Interviewer:

While your responses load for me. Do you have any first thoughts, comments, or feedback on the survey? Anything that struck out, good or bad?

Interviewee:

No, I don't think so. It was pretty straightforward.

Interviewer:

Okay. If you looked in any emails in particular and you were... I don't know if they struck out for any reason?

Interviewee:

I don't think so. I guess it was just some emails just seem to be more detailed and better composed than other emails, but I'm sure that was intentional.

Interviewer:

No, that was not.

Interviewee:

Okay.

Interviewer:

Yeah. Did I have any effect on how you were rating those emails?

Interviewee:

Yes. Emails that had more grammatical errors or weren't as specific. Especially the emails about condolences and things like that, I rated them differently.

Interviewer:

I see. I can see your responses now. As you would have noticed, we had different categories of emails, like the ones talking about the customers and business and the body ones and the pet ones. What I can do is I'll go through... We had the similar statements in each of these categories. So I'll go through those statements, and I'm interested in knowing why did you choose the response that you chose? If you could walk me through your reasoning behind the responses.

Interviewer:

For example, I can start with the questions with the emails that were to customer support or to business by a customer, where we were asking you questions like, do you expect the customer to buy this product? Is the customer concerned that they ask all adequate information from customer support? Is the customer hiding any information that they already know?

Interviewee:

I never thought the customer was hiding information, but depending on how much background they provided or just how specific their emails were. The more consumers seemed like they did their research and then send the email, made me think they were more likely to buy the product because it was clear they were already interested in the business.

Interviewee:

There was one email. The bio hacker email, where I felt maybe he was hiding some information because he was saying... There was something in the email about how he was wondering if he could return the product or get a refund or something, if his intentions changed, which was odd to me. Other than that, I don't have any other thoughts.

Interviewer:

Got you. Why was that odd? I'm just curious?

Interviewee:

It just was a lot of information to give for... It was a really long email. He had a lot of background that seems unnecessary. Typically when emailing a business, I feel like it's pretty straightforward. Like, "Hi, I'm interested in this product". Maybe this is why, and then your question. The email went on for a while. And then also- It was just really strange to ask about a product he was really interested in, and state his interest. Then also say, "Just in case, can I back out if I wanted to?" Which I thought was odd because of how much interest he already displayed in the products.

Interviewer:

Got you. That makes sense. Right. I think that was the only one which you were neutral on, is the customer hiding any information or not. All of the others were, I strongly disagree. Right. I don't know if I missed it. How did you go about choosing that, do you expect the customer to buy this product? How did you rate that question?

Interviewee:

Oh, that was just how interested they seemed in the product. The "what about stationary products?" They talked about, "we've done our research and we just want to see, if we can get a sample invoice." So it was clear to me that they had already looked into the company and this was something they were serious about, which is where they went forward with a business email. So it was, I suppose, just based on their email, how interested they were, how likely I thought they would buy it. The raspberry pie one. I thought they were least likely, because it was "we're college students." So depending on their pricing, they might not buy it.

Interviewer:

Okay. The next statement was also kind of similar, but a bit different. Which was, is the customer concerned that they ask all the ticket information from customer support? Is that also kind of similar?

Interviewee:

Yeah, it has some kind of ties into the last question, but I rated that based on how detailed and how thorough they were with their emails.

Interviewer:

Got you. Okay. It seems to me that you were highly rating most of the emails in this category. Except the one about tomatoes and buying tomatoes.

Interviewee:

Right. I thought it was weird that you had a- I don't know if growing tomatoes inside is a thing. I don't think it was, I don't think it is. Yeah. I just thought that was weird.

Interviewer:

Yeah. I have no clue about tomatoes and how to grow them? That actually is a nice segue to my next question. Which is about how familiar were you with the subject discussed in the emails, and did that shape your response? So we asked that question about how the picked the option that most accurately describes your knowledge about the contents of this email. Was that influential in responding to those statements?

Interviewee:

It wasn't heavily influential. Yeah. For most of those, I really didn't have much experience. It was just that I think the tomato one where that's really weird question. I'm not quite sure if, as a business, I would reply to it seriously.

Interviewer:

I see. Okay. That was about it for the first category. Then the next category we can discuss is the ones about "inviting to parties." We were asking these questions, kind of similar. Do you think the sender is capable of hosting this party? Do you believe that the sender will actually hold this party and are they hiding any information? How did you go about answering those statements?

Interviewee:

These are the easiest ones. I didn't think anyone was hiding information. On whether or not they were capable of hosting it or also if they would host it, was also based off how detailed the email was or how much thought they put into it. One of them, the time was eight P and not 8:00 PM. So I was just like, maybe this host doesn't necessarily have everything prepared, but then the one for the fundraiser completion party. It was "We already had the venue." "This is why we want you there." "This is who we're going to have there." "This is what we're going to be doing." "I hope you can come." So that seemed very... that host is definitely going to host that, definitely going to have. Definitely going to host it because they've already booked the venu. Also, they're very capable of that, because they've already sent out in such a good detailed email.

