

Artificial Intelligence, Human Agency, and the Threat to Humanity: A Christian Education Perspective

Author:

Aprilius Nahak¹
Rachmat Tony
SinjoBantaeng²
Renni Sipahutar³

Affiliation:

Institut Agama Kristen
REAL Batam,
Indonesia¹
Bethany Church
Singapore, Singapore²
Christian Care Mission
Church, Singapore³

Corresponding

Email:

Apriliusnahak94@gmail.com

Article History:

Submitted:

16 September 2026

Revised:

28 September 2026

Accepted:

30 September 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.53547/54dhrs87>



Copyright © 2026.

The Authors. Licensee:

Manthano.

This work is licensed

under a creative

Commons Attribution –

ShareAlike 4.0

International License

Abstract: As generative artificial intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly embedded in education and ministry, Christian education faces the challenge of preserving human agency amid growing reliance on AI systems. This conceptual-theological study examines the implications of AI risks for Christian education and explores how theology can inform the preservation of human dignity and agency. Using qualitative library research and conceptual-thematic analysis, the study draws on literature concerning AI risk, technology ethics, human agency, imago Dei, and Christian education. It argues that the gradual erosion of human agency through habitual delegation represents an everyday dimension of AI risk, potentially weakening human judgement and the capacity to govern AI systems. From a relational understanding of imago Dei, human dignity and moral responsibility transcend intelligence and computational capability. The study proposes Christian AI literacy as a framework comprising four interrelated dimensions: theological, ethical, critical, and humanistic literacy. This framework extends AI education beyond technical competence towards forming responsible persons who preserve human dignity and agency before God, neighbour, and creation.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; Christian AI literacy; Christian education; existential risk; human agency; imago Dei

Abstrak: Seiring dengan semakin luasnya penggunaan kecerdasan buatan (AI) generatif dalam pendidikan dan pelayanan gerejawi, pendidikan Kristen menghadapi tantangan untuk mempertahankan agensi manusia di tengah meningkatnya ketergantungan pada sistem AI. Penelitian teologis-konseptual ini mengkaji implikasi risiko AI bagi pendidikan Kristen dan mengeksplorasi bagaimana teologi dapat menjadi landasan untuk menjaga martabat dan agensi manusia. Dengan menggunakan penelitian kepustakaan kualitatif dan analisis tematik-konseptual, penelitian ini mengkaji literatur tentang risiko AI, etika teknologi, agensi manusia, teologi imago Dei, dan pendidikan Kristen. Penelitian ini berargumen bahwa terkikisnya agensi manusia secara bertahap akibat kebiasaan mendelegasikan tugas kepada AI merupakan dimensi risiko AI dalam kehidupan sehari-hari yang berpotensi melemahkan penilaian manusia dan kemampuannya untuk mengendalikan sistem AI. Berdasarkan pemahaman relasional tentang imago Dei, martabat dan tanggung jawab moral manusia melampaui kecerdasan dan kemampuan komputasional. Penelitian ini mengusulkan literasi AI Kristen yang mencakup empat dimensi yang saling berkaitan, yaitu literasi teologis, etis, kritis, dan humanistik. Kerangka ini memperluas pendidikan AI melampaui kompetensi teknis menuju pembentukan pribadi yang bertanggung jawab dalam menjaga martabat dan agensi manusia di hadapan Allah, sesama, dan ciptaan.

Kata kunci: artificial intelligence; Christian AI literacy; Christian education; existential risk; human agency; imago Dei

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has evolved from systems designed primarily for computational tasks into increasingly capable technologies that generate text, images, code, analyses, recommendations, and decisions across various domains. In education, AI offers opportunities for developing teaching materials, providing feedback, analysing learning data, and supporting adaptive learning. However, its growing capabilities raise a fundamental question concerning human agency: what happens when AI advances faster than humanity's capacity to control, direct, and ethically govern it? Beyond what AI can accomplish, the concern is how increasing reliance on these systems may affect human thinking, judgement, decision-making, and responsibility.

