-based curricula and peer-to-peer coaching, and playbooks for skill transition, will become essential wherever augmenting technologies are used (N. In addition to distributional issues regarding income and wealth, the problem of governability also arises from the AI-enabled economy's creation of labour-capital or capital relations. New equilibrium arrangements are also hampered by political, technical, institutional, and social factors.

Augmentation or automation is not necessarily a better path for labour and capital. Simultaneously, the discourse facilitates optimal decisions of a socially optimum path along a suboptimal path. It can be anticipated that AI will affect labour markets and distribution in several ways, making it a foundation for further investigation. The antitrust regimes are changing at various levels, following the AI technology implementation closely. One of the non-metallic variations of the Moore Law, one of them being the complexity and the related information capacity of AI, is the coincidence with the creation of generative AI.

6. Ethical and Normative Aspects.

The ever-increasing use of Generative AI systems has also fueled renewed concern about the normative and ethical issues surrounding the design and implications of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Algorithmic Systems. Specifically, the question of bias, discrimination, fairness, and accountability in technical systems has become an acknowledged yet still inadequate requirement for the responsible and equitable development of Artificial Intelligence. Justice-based values, especially equity, redistribution, and rights-based claims, are also worth considering, since they influence the use and control of new technologies. Some values call on us not to be dominated by the few, but to be in favour of the many.

Generative AI poses a more serious, even more profound, ethical and normative question: Who will own and control the new systems? What will be the effect of their use on the idealisation of digital intuition, creativity, and cognitive work, more broadly? Whose population will gain from their deployment, and by how much? Regardless of the pace of development and implementation, the appropriate identification of distributive impacts, the design of safety nets for individuals being pushed into specific markets, and the assurance that all people can build up expertise are most pertinent yet insufficient. A strategy based on such realities realises the worth of new systems as a certainty, which entails making a few adaptations to their terms of use, and to what they make and do for the many.

6.1. Equal treatment, compromise, and responsibility in generative systems.

Generative systems like ChatGPT pose bias risks because they generate content based on the information they were trained on. Although the training data used in these systems is enormous, it remains likely that the information is biased with respect to class, gender, race, nationality, and religion (Zajko, 2020). To mitigate such risks, the AI community has introduced measures such as oversight, impact measurement, and auditing. Cobots using generative systems can, nevertheless, inadvertently reproduce systemic prejudices that bolster inequality. An example of such systems is the creation of text that mirrors dominant stereotypes about social groups, reduces the rate at which authorship is assigned to particular groups, or even produces hate speech (Capraro et al., 2024). Given the unequal access, existing differences may exacerbate the risk of being locked out of the information markets, thereby perpetuating inequitable results and cutting resources in the next economic mobility. The emphasis on training individual workers also exacerbates inequality of opportunity.

These problems can be stratified into three dimensions, each of which offers governance solutions. The control of social relations, such as a ban on hate speech, has an underlying level of control. Auditing generative systems provides a way to quantify content to meet compliance requirements; using fines as a deterrent incentivises redistribution with impacted parties. To reach compliance, aggrieved interested parties in a regulated sphere can petition defenders through explicit instructions. One secondary dimension is the need to ensure that human labour is included in the outputs of generative systems as a variable. Establishing a close connection between throughputs and workers' compensation can make compensation computations easily transparent, and the exclusive rights to attached compensations and recognitions can enhance control over joint supplies. Facilitation of opportunistic connections to individual outputs, social credit systems as reflections of favour-rendering clienteles, and configurative capacities to signal effort, in the case of intrinsic value, offer other, supplementary networks.

6.2. Property, glorification of intellectual work and rights.

The question of copyright and ownership of knowledge work created with the help of generative AI systems is a burning issue of constant controversy among governments, legal experts, and practitioners (Sarkar, 2023). It is common knowledge that generative AI that produces text, images, video, or music based on prompts can accomplish this by absorbing and recombining existing information from a diverse range of previously published works. Nevertheless, the character of a book, a report, or a painting generated by a generative model and the ability to refer to it as a creation of one's own are questionable.

