

Simulated research: AI tool adoption

About this simulated case

SIMULATED CASE. All participants, transcript excerpts, timestamps and conclusions are invented for a reproducible product demonstration. No customer data, recorded interviews, live ASR or measured product outcomes are represented. Findings were manually curated and marked confirmed in the fixture, not independently validated.

Research objective

Understand adoption barriers and review a traceable evidence-to-report workflow using invented material.

Participants and method

P1 - Operations Director; 42 min (fictional timeline)
P2 - Product Lead; 38 min (fictional timeline)
P3 - Insights Manager; 51 min (fictional timeline)
P4 - Product Researcher; 44 min (fictional timeline)
P5 - Research Lead; 47 min (fictional timeline)
P6 - Operations Manager; 36 min (fictional timeline)
P7 - Product Manager; 48 min (fictional timeline)
P8 - Insights Analyst; 40 min (fictional timeline)

Manually confirmed findings

F1: Teams save 2-4 hours per week on manual synthesis
Several fictional participants describe 2-4 hours saved after onboarding; this is an illustrative range, not a measured product result.

F2: Ease of use is the first adoption criterion in this scenario
Participants prioritize finding quotes, a clear review flow and low training effort. This qualitative scenario does not establish a market-wide ranking.

F3: Source citations are required for stakeholder trust
Participants ask for exact quotes, timestamps and surrounding context; contradictory evidence remains visible.

F4: Workflow fit supports continued use; a repository can be a barrier
Export compatibility matters in this fictional scenario. P7 and P8 prefer lightweight reports; automated integrations were not tested.

F5: Visible value helps sponsors approve a pilot
Two participants request visible time savings or a small pilot before a subscription decision. This is not evidence of conversion uplift.

Evidence and exact source references

E01 | P1 | 05:10 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

We used to spend six hours on synthesis. With a first draft and source quotes, we save about three hours a week.

E02 | P1 | 14:22 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

The biggest lift is getting from eight calls to something my VP can read without me spending the weekend in a spreadsheet.

E03 | P1 | 22:05 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

Ease of use comes first for me. If a colleague needs a training session to find a quote, adoption stalls.

E04 | P1 | 31:40 | F5 | support | SIMULATED

My sponsor needs to see hours saved before approving another software subscription.

E05 | P2 | 04:30 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

A draft summary saves us two hours each week, but we still review every quotation.

E06 | P2 | 12:15 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

We now start the discussion with the evidence instead of compiling notes from scratch.

E07 | P2 | 19:45 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

A simple review screen matters more to our team than a long list of settings.

E08 | P2 | 28:20 | F5 | support | SIMULATED

A small pilot with a visible time saving is easier to approve than an annual commitment.

E09 | P3 | 06:00 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

I can prepare the weekly readout in one afternoon instead of a full day.

E10 | P3 | 15:50 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

Grouping similar quotes removes repetitive sorting, but interpretation is still my job.

E11 | P3 | 25:10 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

My first question is always whether a new teammate can use it without instructions.

E12 | P3 | 39:05 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

A confident summary is not enough. I need the exact words and the interview timestamp.

E13 | P4 | 07:20 | F1 | counter | SIMULATED

The draft shortens preparation, although the first project took longer to set up.

E14 | P4 | 13:40 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

The clearest interface won our trial even though another tool had more features.

E15 | P4 | 24:55 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

One obvious next step is more useful than five configuration panels.

E16 | P4 | 35:30 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

We check whether a finding still holds when someone says the opposite.

E17 | P5 | 08:10 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

For our regular interviews, we save roughly four hours of manual synthesis each week.

E18 | P5 | 16:35 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

I would choose the tool my colleagues actually open, not the one with the longest feature list.

E19 | P5 | 27:08 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

I need to click back to the quote. Otherwise it's just another AI paragraph that sounds right.

E20 | P5 | 37:25 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

Seeing a contradictory quote makes the report more credible, not less.

E21 | P6 | 05:45 | F1 | counter | SIMULATED

We save about two hours on a typical week, but there was no time saving during onboarding.

E22 | P6 | 14:05 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

The review flow has to make sense to an occasional user as well as a specialist.

E23 | P6 | 23:50 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

When export is hard to find, people return to copying text into documents.

E24 | P6 | 30:15 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

We do not send a summary to leadership until somebody has checked its sources.

E25 | P7 | 06:25 | F1 | counter | SIMULATED

A short draft helps, but I still spend the same time discussing ambiguous evidence.

E26 | P7 | 17:10 | F2 | support | SIMULATED

I want the transcript and the note next to each other rather than hidden in separate menus.

E27 | P7 | 26:30 | F3 | support | SIMULATED

A citation should show what was said before and after, not just a convenient sentence.

E28 | P7 | 33:41 | F4 | counter | SIMULATED

If it exports cleanly and works with our existing doc process, we'll use it. If it becomes another repository, we won't.

E29 | P8 | 07:35 | F1 | counter | SIMULATED

An initial synthesis saves time, but a short project does not always justify a new tool.

E30 | P8 | 16:55 | F1 | support | SIMULATED

The first draft is useful; the final interpretation still needs a researcher.

E31 | P8 | 25:20 | F4 | support | SIMULATED

We need a plain text report that fits our current review process.

E32 | P8 | 34:10 | F4 | counter | SIMULATED

A manual export is enough for us today; we have not tested an automated integration.

Contradictions and limitations

SIMULATED CASE. All participants, transcript excerpts, timestamps and conclusions are invented for a reproducible product demonstration. No customer data, recorded interviews, live ASR or measured product outcomes are represented. Findings were manually curated and marked confirmed in the fixture, not independently validated.

Eight invented participants and four excerpts per interview. Timelines are fictional; these are excerpts, not complete recordings. No population inference, measured ROI, automatic integrations or ASR accuracy can be established. P4/P6 describe onboarding costs; P7/P8 prefer lightweight handoff. Counter-evidence is retained.

Recommendations

F1: Compare review time in a small pilot before projecting savings.

F2: Test the first review task with an occasional user.

F3: Review each supporting and contradictory quote before sharing.

F4: Validate TXT, CSV and PDF handoff with the existing review process.

F5: Define pilot success criteria with the sponsor.