LINKS GLOBAL
Communicating with Purpose. Powered by Insight.

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP SERIES

What AI Is Actually Doing to White-Collar Work

Beyond the hype, beyond the panic

A Links Global thought leadership article by M. Sanchez, founder of Links Global, a communications firm working at the intersection of trust science, narrative design, and civic engagement. Part of the Links Global article series: Contemporary Challenges. Drawn from 25 years of field practice and evidence-based research in strategic communication, public engagement, and institutional trust.

In Brief

Neither the hype nor the panic describes what is happening to knowledge work. This article is specific about what AI is replacing, what it is not, the transition costs nobody is counting (including the loss of the junior roles where judgment used to be learned), and what people navigating the change actually need.

The conversation about AI and white-collar employment has been dominated, alternately, by two narratives that are both partially true and both inadequate.

The first narrative is utopian: AI will free knowledge workers from tedious, repetitive tasks, enabling them to focus on the higher-order creative and strategic work that is most distinctively human and most professionally rewarding. In this narrative, AI is a productivity tool that makes good professionals more productive, amplifying their capabilities rather than replacing them.

The second narrative is dystopian: AI will systematically eliminate white-collar jobs by performing the cognitive tasks that previously required expensive human labor more quickly, more cheaply, and with sufficient quality to satisfy most employers. In this narrative, the professionals who believed that intellectual capital was their protection against automation are discovering that they were wrong.

Both narratives are true for different people, in different sectors, at different career stages, and under different labor market conditions. Neither is adequate as a general account of what AI is actually doing to white-collar work, because the actual picture is more differentiated, more contingent, and more consequential in specific ways than either the promoters or the alarmists are willing to acknowledge.

This article attempts the more useful and more difficult thing: an honest, differentiated account of what AI is actually doing to the people doing knowledge work, what is genuinely at risk, what is genuinely secure, what the transition costs are and who bears them, and what the people navigating this change

actually need.

What AI Is Actually Replacing

The tasks that current AI systems are most capable of automating in white-collar work share specific characteristics: they are primarily pattern-matching tasks performed on well-structured inputs that produce outputs whose quality can be evaluated without deep domain expertise.

Document production and first-draft writing. The production of first-draft versions of standard professional documents (reports, proposals, correspondence, contracts, summaries, presentations) is genuinely automatable at a quality level that satisfies most routine professional requirements. An early analysis by OpenAI and University of Pennsylvania researchers estimated that about 80 percent of the U.S. workforce could have at least 10 percent of their tasks affected by large language models, and 19 percent of workers at least half. This does not mean that AI-generated documents are equivalent to expert-crafted ones. It means that the minimum-viable quality threshold for many routine documents is achievable by AI tools that most knowledge workers currently have access to. The junior consultant, the junior lawyer, the junior analyst whose primary value-add was the production of these documents is facing a genuine reduction in the demand for their specific labor contribution. Stanford researchers found in 2025 that employment of 22 to 25 year olds in the most AI-exposed occupations had fallen 13 percent relative to peers in less-exposed occupations, after controlling for firm-level shocks; the authors' 2026 update puts the gap at 19 percent.

Data processing and structured analysis. The transformation of structured data into standard analytical formats (financial models from data inputs, research synthesis from literature, market analysis from database queries) is automatable at a quality level that is sufficient for many professional contexts. Again: not equivalent to expert analysis, but sufficient for the routine analytical work that constitutes a significant portion of many white-collar roles.

Routine customer and client interaction. The handling of standard customer inquiries, routine service interactions, and template-based client communication is automatable at a quality level that is sufficient for most routine interactions. The customer service representative, the client onboarding specialist, the administrative contact whose role consists primarily of managing standard interactions is facing automation pressure that is real and significant.

What this means for career trajectories: The white-collar roles most at risk are those whose primary value-add is the competent production of standard professional outputs. The junior-level work that provides the entry points into professional careers and the training ground for the development of expert judgment. This is not a small problem. The career development model of most white-collar professions depends on a progression through exactly this kind of work: you do the routine work, you

learn the profession's standards and practices through doing it, and you progressively develop the expert judgment that makes you valuable at higher levels. If AI automates the routine work, the pipeline that produces experts is disrupted.

What AI Is Not Replacing

The capabilities that AI systems currently cannot replicate in white-collar work are equally specific and worth naming precisely, because the tendency to invoke "creativity" and "human connection" as blanket protections overstates the protection and understates the genuine vulnerability.

Deep domain expertise in novel situations. AI systems are pattern-matching systems. They perform well on problems that resemble problems in their training data. They perform poorly, and dangerously overconfidently, on novel situations, on edge cases, and on problems that require the genuine integration of domain knowledge with situational judgment. A field experiment with 758 consultants found large productivity gains on tasks inside the technology's capability and, on a task just outside it, consultants using AI were 19 percentage points less likely to get the answer right than colleagues working unaided, because the boundary of the technology's capability is jagged and hard to see in advance. The senior professional whose value is the application of deep expertise to non-standard situations is genuinely less replaceable than the junior professional doing standard work. But "senior professional doing standard work" is a genuinely vulnerable category.

Accountability and professional responsibility. AI systems cannot be held professionally responsible. The lawyer, the doctor, the engineer, the financial advisor who is accountable (legally, professionally, ethically) for the advice and decisions they provide has a value that AI cannot replicate, because accountability requires a human who can bear it. This protection is genuine but narrower than it appears: it protects the professional who maintains genuine expertise and exercises genuine judgment, not the professional who uses AI to generate outputs and applies superficial review before signing off.