Concerns about machines exceeding human control are not new. Bostrom (2014) examined how artificial superintelligence could potentially acquire influence beyond effective human oversight, while Russell (2019) highlighted the control and alignment problem, particularly the challenge of ensuring that AI objectives remain consistent with human interests. These concerns have gained renewed attention as AI systems increasingly perform tasks previously dependent on human judgement. In a large survey involving 2,778 authors of papers at leading AI venues, between 38% and 51% of respondents assigned at least a 10% probability to advanced AI producing outcomes as severe as human extinction, depending on the question's framing (Grace et al., 2025, pp. 9:1, 9:12). However, these estimates represent subjective expert assessments rather than definitive predictions. The survey authors acknowledge that AI researchers are not forecasting specialists and that responses were sensitive to question framing (Grace et al., 2025, pp. 9:15-9:16). Similarly, the Center for AI Safety (2023) identifies mitigating AI-related extinction risks as a global priority. These findings indicate serious expert concern, although they do not establish a scientific consensus about the likelihood of such outcomes.

Uncertainty, however, does not justify ethical neglect. Jonas (1984) argues that increasing technological power requires expanded ethical responsibility, particularly when its consequences may affect future generations in unpredictable ways. Addressing AI risk therefore requires perspectives beyond technology, including philosophy, ethics, education, and theology. For Christian education, the central question is not merely how AI should be controlled but also what kind of persons are being formed in an increasingly AI-mediated world.

Indonesian Christian religious education (*Pendidikan Agama Kristen*, PAK) scholarship has begun addressing AI, primarily in relation to educational practice and ethics. Pantan (2023) examines ChatGPT as a potential source of disruption or renewal in postmodern PAK. Gulo et al. (2025) and Gulo (2025) explore AI integration as a means of supporting personalised learning and improving teaching efficiency while maintaining Christian values. N. I. Boiliu (2024) considers AI's ethical and spiritual dilemmas in relation to the work of the Holy Spirit, while E. R. Boiliu and Kolibu (2024) investigate cognitive dissonance associated with AI. Puling (2025) examines AI in dialogue with faith formation. Collectively, these studies establish AI as an important educational and ethical concern but largely focus on its appropriate use as a classroom tool. The relationship between severe AI risk, the gradual delegation of

human judgement, and human agency understood through *imago Dei* remains insufficiently explored.

International scholarship similarly addresses AI in Christian and religious education from pedagogical, ethical, and theological perspectives. Condrey (2024) draws on the threefold office of Christ to examine Christian educators' responsibilities in the ChatGPT era. A study of 236 religious education teachers in Germany and Poland found ambivalent attitudes towards AI, with participants recognising its potential for personalisation while expressing concerns about oversimplified religious content and the weakening of spiritual dimensions (Chrostowski & Mąkosa, 2025). A scoping review of 23 publications identified four major themes in AI and Christian religious education: didactic potential, ethical and technical limitations, theological and anthropological reflection, and institutional and cultural conditions. It also highlighted the limited empirical research and attention to diverse cultural and linguistic contexts (Chrostowski, 2026). Meanwhile, Herzfeld (2002, 2023) and Williams and Wyatt (2021) examine AI in relation to the image of God, human uniqueness, and relationality. The Holy See's *Antiqua et Nova* also addresses the relationship between artificial and human intelligence, including its implications for education (Holy See Press Office, 2025). Nevertheless, these discussions are rarely integrated with AI-risk literature or the Indonesian PAK context. This article brings these areas together by connecting AI risk with the everyday erosion of human agency, interpreting this relationship through *imago Dei*, and proposing Christian AI literacy as an educational response.

The theological foundation for this inquiry is *imago Dei*. Genesis 1:26–27 presents humanity as created in God's image and likeness, grounding human dignity and responsibility in a framework that transcends intelligence, productivity, and technological capability. This article adopts a relational understanding of *imago Dei*, in which humanity's identity is grounded primarily in its relationship with God and, consequently, with neighbours and creation (Herzfeld, 2002, 2023). This perspective is complemented by Middleton's (2005) functional-royal interpretation, which understands the image of God as humanity's vocation to represent God's rule through responsible activity in the world. These perspectives are not contradictory: human beings exercise delegated responsibility within creation because of their relationship with the Creator. Human dignity is therefore grounded in relationship, while human agency and accountability are expressed through vocation. Christian education must consequently form persons capable of moral discernment, responsible decision-making, meaningful relationships, and faithful living before God and neighbour, rather than merely transferring knowledge or developing technical competence.

