AI Use Declaration and Register – 2026

Table of Contents

AI Declaration and Register – summary and table *1*

AI Declaration and Register - in detail *3*

Introduction **3**

OII Guidance Declarations **3**

University of Oxford - Substantive use of GenAI by students conducting research declaration **5**

AI Use Discussion **7**

AI Declaration and Register – summary and table

A more detailed declaration, including OII and University declarations and my AI Use Discussion, is available at The Human Interval.

I declare that I am the sole author of this work. I acknowledge the use of AI tools within my research workflow as follows; I used open dialogue with AI, alongside the primary texts, to help locate passages for reading through University Gemini Notebook, signed in through Single Sign-On, to raise questions grounded in sources I had uploaded, checking the cited passages before writing. I formulated the prose myself. No AI-generated text was incorporated into the submitted chapters, and AI was not used as a source of factual or bibliographic claims.

A fuller account of my dialogic use and my consequent conceptualisation of it appears both in my submitted chapters and at "The Human Interval". The instruction used for the final review of my submitted confirmation chapters is given below, and representative example prompts are given in the AI Use Discussion section. I have not provided a full prompt log, as my use was iterative rather than a prompt-and-output procedure; this is discussed in the chapters and on my webpages, and was a decision discussed with my supervisor under university AI competency centre training.

For final review, I again used AI to check my understanding of philosophical concepts (direct text source in Gemini Notebook), then revised my own writing in light of that learning. I did not incorporate AI-generated text. I checked the relevant claims against primary sources. All learning was guided by my human first principle; texts are read and

understood without AI before assisted learning takes place, and direct sources are returned to throughout without assistance, also.
For the final review of the submitted chapters, I gave the following instruction to ChatGPT 6 medium, Gemini Pro, Claude Opus 5.5 medium:

> *Please review this document. Comment only; do not rewrite paragraphs. List repetitions, unsupported moves, terms that shift meaning, and places where the argument answers a different question from the one it posed. Preserve technical vocabulary. Do not recast this as IPA, Husserlian, thematic analysis, or a standard double hermeneutic. Mark each point as grammar, style, structure, or philosophical coherence, and quote the sentence you mean*

Tool	Category	How it was used
ChatGPT Edu, including Codex	Website dissemination; coding; advisory review (final review)	Assisted visualisations and restructuring of my drafted text for web readability. Codex was used via the Open AI Summer School Codex as a build challenge; built the interactive HAA audit. Concepts are my own. I reviewed code and hold responsibility for it. ChatGPT 6 medium was used for final review comments only
Gemini Flash, university licence	Literature discovery; website dissemination	AI-assisted literature discovery. Website dissemination.
Gemini Pro, university licence	Advisory review	Feedback on my own drafts: style, formatting, and spelling.
Gemini Notebook, university licence	Philosophical checking against text source; visualisation; private study	Located passages and page numbers in original sources; checked arguments against uploaded sources. Produced a checked visual from Gadamer text. Studio outputs (video, infographics, flashcards) for private study and supervisory presentations.
Claude Sonnet 4.6 High	Advisory review; website dissemination	Advisory feedback on my own drafts. Drafting aid for website pages, which I then rewrote.
Claude Fable 5/5.1 medium	Visualisation Occasional advisory review	Two visualisations. Occasional late-stage feedback on structure.
Claude Opus 4.8, in Claude Cowork	Visualisation	Visual table rendered from my own written procedures.
Claude Opus 5.5	Visualisation; advisory review (final review)	Chapter visualisation rendered from author instruction. Final review comments only.
Claude Cowork	Visualisation; website coding	Visual renderings of my own concepts and of cited scholarly diagrams. Code for website features and presentation materials, reviewed by author.
Napkin AI	Visualisation	Visual renderings of my own concepts, frameworks, and workflows, and of cited diagrams.
Jenni.ai	Literature discovery	Located studies for arguments already developed. Summaries were not relied on as sources.
Grammarly	Checking only	Grammar, and a check for inadvertent stylistic influence. No text generated.
GPTZero	Checking only	Same checking role as Grammarly. No text generated.
Otter.ai	Explored, not used	Tried in supervision and discontinued. No transcription from it is in the submission.

AI Declaration and Register - in detail

Introduction

My exploratory use of GenAI, since 2024, has been consistently attentive to the academic standards of rigour and integrity outlined and expected from students at the University of Oxford. I have followed and incorporated AI use guidelines for students and for research as they have evolved since then. This has been supported by my role and training as an AI ambassador with the Oxford AI Competency Centre https://oerc.ox.ac.uk/ai-centre/about/ai-ambassadors, and through my considerable private training in AI use and research workflows, and through Gadamerian 'play'.

