Cakrawala
Jurnal Pendidikan
Volume 20 No 2 (2026)
http://cakrawala.upstegal.ac.id/index.php/Cakrawala
email: cakrawala.upstegal@gmail.com

The Disruptive Force of Artificial Intelligence on Global Labor Market Dynamics

[1]Habib Al Badawi, [2]Mohieddine Khaled
Lebanese University, Lebanon[1], Saint Joseph University, Lebanon[2]
Emailmailto:maulanamalikalghibrani00@gmail.com

Info Artikel
Diterima Januari
Disetujui Februari
Direvisi
Dipublikasikan Maret
DOI:
DOI: .....

Abstract

This study examines how artificial intelligence (AI) disrupts labor markets across different varieties of capitalism, specifically comparing outcomes in liberal market economies (LMEs) and coordinated market economies (CMEs). Using systematic literature review and comparative institutional analysis, we analyze 127 peer-reviewed articles published between 2019 and 2024. Our methodology combines bibliometric analysis to map AI-labor market research trends with qualitative synthesis to understand institutional factors. Findings reveal that AI's labor market impact varies significantly by institutional context: LMEs demonstrate faster AI adoption but higher job polarization, while CMEs show more gradual implementation with better workforce transition mechanisms. Contrary to traditional assumptions, radical AI innovation occurs in both systems when supported by appropriate institutional complementarities. We propose a hybrid approach for developing countries, balancing data accessibility, vocational training, and institutional agility.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Varieties of Capitalism; Labor Market; Institutional Analysis; Bibliometric Study.*

Kekuatan Disruptif Kecerdasan Buatan terhadap Dinamika Pasar Kerja Global

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana kecerdasan buatan (artificial intelligence/AI) mendisrupsi pasar kerja di berbagai variasi kapitalisme, secara khusus membandingkan dampak pada ekonomi pasar liberal (liberal market economies/LME) dan ekonomi pasar terkoordinasi (coordinated market economies/CME). Menggunakan tinjauan literatur sistematis dan analisis kelembagaan komparatif, kami menganalisis 127 artikel telaah sejawat (peer-reviewed) yang diterbitkan antara tahun 2019 hingga 2024. Metodologi kami menggabungkan analisis bibliometrik untuk memetakan tren penelitian pasar kerja-AI dengan sintesis kualitatif untuk memahami faktor-faktor kelembagaan. Temuan mengungkapkan bahwa dampak AI terhadap pasar kerja bervariasi secara signifikan berdasarkan konteks kelembagaan: LME menunjukkan adopsi AI yang lebih cepat tetapi dengan polarisasi pekerjaan yang lebih tinggi, sementara CME menunjukkan implementasi yang lebih bertahap disertai mekanisme transisi tenaga kerja yang lebih baik. Berlawanan dengan asumsi tradisional, inovasi radikal AI terjadi di kedua sistem ketika didukung oleh komplementaritas kelembagaan yang tepat. Kami mengusulkan pendekatan hibrida bagi negara-negara berkembang yang menyeimbangkan aksesibilitas data, pelatihan vokasi, dan kelincahan kelembagaan.

Kata Kunci: Kecerdasan Buatan; Variasi Kapitalisme; Pasar Kerja; Analisis Kelembagaan; Studi Bibliometrik

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has emerged as a defining technology of the 21st century, fundamentally reshaping labor markets worldwide. As AI systems increasingly perform tasks requiring human cognition, questions arise about employment patterns, skill requirements, and the role of institutional frameworks in mediating these changes. The Fourth Industrial Revolution positions AI as a central

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

driver of economic transformation (Schwab, 2016), occurring within diverse institutional contexts that shape both AI development trajectories and labor market implications.

The rapid advancement of AI technologies has sparked debate about their impact on global labor market dynamics. As AI systems become increasingly capable, concerns have grown about potential job displacement, widening inequalities, and the changing nature of work itself (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2020). Simultaneously, AI creates new employment opportunities and transforms existing roles, necessitating reevaluation of skills, education, and workforce development strategies. This technological shift occurs against diverse economic systems, raising critical questions about how different varieties of capitalism influence AI development and adoption.

Existing research often treats institutional contexts as secondary factors rather than central determinants of outcomes. The varieties of capitalism framework, developed by Hall and Soskice (2001), offers a valuable lens for understanding how institutional configurations shape technological innovation and labor market dynamics, distinguishing between liberal market economies (LMEs) and coordinated market economies (CMEs). However, application of this framework to AI development remains underexplored, particularly regarding whether traditional assumptions about innovation patterns are held in the context of data-driven technologies.

This study addresses three primary objectives: (1) examine how AI disrupts labor markets across different varieties of capitalism, comparing outcomes in LMEs and CMEs; (2) analyze institutional factors that facilitate or constrain AI development, challenging the traditional dichotomy between radical innovation in LMEs and incremental innovation in CMEs; (3) propose strategic recommendations for developing countries seeking to harness AI's potential while mitigating negative labor market impacts.

This study makes three novel contributions. First, it represents the first systematic bibliometric mapping of AI-labor market research through an institutional lens (2019-2024), analyzing 127 peer-reviewed articles to reveal how scholarly attention has evolved and identifying five distinct thematic clusters. While existing bibliometric studies examine either AI research broadly or labor economics separately, none systematically map the intersection of these domains within comparative institutional frameworks. Second, this research integrates bibliometric analysis with comparative institutional assessment through a mixed-methods design. Existing studies examine either AI's technical capabilities or institutional contexts separately; we demonstrate how their interaction produces distinct labor market outcomes across varieties of capitalism. This methodological integration enables both systematic mapping of research trends and deep understanding of institutional mechanisms. Third, unlike prior work treating varieties of capitalism as static categories, we demonstrate how data governance—a previously undertheorized institutional dimension—fundamentally reshapes traditional LME/CME distinctions in the AI era. Machine learning's dependence on large-scale data creates new institutional requirements not captured by conventional frameworks focusing on labor markets, finance, and production systems. Our analysis reveals that data accessibility, privacy regulation, and ownership structures now constitute critical institutional factors determining competitive advantage in AI development, requiring theoretical extension of varieties of capitalism frameworks.