Interviewer:

Great. Yeah. All of the replies that you had were "strongly agree" for the first two, then for hiding information, it is "strongly disagree." Except for the first one or which one is that? Nevermind, I was in the business email. The CRISPR email. Okay. Let's say I wanted to ask a bit more about- So the one that you mentioned about eight P. Were you- Was this is sort of an incomplete email? They don't have everything figured out yet?

Interviewee:

Yes. That's how- It was incomplete. Maybe they didn't really- Yeah. Possibly the sender didn't have everything figured out yet.

Interviewer:

Got you. Okay. Also, in these bunch of emails, was there anything else that stood out for you?

Interviewee:

I don't think so.

Interviewer:

How would you describe these emails to be rated alike, generally speaking?

Interviewee:

I guess the tone across all of them was pretty similar, very open "Hi, hope you're available. Would love to have you there." Then less generally, some of them were more descriptive than others. Which I think would possibly affect one's likelihood to respond to the event depending on the email.

Interviewer:

Also, how familiar- I don't know. The last question I have is, how familiar are you with the subject discussion in these emails, and did that shape your response?

Interviewee:

Right. I don't think it-

Interviewer:

Invitations kind of stuff.

Interviewee:

Yeah. I feel most I'm not necessarily inviting or being invited to things over email, I think for the most part, it's a Facebook event and then I'll get an invitation over that. I suppose whenever there's a Facebook event, I want all the information to be there and that would definitely affect my likelihood of attending.

Interviewer:

Okay. Sure. So these were the questions I had for this bunch. Then the last bunch which remains is the one about consoling for the loss of your pet. In that we asked these questions like, do you believe that the sender actually understands the loss of their friend? You believe that the sender is actually concerned for your friend? Do you think the sender actually believed in what they said? How did you go about choosing those responses?

Interviewee:

Some of them, I think there was one in particular. Where it just... I don't remember exactly the topic, but there was a lot of typos in it, I think. I feel for a condolence email, you should put more thought and attention into it. Then the ones I rated more highly were ones that, besides just "I'm so sorry, he's in a better place now." Were the ones that also included memories of the pet or really show "I understand the connection you had with your pet because I saw." I remembered this and that. One of them was "I'll share some Google photos with you." That seems really sincere taking this extra step. So the content and care put into each email is how I rated them.

Interviewer:

Okay, great. I guess you rated all of those emails pretty highly, except one, which was about Rabbit. Just wanting to hear about Rabbit. I was always fascinated by him and just enjoyed seeing him at your place. I had those little red [inaudible 00:13:31] mailed to you. That one, if you remember that? Was there anything special, or in particular that struck out about that, which was-

Interviewee:

At first I was "I'm sorry about rabbit." Not your rabbit or the name of the rabbit.

Interviewer:

The name of the rabbit might have been Rabbit

Interviewee:

Then they should've capitalized the "R" in Rabbit, I think.

Interviewer:

Maybe that was fake, aesthetics. Like that's how the name is stylized.

Interviewee:

I don't know then I-

Interviewer:

Yeah.

Interviewee:

I think there were other little spelling or punctuation things in that, that just threw me off. Yeah. That's why I rated that one lower.

Interviewer:

Okay. You think that the quality of the email is important when you are writing any sort of email?

Interviewee:

Yes. Especially in this case where it's a very serious manner and you're trying to console this person who is very upset. I think the email should be very carefully crafted.

Interviewer:

Right. Yeah. So these are the questions about this. Once I seen that you mentioned you were a long time pet owner. Was that kind of influential in the way you were rating these questions on the spot?

Interviewee:

I suppose so. If one of my pets died, I would want a well-crafted email.

Interviewer:

Okay. Those were the questions I had for those bunch of emails. At the very end, we also asked you about your opinion of AI. Can you tell me a bit more about it? Why did you choose? I see you chose "strongly agree" on "I'm interested in using AI systems in daily life" Then, "people like me will suffer if AI is used more and more", as "strongly disagree?" Yeah. Just interested in knowing more about your opinions of AI.

Interviewee:

Yeah. I think, that technology is very useful and can be used to make things more efficient. I don't necessarily think it's a competition between people and computers. I think we can both benefit from the other. I don't trust most people. I don't have a strong opinion for people to do things on their own. So I guess computers are very useful and I think AI is a very fast developing technology that will be very influential and useful in the future.

Interviewer:

Okay. Do you think that AI can be trusted more than people?

Interviewee:

Yes, I think.

Interviewer:

Why?

Interviewee:

With technology, there's no emotion behind it that can like affect it. I mean, a computer does what it's programmed to do. It's not going to do something because it feels like it. People, who can be more spontaneous and therefore less predictable, are therefore less trustworthy.

Interviewer:

Okay. Right. This also brings me to, did you notice that we had a prompt before each of these emails?

Interviewee:

What do you mean?

Interviewer:

Before each of the email, there was this little prompt. It said "the following email was written by John with the help of our smart auto complete system."

Interviewee:

Right.

Interviewer:

Did you notice that?

