

Brianna Tieu

ITWS 1100

Lab 3B – Reflection

For this lab, the AI of choice was ChatGPT. I did 10 iterations in total and after each iteration, I noticed that ChatGPT was suggesting more advanced improvements to the site. For example, for one of the iterations, I asked ChatGPT to help me display the screenshots from the setup lab or Lab 1 in a cleaner way. It gave me a grid format to put the images in, but also gave me a more complex version, where it implemented a carousel to display all the images. When I attempted to use the code from ChatGPT for the carousel, the image display was broken. The image sizing was off and the carousel was not going through all the images properly. Then, it started this rabbit hole of incorrect code when I asked ChatGPT to fix the bugs and in the end, the bugs could not be resolved, so I reverted the changes involving the carousel. I thought this was extremely interesting and an example of why we as developers need to be wary when using AI agents to code. Oftentimes when the assistant runs into a bug, typically if their first response doesn't solve the issue, we get down into this cycle of the AI attempting bug fixes that seem completely incorrect.

However, I thought ChatGPT did a great job with the website customization otherwise. I learned a lot from the code that was produced from ChatGPT and thought about how I could incorporate the syntax and features I learned into my own code. I also thought I could be more broad with the specifications of what I asked the AI to do because after seeing the class example where Claude was able to create a beautiful site given virtually no guidelines or restrictions, I was amazed. I never realized I could incorporate that much customization and functionality using only HTML and CSS. When Claude generated the site in class however, I thought that I shouldn't have been so specific with what I wanted fixed. For example, for one of my prompts, I asked the AI to fix my navigation bar to make it more interactive and dynamic. Instead, I could've expanded this prompt by asking if the AI had other alternative ideas to the current layout of the navigation bar, as the code didn't change the structure of what I had, simply the

styling. I think I might've been particular with what I wanted in the website and therefore I wouldn't say any of my commits were particularly significant or changed that much of the site. I went into this lab already having three aspects of the site I wanted to have: a better navigation bar, more color on the site, and a better grid design to display all the labs. Overall, I would say what you get out of developing with AI is all about what you put in and your prompts. I think AI can get more done when you give it the freedom to think and not restrict it to complete one small feature. I think in the future, I could refine my prompts by not making them so harsh and by giving the AI as much context as possible. I also noticed while developing that if there had been a few messages since the AI assistant had seen my code, the quality of the code decreased drastically. I found that to be a bit annoying while using ChatGPT, but I would say for the best results, this is required. Ultimately, I think agentic AI is an extremely helpful tool for programming, as it helps us explore new concepts, see examples of it in action, and acts as a built-in tutor. However, it should only be used as a tool and not a crutch to rely on. ChatGPT could write hundreds of lines of code that could work exactly as expected, but if it makes no sense to the developer and at that point, it takes away from the learning experience. It is up to the developer to be in the driver's seat and determine if the AI assistant is incorrect, which it is in many cases as AI is smart, but it isn't perfect.