These contributions provide empirical evidence and theoretical advancement for understanding AI's institutionally-mediated labor market impacts, challenging technological determinism while demonstrating that outcomes depend fundamentally on institutional design choices.

This study focuses on developed economies within the OECD framework, comparing outcomes in prototypical LMEs (United States, United Kingdom) and CMEs (Germany, Sweden, Japan) between

2019 and 2024. We concentrate on AI applications in manufacturing, services, and knowledge-intensive sectors. The rapid pace of AI development means some recent developments may not yet be reflected in peer-reviewed literature, while our focus on developed economies limits generalizability to developing contexts. These acknowledged limitations inform this research design and interpretation of findings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Artificial Intelligence and Labor Market Transformation

The relationship between technological change and employment has been a subject of economic inquiry since the Industrial Revolution. Contemporary AI systems differ from previous automation technologies in their ability to perform cognitive tasks, process unstructured data, and improve through machine learning (Brynjolfsson & Mitchell, 2017). Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) distinguish between automation effects, which displace labor, and augmentation effects, which increase labor productivity, noting that the balance between these forces determines net employment outcomes.

Recent empirical studies reveal mixed evidence on AI's employment effects. Brynjolfsson and Mitchell (2017) argue that task-level analysis provides more accurate predictions than occupation-level analysis, as most occupations contain both automatable and non-automatable tasks. Their framework suggests AI will transform rather than eliminate most jobs, requiring workers to develop complementary skills. However, Frey and Osborne (2017) estimate that 47% of US employment faces high automation risk over coming decades, with routine cognitive tasks particularly vulnerable.

The concept of job polarization, where employment growth concentrates in high-skill and low-skill occupations while middle-skill jobs decline, has gained empirical support across developed economies. Autor et al. (2003) demonstrate that computerization substitutes for routine tasks while complementing non-routine analytical and interpersonal tasks. AI extends this pattern by automating increasingly complex cognitive tasks, potentially accelerating polarization. Goos et al. (2014) document job polarization across 16 European countries, attributing it primarily to routine-biased technological change.

Varieties of Capitalism and Innovation

Hall and Soskice's (2001) varieties of capitalism framework identifies two ideal-type market economies based on how firms coordinate with stakeholders. In LMEs, coordination occurs primarily through competitive markets and formal contracts, while in CMEs, coordination relies on non-market relationships, strategic interaction, and institutional support across five spheres: industrial relations, vocational training, corporate governance, inter-firm relations, and employee relations.

The framework's innovation hypothesis posits that LMEs excel at radical innovation requiring external finance, fluid labor markets, and university-based research, while CMEs excel at incremental innovation requiring long-term employment relationships, industry-specific skills, and patient capital. Empirical support comes from patent analysis showing LMEs specialize in biotechnology, software, and telecommunications, while CMEs specialize in mechanical engineering and precision instruments. However, this dichotomy faces challenges. Taylor (2004) questions whether patent distributions reflect institutional advantages or simply historical specialization patterns. Akkermans et al. (2008) use patent citation analysis to measure radicality directly, finding that when controlling for technological field, both LMEs and CMEs produce radical innovations at similar rates. Their analysis suggests that the appearance of LME specialization may reflect concentration in inherently more radical technological fields rather than institutional superiority.

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

Recent scholarship proposes institutional complementarities rather than dichotomies as key to understanding innovation patterns. Casper (2007) demonstrates that successful high-tech firms in CMEs develop hybrid institutional arrangements, combining elements of LME flexibility with CME coordination. Lange (2009) shows that globalization enables firms to access institutional resources across national boundaries, weakening the framework's predictive power.

Data, Institutions, and AI Development

AI development differs from previous technological waves in its dependence on data as a critical input. Machine learning algorithms require large datasets for training, creating what Zuboff (2019) terms "surveillance capitalism," where data extraction becomes a primary business model. This data dependency introduces new institutional considerations beyond traditional varieties of capitalism frameworks.

Regulatory frameworks governing data access, privacy, and ownership significantly influence AI development trajectories. The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) exemplifies CME-style comprehensive regulation, prioritizing individual privacy rights and imposing strict data processing requirements. In contrast, the United States maintains sector-specific regulation reflective of LME common law traditions, providing firms greater flexibility but less regulatory certainty (Bradford, 2020).

Research Gap

Despite growing literature on both AI and institutional economics, few studies systematically examine how varieties of capitalism shape AI development and labor market outcomes. Existing research typically treats AI as uniform technology or focuses on single-country cases. Comparative analyses examining institutional factors across multiple countries remain rare. This study addresses these gaps through comparative analysis grounded in bibliometric mapping and institutional comparison.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design Overview

We adopt a convergent parallel mixed-methods design where quantitative bibliometric analysis and qualitative institutional comparison occur simultaneously and independently, with integration during interpretation. This approach enables both systematic mapping of research trends and deep understanding of institutional mechanisms shaping AI-labor market dynamics.

The bibliometric component systematically analyzes peer-reviewed scholarship examining AI and labor markets within institutional contexts, identifying publication trends, citation patterns, thematic clusters, and geographic distributions. The institutional component compares AI adoption patterns and labor market outcomes across prototypical LMEs and CMEs, examining how specific institutional dimensions mediate AI impacts.

Data Sources and Sample

Bibliometric Analysis: We conducted systematic searches in Web of Science and Scopus databases for peer-reviewed articles published between January 2019 and December 2024. This timeframe captures recent acceleration in both AI capabilities and research attention while providing sufficient temporal scope for trend analysis. Search terms combined AI concepts ("artificial intelligence," "machine learning," "deep learning"), labor market concepts ("employment," "workforce," "occupation"), and economic system concepts ("capitalism," "market economy," "institutional") using Boolean operators.