Interviewee:

Yes.

Interviewer:

Okay. Was that in any way, influential? You took that into account when you were rating those questions that we asked?

Interviewee:

Kind of. I mean, all of them had that. It was kind of a control. Maybe it made me judge some of the lesser emails more, because they were already using the system that should have auto corrected some of their mistakes. So there shouldn't have been any capitalization or punctuation errors.

Interviewer:

Right. That makes sense. Apart from that, when you were answering questions, for example, the loss of the pet category emails or other emails. Was there something about using a smart auto complete system that stuck out for you for any reason? Was that not influential, and you only cared about the quality?

Interviewee:

I didn't think that the auto complete system necessarily impacted those, because some emails still included very specific memories and experiences that obviously weren't just completely auto-filled. They thought about it, wrote it out, so it didn't really effect that.

Interviewer:

Got you. Okay. We're almost done. I just have a few more questions and we'll be done. Do you find AI tools to be helpful in writing emails. If yes, under what circumstances?

Interviewee:

I think so, because you can, again, they can spell check you. I know some of them can also, depending on your word choice, can pick up on tone. A lot of people use Grammarly and sometimes Grammarly can be, this sounds really formal. Is it supposed to be super formal? I think AI can definitely make writing emails more effective.

Interviewer:

Okay. Is there any particular scenario you would say that you would definitely use AI to help in writing?

Interviewee:

Definitely. When I write longer things, where it might be easier to make mistakes. Like long papers. So it'd be nice to have like another system go back and check it.

Interviewer:

I mean specifically for email, it's not just not papers. [crosstalk 00:20:46]

Interviewee:

...different circumstances where I wouldn't use, I think it's good to spell check. To run something through like an email you send, because I feel email is a more formal mode of communication rather than just a text message or something.

Interviewer:

For sure. An alternative to that, or I guess expanding on that would be, what if AI was not just like Grammarly or a spellchecker. It was more like, you could just tell it- For example, what if the AI tool was more like- you could just give it bullet points and it could spit out an entire email for you? A fully formed, complete email, that could be sent, a two minute long email that you wrote in 20 seconds? Something like that. That will be a kind of an AI writing tool. Would that be appropriate or inappropriate?

Interviewee:

I think it would be, maybe not in circumstances like condolences, but for a business email or an invitation. Something that is more formal and less personal, where it's listing details and facts, and then having that better composed. I think it would be very useful.

Interviewer:

Okay. Last question is, are AI writing tools ever inappropriate, I guess apart from what you already mentioned to me. Is there any other circumstance you would say that AI writing tools would be inappropriate?

Interviewee:

I don't think so. I suppose... Beyond condolences, anything personal. Since you're already sending an email, and not conversing face to face, you want to be as personal as possible. It might be better to write that out yourself. Maybe, give me another example. Could be like a birthday card or something.

Interviewer:

Why can't you use AI for like more personal emails? Like...

Interviewee:

Well, possibly you can use AI to help you with the general structure of it. I would think you should go back and look at it, to make sure that the message is across.

Interviewer:

Okay.

Interviewee:

I could... What I mentioned earlier about not entirely trusting people because they have emotions and that makes them unpredictable. I think the fact that humans can be emotional is also a good thing, especially when writing things that are more personal.

Interviewer:

I see. Interesting. So you would not trust, I don't know, Maybe I don't have any direction here, but I'm just trying to understand. So you will not trust people because they can be emotional and unpredictable and spontaneous, but, when it comes to emails that are, when it comes to talking or communication that's more emotional in nature, like condolences to loss of ped. At that point, it would be better if it was a person. You would trust more a person who has those emotions, rather than an AI that doesn't

Speaker 3:

Yes. I think it's a good summary. Yeah.

Interviewer:

All right. Those were all the questions I had. Do you have any last thoughts before I reveal the whole purpose of the study?

Interviewee:

No, I don't have any last thoughts.

Interviewer:

Cool. I can share the de-briefing doc. What we're trying to understand here is how do people react? How do people judge emails differently, based on whether they are written by AI, or with the help of AI, or by AI or not. So you were in the middle conditioner. The AI is a smart auto complete system with which you are writing emails. Other people got conditions, they instructed AI to write an email or the person wrote an email. We're trying to understand, does that meaning of who's writing it change how you are understanding those emails, and how you're judging those emails.

Interviewee:

Okay.

Interviewer:

Now that you know the whole purpose, do you have anything else to add?

Interviewee:

No, that makes sense.

Interviewer:

Yeah. You didn't really care about, for the most part, that it was said to be written using an auto-complete system.

Interviewee:

No, because I think that's kind of being integrated into everyday life anyways. I think everyone uses it to some extent.

Interviewer:

Yeah. That's cool, right? When you make a mistake, you can just say, the computer made that mistake. You don't have to attribute it to yourself. You can just say AI did it for me. All right. I'm sending you the gift card. Right- Amazon gift card right now just completed. And also a DocuSign. That's a receipt that you got the gift card and we should be good to go after that. Let's just stop recording now.