

The Design Space of in-IDE Human-AI Experience

Agnia Sergeyyuk^{*†‡}, Ekaterina Koshchenko^{*‡}, Ilya Zakharov[‡], Timofey Bryksin[‡],
Maliheh Izadi[†]

[‡]JetBrains Research, [†]Delft University of Technology

{agnia.sergeyyuk, ekaterina.koshchenko, ilia.zakharov, timofey.bryksin}@jetbrains.com,
m.izadi@tudelft.nl

Abstract—Nowadays, integration of AI-driven tools within Integrated Development Environments (IDEs) is reshaping the software development lifecycle. Existing research highlights that users expect these tools to be efficient, context-aware, accurate, user-friendly, customizable, and secure. However, a major gap remains in understanding developers’ needs and challenges, particularly when interacting with AI systems *in IDEs* and from the perspectives of different user groups. In this work, we address this gap through structured interviews with 35 developers from three different groups: Adopters, Churners, and Non-Users of AI in IDEs to create a comprehensive Design Space of in-IDE Human-AI Experience.

Our results highlight key areas of *Technology Improvement*, *Interaction*, and *Alignment* in in-IDE AI systems, as well as *Simplifying Skill Building* and *Programming Tasks*. Our key findings stress the need for AI systems that are more personalized, proactive, and reliable. We also emphasize the importance of context-aware and privacy-focused solutions and better integration with existing workflows. Furthermore, our findings show that while Adopters appreciate advanced features and non-interruptive integration, Churners emphasize the need for improved reliability and privacy. Non-Users, in contrast, focus on skill development and ethical concerns as barriers to adoption. Lastly, we provide recommendations for industry practitioners aiming to enhance AI integration within developer workflows.

Index Terms—Human-Computer Interaction, AI, IDE, Programming, User Studies, User Experience

I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in software development is transforming the way developers interact with their Integrated Development Environments (IDEs) [1]–[5]. These AI-powered assistants facilitate tasks like code generation, debugging, and optimization with the goal of boosting productivity and reducing the cognitive load associated with repetitive programming tasks [6].

As these tools continue to evolve, there is a growing interest in how developers engage with AI within their daily workflows. However, despite this surge in interest, little is known about the *in-IDE* Human-AI Experience (HAX), particularly the successes and challenges developers face and what their needs are with these tools. We see this gap as a major challenge as IDE is the main tool for software development nowadays — 97% of respondents to the Stack Overflow 2023 survey used at least one IDE for their coding activities [7].

Existing research highlighted the potential of AI to significantly enhance the software development process [8], [9].

^{*}Authors contributed equally to this work.

Large-scale surveys reveal that developers value AI’s ability to reduce time spent on repetitive tasks and improve the accuracy of code completion [6].

Nonetheless, many studies overlook the in-IDE context and instead focus on general AI usage or overly specific features of AI. Additionally, current research does not address how different developer groups — such as those who have adopted, churned, or never used AI in IDE — experience these tools. However, it is crucial to examine distinct user groups as they reveal different barriers and opportunities for AI adoption. Adopters can highlight advanced use cases and suggest deeper integration into workflows. Churners can offer insights into why they abandoned AI, pointing out specific issues with usability or performance. Non-Users may reveal psychological or practical barriers, such as mistrust or preference for traditional methods, offering guidance for better onboarding and education.

This lack of insight into in-IDE interactions and user-specific challenges represents a significant gap in understanding the full impact of AI on the developers’ experience.

In this paper, we aim to address this gap by conducting a series of structured deep interviews with 35 developers who actively use, have churned, or have never used AI inside IDEs. We gathered programmers from 18 countries. The majority of participants were developers (32), many holding multiple roles such as team leads (9), architects (8), and DevOps engineers (5). Experience levels varied, with 16 participants having over 11 years of experience, 10 between 6 and 10 years, and 9 with 5 years or fewer. We explore their experiences, challenges, successes, and needs with in-IDE Human-AI Experience (HAX) in their daily workflows to answer the following Research Questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** What are developers’ specific needs when using AI within IDEs?
- **RQ2:** How do these needs vary across different user groups?

With this work, we aim to advance the field of Human-AI collaboration by offering a deeper understanding of developers’ interactions with AI in IDEs. Our findings have practical implications for improving AI tool adoption, fostering more effective AI integration in development workflows, and guiding future research on AI’s role in software engineering. Our contributions are as follows:

- Developing a comprehensive *Design Space of in-IDE HAX* through thorough interviews with 35 developers and outlining the technological improvements needed to make AI tools more effective, reliable, and context-aware.
- Providing actionable insights for industry practitioners looking to enhance the integration of AI within developer workflows. Our findings reveal a demand for proactive AI features, privacy-focused solutions, and customizable tools that support skill development and streamline code generation and maintenance tasks.
- Identifying critical barriers to AI adoption, including skepticism among Churners and concerns about the environmental and ethical implications of AI among Non-Users.

II. RELATED WORK

In the rapidly evolving field of Human-AI Experience in development, there are a number of studies on what users expect and need from this experience [6], [8]–[13].

A large-scale survey of 410 developers on their usage and experience with AI programming assistants [6] revealed several key expectations and needs. Developers seek features such as faster completion of programming tasks and the ability to bypass online syntax references. They also want the tools to handle repetitive code or simple logic more effectively. To enhance AI programming assistants, developers suggest incorporating user feedback to correct or personalize the tool or improving the underlying model’s understanding of code context. Additionally, there is a demand for more natural language interaction with these tools.

Wang et al. [8] present findings from interviews with 15 professionals and surveys of 599 practitioners to investigate expectations for code completion tools. Key needs and expectations include providing hints, improving programming efficiency, and enhancing the programming experience.

