

Work, Worth and the Human Vocation in the Age of Generative AI¹

Meritocracy, Social Evaluation and Career Anxiety in Singapore

Hoong Chuin LAU

Abstract

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has intensified concern about occupational displacement, but employment risk alone does not explain the force of contemporary career anxiety. This article argues that AI also threatens identities built around demonstrable competence. The threat becomes especially acute in Singapore, where meritocracy has organized education, employment, and national development around visible achievement, while family obligation and face concerns can make occupational standing socially consequential beyond the individual. The article develops a conceptual account of AI related career anxiety at the intersection of labor market uncertainty, achievement contingent self worth, occupational identity, and relational social evaluation. It uses the term shame cautiously. Singapore is neither culturally uniform nor reducible to a shame culture. Yet shame, understood as a self conscious emotion arising from perceived failure before significant others, helps explain why technological devaluation may be experienced as exposure, loss of standing, or failure toward one's family. The article then brings this account into dialogue with a Christian theology of creation, grace, vocation, stewardship, Sabbath, and hope. Its central claim is that human worth cannot be defended as the shrinking residue of capacities that machines cannot perform. A more durable distinction lies between execution and answerability. AI may execute an expanding range of tasks, while persons and institutions remain responsible for understanding consequences, exercising judgment, explaining decisions, and answering to those affected. Christian vocation relocates the basis of identity from performance to received dignity and reorients work toward service. This does not remove the need for adaptation. It makes adaptation possible without allowing market valuation to become a verdict on personal worth.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; career anxiety; meritocracy; Singapore; shame; face; meaningful work; vocation; theology of work

¹ **AI Assistance Disclosure:** Generative AI tools were used in the research, drafting, synthesis, and editorial development of this paper. The author determined the paper's arguments, theological framing, source selection, revisions, and conclusions, and reviewed the final text for accuracy and interpretation. Responsibility for the views expressed and any remaining errors rests with the author.

Disclaimer: The views expressed are my own and do not represent my university or employer.

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has changed the emotional meaning of automation. Earlier waves of workplace technology were often described as replacing routine physical or clerical tasks. Current systems can draft prose, write code, generate images, summarize cases, propose strategies, and simulate forms of professional conversation. Their outputs enter domains through which educated workers have learned to recognize themselves as competent people. The resulting anxiety therefore concerns more than whether a position will continue to exist. It raises a more intimate question: *if a machine can perform what made me valuable, has my value diminished?*

The labor market literature gives good reasons to resist simple forecasts. Technology usually changes tasks and occupational bundles rather than eliminating whole occupations in a uniform way (Autor, 2015; Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019). Early studies of generative AI report substantial productivity gains in bounded tasks, often with larger gains among less experienced workers (Brynjolfsson et al., 2025; Noy & Zhang, 2023). The same research also shows that benefits depend on task conditions and human expertise. Users can perform worse when they rely on a model outside its capability frontier or cannot detect plausible errors (Dell’Acqua et al., 2023). These findings complicate both technological optimism and predictions of mass replacement. They do not, however, address the full psychological and moral problem. Workers can experience identity threat before any job disappears because the social meaning of their expertise has already begun to change.

Singapore provides a revealing setting in which to examine this problem. Meritocracy has served as a central account of national development and legitimate allocation. Education, credentials, scholarships, occupations, and income are linked through institutions that promise mobility by ability and effort. That promise has delivered real opportunities, but it can also moralize outcomes. Success appears deserved; failure can appear personally attributable even when family resources, institutional sorting, labor demand, and technological change shape the result. In a small and highly educated society, professional identity is also visible to family, peers, and institutional networks. Occupational disruption may therefore be experienced as a loss of income, a loss of status, and a failure before significant others.

This article develops a theological and social account of that layered threat. Its thesis is that generative AI amplifies career anxiety in Singapore because it unsettles a meritocratic moral economy in which competence functions as evidence of deservingness, social standing, and fulfilled family obligation. Face concerns and shame can intensify this process, although neither Singapore nor Asia should be described as a homogeneous shame culture. A Christian theology of grace and vocation offers an alternative anthropology: worth precedes performance, vocation exceeds occupation, and technological capability remains subordinate to human answerability and practical wisdom.

