JSREL Journal of Social Research, Education and Learning
AN INTERNATIONAL PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL • OPEN ACCESS
Vol. 5, No. 1, (2026)

REVIEW ARTICLE

The Impacts of Artificial Intelligence on Education, the Labor Market, and Social Structure: An Interdisciplinary Literature Review

Mostefa Bensilatta
PhD Student, Algeria
Email: bensilatta2012@gmail.com

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
12.01.2026	20.04.2026	15.07.2026	17.08.2026

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX | Vol. 5, No. 1, (2026) | pp. 1-7

ABSTRACT

The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has generated a large and fragmented body of scholarship spanning education, economics, and sociology. This paper offers an interdisciplinary literature review that synthesizes research on three interconnected domains: the integration of AI into teaching and learning, the transformation of labor markets through automation and augmentation, and the broader implications of AI for social structure and inequality. Drawing on foundational and recent studies, the review traces how AI is reshaping instructional practice and educational governance, how it is displacing certain categories of routine work while creating new task demands elsewhere, and how these shifts interact with existing patterns of social stratification. The review identifies three recurring themes across the literature: the tension between AI's potential to personalize and democratize opportunity and its capacity to reproduce or amplify existing inequalities; the persistent gap between optimistic policy discourse and the empirical evidence on classroom and labor-market outcomes; and the underdeveloped state of interdisciplinary dialogue between education researchers, economists, and sociologists studying the same technological transformation from different vantage points. The paper concludes by outlining directions for future research that more explicitly integrate these three literatures.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, education technology, labor market automation, social inequality, interdisciplinary review

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has moved from a specialized subfield of computer science to a general-purpose technology whose effects are felt across nearly every sector of social and economic life (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Unlike earlier waves of automation, which primarily affected manual and routine tasks, contemporary AI systems increasingly perform cognitive tasks that were long considered resistant to mechanization, including pattern recognition, natural language processing, and elements of decision-making (Autor, 2015). This shift has prompted a proliferation of research across disciplines that rarely cite one another: education scholars examining AI-enabled tutoring and assessment, economists modeling labor-market displacement and task reinstatement, and sociologists analyzing how algorithmic systems intersect with class, race, and gender inequality.

This literature review addresses that fragmentation by bringing together three strands of scholarship that are conceptually related but institutionally separate. The first strand concerns AI in education, including intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, and the broader question of whether such tools can substitute for or meaningfully augment human teachers (Selwyn, 2019; Luckin et al., 2016). The second strand concerns AI and the labor market, including predictions about the automatability of occupations, the distinction between job displacement and task displacement, and the polarization of employment opportunities (Frey & Osborne, 2017; Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019). The third strand concerns AI and social structure more broadly, including the ways in which algorithmic systems can encode and reproduce existing social inequalities, and the ethical frameworks that have been proposed to govern AI deployment (Eubanks, 2018; Zuboff, 2019; Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

The review is guided by three questions. First, what does the literature say about the actual, as opposed to anticipated, effects of AI in classrooms and workplaces? Second, to what extent do these effects vary across social groups, and what mechanisms explain this variation? Third, where are the productive points of contact between education research, labor economics, and sociology of technology that could inform a more integrated research agenda? The remainder of the paper is organized around these questions, beginning with AI in education, proceeding to AI and labor markets, and then to AI and social structure, before closing with a discussion of gaps and future directions.

2. AI AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF EDUCATION

The application of AI to education is not new; intelligent tutoring systems have existed since the 1970s, but the scale and sophistication of contemporary systems mark a qualitative shift (Holmes et al., 2019). Luckin et al. (2016) distinguish between AI systems that support the learner directly, such as adaptive learning platforms that adjust content difficulty in real time, and systems that support teachers and institutions, such as early-warning systems that flag students at risk of dropping out. Both categories have expanded considerably over the past decade, driven partly by the availability of large educational datasets and partly by policy enthusiasm for personalized learning.

A central claim in this literature is that AI can personalize instruction at a scale that human teachers cannot achieve unaided, thereby addressing long-standing problems of differentiated instruction in large, heterogeneous classrooms (Holmes et al., 2019). UNESCO's (2021) guidance for policymakers acknowledges this potential while cautioning that the evidence base for learning gains attributable specifically to AI tools, as opposed to well-designed instruction more generally, remains thin and unevenly distributed across contexts. Selwyn (2019) offers a more skeptical reading, arguing that much of the discourse around "intelligent" educational technology conflates technical sophistication with pedagogical effectiveness, and that the question of whether AI systems should replace aspects of teachers' professional judgment is as much a normative question as an empirical one.

