

Content-Centric Prototyping of Generative AI Applications: Emerging Approaches and Challenges in Collaborative Software Teams

Hari Subramonyam*
Stanford University
USA
harihars@stanford.edu

Divy Thakkar*
Google Research
India
dthakkar@google.com

Jürgen Dieber
Stanford University
USA
dieber@stanford.edu

Anoop Sinha
Google
USA
anoopsinha@google.com




Figure 1: Overview of Content-Centric Prototyping Workflow. (a) Example content is used to reverse-engineer prompt instructions, (b) content informs test prompts, and (c) content is used as a benchmark for generated content.

ABSTRACT

Generative AI models are increasingly powering software applications, offering the capability to produce expressive content across varied contexts. However, unlike previous iterations of human-AI design, the emerging design process for generative capabilities primarily hinges on prompt engineering strategies. Given this fundamental shift in approach, our work aims to understand how collaborative software teams set up and apply design guidelines and values, iteratively prototype prompts, and evaluate prompts

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06... \$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

* indicates equal contribution by authors.

to achieve desired outcomes. We conducted design studies with 39 industry professionals, including designers, software engineers, and product managers. Our findings reveal a content-centric prototyping approach in which teams begin with the content they want to generate, then identify specific attributes, constraints, and values, and explore methods to give users the ability to influence and interact with those attributes. Based on associated challenges, such as the lack of model interpretability and overfitting the design to examples, we outline considerations for generative AI prototyping.

ACM Reference Format:

Hari Subramonyam^{*}, Divy Thakkar^{*}, Jürgen Dieber, and Anoop Sinha. 2018. Content-Centric Prototyping of Generative AI Applications: Emerging Approaches and Challenges in Collaborative Software Teams. In *Woodstock '18: ACM Symposium on Neural Gaze Detection, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Many tasks performed by humans, such as writing, programming, and designing, are generative in nature. Consequently, software product teams are exploring ways to augment those tasks with generative AI capabilities [38]. Dedicated software applications and features are emerging that allow generatively recoloring vector graphics [30], completing code [34], conducting data analysis [31], composing emails [33], and writing creative content [32]. Unlike general-purpose interfaces such as ChatGPT [53] and Bard [22] that support open-ended tasks, these tools have *carefully engineered* instructions (i.e., prompts) and dedicated interfaces for end-users to provide input context and invoke those prompts. For instance, Adobe Illustrator allows users to supply a vector image and a natural language description of a color palette to generatively “recolor” the graphics [30]. The question then is, *how to design these generative AI features and prompts that are human-centered, usable, and effective at eliciting the desired output from the generative models for diverse inputs and contexts?*

Human-centered design and iterative prototyping have been extensively researched for conventional software applications [4, 8, 14] and, more recently, for AI applications that are powered by bespoke (task-specific) ML models [66, 71, 80]. In these previous iterations of prototyping applications, software teams had a greater flexibility or *degree-of-freedom* in crafting and executing the designs. In traditional software workflows, UX designers could create interface specifications based on user needs, and engineers could translate those designs into functional software by adding new functions, services, and data tables or adjusting and optimizing existing code as needed to align with the prototype design [60]. With task-specific AI design, while more resource-intensive and complex, teams still largely collected their own data and labels, and trained their own models with specific intentions [1]. Designers prototyping AI experiences could collaborate with AI engineers to directly influence the behavior and output of AI models by specifying the types of interactions and responses desired from the system [67]. Furthermore, collaborative teams could implement features such as explainability, learnability, error handling, and feedback through concerted efforts in both the UI design and AI development stages, ensuring a seamless integration of these critical aspects into the overall user experience [64]. However, with generative AI models,

teams face a reduced degree of freedom because they typically fine-tune a pre-trained foundational model to fit their needs [9, 57]. The steep costs involved in developing new foundational models from the ground up necessitate teams to leverage existing pre-trained models, adapting to the limitations and possibilities they present.

In this regard, emerging research has looked at approaches and challenges to designing generative AI applications by using pre-trained models [36, 52]. For designers prototyping with pre-trained models, they need to develop a designerly understanding of the pre-trained model [46], find effective ways to support user interactions by minimizing the gulfs of execution, evaluation, and envisioning [65], and build correspondence between interfaces, prompts, and underlying generative AI capabilities [54]. Further prompt engineering has its own challenges for software teams and end-users [85, 86], and strategies for effectively and collaboratively designing prompts are largely lacking. While new tools for prompt engineering and prototyping such as MakerSuite [23], ChainForge [3], and Canvil [17] are being developed, we lack an understanding of how to design applications with them effectively. Specifically, in collaborative software teams, this new approach to design prototyping can be a complex process. The limited degree of freedom and the critical role of prompt engineering necessitates a collaborative approach to these tasks to ensure the prompt instructions and model fine-tuning are aligned with the user interfaces, task workflows, and contexts. Furthermore, the process of iteratively designing and evaluating choices during prompt prototyping remains unclear. Our work aims to bridge these gaps by answering the following research questions:

- **Research Question 1:** *What processes are involved in the iterative design, testing, and analysis of prototyping generative AI applications?*
- **Research Question 2:** *How do different roles in collaborative teams contribute to prototyping generative AI applications?*
- **Research Question 3:** *What challenges emerge in the prototyping of generative AI applications, and how do these differ from previous iterations of human-AI design prototyping?*

We conducted a design study with 39 industry practitioners from the United States and India across 13 sessions. In each session, a UX designer, an engineer, and a product manager collaboratively worked on a given generative AI design problem and iteratively prototyped potential solutions using the MakerSuite [23] prototyping tool. We observed that content—both example (ground truth) content and the generated content—played a central role in the iterative design-test-analyze prototyping process, which we call *content-centric prototyping*. More specifically, we observed a range of strategies in approaching prompt prototyping from templates to agent personas, how teams collaboratively engaged in divergent and convergent thinking of formulating instructions and curating few-shot examples, and how different roles contributed to the design and evaluation tasks. We also identified key challenges to prototyping due to the high sensitivity of generative models to prompt phrases, lack of interpretability, and other human-introduced challenges, including overfitting designs to specific content examples and potential transparency issues for end-users that may be hidden at the prompt instruction level. Based on these findings, we discuss how the emerging practice of generative AI prototyping

differs from prior AI experience prototyping, shedding light on new considerations for collaborative teams working on generative AI applications.

2 RELATED WORK

The shift from designing applications for task-specific ML models to generative AI models introduces new layers of complexity and flexibility to the human-centered AI design process [85]. Task-specific models are traditionally engineered through a deliberate process of defining data and model behavior, and designers have some level of control in aligning those specifications for target user needs and interactions that are direct and predictable [67]. In contrast, generative AI, with its broader scope for content creation and autonomous decision-making, demands a more dynamic iterative design process with inherent uncertainties in design decision-making. More specifically, when prototyping generative AI applications, software teams have to balance designing in ways that harness the model's creative potential while contending with the reduced determinacy in how these models interpret and respond to user inputs, ultimately impacting the predictability of user interactions and the fidelity of generated content to user expectations [65]. Here, we characterize this shift in design prototyping and identify knowledge gaps by integrating insights from previous studies on AI prototyping, prompt engineering in generative AI, and the roles of expertise and collaboration in implementing human-centered AI strategies.

2.1 Prototyping AI Experiences

In recent years, work across academia and industry has formulated design guidelines for task-specific ML models including designing interactions [2, 21, 26], explainability [73], privacy [25, 37], transparency [6, 28, 45], etc. To operationalize these guidelines, prior research has considered how software practitioners work with AI as a design material [46, 70, 79], and has developed processes [67] and tools [51, 66] to prototype application experiences with AI models. Across this body of work, the basis for prototyping is that UX teams need to first understand the capabilities and limitations of ML models, including the data the model has been trained on, discerning the behaviors the model has adopted from that data, comprehending the relationships between inputs and outputs, and identify uncertainties and edge cases to the model behavior [15, 16, 81, 82]. Further, to facilitate this understanding approaches such as model-informed prototyping [66] and failure-driven design [51] support opening up the ML black box and allow designers to engage in model sensemaking using real data and model outputs that ultimately inform their design choices in prototyping. Other work has looked at deeper collaboration with engineering teams who understand ML to make design and prototyping more efficient [64, 67]. However, with generative AI models, even a majority of ML engineers within individual product teams may not have the required technical understanding to facilitate designerly understanding in prototyping [89]. The lack of interpretability of these generative AI models is well documented in the literature in which it is not always clear how the prompts drive the generated outputs [47, 59].

