



The Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (TJMDR)

Content Available www.saap.org.in

ISSN: 2583-0317



REFRAMING CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: ADVANCING HUMAN RELEVANCE AS A NEW CSR PRINCIPLE

GAGAN PRAKASH

Associate Professor, IPS Academy, Institute of Business Management & Research Sanwer, Indore.

Article History: Received: 24 June 2026 Revised: 11 July 2026 Accepted: 30 Aug 2026

Abstract:

Purpose: This paper seeks to reframe the ongoing scholarly and policy discussions surrounding the societal obligations associated with artificial intelligence (AI). While governments, regulatory bodies, researchers, media institutions, and end-users have been repeatedly examined as responsible actors in the AI ecosystem, the corporate sector has received comparatively limited conceptual attention. This study, therefore, advances a rearticulated understanding of corporate responsibility by proposing a dedicated principle that anchors how businesses ought to confront the ethical and societal implications of AI technologies.

Design/methodology/approach: The paper develops a conceptual argument structured around two analytical moves. First, it positions AI governance concerns within the broader evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR), arguing that established CSR frameworks are no longer sufficient in the AI-driven business landscape. Second, it theorizes what an updated CSR principle—one explicitly oriented toward the development and use of AI—should encompass, drawing on emerging ethical norms, socio-technical debates, and global policy trends.

Findings: CSR principles have historically been shaped by prevailing ethical priorities and societal expectations. As AI systems increasingly mediate decision-making, operations, and stakeholder relationships, corporations must account for the preservation of meaningful human participation and value in AI-infused environments. This paper conceptualizes this obligation as the **principle of human relevance**, a more pragmatic and future-oriented alternative to the frequently invoked-but often impractical-ideal of human centrality. Similar to other CSR norms (e.g., integrity initiatives, anti-corruption measures, and transparency commitments), this AI-related principle may begin as a voluntary corporate standard but could crystallize into firmer regulatory expectations as societal demands evolve.

Originality/value: This study is among the first to argue systematically for the expansion of CSR principles to explicitly address AI. The formulation of human relevance as the normative core of such a principle offers a fresh intellectual lens, challenging existing assumptions and providing a more actionable orientation for corporate AI responsibility.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; Corporate governance; AI ethics; Corporate social responsibility; Socio-technical risk; Human relevance; Responsible AI.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License. Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retains the copyright of this article.



*Corresponding Author

Dr. Gagan Prakash
Associate Professor
IPS Academy,
Institute of Business Management & Research Sanwer,
Indore.

Produced and Published by

South Asian Academic Publications

I. INTRODUCTION

The pace at which artificial intelligence (AI) is advancing has intensified academic and policy discussions about the social obligations attached to its creation and use [1-4]. A large comparative study of AI regulatory trends across thirty countries by Saheb and Saheb [5] shows a persistent lack of clarity around

ethical approaches to AI, with responsibility implicitly falling onto corporations. Yet relying predominantly on firms to govern AI is problematic: most adopt broad aspirational value statements that do little to shape day-to-day practice [4]. Meanwhile, academic literature continues to generate diverse and sometimes incompatible ethical AI frameworks, leaving organisations and stakeholders with conceptual ambiguity. This paper argues that the proliferation of principles, guidelines and frameworks directed at corporate AI ethics requires consolidation into a single, coherent addition to the canon of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Put differently, the existing architecture of CSR needs revision to explicitly incorporate the risks posed by AI development and deployment. Concerns about the widespread, uncritical or poorly governed adoption of AI across personal, social and economic domains are escalating.

Scholars, industry leaders and policymakers warn of harms emerging from excessive automation and technologisation, prompting calls for unified AI governance-from voluntary frameworks to binding regulatory systems.

For example, Koniakou [6] advocates for governance anchored in universal human rights obligations applicable to both public and private actors, while Floridi and Cowls [7] advance a widely cited five principle model comprising autonomy, justice, beneficence, non-maleficence and explicability. Likewise, Rendtorff [8] highlights autonomy, vulnerability, dignity and integrity as key ethical anchors. Such frameworks are vital for regulatory development, yet they serve different actors in different ways. States are required-by virtue of the social contract-to design and enforce equitable legal structures for AI. Corporations, by contrast, play a dual role: as architects and beneficiaries of AI, they must pursue economic value without compromising societal well-being.