There is still a lot of interest in cognitive labour in terms of wages, demand, and rights. The issue of compensation in professions like software engineering and art is vaguely defined, and, together with the absence of professional standards, it is becoming questionable in terms of agency. The increasing popularity of generative AI will likely prompt an even more pressing discussion of these problems within the professional workforce.

7. Sectoral Impacts and Case Studies.

Generative AI is dynamically boosting many industries by upgrading cognitive work in a world already dominated by the new economy. The companies that are enjoying the most from Generative AI are mainly service-based, including professional services, healthcare, engineering, and research labs. Generative AI transforms the demand for firm-specific tasks, be it drafting, revising, analysing, researching, or coding, allowing workers to focus on the higher-level elements of those tasks. Thus benefiting the development of firms in the knowledge economy, a service-oriented sector. Generative AI also induces a drastic expansion of paid hours and, by extension, a wider labour force when exposed to it (Capraro et al., 2024).

7.1. Knowledge work and professional services.

Professional service practitioners are split on the transformative potential of generative AI on professional services, including accounting, legal advice, and policy analysis (Woodruff et al., 2023). The introduction of cloud-based artificial intelligence and advanced analytics, such as Excel, has transformed the character of managerial, consulting, and research work. Although generative AI contributes to the preparation of client briefs and the creation of content, the technology is less threatening than previous developments because it does not significantly affect income generation (Tubaro & Casilli, 2019). Significant revenue and workforce impacts in the knowledge industries do not depend on generative AI. The availability of remote services such as BetterHelp and LegalZoom, which the COVID-19 pandemic has hastened, is simpler in terms of access to mental health and legal insight but reduces the quality of the services provided and endangers the employment of highly trained professionals. Telehealth companies encourage precarious work in knowledge industries through self-employed jobs. At the same time, technological improvements contribute to process redesign, workflow automation, organisational change, and task redistribution, which considerably reduce the need for managerial, advisory, and analyst services. Demand for management and related consulting also decreases, given that growing access to job-market applicants accelerates the regression towards the mean. Generative AI might deskill sectors or reduce the chances of skilled employees by providing guidance that low-trained workers can deliver through low-cost online services, and by decreasing demand in existing companies. Weaker protections are another weakness of non-permanent employment, as it is susceptible to AI replacement.

7.2. Content generation and creative industries.

Generative AI systems are capable of generating digital text, images, audio, and video that is more and more challenging to tell the difference between human-created content and that which AI has created. Such instruments have been embraced across the creative sectors, including the arts, design, music, literature, and journalism. The main concerns regarding the effects of generative AI on artistic and creative work include authorship and originality, whether economic gains are desirable, and the lack of balance between creative model outputs and the financial benefits content-producers receive.

The take, which is the rise of generative AI systems, demonstrates the broader idea of augmentation rather than the story of complete automation. Generative systems, like ChatGPT, DALL-E, and Midjourney, are not expected to replace a human creator completely, but rather to help with creative process tasks, including idea generation, brainstorming, drafting, inspiration, and variation exploration. In gen AI, content is generated and edited based on prompts and user input; an interactive approach to emerging styles and input forms displaces the focus on predetermined talents and content-makers. Even in the creative industry, where the use of generative AI may seem widespread, respondents find that the tools often complement rather than replace human labour (Woodruff et al., 2023) and hold an ambivalent attitude towards the benefits of the new systems being applied.

7.3. Research laboratories, engineering and healthcare.

The development of generative artificial intelligence expands the capabilities of diagnostic medicine, engineering design, and scientific experimentation by generating early analyses and specifications that are refined by workers (Capraro et al., 2024). In the healthcare sector, e.g., the large language models compose assessment tests and recommend treatment plans based on patient logs, unloading clinicians with documentation and supporting patient-centred care. Equally, clinical decision-support systems are faster at generating diagnostics, as they provide a set of the most likely diagnoses based on the patient's history and examination, or on retrieving the most useful medical literature for new cases.

In design and engineering, generative design tools are parameterised (e.g., weight reduction, material considerations, and manufacturing constraints) to generate multiple solutions that analysts need to consider. Performance specifications can also be used to draft engineering documents, and chemical properties may also be used to propose new molecules.

