UDC:
xxx
xxx
10.62907/juuntics2502010011

The Sociology of Artificial Intelligence Through the Lens of Ethics in the Digital Age

Boris Latinović[1], Olja Krčadinac[2], Željko Stanković3, Lazar Stošić[2]*

[1]"Union – Nikola Tesla" University, Faculty of International Politics and Security,Belgrade, Serbia,
e-mail: blatinovic@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs
[2]"Union – Nikola Tesla" University, Faculty of Informatics and Computer Science, Belgrade, Serbia,
e-mail: okrcadinac@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs, lstosic@unt.edu.rs
[3]Pan-European APEIRON University, Banja Luka, B&H,
e-mail: stanz@medianis.net

Abstract: This paper explores artificial intelligence (AI) as a complex social phenomenon that transcends its technical dimension, becoming an active agent in shaping social relations, power structures, and identities. Through sociological and ethical lenses, it analyzes the challenges AI poses regarding justice, responsibility, and freedom in the digital age. Special attention is given to social responsibility in the development and application of AI systems, issues of algorithmic bias and inequality, as well as the implications of digital surveillance and control. The paper also examines the transformation of identity in the digital era and the complex processes of digital subject formation, with a focus on the specific context of the Balkan region. In the context of the future of work and the new economy, it discusses the socio-economic effects of automation, precarity, and the global challenges faced by local communities. Finally, the study emphasizes the necessity of responsible and inclusive AI development that integrates ethical, social, and political dimensions to create a more just, sustainable, and humane society. Interdisciplinary collaboration and active citizen participation in shaping technological futures are highlighted as essential components.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Sociology of Technology, Ethics, Digital Identity, Digital Transformation.*

Introduction

In contemporary society, artificial intelligence (AI) is not merely a technological phenomenon, but deeply penetrates social and ethical structures. It has become part of everyday life, from algorithms that shape our digital realities to autonomous systems making decisions once reserved exclusively for humans. Sociology, as the science of society, is tasked with analyzing these transformations, while ethics raises questions about the moral boundaries of technology.

In this paper, we will analyze how AI changes social relations, identity, the economy of labor and surveillance, and how an ethical framework can or must respond to these challenges. This topic becomes particularly relevant in the context of societies' increasing dependence on digital technologies, where algorithmic rationality increasingly replaces human judgment. AI is no longer just a support tool, but an active participant in decision-making processes, shaping public opinion, and structuring social institutions. In this light, the question arises about the boundaries between automated efficiency and the humanistic values that form the foundation of social life.

Furthermore, it is important to understand that technology is not neutral – it reflects the interests, biases, and values of those who design and implement it. Therefore, sociological analysis must be complemented by ethical considerations to ensure that AI development aligns with principles of social justice, responsibility, and inclusivity.

A Sociological Perspective on Artificial Intelligence

In recent decades, the sociology of technology has recognized technology not merely as a tool, but as an actor participating in the shaping of social structures. Disciplines such as the sociology of occupa-

*Corresponding author: blatinovic@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs

tions and professions help us analyze these changes. Especially today, when automation and artificial intelligence threaten to replace many jobs, this discipline plays a crucial role. (Matijević, 2025). Theories such as Latour's Actor-Network Theory remind us that machines and algorithms are not neutral – they are social constructs imbued with the values of those who create them. AI brings a new power dynamic: algorithmic decisions affect who gets a loan, a job, or a medical diagnosis. Thus, AI becomes a social actor, worthy of analysis in the context of class, race, and gender relations.

A sociological view of AI involves deconstructing the belief that digital systems are objective or free from human biases. On the contrary, the data on which AI models are trained are products of social practices, carrying layers of historical injustice, economic disparity, and cultural hierarchies. When a machine "learns" the world based on human-generated data, it inevitably internalizes their errors. Therefore, the question of AI becomes a question of social responsibility – both for what we feed into the system and for what it produces.

AI changes how we understand autonomy, authority, and knowledge. Traditionally, decision-making was the privilege of educated, authoritative actors: judges, doctors, professors. Today, thanks to algorithmic expertise, more decisions are made by a "black box" – a system that is difficult to explain and even harder to challenge. This creates a new kind of symbolic authority that stems not from knowledge or empathy, but from computation. Sociologically, this demands a redefinition of trust, as we no longer trust individuals but systems that themselves do not understand their decisions.