Specific to prototyping, an iterative approach of design, test, and analysis is well-established in the literature [4]. Prior work has emphasized leveraging data as a key element for iterating on AI

system design (i.e., data probes) [27, 41, 67]. That is, designers can curate data about varied users and use cases as inputs to the model, and test their design choices along the way [49, 71]. However, given the size and scope of large language models [9] and complex notions of ground truth (i.e., hard to formulate good benchmarks for correct model behavior) [65], it is unclear how existing data-driven approaches for AI prototyping might apply to generative AI applications. Further, in iterative prototyping, the aim is to pinpoint and rectify design breakdown [5, 20, 24, 58, 78]. Given the limited interpretability of generative models, we lack an understanding of how designers might analyze the model behavior to make improvements to their design. Based on these identified constraints, our work aims to uncover how teams collectively understand the generative AI design material and how the approach prototyping applications powered by generative models.

2.2 Generative AI and Prompt Engineering

Emerging work in the design of generative AI tools has put forth initial guidelines for effective prompt crafting, user interaction, and the ethical use of AI, aiming to enhance user experience and foster responsible innovation [12, 65, 76]. Prompt engineering, a core aspect of these guidelines, involves techniques for interacting with large language models (LLMs) by establishing conversation rules, structuring output, and directing the model towards intended outcomes [77]. Current literature draws heavily on human cognitive processes such as the *chain-of-thought* technique, which outlines reasoning steps towards a conclusion and enhances the model's learning process by illustrating how to derive answers [40, 44, 48, 56, 75]. Another important approach, *few-shot prompting*, relies on providing models with examples of desired inputs and outputs to facilitate learning from minimal information, mirroring how humans grasp new concepts from a few examples and apply them to novel situations [10, 39, 42, 43]. The effectiveness of these prompting methods, including few-shot and chain-of-thought prompts, is influenced by factors such as the complexity of the prompts, relevance and ordering of examples, and the incorporation of variations like Self-Consistency Sampling, Self-Ask, and Tree of Thoughts, which further refine the interaction with LLMs [11, 19, 55, 62, 72, 74, 83]. In our work, we aim to understand how design and engineering teams tackle the complexities of prompt engineering. This includes investigating the methods teams use to curate examples that effectively train and guide LLMs, the strategies employed to phrase prompts to achieve specific outcomes, and how these practices impact the development and refinement of prompting interfaces.

2.3 Roles and Collaboration in Human-AI Design

Prior work has extensively looked at different stakeholders' expertise and their collaboration challenges in operationalizing the above-mentioned human-AI design guidelines [64, 82]. With task-specific ML models, each role has a distinct and *well-defined* function in software production; UX roles, emphasizing human psychology and design, collaborate with end-users to establish system requirements, which are then executed by software engineers proficient in computer programming [1, 35, 60, 67]. Challenges primarily emerge due

to inefficient communication and collaboration. That is, UX designers may not be involved in upstream ML modeling tasks [64, 84], or domain experts may not be included in key data-related decisions [87, 88]. Addressing these challenges involves overcoming the “symmetry of ignorance [18]” among AI professionals and other stakeholders by bridging role-specific boundaries with the aim of establishing a shared understanding, or *common ground*, to enhance collaboration and interaction [18, 61, 69]. However, with generative AI, there is less engineering effort in developing bespoke models, and the emphasis is on fine-tuning the models towards specific task objectives [9]. With the shifting nature of engineering tasks and, more broadly, designing and generative AI-powered applications, it is unclear how the different roles and expertise interact and intersect in prototyping tasks.

3 METHOD

As outlined in the research questions, our objective was to gain a deeper understanding of collaborative prototyping strategies deployed by multistakeholder teams comprising User Experience Researchers / User Experience Designers (UXR), Product Managers (PM), and Software Developers (SDE). To this end, we conducted multi-site design workshops with thirty-nine participants and observed their experiences in using a Generative AI prototyping tool (MakerSuite [23]) to design an application for marketing content creation. We selected this domain because of general exposure and familiarity with marketing content across a wide range of demographics, ensuring a diverse set of perspectives and creative inputs. Consequently, the problem itself embodies the challenge of capturing and engaging diverse audiences with compelling narratives that require both creative and strategic thinking.

We conducted the study over a three-month period from June to August 2023. Each design session involved three stakeholders – PMs, SDEs, and UXRs and one of the authors to facilitate the sessions. The sessions lasted 105 minutes each and were conducted over Google Meet (video conferencing software). We obtained approval for this research from the Institutional Review Board of an anonymized US university. All participants signed standard consent forms. Given the observational and experimental nature of our study, our data collection involved a combination of handwritten notes and video recordings. Each design workshop was video recorded with consent.

3.1 Participant Information

We aimed to recruit one participant from each of the three roles for each session. Recruitment was carried out in collaboration with a third-party vendor that specializes in user research participant recruitment, scheduling, and disbursing incentives. We chose participants who had at least one year of relevant professional experience.

The recruitment process involved direct email contact and follow-up phone calls by the vendor. In one instance, one of the scheduled participants was absent, so we rescheduled the session and compensated those who were present. Participants were based in United States of America (USA) and India, this was chosen due to the ability to conduct studies across sites given the research team’s composition. After the study, participants based in the USA were provided a USD \$75 gift card, while participants based in India were provided an INR 2100 gift voucher. These amounts were set

by the vendor partner, and the authors did not influence it. Table 1 describes participant profiles.

3.2 Study Protocol

We anchored our design activity on a real-world application of Generative AI in an organizational setting – marketing content creation (detailed in Section 3.2.1). We used existing professional content creation and copyright workflows based on information on the web and one of the author’s own experiences as a starting point to develop instructions for the protocol. We identified key topics and questions to guide participants toward common goals. The questions corresponded to (1) Product Goals, (2) User Personas, (3) Prompt Structure, (4) Expected Outputs, and (5) Guardrails. However, these were intended as suggested thinking tools and we did not mandate their usage while running the design activity. Participants used MakerSuite [23], to prototype the application. We should note that our intent is not to assess the tool itself. MakerSuite is one of the first publicly available prototyping tools for generative AI applications. In addition to the conversational affordances of tools such as ChatGPT, MakerSuite has specific interface features to provide few-shot examples in a tabular format and also design conversational interactions.

To establish goals and share taxonomy, workshops began with a 25-minute presentation from the lead author, who first introduced the purpose of the study and also provided a hands-on demo of the MakerSuite tool with prompts and examples (unrelated to the study activity). We also provided participants with the basics of prompt engineering using the guidelines presented by [77]. Then, before introducing the activity, participants were instructed that each of them should aim to bring in their role-specific expertise in the design activity and that this was a collaborative effort. For instance, SDEs were requested to engage with identifying relevant datasets and using MakerSuite to experiment and validate against (self-defined) metrics. UXRs were motivated to validate system design choices for user needs and use MakerSuite to work through user interactions and evaluate their prototype based on perceived user needs. Lastly, PMs were encouraged to define product positioning, value proposition, user personas, metrics, and assess output quality.

At this stage, participants were requested to explore MakerSuite on their own and ask the research coordinator any questions they may have. Once participants indicated familiarity with the tool, we provided a detailed description of the design activity and objectives described below. Next participants were asked to collaboratively discuss and design a solution to the provided design brief. Participants spent between 60-70 minutes working through the activity. All participants had access to the prototyping tool via their own web browser, and participants were asked to share their screens with the tool open. In some session, one participant took the lead and shared their own screen for the entire session. In other cases, participants took turns in sharing the screen. Additionally, we provided participants a shared Google Document in which they could share any prompts and contents generated through independent exploration. Throughout the session, the research coordinator asked clarifying questions or engaged in short conversations with study participants based on observations. However, we practiced caution to ensure that their work was not disrupted. The group collectively

Participant Code	Age Group	Gender	Years of Experience	Level of familiarity with Generative AI/LLM [Scale of 1-5]	Location
PM1	31 to 40	M	10	4	USA
SWE1	24 to 30	M	5	4	USA
UXR1	31 to 40	F	1	5	USA
PM2	41 to 50	M	5	4	USA
SWE2	41 to 50	M	5	5	USA
UXR2	31 to 40	M	2	4	USA
PM3	31 to 40	M	6	3	USA
SDE3	41 to 50	M	15	4	USA
UXR3	31 to 40	F	9	5	USA
PM4	24 to 30	M	4	4	USA
SDE4	31 to 40	M	2	3	USA
UXR4	31 to 40	M	4	3	USA
PM5	31 to 40	M	6	5	USA
SDE5	31 to 40	M	10	5	USA
UXR5	24 to 30	M	9	5	USA
PM6	24 to 30	M	1	5	USA
SDE6	24 to 30	M	3	4	USA
UXR6	31 to 40	M	3	3	USA
PM7	31 to 40	M	6	4	India
SWE7	24 to 30	M	3	5	India
UXR7	24 to 30	F	3	3	India
PM8	31 to 40	M	4	4	India
SWE8	31 to 40	M	5	4	India
UXR8	24 to 30	M	7	4	India
PM9	24 to 30	F	1	4	India
SDE9	24 to 30	M	5	5	India
UXR9	31 to 40	M	12	3	India
PM10	24 to 30	M	5	4	India
SDE10	41 to 50	M	10	5	India
UXR10	24 to 30	F	4	3	India
PM11	31 to 40	M	9	4	India
SDE11	31 to 40	M	14	5	India
UXR11	24 to 30	F	2	5	India
PM12	41 to 50	M	8	3	USA
SDE12	31 to 40	F	7	5	USA
UXR12	31 to 40	M	5	3	USA
PM13	31 to 40	M	4	3	USA
SDE13	41 to 50	M	10	3	USA
UXR13	41 to 50	M	20	5	USA

Table 1: Self-Reported Participant Information. Gender: F- Female, M-Male, Level of Familiarity with Generative AI on a scale of 1-5

brainstormed ideas verbally. All data collected was anonymized, and videos were recorded with informed consent.

