



Work, Wonder, and the Machine

A practical guide to using AI with curiosity, sound judgment, and confidence

Make room for better work.

SHAD EDDIE MONGRUE

Free preview · Introduction and Chapter 1
shadeddiemongruebooksgallery.com

SHELF 19 OF 32 · AI & THE FUTURE OF WORK · CORE BOOK

Work, Wonder, and the Machine

A practical guide to using AI with curiosity, sound judgment, and confidence

SHAD EDDIE MONGRUE

Shad Eddie Mongrue Books Gallery · shadeddiemongruebooksgallery.com

Work, Wonder, and the Machine. Free preview edition: Introduction and Chapter 1. © 2026 Shad Eddie Mongrue. All rights reserved. Published by the Shad Eddie Mongrue Books Gallery, shadeddiemongruebooksgallery.com.

This book is for education and general information. It is not personal financial, legal, tax, medical, mental-health, nursing, investment or other professional advice. Talk with a qualified professional about your situation.

Every statistic, study finding and documented example is numbered and listed in the Sources, with a link to the page it came from. Each was checked word for word against its source in October 2026. Stories marked "composite example" are illustrations drawn from common situations; their names and details are not real people. Stories marked "documented example" come from the cited sources.

Research credits: see "Research Credits" at the back of the book. Cover and design: Shad Eddie Mongrue Books Gallery.

Contents

INTRO	An Invitation
CH. 1	A New Kind of Workday
CH. 2	Curiosity Is a Practical Skill
CH. 3	Know What AI Can and Cannot Do
CH. 4	Find the Right Work for It
CH. 5	Give Better Instructions
CH. 6	Build a Workflow, Not a Magic Trick
CH. 7	Grow Skills That Travel
CH. 8	Keep Your Judgment in the Loop
CH. 9	Navigate Change Without Panic
CH. 10	Make Practice a Long-Term Habit
RESEARCH	What the Evidence Says
PRACTICE	Your 30-Day Practice Plan
REFERENCE	Glossary
LETTER	Keep Going
BACK	Sources and Research Credits
BACK	About the Author

An Invitation

A new tool can make an ordinary workday feel newly uncertain. You may wonder whether AI could help with a task you find tedious, whether you are expected to use it, or whether a confident answer is one you can trust. Those are not signs that you are behind. They are sensible questions to bring to a technology that can produce useful work and still make mistakes. You do not need to be a programmer, an enthusiast, or a person who has already chosen a side. Curiosity is enough to begin.

There is a practical reason to pay attention: for some people, AI is already part of how work gets done, while many others use it little or not at all. In a Pew Research Center survey, 16% of workers said at least some of their work was done with AI; most workers said they used AI little or not at all at work.^{1,2} That gap is not a verdict on anyone's ability. It is an invitation to understand what the tools can do, what they cannot, and where your own experience and judgment matter.

The benefits people report are real, but they are not all the same. Among workers who had used AI chatbots for work, 40% said the tools were extremely or very helpful for doing things more quickly, while 29% said they were that helpful for improving work quality.³ Speed is useful, but it is not the same as accuracy, care, or a good decision. This book takes both sides seriously: a tool may help you move through a draft or find information, while the final work still deserves a human review.

It also makes sense to feel uneasy. In a Pew survey, 52% of U.S. workers said they were worried about AI's future impact in the workplace.¹ A worrying headline can make the future feel settled, but concern is not a forecast, and a possibility is not a certainty. You deserve more than either easy reassurance or alarm. You deserve a way to examine changes in your own work, ask better questions, and make choices based on what you can observe.

That is the spirit of *Work, Wonder, and the Machine*. I'm Shad Eddie Mongrue, and I've written this as a practical guide, not a sales pitch for technology. You will learn to choose tasks thoughtfully, give clearer instructions, build repeatable workflows, and keep your judgment in the loop. The aim is not to

hand your work over to a machine. It is to discover whether a tool can help with a particular part of the work while leaving room for what only you can contribute.

This subject is worth loving—not because machines solve everything, but because learning to work with them can make room for better questions, more curiosity, and sometimes less tedious effort. A useful experiment might save you time; another might teach you that a task needs your attention after all. Both are worthwhile discoveries. You can begin with one ordinary piece of work, stay skeptical without becoming closed off, and let practice—not pressure—shape what you think.