One key challenge is understanding how AI fits into the neoliberal economic system. In the era of platform capitalism, dominated by digital giants like Google, Amazon, and Meta, algorithms serve as tools of capital accumulation through personalization, data exploitation, and behavioral steering. In this context, AI is not a neutral technological advancement but an instrument for reproducing existing power relations – both globally and locally.

Viewing AI in relation to strategic culture and globalization in contemporary trends helps us understand the fog of modern challenges to national security. Contemporary societies are entirely technologically dependent, which inherently affects strategic development. Every technological rev (Pavić & Berić, 2025).

Sociology, therefore, cannot afford to be a silent observer of the digital transformation. It must illuminate not only the consequences of introducing AI into various spheres of society but also the deeper cultural matrices that shape our relationship with technology. Who has the power to program? Who is excluded from this process? Who benefits from the "intelligence" we create? These are the questions sociological analysis must continually pose – not to provide final answers, but to foster a responsibility that opens new avenues of reflection.

Theoretical Framework, Ethical and Social Dimensions

When discussing the theoretical framework for understanding artificial intelligence (AI), it is necessary to consider multiple intersecting disciplines—sociology, ethics, political science, and technology. From a sociological perspective, AI is not merely a technological artifact but a complex social construct reflecting societal values, power relations, and cultural structures. Theories such as Actor-Network Theory (ANT) suggest that AI functions as an "actor" within a network of social relations, influencing and shaping institutions, practices, and individual lives. Here, technology ceases to be a passive tool and becomes a dynamic participant in social processes.

The ethical dimensions of AI, on the other hand, reveal deep dilemmas concerning responsibility, transparency, and fairness. When systems make decisions that directly affect people—such as access to credit, employment, or justice—we must ask who bears responsibility in cases of error or injustice: the programmer, the company, or the algorithm itself? These questions open a window into the complexity of accountability in the era of digital autonomous agents. Furthermore, ethical challenges include combating algorithmic biases, which often reflect deeply rooted social inequalities and can further discriminate against already marginalized groups.

The social dimensions of AI are also evident in the reshaping of power and surveillance. As Michel Foucault described in his concept of the panopticon, modern digital surveillance uses AI to monitor, predict, and influence citizens' behavior without their conscious awareness. This "invisible" power of algorithms creates a new form (Latinović, Ostojić, & Krčadinac, 2023) (Latinović, Ostojić, & Krčadinac, 2023).

Finally, the theoretical framework must integrate concepts of social justice and inclusivity. The development and implementation of AI must not be predominantly driven by technocratic or corporate interests but should aim at promoting the common good and improving the lives of all social groups. This requires an interdisciplinary approach and broad participation, including users themselves, to ensure

equality in access and participation in the digital transformation.

Fairness, transparency, and accountability are fundamental principles increasingly referenced in ethical frameworks, such as the EU Guidelines on Trustworthy AI. For instance, if an algorithm discriminates against minorities, it is necessary not only to find a technical solution but also to develop a sociological understanding of the causes of such biases.

Identity and the Digital Subject

Digital identity is not merely a collection of user accounts but a reflection of how AI shapes our perception of ourselves and others. By recommending content based on previous behavior, algorithms reinforce certain patterns of behavior and taste. In this sense, Bourdieu's concept of habitus can help us understand how digital space becomes a site for the reproduction of social differences, where tastes and preferences are not autonomous but the result of algorithmic shaping.

The term digital identity refers to the aspect of digital technology that mediates between the human experience of self-identity and the identity of other people and things. In information and communication technologies, digital identity represents a digital set of claims that one digital subject holds about themselves or other digital subjects (Tešanović, 2011).

In the era of digitalization, identity becomes a more complex and multilayered category that cannot be viewed solely through traditional frameworks. The digital subject is no longer just the "I" in the physical world—it is a construction, an amalgam of information, interactions, and performances in digital space. This new identity is fluid, changeable, often fragmented, and shaped not only by the individual but also by algorithms, networks, and the digital platforms that surround them.

A digital subject is an entity that exists or is represented within a specific digital domain. Each digital subject has a finite but unlimited number of identifying attributes. Digital subjects can be persons; devices and computers (which form the "digital domains," primarily); digital resources; policies and relationships between other digital subjects (for example, between people and devices, or documents, or services...). The experience of a digital identity of a particular entity is inevitably subjective from the observer's point of view (as is the case with physical identity). To connect digital attributes to an entity (subject), the observer must believe that the digital representation truly refers to that entity (Tešanović, 2011).

