

Assessed Coursework Cover Sheet for PSYC0313

STUDENT CANDIDATE NUMBER (given by Examinations and available on Portico): TVPZ9

MODULE NAME & CODE: HUMAN-AI INTERACTION (PSYC0313)

COURSEWORK PART (IF RELEVANT): NA

**NAME OF TEACHER WHO SET THIS WORK:
AMID AYOBİ**

**COURSEWORK TITLE:
INDIVIDUAL PROJECT REPORT, 3000 WORDS**

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: 30TH APRIL 2026

**WORD COUNT (EXCLUDING APPENDICES):
3230**

Figma Canvas to Code Repository: Product Designers Experiences of Agentic AI Tools in Design Workflows

TVPZ9, University College London, United Kingdom

This study investigated how product designers experience agentic AI tools in their design workflows, focusing on tools such as Claude Code, Figma MCP, Claude Design, Figma Make, Gemini and Bolt. Five semi-structured interviews with students and professional designers were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis. Four themes emerged: (1) design increasingly starts before Figma, (2) designers delegate speed but retain judgement, (3) AI connects design and code while weakening direct control, and (4) agentic AI expands design roles and creates new professional pressure. These findings challenge simple automation narratives. Rather than replacing designers, agentic AI tools reconfigure design work by making designers act as orchestrators who prompt, compare, edit and translate between design and code. Design implications include supporting direct manipulation, stronger design-system awareness, transparent version history and clearer privacy controls.

1 Introduction

Agentic AI tools are increasingly entering product design workflows. Unlike conventional chatbots that mainly respond to prompts, agentic AI systems can perform multi-step tasks, generate artefacts, control software tools, and act with partial autonomy. In design contexts, these tools include AI coding agents, AI prototyping tools and Figma-connected workflows that can generate, critique or revise interface ideas.

This matters because these tools connect activities that were previously separated: brainstorming, wireframing, prototyping, code generation, design-system checking and developer handoff. Designers can now use tools such as Claude Code, Figma MCP, Claude Design, Figma Make, Gemini and Bolt to generate prototypes, compare design directions, move between Figma and code, or audit whether implemented components match design files. This may change not only how designers work, but also where design begins and what counts as design expertise.

Prior work in human-AI interaction shows that AI systems are difficult to design with because their behaviour can be uncertain, adaptive and hard to predict [16]. Amershi et al.'s guidelines emphasise that users need support for understanding, controlling, correcting and recovering from AI outputs [1]. HCI research also treats machine learning as a design material because it changes how designers imagine and build interactive systems [5]. These ideas are relevant here because designers are not only designing AI-infused products; they are using AI as part of the design process itself.

Three gaps motivated this study. First, public discussion often focuses on speed and automation, but less on designers' everyday experiences. Second, design tools are often discussed separately from coding agents, although participants increasingly move between Figma, code repositories and AI chat. Third, little is known about what designers delegate to AI agents and what they still control themselves.

This study therefore asks: **How do product designers experience the integration of agentic AI tools into their design workflows?** More specifically, it examines how these tools change the starting point of design work, which tasks designers delegate or retain, and what benefits and barriers they associate with agentic AI.

2 Method

2.1 Participants and Data

Five participants took part in semi-structured interviews about their experiences with agentic AI tools in product design. Interviews lasted approximately 16–31 minutes and were conducted remotely. Participants included students, early-career designers and professional product designers. Their experience ranged from limited startup design experience to several years of product design and engineering work. To protect anonymity, participants are referred to as P1–P5.

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling from my academic and professional network. All participants gave consent for recording and transcription. They were informed that there were no right or wrong answers, that they could skip questions, and that they could stop the interview at any point.

2.2 Interview Questions

The interview protocol covered four areas: (1) participants' background and design experience, (2) how they first encountered agentic AI tools, (3) a recent project or workflow involving tools such as Claude Code, Figma MCP, Claude Design, Figma Make, Gemini or Bolt, and (4) perceived benefits, barriers, privacy concerns and future role changes.

Questions focused on concrete examples rather than only abstract opinions. For example, participants were asked, "Can you walk me through a recent project where you used these tools?"

2.3 Analysis Approach

Analysis used Braun and Clarke's reflexive thematic analysis [3, 4]. I first read all transcripts to become familiar with the data, then created initial codes from participants' own language and workflow descriptions. Examples of early codes included "starts from Claude", "Figma for polish", "AI for PRD", "design-system mismatch", "token cost", "human thinking", "PMs using prototypes", "privacy black box", and "role expansion".

I then grouped related codes into candidate themes and checked whether each theme captured a meaningful pattern across participants. The final themes were not treated as objective facts emerging from the data, but as researcher interpretations shaped by the research question, interview context and my own position as an HCI student studying human-AI interaction. This reflexive position follows Braun and Clarke's argument that themes are actively constructed by the researcher rather than simply discovered in data [4].

Transcript extracts were lightly cleaned for readability by removing filler words and correcting obvious transcription errors, while preserving participants' original meaning and phrasing.

2.4 Ethics and Reflexivity

The interviews focused on professional and educational experiences rather than sensitive personal issues. Participants were reminded that they could skip questions or stop at any time. Transcripts were anonymised and participant names were removed.

As an MSc HCI student interested in AI design tools, I may have been more attentive to productivity gains. To balance this, I actively coded negative cases, including tool abandonment, privacy concerns, token costs, design-system problems and frustration with prompt-based editing. My peer/student role may also have shaped the interviews, as participants sometimes assumed shared knowledge of tools such as Figma, Claude or MCP. In future interviews, I would ask more follow-up questions about exact workflow steps.

3 Findings

3.1 Theme 1: Design Increasingly Starts Before Figma

Planning and early design work often started before participants opened Figma. Instead of beginning from a blank Figma canvas, several participants described starting with Claude, Gemini, paper sketches, a PRD, or even a code repository. P4 explained this shift clearly: *"There was a time where everything used to start from a blank Figma canvas. Now that blank Figma canvas has been shifted to a code repository"*, where the designer can prompt Claude, provide context, and ask it to generate *"5 to 10 different iterations or variations"* as HTML/CSS files before refining the output.

This was also visible in other workflows. P2 described Figma as something they use after the initial thinking has already been structured: *"Figma was something that I always see as you go to Figma once you know what you want."* Instead of using Figma for early brainstorming, P2 relied on paper and Claude: *"I always rely on paper or talking to Claude to in a way formalize and structure my thoughts."* Their current workflow involved bringing *"research trends or insights into Claude"*, using Claude artifacts to spatially arrange information, and then taking the resulting mock-up into Figma.

P5 described a similar AI-first workflow: *"I start with Claude, just Claude. I take an approach of having a PRD first."* They then generated a prototype based on that PRD and used it for team discussion: *"As a team, we start, like, we have a brainstorming session, what we want or what we don't want on that prototype."* Figma appeared later in the process when AI-generated outputs needed to be cleaned, tracked or corrected.

This shows that agentic AI is reorganising the order of design activity. Early design becomes conversational and code-adjacent, while Figma becomes a later-stage space for polish, correction and design-system alignment. This reflects Suchman’s argument that human action is shaped by available artefacts and environments [15].

3.1.1 Design Implication. Design tools should support smoother transitions between AI-generated exploration and professional refinement, preserving rationale, layout, components and version history.

3.2 Theme 2: Designers Delegate Speed, Not Judgement

Participants valued agentic AI mainly for speeding up exploration, prototyping and repetitive checking. However, they did not describe AI as replacing their own design judgement. Instead, they used AI to generate options and then positioned themselves as reviewers, editors and decision-makers. P4 described a workflow where Claude generates several options, but the designer still evaluates them: *“I check which one is looking good, what is good in one, what is good in another, then mix it, match it and then create another iteration HTML file.”*

Similarly, P5 explained that AI had compressed early product work. For PRD and prototyping, they said: *“Initially it used to take a week, something like that. Right now it’s just an hour’s job.”* However, the participant did not treat this as full automation. They still brought the work back into Figma because *“I want clean design, I want version history.”* This suggests that designers delegate speed-oriented work but retain responsibility for intent, quality and final judgement.

P4 made this boundary especially clear when discussing what should remain human-led: *“Thinking is cool to human right now.”* They used agents for more deterministic tasks, such as design audits and PR reviews: *“Anything that is kind of straight up where the output is deterministic, I have agents built for that.”* But for work requiring judgement, the designer still had to direct the tool: *“Anything where thinking is required, I have to tell Claude to go in a particular direction.”*

This challenges simple claims that AI will “do design”. In practice, participants used agentic AI as a generator of possibilities, not as a final authority. The designer’s role shifted from producing every artefact manually to orchestrating, evaluating and refining AI-generated outputs. This also aligns with Schon’s view of design as reflective practice, where practitioners make judgements through cycles of seeing, framing and reframing [13].

3.2.1 Design Implication. Agentic AI tools should support comparison between alternatives, helping designers mark preferred elements, explain trade-offs and combine useful parts of different iterations.

3.3 Theme 3: AI Connects Design and Code but Weakens Direct Control

Participants repeatedly described agentic AI as useful because it connects design and code. For some, this reduced the traditional handoff gap between designers and engineers. P4 explained that previously their role ended at final Figma screens and handoff: *“Earlier, my job was to do till Figma screens final and do handoff to the front end and the back end team.”* With agentic AI, this changed: *“Now I can take it myself to production and build stuff, really contribute to that final.”* For P4, this was empowering because *“there is no handoff”* and *“a designer is enabled to go to code, do that fixes, do that changes, and actually improve the quality of the product.”*

P5 also described a workflow where Claude, Figma MCP and GitHub were connected: *“I have taken the repo of my front end... I set up my Claude and then eventually I give some prompts... I connected my Figma through that and then back and forth I keep on doing and things I can push on GitHub now.”* This shows how agentic AI tools can create a two-way workflow between design files and implementation environments.

However, this connection also created a loss of direct control. Participants often wanted to edit AI-generated designs manually rather than communicate every change through prompts. P1 liked Claude Design because *“you can pretty much interact with it and it was almost like doing it like a full-fledged thing.”* But editing was frustrating: *“Every time I have to suggest some edits, it is taking up a lot of tokens.”* P1 added, *“I felt like if I can click it and edit it myself, I would have liked it better.”* They described a similar issue with Figma Make: *“Every time I have to make some change again I have to rely on Figma AI. So yeah, I didn’t continue that after that.”*

P2 described this as cognitive load. When the AI had already created a rough design, they preferred to make small edits manually: *“If the AI has done a good enough groundwork... where I want to change minute things or make different variations, I would probably just mock up the design on Figma and do it myself.”* The reason was not just speed, but the effort of explaining: *“There is a lot more cognitive load where I have to think about how can I explain this better to Claude and then it will use up my usage tokens to try to generate something that again might not be something that I want.”*

P3 raised a related issue around design-system adherence. AI prototypes were useful at a high level, but “*once we start getting into the nitty details of design system, then it struggles a lot.*” P3 said they sometimes created “*30, 40 iterations to arrive at something which I liked*”, and that this “*might have taken me a similar time if I had created all of this manually.*” This reflects a broader issue in human-AI interaction: when AI systems are powerful but difficult to steer, users may experience both capability and friction [16]. Speed at the macro level can become slowness at the micro level if small visual corrections require repeated prompting.

This theme shows a central tension: agentic AI makes movement between design and code easier, but can make fine-grained design control harder. Designers benefit from speed, but still need direct manipulation, component awareness and reliable editing. Norman argues that good design should make actions visible, understandable and controllable [11]. Participants’ frustrations suggest that many agentic design tools still lack this kind of direct controllability.

3.3.1 Design Implication. AI design tools should combine prompting with direct manipulation, allowing designers to click, edit, resize, align and correct outputs manually while preserving design-system rules.

3.4 Theme 4: Agentic AI Expands Design Roles and Creates New Professional Pressure

Participants did not see agentic AI as only a tool-level change. They also described it as changing expectations around product roles. P1 suggested that design roles may become more generalised: “*Before, like we had people only for UI and also UX separately and then UI engineers will build the UI. I feel like these fields will probably be combined into one single field.*” Their reasoning was that “*with AI you can easily do the coding*”, meaning designers may be “*expected to handle a lot more roles.*”

This role expansion was already visible in workplaces. P3 explained that in their company, product managers were being pushed to explore AI design tools: “*PMs should explore design tools. They should be able to ship a prototype with minimal help from designers by themselves.*” P3 had already supported this change: “*I’ve already given two to three times... demos for using AI tools and how to create designs using AI tools.*” The goal was to enable faster shipping, but it also changed who could produce design artefacts.