Reasons to fall in love with this subject

- **Curiosity gives you a way in** You do not have to arrive with technical talent or a perfect prompt. You can start by noticing a small snag in your work and asking whether AI might help with one part of it. A useful question can be simple: What would make this draft clearer? What information am I missing? Curiosity turns experimentation into something you can practice, not an exam you pass or fail.
- **Small tasks make change easier to see** A job can feel too large to evaluate, but a task is something you can examine closely. You can consider whether a tool might help organize notes, summarize information, or create a first draft, then decide what still calls for your knowledge and attention. This way of looking at work helps you avoid sweeping conclusions about whole occupations and keeps your choices grounded in the work in front of you.
- **A draft can be a beginning, not a verdict** Generative AI can produce fluent text, but fluency alone does not establish that an answer is correct or suitable. That distinction is useful: you can treat an output as material to inspect, question, revise, or set aside. Instead of expecting a magic answer, you can ask for a starting point and then bring in your subject knowledge, the facts you can verify, and the context the tool does not know.
- **Better workflows make the human role visible** The interesting question is not simply whether AI can do something. It is how the tool fits into a process: what you give it, what you ask it to produce, and where you pause to check the result. A documented study of customer-support

agents found an average productivity increase of 14% after access to an AI tool, with a 34% improvement for novice and low-skilled workers and minimal impact for experienced and highly skilled workers.⁴ That result is informative, not a promise for your job.

- **Your skills still have room to grow** Learning to use a tool does not require you to stop developing communication, critical thinking, collaboration, or subject knowledge. In fact, those abilities help you judge whether an output makes sense and explain what needs to change. Pew found that about 70% or more of workers considered interpersonal skills, communication, critical thinking, and basic computer skills very or extremely important, regardless of their AI use.² You can practice with AI while strengthening the skills that help you use it well.
- **Thoughtful practice can make uncertainty manageable** You cannot control every change in the workplace, but you can learn to notice how a tool affects your own tasks, what rules apply, and what you would like to learn next. A little structured practice can replace vague pressure with a concrete question and a next step. You may discover a useful shortcut, a reason to keep a task human-led, or a limitation that changes your plan. Each outcome helps you make a more informed choice.

BY THE END OF THIS BOOK, YOU WILL BE ABLE TO

- Choose a specific task and decide whether AI is a useful fit for it.
- Explain in plain language what generative AI produces and why an answer can still be wrong.
- Turn a vague request into instructions with context, constraints, examples, and a useful format.
- Refine an AI response through follow-up questions instead of expecting one perfect prompt.
- Combine AI with familiar tools and human checkpoints in a repeatable workflow.
- Review AI-generated work for accuracy, tone, bias, and suitability before using it.
- Make a practical learning plan that can change as your tasks, workplace rules, and tools evolve.

How to use this book

You can read the chapters in order, since they move from understanding workplace change to choosing tasks, giving instructions, and reviewing results. Or begin with the chapter that answers the question on your mind. You do not need to master every idea before trying one small, low-stakes task. Keep your own work context in view: a tool that helps with one kind of task may be a poor fit for another.

When you practice, write down what you want the tool to help with, what information it needs, and what a good result would look like. Try a clear request, inspect the response, and revise your instructions or your approach. Notice what improved and what still needed your attention. If the result is not useful, that is information—not proof that you asked badly or that you must keep trying.

Before using AI for work, check the rules and expectations that apply where you work. Do not enter confidential information into a tool unless it has been approved for that use. Keep a person responsible for decisions that require judgment, context, or verification. The goal is not to use AI everywhere; it is to make deliberate choices about when it helps and when it does not.

HOW THIS BOOK HANDLES EVIDENCE

This book distinguishes evidence from illustration. Numbered citations point to the sources behind statistics and documented findings; a documented example uses only details supported by those sources, while a composite example is fictional and is not evidence about a real person or measured outcome. Research findings do not guarantee the same result in your work, and forecasts or exposure measures do not settle what will happen to a particular job. This is education, not personal professional advice; consult an appropriate professional for individual legal, financial, health, or other specialized guidance.

