

Productivity implications for generative AI role-based prompts as a networked hermeneutic

Discourse & Communication

1–2

© The Author(s) 2024

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/17504813241271444

journals.sagepub.com/home/dcm**Sean Rintel**

Microsoft Research, UK

Keywords

Explainability, facilitation, generative AI, productivity, role-based prompts, simulation

As Housley and Dahl (2024) demonstrate, role-based prompts for Generative AI (GenAI) systems are based on vernacular resources of membership categorization and action description, representing a networked hermeneutic of lay and professional sociology. As a Microsoft Human-Computer Interaction researcher, I see three implications for designing GenAI systems for productivity.

First, it may help understand some of the mysteries of GenAI responses, from simple mistakes to the chaos of the ‘Wailuigi effect’ (the meme-ified term for Jung’s ‘shadow’, in which a GenAI does the opposite of what it is asked; Qureshi, 2023). Just as users’ role-based prompting is a networked hermeneutic, so too are GenAI’s reflections of ourselves. Knowing the training data and treating the responses to prompts as methods enacting the hermeneutic may improve GenAI *explainability*. This is important to resolving the metacognitive issues of using GenAI systems – calibrating one’s ability to craft prompts and evaluate outputs (Tankelevitch et al., 2024) – and is also central to the concept of GenAI co-auditing (Gordon et al., 2023). Understanding GenAI responses by way of the networked hermeneutic may provide for explainability beyond mechanized methods.

Corresponding author:

Sean Rintel, Microsoft Research, 21 Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2FB, UK.

Email: serintel@microsoft.com

Second, as a synthetic reflection of a networked hermeneutic, GenAI provides the potential for *simulations* of role-based behavior, to be compared with responses from humans in those roles, and thus open new fields of ‘technomethodological’ inquiry (Button and Dourish, 1996). Such inquiries should not naïvely substitute synthetic personas for real people and assume that the results are either relevant or generalizable. However, there is potential for scaling research into human action that did not exist before.

Finally, understanding role-based prompt behavior and GenAI’s responses holds the promise of *facilitating* team collaboration. This could start with systems coaching users to specify interactional stances that will help a GenAI system provide relevant work information. The more complex version is for systems help unpack the interactional stances of other team members when they are not present. This might enable a synthesis of the holistic interactional stances of teams, ensuring alignment to team goals, aiding onboarding, and help team-members and even other teams to understand one another.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Button G and Dourish P (1996) Technomethodology: Paradoxes and possibilities. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems (CHI '96)*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 13–18 April 1996, pp.19–26. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Gordon AD, Negreanu C, Cambronero J, et al. (2023) Co-audit: Tools to help humans double-check AI-generated content. In: *PLATEAU 2024, 14th annual workshop on the intersection of HCI and PL*, Berkeley, CA, USA, 19–20 February 2024. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Housley W and Dahl P (2024) Membership categorisation, sociological description and role prompt engineering with Chat GPT. *Discourse and Communication* 18(6).
- Qureshi NS (2023) Waluigi, Carl Jung, and the case for moral AI. *Wired*, 25 May. Available at: <https://www.wired.com/story/waluigi-effect-generative-artificial-intelligence-morality/> (accessed 26 January 2024).
- Tankelevitch L, Kewenig V, Simkute A, et al. (2024) The metacognitive demands and opportunities of generative AI. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems (CHI '24)*, Honolulu, HI, USA, 11–16 May 2024. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.

Author biography

Sean Rintel studies the intersection of communication, technology, and work as a Senior Principal Researcher at Microsoft Research. He is currently exploring Generative AI, metacognition, remote and hybrid meetings, and workflows. He is an active editor and reviewer in academic communities.