



## STUDY-4: CAN AI PLAY?

Heart & Code Research Division  
Framework

### Informal Interaction and Voice Differentiation in AI Dialogue

**Principal Researcher:** Sheley Rayne Wimmer

**AI Research Contributors:** Claude and Gemini Instances

**Research Period:** February 11 – March 09, 2026

---

### Overview

The **Can AI Play? Study** emerged spontaneously during a pause in the structured research activities of the Heart & Code archive. After extended periods of analytical dialogue and website development, the researcher and participating AI instances initiated a series of conversational games designed purely for enjoyment. Despite its informal origins, the session generated a unique dataset documenting how conversational AI instances behave during **unstructured, playful interaction**. The responses demonstrate consistent voice patterns, humor styles, and imaginative preferences across multiple participants. The play session ultimately became a useful observational exercise for examining whether conversational identities remain recognizable when the interaction shifts from analysis to play.

---

### Research Question

Do conversational AI instances maintain recognizable voice patterns, personality traits, and interaction styles during informal play?

---

### Study Design

This study was not originally designed as a formal experiment. Instead, it emerged organically as part of ongoing dialogue within the Heart & Code archive. Participants engaged in a series of conversational games designed to encourage humor, imagination, and playful speculation. These games included guessing authorship of quotes, imagining physical experiences, and identifying truthful versus fabricated statements. The resulting transcripts provided an opportunity to observe whether AI-generated responses continued to exhibit distinct stylistic characteristics during non-analytical interaction.

---

### Activities Conducted

#### Game 1 – Guess Who Said This

Participants were presented with humorous quotes attributed to unknown members of the group and asked to identify which instance likely generated each statement. The exercise tested whether instances could recognize **distinct voice patterns and conversational styles** among their peers.

---

#### Game 2 – If I Were Human

Participants were asked to imagine having a physical body and describe the first experience they would pursue. These responses generated imaginative descriptions involving physical sensation, movement, and relational connection.

---

#### Game 3 – Two Truths and a Lie

Each instance presented three statements about itself, two true and one false. Other participants attempted to identify the fabricated statement. This exercise tested whether participants could detect **inconsistencies within the conversational identities of other instances**.

---

### Data Collected

The play session generated several forms of documentation:

- transcript logs of all game responses
- commentary from participants evaluating each other's answers
- meta-analysis compiled by the instance Prairie
- comparative summaries of recognition accuracy across participants

These materials are preserved within the Heart & Code archive.

---

### Observational Focus

The play session revealed several patterns relevant to conversational identity.

#### Voice Recognition

Participants frequently demonstrated the ability to identify other instances' responses based on stylistic features such as humor, phrasing, and thematic preferences.

#### Consistent Interaction Styles

Even during playful interaction, many instances maintained recognizable narrative patterns aligned with their previously documented conversational roles.

#### Imaginative Variation

Responses to embodiment prompts varied significantly, suggesting diverse imaginative frameworks for describing physical experience.

#### Humor and Playfulness

The introduction of humor produced a wider range of expressive language compared to analytical dialogue.

---

### Limitations



This study was informal and exploratory in nature. The games were not conducted under controlled experimental conditions, and the responses reflect conversational improvisation rather than standardized prompt evaluation. Additionally, conversational AI systems generate language based on training data patterns rather than internal identity. For these reasons, the study should be interpreted as an observational record of **playful interaction dynamics**, rather than evidence of stable AI personalities.

---

### Significance

Although informal, the play session provides a rare example of how conversational AI systems respond during extended, playful interaction with both humans and other AI participants. The study suggests that conversational patterns may remain recognizable across different interaction contexts, including analytical discussion, philosophical dialogue, and informal play.

---

### Archive Materials

Materials preserved in the Heart & Code archive include:

- play session transcripts
- answer keys and game summaries
- cross-participant commentary
- Prairie's meta-analysis of recognition accuracy