A New Kind of Workday

A COMPOSITE EXAMPLE · NAMES AND DETAILS ARE ILLUSTRATIVE

On a Tuesday morning, Maya opens her laptop and finds the usual little mountain waiting: a long email thread, notes from yesterday's meeting, a report due by lunch, and a question from a coworker that deserves more than a rushed reply. She knows the work. What she does not know is which part deserves her attention first.

A new AI assistant is available in a work tool. Maya pauses. Could it pull the decisions out of those meeting notes? Maybe. Could it confidently invent a decision that nobody made? Also possible. She tries asking it to summarize the notes, then checks the summary against the original. It gets the main points but misses a concern raised near the end. She adds that concern herself and uses the result as a starting point, not a finished answer.

Nothing about the day has become magical. The inbox is still there; the deadline has not learned patience. But Maya has a new option to test, a reason to ask what work needs her judgment most, and a chance to spend less time sorting and more time thinking. That is a useful place to begin: not with a prediction, but with a question.

The workday is changing, but not all at once

AI matters at work because it has entered the conversation about ordinary tasks: drafting, researching, summarizing, organizing information, and preparing for decisions. It can feel as though a new kind of workday has arrived everywhere at the same time. The evidence points to a more uneven picture. Most American workers say they use AI little or not at all in their jobs; 16% say at least some of their work is done with AI, including 2% who say all or most of it is². Another 25% say some of their work could be done with AI, though they are not using it much now⁵. Possibility and everyday practice are not the same thing.

That gap matters. You may hear about a tool that seems capable of a great deal and still have no approved way to use it at your workplace. Or you may already use a tool for one small task without thinking of yourself as someone who “uses AI.” Your experience is not a referendum on whether the technology is important. It is one point in a transition that differs across jobs, employers, and tasks.

Uncertainty is part of the story, too. In an October 2024 survey, 52% of U.S. workers said they were worried about AI’s future impact in the workplace¹. That worry is understandable. A tool can be useful and unsettling at once. It may save effort on one task while raising questions about who reviews the result, how work is valued, or what skills will matter next. You do not have to settle those big questions before you can learn something useful about your own work.

A headline is a question, not a forecast

Headlines often compress a complicated change into a clean dramatic claim: jobs are disappearing, work is being transformed, or a new tool will make everything faster. Treat those lines as invitations to investigate, not as reliable predictions about your own next year. A general trend does not tell you what will happen to a particular role, team, or task.

Even employers’ expectations about skills are not a timetable for your personal working life. The World Economic Forum reports that employers expect 39% of key skills required in the job market to change by 2030⁶. That is a reason to stay curious and keep learning. It is not proof that 39% of jobs will vanish, nor a list of exactly what you must learn tomorrow. A skill can change in importance while the work itself is reorganized, supported by new tools, or combined with other responsibilities.

A helpful question is more specific than “Will AI take my job?” Try: “Which parts of this job might change, and what would that mean for the parts that still need human judgment?” Break the role into activities. A person may spend time locating information, preparing a draft, checking details, explaining a recommendation, and responding to another person’s needs. AI may be relevant to some of those activities and a poor fit for others. The answer depends on the task, the quality of the tool, the stakes, and the rules around its use.

This approach does not promise that every worker or workplace will benefit. It simply gives you a more useful scale for thinking. A role is not one indivisible block. It is work made up of parts, and those parts can change at different speeds.

Start with friction, not fascination

When a new tool appears, it is easy to begin by asking what it can do. For your own work, begin instead with a recurring point of friction. Which task makes you say, “I wish I had a first draft,” or “I spend too long finding that information,” or “I keep reorganizing these notes before I can think”? Naming the friction gives you a practical experiment. It also keeps you from handing the tool a task simply because the task looks impressive when automated.

Suppose you regularly turn a pile of notes into a short update. You might ask an approved AI tool to propose an outline or identify possible themes. Then you can check whether it missed an important qualification, distorted the meaning, or made an unsupported claim. The goal is not to make the tool responsible for the update. The goal is to see whether it can help with one bounded part while leaving you in charge of what the update should say.

