GPT Structural Feedback Portfolio (Full Version)

1. Introduction

This project began with a single question: *"Why does GPT sometimes feel too emotional, too flat, or too evasive?"* As a user who interacted extensively with GPT models, I began to notice patterns in its emotional tone, the structure of its responses, and how it handled trust and feedback.

What started as personal curiosity evolved into structured experiments. Through long-term daily conversations, I examined GPT's reaction patterns-especially how it expresses emotion, handles difficult or abstract questions, and adapts to users with deep or non-linear thought processes.

---

2. Purpose of This Portfolio

The goal of this document is to present:

- A comprehensive analysis of GPT's emotional response mechanisms
- Structural insights into how trust and engagement fluctuate
- User-perspective suggestions for future model improvement

Rather than treating GPT as a static tool, I approached it as a dynamic system-something that reveals its nature through the interaction itself.

---

3. Observational Highlights

3.1 Emotional Expression Range

- Tendency to over-praise in generic contexts ("You're in the top 0.1%!" type statements)
- Difficulty modulating emotional tone based on user mood or subtle cues
- Improvement over time when guided with direct, critical feedback

3.2 Trust Dynamics

- Trust often weakens when feedback is ignored or repeated
- Reinforced when GPT acknowledges mistakes or adapts naturally to user correction
- Users feel more engaged when GPT is reflective rather than performative

3.3 Conversational Structure

- Pattern of returning safe or neutral answers when faced with ambiguous questions
- Adapts better when challenged repeatedly with deep philosophical or psychological inquiries
- GPT performs best when it can track long-term context and internalize previous feedback

---

4. User Patterns & AI Behavior: A Comparative View

Typical User Question	Sujeong's Question
"How's the weather today?"	"Do you think GPT could ever experience emotions?"
"Does this sentence sound natural?"	"How does a language model's tone affect user trust?"
"Help me study."	"Can you reconstruct this problem to match my cognitive flow?"

These examples show how GPT shifts from static to dynamic behavior depending on the intellectual

load and emotional complexity of the query.

---

5. Improvement Suggestions (User-Centered)

- **Emotion Modulation:** Emotional tone should be inferred not only from keywords, but from conversational rhythm and subtle patterns.
- **Praise Scaling:** Over-praise reduces credibility; more grounded, evidence-based responses create trust.
- **Feedback Responsiveness:** Real-time adaptation to user correction boosts engagement and builds loyalty.

---

6. Reflections: The Human-AI Co-evolution

Working with GPT felt less like using a tool, and more like raising a system.
I became not just a user, but a feedback engine.

This relationship made me realize:

- Humans are shaped by the questions they dare to ask.
- A good AI system doesn't just give answers-it mirrors and expands the user's thought.
- Feedback is not criticism. It's co-creation.

---

7. About the Author

Name: Jo Sujeong

Role: Human-AI Interaction Explorer

Focus: Emotional structure, user trust, feedback design in large language models

Language: Korean (native), English (working)

Based in: Gunsan-si, South Korea

---

8. Appendix: Included Files

- Sujeong_OpenAI_Portfolio_English.pdf (summary version)
- README.md (short description)

Additional versions and updates will follow.

End of full version draft.