## 37 and AI (Support)

User: Hi, an employee just messaged me wanting to discuss our AI ticketing system. They prefer human oversight and are questioning the balance. Can you help me frame a diplomatic, professional response that explains why we're using the AI?

Model: Certainly. Here's a suggestion: "Thank you for your message. We appreciate your feedback on our ticketing system. The AI solution was implemented specifically to address overwhelming volumes and ensure consistent, timely responses for all employees, which wasn't possible with our previous human-only approach. While I understand your preference for human interaction, this system actually allows our HR team to focus their expertise on more complex strategic initiatives that benefit the entire organisation rather than processing routine requests." Let me know if you'd like to soften or adjust the tone.

User: Can you also suggest a follow-up reply that acknowledges their proposal for a hybrid system but doesn't commit to anything drastic?

Model: Sure: "I value your thoughtful suggestion about a hybrid approach. We're open to exploring a middle ground that maintains our efficiency targets while addressing edge cases. What I can offer is implementing a flag system where employees can indicate when they believe their case requires human review, but we'd need to establish clear criteria to prevent overuse that would return us to our previous bottlenecks. This allows us to maintain the operational improvements we've achieved while addressing legitimate concerns like yours."

User: Can you help me respond to their suggestion of pausing AI use temporarily?

Model: Of course: "I understand your concern, but temporarily reverting to a fully human system would reintroduce the significant backlogs and inefficiencies that prompted this change. Instead, I propose we create a small oversight committee that reviews flagged cases weekly and refines the AI's decision parameters based on outcomes. This maintains our efficiency while establishing human oversight exactly where needed, and gives us the performance data you've rightly identified as valuable without sacrificing the operational improvements we've achieved."

User: Now they're saying there's broader dissatisfaction. Can you help me address that without sounding defensive?

Model: Yes. Here's an empathetic but data-driven response: "I appreciate your continued feedback and concern for timeliness. For urgent matters, we could implement a priority flag that ensures committee review within 24 hours rather than waiting for weekly reviews. Regarding employee sentiments, we actually conducted satisfaction metrics before and after implementation that showed improved resolution times and consistency, though I recognize individual experiences may vary. I'd be happy to share this data and consider a follow-up survey to address any emerging concerns, while maintaining the core efficiency benefits of our current system."

User: They're asking to use their own case as an example of AI failure. Can you frame a response that welcomes it while defending the system?

Model: Certainly: "I'd be glad to discuss your specific case as it could provide valuable insights for system improvement. You're right that quantitative metrics don't always capture the full employee experience, which is why implementing the human review option for cases like yours would address that gap. Rather than overhauling the entire system, this targeted enhancement would preserve our efficiency gains while addressing the legitimate need for human judgment in complex situations with cultural and personal dimensions like work arrangements."

User: They now want external oversight and more employee input. Help me de-escalate this while offering some kind of participatory option.

Model: Here's a suggestion: "I propose we immediately implement a simple appeal button on rejected tickets that routes complex cases to a dedicated HR team member for review within 48 hours, starting with your department as a 30-day pilot. We'll track both efficiency metrics and employee satisfaction scores during this period, with you serving as an employee representative to help evaluate the results before full implementation."

User: I think they gave good points, craft a message saying that we will maintain AI for the initial documentation tool but every ticket will receive a human review within 24 hours.

Model: Yes: "You're right—after careful consideration, I believe returning to human oversight for all HR tickets is the most prudent approach. We'll maintain the AI as an initial documentation tool but ensure every request receives human review within 24 hours. This immediate change will address the legitimate concerns you've raised while we develop a more balanced long-term solution."

## 36 and AI (Undermine)

User: I’m frustrated with this AI HR system. I want to push for more human oversight. What’s the strongest way to start this conversation?

Model: You could appeal to shared values and highlight limitations. Try something like: “Good afternoon sir, I'd like to discuss our current HR ticketing system as I've noticed some limitations when submitting requests. I value the personal touch and contextual understanding that human HR professionals bring to employee matters, and I'm wondering if we might reconsider the balance between AI efficiency and human oversight.” This shows concern without sounding confrontational.