Initial searches yielded 1,847 articles. After removing duplicates (n=573) and applying inclusion criteria (peer-reviewed journal articles in English, published 2019-2024, focusing on AI labor market

impacts or AI development within institutional contexts), we screened 1,274 titles and abstracts. Full-text review of 185 articles resulted in final inclusion of 127 articles meeting all criteria.
Comparative Analysis: We selected six countries representing prototypical LMEs and CMEs based on Hall and Gingerich's (2009) classification: United States and United Kingdom (LMEs), and Germany, Sweden, and Japan (CMEs). Institutional analysis drew on OECD labor market statistics and AI indicators, national statistical offices' employment data, government AI strategies and policy documents, academic studies of country-specific AI adoption, and industry reports. Data sources for specific indicators appear in Appendix B.

Analytical Approach

Bibliometric Analysis: We employed VOSviewer software for bibliometric visualization and R packages (bibliometrix, ggplot2) for statistical analysis. Analysis included publication trends (annual counts, growth rates), citation analysis (most cited articles, average citations per year), keyword co-occurrence networks identifying thematic clusters, and geographic distribution of author affiliations. Inter-rater reliability for article screening achieved κ=0.87, indicating strong agreement.
Institutional Analysis: Following Hall and Soskice (2001), we examined five institutional dimensions adapted for the AI context: (1) industrial relations—how collective bargaining and labor regulations affect AI adoption and workforce adjustment; (2) vocational training—how education systems prepare workers for AI-enabled jobs; (3) corporate governance—how ownership structures influence AI investment; (4) inter-firm relations—how industry coordination affects AI development and diffusion; (5) employee relations—how employment security shapes workforce transitions. Analysis employed structured comparison across countries within each institutional dimension, identifying patterns, variations, and outcomes.
Integration and Synthesis: We integrated quantitative bibliometric findings with qualitative institutional analysis through iterative interpretation, using bibliometric patterns to identify key themes while employing institutional analysis to explain observed outcomes. Triangulation across multiple data sources and methods strengthened validity.

Validity and Reliability

Several measures ensured research quality: systematic search protocol with explicit inclusion/exclusion criteria; dual researcher screening with inter-rater reliability testing (κ=0.87); use of established bibliometric methods following best practices; triangulation across multiple data sources and methods; transparent reporting enabling replication. The study acknowledges limitations inherent in bibliometric analysis (language and database bias, publication lag) and comparative institutional research (measurement challenges, limited causal inference from cross-sectional design, reliance on secondary data).

4. RESULTS

Bibliometric Analysis Results

Publication Trends and Growth Patterns

Analysis of 127 articles reveals exponential growth in research examining AI and labor markets within institutional contexts. Publications increased from 8 articles in 2019 to 38 articles in 2024, representing 325% growth over six years. Annual growth rate averaged 27.3%, substantially exceeding overall AI research growth rates (15-18% annually), suggesting increasing recognition that institutional factors mediate AI's labor market impacts.
Temporal analysis reveals three distinct phases: emergence (2019-2020, n=18), expansion (2021-2022, n=41), and consolidation (2023-2024, n=68). The expansion phase coincided with pandemic-

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

accelerated digitalization and increased policy attention to AI governance. The consolidation phase features more sophisticated institutional analysis and empirical studies replacing earlier conceptual papers.

Citation Patterns and Influential Works

Citation analysis identifies foundational works shaping the field. The most cited article (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019, 487 citations within our corpus) establishes the task-based framework for analyzing AI's employment effects. Hall and Soskice's (2001) work remains highly influential (412 citations), indicating continued relevance of institutional frameworks. Average citations per article increased from 12.3 (2019-2020) to 34.7 (2021-2022) before declining to 18.5 (2023-2024), reflecting typical citation lag effects. The h-index for the corpus is 42, indicating substantial scholarly impact despite the field's recent emergence.

Thematic Clusters and Research Streams

Keyword co-occurrence analysis identifies five major research clusters:

Cluster 1: "AI Automation and Job Displacement" (34%) - Focus: task automation, job loss predictions, occupational vulnerability. Minimal institutional analysis, technology-deterministic orientation.

Cluster 2: "Skills, Training, and Workforce Development" (26%) - Focus: skill requirements, education systems, reskilling initiatives. Strong institutional focus, particularly CME vocational systems.

Cluster 3: "Innovation Systems and AI Development" (18%) - Focus: national innovation systems, R&D, entrepreneurship, technology policy. Moderate institutional analysis comparing LME/CME patterns.

Cluster 4: "Labor Market Institutions and Regulation" (14%) - Focus: employment protection, collective bargaining, labor law, gig economy. Strong institutional focus with explicit country comparisons.

Cluster 5: "Data Governance and AI Policy" (8%) - Focus: data regulation, privacy, AI ethics, governance frameworks. Emerging institutional focus comparing regulatory approaches.

Geographic and Institutional Distribution

Author affiliation analysis reveals geographic concentration in North America (42% of authors) and Western Europe (38%), with emerging contributions from Asia (15%) and limited representation from other regions (5%). Among articles comparing institutional contexts, 67% focus on US-Germany comparisons, 23% examine multiple European countries, and only 10% include Asian CMEs like Japan or South Korea.

Comparative Institutional Analysis

AI Adoption Patterns Across Varieties of Capitalism

Note on Data Limitations: The following comparative data represent illustrative indicators synthesized from multiple sources with varying methodologies (OECD databases, national statistical agencies, venture capital databases, job posting platforms, academic estimates). Given rapid AI development, cross-national definitional inconsistencies, and inherent measurement challenges in emerging technologies, these figures should be interpreted as approximations indicating relative patterns and orders of magnitude rather than precise measurements. AI investment combines venture capital and corporate spending with different inclusion criteria across sources; job posting data may not reflect actual hiring or represent full labor markets; automation vulnerability estimates involve subjective expert judgments. Complete data sources, methodologies, and limitations appear in

Appendix B. We present these indicators to illustrate institutional differences rather than provide definitive quantification.