Large language models are used in research laboratories to write about experimental designs, predict outcomes and problems and write reports. Generative chemical design algorithms propose molecules that can be synthesised from standard compounds, generate libraries of compounds that fulfil certain specifications, and propose chemical reactions that a target molecule can form.

8. Theoretical Viewpoints and Prospective Situations.

The recent development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technology raises questions about its potential impacts on the organisation of the economy and on inequality. The emergent capabilities of large language models and generative networks provide new possibilities for augmenting cognitive work, the creative and knowledge-intensive work of professional services, research, and content generation. How past and current automation waves collide with inequality has been the primary focus of economic research (Capraro et al., 2024). There are numerous historical examples of how automation can replace current skills and jobs, and much effort is required in education and retraining to enable employees to move to new fields of need. Nevertheless, technological advancement can change the characteristics of skill acumen and, consequently, revitalise, rather than cut down, the human workforce. Generative AI takes a performative position in creative, cognitive spheres that were once considered safe from automated replacement. Through analysis and elaboration of these abilities, human labourers develop highly advanced manufacturing capacities that may increase workforce participation, wages, and financial consolidation within the targeted industries.

8.1. The augmentation paradigm versus full automation paradigms.

Each of the four previous technological cycles of change has shown some variation in task division, income distribution, and inequality. Unlike previous waves, the present-day flow of generative AI is associated with them through the more optimistic prism of augmentation rather than replacement (Capraro et al., 2024). The social consequences of previous technological developments have been the subject of opposing paradigms that either predict a stable society with unchanging inequalities or cycles of equality. The development of generative AI and cognitive labour is also useful, as the study of task demand is supplemented by the study of profound-margin, inter-occupational task-reallocation processes similar to the third and fourth cycles (Fleming, 2019). The generative AI literature on the viability of the socio-technological transition builds on previous research that forecasts that generative-capable models will persistently supplement, rather than fully automate, cognitive-labour work (Woodruff et al., 2023).

8.2. Long-run distributions and equilibrium analyses.

The key question to evaluate the long-term impacts of generative AI and cognitive labour is whether a new steady state of economic inequality is possible, and, if so, whether, as in past technological transformations, the particular direction is bearable for impoverished socioeconomic classes (E. Jacobo, 2022).

There have been some early signs of significant geographic and sectoral difference in the impact on labor markets: an increase in the concentration of labor markets in urban centers and major cities in particular (where out-migration once was a significant factor) and a relatively small impact on aggregate productivity dispersion; an increasing disparity in the performance of high- and low-productivity firms across the economy (Capraro et al., 2024). These tendencies are consistent with the history of technological revolutions, which created compression in long-run inequality in developed economies: the first Industrial Revolution, the spread of electricity and the advent of Information and Communication Technology. However, the present-day trends, in which the change in task composition in relation to AI differs from previous transitions, marked by the emergence of new activities, compel one to reconsider the mechanics that govern modern processes.

9. Conclusion

The development of generative AI has sparked renewed controversy about automation and the future of work. The data on productivity reveal a turn in the economy that could be considered a parallel to previous shifts in automation and the faster implementation of high-tech products, and an increase in the number of skills and talents required—generative AI with cognitive labour promises to keep analysing mechanisms that connect technological innovation to economic inequality.

Modern generative AI is a collection of machine-learning methods that generate new content from existing data. It also includes algorithms that can produce any type of media, such as text, audio, video, software code, and design. Knowledge generation, procedural facilitation, and content transformation are common cognitive tasks that generative models typically facilitate. This type of activity is characterised as cognitive labour, which involves skills based on knowledge that cannot be fully automated by current technology.

The interaction between technology and cognitive work is closer to a past epoch than to the initial period of history considered in the Cycles of Technical Change. They show how the demand for skills is relocated through the routing of tasks rather than the non-routine work thresholds. The second equilibrium phase of generative AI comes after the initial phase of desktop computing and the internet. The limitations of these early systems were addressed by subsequent cognitive technologies, which enabled more ideas and knowledge to circulate. Similarly, dynamic processes are evident in the present state of affairs with generative models that may manoeuvre within feasible time, focus, and effort constraints for knowledge tasks.

