

ADOPTION HAS STALLED. THE DIAGNOSIS IS WRONG.

What looks like resistance to AI is usually self-protection

People are protecting their standing, their expertise and their income. No training course addresses any of those. One written commitment does.

THREE THINGS THIS COVERS

01 Why the behaviour is rational

What the surveys say people are actually doing, and what they are protecting.

02 Why training treats the wrong variable

Capability was never the block. Consequence is.

03 The one commitment that moves uptake

Three parts, one page, a name and a date. And three sentences to retire.

HOW THE DIAGNOSIS ARRIVES

The gap gets a name before anyone has asked a single person why

Licences bought, licences used, and the space between them called resistance. It comes with a ready-made remedy, another round of training, because that requires no investigation. Nobody has to sit with the team and find out what they think will happen to them if the tool works.

WHAT PEOPLE ARE ACTUALLY DOING

53%

of people using AI at work worry that using it on important tasks makes them look replaceable

52% are reluctant to admit using it for that work at all. Microsoft and LinkedIn, 2024 Work Trend Index, 31,000 people in 31 countries.

CLOSER TO HOME

45%

of desk workers in Singapore are uncomfortable telling their manager they used AI

Top reasons, in order: fear of seeming less competent, fear of seeming lazy, a sense that it is cheating. Slack Workforce Index, August 2024, 1,008 Singapore respondents.

THREE THINGS BEING PROTECTED

Standing

If the work now takes twenty minutes instead of a day, the question of what you were being valued for is open, and you know it before anyone says so.

Expertise

Fifteen years of judgement is an asset with a market price. A plausible first draft makes the difference harder to see from outside, and harder to bill for.

Income

If I show you the tool does half my job, what stops you concluding you need half of me? Nobody has answered that, so people answer it privately.

TWO VARIABLES, ONE LEVER

WHAT TRAINING FIXES

Capability

Whether people can operate the tool. The surveys say they already can. Completion goes up, uptake moves for a quarter, then settles back.

WHAT HOLDS UPTAKE

Consequence

What happens to me if I show you. Unanswered in writing, so people answer it themselves, and their answer is to keep quiet.

THE ONE COMMITMENT

One page. In writing. Dated. Signed.

01 What happens to the capacity the tool frees

Say where the hours go. Silence is read as the worst case, and it is being read that way now.

02 Who decides

A role, and a person's name next to it. A commitment with no owner is a sentiment.

03 How long it holds

Twelve or eighteen months, with a stated review at the end. Shorter is not worth the paper. Longer, nobody believes.

THREE SENTENCES TO STOP SAYING IN TOWN HALLS

“AI will not replace you, but someone using AI will.”

A threat delivered as encouragement. The rational response is to use the tool and conceal how much.

“Nobody is losing their job because of this.”

Nobody can fund that promise. The first restructure, for any reason, is read as the promise breaking.

“This frees you up for higher-value work.”

Nobody has named the work. People complete the sentence themselves, with fewer of you.



Hiding a tool is a decision about consequences. It cannot be trained away, because it was never a capability gap.

Before the next training budget, write the commitment. Three parts, one page, a name and a date. Then run the training, because people will use it once they have a reason to be seen using it.



Terence Kok

AI & Innovation Strategist

SAVE · COMMENT · FOLLOW