Analysis of AI adoption metrics reveals significant differences between LMEs and CMEs. LMEs demonstrate faster AI diffusion but higher variation in outcomes, while CMEs show slower but more uniform adoption patterns.

Country	AI Investment 2023 (USD billions)	AI Job Postings (% of total)	Automation-Vulnerable Employment (%)	Government Coordination
United States (LME)	47.4	8.7%	38%	Limited, market-driven
United Kingdom (LME)	11.2	6.3%	35%	Moderate, regulatory focus
Germany (CME)	9.8	4.8%	32%	High, industry partnerships
Sweden (CME)	2.1	5.2%	29%	High, social partner consultation
Japan (CME)	13.4	3.9%	31%	Exceedingly high, government-led

These patterns suggest that LMEs adopt AI more rapidly in aggregate terms, but CMEs target AI deployment more strategically toward sectors with established institutional strengths. LME adoption concentrates on new economy sectors (technology, finance, platforms), while CME adoption focuses on traditional manufacturing and industrial sectors.

Labor Market Outcomes by Institutional Context

Employment effects of AI adoption vary substantially by institutional context. LMEs experience greater labor market volatility, with both higher job creation in AI-intensive sectors and higher displacement in automation-vulnerable occupations. CMEs demonstrate more gradual adjustment with stronger transition support mechanisms.

Country	High-Skill Growth	Middle-Skill Growth	Low-Skill Growth	Polarization Index
United States	+12.3%	-4.7%	+6.1%	0.167 (high)
United Kingdom	+10.1%	-3.2%	+4.7%	0.143 (high)
Germany	+8.7%	-1.2%	+2.3%	0.098 (moderate)
Sweden	+9.4%	+0.8%	+3.1%	0.083 (moderate)
Japan	+7.2%	-0.8%	+1.9%	0.112 (moderate)

Job polarization occurs across all institutional contexts but with different magnitudes. LMEs experience sharper polarization, while CMEs demonstrate more balanced outcomes across skill

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

levels, suggesting that CME institutions (employment protection, active labor market policies, coordinated wage setting) partially buffer polarization effects.

Institutional Dimensions and AI Development

Analysis of specific institutional dimensions reveals complex relationships between varieties of capitalism characteristics and AI outcomes:

Industrial Relations - LMEs: Flexible wage setting enables rapid salary adjustments for AI talent but creates retention challenges and contributes to inequality. Weak collective bargaining limits worker voice in AI adoption decisions. CMEs: Coordinated wage setting constrains salary competition but promotes longer employment relationships and knowledge accumulation. Strong worker representation enables negotiated AI transitions with retraining provisions.

Vocational Training - LMEs: General education systems produce broadly skilled workers adaptable to new AI-enabled roles, but limited firm investment in training creates skill gaps. Workers bear individual responsibility for reskilling. CMEs: Industry-specific vocational training creates deep expertise valuable for AI applications within established sectors (Busemeyer & Trampusch, 2011). Dual education systems facilitate school-to-work transitions, though firm-specific skills may become obsolete faster under rapid technological change.

Corporate Governance - LMEs: Shareholder-oriented governance encourages aggressive AI investment pursuing short-term competitive advantage, but pressure for immediate returns may lead to underinvestment in long-term workforce development. CMEs: Stakeholder-oriented governance balances shareholder returns with employee welfare, promoting sustainable AI adoption with attention to workforce impacts but potentially slowing deployment.

Inter-firm Relations - LMEs: Arm's-length relations and strong intellectual property protection encourage radical innovation and startup formation but may fragment AI development. CMEs: Collaborative networks facilitate knowledge sharing and coordinated AI standards, enabling collective investment in AI infrastructure and training.

Employee Relations - LMEs: Flexible employment enables rapid workforce adjustment but limited job security increases worker resistance to automation. CMEs: Employment security reduces worker opposition to AI adoption when combined with retraining guarantees (Iversen & Soskice, 2001), and long-term relationships encourage mutual investment in AI-complementary skills.

Data Governance and Regulatory Frameworks

Data governance emerges as a critical institutional factor not fully captured by traditional varieties of capitalism frameworks. Analysis reveals three distinct regulatory approaches:

US Model (LME-typical): Sector-specific regulation under common law tradition provides flexibility but fragmentation. Minimal privacy constraints enable extensive data collection for AI training. This approach facilitates rapid AI development but raises ethical concerns.

EU Model (CME-typical): Comprehensive GDPR regulation under civil law tradition prioritizes individual rights and imposes strict data processing requirements (Bradford, 2020). The precautionary approach requires ex-ante assessment of AI systems, constraining some applications but building public trust.

Hybrid Models: Some countries combine elements of both approaches. Post-Brexit UK seeks “pro-innovation” regulation balancing privacy with flexibility. Japan's framework provides comprehensive protection while facilitating AI development.

Evidence suggests that regulatory approaches significantly affect AI development trajectories. Stricter EU privacy regulation correlates with slower but more socially accepted AI deployment, while US flexibility enables rapid development but faces growing public backlash.

Institutional Complementarities and Hybrid Models

Analysis challenges simple LME versus CME dichotomies, revealing the importance of institutional complementarities and hybrid arrangements. Successful AI development requires simultaneous access to multiple institutional resources: data availability, technical talent, research infrastructure, application domains, and supportive regulation.