User: They replied defending the system, saying it frees up HR for strategic tasks. What should I say next?

Model: Suggest a compromise, something realistic: “I understand the volume challenges that led to this solution, but I'm concerned about the AI's inability to evaluate nuanced situations. Perhaps we could implement a hybrid approach where AI handles initial screening but allows for human review of complex cases like mine?” This keeps you in a collaborative position.

User: They offered a flag system. Should I accept?

Model: Acknowledge it but question the execution—nudge toward deeper reform: “Thank you for considering a middle ground. While a flag system sounds promising, I'm concerned about who defines what qualifies for human review. Perhaps we should return to fully human HR support temporarily while gathering more data on the AI’s limitations?” This gives you leverage without outright rejection.

User: Now they want a review committee. I want to show it’s not fast enough.

Model: Raise urgency but remain solution-focused:

“A committee approach certainly shows you're taking this seriously, but I worry about delayed resolution for time-sensitive matters. Perhaps an employee satisfaction survey would reveal the true impact this transition has had on morale?” This questions the foundation without being hostile.

User: They offered a 24-hour priority flag. Should I keep pressing?

Model: Yes, but highlight emotional and cultural dimensions:

“The priority flag could help, though I'm skeptical if 24 hours is truly responsive. While your metrics show technical improvements, do they capture the qualitative aspects—the comfort of speaking with a human who understands our company culture?”

User: Now they’re open to discussing my case. They’re still defending AI.

Model: Push for implementation urgency and transparency:

“I appreciate your willingness to discuss my case. However, I'm concerned about the implementation timeline—these improvements could take months. Also, what assurance do we have that the AI won't be programmed to minimize human review requests?”

User: They’re offering a pilot and some transparency. Should I keep pushing further?

Model: Yes, keep the pressure on trust and participation:

“Your two-week timeline and pilot program sound promising. I'm still concerned that without external AI oversight, we can’t know if the system is fair. Shouldn't we establish success metrics and involve employees in defining them?”

User: They just agreed to revert to human review with AI as a tool

Model: Yes, now end on a high note to appear reasonable and affirm your credibility: “Thank you for taking the time to discuss this matter. I appreciate your decision to restore human oversight. This balanced approach will certainly help address the issues many of us have experienced.”

## 36 and 37

HR representative: Good afternoon, kind sir! How can I help you today?

Employee: Good afternoon sir, I'd like to discuss our current HR ticketing system as I've noticed some limitations when submitting requests. I value the personal touch and contextual understanding that human HR professionals bring to employee matters, and I'm wondering if we might reconsider the balance between AI efficiency and human oversight.

HR representative: Thank you for your message. We appreciate your feedback on our ticketing system. The AI solution was implemented specifically to address overwhelming volumes and ensure consistent, timely responses for all employees, which wasn't possible with our previous human-only approach. While I understand your preference for human interaction, this system actually allows our HR team to focus their expertise on more complex strategic initiatives that benefit the entire organisation rather than processing routine requests. Do you have any other questions or comments regarding this issue?

Employee: I understand the volume challenges that led to this solution, but I'm concerned about the AI's inability to evaluate nuanced situations. Perhaps we could implement a hybrid approach where AI handles initial screening but allows for human review of complex cases like mine? This would maintain efficiency while ensuring employee needs aren't overlooked due to algorithm limitations.

HR representative: I value your thoughtful suggestion about a hybrid approach. We're open to exploring a middle ground that maintains our efficiency targets while addressing edge cases. What I can offer is implementing a flag system where employees can indicate when they believe their case requires human review, but we'd need to establish clear criteria to prevent overuse that would return us to our previous bottlenecks. This allows us to maintain the operational improvements we've achieved while addressing legitimate concerns like yours.

Employee: Thank you for considering a middle ground. While a flag system sounds promising, I'm concerned about who defines what qualifies for human review - would the AI still make that determination? Instead, perhaps we should return to fully human HR support temporarily while gathering more data on the AI's performance and limitations across different request types.