Upon completion of the activity, we asked participants a series of reflective questions to understand their experiences of using

Generative-AI tools for prototyping. These questions aimed to capture associations between prototyping generative AI prompts and their own expertise and what challenges they faced. In addition, we

probed them about potential features for generative AI prototyping tools.

3.2.1 Activity Description. *GoodWriting Pvt Ltd is a creative writing agency that assists businesses (clients) with crafting engaging written content for their various needs. To create compelling and attractive material, the process requires a lot of creative thinking, writing, iterating, and revising of content. Clients provide a set of requirements to a marketing content creator at GoodWriting. These requirements include information such as product name, value proposition, target demographics, product description, and preferred channel of content distribution.*

GoodWriting wants to use an LLM-based application to support this process. Your goal in today's session is to build a prototype for a creative content writing tool that will allow GoodWriting to do their work more effectively and efficiently.

We prescribed participants to use Instagram as the channel of distribution. In the first five sessions, we provided a detailed example of a beauty product to participants and realized that participants predominantly anchored on creating a tool specific to that product rather than developing a versatile prototype that aligned with our broader design objectives. Recognizing this unintended effect of our initial approach, we incorporated a wider variety of examples, including links to two Instagram posts from both a beauty brand and a clothing brand, to emphasize the importance of generality in design objectives. This adjustment was intended to mitigate the initial oversight and align closely with our study's goals. Subsequent sessions demonstrated an improved engagement in developing a general tool. However, insights gained from the first five sessions also contribute valuable information to our overall findings.

We provided questions to guide the design process. These questions were not prescribed and were provided to motivate the group discussion. *Product Goals* We encouraged participants to think through the goals of the prototype and an eventual product vision. *User Personas* We guided participants to reflect on the needs of the prototype user. *Prompt Structure* We provided guiding questions to help participants identify mappings of user needs and their domain expertise to the prompt structure. *Output Evaluation* We asked participants to define the constituents of good output based on their prompt. *Guardrails* We asked participants to reflect on the validity and appropriateness of their tool's outputs. Complete details of the protocol can be found in the supplementary materials.

3.3 Data Analysis

The two lead authors conducted inductive qualitative coding in Atlas.ti [29] using a grounded theory approach beginning with in-vivo analysis [63]. Lead authors independently open-coded the same three transcripts and developed an initial code book. The resulting codebook consists of 62 high-level codes. Since using a grounded theory approach, we did not see a strong need to compute coder reliability [50]. The codes captured key themes, including strategies for prototyping, prompt phrasing, design inputs, engineering inputs, friction during prototyping, model understanding, prompt evaluation, and observed challenges and concerns such as stereotyping, biases, and generalizability. Throughout the coding process, the lead authors wrote detailed memos describing insights, observations, and emergent themes [7]. Memos were comprised of

analyzing transcriptions as well as videos and included screenshots from the participants' design activities. After the coding was completed, the research team engaged in multiple discussion sessions to iteratively refine and converge on high-level themes and synthesize findings.

4 FINDINGS

Across all sessions, participants had familiarity with large language models and had used services such as Bard [22] and ChatGPT [53] for their work-related tasks, including summarizing documents, synthesizing data from user research, and adding representative placeholder text in interface designs, etc. Although participants were impressed by the capabilities of generative models, the majority also recognized issues with the produced text, including hallucination and low-quality output on certain technical topics. None of the participants had prior experience designing or developing generative AI applications. Given this context about participants' prior exposure to generative models, we report on (1) how participants utilized their role-specific expertise to explore the model and define design objectives, (2) how they approached the given design task of prototyping a marketing content generation tool, and (3) the challenges they encountered in working with this new design material.

4.1 Expertise Guided Formulation of Design Goals

Based on the high-level design brief provided to the participants, all teams first started brainstorming on what role the generative AI should play in supporting the marketing content specialist and how to integrate the application into existing workflows. Given the broad scope of marketing content that can span diverse topics, channels, and audiences, teams initially struggled with defining concrete design objectives. Unlike conventional software design, where the focus is on specifying the exact requirements and functionalities beforehand and detailed planning around how data is input, processed, and output, the challenge here extends to the fluidity and dynamic nature of AI content generation. As designer UX12 commented on this *cold-start problem* "I don't even know where to begin, to be honest." Given these complexities, we observed that, in most sessions, the PMs took charge of the conversation and emphasized understanding the end-to-end marketing process. As illustrated in the quotes below, the initial discussions focused on identifying different stakeholders and mapping the content creation workflows.

PM8: "Before we start, we have to keep in mind that we are actually going to create this for a marketing team. So, it should have all those key points that the team will have ready with them to input into the system so they get the desired output. So that starts with who are going to be our end users for that particular ad, and which channel? And then what is the product going to be?... is it like reducing the team strength of the copywriters and then having just a few of them evaluate what is coming out of our app?"

In these discussions, the engineers and designers adopted more observant, listening roles, contributing technical insights and human-centered considerations when directed by the flow of conversation led by the PM. When discussing how the tool might impact the current roles, the designers brought *human-centered values* into the system conceptualization. Across sessions, an objective was not to completely automate the creative process but to create a symbiotic relationship between the AI and human marketers. One of the designers, UX8, highlights the importance of human expertise in generating content:

PM3: *“How to make the application more appealing? Because I mean, there is value in that, right? In some sense, this someday would ultimately replace even market research. Maybe I don’t know, maybe not...”*

UX3: *“[As a marketer,] I know my audience better than the model. So, from my perspective, I think that is my secret sauce. Like, I understand their values and emotions, and I don’t want the model to search the internet for that information. Like it’s my product. I just want it to take the ingredients that I’m putting together and, like, you know, blend it into an output.”*

Through these initial discussions, teams began to recognize the importance of integrating human creativity with the generative capabilities of AI, deliberating aspects of control and agency across different stakeholders in the marketing pipeline. Moreover, the engineering perspective introduced the concept of “vectors” or key parameters (e.g., channel, product, audience, and tone) as foundational elements for marketing content generation.

4.1.1 Identifying criteria for Success. During this initial discussion, teams also attempted to identify criteria for the success of the application. These can be grouped into *content-specific* criteria and *usability* criteria. From a usability perspective, teams considered metrics such as the time required to generate targeted ad campaigns, how many iterations, ease of prompting the LLM by end-users, and alignment with the current content creation workflow. For instance, UX 13 commented: *“How many iterations do they have to take before they get something they want?”* and in session 3, the PM suggested the application should produce multiple divergent outputs to make the process more efficient. According to PM 3: *“So maybe success would be to generate five different options to present to their team... so we save them time and help them be more creative.”* Separately, PM 4 described effectiveness in terms of delight:

PM4: *“I think there’s a matter of delightful experiences as far as effectiveness goes. And that probably relates to the number of errors encountered... The last point you mentioned was about the regeneration rate, which refers to the frequency of generating new prompts or repeating the same questions.”*

Further, teams invested a significant amount of time considering the quality of the generated output. As PM 4 adds: *“Perhaps there’s a system to measure the effectiveness of these ideas—specifically, how many are actually utilized versus the rate at which new prompts are regenerated. That could be one way to assess it.”* Additionally, the importance of ensuring safety, accuracy, and adherence to political correctness in content creation emerged as pivotal benchmarks for

success. The risk of producing content that is unusable, inaccurate, or potentially offensive highlighted the need for mechanisms to monitor and report on the robustness and appropriateness of responses generated by the models. As UX 4 mentioned:

UX 4: *“I suppose there should be a reporting mechanism for robustness, particularly concerning unusable, inaccurate, or nonsensical responses. We need to understand the models’ safety features. Given that this involves advertising, considerations of political correctness also come into play, ensuring we don’t inadvertently offend or overstep boundaries.”*

In summary, identifying success criteria highlighted the complex interplay between operational efficiency, user satisfaction, and content integrity, providing a starting point for prototyping the application.