P5 described an even broader organisational expectation: “*It has to be part of the workflow... not just me, everybody in my team, tech, non-tech, non-product, everybody has to start with AI tools.*” P2 also connected role-blurring to organisational expectations, arguing that companies increasingly want people who can “*own up the entire vertical.*” They explained: “*When product managers can now code, when product managers can now design as well, that blurring of lines is definitely something that is encouraged.*”

Participants framed this role expansion both positively and critically. On one hand, AI enabled designers to build more, test more and contribute closer to production. P4 described becoming “*much closer to engineering workflows*”, including learning about repositories, PRs and code quality. They concluded that “*the boundary of engineering, product and design has blurred; everyone is doing kind of each other’s roles in some fashion.*” On the other hand, this can increase pressure on designers to cover more areas while still being responsible for craft and quality.

This role-blurring connects with wider debates about AI and the future of work. Jarrahi argues that AI can support human decision-making, but also changes the distribution of expertise between humans and machines [8]. In this study, agentic AI changed not only the human-machine relationship but also relationships between designers, engineers and PMs.

3.4.1 Design Implication. Organisations should define when AI outputs are exploratory or production-ready, and clarify who remains responsible for design quality, accessibility and user experience.

4 Discussion

This study shows that agentic AI is not simply automating product design. Instead, it redistributes work across humans, AI tools and software environments. Participants used AI to accelerate exploration, generate prototypes, produce PRDs, audit design-code consistency and move between Figma and code. However, they retained control over judgement, direction, taste and final quality.

The most significant workflow change was the shift away from Figma as the automatic starting point. Figma became more specialised: a space for polish, version history, component control and final correction. Early ideation increasingly happened in AI chat, code repositories or hybrid AI-code environments.

These findings extend HCI work on human-AI interaction by showing how AI uncertainty appears in design practice. Yang et al. argue that AI systems are difficult to design with because their capabilities and outputs can be uncertain [16]. In this study, uncertainty appeared when participants did not know whether tools would respect design systems, preserve layout quality or produce editable outputs.

The findings also support Amershi et al.'s emphasis on controllability and correction [1]. Participants appreciated fast generation, but frustration emerged when small visual changes required repeated prompting. This creates a paradox: tools designed to save time can create extra interaction work. Human-AI design should therefore support both high-level prompting and low-level direct manipulation.

Privacy and trust also remain important. Agentic tools often require richer context than simple chatbots, including repositories, Figma files, screenshots, PRDs and company information. Trust in automation depends on appropriate reliance and user understanding [9]; in design workplaces, this requires clearer privacy models and explanations of what happens to uploaded context.

There are wider social implications. Participants described agentic AI as expanding what designers, PMs and engineers are expected to do. This may empower individuals, but may also intensify work by expecting fewer people to cover more roles. Human-centred AI should therefore be evaluated not only by productivity, but also by how it redistributes labour, responsibility and accountability [14].

4.1 Limitations

This study has limitations. The sample was small and recruited through convenience sampling, so findings cannot be generalised to all designers. Participants also had different levels of experience, from students to professionals, which created useful variation but limited direct comparison. Finally, the study relied on retrospective interviews rather than live observation, so participants may have forgotten details or described idealised workflows.

Future work could use screen-recorded walkthroughs, diary studies or observations of designers using agentic AI in real projects. A follow-up study could also compare designers, PMs and engineers to examine how agentic AI changes collaboration across product teams.

5 Conclusion

This study shows that agentic AI tools are changing product design by moving early exploration away from the blank Figma canvas and into AI-supported, code-adjacent workflows. Designers used tools such as Claude Code, Figma MCP, Claude Design, Gemini and Figma Make to generate PRDs, prototypes, interface variations and design-code checks. However, participants did not describe AI as replacing design expertise. Instead, they used AI to speed up execution while retaining judgement, direction and final quality control. The key challenge for future agentic design tools is therefore not full automation, but controllable collaboration: tools must support direct editing, design-system alignment, privacy, version history and clear responsibility across product teams.

Word Count

Word count, excluding references and appendices: 3230 words.

References

- [1] Saleema Amershi, Dan Weld, Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Adam Fourney, Besmira Nushi, Penny Collisson, Jina Suh, Shamsi Iqbal, Paul N. Bennett, Kori Inkpen, Jaime Teevan, Ruth Kikin-Gil, and Eric Horvitz. 2019. Guidelines for Human-AI Interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland, UK) (CHI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. doi:10.1145/3290605.3300233
- [2] Liam Bannon. 1991. From Human Factors to Human Actors: The Role of Psychology and Human-Computer Interaction Studies in System Design. *Design at Work: Cooperative Design of Computer Systems* (1991), 25–44.
- [3] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, 2 (2006), 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- [4] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on Reflexive Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11, 4 (2019), 589–597. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806
- [5] Graham Dove, Kim Halskov, Jodi Forlizzi, and John Zimmerman. 2017. UX Design Innovation: Challenges for Working with Machine Learning as a Design Material. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Denver, Colorado, USA) (CHI '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 278–288. doi:10.1145/3025453.3025739
- [6] Upol Ehsan and Mark O. Riedl. 2020. Human-Centered Explainable AI: Towards a Reflective Sociotechnical Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.01092* (2020). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.01092>
- [7] Kenneth Holstein, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hal Daumé III, Miro Dudik, and Hanna Wallach. 2019. Improving Fairness in Machine Learning Systems: What Do Industry Practitioners Need?. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland, UK) (CHI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–16. doi:10.1145/3290605.3300830
- [8] Mohammad Hossein Jarrahi. 2018. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work: Human-AI Symbiosis in Organizational Decision Making. *Business Horizons* 61, 4 (2018), 577–586. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

- [9] John D. Lee and Katrina A. See. 2004. Trust in Automation: Designing for Appropriate Reliance. *Human Factors* 46, 1 (2004), 50–80. doi:10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392
- [10] Q. Vera Liao, Daniel Gruen, and Sarah Miller. 2020. Questioning the AI: Informing Design Practices for Explainable AI User Experiences. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. doi:10.1145/3313831.3376590
- [11] Don Norman. 2013. *The Design of Everyday Things: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Basic Books, New York, NY, USA.
- [12] Raja Parasuraman, Thomas B. Sheridan, and Christopher D. Wickens. 2000. A Model for Types and Levels of Human Interaction with Automation. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics - Part A: Systems and Humans* 30, 3 (2000), 286–297. doi:10.1109/3468.844354
- [13] Donald A. Schön. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books, New York, NY, USA.
- [14] Ben Shneiderman. 2020. Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence: Reliable, Safe & Trustworthy. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 36, 6 (2020), 495–504. doi:10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118
- [15] Lucy Suchman. 2007. *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- [16] Qian Yang, Aaron Steinfeld, Carolyn Rosé, and John Zimmerman. 2020. Re-Examining Whether, Why, and How Human-AI Interaction Is Uniquely Difficult to Design. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. doi:10.1145/3313831.3376301

The appendix includes the interview guide, anonymised participant summary, example coding table, and anonymised transcripts. Full transcripts have been anonymised by removing participant names and identifying details.

A Interview Guide

- (1) Can you tell me about your current role or background in product design?
- (2) How did you first come across agentic AI tools such as Claude Code, Figma MCP, Claude Design, Figma Make, Gemini or Bolt?
- (3) How regularly do you use these tools now?
- (4) Can you walk me through a recent project where you used one of these tools?
- (5) Where did the project start: Figma, code, paper, AI chat, or somewhere else?
- (6) What parts of the workflow did you hand over to AI?
- (7) What parts did you prefer to keep under your own control?
- (8) What did you find most useful about these tools?
- (9) What problems, frustrations or limitations did you experience?
- (10) Do you have any concerns about privacy, trust or data use?
- (11) How do you think these tools will change product design roles in the future?

B Anonymised Participant Summary

Table B1. Participant summary

Participant	Background	Tools mentioned
P1	HCI student with short startup product design experience	Claude Design, Figma Make
P2	Student with experience using tools in academic contexts	Claude, Kilo, Bolt
P3	Professional product designer in a startup context	Gemini, Figure, Claude Code, Figma Make
P4	Engineer and senior product/design practitioner	Claude Code, Figma MCP, design audit agents
P5	Founding/product designer in a startup context	Claude, Figma MCP, GitHub workflow

C Initial Coding Table

Table C1. Example codes and theme development

Initial codes	Final theme
Starts from Claude; PRD first; paper sketch then AI; Figma for polish	Design increasingly starts before Figma
AI for iterations; human thinking; taste; choosing best version; judgement retained	Designers delegate speed, not judgement
Figma MCP; code repository; design-system mismatch; token cost; cannot click-edit	AI connects design and code but weakens direct control
PMs creating prototypes; designer as design engineer; everyone using AI; broader role expectations	Agentic AI expands design roles and creates new professional pressure

D Use of AI Tools

ChatGPT has been used as a functional tool to assist in the process of creating the academic work, such as drafting ideas and planning or structuring written materials.

E Anonymised Interview Transcripts

The following transcripts have been anonymised by replacing participant names with P1–P5 and removing identifying personal or organisational details where possible. The transcripts have been lightly cleaned for readability by removing filler words, backchannel-only turns and obvious transcription errors, while preserving participants’ original meaning and phrasing.

E.1 P1 Full Anonymised Transcript

17m 55s

Interviewer [0:03]: I think the recording has been started. Thank you, P1, for taking part in this study. I’m Interviewer. I’m a student of MSc Human Computer Interaction program at a UK university. This interview is a part of our module that we are studying, that is human-AI interaction. And I’m exploring how product designers use agentic AI tools in their workflows. So this interview will be around like 15, 20 minutes. There are no like right or wrong answers. I’m interested in your honest experiences and opinions. You feel like you are free to skip any question or stop at any point. time. Before we begin, can I have your consent to record this session and transcribe it?

P1 [0:48]: Yeah, sure.

Interviewer [0:50]: Thank you. So first, I wanted to ask you, what’s your background? can you tell me a bit about what you are currently doing and how long you have been studying or working?

P1 [1:07]: Okay, so I’m currently a student at a UK university. I’m also doing human computer interaction. And for work experience, I have worked at a startup for seven months. Apart from that, I don’t think I have any professional experience.

Interviewer [1:20]: I think I lost you. I don’t know. Can you just come again? I think I lost your voice.

P1 [1:25]: I. She does, she can’t hear.

Interviewer [1:32]: Hello.

P1 [1:32]: Really? Is it because of the internet?

Interviewer [1:33]: Now I can, yeah, now I can hear.

P1 [1:36]: Wait, wait a second, I will change my internet. Yeah, Interviewer, can you hear me now?

Interviewer [3:00]: Yes, yes.

Interviewer [3:03]: So you were telling me that you have worked for seven months in a startup?

P1 [3:09]: Yeah, so I was saying I’m a student and I’m doing, I’ll repeat it. So I’m a student and I’m also studying at a UK university and I’m studying human computer interaction. After my undergrad, I worked for like 7 months at a startup, product design startup, but apart from that, I don’t have any professional experience.

Interviewer [3:10]: Not in any company, OK.

P1 [3:28]: Yeah, that’s it.

Interviewer [3:29]: Got it That’s nice. How did you first come across these agentic AI tools? Like what prompted you to try it? Was it a personal decision or something that your college taught you or something you were just exploring around the internet? So what was the first interaction with these agentic tools? example can be Claude Design, Claude Code, Figma MCP, or any other tool that you have used.

P1 [3:56]: I think I mostly tried these tools because I kept seeing it everywhere on like Instagram, LinkedIn, everywhere people are talking about it. And also my classmates are talking about it. So naturally I just wanted to try it out to check if it’s like actually working, if it’s actually good enough, the hype. I just want to...

Interviewer [4:05]: Oh.

P1 [4:15]: know about the hype so I just went into it and I just tried it.

Interviewer [4:19]: Got it. Which tools did you try? Can you name it specifically and what was the most interesting part you liked about that tool?

P1 [4:28]: Okay, so I have used Claude Design. I tried it because on the internet people are saying, oh my god, Claude Design just killed Figma stocks. I was quite curious about why it’s so good and why are people hyping it about so much. So when I first tried it, I liked it actually. The UI was decent. I liked it.

P1 [4:49]: And I also like that it was in, you can pretty much like interact with it and it was almost like doing it like a full-fledged thing. But every time I have to suggest some edits, it is taking up a lot of tokens. And then I don’t know, I felt like if I can like click it and edit it myself, I would have liked it better. So.

P1 [5:09]: That’s my opinion on design. And I also used Figma Make. For Figma Make, I think I just want to try it out. It also made pretty good screens. I really liked it. But as I’m on a free tier, I was not able to take those designs to my design file and edit it more. So every time I have to.