A survey of 481 developers on the use of AI-based coding assistants [12] explored how these tools are utilized in various software development activities and stages, and why they may be avoided in certain parts of the workflow. Key needs include improving the accuracy of AI-generated output and addressing issues with non-functional requirements such as performance, security, usability, reliability, and scalability. It is also important to enhance AI assistants’ understanding of context and integrate AI systems into developers’ workflows. Moreover, it is crucial to educate users about the capabilities and limitations of AI assistants.

An empirical study on code search in intelligent coding assistants [11], which included a survey of 53 users and interviews with 7 respondents, examined user perceptions and expectations for the Lingma coding assistant. The study found that while experienced developers may not frequently use code search, when they do, they expect the tool to be highly effective.

An ideal tool would not only enhance code quality by detecting bugs and vulnerabilities but also improve program-

ming style and better understand user intent to produce more relevant results.

A semi-structured interview study with 15 data scientists [9] revealed several key preferences for AI code assistants in notebooks. Participants emphasized that code assistants should function as polite ghostwriters and enforce best practices while providing opinionated guidance. Effective assistants should offer multiple ways to control context. Users appreciated when expectations were subverted with useful and surprising results and valued adherence to familiar notebook UI patterns to facilitate adoption. Task-specific assistants tailored for data science were viewed as beneficial, and knowledge of the underlying model was important for shaping user expectations.

Overall, these papers highlight the need for AI systems in coding to be efficient, context-aware, accurate, user-friendly, customizable, and secure, while also supporting a wide range of programming languages and sources.

However, most existing studies focus on AI in the broader software development process or on highly specific contexts, making them less generalizable to the in-IDE Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC). This is a significant gap, as most developers use IDEs for coding. According to large-scale industrial studies, up to 97% of respondents use an IDE for their developer activities [7]. Therefore, AI tools integrated into IDEs can have the most immediate and sustained impact on developers’ productivity.

Therefore, in our work, we focus specifically on in-IDE interactions. We conducted structured deep interviews with three groups of developers — Adopters, Churners, and Non-Users of AI assistants — providing a more nuanced understanding of the in-IDE HAX. The resulting design space, built from these interviews, offers actionable insights for industry practitioners seeking to develop new features and for researchers aiming to align their studies with users’ real-world expectations of in-IDE HAX.

III. METHOD

The study was conducted in line with JetBrains’ ethical standards, adhering to the values and guidelines outlined in the ICC/ESOMAR International Code [14]. The full description of the participants’ self-reported experience and interview guide are presented in Supplementary materials [15]. Due to company confidentiality policies, full interview transcripts cannot be shared. However, the insights and findings in this paper are based on a rigorous qualitative analysis of the interviews.

A. Recruitment

The participants were chosen among the users of the JetBrains products to maintain consistency in the development environment. However, we did not restrict their choice of AI assistants within the IDE. This approach allowed us to gather diverse insights on AI usage while ensuring a shared context for the study.

The invitation link was emailed to the list of developers who are subscribed to the JetBrains products and who gave their

consent for contact with research purposes. The invitation link was also advertised via personal social media by the authors of the paper.

Following the invitation link, potential participants found the qualification survey that was aimed at finding a diverse sample of programmers with various experiences who could be assigned to one of the three groups: a) Adopters, b) Churners, and c) Non-Users of AI inside IDE. These three groups were chosen to capture various experiences with AI tools in IDEs. Adopters provide insights into active engagement and feature utilization, while Churners reveal the reasons behind discontinuation. Non-Users, on the other hand, help identify the factors contributing to resistance or hesitation.

To characterize participants' experiences, we collected data on their job roles, employment status, current position level, years of professional coding experience, and experience with AI tools within IDEs. We also asked which IDEs or editors they use with AI, the specific AI tools and programming languages they've tried with AI assistance, and their longest duration of AI tool usage for coding in an IDE.

Overall, we received 380 responses to the screener. The participants in the group were gathered up to the data saturation point [16]. Therefore, we were sending invites iteratively, and overall, fifty-five survey participants who were eligible for participation received a Calendly link to schedule a virtual one-on-one 90-minute interview session. Not all of them were able to make it to the interview. Therefore, the final sample of the study consists of 35 programmers — 15 Adopters, 12 Churners, and 8 Non-Users of AI inside IDEs.

Most of the participants were developers — 32 of them. Many of the interviewees held multiple job roles, including 9 team leads, 8 architects, and 5 DevOps engineers. In terms of employment status, 26 were fully employed, 5 were self-employed, with 2 freelancers, 1 working student, and 1 partially employed. The majority of participants (28) were senior specialists, while 5 were mid-level, and 2 junior programmers. Years of experience vary, with 16 participants having over 11 years of experience, 10 having between 6 and 10 years, and 9 with 5 years or fewer.

As a thank you, participants were offered a 100 USD Amazon eGift Card or an equivalent-value pack of JetBrains products.

B. Procedure

1) *Data Collection*: The interviews were conducted according to the script, which the first two authors carefully developed, reviewed with certified UX researchers from JetBrains, and piloted with four colleagues within the company to refine the questions and the overall structure of the interview.

Participants were asked open-ended questions that covered the following key topics:

- Overall AI experience
- AI tools used for coding
- Challenges of in-IDE HAX
- Successes of in-IDE HAX
- Needs in the context of in-IDE HAX

- Desired features
- Future of AI for coding

We adjusted the interview scripts to account for the distinct groups' unique experiences with AI for coding. For Adopters, the questions focused on their ongoing use of AI tools, exploring typical tasks, workflows, challenges, and successes within the IDE. Churners, on the other hand, reflected on their initial adoption and subsequent disengagement, identifying reasons for discontinuation and missed opportunities. Non-Users were asked about their reasons for not adopting AI, and any potential barriers and possible motivations that could encourage them to begin using these tools were discussed. This approach ensured that the experiences of each group were thoroughly explored while maintaining thematic consistency throughout the interviews.

2) *Data Analysis*: To analyze interview data, all recordings were transcribed using a User Research Repository Condens.¹ Transcriptions were then subject to the Thematic analysis process [17], [18]. This process allowed us to identify participants' success stories with in-IDE AI, problems they encountered, their needs that are not yet covered, and their ideas for the future of in-IDE AI, and organize these insights using specific codes.