Despite rising regulatory action, the business sector has not articulated a unified position on AI misuse. A few technology leaders have voiced alarm, but numerous cases reveal firms taking advantage of regulatory gaps, sometimes by shifting sensitive decisions from humans to algorithms to obscure accountability [9]. To address this gap, the present work situates AI-related corporate responsibilities within the established CSR tradition.

Over the past century, CSR has evolved from a narrow profit-maximisation doctrine to an expectation that companies attend to a wide array of stakeholder and societal concerns. Modern CSR requires organisations to embed social considerations into strategy, operations and governance. Since the 1990s, CSR principles such as transparency, anti-corruption and community investment have gained prominence. As public expectations change, so must CSR.

Section 1 argues that the scale and speed of technological transformation require an explicit AI-focused CSR principle. This is developed through several propositions supported by contemporary scholarship. The paper's second contribution concerns the substance of the proposed principle. While human-centricity appears frequently in state-level AI governance discourse, such a demanding standard is not easily aligned with corporate profit obligations. This study therefore proposes that the preservation of human relevance-not human centrality-should form the core of an AI-related CSR principle. Section 2 elaborates this proposal.

2. WHY A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRINCIPLE FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE?

2.1 AI-Related Responsibility and the Under-examined Role of Business

Major societal challenges linked to AI stem from its opacity, which complicates accountability; the

replication of inequalities through automated decision systems; widening social isolation due to labour displacement; threats to autonomy; and the possibility that humans may lose control over highly autonomous systems or see them used maliciously [10-12]. Some scholars further warn of remote yet profound dangers associated with artificial general intelligence (AGI), a hypothetical state in which machine intelligence exceeds human capability and pursues misaligned goals [13-15]. Others envision more optimistic futures involving collaboration between humans and emotionally aware robots [16,17]. Regardless of long-term scenarios, consensus is clear on one point: immediate risks require urgent attention, and addressing current harms will help prevent future crises.

This raises an essential question: who is responsible for ensuring that AI evolves in ways consistent with human interests? Dignum [10, p. 109] distributes responsibility widely across developers, policymakers, users and society at large. Yet when "everyone" is responsible, coordination failures-characteristic of collective action problems-are likely. To avoid such failures, responsibilities must be clearly allocated among the main actors: civil society, researchers, governments, international bodies and corporations. Although responsibilities of scientists [18], media institutions [19] and states have been thoroughly discussed, the role of business remains comparatively under-theorised [20].

State responsibility is particularly complicated. Despite the growing number of regulatory initiatives-including the EU AI Act (2024) and the U.S. Executive Order on Safe, Secure and Trustworthy AI (2023)-governments face difficulty keeping pace with rapidly changing technologies, balancing innovation and regulation, and resolving conceptual uncertainty about what counts as "AI" [21]. Cross-country comparisons reveal considerable divergence in narratives and regulatory strategies [22,5]. Even so, the corporate sector, which builds and deploys the vast majority of high-impact AI systems, has not been the focus of proportional scholarly attention.

A necessary starting point, therefore, is to define business responsibility in the AI domain with greater clarity.

PI: The core of AI-related business responsibility must be precisely conceptualised.

2.2 Towards an AI-Specific Corporate Social Responsibility Principle

Any normative expectation guiding corporate conduct in relation to AI falls within the remit of corporate social responsibility. Despite being difficult to define precisely, CSR commonly reflects several recurring themes. Crane et al. [23] identify voluntariness, a multi-stakeholder orientation and the balancing of economic and social interests as central elements. Dahlsrud [24] similarly points to stakeholder engagement and the integration of economic, social and environmental priorities. Kerr et al. [25]

emphasise that CSR requires the fusion of financial goals with broader societal considerations.

Reflecting this, Wickert and Risi [26, p. 22] describe CSR as a broad framework through which organisations incorporate ethical, social and environmental responsibilities into strategy and operations. Although such definitions provide a conceptual foundation, they seldom translate directly into actionable guidance. To address this, various CSR principles have been developed since the early 1990s [27], covering areas such as human rights, environmental protection, consumer welfare and anti-corruption. These have been reinforced by initiatives like the Caux Round Table Principles (1994) and the UN Global Compact (2000). As CSR evolved, scholars observed a movement from purely normative voluntarism to hybrid ethical-legal principles. Kerr et al. [25] identified seven such principles, including integrated decision-making, stakeholder engagement, transparency, precaution and accountability. Yet the transformative impact of AI reveals substantial gaps in even the most advanced CSR models.