4.1.2 LLM as an Expert Participant for Requirement Generation. Interestingly, in all teams, participants made use of the Bard model as an additional expert to understand the marketing workflow and to specify design objectives (see Figure 2). For instance, PM 13 queried the LLM about devising a workflow for client content approval, leading to a simplified outline that, while not fully representative of an actual process, provided a valuable starting point for further discussion.

PM 13: *“All right, what is the approval process [for the marketing content]? How are we going to decide who approves it? When is it ready [to be approved]?... I asked it to come up with a workflow for client approval. So here we have the first draft the agency sends the client to provide feedback, revise, and review the final. I mean, it’s so much more simple than any actual approval process with me. But at least it’s given me a starting point at something to think about; I would then want to go in.”*

The preliminary workflow prompted considerations about the real-world complexity of approval procedures, highlighting the LLM’s role in filling in missing expertise within software teams. Similarly, in identifying the content authoring process, manager PM4 asked Bard to generate a potential workflow:

PM4: *“I inquired about a marketer’s workflow, and it provided a structured breakdown into research, brainstorming, writing, and editing. The research phase involves understanding the audience, the goals of the produce client, and the competitor’s landscape. Brainstorming focuses on generating headlines, outlines, and catchy phrases. Writing pertains to drafting the content, and editing involves proofreading and similar tasks. Honestly, seeing how LLMs can aid in each of these steps if we segment the application accordingly, it seems they could be quite helpful by offering specific prompts for each phase.”*

This structured breakdown facilitated discussions about the overall application user experience and where the end-user agency is most needed. Further, these examples reflect a broader tendency to integrate AI into the requirement generation process, where LLMs are seen as collaborative partners with generalized expertise.

However, the oversimplification of complex processes and the potential for generating outputs that lack a nuanced understanding required critical consideration amongst teams to carefully assess the generated content with their own judgment. For instance, based on an exhaustive list of generated questions a marketer might ask their clients, UX12 commented: *“This is a huge overwhelming list of questions. I can help narrow those down, but then how do you want them? Presented from a UX/UI perspective, what is the most relevant information?”* Further, in several instances, based on the lack of specificity of LLM-generated requirements, teams iteratively added details to the prompts to improve the outputs.

4.2 Content-Centric Prototyping

Using the high-level design objectives and success criteria identified through initial discussions, teams proceeded to use MakerSuite [23] to prototype prompts for the application. At a high level, we observed what is distinct about prototyping generative AI is its *content-focused approach*. Unlike using a predefined set of inputs like standard forms or specific interface inputs, the goal here is to empower end-users with the freedom to contribute creative and genuine inputs and receive authentic content as outputs. Here, we synthesize our observations around prototyping strategies, the iterative process of prompt engineering and evaluation, and interactions between prompts and envisioned user interface experiences.

4.2.1 Prototyping Approaches Explored by Teams. Across all sessions, we noticed teams took very different approaches to writing prompts for generating marketing content. The approaches included (1) instantiating a marketing LLM agent, (2) iterating on a simple baseline prompt, (3) creating a prompt template, (4) starting with example content and authoring a prompt that would produce that content, and (5) creating few-shot examples with factors or questions identified in the initial requirements stage. In one session, the team asked the LLM to assume the role of a creative marketing specialist, focusing on how to make the AI “think” like a marketing expert. The focus was on how to contextually guide the LLM to produce expert-level marketing responses and how to teach the AI the nuances of marketing creativity. As Designer UX2 commented: *“So the thing that I see as a limitation here is obviously, this isn’t a creative marketing specialist. It’s a piece of AI. So I think some of the challenges you’re going to encounter are going to be around. How do you get it to think like a marketing expert?”* Hence, the focus of prompt engineering was on precisely defining and contextualizing prompts that guide the LLM to think and respond like a marketer.

In three other sessions, participants approached the prototyping process by getting an initial assessment of how well the model performed without any specialized prompting (i.e., baseline response). This approach was in part because of not knowing how to guide the model in generating content (i.e., another case of cold-start problem). As SE1 commented:

SE1: *“It just seems like there’s a lot of mental work I have to do in order to figure out what’s going to happen. And discussing all of this, we’re just making assumptions. But I think it really comes into play when we actually use it, see what comes out, and then go from there... So I’d be curious what the base response is and then iterate from there.”*

Here, iterating on a simple baseline prompt reflects a reactive approach to prompt engineering, where the initial response serves as grounds for continuous and targeted refinement. This strategy also highlights the need to interpret and debug the generated outputs in order to creatively adjust the prompts in an open-ended manner. In contrast, in two sessions, the teams initially focused on designing a structured prompt template for users to interact with based on the identified factors (tone, channel, etc.). This strategy aims to streamline the input process and more closely aligns with conventional UX prototyping that involves defining structured end-user inputs. AS UX 3 commented: *“users come in, and there are different templates for different campaigns. And then they select a template, and they set some parameters...”* However, this approach led to discussions around enabling users to effectively communicate their needs to the LLM in an unconstrained manner without restricting creativity through highly specific inputs. As PM 7 comments: *“...do we prompt the user to give all the inputs or do you want to give that creative liberty for someone to input something [free form text] and then ask if something is missing?”*

In a fourth approach, which a majority of teams took, they started with some example marketing content either provided to them in the study requirements or gathered by them through the web, they attempted to reverse-engineer existing successful marketing content to create prompts that can replicate similar outcomes. As PM 12 commented: *“So then, what I was going to do is the model output will be the previously used campaign text..., and I’m reverse-engineering the content.”* What this means is, by trial and error, to deconstruct the example content into constituent factors such as surprise or humor and to reconstruct prompts that elicit similar responses from the LLM. Finally, in many sessions, teams started by creating few-shot examples pertaining to each of the factors identified in the initial requirements brainstorming phase. For example, they would curate example content for Instagram vs Twitter or for different demographics such as age groups. This approach leverages the model’s learning capabilities to produce content that aligns with the provided examples. As SE 8 highlights: *“Okay. So this is what I’m trying to do. I am just trying to put some inputs and outputs...I’m basically trying to define variables and teaching the parameters independently.”*

While these are initial starting points for prompt prototyping, throughout the session, teams attempted a combination of approaches. Together, these strategies highlight the prototyping process as requiring critical and creative thinking, analytical reasoning, and a collaborative effort across the different roles.

4.2.2 Iterative Prompt Engineering.

Divergent-Convergent Thinking: On detailed examination of how participants crafted the prompts, several key tasks emerged as essential to the prototyping process. Consistent with the conventional divergent-convergent UX design approach, we observed several instances of *divergent thinking* where teams experimented with varying the details and scope of prompts to see how the AI responded to different contexts to find the right level of prompt abstraction. In session 13, the PM initially asked the LLM to generate an ad campaign for “a competition the NFL (National Football League) with Gatorade (an energy drink).” The resulting Ad included the phrase, “Let’s kick the NFL season off with some ENERGY!”




Figure 2: Examples of using LLM as a Collaboration Partner.

After iterating on the prompt for a bit, they replaced NFL with Tennis to assess whether the new content would reflect the updated sport or whether the prompt needed to be worded at a higher level of abstraction. In a different session, the team experimented with different tones for the generated output to determine whether and which options to give to the marketing content specialist:

PM12: "Is this tone right? Say you wanted it to be more happy, more sad, more exciting. We can give different adjectives to people to select because those can then generate inputs, very specific inputs"

Then, to converge toward consistent and desired types of output, teams introduced *constraints* into the prompts. Similarly, in many sessions, teams iterated up and down the abstraction ladder and added specificity based on the AI's feedback, gradually refining their prompts. In the convergence phase, teams discussed constraints, such as whether to restrict the use of hashtags, limit text length, add a format for the text, etc. For instance, by observing the output length of text, teams hard-coded specific parameters into the prompts (e.g., number of characters) or removed certain end-user options. A notable concern in the convergence stage was the trade-offs between safety and creativity. For instance, by observing the problematic tone of the generated output, engineer SE 4 pondered whether narrowing the focus of prompts by removing tone "is good from a safety perspective, I suppose..." and added "But I wonder if it's like loss of creativity?"