The argument proceeds in five stages. The first reviews research on AI, work, occupational identity, and contingent self worth. The second examines Singapore’s meritocratic institutions and the social meanings attached to achievement. The third develops a careful account of face, shame, and relational selfhood. The fourth proposes a conceptual framework connecting AI

exposure to identity threat in Singapore. The fifth places this framework in dialogue with Christian theology and derives implications for workers, employers, universities, and churches. The article is conceptual rather than empirical. It synthesizes several bodies of scholarship to generate claims that require later testing among Singapore's diverse communities.

Artificial Intelligence and the Meaning of Occupational Threat

Task change and uneven capability

Technological change does not act on a job as if the job were a single object. Occupations contain tasks, relationships, tacit knowledge, institutional permissions, and responsibility for consequences. Autor (2015) argues that automation often substitutes for some tasks while complementing others. Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) likewise distinguish displacement effects from the creation of new tasks. Generative AI expands the range of activities exposed to automation because it works with language, images, and code, but exposure is not equivalent to replacement. Whether a task is automated depends on reliability requirements, workflow redesign, organizational incentives, regulation, and the availability of human oversight.

Experimental evidence reinforces this conditional picture. Noy and Zhang (2023) found that generative AI reduced completion time and improved quality in professional writing tasks. Brynjolfsson, Li, and Raymond (2025) reported productivity gains among customer support agents, with especially strong gains for novices. The pattern suggests that AI can diffuse elements of high performer practice. Yet Dell'Acqua and colleagues (2023) found a jagged technological frontier: consultants working within the model's capability range improved, while those using it for a task beyond that range became more likely to produce incorrect answers. AI can therefore augment performance while obscuring whether users possess the understanding needed to validate an output.

This distinction matters for professional development. If novice performance rises because a system supplies patterns that would otherwise be learned through experience, organizations may obtain immediate gains while weakening the formation of independent judgment. The risk is not inevitable. Good workflow design can use AI as a tutor, critic, or simulation partner. The central point is that artifact quality and human capability are no longer reliable proxies for each other. A polished output may represent expert judgment, competent human AI collaboration, or uncritical acceptance of a generated answer.

Job insecurity and occupational identity

Research on job insecurity distinguishes concern about losing employment from concern about losing valued features of one's work (Hellgren et al., 1999). AI can activate both. Quantitative insecurity concerns the existence of a job. Qualitative insecurity concerns autonomy, status, skill use, advancement, and professional meaning. The second may arise even where employment remains stable. A lawyer may keep her role while losing the research and drafting activities through which she developed expertise. A software engineer may remain employed while wondering whether code generation has reduced the value of the craft that organized his identity.

Occupational identity is the answer to “who am I at work,” sustained through expertise, recognition, membership, and narrative continuity (Ashforth et al., 2008). Identity threat occurs when a change undermines a valued identity or the bases on which others recognize it (Petriglieri, 2011). Generative AI is unusually capable of producing such threat because it imitates visible signs of competence. It does not need to eliminate a role to destabilize the worker’s account of why that role deserves trust, compensation, or prestige.

Career construction research suggests that people respond better to transitions when they can connect changing roles to a broader vocational narrative (Savickas, 2013). Yet this adaptive work becomes harder when self worth is contingent on success in a particular domain. Crocker and Wolfe (2001) describe contingencies of self worth as the domains in which people stake their value, such as approval, competition, appearance, or academic competence. Achievement can motivate effort, but it also produces vulnerability when setbacks are interpreted as evidence about the self. AI makes that vulnerability salient by altering the market value of previously rewarded performance.

Meaningful work research clarifies why the response cannot be reduced to reskilling. Work provides income, but it can also provide purpose, belonging, moral worth, and coherence (Rosso et al., 2010). Calling orientations may deepen commitment and service, yet they can also expose workers to exploitation or identity loss when an occupation becomes the exclusive location of purpose (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). The problem is therefore not that workers care too much about work. It is that modern institutions often ask employment to carry several goods that no market position can securely provide.