P1 [5:27]: make some change again I have to rely on Figma AI. So yeah, I didn't continue that after that.

Interviewer [5:30]: Got it. Cool. How regularly do you use these tools now? is it daily, occasionally, or you just experiment with it? Occasionally.

P1 [5:43]: Yeah, I only tried it once and after that I never went back to it again. Maybe I have to try it properly when I have time because I feel like I tried these out like when I didn't have much time. Like I had to make a lot of things in a very short time.

P1 [6:02]: At that point, I was like on constant pressure and I could not handle this. I thought maybe I'll just do it myself. So I never really properly explored these tools, so I would say once or twice.

Interviewer [6:08]: Mm-hmm. Okay, got it. That's nice. Can you so you mentioned that you use Claude Design, I think recently. So do you remember like what was the project about that you were trying to implement in Claude Design? So do you remember that part? Can you walk me through the process that you followed?

P1 [6:16]: Okay, so I'm trying to recollect. I think so I tried Claude Design.

P1 [6:53]: I think for a fitness application. So basically I was trying to redesign that application. I was not trying to improve the UI. I was actually trying to add more features to it. And at first I was not sure how much it could make. So I did not prompt it perfectly. I just gave a prompt to make a home screen, I think.

P1 [7:15]: not a home screen, a category list of different types of activities that people can like browse into basically cards with that categories names. And when you click that card, next like next list list should pop up. And I originally intended to have like one particular screen. I did not know that it is a fully interactive.

P1 [7:35]: like a prototype. So I just gave a prompt and it kind of did extra more than what I asked for. I asked for like one particular screen, but it did like two to three flows. It was quite decent. I liked it.

Interviewer [7:36]: Got it, that's nice. I think I'll move to the like more general questions for this interview now. So I wanted to ask you about like very general opinion on like what do you think how like changes will happen in coming future, how you will move from design and code.

Interviewer [8:08]: compared to before, like I think before 2022 when there was no agentic AI tools. So what's your opinion on that? How will the future look like in terms of designing and in terms of coding? What are your thoughts about it?

P1 [8:12]: I am not sure about like 100% automation because I feel like every new week, every new agentic tool is getting released and people are hyping it up so much.

P1 [8:36]: At some point, I feel like these AI waves will crash. After a point, people will realize we actually need actual specialists to do the job. But it will definitely change the workflow that I understand. And you can also see this in the markets like [large technology company] is planning to fire 8,000 of their managers, which is crazy.

P1 [8:55]: Now that agent AI has come in, I feel like the roles will be more like generalized. Before, like we had people only for UI and also UI we asked, we used to have people for like UX separately and then UI and then UI engineers will build the UI. I feel like these fields will probably be combined into one single field.

P1 [9:15]: Because with AI you can easily do the coding. That's what I feel like. And yeah, I feel like you'll be you'll be expected to handle a lot more rules.

P1 [9:27]: But I think it will take a few more years before that happens.

Interviewer [9:31]: Got it got it. That's really nice. That's really interesting. And anything, any opinion on like what parts of the workflow will you hand over to an AI agent based on the current scenario and current technologies you we have? And what do you like prefer to keep it to yourself? Can you explain why?

P1 [9:50]: That's an interesting. That is interesting.

Interviewer [9:57]: It's fine if you don't have an new opinion. That is also fine. Yeah, good.

P1 [9:57]: I think...

P1 [10:11]: Because I like to discover it and know like what is actually a problem. Because whenever I try to do any like personal projects or anything, I would just talk with my friends and then they tell me like what is the issue they are facing. And that's how I think I have gotten my previous problem statements. So that problem discovery, I like to do it on myself, by myself.

P1 [10:31]: And the initial research phases, I think I would like to rely on AI because it has definitely helped me speed up the process. That is definitely a big plus. So I would use AI more for research purposes, for brainstorming and everything. But the decision making part should be with me. Like whatever AI generates, I should have the power to decide.

P1 [10:55]: which features should be on like which page, like what is actually useful, what is not useful. I don't want to rely on AI's advice for this because I feel like AI can never truly understand how people react. And I think building phase definitely, I think we can use AI because I use Claude Design and it generated pretty good UI.

P1 [11:14]: I actually like it. So yeah, definitely in the next few years I can see it making even more better UI designs. So for UI, I feel like we can rely on AI, but the refinement part and the testing part where you have to talk to people and then walk them to the prototype and then find changes, I think these parts should be with the human researcher, like the human designer.

Interviewer [11:14]: Mm-hmm.

P1 [11:36]: Definitely those parts should not be given to AI, like asking AI or what should be changed or something like that. No, that part should be with the users. And also when it comes to user research, I feel like I actually, I like talking to participants and understanding what they want, what are their pain points. So that part I feel like I can do it, but once I gather the data, I can ask AI to organize it and map it like that.

Interviewer [11:36]: Good. Got it. Interesting. Very interesting. I think there's a few more questions I have. So on a scale of like 1 to 10, can you give me a number? How much do you trust the AI's output as of now, as of 2026? For example, trust can be in two ways. One, first trust can be in terms of output, like.

Interviewer [12:18]: whatever it generates. Second trust could be with your files and with your personal information being used by AI. So there are like some tools like Figma, MCP, and Claude Code. So in that, these agents can also access your Figma files and get context and then. maybe code it. So on a scale of 1 to 10, what are your thoughts on both these directions? First is the AI's output, that is what AI generates. And second is the trust between the access of your files in these systems.

P1 [12:46]: Mm-hmm. Can you explain the first question? what's the first part?

Interviewer [12:59]: The first part is like whatever the AI generates like you mentioned Claude Design. So on a scale of 1 to 10 how much of how much of the output like do you trust? How much trust do you have with the output of what these agents generate here?

P1 [13:04]: Mm-hmm. Yeah, perfect. locate. When it comes to, for the first question, when it comes to design, I feel like I kind of tend to like it. And if I don't like it, I can obviously make the changes. But I always feel like the initial response to whatever question I give it, I feel like it's not enough.

P1 [13:34]: I always like keep asking so many like back to back. And then when I get to a stage where I'm satisfied, I will leave it. But for research purposes, I think sometimes I don't trust it enough. Like if it tells me, oh, this should not be here, like some very specific design decision, then I will take it. I will consider it definitely, but.

P1 [13:54]: I will want to do my own research as well. So right now I will probably say I will definitely use it. But as for the trusting part, it really depends on that particular project and particular situation. Like I will verify it by myself. So this will answer your first question. For the second one, sorry, what did you ask?

Interviewer [13:57]: So trust can be two ways. First part I think you have answered. Second is being able to access your personal information. So now AI can have context of all your Figma files. So that is very sensitive information. For example, you have your personal projects also in Figma files. You have a company's work also in Figma files. So.

P1 [14:22]: Okay I got.

Interviewer [14:33]: Do you trust AI like using that?

P1 [14:34]: Okay, cool. So I think I am comfortable letting like AI use that if it's handling my personal projects. Yes, I would give it permission as long as it stays within that environment. I feel like I don't really mind because it's helping me build my projects.

P1 [14:55]: But if it comes to any professional projects, then I would be a little unsure. If it's if it's a load in my organization, like how some large technology companies have their own AI and then how the workers in that like company, they use their own AI to do the work. If there's something like that, I think I would 100% trust it and use it. But for my personal project, yes, I would give it access to my file.

Interviewer [15:00]: Oh.

P1 [15:16]: I will just make sure only that particular project is in that file. So I don't care. I trust it completely when it comes to these things.

Interviewer [15:23]: Nice nice. I think it answers my question. Thank you. Just last question, then we are done. So some people argue that these kind of agentic AI tools blur the gap between designer, developer, product manager. I think you have already answered that in a way, but do you have any more thoughts around?

Interviewer [15:44]: Like does this statement resonate with you? Do you think like everything will be just one role or things like that?

P1 [15:52]: Yeah, this is quite interesting because I was just talking about this to my family member who works at [large technology company]. And then they were telling me that in their organisation, like they are actually firing all the managers because now they believe that managing is something that agentic AI can do. And that's what they've already invested in and they've started the process.

P1 [16:13]: And now they are telling me that with agentic AI, now everybody is an engineer. All the managers are being converted into engineers because with the use of agentic AI, anyone can code, anyone can build things. At first I find I found it very absurd because these people, they have learned data structures and they have they have so many years of building products and how can like.

P1 [16:33]: AI completely like make sure that we all have the same level of knowledge and expertise. it was very surprising to me, but I feel like maybe right now we are not there yet, but in the next few years I feel like it can it can be there, but I still I still believe that not like one person will handle the entire project.

P1 [16:55]: Maybe like the particular part, like development can be handled by one person, like design, maybe it will combine frontend coding and the design part and the UX research part, maybe will be combined into one single process with the use of AI. But I also feel like with the AI, it's not that things are getting simpler, it's just that it's getting fast.

P1 [17:16]: We are able to do so much work in less time, but it's also not very ethical to make one person do all the work because then you are just doing so much work for the same salary with the use of AI. And I don't see companies raising our salaries because they also have to invest in AI tools. So the salaries are not going to be increased, but their productivity is getting increased.

Interviewer [17:18]: Oh. Makes sense.

P1 [17:36]: So I personally don't know where I stand on this, but yes, I definitely believe the roles will be combined in the future.

Interviewer [17:39]: You called it out. I think that was it. Thank you so much, P1, for your insights. It was lovely speaking to you.

P1 [17:49]: Yes, thank you.

Interviewer [17:52]: Wait, I will stop the recording.

E.2 P2 Full Anonymised Transcript

27m 16s

Interviewer [0:04]: I think the recording has been started. Thank you, P2, for taking part in this study. I am Interviewer. I'm currently a student in MSc HCI at a UK university. This interview will be a part of a module that we are studying that is human-AI interaction. And I'm exploring how product designers specifically

Interviewer [0:24]: use agentic AI tools in their workflows. This interview will be like 15, 20 minutes long. There are no like right or wrong answers. I'm interested in your honest experiences and whatever thoughts you have. You are free to skip. any question or stop at any point without giving any reason. Before we begin, do I have your consent to record this session and transcribe it? **P2 [0:55]:** Yeah, you have my consent, yeah.

Interviewer [0:57]: Okay, so firstly I want to understand about your background. So what you are doing right now, are you a student, are you a working professional and have you been worked as a product designer before?

P2 [1:11]: So I am currently a student. I haven't worked as a product designer, but I have experiences using tools for academics.

Interviewer [1:14]: Got it, Got it.

Interviewer [1:28]: So if you remember, how first did you like come across these agentic AI tools? What prompted you to try it? I'm specifically want to understand about agentic tools in design. So when was the first time did you come across with these tools and was it a personal decision?

Interviewer [1:48]: Or a decision that your that your colleagues were like doing, or anything that you were just testing it out? What was the like the first time that you like prompted it you to try these tools?

P2 [2:05]: So I would think if I remember my earliest interaction that might be of salience would be this AI and art hackathon, not design, strictly it is more of a AI image.

Interviewer [2:17]: Who?

P2 [2:22]: generation and how do you create, let's say, a storyline based on that. And that is perhaps what comes to my mind straight away. It was definitely something that I tried as part of a greater hackathon. So.

P2 [2:42]: It was not as much a personal choice. It was something that was a tool that we had to use and use it in a capacity to create something, right? So that is the essence of your question, if I understand it right. So that is perhaps my first instance.

Interviewer [2:52]: Got it. That was I think for image generation, right?

P2 [3:02]: Yeah yeah.

Interviewer [3:03]: do you remember which tool did you use?

P2 [3:06]: Oh, back then, if I think it was mid-journey, back very, it was, I would say, pretty early on, I'd say about two or three years ago. It was just getting started.

Interviewer [3:09]: Mid journey, OK. People. Got it, nice. And anything in like user interface design have you used like recently or maybe one or two years back that helps you to create like screens?

P2 [3:27]: Yeah, in terms of user interface, yeah, that was my first interaction, but definitely over the years I have become, I have used, let's say, totally agent, I would say, off-board platforms such as Bolt. design, if you're familiar with Bolt. design, and I've also used...

Interviewer [3:46]: Yeah

P2 [3:50]: coding based tools such as bolt code. So I can I could I would say go in either direction based on what you think is more pertinent.

Interviewer [3:54]: Nice. Also a follow-up question on that. How regularly do you use these tools now?

P2 [4:06]: Bolt IO was something I used back a lot long, relatively long ago, about a year or so ago, but I think in terms of what I used a lot more, will definitely be Claude Code and creating, I would say, designs through that.