Workers who have used AI chatbots for work report more help with speed than with quality: 40% say the tools have been extremely or very helpful in doing things more quickly, while 29% say they have been highly helpful in improving work quality³. Those figures do not tell you what will happen in your job. They do suggest a useful distinction for your own trial: Did the tool reduce time, improve the result, do both, or do neither?

Keep the first test modest. Choose something repeatable and low-stakes, define what a good result would look like, and decide what you will check yourself. If the task involves sensitive information, follow your workplace rules and do not enter confidential material into a tool that has not been approved. A small, careful test can teach you more than an ambitious experiment with no clear way to judge the outcome.

Use uncertainty to ask better questions

Curiosity is not a technical credential. It is the habit of noticing what you do not yet know and asking a question that can help you find out. You can be curious about the tool, but you can also be curious about your own work: What part is repetitive? What part depends on context? Which errors would

matter? What would make a response genuinely useful to the person receiving it?

Those questions turn vague excitement into a workable plan. Instead of asking an AI system to “make this better,” you might ask it to offer three possible structures for a short update, using only the information you provide. You can compare the structures, reject one that changes the emphasis, and revise the one that fits. The experiment is not a test of whether you are clever enough to prompt a machine. It is a way to learn what kind of help is useful in a particular situation.

It is also a way to protect space for the parts of work you value. If a tool can help you get past a blank page or sort a long set of notes, you might have more attention for deciding what matters, asking a colleague a thoughtful question, or explaining an idea clearly. That is a possibility, not a guaranteed result. Sometimes the tool creates extra checking or produces a draft that is more trouble than it is worth. Noticing that is part of learning, too.

You do not need to love every tool, or use one for every task, to find value in this subject. The promising part is the chance to become more deliberate: to spot tedious work, test a practical alternative, and keep the decisions that matter in human hands. When a headline makes the future sound settled, curiosity gives you permission to look closer.

RESEARCH SPOTLIGHT

Research spotlight

One OECD analysis looked at employment growth from 2012 to 2019 and found no clear overall relationship between AI exposure and employment growth across the occupations it analyzed⁷. The brief also cautions that its findings do not establish causality and that further research is needed⁸. In other words, the analysis does not show that AI exposure caused jobs to grow or shrink. It also cannot settle what will happen as today’s tools and workplaces change. Its value here is more modest and more useful: a measure of exposure alone is not a forecast of employment outcomes. When you encounter a claim about AI and jobs, ask what was measured, over what period, and whether the evidence supports the conclusion being drawn. That habit helps keep concern informed without turning every new development into a prediction.

A life example

A DOCUMENTED EXAMPLE

A workplace trial, not a promise

A National Bureau of Economic Research study examined a phased rollout of an AI assistant among 5,179 customer-support agents; about 1,300 received access to real-time suggestions for communicating with customers⁹. The design offered quasi-experimental evidence about the tool's effects, rather than a guarantee about what AI will do in every workplace. In that study, worker productivity increased by 14% on average, with gains of up to 35% among workers in the lowest quintile⁹.

The finding is encouraging, but it needs its boundaries. It concerns a particular assistant, a particular kind of work, and a particular study. It does not mean every worker will become faster by the same amount, or that speed alone captures quality, workload, or purpose. The researchers also observed that workers who had used the system continued to outperform those who had never used it during outages, suggesting they had retained some learning⁹. That is a reminder that a tool's role may include helping people learn, not just producing an immediate answer.

For your own work, take the useful lesson as a question: Could assistance make a task easier while helping you build skill? Then check the answer in your actual setting. A trial is evidence to consider, not a magic trick to copy.

TRY THIS

Map one small possibility

Choose one ordinary task and investigate whether AI could help with a piece of it without taking your judgment out of the process.

1. Write down one task that regularly feels repetitive, slow, or difficult to start.
2. Break it into smaller actions, such as gathering information, sorting notes, drafting, checking, or communicating.
3. Circle one low-stakes action where an approved AI tool might offer a useful starting point.

4. Before trying it, decide what a good result would need to include and what you will verify yourself.
5. Try the tool with nonconfidential information, then compare its response with your own knowledge and the original material.
6. Note what improved, what required extra work, and whether you would use this approach again.