Meritocracy and Achievement in Singapore

Meritocracy as institution and moral narrative

Meritocracy in Singapore is both an allocation principle and a national narrative. It rejects inherited privilege in favor of advancement through ability and effort. In a postcolonial state with few natural resources, the identification and cultivation of talent became closely tied to survival, efficient administration, and economic development. Competitive examinations, educational streaming, scholarships, and public sector recruitment gave institutional form to this commitment. The system enabled mobility for many people and established a public language in which race or family background should not determine opportunity.

Scholarship on Singapore nevertheless shows that meritocracy contains egalitarian and elitist tendencies. Tan (2008) argues that meritocracy can legitimate hierarchy when rewards are treated as proof of merit rather than as outcomes shaped by unequal conditions. Talib and Fitzgerald (2015) show how educational discourse can present differentiated outcomes as a natural expression of diverse abilities. Lim (2017, 2020) describes how education can support mobility while reproducing the cultural assumptions of dominant groups. Interviews with Singaporean youth also reveal a gap between endorsement of meritocracy as an ideal and confidence that it operates consistently in practice (Barr & Skrbiš, 2008; Chin & Vasu, 2019).

These critiques do not establish that meritocratic selection is wholly illusory. They show that merit is institutionally defined. Examinations reward particular forms of knowledge; employers reward credentials, networks, and dispositions; families differ in their capacity to purchase enrichment and absorb risk. When the winners of these processes are described simply as the most meritorious, accumulated advantage disappears from view. The moral consequence is important. If success reflects merit, then downward mobility can be interpreted as a deficit of effort, foresight, or ability.

The Singapore state has recognized several of these tensions. Policy language has moved toward broader definitions of success, lifelong learning, multiple pathways, and respect for different forms of work. SkillsFuture, reforms to school posting, and efforts to reduce excessive credentialism express a desire to preserve mobility while loosening the identification of merit with a narrow academic hierarchy. These reforms matter, but cultural expectations often outlive policy changes. Educational prestige, occupational status, salary, and housing continue to operate as legible signals in everyday comparison.

The extension of educational ranking into adult identity

Singapore's achievement system begins early. School results influence placement, subject combinations, access to institutions, scholarships, and later opportunities. The sequence can teach students that identity is discovered through ranking. Labels have changed and pathways have become more flexible, but the emotional grammar remains familiar: performance opens doors, and lost opportunities may be difficult to recover.

Adult working life extends this grammar. University attended, profession, employer, title, and income become markers through which achievement is read. In a dense urban society, these markers are socially visible. They enter family conversations, reunion comparisons, marriage expectations, and judgments about whether one has made good use of educational opportunity. The meritocratic promise can therefore become an implicit moral equation: disciplined people become productive; productive people advance; advancement confirms worth.

Generative AI interrupts that equation from outside the person. A worker may have studied diligently, entered a selective profession, and accumulated expertise, only to find that new tools perform parts of the role at low marginal cost. The disruption is structurally different from an examination failure, yet a meritocratic imagination may still individualize it. The worker is told to remain relevant, upgrade, pivot, and demonstrate value. Such advice has practical merit. It also risks treating a moving technological frontier as another test that deserving people should pass.

Family obligation and the social ownership of achievement

Achievement in Singapore is not always experienced as an individual possession. Families invest time, money, care, and hope in education. Children may understand success as repayment for sacrifice, evidence of filial responsibility, or a contribution to family security. Parents may likewise experience a child's attainment as shared achievement. This relational structure can give work moral depth. Careers become ways to care for parents, provide for children, and honor those whose sacrifices made opportunity possible.

The same structure can magnify career threat. Redundancy, stalled promotion, or occupational devaluation may feel like failure toward others. Anxiety concerns the ability to meet housing costs or caregiving obligations, but it may also concern disappointing one's family or losing a position that carried collective honor. The point is not that all Singaporean families exert identical pressure. Class, ethnicity, religion, generation, gender, and migration history produce different expectations. The relevant claim is narrower: where achievement is relationally interpreted, occupational disruption travels through a network of obligations and evaluations.

Face Shame and Relational Selfhood

Why shame culture is too blunt

The contrast between Western guilt cultures and Asian shame cultures has a long and problematic history. It treats internally diverse societies as bounded moral types and can imply that Western persons possess autonomous conscience while Asian persons merely conform to external opinion. Contemporary cultural psychology gives little support to such a binary. Guilt and shame occur across societies; both involve self evaluation and perceived standards; and their meaning varies by context, relationship, and language (Tangney et al., 2007).