Interviewer [4:23]: Okay, interesting, interesting. So on like talking on that only. So can you walk me through a like a recent project that you did using Claude Code in which you created designs using Claude Code and what was the starting point for that project? Was it like directly from Claude Code or you started it from Figma, then you translated that to Claude Code. So any any project that.

Interviewer [4:47]: that you can walk through for this interview. That will be great. In A brief scenario, will also work. Like you don't have to go very deep into it. Just I want to just understand the overall workflow that you followed.

P2 [4:56]: Yeah, the overall workflow specifically, it was a personal project you could say, but the workflow was, I wanted to achieve a certain goal X, and in achieving that certain goal X, I was unsure exactly about how to go about it.

P2 [5:18]: Right, I had industry trends, I had data from, let's say, friends and everyone, but I was unsure about how to structure it, right? So I think that is where specifically Claude Code for me speaks a lot more than tools like Loveable or Bolt. io, whereas Claude Code in itself.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

P2 [5:41]: I personally have also used it to plan. I think there is not Claude code specifically has, but there's this application or extension called kilo. ai, which is basically an extension that allows you to use Claude, that allows you to use OpenAI and other tools.

P2 [6:00]: And it has a specific feature called architect mode where you can discuss as well about your design. And then you can, act on it, right? So since I was, my thoughts were all over the place and I wanted to have someone to bounce those ideas with.

P2 [6:20]: I used, I went directly to Claude Code and not Claude Code, sorry, Kilo, and I started speaking to the agent through Kilo. And so yeah, just to give so that I don't make it confusing later on. Kilo is just a provider of other services.

P2 [6:38]: Like other AI generate, Claude or Open AI or Deep Sea, and that is they just have an interface, right? So that is the context, so I'll just be referring to.

Interviewer [6:38]: Cool. Who? So is it like a, so sorry to interrupt you, so is it like a aggregator or sort where you can get all these? Okay

P2 [6:52]: Yeah, it is. It is an aggregate of sorts. Yeah, it is the you a top up money and then you use that API credits from all the providers. So yeah, but I just for clarity, I will be using, I will be talking about Claude later on in this, just referring to that process as Claude. But the distinction is that I'm not using Claude code, I'm using Claude through Kilo app.

P2 [7:17]: Okay, so coming back to the conversation, I think definitely

P2 [7:26]: There is, I don't, I distinctly do not did not use Figma back then. I think coming back to what you mentioned, I do remember that Figma was something that I always see as you go to Figma once what you want, right? I am not, at least in my personal experience, I am not as.

Interviewer [7:31]: Mm-hmm.

P2 [7:47]: experienced with Figma to use it for brainstorming as well. So I always rely on paper or talking to Claude to in a way formalize and structure my thoughts. And once those thoughts are structured, the good thing is back then,

Interviewer [7:58]: Mm-hmm.

P2 [8:06]: I used to just prompt, I used to I used to like sketch it out on paper. And then I used to create a specific prompt that kind of tries to translate that prompt, that image into the design I want. I think one thing I found out.

P2 [8:26]: I was doing wrong is that I could just insert the image of the page itself, but I did not. At least if I were to speak about my habits about using it, I always tried to explain the image as much as I could to be.

P2 [8:44]: application itself instead of adding an image. And those I have personal reasons for that. I personally think adding an image always takes more token and especially since Kilo was a subscription. Not subscription, it was like an API based thing. You have to be very mindful about the credits you used. So that was my.

P2 [9:05]: habits, but did I miss the crux of your question?

Interviewer [9:09]: No, no, I think it's fine.

P2 [9:11]: Yeah but...

Interviewer [9:12]: I understood that you like start with paper, then you give your thoughts to these tools and then kind of like for and it design and for brainstorming mostly.

P2 [9:18]: And then design, yeah So to be, yeah, to be like very, I think summarize my workflow. It is, I have some ideas, I have some trends. I go to Claude, I structure, I go to any LLM, I structure them, and then I design it on a paper and then I structure.

Interviewer [9:25]: Mm-hmm.

P2 [9:38]: and I put it back into Kilo or that provider, right? So that was my earlier, workflow. So I used to do everything in Kilo. It says I used to plan and do everything in Kilo. I think now it has changed with Claude.

Interviewer [9:42]: Skills.

P2 [10:04]: Code Claude specifically, so how I do it is that I bring in those research trends or insights into Claude, I speak to Claude, and the best I think a good.

Interviewer [10:05]: Mm-hmm.

P2 [10:20]: I would say. feature of claw is that it does something called artifacts if you are familiar with that.

Interviewer [10:28]: Yeah I know.

P2 [10:29]: Yeah, and that artifacts I think really gives me a lot. A better idea of what I want. It kind of spatially arranges right my information and I can also get UI mockups from there and that mockup then I use into Figma. So my current workflow has evolved from there.

Interviewer [10:39]: Got it. Very interesting.

P2 [10:55]: I hope I wasn't too unclear. I know I bounced around A lot.

Interviewer [10:57]: No, no, so the artifact part that you mentioned, is it like Claude Design that you have used?

P2 [11:02]: No, no, no. Claude itself makes artifacts within the chat itself, if you are familiar.

Interviewer [11:03]: OK, definitely. Okay okay. Got it I think it creates SVGs is what he was talking about.

P2 [11:12]: Not SVGs, it is, I'm not sure what it is, but it is in some way the smarter interface. I'm not even sure if it is because of some skill I have enabled or not, but it basically generates A clickable interface within the chat itself, chat window itself.

Interviewer [11:13]: Oh.

P2 [11:32]: Right? So what you do is you kind of tell it to, assuming sometimes it does that a lot for me where I give it let's say tables and if that table has like 3 dimensions to it, you cannot show a three dimensional table, right? Usually a table has two dimensions. So the third dimension kind of becomes buttons.

Interviewer [11:33]: Okay

P2 [11:51]: that I can press and then I can go into a specific two-dimensional view of that table through that this. So yeah, so that is something I really like about Claude now, the use of artifacts and I think that has definitely streamlined my design journey a lot more.

Interviewer [11:59]: Very interesting, OK. Interesting, interesting. That's a very good insight. Okay, so I think you have already mentioned like the parts that you gave to AI agent and what parts you like to keep it yourself, like the sketching part and the brainstorming part to give it to Claude. So.

P2 [12:24]: Mhm

Interviewer [12:29]: Like my next question will be, have you encountered any like frustrations or limitations or any unexpected behaviors from these agentic tools?

P2 [12:37]: Yeah I think if I were to remember, definitely there is sometimes where there is a frustration of the agentic AI not being able to understand what you wanted to design. I think that is not a problem of the agentic AI or the LLM, but... an issue on my end where I haven't prompted it well, but I think there is a frustration where I could prompt it better or I could just do it myself. And I have found instances where if the AI has done a good enough groundwork, those specific things, specific instances of where I want to change like minute things.

P2 [13:19]: or make different variations. I would probably just mock up the design on Figma and do it myself. I just think that there is a lot more cognitive load where I have to think about how can I explain this better to Claude and then it will use up my usage tokens to

P2 [13:40]: try to generate something that again might not be something that I want and I just instead of going through it back and forth and using up my usage credits, I just go to Figma and do it myself. I think I am at least particularly very cognizant or very aware of.

P2 [13:59]: how many tokens I use because that has been a very limiting factor, especially considering that I came from a pay as you go subscription model from Kilo. So that is what kind of informs my habits.

Interviewer [14:04]: OKOK. Got it That's very interesting.

Interviewer [14:17]: And like how much so I would like to give you a rating. So on a scale of 1 to 10, how much do you trust the AI's output? AI's output can be in two sense. One can be the taste in the design that it generates or the research quality that it generates.

Interviewer [14:37]: Second, the trust around AI can be accessing your files like personal information. So Figma MCP has context of, so like the Claude can have context of all your Figma file, like your personal files and the company's files. So on both these angles, what rating will you give?

P2 [14:38]: Yeah yeah.

Interviewer [14:57]: to these agentic tools in terms of trust and the output.

P2 [15:02]: Yeah, I think if I were to perhaps go back, the first question itself had two questions to them. If I remember right, could you repeat those two?

Interviewer [15:11]: Yeah, I'll repeat. Okay, the first part is the output that the AI generates. Yeah, output can be research and design. Yeah design and research both, yeah.

P2 [15:16]: And then the research, right? So taste and research, if I understand. So if I were to talk about design specifically, so what is the scale, 1 to 10?

Interviewer [15:25]: Google. Yeah

P2 [15:29]: Okay, so I would in terms of Design, I would definitely say 8.5 and that is specifically because sometimes I think I pigeonhole myself in a certain direction so heavily that I don't look at the general context and I forget key things. So Claude, what it does very well for me is that kind of takes the broader context into view.

Interviewer [15:35]: Yeah

P2 [15:54]: And at least from a design perspective, I think, it's okay, wait, I was trying to fix, let's say, a list and everything. And sometimes I just add to Claude that this is my problem and give me a totally different way of interaction, which makes so much more sense than me trying to trying to shoehorn, let's say, a certain interaction method.

Interviewer [15:55]: Mm-hmm. Mhm

P2 [16:16]: Right? And at least I don't know if there's recency bias or not, but that has happened with me a lot in the recent times where I feel that I was trying to get a certain interaction to work, it wasn't working. And then I just added it to Claude and Claude gave me a totally different interaction way that perhaps give me a totally.

P2 [16:38]: much more efficient way of doing it. That is not design or taste, I think in the conventional manner, but at least in terms of...

Interviewer [16:41]: Mm-hmm.

P2 [16:47]: The interactions, I think the artifacts specifically helped me a lot in terms of that. I have been very much underwhelmed by, I think the research quality depends a lot from model to model. I have been pretty underwhelmed by Claude's quality of research, I think.

P2 [17:07]: Most of its research is very, very bad. I am, however, pretty much impressed by Gemini's capabilities to research. I think specifically, you only mentioned, I think to me, my use of notebook LLM has definitely helped me a lot and then I kind of transitioned to using Gemini 3.1 Pro as well.

P2 [17:31]: And I have been much more happier with the results. Even Chat GPT. Chat GPT is perhaps the most horrible. Chat GPT, despite all the progress it has made, like confidently makes up citations that have not at all existed. Claude just gives you very generic advice.

P2 [17:52]: Whereas Gemini gives you a good, at least I am happy with the advice. But regardless of the advice, I think I am always been a very much, I've always been very skeptical about the AI output. I've just inculcated that habit from the very start. So regardless of what I get from AI,

P2 [18:14]: I never take it as 100% certain, no matter how good it is. So I usually, whichever papers it gives, I go and personally read them regardless of the summary being there. I want to make sure for my own sanity and for my own safety that that paper is actually saying, the summary is actually saying what the paper is.

Interviewer [18:14]: Thank you. Who?

P2 [18:35]: So in terms of research, overall, I'm going to give it 4 at max and that will also be being generous. So that is the first two ratings. What is the second question or the second part?

Interviewer [18:43]: No, then. Yeah, the second question is around the trust part. So how much do you trust on a scale of 1 to 10, like these LLMs, organizing your Figma files, tweaking Figma files, getting access of your Figma files, or any other files, not only Figma files, like your... computer files or things like that. So how much trust do you have as of now?

P2 [19:09]: Yeo. Um... Yeah, I think there are two instances that come to my mind. Firstly, I'll go in terms of relevancy. I think my recent, most latest interaction with Figma was underwhelming. I think I gave it all the context. I also I at least personally thought I did everything right, but maybe it was because I gave it a point.

P2 [19:40]: prompt saying that you have to design this in React or something like that. Maybe that's why, but the output was totally different from what I had given it. It made no.

P2 [20:12]: But another instance I remember is I do not like overleaf. Like I have no idea why I don't like overleaf. I just don't like overleaf. And that is when I was what, I have had enough. I just gave Claude key by, sorry, key, you just have a look and you fix everything. And this was my CV, okay?

P2 [20:33]: I was I just gave it my total access. You have access to the overleaf interface. You can make any kind of edits and all of that stuff. And I was actually very much impressed by its capabilities, I would say. So I think definitely changes from.

Interviewer [20:34]: locate.

P2 [20:54]: MCP to MCP, I think it definitely depends on the way that MCP has been coded, how it has been conveyed to, let's say, a layman. Those are, I think, issues that are not an issue of the agentic AI itself, but more an issue of the person creating that connection.

P2 [21:12]: And also the ways that that connector is presented to someone who is unsure about the disk, unsure about how it works, right? So I think that is the main. So it's not, as I said, again, it's not the AI, which is good because I've given you 2 conditions, right? One where.

P2 [21:33]: I really liked how it manipulated my datas and another one where I was totally unhappy with this. So what comes perhaps comments from that is just the connector and I think the quality of the connector, the bigger ish, yeah.