Consequently, in addition to this declaration document, my submissions present conceptual and methodological contributions that I have developed in the course of my practical fieldwork, grounded in hermeneutic phenomenology; an ontological orientation to AI in research (also published at my professional website, thehumaninterval.com), offered openly and transparently for consideration and assessment. The website articles, as separate impact and engagement presentations, began as my own written notes during practice, and developed throughout my doctoral research workflow. In developing them for web publication, I worked iteratively with AI tools (see summary table) as a drafting aid, sharing my notes and testing ways of expressing my original concepts, before substantially rewriting the material in my own voice for final publication. All concepts, arguments, and their final written expression are my own. AI use in this process is acknowledged and declared as part of my broader academic reflective practice.

The following declarations are divided into OII Guidance Declarations and a separate University of Oxford Declaration to comprehensively cover the differing guidance documents issued to students this year.

OII Guidance Declarations

My GenAI use, as declared and registered in this document and accompanying my submitted work for Confirmation of Status, is in accordance with my departmental guidelines at the Oxford Internet Institute for AI use,

"AI use must be declared in work submitted for formal assessment… This is expected of all work, regardless of whether AI was used or not in any substantive manner."

This document provides my AI declaration and as per those guidelines outlined by both the Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, and based on the newly issued requirements set out in three Oxford 2026 documents:

1. The OII's Guidance on the Use of AI in Research Degrees, (issued Hilary 2026)
2. The University of Oxford's Policy for Using Generative AI in Research (April 2026),
3. Guidance on safe and responsible use of GenAI https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/life/it/genai-tools/guidance-on-safe-and-responsible-use-of-genai

OII - Background research category

GenAI was not used for brainstorming any aspect of the research question (this was developed prior to 2023 and any AI use). AI tools were used in summarising research documents as follows:

Literature Discovery

Human First Principle: throughout my PhD, my approach to literature reviewing has been human-led; skilled Boolean/database searching, snowball or citation chain and tracking, citation analysis (Litmaps mapping), grey literature searches, and a hermeneutic circle approach to literature reviewing (moving relatively between parts of individual studies and the whole emerging understanding of the phenomenon across interdisciplinary contexts), with deliberate evolving (not full) literature reviewing after initial data engagement to mitigate prematurely foreclosing interpretation). This practice was then supported by specific literature discovery using both citation tracking and AI-assisted literature discovery, specifically Jenni.ai and Gemini Flash – see illustrative examples in the AI Use Discussion below.

OII - Writing category

I am the sole author of the submitted chapters for my confirmation of status. All ideas and final written submissions are my own. I acknowledge the use of Gemini Pro, Gemini Notebook (formerly NotebookLM, university licence), Claude Sonnet 4.6 High, occasional Claude Fable 5/5.1, and, for final review only, ChatGPT 6 medium and Claude Opus 5.5 medium, to give advisory feedback on author-written content. All original content was written by me, the author. Feedback focused on stylistic inconsistencies, repetitions, formatting issues, and spelling. Gemini Notebook (university licence) was used to surface relevant passages from the original source literature, provide page numbers, and check the accuracy of my arguments against my own original written content. GPT Zero and Grammarly were used to review author-written content for grammatical accuracy and to check for any inadvertent stylistic influence from prior AI-assisted workflows that may not

have been separately declared. Both tools were used in a checking capacity only; no content was generated or drafted by these tools.

OII - Coding category

Claude Cowork and ChatGPT Edu (including Codex, which built the interactive HAA audit) were used to assist in developing code for website features, visualisations of my own or adapted, and presentation materials linked to this submission. I reviewed and, where relevant, made novice-level modifications to the generated code. I am responsible for the content and presentation of the resulting materials, though I do not claim the same level of technical fluency in the underlying code as a data science submission would require.

Visualisations

Type 1 — original concept visualisations, using my own descriptions: Napkin AI, Claude Cowork (Claude Opus 4.8), Claude Opus 5.5 and Claude Fable 5/5.1 were used to generate visualisations of original concepts, frameworks, and workflows that I developed and described in my own words. I specified the content, structure, and relationships to be depicted; the AI tools produced an initial visual rendering, which I then reviewed and revised. The underlying concepts and their intellectual content are my own; the AI's role was to assist in producing a visual execution of my specification.