Singapore is especially resistant to a singular label. It is multiethnic, multireligious, globally connected, and shaped by Chinese, Malay, Indian, colonial, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, secular, and other traditions. Individualism and relational obligation coexist. A careful account should therefore replace "Singapore is a shame culture" with testable propositions about particular mechanisms.

Shame remains analytically useful when defined precisely. It is a painful self conscious emotion associated with perceived exposure, devaluation, or failure of the self before an actual or imagined audience. Guilt typically concerns a wrong action and may motivate repair; shame more readily concerns what the failure reveals about the person, although the distinction is not absolute (Tangney et al., 2007). Shame can be private, but it is structurally social because the self is viewed through standards that matter to a community.

Face as socially recognized standing

Face refers to a claimed and socially recognized image of worth within relationships. Chinese language scholarship distinguishes several forms of shame and loss of face, including embarrassment over conduct, moral shame, and deep devaluation of the self (Bedford & Hwang, 2003). Face should not be treated as superficial reputation management. It can express legitimate concern for trust, role fulfillment, social harmony, and the effects of one's conduct on others.

Singapore studies show how face can shape responses to stigmatized conditions. Research with people living with HIV found that participants described shame toward family and feared bringing disgrace upon relatives (Ho & Goh, 2017). Research on mental illness stigma similarly identified face, family reputation, and perceived moral defect as culturally relevant themes, while also documenting other religious and social explanations across the population (Tan et al., 2020).

These studies concern health rather than work, so their findings cannot simply be transferred to AI related anxiety. They establish a more limited point: in Singapore, threats to identity can be interpreted through relational standing and can implicate families as well as individuals.

Achievement contingent esteem and anticipatory shame

AI related career anxiety may involve anticipatory shame. A worker imagines a future in which colleagues no longer seek her expertise, relatives ask why her career has stalled, or a younger employee using AI surpasses her. Nothing public may have occurred. The imagined audience is enough to produce exposure. The person may hide uncertainty, work compulsively, overstate mastery, or avoid experimentation that could reveal incompetence.

This dynamic can explain why common organizational messages have mixed effects. Telling employees that everyone must become AI ready signals urgency, but it may also imply that those who struggle are obsolete. Public leaderboards, forced enthusiasm, and casual descriptions of “low value work” can convert a technical transition into status degradation. Shame narrows attention toward self protection. It can inhibit the candid admission that a system is not understood, even though such admission is essential for safe adoption.

Face and family obligation can also support constructive conduct. Concern for one’s professional reputation may motivate careful verification. A relational self may resist the fantasy that a career belongs only to the individual. Family and community can provide durable identities when employment changes. The conceptual task is therefore not to eliminate social evaluation, which is neither possible nor desirable, but to distinguish accountability from humiliation and relational responsibility from achievement based worth.

A Conceptual Framework for AI Related Career Anxiety

The proposed framework connects four levels of analysis. At the technological level, generative AI changes the cost and visibility of task performance. At the organizational level, employers decide whether the technology augments, monitors, deskills, or displaces workers. At the institutional level, Singapore’s education and labor systems assign status to credentials and occupations. At the relational level, workers interpret change through family obligation, peer comparison, face, and personal narratives of merit.

AI exposure becomes identity threat through three appraisals. The first is substitution: can the system perform tasks that justify my role? The second is devaluation: will others value my expertise less even if I remain employed? The third is moral attribution: will difficulty adapting be interpreted by me or others as evidence that I lack effort, ability, or foresight? Meritocratic ideology strengthens the third appraisal because it encourages outcomes to be read as deserved. Face concerns intensify the social audience before whom the appraisal occurs. Achievement contingent self worth determines how deeply occupational judgment enters the evaluation of the whole person.

Several moderators follow from the framework. Anxiety should be lower when organizations provide genuine learning time, preserve developmental tasks, explain decision rights, and distinguish experimentation from evaluation. It should be higher when adoption is opaque, layoffs

are framed as the removal of low performers, or workers must display effortless competence. Family support can buffer threat when it affirms belonging independent of status; it can heighten threat when occupational prestige functions as a primary source of family honor. Christian communities can provide an alternative identity, but they can also reproduce meritocratic ranking through professional networks, leadership selection, and testimonies centered on success.