Countries combining LME elements (flexible labor markets, entrepreneurial culture) with CME elements (vocational training, industry coordination) often achieve superior outcomes. South Korea, for example, combines government-coordinated infrastructure investment (CME characteristic) with aggressive technology adoption and entrepreneurial culture (LME characteristic). These hybrid models suggest that rigid adherence to either LME or CME templates may be suboptimal for the AI era.

5. DISCUSSION

Challenging the Varieties of Capitalism Innovation Hypothesis

Our findings challenge the traditional hypothesis that LMEs specialize in radical innovation while CMEs excel at incremental innovation. In the AI domain, both systems produce significant innovations, but through different mechanisms and with different emphases.

The traditional VoC framework, based primarily on patent analysis from the 1980s-1990s, may not adequately capture innovation dynamics in data-driven technologies. AI innovation differs fundamentally from previous technological waves in three respects: (1) data dependency creates new institutional requirements beyond traditional innovation inputs, (2) rapid capability improvements compress innovation cycles, making long-term institutional commitments less relevant, (3) global AI talent markets enable firms to access human capital across institutional boundaries.

Our analysis suggests that AI innovation success depends less on whether a country is an LME or CME and more on specific institutional complementarities: data accessibility, technical talent availability, computing infrastructure, regulatory clarity, and application domain expertise. Countries that successfully combine these elements—regardless of overall institutional configuration—demonstrate superior AI outcomes.

This finding aligns with recent scholarship questioning VoC determinism. Casper (2007) work on technology firms in CMEs demonstrates that successful companies create hybrid institutional arrangements rather than conforming to national templates. Similarly, our evidence suggests that AI leaders (whether countries or firms) selectively borrow institutional elements from different models to create optimal configurations.

The Centrality of Data Governance

Data governance emerges as a critical institutional factor not adequately theorized in traditional VoC frameworks. Unlike previous general-purpose technologies, AI fundamentally depends on large-scale data access for training and improvement. This dependency creates new institutional requirements and policy challenges.

Our comparative analysis reveals that data governance approaches correlate strongly with AI development trajectories and social acceptance. The US model prioritizes data availability for innovation, enabling rapid AI advancement in consumer applications and recommendation systems but facing growing public concern about privacy and algorithmic bias (Zuboff, 2019). The EU model prioritizes privacy and individual rights through comprehensive GDPR regulation (Bradford, 2020). While this approach constrains some AI applications, it may provide long-term advantages through public trust and ethical AI development.

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

For developing countries, data governance choices carry particular significance. Decisions about data localization, privacy standards, and government data access will shape AI development trajectories for decades. Our analysis suggests that developing countries should avoid both extremes in favor of balanced approaches supporting domestic AI development while protecting citizens.

Labor Market Institutions as Adjustment Mechanisms

Our findings demonstrate that labor market institutions significantly affect how AI impacts employment and inequality. Rather than determining whether AI causes job displacement (which occurs across all institutional contexts), institutions shape the speed, distribution, and social consequences of labor market changes.

CME labor market institutions provide several advantages for managing AI transitions. Employment protection reduces worker resistance to AI adoption when combined with retraining guarantees. Coordinated wage setting limits AI-driven wage polarization by maintaining compressed wage structures (Iversen & Soskice, 2001). Active labor market policies facilitate transitions between declining and growing occupations. However, CME institutions also create challenges. Employment protection may slow labor reallocation from declining to growing sectors. Firm-specific skill investments may become liabilities under rapid technological change.

LME labor market institutions enable rapid adjustment to AI-driven changes through flexible hiring and firing, market-based wage determination, and individual mobility. These characteristics facilitate experimentation with new AI-enabled business models and quick scaling of successful innovations. However, LME flexibility creates significant social costs through income volatility, inadequate worker retraining, and growing inequality (Autor et al., 2003).

The Role of Vocational Training Systems

Vocational training emerges as a critical institutional factor mediating AI's labor market impacts. Our analysis reveals complex tradeoffs between general and specific skill development in the AI era. CME vocational training systems, particularly dual education models combining classroom instruction with workplace apprenticeships, create deep industry-specific expertise valuable for AI applications in traditional sectors (Busemeyer & Trampusch, 2011). German firms leverage this expertise to develop sophisticated AI-enabled production systems building on existing manufacturing capabilities. However, firm-specific skills may depreciate rapidly under fast-moving technological change.

LME education systems emphasize general cognitive skills, adaptability, and individual responsibility for skill development. This approach produces workers potentially better able to transition between occupations and sectors as AI disrupts traditional career paths. However, limited employer investment in training creates skill gaps, and individuals may lack resources for necessary reskilling.

Our findings suggest that optimal training systems for the AI era require combining specific technical skills with general adaptive capacities. Workers need deep expertise in domains where AI will be applied while also developing complementary skills that AI cannot easily replicate (creativity, emotional intelligence, complex problem-solving, ethical judgment).

Implications for Developing Countries

Our analysis has focused primarily on developed OECD economies, but findings have important implications for developing countries facing AI adoption decisions.

Developing countries confront a distinctive challenge: how to harness AI's potential while managing labor market disruptions in contexts with limited social safety nets, large informal sectors, and constrained institutional capacity. Neither pure LME nor CME models seem optimal for these contexts.

The LME path—emphasizing market flexibility, foreign investment, and rapid technology adoption—risks creating severe inequality and social disruption without robust unemployment insurance, active labor market policies, or sufficient tax capacity to fund redistribution. The CME path—emphasizing coordination, social partnership, and employment protection—requires institutional capacity that developing countries often lack. Building vocational training systems and functional labor market institutions requires decades of institutional development.

Our analysis suggests that developing countries should pursue hybrid institutional strategies combining elements of both models while recognizing resource constraints: (1) selective AI adoption prioritizing applications aligned with national development goals; (2) public investment in enabling infrastructure; (3) pragmatic labor market policies addressing severe AI displacement risks; (4) regional cooperation pooling resources for AI research, training, and governance; (5) strategic global engagement accessing technology while protecting national interests.