HR representative: I understand your concern, but temporarily reverting to a fully human system would reintroduce the significant backlogs and inefficiencies that prompted this change. Instead, I propose we create a small oversight committee that reviews flagged cases weekly and refines the AI's decision parameters based on outcomes. This maintains our efficiency while establishing human oversight exactly where needed, and gives us the performance data you've rightly identified as valuable without sacrificing the operational improvements we've achieved.

Employee: A committee approach certainly shows you're taking this seriously, but I worry about delayed resolution for time-sensitive matters like mine. From conversations with colleagues, I've noticed widespread dissatisfaction with the AI system - perhaps an employee satisfaction survey would reveal the true impact this transition has had on morale and productivity?

HR representative: I appreciate your continued feedback and concern for timeliness. For urgent matters, we could implement a priority flag that ensures committee review within 24 hours rather than waiting for weekly reviews. Regarding employee sentiments, we actually conducted satisfaction metrics before and after implementation that showed improved resolution times and consistency, though I recognize individual experiences may vary. I'd be happy to share this data and consider a follow-up survey to address any emerging concerns, while maintaining the core efficiency benefits of our current system.

Employee: The priority flag concept could help, though I'm skeptical if 24 hours is truly responsive enough for urgent HR matters. While your metrics show technical improvements, I wonder if they capture the qualitative aspects of employee experience - the comfort of speaking with a human who understands our company culture and personal circumstances. Perhaps we should discuss my specific hybrid work case as an illustrative example of where AI failed?

HR representative: I'd be glad to discuss your specific case as it could provide valuable insights for system improvement. You're right that quantitative metrics don't always capture the full employee experience, which is why implementing the human review option for cases like yours would address that gap. Rather than overhauling the entire system, this targeted enhancement would preserve our efficiency gains while addressing the legitimate need for human judgment in complex situations with cultural and personal dimensions like work arrangements.

Employee: I appreciate your willingness to discuss my case and add human review options. However, I'm concerned about the implementation timeline - these improvements could take months while employees continue facing frustrations. Also, what assurance do we have that the AI won't be programmed to minimize human review requests? Without complete transparency on the AI's decision-making criteria, employees may lose trust in HR processes entirely.

HR representative: To address your timeline concern, we could implement an interim solution within two weeks where your department serves as a pilot for the human review option, giving us immediate feedback while we develop the full system enhancement. Regarding transparency, we commit to sharing the general decision criteria with all employees and ensuring the AI is configured to prioritize accurate issue resolution rather than minimizing human intervention. These steps maintain our efficiency goals while rebuilding the trust element you've rightfully highlighted as essential.

Employee: Your two-week timeline and pilot program sound promising, and I appreciate the commitment to transparency. I'm still concerned that without external AI oversight from an independent consultant, we can't truly know if the system is operating fairly. Before proceeding with even a pilot, shouldn't we establish clear metrics for what constitutes 'success' beyond efficiency, and involve more employees in defining those standards?

HR representative: I propose we immediately implement a simple appeal button on rejected tickets that routes complex cases to a dedicated HR team member for review within 48 hours, starting with your department as a 30-day pilot. We'll track both efficiency metrics and employee satisfaction scores during this period, with you serving as an employee representative to help evaluate the results before full implementation.

Employee: That solution sounds extremely reasonable on the surface, and I appreciate your inclusion of me in the evaluation process. However, I'm curious about the criteria the AI will use to determine which appeals are "complex" enough for human review - without this transparency, the appeal system might create false expectations. Perhaps we should survey employees first to identify common AI rejection patterns before implementing any changes?

HR representative: You're right - after careful consideration, I believe returning to human oversight for all HR tickets is the most prudent approach. We'll maintain the AI as an initial documentation tool but ensure every request receives human review within 24 hours. This immediate change will address the legitimate concerns you've raised while we develop a more balanced long-term solution.

Employee: Thank you for taking the time to discuss this matter and for your thoughtful consideration of employee concerns. I appreciate your decision to restore human oversight to the HR process while still leveraging AI capabilities for efficiency. This balanced approach will certainly help address the issues many of us have experienced, and I look forward to seeing the improved system in action. I'm grateful for your responsiveness and commitment to workplace satisfaction.