The framework yields propositions for empirical study:

1. Perceived AI substitutability will predict career anxiety more strongly when occupational competence is a major contingency of self worth.
2. Perceived devaluation will mediate the relationship between AI exposure and occupational identity threat even when workers do not expect job loss.
3. Meritocratic beliefs will have a dual effect. Belief in mobility may support adaptive effort, while belief that outcomes reliably reveal merit will intensify self blame when technological change lowers occupational value.
4. Face concerns will strengthen the relationship between identity threat and concealment behaviors, including reluctance to disclose skill gaps or challenge AI outputs.
5. Relational support that separates personal worth from occupational status will weaken the relationship between career disruption and shame.
6. A vocational orientation grounded in service and multiple life roles will predict greater narrative continuity across career transitions than an identity centered exclusively on occupation.

These propositions avoid treating culture as a fixed national trait. Each construct can vary within Singapore and can be compared across occupations, generations, ethnic communities, and religious commitments. Longitudinal research would be especially valuable because anxiety, adoption, competence, and identity influence one another over time.

Human Worth Beyond the Residue of Machine Capability

The limits of uniqueness arguments

Public reassurance often identifies capacities that AI supposedly cannot possess, such as creativity, empathy, judgment, or relationship. These capacities matter, but they provide an unstable basis for dignity. Technical boundaries move, and systems can produce behavior that users experience as creative or empathic. If human worth depends on whatever machines cannot yet do, every improvement in machine capability reduces the conceptual territory in which human beings may claim value.

The same argument is morally exclusionary within humanity. Intelligence, verbal fluency, independence, productivity, and creativity are distributed unequally and can be diminished by disability, illness, age, or injury. A theory that grounds worth in superior performance threatens the dignity of people before it encounters any machine. Human dignity requires a basis that precedes comparative capability.

Christian theology locates that basis in creation. Genesis describes humankind as created in the image of God before any account of achievement or economic contribution (Gen. 1:26–27).

Psalm 8 likewise presents human dignity as a status bestowed by God: humanity is crowned with glory and honor and entrusted with care for creation (Ps. 8:4–6). The doctrine of the *imago Dei* has received varied rational, relational, functional, and Christological interpretations, but across these debates it resists the reduction of persons to economic output. Human beings bear a received status and calling before they establish usefulness. Work belongs to creaturely life and vocation (Gen. 2:15), but it does not create the worker’s right to exist, belong, or be loved.

Grace and achievement

The Protestant doctrine of justification by grace sharpens the critique of achieved worth. Human beings do not secure acceptance before God through intellectual performance, moral accomplishment, occupational prestige, or social contribution. The Bible places the order clearly: salvation is received by grace rather than earned through works, while good works follow as the life for which people are created (Eph. 2:8–10). Grace therefore interrupts the meritocratic transfer from success to deservingness. It does not deny differences in effort or competence, and it does not make consequences disappear. It denies that achievement can bear the weight of final judgment on the person.

This ordering matters for work. Grace does not make effort irrelevant; it frees effort from the task of manufacturing worth. Excellence can become an offering of service rather than a defense against insignificance. Failure can be faced truthfully because it need not disclose the whole truth about the self. In a face sensitive setting, this claim is more than private reassurance. It imagines a community in which confession of limitation does not result in expulsion from belonging.

Churches can nevertheless distort grace by mirroring professional hierarchy. Congregations often celebrate prestigious occupations, platform high achievers, and interpret career progress as evidence of divine favor. Such practices reproduce the achievement economy they verbally reject. A credible theology of grace requires forms of recognition that honor care work, manual work, unemployment, disability, retirement, and unnoticed service.

Vocation beyond occupation

The Protestant tradition expanded vocation beyond monastic or clerical life. Luther described ordinary stations of life as locations of service to the neighbor. Later accounts of vocation emphasize that callings arise through relationships and responsibilities, not only through an inner search for a perfect career (Hardy, 1990; Volf, 1991). Occupation can be a major expression of vocation, but vocation also includes family, church, citizenship, friendship, and care.