This theological perspective also highlights the educational implications of gradually delegating thinking, judgement, decision-making, and value formation to AI. Although AI can assist human activity, excessive reliance may displace the practices through which wisdom, character, and responsibility develop. The concern is particularly relevant to AI-risk discourse. While existential-risk discussions often emphasise abrupt loss-of-control scenarios, Kulveit et al. (2025) describe gradual disempowerment, whereby incremental AI adoption across economic, cultural, and political systems progressively weakens human control and participation. Such outcomes may emerge not from hostile machines but from numerous

individually rational decisions that cumulatively diminish human agency. In this article, the erosion of agency in education is understood as the formative, person-level dimension of this broader dynamic. The capacity to govern AI responsibly depends partly on people who retain independent judgement, moral discernment, and accountable decision-making. Christian education therefore has a role in forming those who will use, evaluate, and govern AI systems.

In response, this article proposes Christian AI literacy as a theological-pedagogical framework for understanding, using, evaluating, and critically engaging with AI while preserving human dignity, agency, moral responsibility, and relationality. Unlike generic AI literacy frameworks, such as Long and Magerko's (2020), which focus on competencies for understanding, evaluating, and using AI, this framework also considers the kind of persons formed through AI use. It translates theological anthropology into educational dimensions and practices, extending existing theological reflections on human uniqueness and relationality (Herzfeld, 2023; Williams & Wyatt, 2021).

Accordingly, this study addresses two questions: why are uncertain but potentially severe AI risks relevant to Christian education, and how can Christian theology, particularly *imago Dei*, provide a framework for preserving human agency and dignity in an increasingly AI-mediated world? Its conceptual contribution is the development of Christian AI literacy as a framework connecting AI-risk discourse, theological anthropology, and educational practice in the Indonesian Christian education context.

Research Method

Study Design

This study employed qualitative library research with a conceptual-theological approach and conceptual-thematic analysis. The research was designed to examine the relationship between artificial intelligence (AI), human agency, and the potential threat AI poses to humanity from the perspective of Christian education. Rather than empirically measuring the effects of AI, the study analysed theological and interdisciplinary literature concerning AI existential risk, human agency, human dignity, moral responsibility, *imago Dei*, and AI in education. Conceptual-thematic analysis was used to identify, organise, compare, and interpret recurring concepts across the selected literature. Such an approach can support conceptual development when the analytical process is systematically structured (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Naeem et al., 2023).

Research Setting

As a library-based conceptual study, the research did not involve a physical research site, educational institution, church, or community from which participants were recruited. The research setting was therefore the scholarly literature relevant to AI, technology ethics, theological anthropology, and Christian education. Particular attention was given to the Indonesian Christian education context because the study addresses the implications of increasing AI adoption for Christian education and ministry in Indonesia. The literature considered included international scholarship on AI risk and technology ethics, theological

studies on human dignity and *imago Dei*, scholarship on AI literacy and education, and Indonesian Christian education literature addressing AI and digital ethics.

Participants and Sampling

No human participants were involved in this study. Consequently, participant population, sample size, and participant recruitment were not applicable. Instead, the study used purposive selection of relevant literature organised into five fields: (1) AI existential risk, loss of control, and the alignment problem; (2) technology ethics, human responsibility, and moral deskilling; (3) AI literacy and AI in education; (4) theological literature on humanity, human dignity, and *imago Dei*; and (5) Christian education literature on AI, both Indonesian and international. The sources selected for each field and their role in the analysis are listed in Table 1. The biblical text of Genesis 1:26–28 was also examined as a primary theological source for the concept of humanity as created in the image of God.

Table 1. Literature corpus by field and its role in the analysis (N = 29)

Field	Sources	Role in the analysis
(1) AI existential risk, loss of control, and alignment (n = 5)	Bostrom (2014); Russell (2019); Center for AI Safety (2023); Grace et al. (2025); Kulveit et al. (2025)	Establishes the nature, scale, and uncertainty of severe AI risk and the gradual-disempowerment pathway
(2) Technology ethics, responsibility, and moral deskilling (n = 4)	Jonas (1984); Vallor (2016); Christian (2020); Vallor & Vierkant (2024)	Provides the ethics of responsibility under uncertainty and the concept of moral and intellectual deskilling
(3) AI literacy and AI in education (n = 3)	Long & Magerko (2020); Pabubung (2021); Miao & Holmes (2023)	Supplies the generic AI-literacy competencies and human-centred principles that the proposed framework retains or modifies
(4) Theological anthropology and <i>imago Dei</i> (n = 6)	Herzfeld (2002, 2023); Middleton (2005); Wyatt & Williams (2021); Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith & Dicastery for Culture and Education (2025); Limbong (2025)	Provides the relational and functional-royal readings of <i>imago Dei</i> used to interpret AI risk and human agency
(5) Christian education and AI (n = 11)	Indonesian: Nikolaos & Arifianto (2023); Pantan (2023); E. R. Boiliu & Kolibu (2024); N. I. Boiliu (2024); Napitupulu & Gulo (2024); Gulo (2025); Gulo et al. (2025); Puling (2025) International: Condrey (2024); Chrostowski (2026); Chrostowski & Mąkosa (2026)	Maps existing educational responses to AI, identifies the research gap, and grounds the implications for curriculum and policy