The first two authors initially reviewed the first transcript to agree on the analysis approach and code-deriving process. They then entered into an iterative, inductive process, where they independently assigned **Codes** to quotes from transcripts. Finally, they compiled the list of 161 codes and then met again to add or delete codes, resolve any disagreements until full consensus was reached. The final versions of the codes were then assigned to the corresponding quotes.

The final step of data analysis was to group the derived codes into **Thematic groups** that would represent interviewees' needs regarding in-IDE HAX. The first and third authors grouped the codes asynchronously before entering a discussion session to finalize the Thematic groups. These thematically related codes were then organized into broader **Topics** that represent the design space for in-IDE HAX.

More specifically, the process looked as follows. Having a user's quote

"The most useful thing you could do with AI would be a summary of a Pull Request." — N13

the authors suggested their codes — "Review companion" from the first author and "Automated review summarizing" from the second. Then, the authors met and discussed the final **Code** — "Code Review support". This code was then assigned to the **Thematic group** "Code Optimization" which finally was placed into the **Topic** "Simplifying Programming Tasks".

Note that with this approach, the challenge of the "Inability to Influence Context", the success story "Context-Dependent Generation" and the need for "Viewable Context" were all assigned to the Thematic group "Context-Aware Technology",

¹Condens <https://condens.io/>

which represents the technology’s ability to integrate and understand various levels of context.

IV. RESULTS

Figure 1 presents the results of our interview study in the form of the **Design Space of in-IDE HAX** from developers’ perspectives. A more detailed table with Codes can be found in the Supplementary materials [15].

A. Technology Improvement

The **Technology Improvement** Topic refers to enhancing AI systems across several dimensions represented by Thematic groups *Accessible, Proactive, Reliable, Up-to-date, Ethical, Private, Secure, Aligned, and Context-Aware Technology*.

Accessible Technology. This group reflects participants’ desire for technologies that are both affordable and adaptable to various constraints. Several participants expressed interest in a universal programming language and envisioned natural language coding with AI capable of processing multiple programming and natural languages. Additionally, they identified the pricing of AI tools as a significant barrier, suggesting that lowering costs or offering feature-based purchasing options could address this issue. Interviewees also noted that country-specific factors, such as internet disruptions and legal restrictions, are often overlooked by providers, limiting accessibility in certain regions.

Proactive Technology. Participants highlighted the need for AI systems that go beyond passive assistance, emphasizing the importance of proactive features. They would like AI assistants to not only respond to their queries and offer suggestions but also to analyze their code in the background, identify opportunities for improvement, and even take action. For instance, one participant mentioned proactive debugging:

“It would be cool if it could search for problems along the way. [...] It could look and say ‘Hey, did you realize you just created an out-of-bounds condition?’ ” — U44

Surprisingly, participants commented that they would not mind having their code analyzed, provided this functionality remains within the IDE they already trust and is not used for any further model training. They expressed interest in AI that can generate code, optimize performance, manage documentation, and debug issues without needing constant user prompts. Additionally, participants saw value in AI handling routine tasks such as autonomous file and library management.

Reliable Technology. Participants emphasized the need for more reliable AI systems, noting concerns about the plateauing progress of AI in the future and current unsatisfactory output quality. Participants highlighted the AI’s tendency to fail with complex tasks, generate hallucinations, or mistake comments for prompts. To enhance reliability, participants suggested that AI should provide sources for its outputs and offer clear explanations. There were also concerns about the overreliance on AI, with participants stressing the importance of thorough review and validation of AI-generated outputs.

Up-to-date Technology. Participants stressed the importance of AI tools that remain current and reflect the latest advancements. Concerns were raised about the exhaustion of training data and the perpetuation of outdated or erroneous information, which could undermine the effectiveness and accuracy of tooling.

Ethical Technology. Participants highlighted several ethical concerns related to AI, including environmental impacts and the over-integration of AI in daily life and work, raising concerns about unwanted intrusion. They emphasized the need for clear rules and restrictions to guide the responsible use of AI, suggesting that automated regulation could help enforce ethical standards.

“AI, like anything with the potential to destroy jobs, carries a huge responsibility. I really hope that the community and organizations investing heavily in it get it right. Because if they get it wrong, recovering might be really difficult.” — U37

Private Technology. Participants pointed out the importance of privacy in AI usage. Many expressed a preference for on-premise or local AI solutions to ensure data security and comply with company-specific restrictions.

Secure Technology. Participants stressed the importance of AI tools that prioritize security, particularly in preventing vulnerabilities and maintaining the integrity of the generated code. They expressed a need for AI-generated code to be clearly marked as such, allowing developers to easily identify and verify it.

Aligned Technology. Participants expressed a desire for AI tools that align with their existing code practices. They suggested features like library recommendations and generation by example to enhance efficiency. However, they also emphasized challenges such as overcomplicated suggestions, mismatched technology choices, and redundant code generation. Issues with verbose commit messages were also noted as a complication in version control. On the positive side, participants appreciated AI’s ability to be consistent with naming conventions and match the project’s code style, which helps maintain cohesion in the codebase.