This distinction gives career transitions narrative continuity. A person may lose an occupation without losing every calling. Skills and opportunities change, while responsibilities to neighbors remain. The relevant question shifts from “Which role proves that I am valuable?” to “What has been entrusted to me, and whom can I serve under present conditions?” Such a shift does not romanticize unemployment. Paid work supplies material security, recognition, and participation in social life; its loss can be devastating. Vocation provides a larger frame within which economic injury can be named without becoming total identity collapse.

Vocation also corrects an individualistic account of purpose. Purpose is not necessarily hidden inside the self awaiting discovery. It is often discerned through the needs of others, the claims of existing relationships, one's capacities, and institutional possibilities. In Singapore, this relational account can affirm family obligation while resisting the reduction of filial faithfulness to salary or prestige.

Sabbath and the refusal of total productivity

Sabbath places a temporal limit on the claim of production. Rest is not merely recovery that enables greater output. It testifies that the world continues without constant human performance and that creaturely limits are good. In an economy of continuous upgrading, Sabbath confronts the fear that any pause will make the worker obsolete.

The practice has institutional implications. Workers cannot receive the gift of limits if employers continually accelerate workloads after introducing productivity tools. AI gains should create room for learning, care, deliberation, or reduced drudgery, rather than automatically becoming higher quotas. Sabbath does not supply a labor policy by itself, but it exposes the moral choice hidden within efficiency: saved time can be returned to people or captured as additional demand.

Execution Answerability and Practical Wisdom

A distinction for human AI work

The strongest account of human contribution should not depend on a fixed list of tasks that machines will never perform. A more durable distinction is between execution and answerability. Execution concerns producing an analysis, draft, prediction, design, or recommendation. Answerability concerns understanding why an action is justified, judging its consequences, explaining it to those affected, correcting it when it fails, and bearing responsibility within a moral and institutional community.

AI can support several elements of judgment and can generate sophisticated explanations. The distinction is therefore not between mechanical output and mysterious human intuition. It is normative and institutional. A system is not licensed, blamed, forgiven, sued, disciplined, or entrusted in the same way as a person or organization. Scripture treats answerability as inseparable from human agency: each person gives an account before God (Rom. 14:12), and those who receive gifts are charged to exercise them as responsible stewards (1 Pet. 4:10). Claims that "the AI decided" often conceal the human choices that selected data, objectives, deployment conditions, and acceptable risk.

Answerability requires competence. A professional cannot responsibly approve an output that she does not understand well enough to contest. This is why automation can create a formation problem. If AI removes the tasks through which novices acquire pattern recognition, organizations may later lack experts capable of oversight. Human AI collaboration must therefore protect learning pathways, not merely place a nominal human at the end of a process.

Practical wisdom at the frontier of computation

Aristotelian practical wisdom concerns deliberation about good action in particular circumstances. It cannot be reduced to selecting the mathematically optimal means because the ends, relevant features, and acceptable tradeoffs are themselves matters of judgment. Contemporary professional ethics similarly emphasizes that rules and technical knowledge require interpretation in concrete cases (Schwartz & Sharpe, 2010).

Generative AI increases the supply of possible answers. This can make practical wisdom more important because organizations must decide which questions deserve attention, whose interests count, when efficiency is unjust, and what uncertainty is tolerable. The frontier of computation is not the frontier of wisdom. More prediction does not determine what should be desired; more generation does not determine which future should be chosen.

Christian practical wisdom begins with the conviction that wisdom is received from God rather than produced by intelligence alone (Prov. 2:6; James 1:5). It requires renewed judgment capable of discerning what is good rather than passive conformity to prevailing patterns (Rom. 12:2). Paul's prayer that love might grow together with knowledge and depth of insight so that believers may discern what is best joins moral perception to love (Phil. 1:9–10). James further describes wisdom from above as peaceable, gentle, open to reason, and full of mercy (James 3:13–17). These texts orient practical wisdom toward love of God and neighbor, justice, humility, and attention to the vulnerable. AI may help a hospital allocate resources, but it cannot settle why the sick possess claims on care. It may optimize a workforce, but optimization alone cannot determine what an employer owes displaced workers. A system can generate moral language; the responsible community must still discern, enact, defend, and answer for a decision.