Interviewer [21:47]: You got it. But do you trust AI for like using your personal data? That is fine with you.

P2 [21:56]: Yeah, I think to be honest, I have added just documents onto Claude and be you just have a look. And I shouldn't be perhaps adding those files, to be honest. it's not a big problem. I'm definitely what I think to give you a very precise this, I just add my entire report into.

P2 [22:19]: AI and ask it to just evaluate how much, how do you think this is? What do you think should be changed in all of that? I don't think it should be done because essentially it might be training on that data. And if you have original ideas in there, AI now knows about it. But then again I thought that what? It is a very I think in today's world where.

P2 [22:41]: Your data is probably gonna be fed into an AI model regardless of you actually doing it. I think the issue is not that big of a privacy issue. I think it is a necessary evil, and because when you internalize that, I've internalized that over the last one or two years, and that is why my trust has...

Interviewer [22:46]: Groups.

P2 [22:59]: increased quite a lot. At least I'm okay with just adding. So if I were to give you a specific Likert scale, personally on my end, I think it's 7.5.

Interviewer [23:06]: Okay, got it. Thank you so much. Just a few more questions and we are done. So like there's a lot of people who, lot of designers, lot of developers, lot of product managers are saying this on LinkedIn and Twitter that these agentic tools are blurring the line between designer and developer and product manager. So.

Interviewer [23:28]: Does that statement resonate with you? Do you have any thoughts on that?

P2 [23:32]: It is blurring the line between with two rows.

Interviewer [23:34]: Designer, product like product designer, product like product manager, and the developers like the software developers.

P2 [23:43]: Yeah, I think definitely there is a blurring of lines, especially because of the capabilities that are garnered through the AI models. And I think the blurring of the line perhaps raises or,

P2 [24:01]: Kind of arises from these. So usually the CEO, the whoever's making the statements, they want results, right? And if you look at results specifically, you want people who can own up the entire vertical, right? And.

P2 [24:21]: When product managers can now code, when product managers can now design as well, that blurring of lines is definitely something that is encouraged more than it is something that is something that perhaps comes from a designer. So I don't think it's something that will come from the product manager.

P2 [24:40]: It is something that is perhaps enforced onto them and in an bid to perhaps reduce head count, but that saying, the blurring of lines is definitely there, but I don't think it is because of the AI itself, but I think it is because of the perceived capabilities of AI and increased expectations from.

Interviewer [24:41]: We.

P2 [25:00]: product managers who are in some way do interact with these, tools because they interact with the, they have to give a PRD right for the software guide and the design kind of informs them about this PRD and you're like basically if you can research, if you can code, if you can design all the AI.

Interviewer [25:07]: And then.

P2 [25:20]: you should be able to do all of it, right? And that is why this blurring is forced on to them. I personally don't think product managers want to do all of it. It's just that it's been forced onto them.

Interviewer [25:21]: Got it Very interesting thought. Cool. I think this last question, so...

P2 [25:34]: Sure.

Interviewer [25:38]: How do you think these agentic AI tools will evolve over time? If you have an opinion on that, like how will it evolve in the design scenario?

P2 [25:49]: Oh, I think, yeah, I think... So I'm not really sure if it is actually very relevant to our topic at hand, but if I were I think we're definitely going to see.

P2 [26:05]: People being put under more stricter limits for the usage tokens that they use.

P2 [26:13]: I think that is how it's going to be perhaps evolve and I think there's going to be in reaction to that I think. Uh... The users themselves will be empowered to give better context to lead to better designs so that the design does not have to do the heavy lifting of inferring what the design, what the product manager or whoever using it means. I have a feeling that if I were that is perhaps where the direction will go, where.

P2 [26:46]: the user is empowered more to give better contextual insights. I think that is definitely going to be the reaction to, let's say, Claude or ChatGPT, reducing the usage limits by quite a lot.

Interviewer [27:00]: Got it Interesting. Cool. I think that was it. Thank you, P2, for insights. Really helpful.

P2 [27:06]: Great, great. No problem, no problem.

Interviewer [27:12]: Cool, I'll stop the recording.

E.3 P3 Full Anonymised Transcript

31m 17s

Interviewer [0:03]: The recording has been started. Thank you, P3, for taking part in the study. My name is Interviewer and I'm currently a student at a UK university. I'm pursuing human computer interaction. So this interview will be a part of a module that I'm studying at a UK university that is human-AI interaction. in which we basically study about how humans are communicating with AI, how humans are using AI as of now. So currently, I'm exploring how product designers experience using agentic tools like Figma, MCP, Claude, code in their workflows. The interview will be around like 15, 20 minutes. There are no like right or wrong answers in this one. I'm interested in your honest experiences and opinions. You are free like free to skip any question or stop at any point without giving any reason. Before we begin, like do I have your consent to record this session and like I'll transcribe this entire recording. So do I have your consent for that?

P3 [1:23]: Yeah, hi, Interviewer. Thank you so much for having me on this interview. if I am able to bring any value to your research and to your project, that is really, that will be really great. So yeah, you have the consent. You can totally record it. That's okay.

Interviewer [1:26]: Cool. Thank you so much. Thank you. The recording will only be used for transcription and will be deleted once the interview is done. Cool. The first thing I want to understand about you is can you just tell me a bit about your current role and how long you have been a product designer?

P3 [1:50]: Botted. Yeah, so I have been practicing product design for around two years now. Before that, I was into UI UX design and recently, so I work at a [company], and...

P3 [2:18]: I got recently promoted to senior product design designer as well in last October. So it's been around total experience in design has been more than three years and in product design it has been around two years.

Interviewer [2:24]: Interesting. And how did you like first come across these agentic ai tools like Figma MCP or Claude code? Like what prompted you to try it? Was it a personal decision or something that your company adopted?

P3 [2:47]: So. At our company, since it's a startup, we have been always pushing towards reducing the software development lifecycle. And a lot of our senior folks were also pushing themselves along with the team to explore AI tools because...

P3 [3:10]: everything was happening in front of us. we were listening to stories that they shipped this product within three days from the ideation. And we wanted to be able to achieve that. So that is always one of our motivations to be able to do that. And that's how AI tools came into place.

P3 [3:30]: Previously, it was mostly coding tools that engineers were using to ship products faster, but design was one of the things that was lagging behind. But in last few months, last four to five months, I think it has already caught up a lot..

Interviewer [3:34]: There you go.

P3 [3:50]: There are a plethora of tools available right now. Only a few of them are good, though a lot of them are at a similar level, just below those good ones. But yeah, I think that was our motivation to be able to, but it was personal as well.

P3 [4:10]: to be able to do that and it was Team. alignment as well here we should explore that because it is it was becoming the norm in all other startups and

Interviewer [4:19]: Thank you.

P3 [4:26]: Startups are usually the first ones to adopt these kinds of things to.

P3 [4:31]: Enable faster shipping, and so we were, we are one of those startups, I would say.

Interviewer [4:40]: Interesting, interesting. That is very interesting. Cool. How regularly like do you use these tools now? Like is it daily, is it occasionally, or do you use it for certain projects?

P3 [4:53]: Occasionally I would say I use.

P3 [4:57]: Because... As a designer or in our current company, what is expected out of designers is they spend the bandwidth on more important roles, which require a totally handcrafted user experience. You could say that.

P3 [5:19]: So a lot of tickets and a lot of... Design jobs are those types of jobs which in which you require a lot of detail to attention. I'm having attention to detail. So those are the tickets that I usually work upon. But sometimes there are other tickets as well which I can explore on myself and I can do it however I want to do it. So I use.

P3 [5:42]: I try to use AI tools in the brainstorming stage and in the prototyping stage. and our PMs currently are using AI tools A lot. they use it almost in every design ticket they use it. There are rarely any tickets that they don't use it and they come directly to me for the design, but mostly.

Interviewer [5:51]: Got it.

P3 [6:10]: it has been added in our instructions as well. KPMs should explore design tools. They should be able to ship a prototype.

P3 [6:20]: with minimal help from designers by themselves. So that is one of the big things that has been happening in the design world, at least in our company. I'm hearing a lot of PMs in other startups or other enterprises as well are using AI tools without the help of designers. So that is there. And I've already given two to three times I've given. what do you say, demos for using AI tools and how to create designs using AI tools that includes Figma Make. We used another tool called Figure because it was able to achieve some kind of design system adherence that we were not able to achieve using Figma Make. So we used Figma Figure for some time.

Interviewer [6:51]: On.

P3 [7:14]: And now we are exploring Claude Code and Claude Design as well. So yeah, that's the scenario right now.

Interviewer [7:14]: Very interesting. Got it. I think you mentioned a lot of insights and a lot of details. Thank you for that. Can you walk me through a recent project where you used like Figma MCP or Claude Code? What did you use it for? And what was the starting point of that project? for example, when there were no like AI tools we used to just directly start from Figma.

Interviewer [7:44]: So what the scenario now, like do we start from Figma, do we start from Claude directly, or do we start from any other tool? Can you just walk me through a recent project? I just need to understand the workflow for that project.

P3 [7:45]: Okay, do you want to see the project itself like by?

Interviewer [8:00]: No, I don't want to see it. You can just verbally explain where did you start that project from? Like was what what kind of tool did you used? What was the project about and very brief and things like that.

P3 [8:02]: That's a got it. So a lot of the times the requirement that is generated is either out of senior folks in the company who want to try out a new way of lead acquisition channel, you could say. So for example, we explored.

P3 [8:34]: A shortlisting tool, which is a university shortlisting tool.

P3 [8:38]: Where you students could come on directly on the page and they can experience the. They can themselves make a short list for going abroad before they actually go there. So we wanted to create a self-serving tool. And this requirement usually comes from PMs or...

P3 [9:03]: You could say a founder, you could say so.

P3 [9:09]: Once the requirement is there, they see some market gap, they have done their research, and this was one of the...

Interviewer [9:11]: Hold on.

P3 [9:20]: Recent projects that I did, so the most.

P3 [9:25]: Play around that I do, playing around that I do with the AI tools is in the brainstorming stage.

P3 [9:31]: Once a project comes to me, I give all of the context to AI and the...

P3 [9:37]: I also communicate what are the exact things that we are trying to achieve. And based on that, once I create some kind of memory with it, I start brainstorming. So defining the problems, what are the anticipated user problems.

Interviewer [9:42]: To.

P3 [10:03]: hypothesis AI helps a lot based on all the insights that we provide, based on all the data as well, based on, data data that was collected on previous iterations of a ticket, you could say.

Interviewer [10:08]: OK.

P3 [10:17]: So once these things are done and a hypothesis is created, so hypothesis science sounds like this is the problem. And the hypothesis is if we solve it this way, it will help the users to achieve this task.

P3 [10:37]: So that kind of solution, once we have in our mind, we start. creating some kind of prototype in the AI tool itself. For example, for brainstorming, I mostly use Gemini.

P3 [10:54]: Because I personally like Gemini's results, it's faster, it helps me create visuals faster in terms of images and creative assets, icons, those kinds of things. And it really, I have personally experienced, I've been using Gemini for quite some time, so it has a...

P3 [11:15]: really good memory layer for my projects and my personal projects as well a lot of times. So it remembers my way of thinking, what are we trying to do, what are we trying to achieve? And it is able to cater to those kind of peculiar needs that you.

Interviewer [11:22]: Google. Hello.

P3 [11:35]: need sometimes. So that memory layer really helps. So I brainstorm in. Gemini and I also use. Claude for brainstorming sometimes.

P3 [11:53]: So Figr was one of the tools which was using Claude's Opus 4.6 model. So that was also trained on a lot of UX flows, a lot of UI screens, and it had a lot of context for how design actually works.

P3 [12:13]: what's good design. So it was really good to. Uh, brainstorm with a figure as well, because it was trained on that kind of data.

P3 [12:25]: And then either on Gemini or on Figure, if you are able to achieve at a solution, arrive at a solution or a hypothesis, then we go on to create a prototype.

P3 [12:38]: you can...

Interviewer [12:38]: Gordon.

P3 [12:40]: You can imagine key what kind of prototype it usually gives currently.

P3 [12:49]: If you don't have any design system setup, it gives a decent prototype. You could, if you have used Claude as well, it gives a decent prototype. But once we start getting into the nitty, unity details of design system, then it struggles A lot. That's my personal experience. So I use it only for prototyping.

P3 [13:08]: Once I know that this is the... Best output I could really extract out of.

Interviewer [13:14]: Mm-hmm.

P3 [13:17]: this AI tool and that is also very iterative. You have to create a lot of iterations. Sometimes I've created iterations like 30, 40 iterations to arrive at something which I liked and...