A second theme concerns equity. Because AI-enabled educational tools typically require reliable infrastructure, well-curated data, and teacher capacity to interpret system outputs, their benefits are not evenly available. The OECD (2019) notes that schools serving disadvantaged populations are often the least equipped to adopt these tools effectively, raising the possibility that AI in education could widen rather than narrow achievement gaps, even as advocates promote it as an equity-enhancing intervention. This tension between AI's stated purpose and its likely distributive effects recurs throughout the literature reviewed in this paper and connects directly to the discussion of social structure in Section 4.

A fourth theme, less prominent in the foundational studies but increasingly visible in recent work, concerns institutional and policy responses to AI adoption in education. Zawacki-Richter, Marín, Bond, and Gouverneur (2019), in a systematic review of AI applications in higher education, found that the great majority of published studies focused on profiling and prediction, intelligent tutoring, and assessment, while comparatively few addressed the institutional and governance structures needed to adopt these tools responsibly, a gap they argue leaves higher education institutions poorly prepared to manage the ethical and pedagogical risks of large-scale AI adoption. Williamson (2017) extends this institutional lens further, arguing that the growing role of large-scale educational data infrastructures, of which AI-enabled tools are one visible manifestation, is reshaping educational governance itself, shifting decision-making authority toward data systems and the private technology vendors that design them, and away from teachers, school leaders, and elected education authorities. This literature adds an important institutional dimension to the classroom-level findings discussed above, suggesting that the equity and effectiveness questions raised by Holmes et al. (2019) and the OECD (2019) cannot be fully addressed without also attending to who controls the design and deployment of the underlying data infrastructure.

2.1 Institutional Capacity and Teacher Preparedness

A closely related strand of research examines whether teacher education and ongoing professional development have kept pace with the demands of AI-enabled classrooms. Holmes et al. (2019) note that most pre-service teacher education programs continue to treat educational technology as a discrete, often elective, topic rather than as a thread integrated throughout the professional curriculum, leaving many teachers without a strong conceptual foundation for critically evaluating the AI-enabled tools they are increasingly expected to use. Selwyn (2019) frames this gap as a structural problem rather than a temporary lag, arguing that the pace of commercial AI product development in education routinely outstrips the capacity of teacher education systems, professional standards bodies, and curriculum authorities to evaluate new tools before they reach classrooms, producing a persistent asymmetry between the marketing claims made for educational AI products and the evidentiary basis available to the teachers expected to adopt them. This asymmetry connects directly to the institutional governance concerns raised by Williamson (2017) and reinforces the equity concerns discussed above, since better-resourced schools and districts are typically better positioned to invest in the kind of sustained professional development that could narrow this gap.

A third theme is the changing nature of teachers' work. Rather than straightforward replacement, several scholars describe a reconfiguration of teaching in which routine tasks such as grading and progress monitoring are increasingly automated, while relational and judgment-intensive aspects of teaching are foregrounded (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016). This pattern mirrors, in miniature, the broader labor-market dynamic discussed in the next section, in which AI substitutes for some tasks within an occupation while leaving others, and in some cases increasing the value of others, largely intact.

3. AI AND THE LABOR MARKET: DISPLACEMENT, AUGMENTATION, AND POLARIZATION

The economics literature on AI and employment is considerably more quantitative than the education literature, and much of it originates in a small number of influential studies. Frey and Osborne (2017) estimated that a substantial share of United States employment was in occupations at high risk of computerization within one to two decades, a finding that generated extensive public and policy attention. Subsequent work has qualified this estimate considerably. Autor (2015) argues that projections based on task automatability tend to overstate net job loss because they underestimate the degree to which automation of some tasks within an occupation increases demand for the remaining, non-automatable tasks, a dynamic he terms task complementarity.

Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) formalize this distinction between the displacement effect, in which AI and robotics directly substitute for labor in specific tasks, and the reinstatement effect, in which new technologies create new tasks in which labor has a comparative advantage. Their empirical work suggests that the net employment effect of automation depends on the balance between these two forces, which in turn depends on the pace of technological change, the rate at which new tasks are created, and institutional factors such as education and training systems. This framework has become a standard reference point for subsequent labor-market research on AI, including work by international organizations. The World Economic Forum's (2020) Future of Jobs Report similarly frames AI's labor-market effects in terms of task reconfiguration rather than simple substitution, while emphasizing substantial projected churn in specific occupational categories.