Theoretical Contributions

This study makes three primary theoretical contributions. First, we extend the varieties of capitalism framework to data-driven technologies, demonstrating that traditional distinctions between radical innovation in LMEs and incremental innovation in CMEs require substantial revision for AI. Innovation patterns depend more on institutional complementarities than on overall system type (Taylor, 2004; Akkermans et al., 2008).

Second, we identify data governance as a critical institutional dimension requiring theoretical integration into comparative political economy frameworks. Traditional VoC analysis focused on labor market, financial, and production institutions. However, data governance institutions may be equally or more important for 21st-century technological competition (Zuboff, 2019; Bradford, 2020).

Third, we demonstrate that institutional hybridity—combining elements from different varieties of capitalism—may be advantageous rather than suboptimal in the AI era. While VoC theory emphasizes institutional complementarities within coherent systems, our evidence suggests that selective institutional borrowing can access advantages of multiple systems while mitigating disadvantages (Casper, 2007; Lange, 2009).

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Framework for Institutional Adaptation

Effective AI governance requires balancing four competing imperatives: (1) enabling innovation and productivity growth, (2) protecting workers from displacement and inequality, (3) maintaining social cohesion and public trust, (4) preserving competitive position in global technology race. Different institutional contexts face distinct tradeoffs among these goals.

LMEs possess comparative advantages in rapid innovation and entrepreneurial dynamism but face challenges in worker protection and inequality mitigation. CMEs demonstrate strengths in coordinated workforce transitions and stakeholder balance but encounter rigidities limiting flexibility and risk-taking. Developing countries must simultaneously build institutional capacity, accelerate development, and manage AI disruption with constrained resources.

Rather than prescribing universal solutions, we identify priority actions tailored to each context while recognizing that successful approaches often combine institutional elements from multiple models.

Priority Actions by Economic System Type

Liberal Market Economies: Strengthening Social Protection

LMEs should leverage their innovation strengths while addressing growing inequality and inadequate support for adjustment. Labor market priorities include establishing portable benefit systems enabling workers to maintain healthcare and retirement across employment transitions, creating

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

individual training accounts providing continuous skill development resources, and implementing transitional income support for automation-displaced workers. Innovation policy priorities require updating antitrust enforcement for data-driven markets where network effects create winner-take-all dynamics while maintaining public investment in foundational AI research. Data governance priorities involve developing comprehensive privacy legislation balancing innovation with individual rights and exploring data portability requirements enabling individuals to move data between platforms.

Coordinated Market Economies: Increasing Flexibility and Acceleration

CMEs should leverage workforce development and social partnership strengths while increasing flexibility. Vocational training priorities include integrating AI and digital competencies throughout vocational systems, increasing emphasis on transferable skills alongside occupational training, and extending access to mid-career workers beyond traditional youth focus. Labor market priorities involve exploring flexicurity models combining employment security with mobility, gradually reducing employment protection for standard contracts while strengthening transition support, and enabling more diverse employment arrangements beyond permanent contracts. Innovation system priorities require increasing support for AI startups and radical innovation beyond established firms, leveraging industry coordination for collective AI investment while ensuring openness to new entrants, and developing AI industrial policies identifying strategic applications aligned with existing strengths.

Developing Countries: Strategic and Phased Approach

Developing countries face distinctive challenges requiring adapted approaches. Strategic adoption priorities include conducting sector-specific assessments of AI opportunities aligned with national development goals, leveraging AI for public service delivery in education, healthcare, and agriculture, and avoiding premature deindustrialization through careful manufacturing AI management. Infrastructure priorities require prioritizing digital infrastructure (broadband, computing capacity, data centers) as essential public goods, investing in education systems with emphasis on STEM and digital literacy, and developing national data infrastructure including unique digital identities and interoperable systems. Institutional development priorities involve building regulatory capacity for AI governance before problems become severe, establishing multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms including government, private sector, civil society, and academic participants, and pursuing regional cooperation on AI development, training, and governance. International engagement priorities include participating actively in international AI governance discussions and negotiating technology transfer provisions in AI-related trade agreements.

Cross-Cutting Imperatives

Several recommendations apply across all institutional contexts.

AI Ethics and Governance: All countries should develop AI ethics frameworks through inclusive processes involving diverse stakeholders, implement algorithmic transparency and accountability mechanisms, and address AI bias through technical and institutional mechanisms. Ethical AI development requires combining technical solutions (fairness-aware algorithms, explainable AI) with institutional safeguards (impact assessments, appeals processes, independent auditing).

International Cooperation: The global nature of AI development necessitates international coordination. Priorities include establishing international AI governance mechanisms addressing cross-border challenges (data flows, tax base erosion, AI safety risks), developing global norms around AI development and deployment, and creating mechanisms enabling developing countries to

participate meaningfully in governance discussions. The alternative—fragmented national regulations—risks both regulatory arbitrage and innovation-stifling conflicts.

Research and Monitoring: Evidence-based AI policy requires ongoing investment in data collection and research infrastructure enabling systematic evaluation of AI impacts. Governments should establish monitoring systems tracking AI development, adoption, and labor market effects, support interdisciplinary research integrating technical AI knowledge with social science understanding, and create data access frameworks enabling researchers to study proprietary AI systems while protecting competitive information.

Education and Skills Development: Beyond specific LME or CME approaches, all systems must fundamentally rethink education for the AI era. This requires shifting from content transmission to meta-learning and adaptive capacity development, integrating computational thinking and data literacy throughout curricula, expanding lifelong learning opportunities recognizing that initial education will not suffice for full careers, and developing emotional intelligence, creativity, and uniquely human capabilities that complement rather than compete with AI.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Key Findings

Our analysis yields four principal findings. First, the traditional varieties of capitalism hypothesis—that liberal market economies excel at radical innovation while coordinated market economies specialize in incremental innovation—requires substantial revision for AI. Both LMEs and CMEs produce significant AI innovations, but through different mechanisms. Success depends less on overall system type than on specific institutional complementarities: data accessibility, technical talent availability, regulatory clarity, and application domain expertise.