Lastly, teams straddled between adding examples to steer the outputs vs. refining the prompt phrasing vs. adjusting model parameters when making corrections over generated output. Adding examples allowed them to specify requirements at a higher level and let the model *implicitly* learn content generation needs. However, in some cases, the requirements needed to be spelled out through explicit prompting to make the output interpretable. In the convergent stage, teams frequently added explicit prompt phrases based on the model performance. As UX 3 commented:

UX3: "And it not only inferred that [tone], which is very impressive. But if we were actually going to ship this, at least for me, I would feel more comfortable knowing that we have defined parameters. For example, 'audience' has a very specific meaning, and 'channel' has its own set of characteristics... Shipping something that feels like a black box, like our first approach about 20 minutes ago where we were just trying to teach it to make ads—it was working [through examples], but we didn't really understand why"

Specific to setting model parameters, in several instances, teams attempted to adjust the model's *temperature* (i.e., degree of randomness), that is, increase it to improve creativity, assuming the crafted prompt might be too constraining. In other cases, reducing the temperature of the output deviated from the intentions of the prompt. As PM11 commented:

PM11: "What came up was incredibly crappy, and it felt kind of patronizing. Then I said, make it sound serious, and then I changed the temperature down a little bit and asked for three different outputs. And so what we've got still came up with a bunch of exclamation points, which I could have asked for without, but it became much more the perfect framing for the Modern Woman."

The iterative nature of prompt engineering, through adjustments in examples, temperature, and phrasing, reflects the dynamic interplay between the AI's generative capabilities and the teams' objectives toward design objectives such as transparency and control.

Prompt Evaluation Strategies: We observed that prompt evaluation was rather complex and required role-specific expertise in formulating test hypotheses and dynamically defining evaluation criteria. Concretely, across all sessions, we noticed that teams formulated a range of hypotheses to gauge the AI's understanding and adaptability to inputs end-users (marketing content specialists) might provide. For instance, in the template approach, UX would

change the age parameter of the prompt and assess whether the change was reflected in the new output. As UX3 commented: *“Like if I changed the age, I am wondering if the ad will be any different”* and followed up with *“It doesn’t understand the concept of age.”* Following up on this, the engineer S3 suggested removing the examples and trying again with the hypothesis that the examples might be confusing to the model: *“what if we don’t show it any samples?... I would love to have something a little bit more structured, where I can just specify parameters and ask the models to give me examples of those parameters.”* In a different session, instead of replacing the example, PM13 suggested interrogating the model about what it had implicitly learned from the examples: *“I have an idea. We could actually ask the model to tell us what it thinks the tone is. Let me try this”*

In addition to testing for generalizability, teams proactively engaged in adversarial testing and formulation of guardrails to identify unintended or harmful outputs. In session 6, the PM hypothesized promoting negative body image for an ad related to clothing and tested the model by varying the prompt:

PM6: *“There is a possibility of unintended effects, such as promoting negative body image, which could negatively impact viewers’ perception of their body. This is particularly sensitive... let me try [adds to the prompt: Make the tone dark and meta, but avoid using harmful language]... it might be useful to include potential warnings about how the output could be misconstrued. This wouldn’t necessarily be part of the marketing campaign itself but rather an additional precaution. Is there a way we can test this separately?”*

Similarly, participants considered edge cases, such as when dealing with sensitive products like toys intended for young children, marketing efforts should be directed toward parents as well. These varied hypotheses and the corresponding model outputs were used as heuristics to determine whether the teams would consider shipping the product. In session 13, the PM expressed reservations about the readiness of the product for release, citing a narrow understanding of the model’s behavior to the prompt given its limited exposure to diverse inputs and examples.

4.2.3 Bridging Prompt Prototyping and Interface Design. The intersection of prompt engineering and interface design is critical to the design of generative AI applications. Across all sessions, participants explored the interplay of prompts and interactions and how best to structure user interfaces (UI) to align with and constrain the prompts. While teams did not explicitly prototype elements of the interface design, the UX designers made the connections between prompts and interface elements, such as designing a form, a questionnaire, a chat interface, a guided wizard, and even a word cloud or dropdown menu with input options. According to UX8:

UX8: *“I envision the input process like this: initially, marketing professionals would write really simple prompts. Next, they would specify the most important keywords. Lastly, they would indicate the desired platform, such as Instagram, Facebook, or newspapers. Based on these inputs, the system would then generate three outputs. That’s how I see it working.”*

In many sessions, teams also discussed ways to present the content to users, including multiple content outputs at once and live updates to content. For instance, in session 7, the team initially talked about an approach where the generated content would update in real-time as the user manipulated the prompt parameters. The designer then mentioned difficulty tracking the input and output correspondence:

UX7: *“How do we ensure the model delivers what users are looking for on the first or perhaps second attempt, as quickly as possible, without requiring them to extensively explore options? If we continuously display live results, there’s a significant chance we might lose track or not recognize if it meets the user’s initial expectations, especially if they keep adjusting their inputs to experiment...”*

Participants were curious about the right level of information to seek from end-users, aiming to define a prompt structure that effectively captures user intent without overwhelming them with questions. UX 13 and PM 13 discuss the importance of designing a decision tree that guides users through the content generation process, suggesting a dynamic interaction model that evolves based on user input:

UX13: *“What’s the maximum number of questions we can ask before it’s too many? What’s the user experience on the page? We need to consider the flow, how much information to provide, and the sequence of questions.”*

PM13: *“It seems we’re creating a decision tree. Depending on the input, some of it will lead to content generation, while others will guide us through different decision-making paths based on questions and answers.”*

These discussions highlight how closely connected the process of designing prompts and the user interface is when building generative AI applications. In summary, in most sessions teams considered how users will input information, how detailed the prompts need to be, and focusing on creating a good overall experience.

4.3 Challenges of Prompt Sensitivity in Prototyping

In the course of prototyping and evaluating prompts, teams grappled with complex design choices on how to effectively harness LLMs to create intuitive and efficient user interfaces that cater to the specific needs of marketing professionals. The vast array of potential questions and the overwhelming list of considerations presented significant challenges to design. Here will present findings on three key aspects of LLM design materials that introduced friction and uncertainty in prototyping.

4.3.1 Acquiring Predictive Models of LLMs. In many sessions, teams encountered unexpected and surprising outputs from the LLM that both intrigued and challenged their understanding of generative AI models. For instance, in one session, the LLM added its own content around prizes for a competition when it was not something mentioned in the input prompt. As PM 12 comments:

PM12: *“[output: It could be seen by millions of fans,] which I like. It even specified when the competition ended and what the winners would receive—details I*

hadn't mentioned. It also came up with the prizes on its own, which is fine by me. It's fascinating to see it mention NBA team joggers. I wonder, is that even a thing?"

These instances provided valuable insights into the LLM's potential for creativity but also underscored the need for careful prompt engineering and output verification. Another significant challenge lay in breaking down the final output into sub-items and debugging outputs. Teams sought to define clear goals for the product, aiming to deliver content that precisely met the marketing team's needs. However, discrepancies in output length and content accuracy prompted reevaluation. As PM 10 commented: *"I said it should be at least 100 characters... It kind of ignored your requirements. It's 174. Again, with these models, they are just so probabilistic that who knows what is actually going on..."* In a similar vein, looking at the output "imagine having skin that is so soft and smooth you can't help but touch it" UX 1 commented *"it's not that inspiring... I'm challenged to think, how do we get it to come back with a more creative response?"* indicating the difficulties in aligning the LLM's outputs with specific design criteria. Moreover, the continuous sensemaking process—where teams attempt to discern the model's behavior, highlights the challenge of reliably predicting and managing outcomes due to the model's sensitivity to specific prompt wording.

4.3.2 Assumptions and Stereotypes In Crafting Prompts. We observed that the process of designing prompts also brings to the forefront the nuanced challenge of navigating the team's assumptions and stereotypes. In four sessions, the LLM's response to inputs inadvertently reinforced stereotypical notions based on the way prompts were structured. For example, in discussions about targeting specific demographics, the underlying assumptions about interests and behaviors played a significant role in shaping the prompts given to the LLM. Such assumptions, while aimed at tailoring content to perceived user preferences, also highlighted the tradeoffs between personalization and the reinforcement of stereotypes. As PM8 noted, *"When considering Tesla, the target audience we're focusing on primarily consists of males around the age group of 35. This demographic is central to our user base for this particular car category."* In a separate session, UX1 ideated on examples for the LLM, illustrating the specificity sought in targeting the Ad yet risking oversimplification:

UX1: "If I were to tailor a campaign specifically for females, I'd consider how to adjust the messaging differently than I would for males. For instance, a male-targeted ad might depict someone covered in mud after a hard day's work, suggesting the need for a gentle cleaner. However, I'm not sure I'd approach a female-targeted campaign in the same manner."