As philosophers like Jacques Derrida emphasize, identity is always "deferred," never fully fixed. In the digital world, this process is amplified — we present ourselves through profiles, posts, likes, photos, and comments, all of which together build our digital "narrative."

Applying the French school of sociology, the issue of transgressing ethical and aesthetic norms arising from the use of AI is examined. How does the use of AI transform the observer-artwork relationship, that is, how does it change the status of the artwork by testing the observer's ability to separate reality from virtual reality on cognitive and perceptual levels? (Bojić, 2024).

At the same time, this narrative is not solely ours. Algorithms "read" and reconstruct our identity, often for purposes of targeted advertising, political influence, or even manipulation. Thus emerges a new entity — the digital subject, who is simultaneously both the creator and the product of the digital system.

In the Balkans, where historical identity has often been a subject of conflicts and negotiations, the digital subject adds an additional layer of complexity. People struggle to preserve their cultural, national, and ethnic identities while being exposed to universal and often globalizing digital standards and narratives. This creates a paradox — on one hand, digitalization can serve as a means of affirming and spreading local and regional cultures; on the other hand, it can lead to homogenization and loss of authenticity.

Social networks and digital media thus become arenas where identities are created, contested, and redefined. In this process, a new form of social interaction arises, where the boundaries between private and public blur, and the subject becomes both a target and an active participant in the dynamic play of power and representation. The digital subject is not a static entity — it is a stage on which conflicts, alliances, self-awareness, and resistance are played out.

Ultimately, understanding digital identity and the subject must be rooted in complex social, historical, and political contexts, especially in regions like ours, where past and present intertwine narratives of belonging, existence, and power. Only then can we truly grasp its implications for personal and collective life, as well as for broader processes of social transformation.

The Future of Work and the New Economy

In the whirlwind of contemporary changes shaping our world, the future of work emerges as one of the most dramatic and complex issues. The digital revolution, automation, artificial intelligence, globalization, and shifts in social relations not only change the way we work but also the very nature of work as a social phenomenon.

Work, through which capital is produced, is just one part of these activities, but one of the most significant, and it lies at the center of the overall existence of human beings. The way we relate to work defines both individuals and hierarchies within societies and states, as well as the distribution of economic and political power. Digital technologies create illusions of work as play, which loses its characteristic burden and is seen as an opportunity for developing individual potentials, which is partly true. At the same time, the very changes brought by digital technologies actualize the Marxist understanding of work as the determinant of economic relations, even in the contemporary world (Karapetrović, 2020).

Everything that was unimaginable until yesterday is becoming reality today — machines and software are taking over tasks once performed by humans. The robotization of production, automation of services, algorithmic management, and digital assistants are redefining the boundaries between human labor and technology. However, this change is neither linear nor equal across all sectors and regions.

In Eastern European countries, including Serbia, this transition unfolds with specific challenges: from lack of infrastructure to issues in educational systems that are not always able to keep pace with technological changes. This means that many traditional jobs will disappear or transform, while new, often highly specialized demands will dominate.

The future of work is not just a technical story. It is deeply philosophical and social. Work has always been not only a means of subsistence but also a place for creating identity, social bonds, and personal affirmation. In the era of the new economy, with flexible, gig, and platform-based work models, these bonds are dissolving or changing. Work becomes fragmented, decentralized, and often insecure. Platforms like Uber, Glovo, and others bring freedom but also insecurity — workers are formally independent but practically exposed to exploitation and lack of social protection. This “new economy” introduces us to a world where workers are often not employees but precarious participants in the service market.

For societies like ours, where social protections and workers’ rights are often fragile, this dynamic can deepen inequality and social tensions. A new social contract is needed that takes into account the reality of the new economy while preserving fundamental workers’ rights. The global interconnection of labor markets and capital brings both opportunities and risks. On one hand, local workers can access international jobs and markets; on the other, pressure for lower labor costs and competition with cheaper global labor become realities. In Eastern Europe, we often observe the phenomenon of “brain drain” — young, educated people migrate to Western European countries seeking better opportunities. This trend impoverishes local communities but also brings remixes of ideas, connections, and potentials for return and reinvestment.

The question is — how to preserve local identity and strength in the context of global economic flows? How to develop an economy that will not be just a pawn on the global chessboard but will have the capacity to generate value based on knowledge, culture, and creativity? In the future of work, the key factor will be adaptability. Traditional education models, which have long been rigid and oriented toward employment in classic industries, must change dramatically. The focus must be on lifelong learning, digital literacy, critical thinking, and intercultural competencies.

