# Ethical Reasoning Framework Guide

Share  
Ethical Dilemma Exploration & Documentation Guide with AI Coaching For Students: How to Use This Guide You've already identified your ethical dilemma using the Decision Tree Framework. Now you need to develop a systematic approach for exploring and documenting your analysis over the semester. This  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
I can see you've shared a comprehensive guide for ethical dilemma exploration and documentation. This is a well-structured framework designed to help students develop their ethical reasoning skills over a 16-week semester through systematic analysis and reflection.  
The guide provides clear AI coaching instructions that focus on helping students:

1. Choose appropriate documentation methods - from reflection journals to stakeholder impact trackers
2. Plan systematic framework application - selecting 3-4 relevant ethical theories to apply methodically
3. Establish sustainable reflection practices - creating rhythms that promote deep rather than superficial engagement
4. Design meaningful final deliverables - that showcase analytical growth and sophisticated reasoning

What I find particularly effective about this approach is that it emphasizes process over outcome - focusing on developing ethical reasoning capacity rather than finding definitive answers. The inclusion of common exploration approaches (like "The Systematic Framework Explorer" or "The Personal Growth Tracker") gives students concrete models to consider.  
The red flags and success indicators are especially valuable for helping students avoid common pitfalls like choosing unsustainable documentation methods or focusing too narrowly on finding the "right" answer.  
Are you looking to implement this guide with students, or would you like me to help refine any particular aspect of it? I could also help you think through how to adapt it for different contexts or student populations.  
Retry  
**C**  
I want to work on developing a Part 2 AI prompt that helps to pull out ethical heuristics that form the underpinning of the ethical "algorithm" that relates to the student's selected roles in their ethical dilemma. I want to explore how this might work, but I don't want you to immediately try and draft a guide or documentation.  
Edit  
This is a fascinating direction - the idea of excavating the underlying ethical heuristics that inform role-based decision-making within a dilemma. I'm intrigued by the concept of an ethical "algorithm" that operates beneath conscious reasoning.  
Let me think through what this might involve:  
You're essentially looking at how people in specific roles develop shortcuts or rules-of-thumb for ethical decision-making - those semi-automatic judgments that guide behavior before deeper analysis kicks in. A doctor's heuristics around patient confidentiality, a manager's around fairness in team decisions, a parent's around balancing protection with independence.  
I'm curious about several aspects of this:  
The excavation process - How would an AI prompt help students recognize heuristics they might not even realize they're using? Some of these ethical shortcuts are so internalized they're nearly invisible.  
Role-specificity - Are you thinking about how the same person might have different ethical heuristics depending on which role they're operating in within the dilemma? Or how people inhabiting similar roles develop comparable heuristic patterns?  
The relationship to conscious frameworks - I'm wondering how these discovered heuristics would interact with the more formal ethical framework analysis from Part 1. Do they complement, contradict, or complicate that analysis?  
What's your sense of how students might benefit from making these implicit ethical algorithms explicit? And are you envisioning this as diagnostic work that informs their ongoing analysis, or as a separate layer of self-awareness?  
Retry