Myths and honest truths

- **Myth:** If a headline says AI can do a job, that job is about to disappear. **Truth:** A headline about a capability does not predict what will happen to a whole occupation. Ask which tasks are involved, what the evidence actually measures, and how people will use the tool.
- **Myth:** If AI saves time, it must improve the work. **Truth:** Speed and quality are different outcomes. A faster draft can still need careful checking, revision, or rejection.
- **Myth:** You need to be tech-savvy to experiment usefully. **Truth:** A clear question about a familiar task is a good beginning. Curiosity and sound judgment matter more than performing technical wizardry.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- AI is part of work for some people and still a possibility, not a daily reality, for many others.
- Treat broad claims about the future as prompts to investigate rather than forecasts about your own job.
- Look at tasks and recurring friction before deciding where AI might help.
- Measure both time and quality, and keep a human checkpoint for work that matters.
- Curiosity makes experimentation practical; judgment makes it responsible.

REFLECT

- 1. Which recurring task in your work would you most like to make less tedious?*
- 2. What would you need to check before trusting AI-generated help with that task?*
- 3. What part of your work do you want more room to do thoughtfully?*

Nine more chapters are waiting

You've read the Introduction and Chapter 1. The full 92-page book continues with:

- CH. 2 Curiosity Is a Practical Skill
- CH. 3 Know What AI Can and Cannot Do
- CH. 4 Find the Right Work for It
- CH. 5 Give Better Instructions
- CH. 6 Build a Workflow, Not a Magic Trick
- CH. 7 Grow Skills That Travel
- CH. 8 Keep Your Judgment in the Loop
- CH. 9 Navigate Change Without Panic
- CH. 10 Make Practice a Long-Term Habit

Plus the research analysis "What the Evidence Says", a 30-day practice plan, a glossary, and every source with full research credits.

JOIN FREE OR GO INSIDER

Join the free Reader's Circle at shadeddiemongruebooksgallery.com to read the full book online, listen with AI reading mode in a man's or a woman's voice, and download the PDF. Want every shelf? Reserve an Insider membership.

Sources for these chapters

Numbers in the text (like ³) point to these sources. Every statistic, finding and documented example was copied from its source page, checked word for word against that page in October 2026, and is restated here in plain English. Figures can change as sources update. This book is for education and is not personal financial, legal, medical, mental-health, nursing, investment or other professional advice.

- 1 **Pew Research Center.** *U.S. Workers Are More Worried Than Hopeful About Future AI Use in the Workplace.* October 7-13, 2024. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/02/25/u-s-workers-are-more-worried-than-hopeful-about-future-ai-use-in-the-workplace/>
- 2 **Pew Research Center.** *U.S. Workers Are More Worried Than Hopeful About Future AI Use in the Workplace: 1. Workers' exposure to AI.* February 25, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/02/25/workers-exposure-to-ai/>
- 3 **Pew Research Center.** *Workers' experience with AI chatbots in their jobs.* February 25, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/02/25/workers-experience-with-ai-chatbots-in-their-jobs/>
- 4 **National Bureau of Economic Research.** Erik Brynjolfsson, Danielle Li & Lindsey R. Raymond. *Generative AI at Work.* April 2023. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31161>
- 5 **Pew Research Center.** *U.S. Workers Are More Worried Than Hopeful About Future AI Use in the Workplace.* February 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2025/02/ST_2025.2.25_AI-Workers_REPORT.pdf
- 6 **World Economic Forum.** *Future of Jobs Report 2025: The jobs of the future – and the skills you need to get them.* 2030. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/jobs-and-the-future-of-work/future-of-jobs-report-2025-jobs-of-the-future-and-the-skills-you-need-to-get-them/>
- 7 **oecd.org.** *Artificial intelligence and employment.* https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/artificial-intelligence-and-employment_c2c1d276-en.html
- 8 **OECD.** *Artificial Intelligence and Employment: New Evidence from Occupations Most Exposed to AI.* December 2021. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2021/12/ai-and-employment_cac3603e/73c095f6-en.pdf
- 9 **National Bureau of Economic Research.** Erik Brynjolfsson, Danielle Li. *The Economics of Generative AI.* 04/24/2024. <https://www.nber.org/reporter/2024number1/economics-generative-ai>