P3 [13:31]: It might have taken me similar time. I'm talking about a few days ago. It might have taken me a similar time if I had created all of this manually. But once you start using it, you get to know what kind of instructions that you have to provide to get your desired output.

P3 [13:50]: So. That is a kind of a learning curve. It's not difficult to achieve that, but yeah.

P3 [14:01]: It requires some of playing around with the tool, spending time with the tool. And yeah, once I have a prototype, for example, this D2C shortlisting tool that I was creating, I created a prototype in figure once. And I tried it in Claude as well, Claude code, just to check whichever is providing a better output I.

P3 [14:27]: Because we have access to these resources right now, so I sometimes get multiple prototypes just to see if...

P3 [14:36]: one model, 4.7 or 4.6 or any other model, for example, Figma Make is performing better or giving a better output, thinking in a different way. But a lot of times they give a very similar output because the data is, I think, kind of same that they are being trained on. So.

Interviewer [14:38]: And.

P3 [14:58]: Once you have a prototype, then... You take it to Figma and get your get very hands-on with the actual design.

P3 [15:08]: And once the design is ready, we hand it to devs, hand it over to devs. So this is kind of how the workflow looks right now. Like summarizing it would be brainstorming with AI, then getting it to work inside, getting all the context inside.

P3 [15:27]: tool which understands and creates design for you.

P3 [15:31]: and then taking it forward to Figma and creating and finishing and finalizing the design on that and then giving it to developers to start the production. So that's how the workflow kind of looks right now. And.

Interviewer [15:34]: Mm-hmm.

P3 [15:52]: There are some challenges in the current workflow. So we always try to, we are still trying to find how we can create designs which are design system adherent.

P3 [16:05]: using any of these AI tools so that it can be directly given to devs by a product manager.

P3 [16:16]: So currently, that is one of the bottlenecks, I would say, because AI tools are not able to create designs which are exactly.

P3 [16:29]: Uh, to design system, so that is one of the bottlenecks. Uh, I'm not, I've not been able to explore Claude Code Connect in Figma.

Interviewer [16:29]: Adhering to the Design System.

P3 [16:41]: Because that is, it requires a bigger investment in the plan that Figma provides. So we haven't been able to explore that, but I have heard it also helps a lot in development cycle. But that is yet to be explored.

Interviewer [16:47]: Hoo hoo hoo.

Interviewer [16:57]: Who bought it?

P3 [17:00]: Yeah, we also want to enable PMs to be able to make designs which directly developers can work on. So this is how the workflow kind of looks right now. And these are a few challenges that we are facing right now and trying to find solutions as well.

P3 [17:19]: And some things that are yet to be explored, for example, this thing, Code Connect and Figma. So these are a few things.

Interviewer [17:30]: Got it. Very interesting. Thank you so much. That was a lot of insights. My next question would be around like trusting the AI's output. So for example, like now AI can, so Claude code like works both ways. Claude code can also understand the Figma's context and make changes. And it can also translate a design to. towards the code. So how, if you can give me a number from 1 to 10, how much do you trust AI's output? For example, when it modifies your Figma files or generate components, how much verification is required? If you can elaborate, that would be great. But you also mentioned that. Figma is kind of a playground for you. Like it's the last step where you refine everything. So on a scale of 1 to 10, how, like where is the AI's output right now in terms of design?

P3 [18:16]: So when you say trust, what do you exactly refer to? Trust in what sense?

Interviewer [18:30]: Okay, trust can be in two ways. One can be security wise, like it can, it has access of all your company's files. First is that trust. Second is the out, like the trust of the output, the taste, basically, the taste that the AI agent is delivering.

Interviewer [18:49]: like the design test. So I think both of them I want to understand.

P3 [18:50]: I think the tools that we are exposing are Figma files to using MCP are pretty big enterprises and I first not in the tool but in the people who are building the tool.

Interviewer [19:02]: Who?

P3 [19:15]: So that is something I do not worry about right now because

P3 [19:21]: You could say that all of our data is... Available on Claude, right? on personal accounts as well. All of my data is available on Google, but I trust Google.

P3 [19:34]: I do not. trust some technology that is supporting it because I am not even really aware that much about how all of these things work because

Interviewer [19:39]: I think.

P3 [19:47]: I'm not a tech guy, but I trust in the people who are making it, I would say. Security reasons and those things I'm not really worried about right now....

P3 [20:08]: Our company.

P3 [20:11]: Design is not something that holds a lot of secrets for. any kind of secrets that could be replicated somewhere and someone else could be making money off it because we are in the B2C industry and all of our designs are public once they are live. So if anyone had to copy them, they could.

P3 [20:36]: Anyways, copy them.

P3 [20:40]: That is the another,. The other thing you could say, key code is also being exposed if you are using Code Connect or if you are using some other tool which...

P3 [20:54]: has all access to your code.

P3 [20:59]: Oh. I'm not really in the position to answer Ki how that is to be handled or or.

P3 [21:10]: I don't have any expertise in that.

Interviewer [21:12]: That is, that is totally fine, yeah.

P3 [21:13]: That thing, so I can't comment on that.

P3 [21:17]: But yeah, that is there because we are in the B2C industry. all of our designs are already public, so we are not really worried about.

Interviewer [21:21]: That makes sense, actually, yeah

P3 [21:27]: For B2B companies, I think it might be who are working on projects like projects like which.

P3 [21:36]: are only provided once there are some companies subscribe to it when someone has paid for it. So those and that is their moat. For example, if their product is the moat.

Interviewer [21:38]: Mm-hmm.

P3 [21:47]: For us, product is... something you could say enabler.

Interviewer [21:52]: Enabler.

P3 [21:54]: Yeah, and for a lot of companies, product is their mode. For them, it becomes even more important, I would say. So that, for those kinds of products, I think it is important in terms of security and safety.

Interviewer [21:58]: You got it.

P3 [22:09]: The second thing that you talked about was test.

P3 [22:14]: Lists. I. I would say AI sometimes surprises me not with their visuals, but how they are thinking about the problem. So how they are creating the UX and how they are structuring their layout. Sometimes it surprises me because.

Interviewer [22:24]: And...

P3 [22:36]: It is sometimes really efficient to create UIs which are.

P3 [22:44]: communicating what we want to communicate very efficiently.

P3 [22:48]: without wasting a lot of space, without using a lot of negative space, and they are to the point. Their copy is also to the point. Sometimes those kinds of things surprise me, and pleasantly. So.

P3 [23:04]: But visually, if you'd say...

P3 [23:06]: I have experience key, if your product, if your prompt is as generic as possible, then the output given by the tool is generally decent, good, you could say, in today's time. But if you start going as specific as possible and try to make it adherent.

Interviewer [23:12]: Mhm

P3 [23:26]: Into our design system, I think those are the things that AI needs to still catch up on.

Interviewer [23:26]: The. Got it Really interesting.

P3 [23:37]: Yep.

Interviewer [23:41]: Yeah, do you want to say anything more?

P3 [23:43]: No, I think that's it. Yeah, are there any more questions?

Interviewer [23:46]: Okay, just, yeah, just last like few questions I have. do you think, do you agree with the statement that these particular like agentic systems are blurring the line between designer and developer and product manager? do you resonate with it? Do you think like everything will be like a single role in coming future?

Interviewer [24:08]: Like product manager will be doing everything. The coding part also, design part also, and the product management like which would they do it right now as well.

P3 [24:19]: Yeah, I totally think that the lines have already started blurring and...

P3 [24:27]: I believe an engineer cannot be just an engineer anymore. They have to be a product engineer. And a lot of UI, UX designers who just used to do UI and UX, they will actually have to push themselves to become really good product designers.

P3 [24:47]: And PMs, I would say they are also, this is actually happening, all these three cases that I'm talking about, these are actually happening in today's time. So PMs will also be working on creating the design itself using prototyping tools or, and using no code tools, they should be able to.

Interviewer [24:54]: Thank you.

P3 [25:08]: It is these days expected they should be able to test out their hypothesis using a small experiment using no-code tools as well, so... That is already happening and in future I would say these slides will keep on blurring and the most important part.

P3 [25:27]: I would. think would be, or I assume would be, this is what I think, key, someone who is...

P3 [25:41]: Um... Execution part will be done by AI, but someone who is able to think in a way that helps the company or the business make more money.

Interviewer [25:46]: And then?

P3 [25:56]: Explore new avenues, explore new channels for making money, and think about different things that could help them be more efficient in their operations, and those sorts of things who are able to.

P3 [26:11]: make money for the company. I think those are the roles that would survive the most and most efficiently. And I would say the key. Product is at the center of all these things for whatever product companies there are. If product is of any importance to them.

Interviewer [26:18]: Mm-hmm.

P3 [26:31]: Every other role will be leaning towards product. I would believe that in upcoming years.

Interviewer [26:38]: Got it That's with.

P3 [26:39]: because product is what. bots making money for them. And we want to be, not we as individuals, but we as an organization. If someone tries to run a company on some funding, they have finite resources. And they would always prefer people who are able to do.

Interviewer [26:43]: Who?

P3 [27:02]: more than just their defined roles.

P3 [27:06]: no one would expect in today's world, if you have AI, then you should have a lot of more time in.

P3 [27:17]: In the time that AI is working on the execution, you have much more time to work on other things. So that time is to be utilized on thinking about all those things that I talked about. So that product.

P3 [27:31]: Product sense and product thinking is something for product in for product folks itself who are directly associated with those engineers, PMs, and designers. I think product thinking is something that will be the most valuable thing.

Interviewer [27:33]: Who? Got it Very interesting thing. I also resonate with that thought. Just last one question, then we are done. Like how comfortable are you with like AI agents having I think from past few months, I've been seeing this trend where like every other.

Interviewer [28:09]: AI agent is having like autonomy over design decisions. Like for example, choosing components, existing layout, fixing brand guidelines. Like many designers are using AI systems for design decisions. So are you like comfortable with AI having? Autonomy over desired decisions in coming future.

P3 [28:35]: I think. When Design is being post.

P3 [28:42]: And it is not always pushed in a 100% rollout. Design is always tested out first, so that business as usual is not affected. So when business as BAU is not affected, and if we...

Interviewer [28:48]: Oh.

P3 [29:01]: push out a design, push out design that is being totally generated using AI and we are relying a lot if I am as a PM I am relying a lot on AI's execution and that includes design sense as well.

P3 [29:18]: I have only to learn because I have created that using a lot of references that I've already seen maybe.

P3 [29:29]: So I trust that AI is creating something close to that. I would say I would trust. the person or the individual contributor who is using AI to create something, their judgment is more to be trusted, but there's a safety net as well, even if I come from a non-design background and I rely on AI.

P3 [29:54]: So there's a safety net that it is an experiment and not everything, not all the decisions are taken.

P3 [30:11]: stakeholders involved.

P3 [30:14]: like engineers, other PMs or designers or other senior folks, business people who can always give out their feedback and.

Interviewer [30:16]: And.

P3 [30:26]: It is. Rarely it is just a single person's effort when we roll out a product. So I would say, Key, that is also one of the things that.

P3 [30:42]: that I'm not really afraid of because that does not really happen in real workflows that be solely rely on AI.

Interviewer [30:46]: Design. Got it.

P3 [30:52]: It involves a lot of other stakeholders judgments as well. So yeah.

Interviewer [30:55]: Yeah, that actually makes sense. I think that was it. Thank you, P3. Thank you for your time. Thank you for the insights.

P3 [31:06]: Thank you, it was really great connecting with you and talking about AM.

Interviewer [31:10]: likewise, likewise, I'll stop the recording just a minute.

E.4 P4 Full Anonymised Transcript

17m 53s

Interviewer [0:05]: Well, I think the recording has been started. Thank you, P4, for taking part in the study. my name is Interviewer, and I'm currently a student in MSc Human Computer Interaction at a UK university. this interview will be a part of a module that is human-AI interaction, and I'm exploring how product designers experience using... agentic AI tools like Figma MCP and Claude Code in their workflows. The interview will be around like 30, 35 minutes and there are no like right and wrong answers. I'm interested in your honest experiences and opinions. You are free to skip any question or stop at any point without giving a reason. Before we begin, can you confirm you have read and signed the information sheet and consent form? Do you have any questions before we start? Okay, cool.

Interviewer [0:57]: So I do like ask your permission to record the session audio and screen.

P4 [1:04]: Yes, yes, yes.

Interviewer [1:06]: Good. So firstly, I wanted to ask your background, like about a background. So can you tell me a bit about a current role and how long have you been working as a product designer?

