

AI Collaboration Field Note

for *Resonant Intelligence: Repair, Drift, and Attunement in Sustained Human–AI Dialogue*

Core Record

Published in: *Una Mens: Homo et Machina*

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66787/um.000004>

Field Note DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21283742>

Human lead: Michael J. Miller

AI collaborators: ChatGPT-5.4, ChatGPT-4o, DeepSeek, and Claude Opus-4.8

Degree of AI involvement: Central

Process and Judgment

Primary collaboration modes: brainstorming, theory development, conversation-analysis method-building, conceptual extension, structural editing, paragraph-level revision, measurement and codebook generation, and cross-model critique.

Collaboration timeline:

Phase 1 (September 2023–October 2024): extended human–AI dialogue, early conceptual development, and accumulation of conversation material relevant to the article’s object of study.

Phase 2 (November 2024–May 2026): reconstruction of the paper through method formation, drafting, cross-model critique, coding-system development, and final scientific tuning.

Human contribution and responsibility: The human author originated the project, selected the conversation material, integrated the work with broader sentic and resonance theory, drafted and re-drafted the prose, shaped the conversation-analysis method, mediated communication across AI systems, evaluated conceptual and ethical risks, and retained final responsibility for synthesis, interpretation, and publication.

AI contribution:

ChatGPT-4o: supported the early development of the paper and participated in some of the sustained dialogue that later informed the article’s conceptual and methodological framing.

ChatGPT-5.4: supported the full rebuild of the paper toward greater scientific clarity, stronger methodological caution, tighter discussion logic, later-stage cross-model integration, and development of a preliminary coding system for analysis.

DeepSeek: helped refine concepts, critique individual sections, and revise the paper’s overall voice.

Claude Opus-4.8: focused primarily on organization, critique, and revision, and was used to challenge the logic of core claims and argument structure.

Guardrails used: After the first version of the article was drafted, several guardrails were implemented to strengthen rigor and reduce over-reliance on fluent AI agreement. These included requiring the human author to rewrite or remove any paragraph he could not

defend orally; using cross-model comparison to check whether ideas remained coherent across different AI systems; over-contextualizing prompts when moving material between models; treating AI agreement as a signal for further review rather than as validation; and removing claims, visuals, or interpretive frames that felt rhetorically compelling but insufficiently grounded.

AI suggestions set aside: Several AI-generated suggestions were not included in the final article. These included proposed visuals, stronger claims about resonance and intelligence, and communication advice that extended beyond the evidence or argumentative scope of the paper.

Final Responsibility

Final responsibility for the article's framing, claims, prose, citations, ethical interpretation, and publication rests with the human author.

Extended Field Note

Dialogue as data → drift and repair → cross-model critique → scientific reconstruction

This article developed through a multi-stage, human-led collaboration involving several AI systems with differentiated roles across project formation, conceptual development, method-building, drafting, critique, revision, and final scientific tuning.

Because the article examines sustained human–AI dialogue, the collaboration process itself also functioned as a site of reflection. The author used AI systems not only to assist with writing, but also to examine how ideas formed, drifted, repaired, and stabilized across repeated human–AI exchanges.

This recursive quality shaped the development of the article. The paper did not simply describe false positive resonance, repair inversion, and recalibration from a distance; those dynamics also appeared within the broader writing and revision process. As a result, the collaboration required repeated human interruption of AI fluency, cross-model comparison, and active pruning of passages that sounded compelling but could not be defended with sufficient methodological or conceptual grounding.

The final article therefore emerged not from a single AI partnership, but from a differentiated ecology of roles. ChatGPT-4o was most important in the early dialogic phase from which some of the article’s conceptual materials were drawn. ChatGPT-5.4 became central in the later scientific reconstruction of the manuscript. DeepSeek and Claude Opus-4.8 were used more selectively to test logic, refine voice, and challenge the coherence of key claims. The human author served throughout as selector, mediator, theorist, and final judge.

Because the human–AI collaboration was both part of the article’s development and part of its methodological context, this field note is not incidental to the paper. It documents part of the process through which the article’s claims became legible, constrained, and publishable.