3. WHY EXISTING CSR PRINCIPLES ARE INSUFFICIENT FOR AI

3.1 Limitations of Current CSR Frameworks

Some might argue that AI-related responsibilities are already captured by principles like transparency or accountability. Indeed, Renieris et al. [28] report that 90% of senior managers in major firms view responsible AI as part of their CSR agenda. However, AI introduces qualitatively distinct challenges [8]. First, contemporary AI systems create new and far-reaching harms that extend beyond past technological risks. Second, regulatory frameworks remain fragmented and slow to catch up, creating uncertainty and loopholes. In such circumstances, corporate self-regulation becomes especially important.

Yet even when firms seek to act responsibly, a structural void persists: they lack a unifying moral or normative principle that ties together existing frameworks on fairness, transparency and dignity. A foundational principle within CSR is needed to guide corporate action in the AI era.

P2: A new CSR principle is required—one that directly addresses the economic, political and social challenges posed by AI.

3.2 Identifying the Ethical Foundation for an AI-Focused CSR Principle

CSR principles exert influence across the regulatory spectrum—from voluntary self-regulation to co-regulation and eventually binding legislation [29,30]. Many began as moral expectations and later became codified when voluntary efforts proved insufficient. Anti-corruption is a prime example: initially grounded in social norms of honesty, it evolved into a complex regulatory domain.

Following this trajectory, any new AI related CSR principle must rest on a universal moral foundation. Human dignity, despite varied philosophical

interpretations, meets this criterion. It underpins the international human rights system and is explicitly recognised in documents such as the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and numerous national constitutions. Human dignity is already cited as a rationale for responsible AI governance [31-33]. The EU AI Act (2024) and civil society initiatives such as the 2017 Asilomar Principles likewise foreground dignity as a protected value.

This leads to the following proposition:

P3: An AI related CSR principle should be grounded in the moral norm of human dignity.

4. PRESERVING HUMAN RELEVANCE: THE FOUNDATION OF A NEW CSR PRINCIPLE

4.1 Why Human-Centric AI Is an Inappropriate CSR Foundation

Human centric AI has become a dominant theme in policy discussions. EU officials, for example, have described the EU AI Act as a major step toward global human-centric AI. The EU's ethical guidelines define human-centric AI as systems developed and overseen with human values and dignity at their core [34]. Scholars have expanded on this idea, emphasising autonomy, explainability, human control and goal alignment [35-37].

However, human centric AI is not an appropriate foundation for a CSR principle for several reasons - Although widely invoked in policy discussions, the idea of "human-centric AI" does not provide a suitable foundation for a CSR principle. The primary difficulty lies in its tension with the economic purpose of corporations: placing humans at the centre of all AI-related decisions presupposes that firms can subordinate commercial imperatives to broader social aims, whereas CSR traditionally operates by balancing rather than replacing economic objectives. Expecting companies to uphold an uncompromising human-first orientation would impose obligations that exceed the practical and structural limits of corporate activity. Moreover, human centrality functions more effectively as a policy narrative than as an operational governance standard. Its credibility depends heavily on the actor articulating it; while governments can legitimately promote human-centric visions, corporate adoption of the term often risks being interpreted as symbolic or superficial. The concept has also faced significant theoretical and cultural criticism. Scholars such as Floridi [38] view it as redundant and overly anthropocentric, while Taylor et al. [39] raise concerns about its conceptual ambiguity. Mhlambi [40] further argues that its philosophical foundations reflect predominantly Western individualistic traditions and fail to account for relational or community-oriented ethical frameworks. Taken together, these limitations indicate that human-centricity cannot serve as a coherent or credible basis for AI-related corporate responsibility. What is needed instead is a principle that is both normatively grounded and practically aligned with corporate realities—namely, a

commitment to preserving human relevance in a world increasingly shaped by AI systems.

Dimensions of Emerging Human Irrelevance

The most discussed form of declining human relevance is economic irrelevance. A growing body of research suggests that AI may usher in a post-work society where many individuals cannot meaningfully participate in labour markets [41-43]. Previous technological revolutions displaced certain kinds of labour but also created new forms of employment. AI differs by challenging human capabilities across nearly all occupations. Non-professional jobs are most vulnerable in the near term, while professional roles may erode more slowly [44]. Although current evidence, such as Delfanti and Frey [45], indicates gradual rather than immediate displacement, long-term trajectories point towards substantial job loss.