Nations like the United States have the resources to be close to the material and procedural issues generated by generative technologies, but the traditional propensity of technological change to focus on displacement, concentration, and stratification remains a concern (Capraro et al., 2024). The rise of digitisation, automation, and growth and complexity make it necessary to record and explore the interplay between particular capabilities of generativity and the economy. Complementarities, both realised and assumed, can, however, prompt an initial inquiry into the connections between generative AI and inequality.

References:

1. Bughin, J. (2023). Does artificial intelligence kill employment growth: The missing link of corporate AI posture? *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 6*, 1239466. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10691467/

2. Capraro, V., Lentsch, A., Acemoglu, D., Akgun, S., Akhmedova, A., Bilancini, E., Bonnefon, J. F., Brañas-Garza, P., Butera, L., Douglas, K. M., Everett, J. A. C., Gigerenzer, G., Greenhow, C., Hashimoto, D. A., Holt-Lunstad, J., Jetten, J., Johnson, S., Kunz, W. H., Longoni, C., Lunn, P., Natale, S., Paluch, S., Rahwan, I., Selwyn, N., Singh, V., Suri, S., Sutcliffe, J., Tomlinson, J., van der Linden, S., Van Lange, P. A. M., Wall, F., Van Bavel, J. J., & Viale, R. (2024). The impact of generative artificial intelligence on socioeconomic inequalities and policymaking. *PNAS Nexus, 3*(6), pgae191. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC11165650/

3. Das, S., Steffen, S., Clarke, W., Reddy, P., Brynjolfsson, E., & Fleming, M. (2020). Learning occupational task-sharing dynamics for the future of work. In *AIES '20: Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (pp. 251–257). ACM. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2002.05655

4. Fleming, P. (2019). Robots and organisation studies: Why robots might not want to steal your job. *Organisation Studies, 40*(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618815528

5. Fossen, F. M., Samaan, D., & Sorgner, A. (2022). How are patented AI, software and robot technologies related to wage changes in the United States? *Labour Economics, 78*, 102225. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9237468/

6. Frank, M. R., Autor, D., Bessen, J. E., Brynjolfsson, E., Cebrian, M., Deming, D. J., Feldman, M., Groh, M., Lobo, J., Moro, E., Wang, D., Youn, H., & Rahwan, I. (2019). Toward understanding the impact of artificial intelligence on labour. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(14), 6531–6539. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6452673/

7. Hemmer, P., Schemmer, M., Kühl, N., Vössing, M., & Satzger, G. (2024). Complementarity in human-AI collaboration: Concept, sources, and evidence. *Information Systems Frontiers*. Advance online publication. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2404.00029

8. Jacobo, J. E. (2022). Back to the surplus: An unorthodox neoclassical model of growth, distribution and unemployment with technical change. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2211.14978

9. Kausik, B. N. (2022). Income inequality, cause and cure. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2201.10726

10. Nippani, A. (2020). Automation and labour in India: Policy implications of job polarisation pre and post COVID-19 crisis. *SocArXiv*. https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/h9gaw/

11. Sarkar, A. (2023). Exploring perspectives on the impact of artificial intelligence on the creativity of knowledge work: Beyond mechanised plagiarism and stochastic parrots. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing (CSCW '23)*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.10751

12. Tubaro, P., & Casilli, A. (2019). Micro-work, artificial intelligence and the automotive industry. *Economia e Politica Industriale, 46*(3), 333–345. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40812-019-00121-1

13. Woodruff, A., Shelby, R., Kelley, P. G., Rousso-Schindler, S., Smith-Loud, J., & Wilcox, L. (2024). How knowledge workers think generative AI will (not) transform their industries. In *CHI '24: Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.06778

14. Zajko, M. (2020). Conservative AI and social inequality: Conceptualising alternatives to bias through social theory. *AI & Society*. Advance online publication. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2007.08666