Interview with P3

Interviewer: Thank you for taking the time to participate in our research about the GPT Store today. How long have you been using the GPT Store?

P3: I've been using the GPT Store for about one year now.

Interviewer: Great. Based on your experience, could you share the main challenges you've encountered while using the GPT Store?

P3: Sure. I think the biggest issue is the categorization system. To be honest, the current categorization is just too basic. We need better rating systems and more detailed categories. Using the GPT Store now feels like searching in a massive library with only a few vague labels.

Interviewer: Could you elaborate on the problems with the categorization system? What aspects make it inconvenient for you?

P3: Well, if I'm looking for a GPT in a specific field like "data analysis," the current categories might just roughly place it under "Productivity" or "Programming." There are no subcategories, no industry-specific classifications, and it's hard to quickly see which tools are actually good quality. I often spend 20 minutes just to find a GPT that actually fits my needs, which is such a waste of time. We really need a detailed categorization system with ratings like other platforms have.

Interviewer: You mentioned rating systems - what elements do you think an ideal rating system should include?

P3: First, there should be a clear star rating so users can immediately see which GPTs are high quality. Second, there should be a user review section where people can describe their specific experiences. Third, it would be best to have ratings across different dimensions like accuracy, response time, ease of use, and so on. That way we wouldn't have to test everything ourselves each time.

Interviewer: I see. Besides the categorization system, have you observed other issues with the GPT Store?

P3: Another obvious problem is the huge variation in creator quality. Some GPTs are clearly created by professional developers - they're high quality, responsive, and accurate. But there are also many that feel thrown together, with a terrible user experience.

Interviewer: Could you give an example of this quality variation?

P3: Last week I tried using a GPT that claimed to help analyze financial data, but the advice it gave was very basic and even had some errors. Meanwhile, another GPT with similar functionality provided in-depth analysis and professional advice. The gap is just so obvious. I wish there was a better way to filter out the ones that don't work properly. Right now, it feels like I'm testing everything myself just to find something decent. It's really time-consuming.

Interviewer: How do you deal with these quality variations? Do you have any strategies for finding high-quality GPTs?

P3: I usually check the conversation count first - theoretically, the ones with more users should be better quality. But that's not always reliable because...

Interviewer: Because of what?

P3: That brings me to the third issue I wanted to mention - security and regulatory problems. It's really frustrating when you realize some products are just boosted to the top through fake accounts. Some GPTs clearly have manipulated rankings, which makes it hard to know what's genuinely popular or useful.

Interviewer: How did you discover that rankings were being manipulated?

P3: Sometimes you'll see a GPT that was just released a few days ago suddenly having thousands of conversations, which obviously doesn't seem right. I've also seen discussions in tech communities about people using bot accounts to boost their GPT rankings. It makes you question the credibility of the entire platform.

Interviewer: Have these security issues affected the way you use the GPT Store?

P3: Definitely. I now tend to use GPTs that have well-known developers or organizations behind them, rather than just relying on the platform's recommendation system. I also test a few questions before committing to using one, to see the quality of responses rather than blindly trusting the rankings. But this goes back to my earlier complaint - we shouldn't have to test everything ourselves. The platform should have better quality control mechanisms.

Interviewer: Based on these issues you've mentioned, how do you think the GPT Store could improve?

P3: First, a more detailed categorization system is a must, with subcategories and multi-dimensional filtering options. Second, we need a more reliable rating system so users can see genuine reviews. Third, there should be stricter quality control, maybe introducing some certification mechanism to mark verified high-quality GPTs. Finally, the platform needs better anti-cheating systems to prevent ranking manipulation.

Interviewer: These are all valuable suggestions. With these issues present, what keeps you coming back to use the GPT Store?

P3: Despite these problems, there are some excellent tools on the GPT Store that have genuinely helped me solve real problems. When you finally find a good GPT, it can save you tons of time. I believe as the platform matures, these issues will gradually be resolved. As an early user, I also hope to help make the platform better by providing feedback.

Interviewer: What are your expectations for the future of the GPT Store?

P3: I hope to see it become more user-friendly, with a more refined categorization system and stricter quality control. I'm also looking forward to seeing more high-quality GPTs in specialized fields. If the platform can address these basic issues, I think its potential is enormous. After all, making AI technology more accessible and personalized is a really valuable direction.

Interviewer: Thank you so much for your valuable insights. Your feedback is extremely helpful for understanding user experiences and improvement suggestions.

P3: No problem, happy to share my thoughts. I hope this feedback helps improve the GPT Store and make it more practical and user-friendly.