Data Collection

Literature was retrieved from Google Scholar, DOAJ, Garuda, and SINTA, supplemented by institutional documents from the Center for AI Safety, UNESCO, and the Holy See. Searches used English and Indonesian keywords related to AI risk, human agency, human dignity, *imago Dei*, AI literacy, and Christian education. Following duplicate removal and relevance screening, 29 sources published between 1984 and 2026 were selected (Table 1). The corpus included peer-reviewed articles, conference proceedings, scholarly monographs, and institutional statements. Foundational works by Jonas (1984), Bostrom (2014), Russell (2019), and Christian (2020) were retained. Peer-reviewed versions of relevant preprints were cited (Grace et al., 2025; Kulveit et al., 2025). Non-scholarly and exclusively technical publications lacking ethical, educational, or theological relevance were excluded. The literature was analysed thematically.

Data Analysis

The analysis employed conceptual-thematic analysis through three interconnected stages. *First*, AI-risk literature was examined to identify concerns regarding existential risk, loss of control, and the alignment problem, particularly their implications for human agency. *Second*, these concerns were interpreted through theological categories of *imago Dei*, human dignity, freedom, moral responsibility, and relationality, distinguishing descriptive claims in AI literature from normative theological claims. *Third*, the theological synthesis was translated into implications for Christian education, particularly Christian AI literacy as a response to preserving human agency, dignity, responsibility, and relationality amid increasing AI use. The analysis involved data reduction, thematic categorisation, comparison, and interpretive synthesis. Recurring concepts were compared across AI-risk discourse, technology ethics, theological anthropology, and Christian education to construct the central theological-pedagogical argument. Analytical transparency was maintained to support trustworthiness (Nowell et al., 2017). AI-related extinction was treated as an uncertain potential risk, not an established outcome. Four dimensions of Christian AI literacy were derived by clustering recurring concerns according to the human capacities at stake and examining them against the theological categories.

Ethical Considerations

Because this study involved no human participants, interviews, surveys, personal data, or primary empirical fieldwork, informed consent, participant confidentiality, and anonymity were not applicable. The study therefore did not require Institutional Review Board or research ethics committee approval. The research relied on publicly accessible scholarly and institutional sources, and all sources were acknowledged through appropriate academic citation. Research integrity was maintained throughout the selection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the literature.

Results

The conceptual-thematic analysis yielded four conceptual propositions. They are not summaries of individual sources but claims formulated through the synthesis of the five literature fields. *First*, severe AI risk is serious enough to warrant educational attention but too uncertain to justify either prediction or fatalism. *Second*, AI risk arises chiefly from misalignment and the delegation of human judgement rather than from machine malice. *Third*, the erosion of human agency is the formative, everyday dimension of AI risk and therefore falls within the responsibility of education. *Fourth*, when read through *imago Dei*, the preservation of human agency requires a distinctively Christian form of AI literacy comprising four interrelated dimensions. These propositions provide the analytical foundation for the theological and pedagogical discussion that follows.

Proposition 1: AI Risk Is Significant but Uncertain

Expert estimates of catastrophic AI outcomes require careful epistemic contextualisation. Grace et al. (2025) reported median estimates of 5% or 10% for human extinction or similarly permanent and severe disempowerment, depending on question wording (pp. 9:10–9:11). Across the survey questions, 38%–51% of respondents assigned at least a 10% probability to extinction-level or similarly severe outcomes (p. 9:12). These findings do not establish a consensus that AI will cause human extinction. Rather, they indicate that a substantial minority of AI researchers consider such outcomes sufficiently plausible to warrant attention. The authors also note substantial variation and framing effects and caution that AI researchers are not forecasting experts (pp. 9:15–9:16). Bostrom (2014) identifies advanced AI as a potential existential risk, while Russell (2019) highlights the challenge of aligning increasingly capable AI with human values. Thus, AI risk warrants educational attention without supporting either confident prediction or fatalism.