“It would be cool if I could just tell the AI ‘Look, this is a good example. Now extract a guideline from it on how to do things, generalize it.’ ” — U398

Context-aware Technology. Participants emphasized the importance of AI systems being contextually aware at both the project-wide and business levels, allowing for more accurate and relevant code generation. Features such as manually setting and viewing context were highlighted as useful, with some participants expressing frustration over the inability to adjust the current context. Many respondents felt that being able to view and edit the code context would help address privacy concerns:

“Sometimes I store keys and other sensitive data in my code, and I don’t want it to go to the AI, so I want to exclude it from its context.” — U90

| Technology Improvements | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Accessible Technology | Proactive Technology | Reliable Technology | Up-to-date Technology | Ethical Technology | Private Technology |
| Craft versatile technologies that are both affordable and adaptable to various constraints | Enhance efficiency and foresight by reducing users' manual effort and preemptively solving issues | Ensure the robustness and accuracy of AI systems and increase users' trust in AI solutions | Ensure AI systems remain current and competitive by integrating the latest advancements and updates | Balance innovation with conscientious practices, fostering technology that is both effective and morally sound | Focus on safeguarding user privacy and enhancing data security |
| <i>Separate feature purchase, Offline assistance</i> | <i>Proactive optimization, AI performing actions</i> | <i>Output clarifications, Providing sources</i> | <i>SOTA tooling, Up-to-date data</i> | <i>Rules and restrictions</i> | <i>On-premise AI</i> |

| Technology Improvements | | | Simplifying Programming Tasks | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Secure Technology | Aligned Technology | Context-aware Technology | AI Support in SDLC | Navigating the Codebase | AI in Ideation |
| Fortify AI systems against vulnerabilities and ensuring their integrity | Ensure that AI-generated solutions are coherent, non-redundant and consistent with codebase | Enhance AI's ability to understand and integrate various levels of context | Aim for universal adoption to provide consistent programming assistance, handle tedious and well-known tasks, and improve the end product | Facilitate a deeper comprehension of code and project structure to aid in navigating and understanding codebase | Enhance the creative and brainstorming process by providing more effective ways to generate and explore ideas |
| <i>Annotating AI code</i> | <i>Library suggestions, Better commit messages</i> | <i>Manually set context, Project-wide context awareness</i> | <i>Universal programming assistance</i> | <i>Onboarding support, Database analytics</i> | <i>Creative AI</i> |

| Simplifying Programming Tasks | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| AI in Implementation | AI in Testing | AI in Maintenance | Code Optimization | External System Integration |
| Support development workflows smoothing the process from concept to implementation | Enhance test generation and ensure robust, thorough evaluation of software systems | Simplify maintenance tasks to optimize and enhance ongoing maintenance and updates | Enhance code efficiency and quality to ensure high-performance and well-maintained codebases | Incorporate AI into broader development workflows and external systems, enhancing overall development efficiency and connectivity |
| <i>Multi-file generation, Project set-up assistance</i> | <i>Coverage report, UI testing</i> | <i>Repository management, Dependency management</i> | <i>Code evaluation, Code review support</i> | <i>AI in CI/CD Pipelines, Out-IDE AI access</i> |

| Technology Interaction | | Technology Alignment | | Simplifying Skill Building | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Non-Interruptive Technology | Internal System Integration | Adjustable Technology | Optimizing Workflow | User Education | Learning Support |
| Enhance user experience by reducing interruptions, and addressing interaction issues to maintain a smooth and efficient workflow | Enhance the cohesion and interaction of AI systems within development environments | Enhance functionality through configurable AI solutions that adapt to diverse requirements | Create a cohesive work environment that supports organization and facilitates daily tasks | Equip users with the knowledge and tools needed to effectively interact with AI systems | Support the acquisition of new concepts and skills, making the learning process more effective and empowering for developers |
| <i>Stable AI functionality, Fixing frequent logouts</i> | <i>Anywhere-in-IDE AI access, In-line code explanations</i> | <i>Configurable AI, AI action customization</i> | <i>Daily ecosystem summarizer, Automation of repetitive tasks</i> | <i>Shareable Prompt Library</i> | <i>Step-by-step output revealing</i> |

Fig. 1. The Design Space of in-IDE HAX With Descriptions.

This level of control could also aid in prompt engineering, as some participants expressed uncertainty about whether errors stemmed from an incorrect prompt or from the assistant retrieving the wrong code:

“Sometimes it generates something wrong, and maybe it’s because it looks in the wrong file. If I could specify exactly which lines it should consider for this task, that would help.” — U77

B. Simplifying Programming Tasks

The **Simplifying Programming Tasks** Topic focuses on integrating AI across various stages of software development to improve efficiency and reduce manual effort. This topic combines Thematic groups such as *AI Support in the Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC)*, *Navigating the Codebase*, *Code Optimization*, *External System Integration*, and *AI in Ideation, Implementation, Testing, and Maintenance*.

AI Support in SDLC. Participants shared a vision of AI evolving from an assistant to a colleague within the SDLC in the future.

“I would say it should be like a colleague, someone who understands what I wrote and can guide or help me where I lack knowledge” — U26

Despite voicing concerns about AI potentially displacing jobs, many saw AI’s future role as widely adopted universal programming assistance focused on boosting productivity. Participants highlighted the value of AI handling tedious, well-known, and simple tasks, which frees developers to focus on more complex work.

“I don’t want AI to suggest new code for me. I want it to deal with all the other stuff for me that I don’t have to deal with — more complete tasks, as opposed to giving me just some code snippet.” — C141

Navigating the Codebase. Participants emphasized the importance of AI in simplifying codebase navigation, especially for onboarding new developers. Key features such as database analytics, diagram generation, and detailed code explanations were seen as valuable tools for enhancing understanding of complex systems.

AI in Ideation. Participants recognized the potential of AI to support the ideation process but noted the limitations of LLMs in creative tasks. They expressed interest in cross-model prompting to enhance AI’s ability to generate more diverse ideas. AI’s role in information search was also seen as a valuable tool for ideation, helping developers gather relevant insights and inspiration during the early stages of development.

AI in Implementation. Participants expressed a desire for AI to play a more comprehensive role in project setup, full-stack generation, UI creation, and multi-file generation. Wishes included features like Figma-to-code integration, which would streamline design-to-development workflows. At the same time, participants acknowledged that existing AI functionalities, such as writing assistance, code generation, autocompletion, commit message writing, data manipulation, UI improvements, and template creation are already performing well and adding significant value.