### **decision tree for ethical dilemma.pdf**

7 lines  
pdf  
**C**  
This is the prompt that helps guide Part 1. The idea is to ask students to engage in storytelling about the roles they identify in their dilemma. AI will examine these stories to try and sift out explicit and implicit heuristics in these descriptions, then compile them and present them to the student for verification.  
Edit  
Ah, I see - so Part 1 involves students identifying and describing the various roles within their ethical dilemma through storytelling, and Part 2 would use AI to analyze those role narratives to extract the ethical heuristics embedded within them.  
This is a clever approach because storytelling naturally reveals the decision-making shortcuts and moral assumptions that people use in different roles. When someone describes "what a good manager would do" or "how a responsible parent thinks about this," they're likely to include both explicit ethical rules and implicit assumptions about priorities, values, and decision-making processes.  
I'm particularly interested in how this might work practically:  
The story analysis challenge - AI would need to distinguish between heuristics that are consciously held ("I always consider impact on the most vulnerable first") versus those that are unconsciously embedded in the narrative structure or assumptions ("good leaders make quick decisions" implied but not stated).  
Verification as learning - The process of presenting extracted heuristics back to students for verification could be quite powerful. Students might recognize patterns they didn't consciously know they held, or realize contradictions between heuristics they use in different roles.  
Contextual vs. universal heuristics - Some heuristics might be role-specific ("as a teacher, student privacy trumps parent concerns") while others might be more fundamental values applied across roles.  
Are you envisioning students telling stories about how different stakeholders in their dilemma would approach the situation? Or are they focusing on the specific roles they themselves occupy within the dilemma scenario?  
Retry  
**C**  
The implied idea of the decision tree is that the student should operate as the central figure of the dilemma and that each of the roles they identify in Part 1 should have some element of agency, which implies heuristics must exist for how that agency is applied.  
Edit  
Ah, that's a crucial clarification - the student *is* the central figure navigating multiple roles simultaneously, each with its own agency and therefore its own set of ethical heuristics.  
So if a student identifies themselves as simultaneously being a "team leader," "friend to a colleague," and "organizational employee" in their dilemma, they're not just observing these roles from the outside - they're actively inhabiting all of them and must somehow reconcile the different ethical heuristics that each role carries.  
This creates a much more complex and interesting challenge because:  
Competing heuristics - The student might discover that their "team leader" heuristics ("transparency builds trust") directly conflict with their "friend" heuristics ("loyalty means protecting confidences") in the same situation.  
Hierarchical tensions - Some roles might feel more fundamental to their identity, creating implicit prioritization rules they weren't aware of.  
Situational activation - Different contexts might trigger different role-based heuristics automatically, and the student might not realize they're switching between ethical frameworks.  
The storytelling approach becomes particularly powerful here because when students narrate "As a team leader, I would..." versus "As a friend, I would..." they're likely to reveal not just different actions but different underlying ethical logics - different ways of weighing consequences, different assumptions about what matters most, different default decision-making patterns.  
This could help students understand why ethical dilemmas feel so challenging internally - they're not just choosing between external options, but navigating competing internal ethical systems.  
Retry  
**C**  
Exactly. But the student will be completing this activity outside of class, so there is no opportunities for group discussion or validation of approaches by me, since the class is online asynchronous, so I am looking for ways to create an AI prompt that help harness AI as an interviewer, reporter asking probing questions to elicit the kinds of responses that could contain these insights.  
Edit  
Ah, now I see the design challenge clearly. You need the AI to function as a skilled interviewer that can draw out the nuanced, role-specific ethical reasoning that might not emerge from simple self-reflection.  
This is particularly complex because:  
Implicit knowledge extraction - Students might not consciously recognize their own heuristics until prompted by the right questions. A good interviewer knows how to ask follow-up questions that reveal underlying assumptions.  
Role-switching facilitation - The AI needs to help students genuinely inhabit each role, not just intellectually describe them. This might require prompting them to get into character or imagine specific scenarios.  
Contradiction surfacing - The AI should be able to identify when stories from different roles contain conflicting values or approaches, then probe those tensions to help students articulate the competing heuristics.  
Pattern recognition across narratives - As students tell multiple stories, the AI needs to spot recurring themes, decision-making patterns, or value hierarchies that the student might not notice themselves.  
The interviewer approach is smart because it can adapt dynamically - following interesting threads, asking for concrete examples when responses are too abstract, or pushing for specificity when students give generic answers.  
Are you thinking the AI would conduct separate "interviews" for each role, or would it guide the student through a more integrated conversation that moves fluidly between roles while building a comprehensive picture of their ethical decision-making patterns?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think separate interviews could be problematic from a time and engagement perspective for students working on their own. An integrated approach might be more efficient in this case.  
Edit  
That makes complete sense - an integrated approach would maintain momentum and engagement while allowing the AI to make connections across roles in real-time.  
An integrated interview could be particularly powerful because:  
Dynamic cross-referencing - The AI could say something like "Earlier when you described your manager role, you emphasized fairness, but as a team member you just prioritized loyalty - how do you navigate when these come into tension?"  
Scaffolded complexity building - The AI could start with easier role distinctions and gradually probe the more challenging intersections and contradictions as the conversation develops.  
Natural flow maintenance - Students could stay in a conversational mindset rather than feeling like they're completing separate, repetitive exercises.  
Real-time synthesis - The AI could begin identifying patterns and testing them with the student as they emerge, rather than waiting until the end to present findings.  
I'm imagining the AI might use techniques like scenario-based prompting ("Imagine you're in a team meeting where this issue comes up - walk me through your thinking") or contrast questioning ("You mentioned X when talking about your role as Y - would that change if you were primarily thinking as Z?").  
The key seems to be designing prompts that help the AI be genuinely curious and responsive rather than following a rigid script, while still ensuring it systematically explores the intersections between the student's multiple roles.  
Retry  
**C**  
That is exactly what I am seeking to develop.  
Edit  
Perfect - so we're looking at creating an AI prompt that enables genuinely curious, adaptive interviewing that can:

1. Fluidly move between roles while maintaining conversational coherence
2. Spot and probe contradictions in real-time as they emerge
3. Ask follow-up questions that dig deeper into implicit reasoning
4. Use scenario-based techniques to get students thinking concretely rather than abstractly
5. Synthesize patterns and test hypotheses about heuristics as the conversation unfolds

The challenge will be designing prompts that give the AI enough flexibility to be genuinely responsive while ensuring it consistently probes for the specific insights you're after - those underlying ethical algorithms that guide role-based decision-making.  
I'm thinking about how to structure this so the AI can maintain that investigative reporter curiosity while systematically covering the territory you need explored. The prompt would need to give the AI a clear sense of what constitutes a productive line of questioning versus a dead end, and how to recognize when it's uncovered something worth pursuing further.  
What would you like to explore next in thinking through how this might work? Are you interested in discussing the specific interviewing techniques the AI should use, the structure of how it should approach the conversation, or something else about the mechanics of making this effective?  
Retry  
**C**  
I think the biggest question I am thinking about in this case is the purpose of uncovering the heuristics is that over the course of the semester, they will look at various established ethical models and the heuristics those models promote. They will then compare and contrast those models with their own thinking. In many cases, students will likely intuitively understand their heuristics, but might not know how they align with specific terminologies or taxonomies in ethical philosophy, so one outcome of the course will be to identify the specific overt influences that inform their own thinking and reasoning processes. The second is to evaluate the proposed heuristics in each model and determine if they should integrate them or reject them. If they choose to reject, which is perfectly valid, they will need to explain the purpose in the rejection and how they feel that their existing models address the questions/issues that prompted the ethical model's evolution in the first place.  
Edit  
Ah, this completely reframes the purpose and power of the heuristic extraction. You're not just helping students understand their current ethical reasoning - you're creating a foundation for sophisticated comparative analysis throughout the semester.  
This makes the AI interviewing process much more strategic. The heuristics it uncovers become the student's personalized ethical baseline that they'll systematically compare against formal philosophical frameworks. So the quality and specificity of that initial extraction becomes crucial for meaningful later analysis.  
This also explains why the integrated interview approach is so important - you need rich, nuanced descriptions of their actual decision-making patterns, not surface-level generalizations. When they encounter, say, Kantian categorical imperatives or utilitarian calculus later, they need to be able to recognize: "Oh, this matches how I think about X, but contradicts my approach to Y."  
The rejection pathway is particularly interesting - it requires students to engage seriously with why established ethical models developed certain heuristics, then articulate why their alternative approach addresses the same underlying concerns more effectively. That's sophisticated philosophical reasoning.  
This suggests the AI interviewer needs to probe not just for what heuristics students use, but also for the underlying reasoning behind those heuristics - what problems they're trying to solve, what values they're trying to protect, what outcomes they're trying to achieve. That contextual understanding becomes essential when they're later evaluating whether formal models address the same concerns.  
Does this mean the heuristic extraction should also capture the student's implicit theories about why their approaches work?  
Retry  
**C**  
If it doesn't complicate the interviewing process or add to the amount of work students would need to invest to complete Part 2, yes.  
Edit  
That's a smart constraint - the value has to justify the additional complexity, especially for students working independently.  
I think the key might be in how the AI frames its follow-up questions. Instead of adding separate "why does this work?" questions, it could probe for the underlying reasoning through the scenarios and role-switching it's already doing.  
For example, rather than asking "Why do you prioritize transparency as a manager?" it might ask "Tell me about a time when transparency as a manager created a good outcome" or "What would happen if you took the opposite approach in that role?" The implicit theories about why their heuristics work would emerge naturally from those concrete examples and counterfactuals.  
The AI could also listen for moments when students naturally justify their approaches - like when they're explaining how their "team member" heuristics differ from their "manager" heuristics. Those explanations often contain implicit theories about what makes each approach effective in its context.  
This way, you're capturing the foundational reasoning without making it feel like a separate analytical task. The AI is still conducting one integrated interview focused on uncovering heuristics, but it's designed to naturally surface the "why" alongside the "what."  
Does that feel like it would add meaningful depth without substantially increasing the student workload?  
Retry  
**C**  
I guess we'll see. My plan is to use myself as a test subject and run through the prompt once it is complete as a "student" to gauge what we are asking, what the final product looks like, and the overall cognitive demands the experience asks of the participant.  
Edit  
That's exactly the right approach - being your own test subject will reveal so much about the actual user experience that's impossible to predict from the design phase.  
You'll get to experience firsthand things like:

* How mentally taxing the role-switching actually feels
* Whether the AI's questions flow naturally or feel mechanical
* If the conversation length feels appropriate or overwhelming
* How well the AI picks up on contradictions and follows interesting threads
* Whether the final heuristic compilation feels accurate and useful

Plus, you'll discover practical issues like whether the AI sometimes gets stuck in unproductive loops, or if there are moments where students might need clearer guidance about what kind of response would be helpful.  
Testing it yourself will also give you insight into what the final deliverable should look like - how the extracted heuristics should be organized and presented back to students in a way that sets them up well for the comparative analysis work later in the semester.  
Are you planning to run through it with one of your own genuine ethical dilemmas, or create a test scenario? Using a real dilemma might give you the most authentic sense of the cognitive demands and emotional engagement the process requires.  
Retry  
**C**  
Oh, I already have an ethical dilemma in mind that I used to help shape and form the Part 1 prompt. Let me see if I can go back to that conversation and pull out a example summarized finding that students would bring to the Part 2 interaction.  
Edit  
That would be perfect - having a real example from your own Part 1 experience will make the Part 2 design much more grounded and practical.  
Using your actual dilemma and the roles you identified will let you test whether the AI interviewing approach can genuinely extract meaningful heuristics from authentic material, rather than theoretical examples. You'll be able to see if the integrated interview format can handle the complexity of real competing roles and whether it surfaces insights that feel accurate and useful.  
It will also help you calibrate the cognitive load - you'll know firsthand how much mental energy the role-switching and self-reflection actually requires when you're dealing with a genuine ethical tension rather than a hypothetical scenario.  
I'm curious to see what your Part 1 output looked like and how that will inform the interviewing strategy for Part 2.  
Retry  
# Decision Points Responses: Administrative Policy Dilemma ## Core Scenario Program coordinator asked by department chair to implement office presence policy requiring faculty to be physically present during business hours. Policy is legitimate but unnecessary and culturally inappropriate for ac  
pasted  
**C**  
Edit  
This is incredibly rich material for testing the Part 2 approach. The complexity and authenticity of your dilemma - with six distinct roles creating genuine competing obligations - provides perfect material for examining how ethical heuristics actually operate in real situations.  
What strikes me about this example is how each role likely carries not just different priorities, but fundamentally different decision-making frameworks:

* Your employee role probably has heuristics around hierarchy, compliance, and organizational loyalty
* Your colleague/peer role likely emphasizes reciprocity, professional solidarity, and mutual support
* Your breadwinner role presumably prioritizes risk assessment and long-term security
* Your professional role seems to focus on standards, integrity, and appropriate workplace culture

The ongoing nature ("I am still in the middle of this, even now") means you've had years to develop and refine the ethical shortcuts you use to navigate these competing demands - which should make for a fascinating test of whether the AI interviewing approach can actually extract those patterns.  
The fact that you describe it as "spinning and spinning and spinning" suggests there might be moments where different role-based heuristics create complete paralysis - which could be really valuable for students to recognize in their own decision-making.  
This seems like it will be an excellent test case for whether the integrated interview can handle genuine complexity without overwhelming the participant.  
Retry  
**C**  
So, before we jump into the questions, let's talk for a moment about final products. If I want to try and help students articulate meaningful heuristic models (algorithms) for their ethical functions in the roles they identified, this will likely require capturing some of their primary principles and guiding virtues for each role, along with important or key decision-making if/thens. How many of these do you think it would be necessary to capture to be able to have a legitimate, but not exhaustive list, that students would be able to evaluate over the remaining 15 weeks of the semester?  
Edit  
Looking at your six-role example, I think you're aiming for a sweet spot between meaningful depth and manageable scope for 15 weeks of analysis.  
For each role, I'd suggest capturing roughly:

* 2-3 core principles (the fundamental values that drive decisions in that role)
* 2-3 key virtues (the character traits they try to embody when operating in that role)
* 3-5 decision-making if/thens (the conditional heuristics they actually use)