Proposition 2: AI Risk Arises from Misalignment and Delegation, Not Malice

AI-risk literature does not assume that machines are malicious. Severe harm may arise from misalignment between AI objectives and human intentions or values (Christian, 2020; Russell, 2019). Christian (2020) highlights the difficulty of translating complex human values into objectives that machine-learning systems can optimise, while Russell (2019) emphasises maintaining compatibility between machine objectives and human preferences. AI risk therefore concerns not only whether systems might oppose humanity, but whether increasingly capable systems remain under meaningful human direction and accountability. This has important educational implications. AI capabilities do not constitute wisdom, moral judgement, or responsibility. Moreover, technology can shape human capacities and practices, making AI evaluation a question of both what systems can do and what their use does to human capabilities (Jonas, 1984; Vallor, 2016; Vallor & Vierkant, 2024). Kulveit et al. (2025) similarly argue that incremental substitution of human cognition and labour may reduce human influence without deliberate AI hostility.

Proposition 3: Human Agency Is the Formative Dimension of AI Risk

The third proposition identifies the erosion of human agency as a formative dimension of AI risk. Human agency refers to the capacity to think, judge, choose, act, and assume responsibility. Vallor (2016) and Vallor and Vierkant (2024) highlight the potential for moral and intellectual deskilling when technologies increasingly perform tasks requiring human judgement and practical wisdom. This concern is particularly relevant to education. When learners repeatedly delegate writing, analysis, problem-solving, or decision-making to AI,

Table 2. Dimensions of Christian AI literacy: basis, literature, learning outcomes, and sample activities

Dimension	Theological or philosophical basis	Supporting literature	Illustrative learning outcome	Sample activity
Theological literacy	Creation, providence, and stewardship; functional-royal vocation of <i>imago Dei</i>	Middleton (2005); N. I. Boiliu (2024); Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith & Dicastery for Culture and Education (2025)	Learners explain AI as a human cultural product accountable to God, neither an object of trust nor of fear	Reading Genesis 1:26–28 and 2:15 alongside a case of AI use and discussing what stewardship requires
Ethical literacy	Ethics of responsibility under uncertainty; virtue ethics and moral deskilling	Jonas (1984); Vallor (2016); Vallor & Vierkant (2024); Condrey (2024)	Learners identify who is responsible for AI-assisted decisions and set justified limits on delegation	Drafting a class AI-use covenant that requires disclosure of AI assistance
Critical literacy	Epistemic responsibility; the alignment problem	Long & Magerko (2020); Russell (2019); Christian (2020); Miao & Holmes (2023)	Learners evaluate AI outputs for accuracy, bias, and hidden assumptions and justify their own conclusions	Comparing an AI-generated interpretation of a biblical text with scholarly commentaries and identifying errors or omissions
Humanistic literacy	Relational understanding of <i>imago Dei</i> ; Christian humanism	Herzfeld (2002, 2023); Wyatt & Williams (2021); Chrostowski & Mąkosa (2026)	Learners distinguish simulated empathy from personal presence and prioritise embodied relationships in learning and ministry	Reflective journaling or mentored conversation on experiences of care; for young children, storytelling, play, and prayer

efficiency may reduce opportunities to practise the cognitive and moral capacities education seeks to cultivate. Although the specific effects among Christian educators and learners require empirical investigation, the deskilling literature raises an important educational question: whether people retain the capacity and willingness to think, judge, choose, and take responsibility when AI can perform these activities. Human-centred AI education therefore emphasises agency and using AI to support rather than displace human capabilities (Miao & Holmes, 2023). In this sense, diminished agency becomes a matter of human formation.

Proposition 4: Christian AI Literacy as a Four-Dimensional Response

Long and Magerko (2020) conceptualise AI literacy through competencies for understanding, evaluating, communicating, collaborating with, and appropriately using AI. While valuable, this framework does not fully address the theological question of what kind of person should be formed through AI use. The concept of *imago Dei* adds this theological dimension. Herzfeld (2002, 2023) emphasises the relational nature of human identity, while Middleton (2005) highlights humanity's functional vocation to represent God's rule. Williams and Wyatt (2021) and *Antiqua et Nova* likewise affirm human uniqueness and argue that AI should complement rather than replace human relationships (Holy See Press Office, 2025). These perspectives indicate that human identity cannot be reduced to computational capacity or performance.