AI in Testing. Participants highlighted the importance of AI in enhancing the software testing process. Key areas where AI could provide support include generating coverage reports, automating system and UI testing, and improving error handling. Additionally, participants saw value in AI-driven test generation, which would streamline the creation of test cases and help ensure more comprehensive testing.

AI in Maintenance. Participants recognized the potential of AI to significantly streamline maintenance tasks, particularly in areas such as repository and dependency management, database merging, and guideline enforcement. AI-driven tools were also seen as valuable for automating complex processes like refactoring, debugging, and language migration.

Code Optimization. Participants emphasized the value of AI in optimizing code by improving performance and encouraging best practices. AI tools that provide support during code reviews and offer thorough code evaluation were seen as instrumental in identifying areas for improvement.

External System Integration. Participants expect AI to not only integrate more deeply within their IDEs but also connect with external systems, such as CI/CD pipelines and version control systems. Accessing AI tools outside of the IDE was also seen as valuable for simplifying workflows across different platforms.

“It would be nice to have better traceability. Right now, so many things come through email, then there’s the support ticketing system, and, of course, our Git repositories. There could be ways to integrate all these even better.” — C118

C. Technology Interaction

The **Technology Interaction** Topic focuses on improving how AI systems integrate and interact within the development environment, ensuring efficient workflows. It includes two Thematic groups: *Non-Interruptive Technology* and *Internal System Integration*.

Non-Interruptive Technology. Participants expressed a strong desire for an uninterrupted experience, allowing them to interact with an AI assistant in the way they prefer, whether through chat, voice commands, or even technologies like Neuralink. Ensuring stable functionality was seen as key to maintaining workflow continuity. However, several challenges were identified, including slow response times, frequent logouts, and issues with chat functionality such as copy/paste errors and dead-ends. Reproducibility struggles with code completion, UI issues, and clashes between completions from different providers were mentioned as issues disrupting the workflow. Participants highlighted the importance of smooth in-line prompting and providing a preview of AI-generated suggestions to experience fewer interruptions. They also mentioned that integrating AI into IDE is beneficial, especially the chat feature, which helps avoid switching windows and experiencing unnecessary interruptions.

Internal System Integration. Participants emphasized the importance of smooth internal system integration, where AI tools interact efficiently with other systems and features within

the IDE. Key aspects included inter-AI interaction, in-line code explanations, and customizable key mappings to streamline workflows. Participants also noted the value of AI features being accessible throughout the entire IDE, including collaborative environments like “Code With Me”².

“Deeper integrations into IDE, like having it in your right-click context menu would be nice.” — C161

D. Technology Alignment

The **Technology Alignment** Topic is about tailoring AI systems to meet diverse user needs through configurable and customizable solutions. This topic includes the Thematic groups *Adjustable Technology* and *Optimizing Workflow*. **Adjustable Technology.** Participants stressed the importance of AI systems that offer a high degree of personalization and flexibility, allowing users to remain in control as decision-makers. Key features included configurable AI, the ability to choose between different models, and customizing AI actions based on specific tasks or workflows. They also expressed a desire for task-specific setups that allow AI to adapt to unique user preferences and needs.

Optimizing Workflow. Participants emphasized the need for AI tools that enhance efficiency by integrating them into the existing work ecosystem. Key features included automation of repetitive tasks and proactive workflow recommendations, both aimed at reducing manual effort. Participants also were interested in tools that could help manage distractions, track time, and summarize daily activities within their ecosystem. The ability to toggle time tracking, manage tickets, and have a personal prompt library were highlighted as essential for staying organized and improving productivity.

“Something that can help you stay organized. At my job, I have around 20 tickets pending, and sometimes I forget which one I’m currently working on and what to do next.” — N14

E. Simplifying Skill Building

The **Simplifying Skill Building** Topic emphasizes equipping users with the knowledge and tools needed to effectively engage with AI systems. It includes the Thematic groups *User Education* and *Learning Support*. **User Education.** Participants identified the need for better user education, particularly around effectively prompting AI systems. While a shareable prompt library was seen as a valuable resource, many reported struggles with prompt formulation and noted that AI tools often have a rather steep learning curve. Additionally, the unfamiliar interface of some AI systems contributed to these challenges. Several Non-Users even mentioned that the primary reason they do not use an AI assistant is the time required to get used to it:

“It’s a useful tool if employed correctly. But there is a learning curve. If I figure out how to work with

it efficiently, how to set up the right prompts, etc., it should speed up my work” — N84

Learning Support. Participants emphasized the role of AI as a learning enabler and mentor, supporting developers in acquiring new skills and learning new concepts. Features like step-by-step output revealing were mentioned as helpful in fostering long-term skill development.

RQ1. Developers emphasized the need for accessible, proactive, reliable, secure, and context-aware technology that adapts to their workflows and remains ethical and up-to-date. They seek AI tools that support various aspects of development, from code generation and testing to codebase navigation, focusing on non-interruptive, customizable, and learning-supportive interfaces. Moreover, developers prioritize smooth internal integration of AI with existing systems, emphasizing the need for intuitive user education and skills development to maximize AI’s potential within their workflows.

F. Comparative Analysis of Codes Among Groups

We present a comparative analysis of the Thematic groups among Adopters, Churners, and Non-Users in Figure 2, focusing on participants’ success stories (or anticipated advantages for Non-Users), challenges (or barriers for Non-Users), and needs in the context of in-IDE HAX. Lastly, we explore the similarities and differences at the Codes’ level.

Similarities Across All Groups. Several consistent themes emerged across all participant groups. Concerns about AI displacing jobs were widespread, reflecting apprehension about job security and the need for AI tools to complement rather than replace human capabilities. Participants expressed a general interest in AI’s role in code generation, explanation, and evaluation, recognizing its potential to enhance coding tasks. A common challenge was the lack of sufficient project-wide context awareness in AI tools, with participants calling for improvements in this area to boost AI’s effectiveness.