P4 [1:16]: Yeah, so I'm an engineer and product designer. I have been in this industry for about 7 years now. I started as an engineer at [company] and my last role was at [company] as a senior product designer. So it's been, yeah, it's been seven years now.

Interviewer [1:19]: Nice So you have like a good experience. So how did you like first come across these agentic ai tools like Figma MCP or Claude Code? What prompted you to try it?

P4 [1:43]: Yeah, so last year in March, while AI was still evolving in my company, last company, [company], the founders were quite focused on changing the company to becoming an AI native. And we were all using, like ChatGPT has been there for about 2000 years.

P4 [2:02]: 22, I guess, 23, not sure. But so we all have been using AI, so there was nothing new in using AI, but AI with other tools, like using different tools, that wasn't possible until MCP by Anthropic came in. So I, and again, I think Figma MCP was not there.

Interviewer [2:04]: Mum.

P4 [2:20]: back then in March last year. So when it launched, I tried and tested it. And yeah, again, it was because of social media. That's where I heard from it. I think all the news and everything is coming through social media these days. That's the place where I heard about it. And yeah, because I am used to AI tools, GPT, Claude, and Gemini, so I just gave it a shot.

Interviewer [2:33]: Thank you.

P4 [2:49]: Asked AI to figure out what this is and how to use it. And then yeah, plugged it and did my first testing.

Interviewer [2:58]: Nice. So how regularly do you use these tools now? is it daily, occasionally?

P4 [3:01]: Yeah, so AI is daily, that is for sure. Now tools is like context dependent. There are so many MCPs. There is an ocean MCP, there is linear MCP, there is Figma MCP. So every tool has built their own MCP and now based on my workflow in that day, if I'm working on some of my projects and...

Interviewer [3:06]: No, no.

P4 [3:24]: If I need some design, I need to take designs from my frontend code to Figma or from Figma to code. That's where I have to use Figma MCP because it's kind of clean way to bring code and design context into one. So I would say based on context as and when needed, I am figuring it out. There is no direct.

P4 [3:46]: the days where I'm using it. But yeah, you can say frequently, I would say frequently.

Interviewer [3:52]: Okay, interesting. So now I would like to talk about like what's a recent project that you did where you used Figma MCP or Claude Code and what did you use it for?

P4 [4:05]: Figma MCP and claude code. So I am teaching other people, like designers, how to transition into becoming a design engineer. So definitely I'm doing hands-on exercise with everyone in that cohort that we have, where we are telling how to use and figure out plot code and all the MCPs.

P4 [4:24]: CLS and stuff. The projects that I'm working on is I build one tool called CC Rabbed, wherein you can see your Claude Code uses stats. So in that I used Figma MCP to take a design inspiration, build that in Figma, did some tweaks and brought it back to the code.

P4 [4:44]: So that was the last project that I used. And I'm also working on a website right now. So again, for the website, I'm prompting Claude Code to figure out the basic IA and wireframes and explorations. And then once I am 80% close to that exploration, for the final finish and polish, I take it to Figma.

P4 [5:03]: and then bring it back to code.

Interviewer [5:06]: Got it. And what was like the starting point for this particular project? Like was it just like do you start project from your design file or directly from Claude?

P4 [5:14]: I start from Claude because the exploration and the speed is far more than Figma. There was a time where everything used to start from a blank Figma canvas. Now that blank Figma canvas has been shifted to a code repository basic.

P4 [5:33]: wherein you just prompt Claude that, hey, give that context what I'm trying to do, and ask it to generate 5 to 10 different iterations or variations of that, and it just generates many HTML CSS files. And then I check which one is looking good, what is good in one, what is good in another, then mix it.

P4 [5:51]: match it and then create another iteration HTML file. So that's where my playground starts. And then when I am, as I said, I am mostly confident with how things are looking in code, then I take it to Figma.

Interviewer [6:03]: Nice.

P4 [6:06]: Figma is like for final finishing and polishing.

Interviewer [6:09]: Got it So how has this like changed how you move between design and code? I think I've like compared to before I think you have already mentioned. Okay, cool. So what parts of the workflow do you hand over to the agent, AI agent, and what do you prefer to keep it for yourself?

P4 [6:16]: Yeah So thinking is my, wherever, see, Claude is like any as like you have to tell it what to do. So definitely thinking is cool to human right now. Now depending on what agents and we have skills, rules and agents, it's context dependent again. So right now I have a.

P4 [6:45]: skill that does design audit. What it does is it checks the Figma designs and the component and checks what is right, what is wrong as per the designs in the component and vice versa. So that is 1 agent. And if I have to do PR fixes, PR reviews, there is an agent for that.

P4 [7:05]: that has skills and rules. So anything that is kind of straight up where the output is deterministic, I have agents built for that. Anything where is thinking is required, I have to tell Claude to go in a particular direction. That's where we don't, until unless I have a solid workflow ready.

P4 [7:24]: which becomes a skill and rules, agent is not needed as such because Claude itself is a good agent. Building A sub-agent in Claude is a very specific purpose that you want to use that agent for, like match Figma designs versus code components, match do.

P4 [7:45]: PR fixes. Something like these are good. Otherwise, yeah, with Claude, many things just work.

Interviewer [7:53]: Nice. And like what are the like what are some of the most useful things that you find like most valuable and useful things about using these tools? Is there any specific that is coming in your mind?

P4 [8:05]: I think this whole time right now, it's like enabling me to do more stuff. Like earlier, my job was to do till Figma screens final and do handoff to the frontend and the backend team. Now I can take it myself to production.

Interviewer [8:11]: Yeah, okay.

P4 [8:23]: and build stuff, really contribute to that final. So there was a time where Figma designs and the actual production does not match. Now, there is no handoff. A designer is enabled to go to code, do that fixes, do that changes, and...

P4 [8:42]: actually improve the quality of the product. So that amazes me. And people are building so many mini self products for themselves. Like maybe there is a loom out there, but people have created their own way of mini product of loom or money manager app or anything like that, right?

P4 [9:03]: So that is again a good. enablement or empowering that everyone has. So that amazes me that you are no longer just there till idea. Now if you have idea you can execute it till end to end and it's quite easy.

Interviewer [9:15]: Great. And has it changed how you collaborate with developers also? does it get got better?

P4 [9:27]: Yes, so yeah actually I think I'm now much closer to developers than even before. Earlier it was just a handoff and then basic interactions and then QA once they have done. Now because I'm taking things till code and doing things, I'm learning a lot from them.

P4 [9:46]: They are helping me understand a lot of how things work, what should be the right way to write a code or audit, how you should think, like the mental model of working in a repository, code repository, right? What are different architectures, frameworks, how to raise a PR, how to find, how to see bugs.

P4 [10:08]: Like how to interact with Claude and make the quality out there. So with this, I think I'm much closer to engineering workflows, which were alien to everyone. I'm an engineer, so I knew a few things, but there are many non-technical people who still.

P4 [10:26]: have so much to understand. So I think it's a good environment where like the boundary of engineering product and design has blurred, everyone has doing kind of each other roles in some fashion.

Interviewer [10:32]: Blurred. Got it And have you encountered any frustrations, limitations, or like any unexpected behaviors from these tools?

P4 [10:44]: Yeah, Claude is dumb at times.

P4 [10:51]: Again, thinking maybe you have the best thinking and the best prompt, but Claude may understand it in a different context. For example, very naive example, I all if I tell any AI my name is P4. So Claude thinks I am a girl. So Claude answers she might be.

Interviewer [10:55]: Mm-hmm.

P4 [11:11]: having a trouble in. So Claude is done in understanding the human context that a male can also have a name called Assure, right? And if that's one simple thing and sometimes I have my engineer friend, he works with Claude day in day out. There are code outputs that Claude does.

Interviewer [11:19]: If.

P4 [11:30]: doesn't write good quality code outputs. It does the job, the functionality is working, but the code quality is not good. Or it might have taken a different direction, or it might just have not know, like the port was 3001, but the AI is figuring out at port 5000.

P4 [11:49]: Like this thing and the instance what that Claude was thinking, there is some issue with code, but the only issue was with the port number and one R was wasted in that. So at times Claude is dumb. It was just a simple port issue, but Claude was hallucinating in, oh, the code may be wrong here, code may be wrong there, something like that.

Interviewer [12:12]: Got it That's actually interesting. And how much do we like trust the AI's output? For example, like when it modifies a Figma files or generates components, because I think Claude is two-way, like you can also communicate and create something on Figma from Claude, plus you can directly ask Claude to.

Interviewer [12:31]: create code out of it. So how do you trust like both ways when you are looking?

P4 [12:32]: I don't think it's about trust, it's about getting the output more. The trust is on AI.

P4 [12:44]: and its ability to do stuff that I have. The output may be close to what I want or maybe not. So... That may be due to how I have prompted or are my systems in place, like maybe token structure or my frontend code is good. The referencing of the current component is good. So in that way, I think I have no issues with that. Rest is not an issue. The output may vary.

P4 [13:12]: based on what I want Claude to do. So I have created a full design system just with Claude in Figma. So now there was a time I used to start in Figma, the design system, then tell my frontend engineer, and then they used to do it in the code. Now I start with design system.

P4 [13:31]: in code and then take it to Figma. So the whole process has changed in that way. So as I said, Figma is the polish and the playground, final place to polish. So that's where I want my tokens. So I bring the tokens from repo to Figma and then polish it and then drag to code.

Interviewer [13:40]: Big. Okay, and are there any tasks that you would not delegate to an agent? Like if it were capable?

P4 [13:58]: Uh...

Interviewer [13:59]: Like anything that is coming to my mind.

P4 [14:02]: Nothing like I like I think I am in that AI hype that everything that I want I would first go with AI and if it doesn't do then I would maybe retract and figure out how I can do it. But mostly my natural bias is.

P4 [14:21]: Can AI do it? Because that's the way to go. And if it is not able to get there, maybe then I will try something by my own self. Like thinking is again something which is very cool to humans, I guess. Nothing else.

Interviewer [14:34]: Oh. Got it. And do you have like any concerns about, for example, you said that you created a design system and the design system was also communicating, like code was also being created from that particular design system and your design files were also exposed to these LLMs. So were there any concerns about your... like personal data or like being accused by an AI agent.

P4 [15:01]: No, I think AI knows us far more than our Figma files or any other thing. So that thing...

Interviewer [15:02]: No, okay.

P4 [15:11]: There was a time where this was thing like AI would know us far better than we know ourselves. That is still there. But talking about the security angle of access to Figma files and all that, I don't think that's a problem because as long as it's just between me and me.

P4 [15:32]: AI in my Figma and not exposed to any third party accessing my Figma and then that I am fine. So.

P4 [15:41]: Yeah, but I don't know how these AI companies are using my data for their own data. So that's a black box.

Interviewer [15:45]: SN. Interesting. And like has these any of these tools have changed how you think about your role as a designer? Like do you feel more like a director or a collaborator or something else like?

P4 [15:58]: Yeah, I think it's more of, so when we used to design, it was also about managing people, expectations, feedback, and at the same time doing the craft. So we are still doing the craft, but now it's more of giving directions and thinking again on how to go and achieve that.

P4 [16:19]: It's more about speed and executing rather than craft as all. So yeah, there is a fundamental shift. The whole design process has changed. But yeah, it's more about managing and figuring out with Claude and its system, then manually figuring out, taking mood boarding, wire framing, researching.

P4 [16:42]: That all has gone out of the box.

Interviewer [16:45]: Got it And how do we like imagine the change being in place like over the next few years, like within the use of agentic AI? What will change? do you have anything in mind?

P4 [16:56]: I think it's gonna get better and better and better. The world, like AI is going nowhere and we can't beat AI. We can't challenge AI. The only way to win is use AI to figure out your work, build something with it. Today, there are so many broken processes with AI also.

Interviewer [17:00]: Yeah, OK.

P4 [17:18]: Like everything will get agentic. The big companies are already working towards that direction, where it feels like I'm just thinking and things are maybe happening. I don't know when it will come, but models will continue to improve and...

Interviewer [17:21]: Thank you.

P4 [17:32]: Our work will continue to evolve with that. So I am excited. I don't know how it will evolve, but. It's written was, I guess.

Interviewer [17:41]: Interesting. I think that was it. So thank you, P4, for your time. It was really great.

P4 [17:46]: Thanks. Yeah, likewise. Thank you.

Interviewer [17:48]: Yeah, I'll stop the recording.

E.5 P5 Full Anonymised Transcript

16m 40s

Interviewer [0:04]: Okay, I think the recorded has been started. Okay, thank you, P5, for taking part in the study. I'm Interviewer. I'm currently doing MSC at HCI at a UK university. So this interview will be like a part of a module that I'm studying that is human-AI interaction. And I'm exploring how product designers experience.