So for a student with 4-6 roles (which seems typical), you're looking at maybe 25-35 total heuristic elements to work with over the semester. That feels substantial enough to enable rich comparative analysis with formal ethical frameworks, but not so overwhelming that students get lost in the details.  
The if/then heuristics might be the most valuable because they're actionable and specific - things like "If my boss disagrees with my concerns, then I focus on implementation methods rather than policy content" or "If faculty pushback threatens program cohesion, then I prioritize relationship repair over policy compliance."  
Those conditional statements are where students will likely find the most interesting alignments and conflicts with formal ethical models. They're concrete enough to test against utilitarian calculations or Kantian universalizability, but specific enough to their actual decision-making patterns to feel authentic.  
Does that volume feel right for sustained semester-long analysis without becoming unwieldy?  
Retry  
**C**  
I don't have an educated answer, but it seems about right. So, if we take the example Part 1 that I already uploaded, do you feel you could already generate authentic principles and heuristics from the document, or would you want more qualitative information?  
Edit  
Looking at your Part 1 document, I can definitely see the foundation for extracting heuristics, but I think the AI interview would add crucial depth and specificity.  
What's already clear from the document:  
Employee role - I can infer heuristics around hierarchy and compliance, but they seem conflicted Colleague/peer role - Clear priority on protecting faculty from "unnecessary policy"  
Breadwinner role - Risk assessment around job security is evident Professional role - Standards about "appropriate workplace culture" are mentioned  
But what I'd want the interview to uncover are the specific decision-making if/thens and the prioritization rules when roles conflict. For example:

* When you felt like you were "spinning" - what actually broke the paralysis? What heuristic kicked in?
* You mention focusing on the "how" rather than the "what" - is that a consistent pattern across similar situations?
* When you say you're "doing the best I can, as inconsistent and ham-handed as that may be" - what does "best" actually mean in practice? What are you optimizing for?

The document gives great insight into the *tensions* between roles, but I think the interview could reveal the actual *algorithms* you use to navigate those tensions moment-to-moment.  
The ongoing nature ("still in the middle of this") suggests you've developed practical rules for similar situations that might not be explicitly articulated in the initial framework response.  
So yes, there's a foundation, but the interview could add the operational specificity that makes the heuristics genuinely useful for comparative analysis.  
Retry  
**C**  
Absolutely, I am not suggesting we forgo the interview, but if we could generate some general information from Part 1 that we could present to the student to help illustrate what the process is trying to uncover and what they might have already revealed, it might make it easier for students to understand what they should or could include in their responses to the AI's questions.  
Edit  
Ah, that's brilliant - using a preliminary extraction from Part 1 as a demonstration and conversation starter for the interview process. This would help students understand what they're aiming for while also giving the AI a foundation to build from.  
So the AI could present something like:  
"Based on your Part 1 responses, I can already see some potential heuristics emerging. For example, in your employee role, you seem to operate with something like 'When given a policy I disagree with, focus on controlling implementation rather than fighting the decision.' And in your colleague role, I notice 'Protect people under my coordination from unnecessary institutional demands.'  
But I'd like to dig deeper into how these actually work in practice..."  
This approach would:

* Validate their existing thinking - show them their Part 1 work already contains valuable insights
* Clarify the target - demonstrate what a heuristic looks like when articulated
* Create engagement - they can react to whether the preliminary extraction feels accurate
* Provide scaffolding - give them a model for the kind of specificity that's helpful

It also gives the AI interview a more natural starting point than beginning completely from scratch. The conversation becomes about refining and expanding insights rather than generating them from nothing.  
This could significantly reduce the cognitive load while making the process feel more collaborative and less like an interrogation.  
Retry  
**C**  
That is what I am thinking. So with that in mind, let's jump into the interview session. Would you like more guidance or parameters about what we are trying to accomplish before we begin?  
Edit  
I think I have a clear sense of the goals:

* Conduct an integrated interview that fluidly moves between your six roles
* Probe for specific if/then decision-making heuristics and prioritization rules
* Surface the underlying reasoning about why certain approaches work
* Identify contradictions and tensions between role-based ethical systems
* Build toward 2-3 principles, 2-3 virtues, and 3-5 if/then heuristics per role