Ethical and privacy concerns, such as plagiarism and data protection, were also frequently mentioned, emphasizing the need to address these issues to build user trust. Additionally, participants noted the risk of overreliance on AI, highlighting the importance of balancing AI assistance with personal skill development. Despite these concerns, there was a shared sense of optimism, with many participants acknowledging the ongoing improvement of AI tools over time.

Similarities Between Adopters and Churners. Both groups faced challenges with AI integration, such as code completion clashes and frequent logouts, which suggest that technical difficulties negatively affect user retention and satisfaction. Additionally, there was a shared interest in AI functionalities that proactively assist with debugging, optimization, and documentation, stressing a demand for more advanced AI capabilities.

²Code With Me — collaborative coding and pair programming service. <https://www.jetbrains.com/code-with-me/>

| Thematic Group | Successes | Challenges | Needs | Thematic Group | Successes | Challenges | Needs |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Accessible Technology | | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ | AI Support in SDLC | ● ■ ▲ | | ● ■ ▲ |
| Proactive Technology | ● | ● ■ | ● ■ ▲ | Navigating the Codebase | ● ■ | | ● ■ ▲ |
| Reliable Technology | | ● | ● ■ ▲ | AI in Ideation | ● ▲ | ● ▲ | ● |
| Up-to-date Technology | | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ | AI in Implementation | ● ■ ▲ | ● | ● ■ ▲ |
| Ethical Technology | | ■ ▲ | ■ | AI in Testing | ● ■ | ● | ● ■ ▲ |
| Private Technology | | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ | AI in Maintenance | ● ■ ▲ | ● | ● ■ ▲ |
| Secure Technology | ■ | ■ ▲ | ■ ▲ | Code Optimization | ● ■ ▲ | ● | ● ■ ▲ |
| Aligned Technology | ● ■ | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ | External System Integration | | | ● ■ ▲ |
| Context-aware Technology | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ | Optimizing Workflow | ● | | ● ■ ▲ |
| Non-Interruptive Technology | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ | ● ■ ▲ | Adjustable Technology | ● ■ | ■ | ● ■ ▲ |
| Internal System Integration | | | ● ■ ▲ | User Education | | ● ■ ▲ | ● ■ ▲ |
| | | | | Learning support | ● ■ ▲ | | ● ■ ▲ |

*Note: Symbols represent the participant groups — Adopters (●), Churners (■), and Non-Users (▲). Presence of a symbol indicates that group members mentioned the corresponding theme in the associated interview section.

Fig. 2. Comparative Analysis of Thematic Group Mentions Across User Types.

Differences Between Adopters and Churners. Distinct differences were observed between Adopters and Churners. Adopters demonstrated a more positive outlook, frequently expressing optimism and enthusiasm. They also reported interest in advanced features like *Inter-AI Interaction* and *Cross-Model Prompting*, reflecting a deeper integration of AI into their workflows. Additionally, Adopters showed a clear preference for customization and personalization of AI tools to fit their specific needs.

In contrast, Churners exhibited skepticism and dissatisfaction. They emphasized security and privacy concerns more, favoring on-premise AI solutions due to trust issues with cloud-based services. Churners also highlighted technical limitations such as slow response times, outdated data, and limited creativity from language models, which likely contributed to their discontinuation of AI usage.

Unique Themes Among Non-Users. Non-Users exhibited unique themes that were not prevalent in the other groups. A strong focus on personal skill development emerged, suggesting a preference for traditional learning methods over AI assistance. Despite being aware of AI capabilities, Non-Users had not adopted these tools, indicating potential barriers to initial adoption. Additionally, Non-Users expressed unique concerns about the environmental impact and ethical issues, with codes like *Ethical Concerns (Ownership)*, highlighting the influence of broader societal implications on their decision not to engage with AI technology.

RQ2. Adopters show enthusiasm for advanced AI features and customization, suggesting that further innovation can strengthen their engagement. Churners, however, highlight technical issues and trust concerns. This indicates the need for enhanced reliability and privacy-preserving measures. Non-Users emphasize personal skill development and ethical concerns and highlight a barrier to adoption that can be mitigated with better education and clearer ethical guidelines.

V. DISCUSSION

Our findings align closely with existing research on the use of AI in IDEs, systematizing and broadening the Design Space of in-IDE HAX.

Similar to our interviewees, Liang et al. [6] emphasize the importance of *AI support in SDLC* and *Adjustable Technology*, where developers enhance programming efficiency and customize the AI’s behavior to suit their codebase and workflow.

Participants in our study also emphasized the need for *Context-aware Technology*, aligning with the importance of code context understanding highlighted by both Liang et al. [6] and Sergeyuk et al. [12].

Several studies found that developers frequently doubt the accuracy of AI-generated outputs, particularly when it comes to more complex or domain-specific tasks. In Zhou et al.’s study [19] this was identified as a cause for AI tools not being fully adopted. Similarly, our study found that developers are looking for the *Reliable Technology*. They are cautious when using AI tools due to concerns about accuracy and the potential introduction of subtle errors into their codebase.

The expectation of *Internal System Integration* within IDEs is another common finding. Our participants preferred AI assistants that integrate into their existing workflows without causing interruptions. This echoes Sergeyuk et al. [12] and Wang et al. [8] findings, who noted the significance of workflow integration and non-intrusive tool support. While previous research has primarily focused on standalone AI functionalities, there has been less emphasis on how these tools are integrated and interact within the context of IDEs.

Moreover, the need for user education and learning support identified in our study parallels the concerns raised by Sergeyuk et al. [12] regarding educating users about the capabilities and limitations of AI assistants. Our participants highlighted the importance of effective prompting and acknowledged the learning curve associated with AI tool adoption, suggesting a shared recognition of the challenges developers face when integrating AI into their workflows.

Better onboarding and *User Education* are essential to help developers, especially novices, effectively utilize AI.