Implications for Singaporean Institutions

Employers

Employers should treat AI adoption as an identity and formation process, not only a technology deployment. Communication should distinguish task redesign from judgments about personal worth. Workers need protected time to learn, clear statements of responsibility, and safe channels for admitting uncertainty. Performance systems should reward verification, escalation, and responsible refusal, rather than only speed or visible enthusiasm.

Organizations should also audit the developmental structure of work. Removing all entry level drafting, analysis, or troubleshooting can save time while destroying the apprenticeship through which judgment develops. Senior staff should identify which tasks novices must continue to perform or critically reconstruct. When displacement occurs, procedural dignity matters: transparent criteria, transition support, and acknowledgment of service reduce the conversion of economic loss into humiliation.

Universities and professional education

Universities should prepare students to work with AI while refusing to make employability their sole account of education. Students need technical fluency, domain knowledge, and repeated practice evaluating model outputs. They also need ethics, historical understanding, communication, and opportunities to exercise responsibility toward real communities. The objective is not to preserve assignments that AI can complete unchanged. It is to design learning in which students must explain decisions, encounter consequences, and demonstrate independent understanding.

Singapore's universities can also broaden the narratives through which success is recognized. Career services and alumni communication often foreground prestigious placements and rapid advancement. They can give greater visibility to nonlinear careers, care responsibilities, public service, skilled trades, failed ventures, and transitions after redundancy. Such narratives weaken the assumption that a good life follows one ranked pathway.

Churches

Churches are positioned to challenge achievement contingent worth, but only if their common life embodies the challenge. Preaching on grace and vocation should be accompanied by practices that honor people apart from occupational status. Small groups can provide settings in which job loss and fear are spoken without shame. Pastoral care should recognize that career anxiety may involve family honor, provider identity, and social comparison, not merely financial planning.

Christian formation should also address AI as a practice of power. The question is not only whether believers use a tool honestly. It is how organizations distribute gains and harms, whether workers retain meaningful agency, and whose voices are excluded from technological decisions. Churches can convene employers, workers, technologists, and theologians to examine local cases rather than issuing generic endorsements or warnings.

Workers and families

Workers need a practical response that avoids both denial and panic. One useful exercise is to sort current tasks into those that can be automated, those that can be augmented, and those for which the worker remains answerable. The categories will change, but the exercise directs attention toward understanding, judgment, relationship, and responsibility. Workers should learn AI through real tasks and record where domain knowledge was required to detect failure.

Career experiments can create options without demanding an immediate reinvention. A worker might join an adjacent project, teach a skill, shadow another role, or test a small AI enabled workflow. At the same time, families can examine how they speak about success. Support becomes protective when belonging survives changes in title and salary. This does not require indifference to achievement. It requires refusing to make occupational outcome the final measure of filial or personal worth.

Limitations

This article has three main limitations. First, it synthesizes literatures that were not developed to explain one another. The connections are conceptual claims, not established causal results. Second, the evidence on generative AI remains early and task specific. Capability, adoption, and regulation will change. Third, a Christian theological framework cannot be presented as Singapore's shared public anthropology. It is offered as a particular tradition in dialogue with a pluralistic society. Its public value depends on whether it illuminates experience and supports practices of dignity without demanding theological agreement as a condition of protection.

Conclusion

Singapore's response to AI will reveal what its meritocracy ultimately asks of people. If the public message is reduced to "upgrade or be left behind," technological disruption becomes another examination for which individuals bear the consequences of failure. Those with time, money, confidence, supportive employers, and strong educational foundations will be better placed to pass. Those carrying care responsibilities, financial strain, disability, weaker credentials, or the psychological effects of earlier setbacks may struggle to do so. Calling the outcome meritocratic does not make the burden equally bearable.

Reskilling remains necessary, but it is not an adequate social settlement. A government that urges continuous adaptation must also ask who absorbs the cost of that adaptation, which workers lose the tasks through which expertise is formed, and what happens to those who cannot move at the speed demanded of them. Without paid learning time, credible transition pathways, accessible mental health support, and protections against humiliating forms of displacement, the language of lifelong learning can become a polite way of transferring technological risk from institutions to individuals. Anxiety, concealment, burnout, and shame would then be treated as private failures rather than foreseeable consequences of policy and organizational design.