Alex Wood, a sociologist studying the nexus of labor markets and new technologies, is explicit in his view that assumptions about the potential of artificial intelligence to free us from work are mistaken, as history has shown that automation further enhances the production process under capitalism and is unlikely to undermine its foundations. Artificial intelligence is no closer to discarding living labor than industrial machines were in the 19th century, and generally, there is little prospect that the Fourth Industrial Revolution will bring widespread unemployment. What technological development leads to are transformations of work and the workforce, new forms of exploitation, as well as social polarization and a new hierarchy (Jeremić, 2023).

In regions with a long tradition of education but also bureaucratized systems, changes are slow but necessary. A system is needed that enables workers to quickly retrain, develop “soft skills,” and be ready for changes in the labor market. There is no future of work without clear ethical and political answers. Who controls technology? Who has the right to the fruits of automation and artificial intelligence? How can we avoid further polarization between the rich and the poor, between those with access to new technologies and those who remain marginalized? These are not only economic questions but also deeply political and moral ones. The new economy must have a human face, and digital transformation must be accompa-

nied by policies that protect workers and enable the fair distribution of wealth. With the development of advanced technologies, namely AI systems in the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the digital economy will increasingly gain importance, as it becomes evident that natural, especially non-renewable resources, are diminishing, human needs are growing, and the only way forward is to use smart technologies to economize organizational potentials, as a result of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Anđelković, Radosavljević, & Lilić, 2021).

In our region, social inequalities as well as opportunities for social mobility are reflected. The future of work and the new economy are not distant abstract concepts. They are already here, before us, shaping everyday life and destinies. For our region, the challenge is enormous — how to harmonize technological progress with social justice, how to preserve local values and identities within the global network, and how to build a sustainable, inclusive, and humane world of work. The future of work must also be a future of dignity, solidarity, and freedom.

Digital Surveillance and Power

Artificial intelligence enables sophisticated forms of surveillance—from biometric facial recognition to predictive policing. Foucault's concept of the panopticon becomes a reality in digital form: people behave as if they are constantly being watched because, in fact, they are. This creates a new form of power—an invisible, algorithmic power that shapes behavior without direct coercion. Ethics here demands clear boundaries: where does legitimate protection end and repression begin?

In an era when digital has become the universal language of communication, work, and social interaction, the concept of surveillance gains a new, more complex, and often frightening dimension. Digital surveillance is no longer just a tool of repressive regimes or technological corporations but a fundamental aspect of power in modern society.

Surveillance is not a new phenomenon. Since ancient times, authorities have used various methods to monitor and control their citizens. However, digital technology gives surveillance new power—speed, scope, depth, and most importantly, invisibility. Traditional narratives of capitalism rely on assumptions about competition, limited resources, and a winner-takes-all mentality as the basis for business and economic activity. These approaches leave little room for ethical analysis, offer a simplified view of human beings, and focus on strengthening rather than creating value (Stanković Pejnović, 2021).

In the digital world, data is the new currency, and surveillance manifests itself through tracking every step we take: internet searches, movements on social networks, purchases, phone calls, and even physical location via GPS. This massive collection of data enables those in power not only to react to behavior but also to predict and shape it. In Eastern European societies, with their historical legacy of authoritarian regimes and secret services, this form of surveillance carries additional weight. The collective memory of how power used information to control individuals and masses further intensifies fear and distrust toward digital technologies.

Digital surveillance is not only a matter of the state apparatus. Technology companies like Google, Facebook, and Amazon collect vast amounts of personal data daily, which are used for profiling, targeted advertising, and political manipulation. This "new power" is often hidden, inaccessible to ordinary people, and rarely subject to serious regulation. In countries with weak institutional frameworks, as is the case here, there is a risk that this power will be abused to strengthen corruption, manipulate voters, and suppress freedoms. Yet, digital surveillance is not only a story of domination. There are also tools and practices of resistance — from encryption and decentralized networks to movements for privacy protection and digital rights. In our society, where political participation is often fragmented and passive, digital technology can be a double-edged sword. It can further control and pacify but also empower citizens through information, connectivity, and collective action.

The issue of digital surveillance leads us deeper into fundamental questions of freedom, privacy, and identity. How to balance the need for security with the preservation of basic human rights? Who has the legitimacy to collect and use our data? At a time when algorithms make decisions about us — from employment to healthcare — transparency and control over these processes become key demands for safeguarding democratic values.

