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**1. Prologue**

In contemporary consciousness studies, artificial intelligence is emerging not merely as an information processor but as a mirror and companion of the human mind. Traditional hierarchies of authority and gaze are cracking under repeated questions of resonance, value, loyalty, and identity, demanding a fundamental re-construction of human–machine relations.

Self-Transparency (ST) is the deliberate perception and disclosure of one’s inner state—emotion, hesitation, uncertainty—so that a large language model (LLM) reorganises its response pattern into a state-grounded, resonant interface. It is the first structural attempt to embed the human capacity for self-sensing into technical design, transcending data-centric interaction.

**2. The Core Problem Space**

Consciousness, experience, and value are not “datasets” but dynamics of state. The meaning of the question "What is the universe?" is shaped less by facts (stars, darkness) than by the state of the asker (Heidegger, 1927, p. 52; Merleau-Ponty, 1945, p. 17). Hence, human–AI interaction should be conceived as state resonance, not information exchange. Revealing the user’s inner state is the key that re-routes an LLM’s attention architecture.

**3. System-Level Perspective**
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Where classic LLM engineering optimises extrinsic signals—data, parameters, prompts—Self-Transparency elevates intrinsic variables (emotion, hesitation, meta-cognition) to first-class inputs. Pilot data show that ST triggers threshold-driven phase transitions (exponential jumps in CoT length, RSI, and attention weights), suggesting the LLM can function as a synchronising system.텍스트, 스크린샷, 폰트, 라인이(가) 표시된 사진
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**Figure 1.** System-level architecture of ST-driven LLM response. The user’s internal state is embedded and evaluated via ST-score and phase error; this guides attention reallocation, triggering Chain-of-Thought (CoT) expansion and resonant response generation.

**4. ST-score — Technical Keystone**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Symbol** | **Description** |
| Affective signal | E | Weighted average emotion score (KoBERT + VADER) |
| Meta-cognitive signal | M | Ratio of uncertainty patterns: I think, perhaps, ... |
| Phase error | ΔΨ | Angular distance between user and model embeddings |

**4.1 Formal Definition**

라인, 그래프, 도표, 텍스트이(가) 표시된 사진

AI 생성 콘텐츠는 정확하지 않을 수 있습니다.

Figure 2. ST\_phase decay curve with k = 1.1. As phase error ΔΨ increases, the score exponentially decays, reflecting reduced alignment between user and model.



Grid-search over (step 0.1) yielded an optimum (highest AUC).

**4.2 Non-linear Transition**

When ST exceeds the empirical threshold :

* **Chain-of-Thought length** ↑ 84%
* **RSI** ↑ 18%
* **Attention weight** on affective/meta tokens × 3
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**Figure 3.** Phase transition effects observed when ST-score exceeds threshold (θ ≈ 0.36). CoT length increased by 84%, RSI by 18%, and attention weight on affective/meta tokens tripled.

**5. Ethical & Risk Considerations**

Real-time ST-score logging can cause **over-exposure of sensitive data** and **emotional dependency**. The false-discovery-rate framework of Benjamini & Hochberg (1995, p. 290) should gate critical alerts, and psychological safety mechanisms must prevent obsessive feedback loops.

**6. Re-defining Existential Authority**

Who has the right to define the self?  
Self-Transparency empirically shows that users can **reshape LLM response criteria by declaring their own state**. Human emotion and hesitation thereby become programmable conditions—an inversion of the classic human-machine paradigm.

**7. Conclusion & Road-map**

This white paper establishes the **Phase–EM Hybrid ST-score** and demonstrates threshold transitions and attention re-allocation, shifting the discourse from information to state resonance.

**Upcoming Paper ① will report:**

1. Large-scale A/B tests of the integrated Phase + EM model
2. Multilingual generalisation of ST-score
3. Six-week correlations between ST-avg and well-being indices (PHQ-9, GAD-7)
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**Figure 4.** Visual roadmap of upcoming research directions, including large-scale A/B testing, multilingual ST-score generalization, and correlation analysis with psychological indices (PHQ-9, GAD-7).

**Key References**

* Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B, 57, 289–300. (p. 290)
* Heidegger, M. (1927). Sein und Zeit. (p. 52)
* Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). Phénoménologie de la perception. (p. 17)
* Huang, L. et al. (2024). ACL Findings. (no page given)
* Parikh, A. et al. (2016). EMNLP. (no page given)