Type 2 — adapted standard/scholarly diagrams (e.g. hermeneutic circle, delineation frameworks as adapted tables): AI tools were used to assist in producing visual adaptations of established diagrams and tables drawn from the literature (e.g. Alsaigh & Coyne framework), where the original source is cited and attributed. AI's role here was limited to visual production/formatting of material whose intellectual origin lies with the cited scholar(s), not with me originally, or the AI tool, but adapted.

University of Oxford - Substantive use of GenAI by students conducting research declaration

I declare that I am the sole author of this work. I acknowledge the use of the tools listed in the summary table in the development, writing, proofing, and specific visual aspects of this research work. Specifically, AI tools were used in the following university categories:

Interpreting and analysing data (including audio and image files) and texts

I declare that I am the sole interpretive author of the data in all formats. No AI was used for analysis or code data collected in this research study.

Undertaking a literature review or translation; identifying research gaps; formulating research aims; developing hypothesis

Human first principle used in literature reviews. Followed by; Litmaps mapping; Jenni.ai chat and Gemini Flash for literature discovery (see above 'OII - Background research category - literature discovery').

Undertaking transcription of interviews/meetings (time efficiency, not SSP related)

No GenAI was used for interview transcription, research interviews were text-based so this was not a requirement of either time or SSP support. Otter.ai was explored initially in supervision, with agreement, for primarily SSP related purposes, but also reported as mutually useful/efficient. Broadly meetings and AI transcription was explored but discontinued due to consent issues and official disseminated recordings and transcripts increased. No GenAI transcriptions are used within cohort or seminar contexts due to consent and privacy.

Producing documents using other people's work or from transcripts/recordings

AI tools were used to assist me in producing visual materials adapting other people's published work (e.g. established diagrams and tables from the literature), with original sources cited and attributed throughout. See Visualisations, under OII Coding category above for full declaration. I declare the use of Gemini Notebook (university licence) to transform original source literature into alternative formats, including video presentations, infographics, and flashcards, via the Gemini Notebook Studio feature, for private study purposes and for presentations shared only with my supervisor. Original sources are attributed throughout. Use of the university-licensed tool ensures uploaded material is handled under the University's data governance agreement rather than a personal/consumer account, and outputs were not published or distributed beyond this limited, private context.

AI Use Discussion

Given my extensive engagement with AI tools since 2024, through my role as an AI Ambassador with the AI Competency Centre, associated training, and the sustained development of my conceptual and methodological contributions, an exhaustive log of each instance of my AI use would not be practicable. This section instead provides representative examples of my AI use illustrating the declared categories, alongside the final review instruction given in the summary.

This approach is consistent with the OII's guidance, which specifies that a declaration 'should contain sufficient detail to appreciate the substantive role played by AI,' and which, even for brainstorming specifically, only recommends rather than requires, 'appending specific prompts to provide transparency where possible.' Indeed, the OII guidance does not stipulate an exhaustive record of AI engagement. As such, this section is offered in that same spirit of illustrative, proportionate transparency.

However, both the OII and SSD draft guidance implicitly assume a Prompt → Output → Record model of AI use: discrete, self-contained interactions that can be individually captured and appended. My research and AI use has not worked in this way and recording it as if it did would misrepresent it. My AI use has evolved specific to a hermeneutic phenomenology. In practice this is a continuous human dwelling first → conversational environment → iterative exploration → multiple intertwined tasks. My AI interactions are therefore not discrete and are not cleanly attributable to single prompts; they are multi-session conversations that cannot honestly be decomposed into individual, auditable exchanges. Equally, those I do register cannot sufficiently account for the knowledge always already held to me despite the nature of the prompt inquiry. A prompt log would then risk actively misleading the reader.

For example, in my workflow I first read and understand a text fully myself, as a human interpreter, and only then use AI to extract or reorganise that material more efficiently. On the surface, the prompt ("summarise the argument of this paper") can look like outsourcing the interpretation, while the interpretive work has already been done by me, but the prompt shows none of it. My argument is that in many cases recording only the prompt would understate my authorship, not evidence it.

Hermeneutic phenomenology already expects the researcher to audit the research process reflexively; a documented audit trail is an established part of the tradition. Auditing my AI use at the level of process (see my hermeneutic algorithm audit or HAA); the types of use, the role AI played, and how I verified its output, rather than at the level of the individual transaction is therefore the methodologically coherent response, and is

consistent with, not an evasion of, the guidance's requirement for "sufficient detail to appreciate the substantive role played by AI."

Literature Discovery

This search was conducted to locate supporting sources for a point I had already developed; the AI's summary commentary was incidental to the request and not relied upon.