A second major theme in this literature is polarization. Autor (2015) and related work document a long-term pattern in which automation, including AI-enabled automation, has disproportionately displaced middle-skill, routine-task occupations, while both high-skill, abstract-task occupations and low-skill, manual-task occupations have proven comparatively resilient. This polarization has implications for income distribution and occupational structure that extend well beyond the immediate question of job counts, connecting labor economics to the sociological literature on inequality discussed in Section 4. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) describe this dynamic as part of a broader "great decoupling" between productivity growth and median wage growth, attributing a significant share of this decoupling to digital and AI-enabled technologies.

A third theme concerns the pace and unevenness of adoption. Susskind (2020) argues that public debate about AI and work often assumes a uniform and rapid pace of technological change that does not match the empirical record of gradual, sector-specific diffusion. This observation is important for interpreting the education literature reviewed above: if AI adoption in the economy at large is gradual and uneven, the same is likely true of AI adoption in schools, which suggests caution in extrapolating from early-adopter contexts to education systems as a whole.

3.1 Skills, Reskilling, and Workforce Transitions

A substantial applied literature has examined the specific skill implications of AI-driven automation, extending the more theoretical displacement-reinstatement framework of Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) into workforce-planning terms. The McKinsey Global Institute's skill-shift analysis (Bughin et al., 2018) projects substantial growth in demand for technological, social-emotional, and higher cognitive skills relative to demand for physical and manual skills and basic cognitive skills, a projection broadly consistent with the polarization pattern documented by Autor (2015) but framed in terms directly actionable for workforce and curriculum planning. Bughin et al. (2018) further estimate that a substantial share of the workforce in advanced economies may need to change occupational categories or undertake significant retraining over the coming decade, a scale of transition that, they argue, existing adult education and workforce-training systems are not currently resourced to support.

This reskilling literature connects directly back to the education-focused discussion in Section 2: if large-scale occupational transitions are anticipated, the capacity of both initial education systems and adult retraining infrastructure to support these transitions becomes a first-order policy question, one that neither the education-technology literature nor the labor-economics literature reviewed here has yet addressed in a fully integrated way. This gap is revisited in the discussion of interdisciplinary research opportunities in Section 5.

4. AI AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE: INEQUALITY, GOVERNANCE, AND ETHICS

Where the education and labor-market literatures focus primarily on outcomes, the sociological and ethics-oriented literature on AI focuses more on mechanisms: how algorithmic systems come to encode particular assumptions, whose interests they serve, and how their effects are distributed across social groups. Eubanks (2018) provides an influential account of how automated decision-making systems in social services can disproportionately burden low-income populations, arguing that the appearance of algorithmic neutrality can obscure decisions that would be recognized as discriminatory if made by a human caseworker. Zuboff (2019) situates AI within a broader critique of what she terms surveillance capitalism, in which behavioral data extraction becomes a primary business model, with implications for both labor markets and the governance of educational and other public institutions that adopt commercial AI platforms.

A parallel literature has developed around the ethical governance of AI. Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena (2019) conducted a systematic review of AI ethics guidelines published by governments, companies, and civil-society organizations, finding substantial convergence around principles such as transparency, fairness, and accountability, but far less convergence on how these principles should be operationalized or enforced. Floridi and Cowls (2019) propose a unified framework of five principles, beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability, intended to synthesize this proliferation of guidelines into a coherent ethical foundation. This governance-oriented literature intersects with both education and labor-market research: the OECD (2019) and UNESCO (2021) reports cited in Section 2 explicitly draw on ethics-of-AI frameworks in their recommendations for educational policy, while similar frameworks inform emerging regulatory proposals for AI in employment contexts.

A recurring finding across this literature is that AI systems tend to reflect and can amplify the social structures within which they are developed and deployed, rather than operating as neutral technical instruments. This has direct implications for the equity concerns raised in the education literature and for the polarization dynamics identified in the labor-market literature. If, as Eubanks (2018) and Zuboff (2019) argue, algorithmic systems tend to reproduce existing patterns of advantage and disadvantage, then the optimistic claims made for AI's potential to personalize education or to create new categories of skilled work should be read alongside a serious accounting of who is positioned to benefit from these changes and who bears the associated risks.