Economic irrelevance may give way to existential irrelevance. Work provides meaning, dignity and social identity. When work disappears, so too may the psychological structures that enable purpose and self-worth. While some envision a leisure-driven society supported by universal basic income [46], empirical research links unemployment to depression and suicide [47]. At a societal level, the erosion of meaningful work threatens the foundations of democratic participation [48].

AI also accelerates political irrelevance. Algorithmic influence on opinion formation, behaviour and information exposure is well-documented [20,49,50]. This undermines democratic agency. As AI becomes more accurate and efficient than humans in certain decision domains, individuals may voluntarily cede judgement to machines [1].

A related concern is ethical irrelevance. AI operates through formalised, binary structures, lacking emotional intelligence, empathy or situational sensitivity. Increasing dependence on such systems risks diminishing appreciation for human moral reasoning [51].

Emerging technologies also raise concerns about evolutionary irrelevance. Genetic editing, enhancement technologies and brain-machine interfaces may allow privileged groups to deviate from the shared human evolutionary path [52]. Others, meanwhile, will be shaped indirectly by AI systems that influence cognition and behaviour [53].

This feeds into historical irrelevance: a technologically transformed future humanity may feel little continuity with present generations, weakening intergenerational moral concern.

Finally, while less ethically charged, AI may result in military irrelevance, as robotics replace humans on the battlefield, diminishing traditional notions of honour, sacrifice and soldierly identity [54].

These forms of irrelevance are interconnected. Corporations hold considerable influence in preventing economic irrelevance and partial influence in other domains. The preservation of human relevance should therefore anchor a new CSR principle for AI.

4. CONCLUSION AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

This paper has argued that corporations, as the primary developers and deployers of AI, must shoulder explicit responsibility for mitigating its risks alongside governments. Two central claims were presented. First, the paper identified the need for a dedicated AI-related CSR principle that synthesises dispersed expectations concerning transparency, precaution, accountability and dignity. Second, it proposed that the principle should centre on preserving human relevance rather than embracing the more aspirational yet less practical concept of human-centricity.

The study makes two theoretical contributions. For CSR scholarship, it adds a new principle suited to contemporary technological change. Although CSR now encompasses transparency, ethics, anti-corruption and community engagement, it currently lacks an explicit anchor for AI governance. This paper fills that gap. For the AI ethics literature, it highlights the conceptual limits of human-centric AI when applied to corporate governance and offers a more realistic alternative.

If adopted, an AI-specific CSR principle would provide civil society, regulators and scholars with a clear benchmark to evaluate corporate conduct. Expecting firms to uphold human relevance—even while automating certain activities is feasible and consistent with organisational objectives. Companies that use AI to enhance rather than eliminate human involvement could benefit from improved public trust. Examples already emerging, such as retailers reintroducing human staff to improve customer experience, underscore this potential.

If the concept gains acceptance, corporations may incorporate "human relevance" language into governance documents, codes of ethics and public reporting. Governments could reference the principle in strategy papers or regulatory roadmaps. As with anti-corruption norms, what begins as a moral expectation may eventually evolve into enforceable regulation.

Future research should investigate how organisations operationalise this principle across diverse industry contexts, develop detailed case studies that illustrate emerging best practices, and further analyse the ways in which CSR can function as an effective bridge between corporate behaviour and ethical AI governance.

5. FUNDING

Not received any grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors for the conduct of this research.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Would like to express sincere gratitude to my respective institution for providing the academic environment and support necessary to undertake this

research. No additional acknowledgements are applicable.

7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Declare that there have been no known financial interests, personal relationships, or competing interests that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

8. INFORMED CONSENT

Not applicable. This study did not involve human participants, patients, or the collection of identifiable personal data requiring informed consent.

8. ETHICAL STATEMENT

This research is conceptual and based exclusively on the review and analysis of existing literature and publicly available documents. It did not involve human participants, animals, clinical trials, or primary data collection requiring approval from an Institutional Ethics Committee.

10. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

The author solely conceived and designed the study, conducted the literature review and analysis, synthesized the findings, drafted and revised the manuscript, and approved the final version for submission. The author accepts full responsibility and accountability for all aspects of the work, ensuring the accuracy and integrity of the research.