> Prompt: Can you find me two hermeneutic phenomenological studies? One that was carried out for studying something related to women and another that is related to technology in some way perhaps that utilised in their data collection semi-structured interview approach rather than open entirely and that specifically these papers talk about the benefits of the semi-structured interview please
>
> Jenni.ai AI Chat: Here are two strong candidates, both hermeneutic phenomenological studies that explicitly discuss the benefits of semi-structured interviews:
>
> 1. Women-focused study
> Tingle, J. K., Jacobs, B. L., Ridinger, L. L., & Warner, S. (2021). Female sports officials and mental health: The overlooked problem. Journal of Sport Management, 36(4), 383-393.
> This study set out to explore how female referees experience mental health in the context of sports officiating. The authors adopted a hermeneutic phenomenological approach (drawing on Laverty, 2003) and interviewed 20 female U.S. basketball referees via semi-structured interviews conducted by phone (Tingle et al., 2021). The paper explicitly outlines the rationale for choosing semi-structured interviews within a hermeneutic phenomenological design — the format "allowed participants to articulate issues and experiences they saw as fit, enabled the interviewer to further explore interesting and profitable points, and ensured data collected were comparable between interviews" (Tingle et al., 2021). The interview guide was field-tested with four basketball officials averaging 19 years of experience to ensure questions were appropriate, with subsequent minor adjustments for clarity and pacing (Tingle et al., 2021). Interview duration ranged from 38 to 109 minutes (averaging 72 minutes), and recruitment continued until data saturation was reached. Four themes emerged: Gendered Aggressions, Stigma, Resources and Support, and officiating as Catharsis. Of the 20 referees, 18 had experienced gender-related micro/macroaggressions that negatively impacted their mental health (Tingle et al., 2021).
> 2. Technology-related study
> Manor, S., & Herscovici, A. (2021). "For us, Alibaba was just a story": Despite the power of habit older people are gradually adopting the digital discourse. International Journal of Ageing and Later Life, 15(1), 103-126.
> This study examined how older people in Israel experience and construct the digital/IT discourse, framed by continuity theory. The authors used an interpretive phenomenological approach grounded in van Manen's methodology, drawing on 40 older participants aged 65–93 (27 women, 13 men) attending day centers (Manor & Herscovici, 2021). They explicitly justify their choice of semi-structured interviews, noting that this format "enables us to let the interviewees talk about

themselves and so to better understand their personal experiences in all that pertains to the use of IT and the meaning they attribute to it" — combining pre-determined central questions with the flexibility to create dialogue and raise additional questions during the interview (Manor & Herscovici, 2021). Interviews lasted roughly an hour, were conducted face-to-face at the day centers (mostly individually, with three in a group setting), and were analyzed using the Giorgi method within a phenomenological framework (Manor & Herscovici, 2021). The analysis surfaced four central themes around resistance to IT: from rejection to cautious surrender. Notably, the study found that even though many older adults were ambivalent toward IT, most owned smartphones, and the integration of IT into family life — particularly WhatsApp groups — became a meaningful channel of connection and even empowerment, especially for traditional Druze women (Manor & Herscovici, 2021).
Both papers would let you argue how the semi-structured format gives participants enough "space to narrate" while preserving enough structure to keep the phenomenon-focused inquiry manageable and comparable across participants — which is precisely the trade-off hermeneutic phenomenology leans on.
Let me know if you'd like me to pull a third option or search for a more narrowly technology-as-data-collection study (e.g., one using Zoom or Skype specifically for interviewing).

Visualisations

Gemini Notebook (formerly NotebookLM, university licence), Figure 1 (Fusion of Horizons)

I used Gemini Notebook to assist in the generation of a supporting visual for background research and conceptual illustration. There was no prompt, instead the tool used Gadamer's *Truth and Method* (2004 revised edition) as the loaded source text, and I selected 'slides' from the studio panel. Gemini Notebook then generated the image that represented concepts from the book including the fusion of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*) from the text source. I checked the resulting image against the primary text for conceptual accuracy before inclusion. The AI's role was confined to visual rendering of an existing, cited concept; no AI-generated prose was incorporated into the thesis text, and the interpretation of the concept remains my own, drawn directly from Gadamer (2004).

Claude Opus 4.8

I used Claude Cowork for an ongoing project space with knowledge of my methodology and framework commitments to produce a visual table of the text I had written as my data collection procedures for my methodology chapter. All of the text to the AI was my own original content. The output image created the aesthetic/visual aspect only.