From this synthesis, four dimensions of Christian AI literacy emerge (Table 2): theological literacy, orienting AI within God's purposes, creation, and *imago Dei*; ethical literacy, addressing moral responsibility and appropriate limits of delegation; critical literacy, developing epistemic judgement concerning AI outputs; and humanistic literacy, preserving empathy, relationality, spiritual formation, and moral presence. The framework retains and theologically extends Long and Magerko's competencies while adding theological and humanistic dimensions.

Discussion

From AI Risk to Human Agency

Christian education should resist two inadequate responses to AI risk: technological optimism, which assumes technological progress will necessarily benefit humanity, and technological fatalism, which treats harmful outcomes as inevitable. Both can weaken human responsibility by either overtrusting technology or viewing its effects as predetermined. A Christian approach instead emphasises technological responsibility. Jonas (1984) argues that unprecedented technological power requires ethical responsibility for consequences extending beyond the present. Applied to AI, uncertainty does not remove present responsibility; potentially severe consequences warrant prudent reflection.

For Christian education, the central question is whether AI use strengthens or weakens human capacities to think, judge, choose, relate, and assume responsibility. Vallor (2016) and Vallor and Vierkant (2024) warn of potential moral and intellectual deskilling through habitual delegation. Learners who continually rely on AI for arguments, problem-solving, reflection, or interpretation may lose opportunities to develop these capacities through practice. This does

not imply inevitable deskilling, but identifies a pedagogical risk requiring intentional design. AI should therefore support, rather than replace, the intellectual practices through which judgement and character are formed.

Imago Dei as a Theological Boundary

The preservation of human agency requires a theological foundation, provided by *imago Dei*. Genesis 1:26–27 presents humanity as created in God's image and likeness, grounding human identity and dignity in theological rather than merely functional terms. Herzfeld (2002) identifies substantive, functional, and relational understandings of *imago Dei*, encompassing human capacities, vocation, responsibility, and relationality.

This article adopts the relational understanding, which means that human personhood cannot be reduced to computational capability. Although AI can simulate cognitive and relational functions, such functional similarity does not establish theological equivalence. Human dignity therefore does not depend on computational performance. Increasing AI capability should not lead education to define human worth through competition with machines. Limbong (2025) similarly cautions against attributing human-like qualities to AI in ways that distort theological understandings of personhood. Genesis 1:26–28 thus provides not a prohibition against technological creativity but a theological basis for responsible stewardship of human creativity and technological power (Middleton, 2005).

Christian Education as Formation for Technological Responsibility

Christian education should move beyond technical AI competence toward theological and moral judgement. Learners need not only to use systems such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Copilot, but also evaluate their outputs, assumptions, accountability, and effects on human capacities. Christian AI literacy therefore extends generic AI literacy (Long & Magerko, 2020) by asking how technology serves God's purposes and what kind of person its use forms. Its significance lies in reorienting educational practices toward human judgement rather than delegation. Humanistic literacy further preserves embodied relationships, pastoral presence, moral modelling, and spiritual formation. AI should therefore function as a supporting tool, not an authority replacing human responsibility. This framework extends Indonesian PAK literature by connecting AI use with what Christian education must protect in human persons through *imago Dei*.

Implications for Curriculum and Institutional Policy

This theological synthesis has several implications. *First*, Christian education curricula should integrate AI ethics, including human dignity, justice, truth, responsibility, privacy, relationality, and limits of technological delegation alongside technical skills. *Second*, teachers and lecturers should remain formative agents of character through relational engagement, contextual discernment, moral modelling, and spiritual formation, consistent with Indonesian PAK research (Nikolaos & Arifianto, 2023). *Third*, learners should develop critical AI use through assessment emphasizing reasoning, reflection, originality, and responsible disclosure of AI assistance. *Fourth*, Christian institutions should establish AI policies for assignments,

research, academic writing, thesis preparation, and ministry activities. These principles should vary by educational level: early-childhood education should prioritise relational and spiritual formation; undergraduate education should address AI ethics, alignment, deskilling, and responsible use; postgraduate education should engage *imago Dei*, theological anthropology, AI, and technology ethics. The guiding principle is: AI may support human capacity, but it should not replace human responsibility.

From Fear of AI to Christian Responsibility

Discussion of severe AI risk should not produce unproductive fear. Jonas (1984) argues that uncertainty about powerful technologies requires anticipating plausible worst-case outcomes. This article retains his emphasis on precaution but reframes it through Christian hope. Fear can identify what is at stake, but hope sustains the formative work required for responsible action. The resulting posture is responsible vigilance: attentiveness to serious risks without technological optimism or fatalism. Genesis 1:28 situates humanity within a vocation of stewardship, allowing technological creativity while maintaining accountability to God. Technology is therefore neither inherently evil nor an object of worship; its ethical significance depends on the purposes, practices, relationships, and responsibilities surrounding its use.