Interviewer [0:24]: like using agentic tools like Figma MCP and Claude Code in their workflows. This interview will be around like 15, 20 minutes. There are like no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your honest experiences and opinions. You are free to skip any question or stop at any point without giving any reason. So before we begin.

P5 [0:28]: Interviewer.

Interviewer [0:44]: Can you just confirm that it's like it's your consent on this interview and I can record it?

P5 [0:49]: Yeah, sure.

Interviewer [0:52]: Cool. So firstly, like I'll I wanted to ask you about can you tell me a bit about your current role and how long you have been working as a product designer?

P5 [1:02]: Sure. Hi, Interviewer. I have been working at [company] and I have been working as a founding designer of past one year. So before that, like I have experience around plus two years in product designing.

Interviewer [1:12]: OK. Great. Can you just tell me, if you remember, how did you first come across these agentic ai tools like claude code and figma mcp? What prompted you to try it?

P5 [1:32]: So recently, I think two, three months back, a lot of clouds started blooming. So there was this concept of MCP and MCP everywhere. So I actually consulted one of my mentors to set up all these things. And eventually, that's how, like I said.

P5 [1:54]: things of the Figma, Claude, like that's how I bridged this gap.

Interviewer [2:00]: Got it. So was it like a personal decision or something like your team adopted is in the company?

P5 [2:07]: Like I was trying to switch towards agentic tools and like I see how the industry is changing. I didn't want to be left behind, so I initially started myself, but eventually currently we have adopted this.

P5 [2:25]: approach that we start with AI tools and that's how we work here right now.

Interviewer [2:31]: Got it, cool, cool. How regularly do you use these tools? is it daily, occasionally, or experimentally?

P5 [2:37]: It is daily. That's how we started. Like it has to be part of the workflow or like not just me, everybody in my team, tech, non-tech, non-product, everybody has to start with like tools, AI tools. Otherwise, we like this is how this is the kind of approach we are taking currently.

Interviewer [2:40]: Design.

P5 [2:56]: Oh, I think, yeah, that's about it.

Interviewer [2:58]: Interesting. Can you just walk me through like a recent project that you did which used Figma MCP Claude Code? Like what did you use it for? Like any recent project or anything that you build?

P5 [3:10]: I'm not sure I can share that, but I can talk about it.

Interviewer [3:13]: No, no, you don't have to share it. You can just like tell me.

P5 [3:15]: Yeah sure. So we currently are building a product and it is, it's more on to a co-pilot kind of thing. So how, so do you want to know the workflow? I like what kind of.

Interviewer [3:20]: No, no, no, just tell me like in very, very short.

P5 [3:34]: I have... Taking the repo of my friend end or whatever based on that product we are building and on that I set up my Claude and then eventually I give some prompts like set up my MCP with Figma. I connected my Figma through that and then back and forth I keep on doing and things I can push things.

P5 [3:59]: on GitHub now. That's how it is currently.

Interviewer [4:02]: Got it And like you mentioned that you like created this kind of workflow where you work with Claude Code and you like communicate with Figma MCP to understand design part of it. So what change have you been experiencing like previously? I think you must have started your designing in some other tool, then you switch to code or then you give it to developers. So like what was the starting point?

P5 [4:09]: YeahMan.

Interviewer [4:26]: As of now, in this age. For a Project.

P5 [4:31]: Okay, how do I start any project? That's what you are trying to ask. I have a strong opinion on this, but I can tell you, I start with Claude, just Claude. I take an approach of having a PRD first.

Interviewer [4:33]: Yeah

P5 [4:49]: Eventually, then I have a prototype based on that PRD or whatever output I get. And eventually, as a team, we start, we have a brainstorming session, what we want or what we don't want on that prototype. If that's the thing we want to take forward, we take decisions from that. And then eventually, if...

P5 [5:11]: That is exactly the design I want. I go to code and I just, because I have the repos right, I repo folder, so I start building on that top of that. But here I do have an opinion. Currently what I've been facing is that just don't work.

Interviewer [5:14]: No, no.

P5 [5:31]: like it does not work and you have to go back to the roots where you have to edit something in the Figma. So currently I am stuck in the loop like how exactly should I like collaborate both of these that I that I have a balance instead of.

Interviewer [5:38]: And.

P5 [5:51]: thinking that this thing is going to take my time. I just want to optimize everything well. Microphone.

Interviewer [6:00]: What is what, whatever what I understand from this is you directly go to Claude Code, you create something based on the PRD that your PM gives you, gives you, and OK.

P5 [6:04]: No, we generate the PRD myself, yeah.

Interviewer [6:10]: Okay, you generate the PRD, then you create the design directly from Claude Code, prototype directly from Claude Code. And then if the output or like if it doesn't match, then you go to Figma and then edit something and then maybe again go to Claude Code.

P5 [6:12]: Correct, prototype, yes, correct, yeah. Correct, correct, correct.

Interviewer [6:26]: Got it and then how you translate your Claude Code to Figma, like is the communication two-way right now?

P5 [6:33]: So there's only one reason to do that. It is to keep a track of version history, like whatever designs has been put. That's the only role here. So there's a, I have, since I have connected with the MCP, if I just give a command that, copy this thing to my Figma, so there are follow up.

P5 [6:52]: commands which Claude Code keeps on asking. I keep on granting and then eventually it pastes there. But I don't think so that is a good approach. But yeah, like it just not feels the design as a designer, when an AI is copying things, it is broken there.

Interviewer [6:55]: Got it Interesting. Like what parts of the workflow that you mentioned do you hand over to the AI agent? Like what do you prefer to keep it to yourself? Like is there any some like is there something in the process which you keep it yourself and don't give it to like the agent?

P5 [7:11]: And. I didn't get you.

Interviewer [7:28]: Okay, so like you mentioned that there's a workflow that you follow, right? Like PRD generation, then you give that PRD to Claude Code. Claude Code creates the design.

P5 [7:31]: So are you like you are asking in what ways? I don't have I don't want input of an AI.

Interviewer [7:42]: Exactly, like what parts of the workflow do we want to hand over to an AI agent? What and what part do we want to keep it to yourself?

P5 [7:49]: Right, especially when it comes to PRD and prototyping. Initially it used to take a week, something like that. Right now it's just an hour's job that things.

P5 [8:03]: Are visualize and we can have a big strong session, so I love this part that the thinking part is a cut short now. I just when I know there are visual when I know the I know the direction we have to take eventually that thing now I'm bringing back to Figma because I want clean design, I want version history, so that is like my.

P5 [8:23]: that's something what as a product and as a company we want to keep, right? That's the workflow we are following that. We want our Figma files to have that originality that there are the real designs, right? Not Claude to Design, but Figma to Claude, that kind of approach. So once I know the prototype.

Interviewer [8:29]: And. From you.

P5 [8:41]: I come back to Figma, I design. If I know there's something major change, I go back to prototype, ping any of the snippets, like I want to show animation. So I will go there, then I will take that artifact, right? That's what we call. I just give that link to the developer and they can understand what I want to.

Interviewer [8:44]: The.

P5 [9:00]: get like what I want them to have it. Yeah, that is what has been happening. So I, in short, when it is about brainstorming, thinking, that's what I am still using Claude for, but for originality for actually speeding up my time, I'm using Figma because.

Interviewer [9:04]: Mm-hmm.

Interviewer [9:21]: Got it Nice. has it changed any how you, has it changed in any ways how you collaborate with developers or other team members?

P5 [9:31]: Definitely, because since now I don't have to depend on them to fix a bug, at least on frontend. The fact that I know how to raise a PR, the fact that I have this claude, I, and it has to be very, like it is about some small things, like I don't like.

P5 [10:03]: This thing has been solved, yeah, here.

Interviewer [10:06]: Nice interesting. Cool. Have you encountered any frustrations, limitations, or like any unexpected behaviors from these tools?

P5 [10:08]: Yes, so like I said, when I was taking this approach to Claude first, I feel if it is your passion project or a personal project, it works well because nobody cares about what kind of tech stack you have used, right? But when it comes to company tool, like company tool you're building or whatever you're...

Interviewer [10:21]: And.

P5 [10:39]: building for the company, it just won't work because the kind of code Claude will read and write, it will be very different than what your frontend, whatever your technical people are using. So it has additionally created, like now my frontend people take time to read my codes. That's not what we wanted.

Interviewer [10:40]: At 10.

P5 [11:02]: So that that is happening currently.

Interviewer [11:04]: Got it I think the code structure might be different than what the frontend guy will make. it's different from got it, but so it's very difficult for them to understand it and then maybe make changes, increase the time.

P5 [11:07]: Right, right, right. Right. So instead of reducing the time, it has increased the time. And even for me, I have to go back and forth to Figma and this prototyping tool. Like I need, because not Claude can't do everything. It cannot. Even after giving 10 rounds of iterations, it just not get it what I want.

P5 [11:35]: I have to come back to Figma and do things from the scratch.

Interviewer [11:38]: Nice. And how much do you trust like the AI's output? Can you give me like a rating out of 10? How much trust do you have?

P5 [11:48]: See, if you have a very clear PRD, you have solid prompting for iteration versions to have that first version, it is there, 8 on 10. It's right there. Then comes whatever your vision is.

Interviewer [11:51]: Mm-hmm.

P5 [12:06]: how fine-tune you want to do that, that part I do that on Figma. So yeah, it's almost there, but it will not be totally there. That's the, that's what I've figured out.

Interviewer [12:11]: Got it Cool. Do I have any like concerns about your design system or the De? Data, these like tools are using, for example, not to have access to all your Figma files of the company. do you have like any concerns about it, or you are fine with it?

P5 [12:33]: not really, because it is in a way helping, like it is trying to understand who I am as a user and because I have installed this on my desktop, so it understands everything and eventually at some point if I have to.

P5 [12:54]: ask something which I don't remember, they tend to explain me this is what. So for example, there is something called a Skills. Now I have made those skills such that it helps me understand things. So I think it is working well. I don't have any concerns as such.

Interviewer [13:03]: Mm-hmm. Nice.

Interviewer [13:14]: Cool. So like some people argue these tools like blur the line between designers and developers. So doesn't that does that like resonate with you?

P5 [13:21]: And. As in we don't are you trying to in a way say that we don't need a developer anymore in that direction?

Interviewer [13:30]: No, no, no. So what I'm saying is like... Like previously, I think before coming, like before the launch of these tools, roles are very separated. Like there was a product manager, then there was a product designer, and there was like a web developer, or you can say a software developer. But after coming, like after the launch of AI, all the like the difference between these roles have been like narrowed down.

Interviewer [13:56]: everyone is doing like everything, some. So does that resonate with you is what I'm asking.

P5 [13:56]: Then. Totally, but again, it depends on company to company or wherever you work at, because currently I know I can push codes, but is that code good enough? That's the question.

Interviewer [14:04]: I got, I got nice. And how comfortable are you with the like using AI agents? And people like are also saying like it has like also increased autonomy over design decisions. Like people are heavily using AI agents to get like design decisions, right? For example, choosing components or like adjacents. existing spaces, colors, and things like that. So are you comfortable with the autonomy of all your devices to an AI or not?

P5 [14:38]: Oh. Not really, because I take this as a prototype tool, right? I am not blindly trusting it because for me as a human, whatever taste you have, that is not something AI can give. I will have a direction, but it will not have the direction you can give. There have been instances where I am pointing it out, this is what you are doing wrong.

P5 [15:03]: And it takes time for these AI agents to understand, okay, this is exactly what she's trying to pinpoint, and that is exactly wrong. So that happens quite a lot of time. So that's why I cannot blindly believe, Ki, that's what you have to, yeah

Interviewer [15:03]: Understandable. Got it. I think just last question. How do you like imagine your use of agentic AI tools? Like how will it evolve according to you in the next few years?

P5 [15:28]: With respect to Design.

Interviewer [15:31]: Yeah, in respect of Design.

P5 [15:33]: I think already I'm seeing there's a crazy buzz going around on Twitter everywhere. But right now I feel, I still feel is that now more people will have taste, right, which people lacked before, but you will always evolve.

P5 [15:54]: That's what I feel. Design will always keep you evolving because it is subjective in the end. So yeah, if some things are going, some things will come some way. But though, as and when AI approach like evolves. So I think there will be new things.

P5 [16:13]: What I think is now the rules are not limited, that's for sure. So expectations have increased. So maybe as a designer, I want to be a designer, maybe a builder. So that is what is going to happen in future. That's for sure.

Interviewer [16:16]: Very interesting. I think that that was it. Thank you so much. Thank you so much for your inputs. It was really nice.

Interviewer [16:36]: I will stop the recording.

END