Interview with P5

Interviewer: Hi, thank you for taking the time to participate in our research interview about the GPT Store. We'll chat for about 20 minutes - I'm mainly interested in learning about your experience and thoughts using the GPT Store. First, could you briefly introduce how you've been using the GPT Store?

P5: Hi there! No problem. I've been using the GPT Store since shortly after it launched, so for about one year now. I'm a software developer with a strong interest in AI, so I frequently try different GPTs to help with my work or solve everyday problems.

Interviewer: Great! Could you share some of the GPTs you use most frequently and what you use them for?

P5: I mainly use programming-related GPTs that help me find bugs or optimize my code. Then there are some GPTs that help me write documentation, and occasionally I use some for data analysis. I've also tried some of the more creative GPTs, but those were mostly out of curiosity.

Interviewer: I see. What's your impression of the quality of these GPTs you've been using?

P5: To be honest, the quality varies tremendously. Some GPTs are really excellent - they understand my intent accurately and provide valuable assistance. But I've also encountered many GPTs that aren't so great - they feel like someone just threw them together without much thought or refinement.

Interviewer: Could you elaborate on these quality differences? What specific aspects stand out to you?

P5: Sure. High-quality GPTs typically understand my questions precisely, even when I'm not being super clear. They provide targeted solutions and consider various edge cases. But the lower-quality ones can only handle the most basic questions - once the problem gets a bit complex, they give very generic answers, sometimes completely irrelevant.

Also, good GPTs usually have some continuity - they remember previous conversations and can build on them. The not-so-good ones seem to start from scratch every time, with no contextual coherence.

Interviewer: You mentioned differences among creators. Could you share more observations about that?

P5: Yeah, I think the quality of GPTs largely depends on the expertise and commitment of the developers who created them. You can clearly tell which GPTs were created by professionals who really know what they're doing - they carefully design prompts, consider potential use cases, and continuously optimize based on feedback.

In contrast, some GPTs feel like someone's casual experiment. They might only have very basic functionality without considering the various scenarios that might come up in actual use. These GPTs often lack personalization capabilities, giving you the feeling of a generic template.

Interviewer: Could you give a specific example to illustrate this difference?

P5: Sure. I used a GPT for code analysis that not only found bugs but also explained why the bug occurred and provided several possible fixes, each with detailed pros and cons. This was clearly created by an experienced developer who understood what programmers really need when dealing with bugs.

But I also tried another GPT that claimed to do the same thing, and it just pointed out errors with very basic fix suggestions, without any in-depth analysis. When I asked why it worked that way, it gave very superficial explanations that seemed copy-pasted from some programming 101 tutorial.

Interviewer: How do these quality differences affect your decisions about which GPTs to choose and use?

P5: It has a huge impact. I've become much more cautious now and won't easily try a new GPT unless it has good reviews or is developed by a creator I trust. I also spend more time testing a GPT's capability boundaries to see how it performs with complex problems.

And honestly, after several disappointing experiences, my expectations for the entire platform have somewhat decreased. I understand that creating a truly excellent GPT requires expertise and significant time investment, and not all creators can achieve that.

Interviewer: What do you think the GPT Store platform could do to improve the user experience in this regard?

P5: I think the platform should establish stricter quality review mechanisms - not just checking if content complies with guidelines but also evaluating the GPT's utility and effectiveness. Perhaps they could introduce a more detailed rating system that allows users to evaluate GPTs across different dimensions like accuracy, innovation, response speed, and so on.

Also, I think the platform should provide more guidance and best practices for creators to help them build higher quality GPTs. They might even offer templates or frameworks, especially for creators without much technical background.

And I think the low entry barrier is a double-edged sword. On one hand, it promotes innovation and diversity, but on the other hand, it leads to an influx of GPTs with varying quality. The platform might consider setting some basic quality standards or introducing some kind of certification mechanism.

Interviewer: You mentioned the low entry barrier issue. Could you share more thoughts on this?

P5: Well, I don't think the low barrier itself is the problem - it's great that more people can participate in AI innovation. The issue is that there don't seem to be enough mechanisms to distinguish between carefully designed professional GPTs and those that are just casual experiments.

When anyone can easily create and publish GPTs, naturally there will be many products of varying quality on the platform. Experienced users like me might be able to identify which ones are worth trying, but for new users, this chaos can cause confusion and disappointment.

I think the platform needs to find a balance - maintaining openness for innovation while ensuring users can easily find high-quality GPTs. Maybe they could implement a tiered system where verified high-quality GPTs are more discoverable.

Interviewer: As a frequent user of the GPT Store, have you noticed how the creators' knowledge background affects the quality of their GPTs?

P5: Absolutely. I've noticed that creators with deep expertise in specific domains tend to develop more valuable GPTs. For example, a programming assistant created by someone with years of software development experience is usually much better than one made by someone with just basic programming knowledge.

Professional expertise allows creators to anticipate real problems users might face, add necessary context and knowledge, and design more natural interaction flows. They know what information is important, what can be omitted, and how to present information most effectively.

In contrast, creators lacking domain expertise can only provide surface-level functionality. Their GPTs might look fancy but struggle when dealing with actual problems.

Interviewer: How do you think users can find truly high-quality GPTs among so many options?

P5: That's definitely a challenge. I usually check ratings and usage numbers, though these metrics aren't always reliable. I also look at the creator's background - if it's created by a well-known team or expert, the quality is usually more guaranteed.

But most importantly, I test them myself. I'll test a new GPT with some standard questions to see the quality of its responses. Only if it passes my initial tests will I use it for actual work.

I think the platform could provide more diverse filtering and sorting options, like filtering by professional field, creator background, update frequency, and so on. Maybe they could also introduce something like "Editor's Picks" where a team of platform experts screens and recommends high-quality GPTs.

Interviewer: Last question - what direction do you think the GPT Store should develop in the future, especially regarding improving overall quality?

P5: I think the platform needs to focus more on quality rather than just quantity. Maybe they could establish better feedback mechanisms so creators can continuously improve their GPTs. The platform could also provide more analytical tools to help creators understand how users are using their GPTs and what aspects need improvement.

I'd also like to see more industry collaborations, like having domain experts participate in creating and reviewing relevant GPTs. This would ensure these GPTs truly meet professional standards and practical needs.

Additionally, I think the platform could consider some incentive mechanisms to encourage creators to continuously optimize and update their GPTs rather than abandoning them after creation. This could be through revenue sharing or other forms of recognition and rewards.

Overall, I believe the GPT Store has enormous potential, but it needs to focus more on quality control and user experience to truly leverage the value of AI.

Interviewer: Thank you so much for your valuable insights and time! Your feedback is extremely helpful for understanding the user experience of the GPT Store.

P5: You're welcome!