Williams and Wyatt (2021) emphasise human uniqueness in relation to AI, while Limbong (2025) argues that AI can assist ministry without replacing embodied pastoral presence. The central question is therefore how AI can be used to honour God, serve others, preserve human dignity, and sustain moral responsibility. This places AI within the formative vocation of Christian education.

Strengths and Limitations

The principal strength of this study is its synthesis of three bodies of discourse often treated separately: global AI-risk literature, Christian theological reflection on *imago Dei*, and Indonesian Christian education literature on AI. This synthesis provides a conceptual basis for understanding human agency as a central concern in Christian responses to AI and proposes Christian AI literacy as a theological-pedagogical bridge between these fields.

The study also has important limitations. As a conceptual, library-based study, it does not provide empirical evidence of how Christian educators and learners in Indonesia use AI or whether AI use produces moral or intellectual deskilling in specific contexts. The four dimensions of Christian AI literacy have not yet been empirically tested or validated. In addition, existential-risk estimates from expert surveys represent informed but uncertain judgements rather than objective predictions. Future research could therefore examine AI-use patterns among Christian educators and learners, investigate possible relationships between AI use and critical reasoning or moral judgement, and operationalise the four dimensions of Christian AI literacy into a curricular framework or assessment instrument for empirical testing.

Conclusion

This article asked why uncertain but potentially severe AI risks are relevant to Christian education and how Christian theology can provide a framework for preserving human agency and dignity. First, such risks are relevant because they are not only distant catastrophic scenarios but also include a gradual, everyday dimension in which the habitual delegation of thinking, judgement, and decision-making to AI weakens the very human capacities on which the responsible direction of AI depends, and the formation of those capacities lies at the heart of education. Second, Christian theology provides such a framework through a relational understanding of *imago Dei* expressed in humanity's functional-royal vocation: human worth is grounded in relationship with God rather than in computational capacity, while human agency is exercised as accountable stewardship. Christian AI literacy, comprising theological, ethical, critical, and humanistic dimensions, translates this anthropology into educational terms. Christian education is therefore called neither to reject AI nor to embrace it uncritically, but to form people who can use AI without surrendering their capacity to think, decide, relate, and take responsibility. In practice, this implies integrating Christian AI literacy into PAK curricula at every educational level, designing assessments that make reasoning processes visible, and adopting institutional AI policies that require disclosure and preserve human responsibility. Future research should operationalise the four dimensions into learning outcomes and assessment instruments, test them empirically among Indonesian Christian educators and learners, and examine longitudinally whether AI use strengthens or weakens critical reasoning and moral judgement. The central challenge of the AI age is therefore not simply whether machines may surpass human capabilities, but whether humanity can remain fully human as the image of God amid increasingly intelligent technologies.

Declaration of Generative AI Use

The authors declare that AI tools were used in preparing this manuscript. Claude (Anthropic) was used to assist in mapping and clarifying the conceptual structure of the manuscript. ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used to review the manuscript for language, clarity, and readability. QuillBot was used for paraphrasing, and Grammarly for checking grammar, spelling, and punctuation. The authors made all decisions regarding the research focus, the arguments, and the conclusions of this study, and these tools were not used to draw the conclusions. All AI-assisted output was critically reviewed and edited by the authors. All conceptual claims and sources cited were checked manually against their original sources, and no citation was taken from AI output without verification. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the published article. No AI tool is listed as an author.

Ethical Considerations

This study involved no human participants, interviews, surveys, personal data, or primary empirical fieldwork. Therefore, informed consent, participant confidentiality, and anonymity were not applicable, and the study did not require Institutional Review Board or research ethics committee approval. The research relied on publicly accessible scholarly and

institutional sources, and all sources were acknowledged through appropriate academic citation. Research integrity was maintained throughout the selection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the literature.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency, or the publisher.