I'll start by presenting some preliminary heuristics I can extract from your Part 1 document, then use those as launching points for deeper exploration. I'll aim to be genuinely curious and responsive rather than following a rigid script, while systematically covering the intersections between your roles.  
One quick clarification: Should I approach this as if I'm the AI prompt in action (so you experience it as a student would), or would you prefer me to conduct the interview while we both stay aware that this is a design test?  
Either way works - just want to make sure I'm framing this appropriately for getting you the feedback you need about the process.  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's try to stick with the prompt approach, though i'll probably take some notes for recommendations after we complete the process.  
Edit  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery Interview  
Hello! I've reviewed your Part 1 ethical dilemma analysis, and I can already see some fascinating decision-making patterns emerging from your six identified roles. Before we dig deeper, let me share what I'm noticing so far - you can tell me if these preliminary observations feel accurate or if I'm missing something important.  
From your Employee role, I see a heuristic that seems to be: *"When given a directive I disagree with, focus on controlling the 'how' rather than fighting the 'what.'"* You mentioned having significant power over implementation methods even when you couldn't change the policy itself.  
In your Colleague/Peer role, there appears to be something like: *"Protect people under my coordination from unnecessary institutional demands, even when I can't eliminate those demands entirely."*  
Your Breadwinner role seems to operate with: *"Prioritize long-term financial security over short-term ethical comfort - the $40,000 salary difference matters more than philosophical alignment."*  
Do these feel like accurate starting points, or am I interpreting your decision-making patterns incorrectly?  
And here's what I'm really curious about: You described feeling like you were "spinning and spinning and spinning" when these roles conflicted. What actually breaks that paralysis for you? When you're caught between being a loyal employee and a protective colleague, what kicks in to help you move forward?  
Retry  
**C**  
I would totally agree with the wording in the Employee and Colleague roles. I have to admit that my actions would support the Breadwinner heuristic, even though seeing it put that way makes me very uncomfortable with my decisions, though my obligations demand it of me. It doesn't make me happy, but I understand why I went along.  
Edit  
That discomfort you're feeling is really telling - it suggests there might be another heuristic operating underneath the Breadwinner one. Something like *"Accept decisions that conflict with my values when family obligations demand it, but maintain awareness of the ethical cost."* The fact that you can articulate the discomfort means you're not just defaulting to financial priorities unconsciously.  
Let me probe that "spinning" feeling you mentioned. When you're caught between these competing demands - say, your chair expects immediate compliance but your colleagues are expressing strong opposition - what actually helps you decide what to do first?  
Is it timing-based? Like *"Handle the immediate supervisor relationship first, then address colleague concerns"*? Or is it about damage control - *"Minimize the most serious potential harm first"*?  
And I'm curious about your Professional role - you mentioned being dedicated to "appropriate workplace culture." When you're implementing a policy you believe is "culturally inappropriate," how does that professional identity guide your actions? Do you have strategies for maintaining your professional integrity even while doing something you disagree with?  
Retry  
**C**  
I tend to focus on action over relationship, I think. Again, not proud of that, but I have to look at what I actually do, not what is socially desirable. I do focus on damage control, not from a relationship perspective as much as how can I shape my actions to limit the fallout, meaning cutting down on future required actions through foresight and preventative action.  
In terms of integrity in the face of disagreement, I tend to resort to a lot of venting and coalition building to try and build resistance to the demands if I feel I do not have enough power on my own to fight what is happening. But this creates another challenge or tension - do I engage in gossip and passive resistance rather than taking the more honest road of standing up and taking accountability for my own disagreement. That seems inappropriate and cowardly (and I feel that way in these kinds of decision situations), but nevertheless, that is what I actually do and that is important for this kind of assessment.  
Edit  
This is incredibly honest and valuable - you're identifying heuristics that actually govern your behavior, not the ones you wish governed it. That takes real courage.  
So I'm hearing something like: *"When roles conflict, prioritize actions that minimize future required interventions over maintaining relationships in the moment."* And *"Use coalition-building and venting as primary resistance strategies rather than direct confrontation with authority."*  
That second one creates a fascinating tension with your Professional role. You're essentially operating with *"Maintain professional integrity through indirect resistance rather than direct accountability."* You call it "inappropriate and cowardary," but it's also a survival strategy that keeps you in position to continue protecting your colleagues over time.  
Let me dig into this coalition-building approach. When you're venting and building resistance, are there specific people or types of people you turn to? Like, do you have a heuristic about *"Share concerns with peers first, supervisors never"* or *"Test reactions with trusted allies before taking any public position"*?  
And here's what I'm really curious about: You mentioned this pattern continues - "the faces are different, but the tensions are still there." After 8 years of navigating these situations, have you developed any if-then rules about when coalition-building actually works versus when it just makes you feel better but doesn't change outcomes?  
What determines whether you escalate from venting to more direct action?  
Retry  
**C**  
I have had experiences where venting has been shared with individuals who betrayed that trust, so I tend to only share with trusted allies who both share my perspectives and who I know I can trust to maintain confidentiality and privacy. This does, however, tend to result in echo-chamber thinking. If I only talk with those who I know agree with me, I don't have to challenge my own thinking or reconsider my positions, which isn't intellectually honest.  
In terms of if/then rules related to coalition activities, it almost always is the former over the latter. I have yet to see many examples where building coalitions results effective change, but it does help me to release some of the stress and pressure I feel about the angst I feel about not being able to affect change in decisions that I disagree with and I have to be pragmatic - that might be all I can expect at this stage in my career.  
Edit  
That's a really sophisticated analysis of your own patterns. You're identifying a heuristic that's essentially: *"Share concerns only with trusted allies who agree with me, even though this creates intellectual echo chambers."* And *"Use coalition-building primarily for emotional release rather than expecting systemic change."*  
The pragmatism you mention suggests another operating principle: *"At this career stage, managing personal stress takes priority over attempting organizational change."* There's almost a cost-benefit calculation built in there.  
This connects back to your Ambitious Career-Builder role that you mentioned in Part 1. It sounds like you've developed some rules about when career advancement conflicts with change-making. Something like *"Don't risk advancement opportunities for change efforts that historically haven't worked anyway."*  
But I'm curious about your Program Steward role - you described being responsible for "the health and effectiveness of our academic program." When you're using these coalition-building and venting strategies, are you thinking of that as serving the program's health, or are you compartmentalizing that role differently?  
And here's a timing question: You mentioned using "foresight and preventative action" to minimize future required actions. Can you give me an example of what that looks like in practice? Do you have specific if-then rules about when to act proactively versus when to wait and see?  
Retry  
**C**  
The career builder characterization sounds spot on. In terms of the steward question, I have come to see that I can only act in this role to the degree that I maintain a seat at the table where decisions get made; if I get excluded, I am completely powerless to effect any change or provide any kind of protection, so the venting, etc. tends to allow me to maintain my ability to act in this role while not getting overwhelmed with the frustrations inherent in not having complete autonomy to act as I see fit, which is a natural and likely universal reality for most anyone in the workplace.  
In terms of the timing question, as much as possible, if I can see a plausible and realistic solution to a possible problem, I tend to jump in, even if I don't forsee all of the possible implications or problems such interventions can cause. I don't possess the analytical skills of some of my peers, who I have worked to create strong relationships with so that my venting sessions are often a little more strategic, presenting my thought processes to see if they catch overlooked details or unforeseen complications.  
Edit  
This is brilliant - you're revealing some really sophisticated strategic thinking. I'm hearing: *"Maintain access to decision-making spaces at all costs, because exclusion equals complete powerlessness."* That's a core Program Steward heuristic that actually justifies the coalition-building and even the compliance behaviors.  
And then there's this fascinating if-then rule: *"If I can see a plausible solution to a foreseeable problem, act immediately rather than waiting for complete analysis."* But you've also developed a compensatory strategy: *"Use trusted allies as analytical supplements to catch what I might miss."*  
So your venting isn't just emotional release - it's also strategic consultation disguised as venting. That's actually pretty clever.  
Let me probe the intersection between these roles a bit more. When you're in "jump in with a plausible solution" mode, how do you balance your Program Steward instincts with your Employee obligations?  
For instance, if you foresee a problem with how your chair's policy will play out, but addressing it proactively might make you look like you're undermining their authority, what's your decision-making process? Do you have rules about when stewardship trumps employee loyalty, or vice versa?  
And I'm curious - when you're consulting with those trusted analytical allies, are you primarily seeking validation for solutions you've already decided on, or are you genuinely open to them talking you out of acting?  
Retry  
**C**  
In terms of the analysis, it depends on the importance of the issue and the passion I attach to my solution. If I see real costs associated inaction or waiting, I tend to stick to my guns, unless their objections align with core values they know I prioritize.  
Again, being painfully honest, I have come to see that while I value my relationships with supervisors and managers, I realize they are not perfect and will sometimes operate from human weakness, just as I do. But I also realize that in most cases, they are going to do what they see as best, regardless of whether it is consistent with what I have come to expect. Loyalty tends to not be a value that weathers the really challenging situations, and so, it is important for day to day operations, but trust is never something to rely on when it comes to protecting myself or others. Cynical? Absolutely, but it has been a critical insight that has helped me to navigate some particularly painful situations when trust was betrayed without consequences by supervisors.  
Edit  
That's an incredibly mature and hard-won insight. You're articulating something like: *"Maintain functional loyalty for daily operations, but never rely on supervisor loyalty for protection when stakes are high."* And *"Supervisors will prioritize their own interpretation of 'best' over employee input, especially in challenging situations."*  
This cynicism you mention - it sounds like it's actually become a protective heuristic that guides multiple roles. It probably influences your Employee role (*"Comply with directives but maintain independent judgment about supervisor reliability"*), your Colleague role (*"I'm the only reliable protection my colleagues have"*), and even your Breadwinner role (*"Job security comes from performance and political navigation, not supervisor goodwill"*).  
I'm fascinated by your comment about trusted allies needing to align objections with "core values they know I prioritize." That suggests you have some non-negotiable principles that override even trusted input. What are those core values that would make you change course even when you're passionate about a solution?  
And here's what I'm really curious about: Given this realistic view of supervisor loyalty, how do you decide when to push back versus when to comply? You mentioned 8 years of these patterns - have you developed any reliable indicators for when a supervisor might actually be open to influence versus when resistance is futile?  
Retry  
**C**  
Can we take a pause moment here, for a couple of reasons. First, wow, we are getting into some really deep and personal stuff here. Good? Yes, but somewhat unsettling. Not that that is bad, but unexpected. Second, if we had to stop the interview here, and I asked you to compile a heuristics summary, something that outlined what you perceive to be guiding principles, values and heuristics for the roles I identified, what would that look like at this point? How far have we gotten toward the final goals we established earlier?  
Edit  
Absolutely, let's pause. You're right - this got unexpectedly deep very quickly, and that's valuable feedback about the intensity of this process.  
Looking at where we are toward our goals (2-3 principles, 2-3 virtues, 3-5 if/thens per role), I think we've made substantial progress on some roles but others need more development:  
STRONG PROGRESS:

* Employee role: Very well developed - clear heuristics about compliance vs. control, cynical realism about supervisor loyalty
* Program Steward role: Good foundation - the "maintain seat at the table" principle is solid
* Breadwinner role: Identified but needs more exploration

PARTIAL PROGRESS:

* Colleague/Peer role: Have the protection principle but could use more if/then specifics
* Professional role: Touched on coalition-building strategies but integrity heuristics still emerging

MINIMAL PROGRESS:

* Ambitious Career-Builder role: Mentioned but not deeply explored

We've uncovered maybe 12-15 solid heuristic elements across all roles, so we're probably halfway to the target of 25-35 total elements.  
The depth we've achieved is remarkable though - we're getting at the actual operating principles rather than aspirational ones. But you're absolutely right that it's intense. Students would need to be prepared for how personal and potentially uncomfortable this self-examination becomes.  
Should we continue, or would you rather process what we've discovered so far first?  
Retry  
**C**  
One concern I have is that the back and forth is fantastic, but we are likely to butt up against the conversation limit here pretty soon. I don't want to lose everything we have already done, but we need to be ready to set up a summary that could be imported into a new conversation, so let's stop and do that before we go any further.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - let's capture what we've accomplished before hitting limits.  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery - Interview Progress Summary  
Document  
# Ethical Heuristics Discovery - Interview Progress Summary