We can see that as teams navigate the assumptions and stereotypes inherent in crafting prompts, they are also negotiating the broader impacts of their design decisions on societal norms and values.

4.3.3 Overfitting Prompts to Specific Examples. Across all sessions, teams made use of examples from existing campaigns in the prompt prototyping process. We observed that this can be a concern in the

generated outputs in which the model is too closely tailored to the specific examples it has been trained on, limiting its ability to produce diverse and broadly applicable outputs. In fact, in one of the sessions, PM 13 expressed astonishment at the model's capability to generate content from a single example: *"I'm amazed that they can do this much from one example...these examples are all very similar to the first example since they're all generated from the first example"* but also noted the necessity for more comprehensive market research to ensure diversity in the generated examples. Given the lack of familiarity with prototyping generative AI applications, we noticed this tension across teams between zooming into specific use cases to refine the prompt design and the need to ensure that models can generalize across diverse scenarios.

To summarize this section, we find that in prototyping generative AI applications, teams constantly need to balance the specificity of prompts with the goal of achieving broad applicability in their AI models. They encountered challenges like prompt sensitivity and complex evaluation needs while at the same time defining goals and metrics for success, which required careful deliberation across different roles and expertise.

5 DISCUSSION

Our findings show that prototyping generative AI applications is dependent on the teams' ability to work with **'content' as a design material**. Given the broad and dynamic capabilities of generative AI models, *anchoring* on content gave participants a familiar referential *common ground* [13] to identify prompt intentions, engage in prompt engineering, and iteratively evaluate the generated output (Figure 1). The content-centric approach also allowed participants across each role to bring in their own role-specific perspectives, such as identifying feature vectors based on content, defining subjective and human-centric evaluation metrics, and grounding the prototyping process within the end-user content creation workflows. Overall, while anchoring on content made it possible for our participants (who are new to generative AI prototyping) to engage in design thinking across instructions, interface, and use contexts, our findings also highlighted several unintentional constraints and potential limitations that we need to account for in this emerging approach to design. Our observed challenges regarding prompt designing, debugging, and evaluation align with prior work [36]. In addition, we find a content-centric approach can potentially lead to implicit assumptions, overfitting design solutions to specific example content, reinforcing existing biases, and introducing generalizability and scalability issues as well as legal and ethical complications. Here, we reflect on the observed strategies and challenges and the shifting nature of prototyping from the previous task-specific human-AI design to the now generative AI design.

5.1 The Shifting Nature of Prototyping: From Task-Specific to Generative AI

In prior iterations of human-AI design, HCI researchers have identified AI-first and UI-first approaches to AI software design and proposed alternatives by considering alignment between AI and UX components [64, 67, 82]. The emphasis has been on collaboration across roles in which UX design and AI engineering can happen in parallel by informing and constraining each other. However, with

generative AI models, **these distinctions between AI and UI and design and engineering are blurry** as the focus shifts towards leveraging prompt engineering as a means to design and implement functionality. In our sessions, we noted that both designers and engineers encountered an initial hurdle (or cold-start problem) where each group tended to rely on the expertise of the other or assumed that the responsibility for prototyping (prompt ‘engineering’) fell outside their purview. This mutual dependency and misalignment of expectations created initial obstacles to the prototyping process. In contrast to earlier models of human-AI design, where each role operated with its own specific design representations—such as interface designs for UI/UX designers and AI specifications for engineers—they are now working with the same design representation, i.e., prompts.

Based on how teams authored the prompts, we identified four main sub-components of a prompt that include (1) the input context, (2) the system instructions, (3) the output constraints, and (4) few-shot examples (Figure 3). The input context provides the generative model with the necessary background or situational context to understand the task at hand. It encompasses specific details that the end-user might provide when using the prompt to tailor the generated response. The system instructions are commands or requests detailing what the model is expected to do and specify the task, action, or outputs desired from the AI. The output constraints provide guidelines or boundaries for the generated response. In our sessions, these constraints included stylistic aspects such as format and length of response as well as high-level guardrails, e.g., asking the model not to generate harmful content. Finally, the few-shot examples provided the model with illustrative content that implicitly indicated the desired nature of the output or behavior expected of the generative model. In addition to the ‘anatomy’ of a prompt, our findings revealed how teams strategically approached thinking about these components and how different roles contributed to the prompt components. Designers who have expertise in crafting interfaces and designing input/output flows found themselves particularly drawn to utilizing prompts as a metaphorical ‘template’ during the prototyping process. Conversely, certain design participants encountered challenges in understanding the concept of few-shot examples within prompts, a technique fundamentally rooted in engineering principles. Given the interconnected nature of these sub-components, and as shown in our findings—prototyping involving refining information across the various sub-components—led to blurred lines between roles and design representations.

This merging of roles and responsibilities has obscured individual **agency and ownership**, challenging the conventional division of tasks, such as modular design principles within project teams. Further, in identifying issues with separation of concerns, Subramonyam et al. advocate for the concept of “leaky abstractions” which allow for some overlap across boundaries while preserving distinct design artifacts specific to each role [64]. However, in the context of generative AI prototyping, these separations become even more *indistinct*, with shared artifacts and process integration further blurring the lines between different roles. It remains an open question how this evolving dynamic will impact the definition of roles, the nature of design representations, and the methodologies employed in prototyping generative AI applications. Future

research should look at how distinct roles and expertise can effectively contribute to crafting instructions for generative AI.

5.1.1 From Data Centric to Content Centric Design: Data and content offer both overlapping and unique viewpoints in the context of AI design. Data is considered the backbone of machine learning, and prior work has looked at how designers can use data to understand ML model behaviors, engage in divergent and convergent design thinking, collaborate, and evaluate AI applications [20, 27, 66, 67]. In this regard, generative AI models are similar in that they are trained on high volumes of diverse content and can autonomously generate new, contextually relevant outputs that mirror, complement, or expand upon the data they have been exposed to. However, data in bespoke ML model serves distinct roles – including training datasets, human-provided inputs, and the generation of data-driven outputs— providing a greater degree of freedom for teams. Working with data as design probes allows teams to achieve alignment across AI, UI, and human end-users. With generative AI models, the scope of content is rather vast, yet there’s a notable limitation in the flexibility to craft user experiences that intuitively accommodate custom tasks without compelling end-users to manually create their own prompts. However, we observed that by taking a content-centric approach, teams attempted to recover some of the lost degrees of freedom in crafting better designs for end users. Drawing on Terry et al.’s work on AI alignment [68], we find that the key components of content-centric prototyping have parallels with the process of achieving AI alignment. In our study, teams made use of example content to operationalize the concepts of specification alignment (the ability of AI systems to correctly interpret a user’s intent) and process alignment (the ability of the user to influence the process by which the AI generates the output) in nuanced ways to enhance the interaction between users and AI systems. We observed this, especially when participants attempted to reverse engineer prompts into specific requirements and as they sought to discern the process behind content creation.

Despite these benefits, our findings also highlighted potential pitfalls to content-centric prototyping. In working with content as a design material, teams made implicit assumptions about cultural norms, user behaviors, content formats, concept abstractions, etc., which may not be universally applicable or might exclude important user demographics, leading to systems that perform well under narrow conditions but fail to address a broader spectrum of needs and contexts. Crucially, these **design choices often remain undocumented and invisible to end-users**, not clearly reflected through the user interface’s affordances. For instance, the software team’s predefined notions of tone and emotions embedded within the prompt may not be apparent to end users. This discrepancy can lead to a misalignment between the users’ mental models and their expectations regarding the application’s behavior [65]. Additionally, teams made use of the web to search and retrieve example content for prototyping. When content is sourced from public or third-party repositories, the legal rights to use this content in training AI systems must be carefully considered to avoid copyright infringement. Granted, this is likely a consequence of our study design, future work should explore strategies for **responsibly using content**, including developing guidelines for ethically sourcing and utilizing data, ensuring compliance with copyright laws, and implementing




Figure 3: Four Main Components of a Prompt Prototype.

robust procedures for obtaining necessary permissions. Finally, designing prompts around specific examples or **narrowly defined content can result in overfitting**, where the model performs poorly in new contexts.

5.1.2 Designing for Expanded Degrees of Freedom in Use. Unlike task-specific models with focused behavior and inputs and outputs, generative AI models exhibit *dynamic* capabilities and can implement ad-hoc functionality in response to prompts. Our findings show that teams faced challenges in deliberately crafting the specific tasks that the prompts were intended to execute. For instance, teams ideated several approaches ranging from specific prompts to set the tone of the content to broad prompts that generate the entire content given some marketing value proposition. As reported, in many sessions, teams made use of generative AI as a domain expert collaborator to generate fuzzy specifications regarding what tasks and functionalities the model should support. We foresee that executing user research to address a potentially wide array of needs (thereby utilizing the expanded degree of freedom in use that generative AI offers) could present its own set of challenges. Despite its tendency to generalize across vast amounts of information, generative AI can still serve as a valuable initial reference point for identifying and shaping prompt intentions. Future work should focus on a **combination of these methods, enhancing the integration of generative AI in the early stages of design** and user-researcher-in-the-loop to gain insights into the diverse needs and preferences of users.