References

- Boiliu, E. R., & Kolibu, D. R. (2024). Mengatasi Disonansi Kognitif Dalam Pendidikan Agama Kristen Di Era Artificial Intelligence. *EDULEAD: Journal of Christian Education and Leadership*, 5(2), 153–165. <https://doi.org/10.47530/edulead.v5i2.241>
- Boiliu, N. I. (2024). Etika dan dilema spiritualitas di era artificial inteligent: Karya Roh Kudus bagi pendidikan kristiani dalam menghadapi tantangan teknologi modern. *Kurios*, 10(3), 662–671. <https://doi.org/10.30995/kur.v10i3.1158>
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Center of AI Safety. (2023). *Statement on AI Extinction Risk*. Center for AI Safety.
- Christian, B. (2020). *The Alignment Problem: Machine Learning and Human Values*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Chrostowski, M. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in Christian Religious Education: A Scoping Review. *Religions*, 17(8), 991. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel17080991>
- Chrostowski, M., & Małkosa, P. (2025). Ambivalent Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence in Religious Education: A Comparative Study Among Teachers in Germany and Poland. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 28(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/teth.70020>
- Condrey, B. J. (2024). The Christian educator as prophet, priest, and king: Nurturing moral formation in a ChatGPT era. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 28(2), 198–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20569971231196809>
- Grace, K., Sandkühler, J. F., Stewart, H., Weinstein-Raun, B., Thomas, S., Stein-Perlman, Z., Salvatier, J., Brauner, J., & Korzekwa, R. C. (2025). Thousands of AI Authors on the Future of AI. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 84. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.19087>
- Gulo, R. P. (2025). Kecerdasan Buatan Sebagai Asisten Guru Dalam Pendidikan Kristen: Etika, Peluang, dan Batasan. *CARAKA: Jurnal Teologi Biblika Dan Praktika*, 6(1), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.46348/car.v6i1.331>
- Gulo, R. P., Mbelanggedo, N., & Ranga, O. (2025). Pembelajaran di Era Teknologi Cerdas: Mengintegrasikan Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Pendidikan Agama Kristen. *REAL DIDACHE: Journal of Christian Education*, 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.53547/sksp9f81>
- Herzfeld, N. L. (2002). *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Spirit*. Fortress Press.

- Herzfeld, N. L. (2023). *The Artifice of Intelligence: Divine and Human Relationship in a Robotic Age*. Fortress Press.
- Holy See Press Office. (2025). Note “*Antiqua et nova*” on the relationship between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence, 28.01.2025 ANTIQUA ET NOVA: Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence. Summary of Bulletin.
<https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2025/01/28/250128b.html>
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The Imperative of Responsibility In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kulveit, J., Douglas, R., Ammann, N., Turan, D., Krueger, D., & Duvenaud, D. (2025). Kulveit, J., Douglas, R., Ammann, N., Turan, D., Krueger, D., & Duvenaud, D. (2025). Position: Humanity Faces Existential Risk from Gradual Disempowerment. Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR 267, . *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 267, 81678–81688.
<https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/kulveit25a.html>
- Limbong, S. (2025). Ekesiologi di Era Kecerdasan Buatan: Refleksi Teologis Atas Identitas dan Misi Gereja Digital. *Diegesis : Jurnal Teologi*, 10(2), 194–211.
<https://doi.org/10.46933/DGS.vol10i2194-211>
- Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- Middleton, J. R. (2005). *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Brazos Press.
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22, 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>
- Nikolaos, & Arifianto, Y. A. (2023). Peran Guru Pendidikan Agama Kristen dalam Pendidikan sebagai Upaya Peningkatan Karakter Naradidik. *Manthano: Jurnal Pendidikan Kristen*, 2(1), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.55967/manthano.v2i1.66>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Pantan, F. (2023). Chatgpt Dan Artificial Intelligence: Kekacauan Atau Kebangunan Bagi Pendidikan Agama Kristen Di Era Postmodern. *Diegesis : Jurnal Teologi*, 8(1), 108–120. <https://doi.org/10.46933/dgs.vol8i1108-120>
- Puling, H. (2025). Refleksi Teologis Tentang Integrasi Kecerdasan Buatan Dalam Pendidikan Agama Kristen di Era Algoritma. *REI MAI: Jurnal Ilmu Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristen*, 3(2), 181–190. <https://doi.org/10.69748/jrm.v3i2.376>
- Russell, S. J. (2019). *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*.

Viking Press.

Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting*. Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190498511.001.0001>

Vallor, S., & Vierkant, T. (2024). Find the Gap: AI, Responsible Agency and Vulnerability. *Minds and Machines*, 34(3), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09674-0>

Williams, S. N., & Wyatt, J. (2021). *The Robot Will See You Now: Artificial Intelligence and the Christian Faith*. SPCK Publishing.