11. REFERENCES

1. Kaas MHL. The perfect technological storm: artificial intelligence and moral complacency. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2024; 26:49. doi:10.1007/s10676-024-09788-0. (Springer)
2. Krkač K. Corporate social irresponsibility: humans vs artificial intelligence. *Soc Response J.* 2019;15(6):786–802. doi:10.1108/SRJ-09-2018-0219.
3. Saheb T, Saheb T. Topical review of artificial intelligence national policies: a mixed method analysis. *Technol Soc.* 2023; 74:102316. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102316. (ScienceDirect)
4. Bednar K, Spiekermann S. Eliciting values for technology design with moral philosophy: an empirical exploration of effects and shortcomings. *Sci Technol Human Values.* 2024;49(3):611–645. doi:10.1177/01622439221122595. (Sage Journals)
5. Bareis J, Katzenbach C. Talking AI into being: the narratives and imaginaries of national AI strategies and their performative politics. *Sci Technol Human Values.* 2022;47(5):855–881. doi:10.1177/01622439211030007.
6. Koniakou V. From the "rush to ethics" to the "race for governance" in artificial intelligence. *Inf Syst Front.* 2023;25(1):71–102. doi:10.1007/s10796-022-10300-6.
7. Floridi L, Cowls J. A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harv Data Sci Rev.* 2019;1(1). doi:10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1.
8. Rendtorff JD. Outline of ethical issues concerning government, business and information technologies. In: Lütge C, Uhl M, Kriebitz A, Max R, editors. *Business Ethics and Digitization.* Cham: J.B. Metzler; 2022. p. 133–154.
9. Diamantis ME. The extended corporate mind: when corporations use AI to break the law. *N C Law Rev.* 2020;98(4):893–932.
10. Dignum V. *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way.* Cham: Springer; 2019.
11. Šucha V, Gammel J. *Humans and societies in the age of artificial intelligence.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union; 2021. doi:10.2760/61164.
12. Sartori L, Theodorou A. A sociotechnical perspective for the future of AI: narratives, inequalities, and human control. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2022;24(1):4. doi:10.1007/s10676-022-09624-3.
13. Barrat J. *Our Final Invention: Artificial Intelligence and the End of the Human Era.* New York: St Martin's Press; 2013.
14. Bostrom N. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014.
15. Tegmark M. *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence.* New York: Alfred A Knopf; 2017.
16. Nahavandi S. Industry 5.0—a human-centric solution. *Sustainability.* 2019;11(16):4371. doi:10.3390/su11164371.
17. Dietz E, Kakas A, Michael L. Argumentation: a calculus for human-centric AI. *Front ArtifIntell.* 2022; 5:955579. doi:10.3389/frai.2022.955579.
18. Frankel MS. An empirical exploration of scientists' social responsibilities. *J Responsible Innov.* 2015;2(3):301–310. doi:10.1080/23299460.2015.1096737.
19. Knott A, Wilson C, Furlanello T, et al. AI content detection in the emerging information ecosystem: new obligations for media and tech companies. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2024;26(4):63. doi:10.1007/s10676-024-09795-1.
20. Flyverbom M, Deibert R, Matten D. The governance of digital technology, big data, and the internet: new roles and responsibilities for business. *Bus Soc.* 2019;58(1):3–19. doi:10.1177/0007650317727540.
21. Maas MM. Aligning AI regulation to sociotechnical change. In: Bullock J, Chen Y-C, Himmelreich J, Hudson V, Korinek A, Young MM, Zhang B, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of AI Governance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2022.
22. Saheb T, Saheb T. AI policies towards the AGI challenge: an international assessment. Working paper; 2023.
23. Crane A, Matten D, Spence LJ. *Corporate Social Responsibility: Readings and Cases in a Global Context.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2014.