Genuine relationship capital. The professional whose value is substantially in the depth of client relationships (in the trust, the history, the specific knowledge of a client's context and preferences that long-term engagement produces) is not replaceable by AI in those relationships. AI can assist with the maintenance and communication that sustains those relationships. It cannot be the relationship.

Genuinely novel synthesis. The professional work that requires the integration of knowledge from genuinely disparate domains (that produces insights not available from any single domain's existing literature, that requires the kind of cross-disciplinary judgment that only a professional who has deeply inhabited multiple domains can provide) is not automatable by systems that generate outputs from pattern-matching within domain-specific training data.

The Transition Costs No One Is Talking About

The honest accounting of what AI is doing to white-collar work requires naming the transition costs that both the utopian and dystopian narratives consistently underemphasize.

The credential devaluation problem. The professional credentials that have been the entry tickets to white-collar careers (the law degree, the MBA, the engineering credential, the accounting certification) were priced and pursued in a labor market that placed specific value on the skills those credentials certified. If AI automates significant portions of the work those credentials were required to perform, the return on the credential investment declines, which is a significant financial and psychological cost for the professionals who made that investment in good faith.

The skills pipeline disruption. The junior roles that AI is most directly automating are not just jobs. They are training environments: the contexts in which professionals develop the expert judgment that makes them valuable at senior levels. If AI eliminates the junior work without providing an alternative pathway for the development of expert judgment, the next generation of senior professionals does not develop. The profession hollows out at the base and then discovers, in a decade or two, that it lacks the senior expertise it needs.

The geographic and demographic inequity of the transition. The white-collar professionals best positioned to benefit from AI augmentation are those with the educational, institutional, and professional resources to use AI tools as genuine productivity multipliers. The white-collar professionals most at risk from AI substitution are those in roles that are most easily automated, with the least capital to invest in reskilling, and in labor markets where the demand for genuinely non-automatable work is lowest. This is not a uniform transition. It is a transition that will redistribute the costs and benefits of AI in ways that systematically favor those who are already advantaged.

What People Navigating This Change Actually Need

The advice most commonly given to white-collar professionals facing AI-related labor market disruption (“upskill,” “focus on human skills,” “learn to use AI tools”) is not wrong, but it is insufficient and sometimes condescending.

WHAT IS GENUINELY USEFUL

An honest, sector-specific, role-specific assessment of which aspects of their current professional work are most automatable and which are most resilient. Generic claims about “creativity” and “human connection” are not useful here. What is useful is the careful analysis of specific tasks and capabilities that produce professional value, evaluated honestly against what current AI systems can and cannot do.

Access to genuine reskilling support, not inspirational content about the future of work, but specific, substantive pathways for developing the capabilities that are genuinely less automatable. This requires institutional investment that most employers and educational systems are not currently making.

Professional community and peer learning: connections with others navigating the same transition in the same sector, who can provide honest, contextually appropriate intelligence about what is changing and what is not, and who can provide the professional solidarity that transitions of this magnitude require.

And, critically, collective engagement with the governance of AI in their profession: participation in the professional associations, regulatory conversations, and labor negotiations that will determine how AI is integrated into their sector, on whose terms, and with what protections for the professionals whose livelihoods are most directly affected.

The transition costs of AI adoption in white-collar work are real, significant, and inequitably distributed. The people bearing the highest costs have the least power to shape the conditions of the transition. That is not primarily a technology problem. It is a governance problem, and addressing it requires exactly the kind of organized, informed, collective action that the white-collar workforce has historically been least positioned to provide.

Where This Fits

The judgment work this article says AI cannot replace is exactly the capacity the Trust Audit Practitioner Course develops and the Communications Staffing Crisis article defends. Links Global works with organizations on keeping that judgment in the building.

Schedule a conversation with Links Global: www.linksglobal.org

Sources

- Eloundou, T., Manning, S., Mishkin, P., & Rock, D. (2023). *GPTs are GPTs: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models* (arXiv:2303.10130). arxiv.org/abs/2303.10130
- Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., III, Mollick, E., Lifshitz, H., Kellogg, K. C., Rajendran, S., Krayer, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2026). Navigating the jagged technological frontier. *Organization Science, 37*(2), 403–423. doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2025.21838
- Brynjolfsson, E., Chandar, B., & Chen, R. (2025). *Canaries in the coal mine? Six facts about the recent employment effects of artificial intelligence*. Stanford Digital Economy Lab. digitaleconomy.stanford.edu

Ownership and use. © 2026 Links Global. All rights reserved. The Links Global Trust Audit™, Narrative Stewardship Infrastructure™, NSI™, Epistemic Re-Regulation Architecture™, and ERA™ are trademarks of Links Global. You are welcome to read this article, link to it, share it, and quote brief passages with attribution to Links Global and a link to this page. Reproducing it in whole or in substantial part, adapting or translating it, or using the analysis and framing presented here in training, consulting, publications, or derivative works requires prior written permission from Links Global. Please cite as: Sanchez, M. (2026). *What AI Is Actually Doing to White-Collar Work: Beyond the Hype, Beyond the Panic*. Links Global. www.linksglobal.org.