4.1 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

A specific and well-documented mechanism through which AI systems can reproduce social inequality is algorithmic bias, the tendency of machine-learning systems trained on historical data to reproduce, and sometimes amplify, patterns of discrimination present in that data. Noble (2018) documents this dynamic in the context of commercial search engines, showing how search algorithms optimized for engagement and advertising revenue can systematically reproduce racist and sexist associations present in existing web content, a finding with direct relevance for AI-enabled educational and hiring tools that rely on similar underlying techniques. Binns (2018) approaches the same problem from the standpoint of political philosophy, arguing that technical debates about algorithmic fairness, which typically focus on statistical criteria such as equalized error rates across groups, cannot be fully resolved through technical means alone because different fairness criteria embody different, and sometimes mutually incompatible, substantive theories of justice, echoing the broader point made by Jobin et al. (2019) that convergence on abstract ethical principles for AI has not been matched by convergence on how to operationalize them.

This algorithmic-bias literature sharpens the equity concerns raised throughout this review. It suggests that the risk is not only that AI in education and employment will be unevenly adopted across advantaged and disadvantaged groups, the access-based equity concern raised by the OECD (2019), but that even where AI systems are adopted uniformly, their outputs may systematically disadvantage particular groups through mechanisms that are often opaque to the institutions deploying them, reinforcing the case made in Section 5 for closer integration between technical, educational, and sociological research on AI's societal effects.

5. DISCUSSION: INTERDISCIPLINARY SYNTHESIS AND RESEARCH GAPS

Reading these three literatures together reveals a consistent structural pattern. In education, AI is described as having the potential to personalize and democratize learning, while empirical and equity-focused research raises concerns about uneven access and unproven learning gains (Holmes et al., 2019; OECD, 2019). In labor markets, AI is described as reconfiguring rather than eliminating work, while empirical research on polarization suggests that the benefits of this reconfiguration accrue disproportionately to already advantaged workers (Autor, 2015; Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019). In the broader social-structural literature, AI is described as a governable technology amenable to ethical frameworks, while critical scholarship suggests that governance efforts routinely lag behind deployment and that existing inequalities shape both the design and the effects of AI systems (Eubanks, 2018; Jobin et al., 2019).

This pattern suggests a clear direction for future interdisciplinary research: studies that explicitly connect classroom-level and firm-level data on AI adoption to the broader distributive questions raised by sociologists and ethicists of technology. At present, education researchers rarely draw on labor economists' distinction between displacement and reinstatement effects, even though this distinction is directly relevant to debates about whether AI will deskill or reskill the teaching profession. Similarly, labor economists studying automation rarely engage with the equity-focused critiques developed in the sociology of algorithms, even though the polarization patterns they document are precisely the kind of distributive outcome that sociological research seeks to explain. Building genuinely interdisciplinary research teams, and developing shared datasets and terminology across these fields, represents a significant but tractable opportunity for future scholarship.

A second gap concerns the underrepresentation of contexts outside high-income countries in all three literatures. Much of the foundational work reviewed here, including Frey and Osborne (2017), Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019), and Selwyn (2019), draws primarily on evidence from the United States and Western Europe. The World Bank's (2022) work on global inequality and the OECD's (2019) comparative education data suggest that the mechanisms and magnitudes of AI's effects on education and labor markets are likely to differ substantially in other institutional and economic contexts, an area that remains comparatively underexplored.

6. CONCLUSION

This review has synthesized research on AI in education, AI and labor markets, and AI and social structure, arguing that these three literatures, though institutionally separate, describe interconnected dimensions of the same technological transformation. Across all three domains, a consistent tension emerges between AI's stated potential to personalize, augment, and democratize, and empirical evidence pointing toward uneven adoption, persistent skill and resource-based polarization, and the reproduction of existing social inequalities. Future research would benefit from more deliberate integration across these literatures, from greater attention to contexts beyond high-income countries, and from empirical designs that connect micro-level evidence on classroom and workplace AI adoption to macro-level questions about social stratification and governance.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(2), 3–30.

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

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 149–159.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W. W. Norton & Company.

Bughin, J., Hazan, E., Lund, S., Dahlström, P., Wiesinger, A., & Subramaniam, A. (2018). Skill shift: Automation and the future of the workforce. McKinsey Global Institute.

Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. Harvard Data Science Review, 1(1).

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

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. Pearson.

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.

OECD. (2019). Artificial intelligence in society. OECD Publishing.

Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Polity Press.

Susskind, D. (2020). A world without work: Technology, automation, and how we should respond. Metropolitan Books.

UNESCO. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO Publishing.

Williamson, B. (2017). Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice. SAGE Publications.

World Bank. (2022). Poverty and shared prosperity 2022: Correcting course. World Bank Publications.

World Economic Forum. (2020). The future of jobs report 2020. World Economic Forum.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1), 39.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.