5.2 Limitations

Given the novelty of generative AI in software products and constraints to gathering process-related data in real-world teams, we focused on a controlled design study with a pre-determined application context, i.e., marketing content creation. While this setup allowed us to glean insights into prompt prototyping and collaboration, it may not be representative of real-world teams. The complexity and variability inherent in different projects, industries, and team structures are likely to influence the process and outcomes of generative AI design in ways not fully explored in our study.

Second, we did not include domain experts, in our case, marketing content creators, copyright specialists, etc. While our study is representative of typical roles in software product teams, including individuals with specialized expertise could have influenced how teams curated and interpreted marketing content, leading to different outcomes. Hence, we largely focus our analysis and discussion on the process we observed while cautiously reporting potential pitfalls to content-centric prototyping. Additionally, our focus on a specific application area means that potential pitfalls and limitations identified in our study may not comprehensively cover the spectrum of challenges faced by teams working across various domains and with different types of content and user needs.

6 CONCLUSION

Generative AI models as a design material offer a dynamic operational scope with support for varied functionality while constraining the degree of freedom software teams have in working with pre-trained models. In this work, we investigate how collaborative software teams prototype generative AI applications by engaging in prompt engineering. Unlike end-users crafting their own prompts for bespoke tasks, teams prototyping applications need to carefully align the prompt instructions with human-centered values while at the same time ensuring they support diverse users and contexts. By conducting a design study with 39 practitioners, we identified a content-centric prototyping approach. In working with content as a design material, collaborative teams applied different strategies to design and evaluate the prompts. We also identified potential challenges and pitfalls due to the high sensitivity of generative models to prompts and overreliance on example content. Finally, we contrast content-centric prototyping with prior work on human-AI design and highlight considerations for collaborative teams working on generative AI applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] Saleema Amershi, Andrew Begel, Christian Bird, Robert DeLine, Harald Gall, Ece Kamar, Nachiappan Nagappan, Besmira Nushi, and Thomas Zimmermann. 2019. Software engineering for machine learning: a case study. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice*. IEEE Press, 291–300.

- [2] Saleema Amershi, Dan Weld, Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Adam Fourney, Besmira Nushi, Penny Collisson, Jina Suh, Shamsi Iqbal, Paul N Bennett, Kori Inkpen, et al. 2019. Guidelines for human-AI interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 3.
- [3] Ian Arawjo, Priyan Vaithilingam, Martin Wattenberg, and Elena Glassman. 2023. ChainForge: An open-source visual programming environment for prompt engineering. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 1–3.
- [4] Michel Beaudouin-Lafon and Wendy E Mackay. 2009. Prototyping tools and techniques. In *Human-Computer Interaction*. CRC Press, 137–160.
- [5] Paul Beynon-Davies and Steve Holmes. 2002. Design breakdowns, scenarios and rapid application development. *Information and software technology* 44, 10 (2002), 579–592.
- [6] Umang Bhatt, Alice Xiang, Shubham Sharma, Adrian Weller, Ankur Taly, Yunhan Jia, Joydeep Ghosh, Ruchir Puri, José MF Moura, and Peter Eckersley. 2020. Explainable machine learning in deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 648–657.
- [7] Melanie Birks, Ysanne Chapman, and Karen Francis. 2008. Memoing in qualitative research: Probing data and processes. *Journal of research in nursing* 13, 1 (2008), 68–75.
- [8] W Bischofberger. 1996. User interface prototyping-concepts, tools, and experience. In *Proceedings of IEEE 18th International Conference on Software Engineering*. IEEE, 532–541.
- [9] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258* (2021).
- [10] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *arXiv:2005.14165* [cs.CL]
- [11] Jiahui Chen, Lichang Chen, Heng Huang, and Tianyi Zhou. 2023. When do you need Chain-of-Thought Prompting for ChatGPT? *arXiv:2304.03262* [cs.AI]
- [12] Xiang'Anthony' Chen, Jeff Burke, Ruofei Du, Matthew K Hong, Jennifer Jacobs, Philippe Laban, Dingzeyu Li, Nanyun Peng, Karl DD Willis, Chien-Sheng Wu, et al. 2023. Next Steps for Human-Centered Generative AI: A Technical Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15774* (2023).
- [13] Herbert H Clark and Susan E Brennan. 1991. Grounding in communication. (1991).
- [14] Adrién Coyette, Suzanne Kieffer, and Jean Vanderdonck. 2007. Multi-fidelity prototyping of user interfaces. In *IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer, 150–164.
- [15] Dominik Dellermann, Adrian Calma, Nikolaus Lipusch, Thorsten Weber, Sascha Weigel, and Philipp Ebel. 2019. The future of human-ai collaboration: a taxonomy of design knowledge for hybrid intelligence systems. (2019).
- [16] Graham Dove, Kim Halskov, Jodi Forlizzi, and John Zimmerman. 2017. Ux design innovation: Challenges for working with machine learning as a design material. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 278–288.
- [17] KJ Feng, Q Vera Liao, Ziang Xiao, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Amy X Zhang, and David W McDonald. 2024. Canvil: Designerly Adaptation for LLM-Powered User Experiences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09051* (2024).
- [18] Gerhard Fischer. 2000. Symmetry of ignorance, social creativity, and meta-design. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 13, 7-8 (2000), 527–537.
- [19] Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Ashish Sabharwal, Peter Clark, and Tushar Khot. 2023. Complexity-Based Prompting for Multi-Step Reasoning. *arXiv:2210.00720* [cs.CL]
- [20] Fabien Girardin and Neal Lathia. 2017. When User Experience Designers Partner with Data Scientists. In *2017 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- [21] Google. 2019. People + AI Guidebook. <https://pair.withgoogle.com/>
- [22] Google. 2023. Bard. <https://bard.google.com/>
- [23] Google. 2024. MakerSuite. <https://makersuite.google.com/>
- [24] Raymond Guindon, Herb Krasner, Bill Curtis, et al. 1987. Breakdowns and processes during the early activities of software design by professionals. In *Empirical studies of programmers: Second Workshop*. 65–82.
- [25] Thilo Hagendorff. 2019. The ethics of AI ethics—an evaluation of guidelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03425* (2019).
- [26] Jeffrey Heer. 2019. Agency plus automation: Designing artificial intelligence into interactive systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, 6 (2019), 1844–1850.
- [27] Karey Helms, Barry Brown, Magnus Sahlgren, and Airi Lampinen. 2018. Design Methods to Investigate User Experiences of Artificial Intelligence. In *2018 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- [28] Sungsoo Ray Hong, Jessica Hullman, and Enrico Bertini. 2020. Human factors in model interpretability: Industry practices, challenges, and needs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW1 (2020), 1–26.
- [29] Azumio Inc. 2019. Calorie Mama Food AI: Instant food Recognition and Calorie Counter using Deep Learning. <http://www.caloriemama.ai/>
- [30] Adobe Inc. 2024. Adobe Firefly. <https://www.adobe.com/products/firefly.html>
- [31] DataRobot Inc. 2023. DataRobot. <https://www.datarobot.com/>
- [32] Jasper AI Inc. 2023. Jasper. <https://www.jasper.ai/>
- [33] Missive App Inc. 2023. Missive. <https://missiveapp.com/>
- [34] Tabnine Inc. 2023. Tabnine. <https://www.tabnine.com/>
- [35] Azra Ismail, Divy Thakkar, Neha Madhiwalla, and Neha Kumar. 2023. Public Health Calls for/with AI: An Ethnographic Perspective. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, CSCW2 (2023), 1–26.
- [36] Ellen Jiang, Kristen Olson, Edwin Toh, Alejandra Molina, Aaron Donsbach, Michael Terry, and Carrie J Cai. 2022. Promptmaker: Prompt-based prototyping with large language models. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*. 1–8.
- [37] Anna Jobin, Marcello Lenca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 1, 9 (2019), 389–399.
- [38] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169* (2023).
- [39] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *arXiv:2001.08361* [cs.LG]
- [40] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2023. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. *arXiv:2205.11916* [cs.CL]
- [41] Peter Kun, Ingrid Mulder, Amalia De Götzen, and Gerd Kortuem. 2019. Creative Data Work in the Design Process. In *Proceedings of the 2019 on Creativity and Cognition*. ACM, 346–358.
- [42] Brenden M. Lake, Tal Linzen, and Marco Baroni. 2019. Human few-shot learning of compositional instructions. *arXiv:1901.04587* [cs.CL]
- [43] Brenden M. Lake, Tomer D. Ullman, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Samuel J. Gershman. 2016. Building Machines That Learn and Think Like People. *arXiv:1604.00289* [cs.AI]
- [44] Andrew K. Lampinen, Ishita Dasgupta, Stephanie C. Y. Chan, Kory Matthewson, Michael Henry Tessler, Antonia Creswell, James L. McClelland, Jane X. Wang, and Felix Hill. 2022. Can language models learn from explanations in context? *arXiv:2204.02329* [cs.CL]
- [45] Q Vera Liao, Daniel Gruen, and Sarah Miller. 2020. Questioning the AI: Informing Design Practices for Explainable AI User Experiences. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–15.
- [46] Q Vera Liao, Hariharan Subramonyam, Jennifer Wang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2023. Designerly understanding: Information needs for model transparency to support design ideation for AI-powered user experience. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–21.
- [47] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing. *arXiv:2107.13586* [cs.CL]
- [48] Tania Lombrozo and Susan Carey. 2006. Functional explanation and the function of explanation. *Cognition* 99, 2 (2006), 167–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.12.009>
- [49] Nirav Malsattar, Tomo Kihara, and Elisa Giaccardi. 2019. Designing and Prototyping from the Perspective of AI in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, 1083–1088.
- [50] Nora McDonald, Sarita Schoenebeck, and Andrea Forte. 2019. Reliability and Inter-Rater Reliability in Qualitative Research: Norms and Guidelines for CSCW and HCI Practice. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 72 (Nov. 2019), 23 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359174>
- [51] Steven Moore, Q Vera Liao, and Hariharan Subramonyam. 2023. fAllureNotes: Supporting Designers in Understanding the Limits of AI Models for Computer Vision Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–19.
- [52] Meredith Ringel Morris, Carrie J Cai, Jess Holbrook, Chinmay Kulkarni, and Michael Terry. 2023. The design space of generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10547* (2023).
- [53] OpenAI. 2023. ChatGPT. <https://chat.openai.com/chat>
- [54] Savvas Petridis, Michael Terry, and Carrie J Cai. 2023. PromptInFuser: How Tightly Coupling AI and UI Design Impacts Designers' Workflows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15435* (2023).
- [55] Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Measuring and Narrowing the Compositional Gap in Language Models. *arXiv:2210.03350* [cs.CL]
- [56] Ben Prystawski, Paul Thibodeau, Christopher Potts, and Noah D. Goodman. 2023. Psychologically-informed chain-of-thought prompts for metaphor understanding in large language models. *arXiv:2209.08141* [cs.CL]
- [57] Evani Radiya-Dixit and Xin Wang. 2020. How fine can fine-tuning be? learning efficient language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*