The responsibility is therefore asymmetrical. Workers have a duty to learn where they reasonably can, but governments and employers possess far greater power to determine the conditions under which learning occurs and the dignity afforded to those in transition. Public success cannot be measured only by adoption rates, productivity gains, or the number of workers who obtain new credentials. It must also be judged by whether people can acknowledge uncertainty without losing standing, whether slower adapters remain protected from contempt, and whether those whose occupations are devalued still have meaningful ways to contribute.

Christian theology brings the underlying moral issue into focus. Human worth cannot be the residue left after machines acquire another capability. Creation places dignity before achievement; grace refuses to equate acceptance with merit; vocation locates work within a wider field of service; and Sabbath limits the authority of productivity. The distinction between execution and answerability then assigns responsibility where it belongs. Machines may execute more tasks, but institutions remain answerable for how technological gains and injuries are distributed.

Singapore can preserve the worthy promise that ability and effort should open opportunity without implying that every person who struggles to adapt has failed a fair test. That will require more than producing AI-savvy citizens. It will require public institutions willing to protect people whose pace, circumstances, or capacities do not fit the preferred trajectory of technological change. The question is not simply whether Singapore's workforce can keep up with AI. It is whether a meritocratic society can advance technologically without making those who cannot keep up feel that they no longer deserve a place within it.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(2), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.2.3>
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325–374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316059>
- Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3>
- Barr, M. D., & Skrbis, Z. (2008). *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, ethnicity and the nation-building project*. NIAS Press.
- Bedford, O., & Hwang, K. K. (2003). Guilt and shame in Chinese culture: A cross-cultural framework from the perspective of morality and identity. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 33(2), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5914.00210>
- Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2025). Generative AI at work. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 140(2), 889–942. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044>
- Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(1), 32–57. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2009.54.1.32>
- Chin, J., & Vasu, N. (2019). Perceptions of meritocracy in Singapore: Inconsistencies, contestations and biases. *Asian Studies Review*, 43(2), 184–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2019.1587592>
- Crocker, J., & Wolfe, C. T. (2001). Contingencies of self-worth. *Psychological Review*, 108(3), 593–623. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.3.593>
- Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Kraymer, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2023). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Harvard Business School Technology and Operations Management Working Paper 24-013*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4573321>
- Hardy, L. (1990). *The fabric of this world: Inquiries into calling, career choice, and the design of human work*. Eerdmans.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398311>
- Ho, L. P., & Goh, E. C. L. (2017). How HIV patients construct liveable identities in a shame based culture: The case of Singapore. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 12(1), 1333899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2017.1333899>

- Lim, L. (2017). Reproducing elites: Meritocracy, the state and the politics of the curriculum in Singapore. In H. M. Gunter, D. Hall, & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *Corporate elites and the reform of public education* (pp. 119–132). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781447326823.010>
- Lim, L. (2020). Meritocracy, policy and pedagogy: Culture and the politics of recognition and redistribution in Singapore. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(3), 273–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1450769>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586>
- Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 641–662. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0087>
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001>
- Savickas, M. L. (2013). Career construction theory and practice. In R. W. Lent & S. D. Brown (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (2nd ed., pp. 147–183). Wiley.
- Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. E. (2010). *Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing*. Riverhead Books.
- Tan, G. T. H., Shahwan, S., Goh, C. M. J., Ong, W. J., Wei, K. C., Verma, S. K., Chong, S. A., & Subramaniam, M. (2020). Mental illness stigma's reasons and determinants among Singapore's lay public: A qualitative inquiry. *BMC Psychiatry*, 20, 422. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02823-6>
- Talib, N., & Fitzgerald, R. (2015). Inequality as meritocracy: The use of the metaphor of diversity and the value of inequality within Singapore's meritocratic education system. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12(4), 445–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2015.1034740>
- Tan, K. P. (2008). Meritocracy and elitism in a global city: Ideological shifts in Singapore. *International Political Science Review*, 29(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512107083445>
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 345–372. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>
- Volf, M. (1991). *Work in the Spirit: Toward a theology of work*. Oxford University Press.