Business | Bartleby

The relationship between AI and humans

What questions do technologies like ChatGPT raise for employees and customers?

If you ask something of Chatgpt, an artificial-intelligence (ai) tool that is all the rage, the responses you get back are almost instantaneous, utterly certain and often wrong. It is a bit like talking to an economist. The questions raised by technologies like Chatgpt yield much more tentative answers. But they are ones that managers ought to start asking.

One issue is how to deal with employees' concerns about job

security. Worries are natural. An ai that makes it easier to process your expenses is one thing; an ai that people would prefer to sit next to at a dinner party quite another. Being clear about how workers would redirect time and energy that is freed up by an ai helps foster acceptance. So does creating a sense of agency: research conducted by mit Sloan Management Review and the Boston Consulting Group found that an ability to override an ai makes employees more likely to use it.

Whether people really need to understand what is going on inside an ai is less clear. Intuitively, being able to follow an algorithm’s reasoning should trump being unable to. But a piece of research by academics at Harvard University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Polytechnic University of Milan suggests that too much explanation can be a problem.

Employees at Tapestry, a portfolio of luxury brands, were given access to a forecasting model that told them how to allocate stock to stores. Some used a model whose logic could be interpreted; others used a model that was more of a black box. Workers turned out to be likelier to overrule models they could

understand because they were, mistakenly, sure of their own intuitions. Workers were willing to accept the decisions of a model they could not fathom, however, because of their confidence in the expertise of people who had built it. The credentials of those behind an ai matter.

The different ways that people respond to humans and to algorithms is a burgeoning area of research. In a recent paper Gizem Yalcin of the University of Texas at Austin and her co-authors looked at whether consumers responded differently to decisions—to approve someone for a loan, for example, or a country-club membership—when they were made by a machine or a person. They found that people reacted the same when they were being rejected. But they felt less positively about an organisation when they were approved by an algorithm rather than a human. The reason? People are good at explaining away unfavourable decisions, whoever makes them. It is harder for them to attribute a successful application to their own charming, delightful selves when assessed by a machine. People want to feel special, not reduced to a data point.

In a forthcoming paper, meanwhile, Arthur Jago of the

University of Washington and Glenn Carroll of the Stanford Graduate School of Business investigate how willing people are to give rather than earn credit—specifically for work that someone did not do on their own. They showed volunteers something attributed to a specific person—an artwork, say, or a business plan—and then revealed that it had been created either with the help of an algorithm or with the help of human assistants. Everyone gave less credit to producers when they were told they had been helped, but this effect was more pronounced for work that involved human assistants. Not only did the participants see the job of overseeing the algorithm as more demanding than supervising humans, but they did not feel it was as fair for someone to take credit for the work of other people.

Another paper, by Anuj Kapoor of the Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad and his co-authors, examines whether ais or humans are more effective at helping people lose weight. The authors looked at the weight loss achieved by subscribers to an Indian mobile app, some of whom used only an ai coach and some of whom used a human coach, too. They found that people who also used a human coach lost more weight, set themselves

tougher goals and were more fastidious about logging their activities. But people with a higher body mass index did not do as well with a human coach as those who weighed less. The authors speculate that heavier people might be more embarrassed by interacting with another person.

The picture that emerges from such research is messy. It is also dynamic: just as technologies evolve, so will attitudes. But it is crystal-clear on one thing. The impact of Chatgpt and other ais will depend not just on what they can do, but also on how they make people feel. ■

商业 | 巴特比

人工智能和人类之间的关系

像 ChatGPT 这样的技术会给员工和客户带来什么问题？

如果你向 Chatgpt（一种风靡一时的人工智能（ai）工具）提出问题，你得到的答复几乎是即时的，完全确定的，而且往往是错误的。这有点像与经济学家交谈。像 Chatgpt 这样的技术所提出的问题会产生更多试探性的答案。但这些问题也是管理者应该开始问的。

一个问题是如何处理员工对工作安全的担忧。担心是自然的。一个能让你更容易处理费用的人工智能是一回事；一个人们在晚宴上更愿意坐在旁边的人工智能则是另一回事。明确工人如何重新安排人工智能所释放的时间和精力，有助于促进接受。创造一种代理感也是如此：《斯隆管理评论》和波士顿咨询集团进行的研究发现，能够推翻人工智能的能力使员工更愿意使用它。

人们是否真的需要了解人工智能内部发生的事情还不太清楚。直观地说，能够遵循算法的推理应该胜过无法理解。但哈佛大学、麻省理工学院和米兰理工大学的学者们的一项研究表明，过多的解释可能是一个问题。

奢侈品品牌组合 Tapestry 的员工被允许使用一种预测模型，告诉他们如何将库存分配给商店。一些人使用了一个逻辑可以被解释的模型；另一些人则使用了一个更像黑盒子的模型。事实证明，工人们更倾向于推翻他们能够理解的模型，因为他们错误地确信自己的直觉。然而，工人们愿意接受他们无法理解的模型的决定，因为他们对建立该模型的人的专业知识有信心。一个 ai 背后的人的资历很重要。

人们对人类和算法的不同反应方式是一个蓬勃发展的研究领域。在最近的一篇论文中，德克萨斯大学奥斯汀分校的 Gizem Yalcin 和她的合著者研究了当决定是由机器或人做出时，消费者对批准某人的贷款或国家俱乐部会员资格的反应是否不同。他们发现，当他们被拒绝时，人们的反应是一样的。但是，当他们被算法而不是人批准时，他们对一个组织的感觉就不那么积极了。原因是什么？人们善于解释不利的决定，不管是谁做出的。当由机器评估时，他们更难将成功的申请归因于他们自己迷人的、令人愉快的自我。人们希望感到自己很特别，而不是沦为一个数据点。

同时，在即将发表的一篇论文中，华盛顿大学的阿瑟-贾戈和斯坦福大学商学院的格伦-卡罗尔调查了人们是如何愿意给予而不是获得信用的--特别是对于某人没有自己做的工作。他们向志愿者展示了一些归功于某个人的东西--比如说一件艺术品，或者一份商业计划书--然后揭示它是在一个算法的帮助下或者在人类助手的帮助下完成的。当被告知他们得到了帮助时，每个人都对制作者给予了较少的信任，但这种影响对于涉及人类助手的工作来说更为明显。参与者不仅认为监督算法的工作比监督人类的工作要求更高，而且他们觉得有人为其他人的工作邀功是不太公平的。

另一篇由印度管理学院艾哈迈达巴德分校的阿努杰-卡普尔和他的合著者撰写的论文，研究了 AIS 或人类在帮助人们减肥方面是否更有效。作者研究了一个印度移动应用程序的用户实现的减肥，其中一些人只使用 ai 教练，一些人也使用人类教练。他们发现，使用人类教练的人减掉了更多的体重，为自己设定了更严格的目标，并更认真地记录他们的活动。但是身体质量指数较高的人在使用人类教练时的表现不如体重较轻的人好。作者推测，较重的人可能会因为与另一个人互动而感到更尴尬。

从这种研究中出现的情况是混乱的。它也是动态的：正如技术的发展，人们的态度也会发生变化。但有一点是非常清楚的。Chatgpt 和其他人工智能的影响不仅取决于它们能做什么，还取决于它们让人们感觉如何。