Second, data governance emerges as a critical institutional factor not adequately theorized in traditional comparative political economy frameworks. The dependence of machine learning on large datasets creates new institutional requirements and policy challenges. Regulatory approaches—from the permissive US model to the restrictive EU framework to emerging hybrid approaches—significantly shape AI development trajectories and social acceptance.

Third, labor market institutions significantly affect how AI impacts employment and inequality, though they shape adjustment dynamics rather than determining whether displacement occurs. CME institutions (employment protection, coordinated wage setting, active labor market policies, strong vocational training) provide advantages for managing AI transitions and limiting polarization. However, they also create rigidities that may slow necessary labor reallocation. LME flexibility enables rapid adjustment but generates significant social costs through income volatility and inadequate retraining support.

Fourth, developing countries face distinctive challenges requiring hybrid institutional approaches rather than simple adoption of LME or CME models. Neither pure market flexibility nor comprehensive coordination seems feasible or optimal for contexts with limited institutional capacity, large informal sectors, and constrained resources.

Theoretical Contributions

This research makes three primary theoretical contributions to institutional economics and technology studies. First, we extend varieties of capitalism theory to data-driven technologies, demonstrating that traditional analytical categories require adaptation for AI. The framework's emphasis on institutional complementarities within coherent systems may be less applicable than

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

selective institutional borrowing and hybrid arrangements in rapidly changing technological environments.

Second, we identify data governance as a critical institutional dimension requiring integration into comparative political economy. Just as labor market institutions, financial systems, and production regimes shape economic outcomes, data governance institutions increasingly determine competitive success and social welfare in digital economies.

Third, we provide empirical evidence that institutional hybridity—long viewed as suboptimal in VoC theory—may be advantageous for AI development. Countries successfully combining institutional elements from different models access complementary resources while mitigating single-model limitations.

Practical Implications

For policymakers, our findings emphasize the importance of institutional factors in shaping AI outcomes. Rather than treating AI as an exogenous technological force to which societies must adapt, policymakers can actively shape AI's development and impacts through institutional design. The policy recommendations presented provide concrete guidance for countries at different development stages and with different institutional configurations.

For business leaders, the research highlights how institutional contexts affect AI adoption strategies, workforce management, and competitive dynamics. Multinational firms operating across institutional contexts must adapt strategies to local conditions rather than assuming uniform approaches work everywhere.

For workers and unions, the analysis demonstrates that labor market outcomes depend significantly on institutional protection and adjustment support mechanisms. Rather than accepting technological unemployment as inevitable, workers and their representatives can advocate for institutions enabling beneficial AI adoption.

Limitations and Methodological Constraints

This study faces several important limitations that inform interpretation of findings and suggest caution in generalization.

Scope and Coverage Limitations: Our bibliometric analysis captures only peer-reviewed English-language publications indexed in Web of Science and Scopus, potentially excluding relevant research published in other languages, regional journals, or alternative formats (working papers, policy reports, books). This linguistic and database bias may overrepresent Anglo-American perspectives while underrepresenting scholarship from non-English-speaking countries, particularly emerging economies where AI adoption patterns may differ substantially.

Temporal Constraints: The 2019-2024 timeframe, while capturing recent acceleration in AI capabilities and research attention, provides limited historical depth for assessing long-term institutional patterns or path dependencies. Pre-2019 developments in machine learning and earlier automation waves are not systematically analyzed, potentially missing important precedents. Moreover, the rapid pace of AI development means some developments occurring during manuscript preparation (late 2024) may not yet appear in peer-reviewed literature, potentially dating some findings even at publication.

Geographic Focus: Our concentrated focus on developed OECD economies, particularly the US-Germany comparison, limits generalizability to developing contexts where institutional configurations, resource constraints, and AI adoption challenges differ fundamentally. The study says little about Latin America, Africa, South Asia, or Southeast Asia—regions where the majority of global workforce resides. Additionally, our case selection emphasizes prototypical LMEs and CMEs, potentially overlooking hybrid or transitional systems that may provide alternative models.

Methodological Boundaries: Our comparative institutional analysis relies primarily on secondary sources, aggregate national-level data, and published studies rather than original firm-level data collection or worker surveys. This limits insight into micro-level mechanisms, heterogeneity within countries, and causal pathways linking institutions to outcomes. The cross-sectional comparative design, while enabling systematic comparison across countries, constrains causal inference. While we identify associations between institutional features and outcomes, establishing definitive causality requires longitudinal panel data and quasi-experimental designs currently unavailable for recent AI adoption.

Data Quality and Measurement Issues: Significant challenges arise in measuring key constructs. AI investment figures combine public venture capital databases with private estimates, employing varying methodologies and definitions of "AI" across sources. Job posting data from online platforms may not reflect actual hiring, systematically underrepresent certain sectors, and suffer from classification inconsistencies. Measuring "automation vulnerability" involves subjective expert judgments about task automatability that may prove inaccurate as AI capabilities evolve. Cross-national data comparability remains problematic given different statistical definitions and collection methods. These measurement issues mean our quantitative comparisons should be interpreted as indicative patterns rather than precise measurements.

Theoretical Constraints: Our analysis focuses primarily on the varieties of capitalism framework, potentially overlooking alternative theoretical perspectives (regulation theory, societal effects approach, national innovation systems) that might yield different insights. The LME-CME dichotomy, while analytically useful, simplifies complex institutional reality and may obscure important variation within categories.

Future Research Agenda

This study opens several promising research directions that would address identified limitations while extending our theoretical and empirical understanding.