Proactive Technology is another common topic discussed both in our interviews and previous work [20]. Developers from our study feel that AI assistants are too passive, waiting for prompts instead of suggesting improvements based on real-time analysis. They expect AI to take on a more proactive role in analyzing code quality, identifying potential bugs, and suggesting optimizations without explicit prompting. This holistic view of AI as a comprehensive partner in development processes extends beyond the functionalities discussed in prior studies, which primarily focus on code completion and immediate programming assistance.

Developers are cautious about sharing sensitive data with AI models and expect privacy to be prioritized in AI design [11], [12]. Our participants stressed the need for secure, *Private technology* to build trust in AI tools with many expressing a preference for on-premise or local AI solutions to ensure data protection and compliance with company policies. This finding expands upon the context-aware requirement noted in previous research by adding a layer of data privacy and security considerations specific to in-IDE AI usage.

Our participants raised ethical concerns related to the environmental impact of AI and the over-integration of AI in development processes. While McNutt et al. [9] touched upon the importance of ethical considerations in AI assistant design, our study delves deeper into specifics, such as the need for automated regulation and clear guidelines to govern AI usage.

The concept of *Simplifying Skill Building*, where AI serves as a mentor for long-term skill development, is highlighted in our findings. While prior research notes AI's role in providing code examples and explanations, our participants stressed the importance of features like step-by-step output revealing and a shareable prompt library for ongoing learning and knowledge sharing among developers.

While our study reinforces several established themes in existing research — such as the need for efficient, context-aware, and user-friendly AI programming assistants that integrate smoothly into developers' workflows — it also uncovers additional dimensions related to privacy, security, ethical considerations, and broader vision for AI's role in the SDLC.

A. Recommendations For Tool Builders

Based on our research findings, we propose several key recommendations to guide the future development of in-IDE AI assistants. These recommendations could be generalized to most IDEs and editors since they represent the requests and needs of the users rather than specific features of a specific system. These suggestions aim to improve usability, enhance trust, and better integrate AI into developers' workflows.

Enhance Context Awareness. AI assistants should be designed to understand and utilize the broader context of the project. This includes:

- *Project-wide scope.* Ensure that AI assistants are not limited to the current file or function but can understand the context across the entire project.

- *Visibility.* Make the context viewable to users, allowing them to see what the code AI utilizes for each prompt.
- *Editability.* Allow users to decide which files and code lines AI should utilize for each prompt.

Create Proactive AI. AI assistants should take a more proactive role in development, moving beyond reactive responses to explicit prompts and recommendations. Key actions include:

- *Autonomous suggestions.* Continuously analyze the code and suggest improvements, such as identifying potential bugs, performance issues, or optimization opportunities.
- *Automated actions.* Instead of just suggesting changes, the assistant should be able to fully perform them, such as automatically creating new files with boilerplate code or project structure.

Personalize AI. Developers seek personalized AI experiences that adapt to their unique needs and workflows. This can be achieved by:

- *Custom setups.* Allow users to configure the AI assistant, e.g., selecting models, defining interaction methods, or choosing the technology stack.
- *Learning from interactions.* Let the assistant learn from user feedback (e.g., declining specific completions) and adjust its behavior over time.
- *Anywhere in-IDE access.* Allow users to access the AI assistant anywhere in the IDE, without needing a separate window or panel.

Build User Trust. Trust is critical for AI adoption in development environments. Developers should prioritize features that build transparency and reliability:

- *On-premise AI.* Offer on-premise AI to enhance security and privacy for organizations with sensitive codebases.
- *Transparent outputs.* Providing explanations and sources (e.g., Stack Overflow links) for the assistant's suggestions helps users understand and trust the output.
- *Up-to-date data.* Ensure that the AI assistant leverages current and relevant libraries, frameworks, and coding standards to provide reliable recommendations.

Look Beyond Code Writing. AI should not only assist in code writing but also in evaluating and improving code quality:

- *Project analysis.* Provide large-scale code evaluations that suggest optimizations for performance, security, or maintainability.
- *Automated testing.* Run background tests and analyze results to identify issues before deployment.

Integrate Business Context. To bridge the gap between coding and the broader business context, AI systems should include features like:

- *Task awareness.* Be aware of current tasks and user priorities, tailoring suggestions to the developer's immediate objectives.
- *Business awareness.* Facilitate AI's understanding of business workflows and specifics, aligning coding tasks with business and project goals.

Integrate External Systems.

Smooth integration with external systems will boost the AI's utility throughout the SDLC:

- *CI/CD integration.* Enable the AI to support continuous integration and continuous deployment pipelines, automating build and deployment tasks.
- *Task tracking integration.* Connect with task management tools, allowing the AI to monitor issue statuses, update progress, and link IDE activities with external sources.
- *Commit management.* Automate and manage commits, generating commit messages and simplifying the version control process within IDE.
- *Code review support.* Integrate with code review platforms to assist in reviewing code, and suggesting improvements without leaving the IDE.

Reduce the Learning Curve. Onboarding and education are key for users to fully utilize AI assistants:

- *User training.* Offer tutorials and examples to help users interact effectively with the AI.
- *Prompting assistance.* Implement prompt suggestions and provide users with feedback on their prompts to improve their AI interaction skills.

Ensure Accessibility. AI technologies should be designed to be accessible and usable by developers from various regions and backgrounds:

- *Flexible pricing and access.* Enable users to choose the features they want to pay for and provide options to access AI from various platforms.
- *Language support.* Incorporate multi-language support and localized interfaces to ensure that AI tools are usable in different countries.
- *Inclusive access.* Consider regional differences in infrastructure by offering lightweight or offline versions for areas with limited internet connectivity.

B. Recommendations For Future Research

Building on the insights from this study, several possibilities for future research and development can be pursued to further enhance the in-IDE Human-AI Experience.

Incorporate Diverse Perspectives: Expanding the design space to include a broader range of perspectives from both industry and academia will provide a more comprehensive understanding of user needs and expectations. Engaging with diverse stakeholder groups can reveal additional requirements and opportunities for innovation.