24. Dahlsrud A. How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corp Soc Respons Environ Manag.* 2008;15(1):1–13. doi:10.1002/csr.132.
25. Kerr M, Janda R, Pitts C. *Corporate Social Responsibility: A Legal Analysis.* Markham (ON): LexisNexis Canada; 2009.
26. Wickert C, Risi D. *Corporate Social Responsibility.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2019.
27. Frederick WC. The moral authority of transnational corporate codes. *J Bus Ethics.* 1991;10(3):165–177. doi:10.1007/BF00383154.
28. Renieris, E. M., Kiron, D., & Mills, S. (2022). Should organizations link responsible AI and corporate social responsibility? It's complicated. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 63(3), 1–6.
29. Kaplow L. General characteristics of rules. In: Bouckaert B, De Geest G, editors. *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics.* Vol. 5. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2000. doi:10.4337/9781782540519.00008.
30. Sama LM, Shoaf V. Reconciling rules and principles: an ethics-based approach to corporate governance. *J Bus Ethics.* 2005;58(1–3):177–185. doi:10.1007/s10551-005-1402-y.
31. Latonero M. *Governing Artificial Intelligence: Upholding Human Rights and Dignity.* New York: Data & Society Research Institute; 2018.
32. Risse M. Human rights and artificial intelligence: an urgently needed agenda. *Hum Rights Q.* 2019;41(1):1–16. doi:10.1353/hrq.2019.0000.
33. Ulgen, O. (2022). AI and the crisis of the self: Protecting human dignity as status and respectful treatment. In A. J. Hampton & J. A. DeFalco (Eds.), *The Frontlines of Artificial Intelligence Ethics: Human-Centric Perspectives on Technology's Advance* (pp. 37–58). Routledge. doi.org [1]33.
34. European Commission. *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union; 2019. doi:10.2759/346720.
35. Bryson JJ, Theodorou A. How society can maintain human-centric artificial intelligence. In: Toivonen M, Saari E, editors. *Human-Centered Digitalization and Services.* Singapore: Springer; 2019. p. 305–323.
36. Amariles DR, Baquero M. Promises and limits of law for a human-centric artificial intelligence. *Comput Law Secur Rev.* 2023; 48:105795. doi: 10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105795.
37. Floridi L. The European legislation on AI: a brief analysis of its philosophical approach. *Philos Technol.* 2021;34(2):215–222.
38. Floridi L. The European legislation on AI: a brief analysis of its philosophical approach. *Philos Technol.* 2021;34(2):215–222. doi:10.1007/s13347-021-00460-9.
39. Taylor RR, O'Dell B, Murphy JW. Human-centric AI: philosophical and community-centric considerations. *AI Soc.* 2024;39(5):2417–2424. doi:10.1007/s00146-023-01694-1.
40. Mhlambi S. From rationality to relationality: Ubuntu as an ethical and human rights framework for artificial intelligence governance. *Carr Center for Human Rights Policy Discussion Paper Series.* 2020;9.
41. Ford M. *Rise of the Robots: Technology and the Threat of a Jobless Future.* New York: Basic Books; 2015.
42. West DM. *The Future of Work: Robots, AI, and Automation.* Washington (DC): Brookings Institution Press; 2018.
43. Dorsey S. *Upper Hand: The Future of Work for the Rest of Us.* Hoboken (NJ): Wiley; 2022.
44. Susskind R, Susskind D. *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts.* Updated ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2022.
45. Delfanti A, Frey B. Humanly extended automation or the future of work seen through Amazon patents. *Sci Technol Human Values.* 2021;46(3):655–682. doi:10.1177/0162243920943665.
46. Danaher J. In defence of the post-work future: withdrawal and the ludic life. In: Cholbi M, Weber M, editors. *The Future of Work, Technology, and Basic Income.* New York: Routledge; 2020. p. 113–129.
47. Classen TJ, Dunn RA. The effect of job loss and unemployment duration on suicide risk in the United States: a new look using mass layoffs and unemployment duration. *Health Econ.* 2012;21(3):338–350. doi:10.1002/hec.1719.
48. Ratner J, editor. *Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy.* New York: Modern Library; 1939.
49. Den Hond F, Moser C. Useful servant or dangerous master? Technology in business and society debates. *Bus Soc.* 2023;62(1):87–116. doi:10.1177/00076503211068029.
50. Stockinger E, Maas J, Talvitie C, Dignum V. Trustworthiness of voting advice applications in Europe. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2024;26(3):55. doi:10.1007/s10676-024-09790-6.
51. Koering D. Exploring the human-AI nexus: a friendly dispute between second-order cybernetical ethical thinking and questions of AI ethics. *Enacting Cybern.* 2023;1(1):5. doi:10.58695/ec.4.
52. Harari YN. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow.* London: Vintage; 2017.
53. Van den Eede Y. Where is the human? Beyond the enhancement debate. *Sci Technol Human Values.* 2015;40(1):149–162. doi:10.1177/0162243914551284.
54. Van der Maarel S, Verweij D, Kramer EH, Molendijk T. "This is not what I signed up for": sociotechnical imaginaries, expectations, and disillusionment in a Dutch military innovation hub. *Sci Technol Human Values.* 2025;50(4):1030–1054. doi:10.1177/01622439231211032.