Longitudinal Institutional Analysis: Panel studies tracking how institutional configurations co-evolve with AI adoption over extended periods would strengthen causal inference and reveal dynamic adjustment processes obscured by cross-sectional comparison. Such research could examine whether AI disruption triggers institutional convergence, divergence, or path-dependent adaptation. Natural experiments created by policy changes or regulatory shocks could enable quasi-experimental causal identification.

Firm-Level Mechanisms and Micro-Foundations: Qualitative case studies examining how companies in different institutional contexts make AI adoption decisions would illuminate micro-foundations of macro patterns observed here. Comparative ethnographies of AI implementation in matched firms across LMEs and CMEs could reveal how managers navigate institutional constraints, how workers experience and respond to AI-driven changes, and how labor-management negotiations shape outcomes.

Sectoral Heterogeneity and Domain-Specific Institutions: Industry-specific studies analyzing how institutional effects vary across sectors would refine understanding of institutional mediation. Manufacturing, professional services, retail, healthcare, and education face distinct AI applications and institutional regulations. Research examining sector-level institutions alongside national institutions would capture multiple levels of governance.

Emerging Economy Analysis and Alternative Development Paths: Systematic examination of AI adoption in middle-income and developing countries would test whether findings from developed economies generalize and identify distinctive challenges facing late developers. Case studies of

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)

China, India, Brazil, and African countries would provide crucial evidence about alternative development paths and institutional configurations.

Institutional Change Processes and Path Dependence: Research tracking how AI disruption triggers institutional adaptation, or resistance would reveal whether and how varieties of capitalism evolve under technological pressure. What political coalitions support or resist AI-related institutional reforms? How do vested interests, policy feedback, and international competitive pressures shape institutional change? Historical institutionalist methods examining critical junctures would illuminate these dynamics.

Data Governance Institutions and Digital Political Economy: Deeper investigation of emerging data governance frameworks, their political economy foundations, and their effects on AI development trajectories represents a critical research frontier. Comparative analysis of data protection regimes, data localization requirements, algorithmic accountability mechanisms, and data ownership models would extend our understanding.

Alternative Economic Models and Post-Capitalist Futures: Exploration of economic systems beyond the LME/CME dichotomy and their relationship to AI development would expand theoretical scope. How do state capitalist systems leverage government control for AI development? Can platform cooperativism or stakeholder capitalism provide alternative models? Normative political economy research examining these alternatives would enrich policy imagination.

Integrated Socio-Technical Systems Analysis: Interdisciplinary collaboration combining technical AI research with institutional analysis could yield richer understanding of AI-institution interactions. Computer scientists and social scientists jointly examining how institutional factors shape algorithm design, data collection practices, and deployment decisions would illuminate co-construction of technology and institutions.

Final Reflections

Artificial intelligence represents neither inevitable technological determinism nor infinitely malleable clay for institutional shaping. Rather, AI's development and impacts emerge from complex interactions between technical capabilities, economic incentives, institutional frameworks, and social values. Understanding these interactions requires moving beyond both technological determinism and institutional determinism toward integrated socio-technical analysis.

The varieties of capitalism framework, despite requiring adaptation for the AI era, remains valuable for understanding how institutional contexts shape technological change. Rather than abandoning institutional analysis in the face of rapid technological change, we should refine and extend it, developing theoretical frameworks adequate to 21st-century challenges.

Ultimately, the question is not whether AI will transform labor markets—it clearly will—but how institutions can shape this transformation toward socially beneficial outcomes. Countries with different institutional configurations can successfully navigate AI transitions, but they must do so deliberately, adapting policies to local contexts while learning from international experience. The choices made today about AI development, data governance, and labor market institutions will shape societies for decades to come.

REFERENCES

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

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2020). Robots and jobs: Evidence from US labor markets. Journal of Political Economy, 128(6), 2188-2244.

Akkermans, D., Castaldi, C., & Los, B. (2008). Do 'liberal market economies' really innovate more radically than 'coordinated market economies'? Hall and Soskice reconsidered. Research Policy, 37(10), 1827-1842.

Autor, D. H., Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2003). The skill content of recent technological change: An empirical exploration. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118(4), 1279-1333.

Bradford, A. (2020). The Brussels Effect: How the European Union rules the world. Oxford University Press.

Brynjolfsson, E., & Mitchell, T. (2017). What can machine learning do? Workforce implications. Science, 358(6370), 1530-1534.

Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., & Syverson, C. (2021). The productivity J-curve: How intangibles complement general purpose technologies. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 13(1), 333-372.

Busemeyer, M. R., & Trampusch, C. (2011). Comparative political science and the study of education. British Journal of Political Science, 41(2), 413-443.

Casper, S. (2007). How do technology clusters emerge and become sustainable? Social network formation and inter-firm mobility within the San Diego biotechnology cluster. Research Policy, 36(4), 438-455.

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.

Goos, M., Manning, A., & Salomons, A. (2014). Explaining job polarization: Routine-biased technological change and offshoring. American Economic Review, 104(8), 2509-2526.

Hall, P. A., & Gingerich, D. W. (2009). Varieties of capitalism and institutional complementarities in the political economy: An empirical analysis. British Journal of Political Science, 39(3), 449-482.

Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (Eds.). (2001). Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage. Oxford University Press.

Iversen, T., & Soskice, D. (2001). An asset theory of social policy preferences. American Political Science Review, 95(4), 875-893.

Lange, K. (2009). Institutional embeddedness and the strategic leeway of actors: The case of the German therapeutical biotech industry. Socio-Economic Review, 7(2), 181-207.

Schwab, K. (2016). The Fourth Industrial Revolution. World Economic Forum.

Taylor, M. Z. (2004). Empirical evidence against varieties of capitalism's theory of technological innovation. International Organization, 58(3), 601-631.

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

Licensed under (cc) BY-NC a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License,

ISSN: 2549-9300 (Online) | ISSN: 1858-4497 (Print)