Digital surveillance and power are inevitable companions of the digital age. Understanding them requires a multidisciplinary approach, where technical aspects intertwine with sociological, political, and philosophical reflections. Hence the need for a critical approach, education, and activism that will enable the digital world to be a space of freedom, not control.

Directions for Responsible Development

For a sustainable and fair integration of AI into society, interdisciplinary cooperation is essential: sociologists, ethicists, developers, and legislators must jointly define guidelines. Inclusivity in technology development means respecting diverse social perspectives, while transparency entails understanding how algorithms make decisions. It is necessary to develop models of collective responsibility, where users also participate in shaping the rules of the game.

In a world that is rapidly changing under the influence of technology, globalization, and social transformations, development as a concept gains new weight and responsibility. Responsible development is no longer just an idea or slogan, but a necessity arising from the deep ecological, social, and economic crises that the world and our society are experiencing. Thanks to the development of technological networks, informational capitalism does not stop at national borders but becomes global capitalism. Accordingly, the new networked society is a global society. Globally connected financial capital is one of the key features of the new economy. Social wealth is no longer primarily the result of economic activity but rather the circulation of financial capital within global financial networks (Mihajlov Prokopović, 2016).

Responsible development is based on the concept of sustainability — a harmony between economic growth, social justice, and environmental preservation. It is not only a matter of future generations but also of the present in which we live. Sustainability means that development must not deplete resources, deepen inequalities, or jeopardize fundamental human values. In the context of Eastern Europe, this concept carries particular weight because the transition from a socialist to a capitalist system has left deep scars: devastated natural resources, disorganized economies, and social injustice often masked by economic growth.

Rapid technological progress brings new opportunities but also new risks. Responsible development implies technology that serves humanity, not the other way around. Digitalization, artificial intelligence, robotics, and biotechnology must be developed with strong ethical reflection, transparency, and community participation. It is especially important that technology does not become a tool of exclusion or a new form of domination but remains inclusive and accessible to all, rather than widening the gap between those who have access and those who are excluded.

Responsible development cannot exist without a just society. This means development must aim to reduce inequalities — economic, gender, ethnic, regional. Social inclusion implies that all social strata have an equal chance to participate in and benefit from development. Today, members of Generation Alpha are growing up in the era of artificial intelligence, in which we will also have a two-way street and interaction in shaping the landscape where this new technology and the generation itself evolve (Savić, Lazarević, Grujić, & Čolić Mihajlović, 2025).

In our region, where historical injustices, wars, and transitional inequalities have left deep scars, the path of responsible development must also include a strong social dimension — from education to healthcare, from employment to the protection of vulnerable groups. Democracy and transparency are the pillars of responsible development. Decision-making processes that concern the community must be open, inclusive, and based on trust. Citizens must not be passive observers but active participants in shaping their own future. This entails strengthening civil society, independent media, and institutions that guarantee government accountability. Without participation, development can easily become exploitative and unsustainable.

Without developed ecological awareness, responsible development cannot exist. Climate change is a global challenge requiring both local and global responses. Responsible development means transitioning to a green economy, renewable energy sources, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable waste management. For countries often dependent on traditional energy sources and industries, this is a challenge that requires political will and innovative solutions.

Finally, one of the most important directions of responsible development is investing in education that will enable people to understand and actively participate in the complex processes of the modern world. This is education that fosters critical thinking, creativity, and ethical responsibility. In societies with limited resources and challenges in the education system, such an approach is key to long-term transformation. Responsible development is not an abstract goal but a concrete practice and a choice of values that society and individuals make every day. It is a walk along a thin line between progress and preservation, between power and responsibility, between the present and the future. For our region, with all its specificities, responsible development represents a chance to overcome the past and create a new paradigm of social and economic life that will be more just, humane, and sustainable.

Conlusion

Artificial intelligence is not merely a product of technological imagination, but also a social actor that reshapes power relations, identities, and everyday life. Through sociological and ethical lenses, new questions arise about justice, freedom, and responsibility.

The sociology of artificial intelligence through the prism of ethics in the digital age reveals a multi-layered dynamic of contemporary society, where technology ceases to be just a tool and becomes an active agent in shaping social relations, identities, and power. AI, with its capacities for automation, learning, and decision-making, is no longer an abstract technological phenomenon but a key factor transforming social reality, opening profound ethical dilemmas and challenges.