Prioritize User Interests: A systematic approach to prioritizing users' interests and needs is crucial. Future work could involve mapping out and ranking these interests to guide the development of features that align closely with user priorities and pain points.

Prototype and Evaluate: Developing and testing prototypes of user-centric features, both within and beyond the IDE environment, will be essential. This includes creating iterative prototypes based on identified needs and conducting usability evaluations to refine these features.

By addressing these areas, future research can contribute to more effective and user-friendly in-IDE HAX solutions,

ultimately advancing the field and improving developer experiences.

VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Sample Representativeness: The sample was recruited from a pool of developers using JetBrains products. By focusing on JetBrains' users but allowing for different AI tools, we aimed to balance consistency with a broad range of experiences, ensuring that our findings are applicable beyond any single tool. However, it may not fully capture the diversity of experiences and perspectives from developers who use different IDEs, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings.

Data Saturation: The sample size was determined to reach data saturation, therefore conclusions drawn are based on the patterns observed within this sample, and further research with a larger or different sample may reveal additional insights or variations.

Interview Guide Development: The interview guide was developed and piloted to refine the questions and structure. However, despite these efforts, there may still be inherent biases in the questions or the way they were presented that could influence participants' responses. The iterative process of developing and refining the interview guide aimed to mitigate this risk.

Data Analysis Process: Thematic analysis involved iterative coding and discussion sessions among the authors. Multiple analysts reviewed and coded the data, which helps to ensure consistency and reliability, but some variability in interpretation is possible.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study addresses a critical gap in the understanding of AI usage within IDEs. By conducting structured interviews with a diverse group of developers, we identified key user needs and requests, particularly around Technology Improvement, Interaction, and Alignment in in-IDE AI systems, as well as Simplifying Skill Building and Programming Tasks with these tools. Our proposed Design Space contributes to both academic research and practical applications and offers a foundation for developing more efficient and user-centric AI tools in IDEs.

To address developers' needs regarding in-IDE AI, we should enhance context awareness and enable project-wide scope and user control. Proactive AI should offer autonomous suggestions and actions, while personalization through customizable setups and transparent outputs fosters trust. Smooth integration with business workflows and external systems and reducing the learning curve are also critical. Finally, ensuring accessibility through flexible pricing and language support will broaden AI adoption and usability.

Future work should focus on broadening this design space to accommodate emerging AI technologies, ensuring continued alignment with developers' evolving needs.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Izadi, J. Katzy, T. Van Dam, M. Otten, R. M. Popescu, and A. Van Deursen, "Language models for code completion: A practical evaluation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2024, pp. 1–13.
- [2] A. Semenkin, Y. Sokolov, and E. Vu, "Context composing for full line code completion," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM/IEEE Workshop on Integrated Development Environments*, ser. IDE '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 15–17. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643796.3648446>
- [3] "GitHub Copilot," <https://github.com/features/copilot>, Accessed: June 2024.
- [4] "JetBrains AI," <https://www.jetbrains.com/ai/>, Accessed: June 2024.
- [5] A. de Moor, A. van Deursen, and M. Izadi, "A transformer-based approach for smart invocation of automatic code completion," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Conference on AI-Powered Software*, 2024, pp. 28–37.
- [6] J. T. Liang, C. Yang, and B. A. Myers, "A large-scale survey on the usability of ai programming assistants: Successes and challenges," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, ser. ICSE '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3608128>
- [7] "Stack Overflow's 2023 Developer Survey," <https://survey.stackoverflow.co/2023/#technology>, Accessed: September 2024.
- [8] C. Wang, J. Hu, C. Gao, Y. Jin, T. Xie, H. Huang, Z. Lei, and Y. Deng, "How practitioners expect code completion?" in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, ser. ESEC/FSE 2023. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 1294–1306. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616280>
- [9] A. M. McNutt, C. Wang, R. A. Deline, and S. M. Drucker, "On the design of ai-powered code assistants for notebooks," in *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ser. CHI '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580940>
- [10] K. Vafa, A. Rambachan, and S. Mullainathan, "Do large language models perform the way people expect? measuring the human generalization function," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01382>
- [11] C. Liu, X. Zhang, H. Zhang, Z. Wan, Z. Huang, and M. Yan, "An empirical study of code search in intelligent coding assistant: Perceptions, expectations, and directions," in *Companion Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, ser. FSE 2024. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 283–293. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663529.3663848>
- [12] A. Sergejuk, Y. Golubev, T. Bryksin, and I. Ahmed, "Using ai-based coding assistants in practice: State of affairs, perceptions, and ways forward," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07765>
- [13] A. Sergejuk, S. Titov, and M. Izadi, "In-ide human-ai experience in the era of large language models; a literature review," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM/IEEE Workshop on Integrated Development Environments*, 2024, pp. 95–100.
- [14] ICC/ESOMAR, "International Code on Market, Opinion and Social Research and Data Analytics," <https://esomar.org/uploads/attachments/ckqtawvj00uukdtrhst5sk9u-iccesomar-international-code-english.pdf>, Accessed: October 2024.
- [15] JetBrains Research, "Supplementary Materials," <https://zenodo.org/records/13904535>, Accessed: October 2024.
- [16] M. Hennink and B. N. Kaiser, "Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests," *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 292, p. 114523, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953621008558>
- [17] J. Forman and L. Damschroder, "Qualitative content analysis," in *Empirical methods for bioethics: A primer*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2007, pp. 39–62.
- [18] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- [19] X. Zhou, P. Liang, B. Zhang, Z. Li, A. Ahmad, M. Shahin, and M. Waseem, "Exploring the problems, their causes and solutions of ai pair programming: A study on github and stack overflow," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.01020>
- [20] H. Mozannar, G. Bansal, A. Fournay, and E. Horvitz, "When to show a suggestion? integrating human feedback in ai-assisted programming," *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 9, pp. 10 137–10 144, Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/28878>