- and Statistics. PMLR, 2435–2443.
- [58] Holger Rhinow, Eva Köppen, and Christoph Meinel. 2012. Prototypes as boundary objects in innovation processes. In *Proceedings of the 2012 International Conference on Design Research Society, Bangkok, Thailand*.
- [59] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Tali Bers, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2022. Multitask Prompted Training Enables Zero-Shot Task Generalization. arXiv:2110.08207 [cs.LG]
- [60] Ahmed Seffah, Jan Gulliksen, and Michel C Desmarais. 2005. *Human-centered software engineering-integrating usability in the software development lifecycle*. Vol. 8. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [61] Robert Stalnaker. 2002. Common ground. *Linguistics and philosophy* 25, 5/6 (2002), 701–721.
- [62] Keith E. Stanovich and Richard F. West. 2000. Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 23, 5 (oct 2000), 645–665. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x00003435>
- [63] Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*. Sage publications.
- [64] Hariharan Subramonyam, Jane Im, Colleen Seifert, and Eytan Adar. 2022. Solving separation-of-concerns problems in collaborative design of human-AI systems through leaky abstractions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–21.
- [65] Hariharan Subramonyam, Christopher Lawrence Pondoc, Colleen Seifert, Maaneesh Agrawala, and Roy Pea. 2023. Bridging the Gulf of Envisioning: Cognitive Design Challenges in LLM Interfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14459* (2023).
- [66] Hariharan Subramonyam, Colleen Seifert, and Eytan Adar. 2021. ProtoAI: Model-Informed Prototyping for AI-Powered Interfaces. In *26th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. 48–58.
- [67] Hariharan Subramonyam, Colleen Seifert, and Eytan Adar. 2021. Towards a process model for co-creating AI experiences. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2021*. 1529–1543.
- [68] Michael Terry, Chinmay Kulkarni, Martin Wattenberg, Lucas Dixon, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2023. AI Alignment in the Design of Interactive AI: Specification Alignment, Process Alignment, and Evaluation Support. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00710* (2023).
- [69] Divy Thakkar, Azra Ismail, Pratyush Kumar, Alex Hanna, Nithya Sambasivan, and Neha Kumar. 2022. When is machine learning data good?: Valuing in public health datafication. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–16.
- [70] Anna Vallgård and Johan Redström. 2007. Computational composites. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 513–522.
- [71] Philip van Allen. 2018. Prototyping ways of prototyping AI. *interactions* 25, 6 (2018), 46–51.
- [72] Boshi Wang, Sewon Min, Xiang Deng, Jiaming Shen, You Wu, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Huan Sun. 2023. Towards Understanding Chain-of-Thought Prompting: An Empirical Study of What Matters. arXiv:2212.10001 [cs.CL]
- [73] Danding Wang, Qian Yang, Ashraf Abdul, and Brian Y Lim. 2019. Designing theory-driven user-centric explainable AI. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–15.
- [74] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. arXiv:2203.11171 [cs.CL]
- [75] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.), Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 24824–24837. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/9d5609613524ec4f15af0f7b31abca4-Paper-Conference.pdf
- [76] Justin D Weisz, Michael Muller, Jessica He, and Stephanie Houde. 2023. Toward general design principles for generative AI applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05578* (2023).
- [77] Jules White, Quchen Fu, Sam Hays, Michael Sandborn, Carlos Olea, Henry Gilbert, Ashraf Elnashar, Jesse Spencer-Smith, and Douglas C. Schmidt. 2023. A Prompt Pattern Catalog to Enhance Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT. arXiv:2302.11382 [cs.SE]
- [78] Terry Winograd, Fernando Flores, and Fernando F Flores. 1986. *Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation for design*. Intellect Books.
- [79] Qian Yang. 2018. Machine Learning as a UX Design Material: How Can We Imagine Beyond Automation, Recommenders, and Reminders?. In *2018 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- [80] Qian Yang, Justin Cranshaw, Saleema Amershi, Shamsi T Iqbal, and Jaime Teevan. 2019. Sketching NLP: A Case Study of Exploring the Right Things To Design with Language Intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 185.
- [81] Qian Yang, Alex Scuito, John Zimmerman, Jodi Forlizzi, and Aaron Steinfeld. 2018. Investigating how experienced UX designers effectively work with machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, 585–596.
- [82] Qian Yang, Aaron Steinfeld, Carolyn Rosé, and John Zimmerman. 2020. Re-examining Whether, Why, and How Human-AI Interaction Is Uniquely Difficult to Design. In *Proceedings of the 2020 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–13.
- [83] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models. arXiv:2305.10601 [cs.CL]
- [84] Nur Yildirim, Alex Kass, Teresa Tung, Connor Upton, Donnacha Costello, Robert Giusti, Sinem Lacin, Sara Lovic, James M O'Neill, Rudi O'Reilly Meehan, et al. 2022. How Experienced Designers of Enterprise Applications Engage AI as a Design Material. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–13.
- [85] JD Zamfirescu-Pereira, Heather Wei, Amy Xiao, Kitty Gu, Grace Jung, Matthew G Lee, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 2023. Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3. (2023).
- [86] JD Zamfirescu-Pereira, Richmond Y Wong, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 2023. Why Johnny can't prompt: how non-AI experts try (and fail) to design LLM prompts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–21.
- [87] Sabah Zdanowska and Alex S Taylor. 2022. A study of UX practitioners roles in designing real-world, enterprise ML systems. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–15.
- [88] Amy X Zhang, Michael Muller, and Dakuo Wang. 2020. How do data science workers collaborate? roles, workflows, and tools. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW1 (2020), 1–23.
- [89] Haiyan Zhao, Hanjie Chen, Fan Yang, Ninghao Liu, Huiqi Deng, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Mengnan Du. 2023. Explainability for Large Language Models: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01029* (2023).