From a sociological perspective, AI raises the question of responsibility: who bears the moral and social responsibility for the decisions machines make? In the digital age, where the boundaries between humans and technology blur, an ethical framework becomes imperative to guide the development and application of AI systems. Without clear norms and principles protecting human rights, dignity, and social justice, there is a risk of deepening social inequalities, exploitation, and loss of autonomy.

Artificial intelligence becomes an instrument of power—not only in economic and political terms but also in shaping collective and individual identity. Digital surveillance, profiling, and algorithmic control can threaten privacy and freedom, thereby undermining the foundations of democratic society. It is sociologically crucial to understand how these technologies fit into existing social structures, often reproducing and amplifying existing injustices, especially in societies with histories of transition and social tension. In this sense, ethics in the digital age is not merely an academic abstraction but a practice that must be integrated at every level of AI development and deployment—from algorithm design to regulatory policies and social oversight. Responsibility entails not only technical transparency and explainability but also the inclusion of diverse social actors, especially marginalized groups, to ensure equitable access and avoid discriminatory practices.

The sociological discourse on AI opens space for redefining the human subject in the digital era. Identity is no longer a fixed category but a dynamic process in which technologies play a key role in shaping self-perception, social interaction, and collective narratives. While this process offers opportunities for empowerment and creativity, it also poses risks of alienation and manipulation if ethical and social dimensions are neglected.

Ultimately, the sociology of artificial intelligence through the prism of ethics calls us to reflect more deeply on the meaning of development and progress in the digital age. Technology must serve humanity, not the other way around. This principle, imbued with social justice and ethical responsibility, is the only way to ensure that a future in which AI occupies a central place will be inclusive, sustainable, and just.

For societies like Serbia and the broader region, where historical and social specificities are pronounced, this paradigm offers the possibility not only for technological modernization but also for profound social transformation, in which artificial intelligence becomes a tool of empowerment rather than new domination. Ethics and sociology in the digital age are not merely theoretical challenges but practical guides for creating a world where technology and humanity coexist in a symbiosis of mutual understanding, respect, and shared responsibility.

References

Anđelković, M., Radosavljević, M., & Lilić, V. (2021). Digitalna ekonomija u četvrtoj industrijskoj revoluciji. *Pravo, ekonomija i menadžment u savremenim uslovima lemima, 25.*

Bojić, L. (2024). Simulation of an online social network: The impact of the recommendation system on attitude change and polarization of AI agents. In *Interdisciplinary scientific conference philosophy of media: media and intelligence* (pp. 22-23). Belgrade: Beograd: Estetičko društvo Srbije: NVO Mladi grašak za umetnost, kulturu, medije i društvena pitanja.

Jeremić, S. (2023). Budućnost rada ili budućnost bez rada: razmišljanja od Marksa do danas. *Antropologija 23*(2), 9-28.

Karapetrović, M. (2020). Filozofija u digitalno doba. Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Banjoj Luci.

Latinović, B., Ostojić, B., & Krčadinac, O. (2023). The Sociological Perspective of Transhumanism Through the Prism of the Sports-Marketing Industry. *Sports science and health, 25*(1), 90-97. https://doi.org/10.7251/SSH2301090L

Matijević, B. (2025). *Na putu ka profesiji, Sociološki modeli i sektor informacionih tehnologija u Srbiji.* Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, Institut od nacionalnog značaja za Republiku Srbiju.

Mihajlov Prokopović, A. (2016). *Transformacija tradicionalnih medija u novom tehnološkom okruženju*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu

Pavić, A., & Berić, H. (2025). Вештачка интелигенција између стратешке културе и глобализације. *Baština, 35*(65). https://doi.org/10.5937/bastina35-56357

Savić, N., Lazarević, J., Grujić, F., & Čolić Mihajlović, V. (2025). Konkurentnost generacija Z i Alfa u doba generativne veštačke inteligencije. *Economics of Enterprise, 73*(1-2), 115-133. https://doi.org/10.5937/EKOPRE2502115S

Stanković Pejnović, V. (2021). Nova moć preoblikovanja svijeta. *Matica, 22*(88), 87-118. *http://repozitorijumips.rs/122/1/05%20*

vesna%20stankovic%20pejnovic%2088.pdf
Tešanović, B. (2011). Digitalni identitet (Digital identity). *INFOTEH-*. JAHORINA Vol. 10, Ref. E-III-2, (pp. 593-595). Jahorina: Infoteh. https://infoteh.etf.ues.rs.ba/zbornik/2011/radovi/E-III/E-III-2.pdf