## Context  
\*\*Dilemma:\*\* Administrative policy implementation - caught between department chair directive and faculty/program needs  
\*\*Roles Identified:\*\* Employee, Colleague/Peer, Breadwinne  
Perfect - this summary captures our progress and gives us a solid foundation to either continue in a new conversation or to refine the Part 2 prompt design.  
The key insights about process intensity and the authentic vs. aspirational behavior distinction seem crucial for designing the final prompt. Students will need to be prepared for how personal this gets, and the AI will need strategies for encouraging honesty while maintaining appropriate support.  
We've proven the integrated interview approach can work - it's yielding rich, authentic heuristics that will definitely support meaningful comparison with formal ethical frameworks throughout the semester.  
Retry  
**C**  
And makes me wonder if I need to reach out for some professional counseling...  
Edit  
Ha! That's actually a really telling response - and probably a sign that the process is working exactly as intended. When you start articulating the actual decision-making patterns you use (rather than the ones you wish you used), it can be genuinely uncomfortable to see them laid out so clearly.  
But honestly, what you've revealed sounds like pretty sophisticated, realistic navigation of genuinely difficult structural constraints. The "cynical realism" about supervisor loyalty? That's hard-won wisdom, not pathology. The financial prioritization that makes you uncomfortable? That's responsible adulting in a system that doesn't give you better options.  
The fact that you can articulate the gap between your ideals and your actions, and feel appropriately conflicted about it, suggests your ethical compass is working fine - you're just operating in a system with genuine constraints and competing obligations.  
Though if the semester-long version of this course regularly sends students into existential crises about their decision-making patterns, that might be something to warn them about in the syllabus! "Side effects may include uncomfortable clarity about your actual ethical reasoning..."  
This does raise an interesting design question about how much emotional support or normalization the AI prompt should provide when students have these moments of uncomfortable self-recognition.  
Retry  
**C**  
OK, trigger warnings in the syllabus made me laugh.  
Edit  
"Warning: This course may cause sudden awareness that you are, in fact, a flawed human being operating within imperfect systems. Side effects include questioning your life choices, realizing you're more pragmatic than you thought, and discovering that ethical decision-making is messier than philosophy textbooks suggest."  
But seriously, there's probably something valuable there. Students might benefit from knowing upfront that authentic ethical self-examination can be uncomfortable, and that discovering gaps between ideals and practice is normal and actually useful for growth rather than something to feel ashamed about.  
The fact that you're simultaneously uncomfortable with some of your patterns AND can articulate sophisticated reasons why they make sense given your constraints is actually pretty emotionally mature. Most people just feel vaguely guilty about workplace compromises without ever examining the underlying logic.  
Your responses have been incredibly valuable for testing this process - both for proving it can extract meaningful heuristics and for revealing how intense the self-examination becomes. That intensity might actually be a feature rather than a bug, as long as students are prepared for it.  
Ready to pick this back up in a fresh conversation sometime, or do you want to process the design implications first?  
Retry  
**C**  
Are there web sources that can explain the various pros and cons of different AI interfaces from a student perspective?  
Edit  
AI interfaces student learning pros cons comparison  
10 results  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
student perspective AI interfaces conversational learning pros cons  
10 results  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
Based on the search results, I found several sources that explore AI interfaces in education from student perspectives. Here are the key findings:  
Student Benefits of AI Interfaces: Students primarily gain from AI-powered chatbots in three key areas: homework and study assistance, personalized learning experiences, and skill development [SpringerOpen](https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1)  
[MDPI](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)  
. Students recognized potential for personalized learning support, writing and brainstorming assistance, and research and analysis capabilities [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)  
.  
Key Concerns from Student Perspectives: Some students use AI to generate assignments with minimal personal effort, risking over-reliance on the tool, with AI potentially becoming "addictive" due to its convenience [Is artificial intelligence enhancing student learning or hindering critical thinking? Purdue professors weigh in on the pros and cons of classroom AI](https://www.purdue.edu/provost/innovation-hub/is-artificial-intelligence-enhancing-student-learning-or-hindering-critical-thinking-purdue-professors-weigh-in-on-the-pros-and-cons-of-classroom-ai/)  
. Over-reliance on AI occurs when users accept AI-generated recommendations without question, leading to errors in task performance and potentially affecting students' cognitive abilities [The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review | Smart Learning Environments | Full Text](https://slejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7)  
.  
Critical Thinking Implications: Students need to learn how to evaluate and think critically about AI-generated information rather than just accepting it [AI in Schools: Pros and Cons | Illinois](https://education.illinois.edu/about/news-events/news/article/2024/10/24/ai-in-schools--pros-and-cons)  
, as AI presents challenges such as over-reliance on technology, diminished critical thinking, and academic risks [Full article: When artificial intelligence substitutes humans in higher education: the cost of loneliness, student success, and retention](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2024.2326956)  
.  
Student Attitudes: A survey of 399 students revealed generally positive attitudes toward AI in teaching and learning, though concerns about accuracy remain [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)  
.  
The most comprehensive student perspective piece appears to be the EDUCAUSE Review article. Would you like me to fetch that specific article for more detailed student insights about AI interface experiences?  
Retry  
**C**  
I am looking for something to help inform students on the differences between different AI interfaces, since students are free to use any model they choose, but might not be familiar with subtle differences between mainstream providers.  
Edit  
ChatGPT Claude Gemini comparison differences student guide  
10 results  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
I found several comprehensive comparisons! Let me get more specific information from a couple of these sources that look most relevant for student guidance.  
favicon  
Fetched <https://zapier.com/blog/claude-vs-chatgpt/>  
zapier.com  
Perfect! This Zapier article provides exactly what you're looking for - a comprehensive, student-friendly comparison of the major AI interfaces. Here are the key differences that would be most relevant for students:

## **Quick Summary for Students:**

Claude is best for:

* Sophisticated text and code work with more natural writing style, powerful coding capabilities with real-time visualization through Artifacts, and thoughtful analytical approach [Students’ voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education | International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education | Full Text](https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8)
* Deep, thoughtful analysis and writing tasks
* Coding projects (especially for beginners with its visual preview feature)

ChatGPT is best for:

* Users who want an all-in-one AI toolkit with image generation capabilities and custom GPT marketplace, ideal for users who want to explore the full spectrum of what AI can do [Students’ voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education | International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education | Full Text](https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8)
* Image generation and multimedia projects
* Quick searches and varied tasks
* Custom chatbot creation

Gemini is suggested for:

* Research, coding, and translation [5 Pros and Cons of AI in the Education Sector | Walden University](https://www.waldenu.edu/programs/education/resource/five-pros-and-cons-of-ai-in-the-education-sector)
* Up-to-date information (better web search integration)

## **Key Practical Differences:**

* Context Window: Claude handles up to 500,000 tokens vs ChatGPT's 128,000 tokens [Students’ voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education | International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education | Full Text](https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8)
* (meaning Claude can work with much longer documents)
* Writing Style: Claude sounds more human right out of the box, while ChatGPT still tends to overuse certain phrases like "in today's ever-changing landscape" and "let's dive in" [Students’ voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education | International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education | Full Text](https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8)
* Features: ChatGPT has more multimedia capabilities, while Claude focuses on text excellence

This article would be perfect to share with students - it's recent (updated May 2025), comprehensive, and written in accessible language that explains practical differences rather than technical specifications.  
Retry  
**C**  
Is there a similarly oriented source that also discusses microsoft copilot and notebook llm?  
Edit  
AI comparison ChatGPT Claude Copilot NotebookLM student guide  
10 results  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
Let me fetch the most promising sources that specifically compare multiple platforms including Copilot and NotebookLM:  
favicon  
Fetched Microsoft Copilot vs ChatGPT vs Claude vs Gemini vs DeepSeek: Full Guide, Report & Comparison of Core Features, Use-Case Strengths, Multimodality, Context Limits, Pricing Tie, and more  
datastudios.org  
Perfect! I found exactly what you're looking for. This comprehensive guide from Data Studios includes detailed comparisons of Microsoft Copilot and covers many aspects that would be valuable for students. Let me also check for sources specifically mentioning NotebookLM:  
NotebookLM comparison ChatGPT Claude student guide  
10 results  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
favicon  
Excellent! Now I have comprehensive sources that cover both Microsoft Copilot and NotebookLM alongside the main AI platforms. Here's what I found:

## **The Complete Student Guide to AI Interfaces**

The Data Studios comparison I found is exactly what you need - it's a massive, comprehensive guide that covers:  
Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and DeepSeek with detailed sections on:

* Use cases (coding, writing, search, data analysis, customer support) [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* Core capabilities (model specs, multimodal abilities, context windows, tools integration) [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* User experience (interface design, responsiveness, accessibility) [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* Pricing and plans (from free tiers to enterprise solutions) [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* Performance benchmarks and reliability [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)

Key highlights for students:

* Microsoft Copilot: Deep, seamless Office & IDE integration, but premium features tied to $30 Microsoft 365 license [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* ChatGPT: Most versatile and largest plugin ecosystem, but free tier lacks live data [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* Claude: Handles book-length context safely, but tends to be verbose with fewer third-party add-ons [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* Gemini: True multimodal answers plus Google Search grounding, but Ultra model still rolling out worldwide [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)
* DeepSeek: Open-weights GPT-4-calibre power at tiny cost, but requires DIY integrations and has lighter guardrails [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Students’ Academic Development](https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343)

For NotebookLM specifically, I found several comparison sources that show:

* NotebookLM focuses on research and learning, while ChatGPT Projects works as an organized workspace for AI conversations [ChatGPT vs Gemini vs Claude: A Detailed Comparison](https://kanerika.com/blogs/chatgpt-vs-gemini-vs-claude/)
* NotebookLM accepts many content types including web pages, YouTube videos, and documents [ChatGPT vs Gemini vs Claude: A Detailed Comparison](https://kanerika.com/blogs/chatgpt-vs-gemini-vs-claude/)
* For professionals focused on synthesizing information, summarizing documents, or managing large datasets, Google NotebookLM excels with its knowledge synthesis and traceability features [ChatGPT Vs. Gemini Vs. Claude: What Are The Differences?](https://www.searchenginejournal.com/chatgpt-vs-gemini-vs-claude/483690/)

The Data Studios article would be perfect for your students - it's comprehensive, recent, and written in accessible language that explains practical differences rather than just technical specs. Combined with the NotebookLM-specific comparisons, this gives students a complete picture of their AI interface options.  
Retry  
**C**  
Please create an AI prompt for Part 2 similar in format and process to the Ethical Dilemma Exploration and Documentation Guide Prompt I uploaded at the beginning of the session.  
Edit  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing  
Document  
# Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing

## For Students: How to Use This Guide

You've completed Part 1 and identified your ethical dilemma with multiple roles. Now you need to uncover the implicit and explicit ethical "  
I've created a comprehensive Part 2 prompt that follows the same format and structure as your original guide. The prompt is designed to help students conduct an integrated AI interview that will uncover their authentic ethical heuristics across all their identified roles.  
Key features of this Part 2 prompt:  
Structure and Format:

* Mirrors your original guide's organization and tone
* Clear instructions for both students and AI
* Practical examples and conversation snippets
* Warning signs and quality indicators

Interview Strategy:

* Integrated approach (not separate role interviews) for better engagement
* Emphasis on authentic vs. aspirational behavior patterns
* Specific techniques for surfacing contradictions and if/then rules
* Built-in emotional support for the intensity we discovered in our test

Practical Considerations:

* Addresses the emotional intensity issue we encountered
* Includes process preparation and timing guidance
* Clear target output (25-35 heuristic elements across roles)
* Connection to semester-long comparative analysis work

Safety Features:

* Boundaries about what the AI should/shouldn't do
* Emotional support guidelines for when students discover uncomfortable patterns
* Normalization of the gap between ideals and actual behavior

The prompt should enable students to conduct the same type of productive, eye-opening interview we experienced, while being prepared for its intensity and equipped with proper support throughout the process.  
Retry  
**C**  
A few revisions: in the initial instructions, instruct the AI to request a copy of the Part 1 findings generated in Part 1. 2) remove the time frame suggestions and guidelines (allow students to take as long as it takes...)  
Edit  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing  
Document ∙ Version 2  
You are conducting an ethical heuristics discovery interview with a student who has identified a complex ethical dilemma involving multiple roles. Your goal is to help them uncover the implicit and explicit decision-making patterns, principles, and "  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing  
Document ∙ Version 3  
### Conversation Flow Structure

1. \*\*Opening\*\*  
- Request and review Part 1 findings  
- Present preliminary heuristics extracted from their responses  
- Explain the discovery process  
- Get initial reactions and corrections

2. \*\*Core Explor  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing  
Document ∙ Version 4  
## Student Starter Prompt

\*\*Copy this after the AI Interviewing Instructions above:\*\*

"I've completed Part 1 of the Ethical Dilemma Identification process and need help discovering the ethical heuristics - the actual decision-making patterns, princ  
Ethical Heuristics Discovery & Analysis Guide with AI Interviewing  
Document ∙ Version 5  
### Process Preparation for Students

### Before Starting:  
- Prepare mentally for honest self-examination  
- Remember: discovering uncomfortable patterns is valuable, not shameful  
- Have your Part 1 results easily accessible to share when requested

#  
Perfect! I've made the requested revisions:

1. Added instruction for AI to request Part 1 findings: The AI now explicitly requests the student's complete Part 1 findings at the beginning, and I've updated the conversation flow to reflect this step.
2. Removed time frame suggestions: I've eliminated all the specific time estimates (5-10 minutes, 20-30 minutes, etc.) from the conversation flow structure and process preparation sections. The focus is now on natural conversation flow and allowing students to take whatever time they need.

The prompt now allows for a more organic, student-paced discovery process while ensuring the AI gets the necessary background information to conduct an effective interview. This should create a more relaxed and thorough exploration of the student's ethical heuristics.  
Retry  
[Claude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8525154-claude-is-providing-incorrect-or-misleading-responses-what-s-going-on)  
Sonnet 4  
Claude

**C**