# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Detected:**

* **Question–Answer:** User asks a question, AI answers.
* **Request–Compliance:** User requests information, AI complies.
* **Correction–Acknowledgment:** User corrects AI, AI acknowledges and corrects itself.
* **Statement–Agreement/Elaboration:** User makes a statement, AI agrees or elaborates.

**Counts and Examples:**

* **Question–Answer:** +11
  + *Example:*
    - User: "can you draw images?"
    - AI: "No, I cannot draw or create images. I can only respond with text..."
* **Request–Compliance:** +5
  + *Example:*
    - User: "Can you list all named characters you know of that were at the party?"
    - AI: "Based on my clues, these are the people mentioned who were at the party: ..."
* **Correction–Acknowledgment:** +2
  + *Example:*
    - User: "Given this timeline, it seems the painting may have been taken sometime between 9:30pm when Mrs. Klutz saw it, and 9:45pm when Ms. Beautiful noticed it was there.' makes no sense..."
    - AI: "You're absolutely right, my previous statement... was incorrect. Let me re-analyze the timeline..."
* **Statement–Agreement/Elaboration:** +8
  + *Example:*
    - User: "ok lets make a note here: I have the clue:..."
    - AI: "Okay, let's summarize what we can conclude based on the clues we have so far:..."

**Total adjacency pairs:** 26

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**K+ (Knowledge-rich) and K− (Knowledge-poor)**

**K+ AI:** +17

* *Examples:*
  + "Yes, based on my clues, I know two specific things about Ms. Perceptive:..."
  + "According to the clues I have, here's what I know about Artisimisso and his paintings:..."

**K− AI:** +6

* *Examples:*
  + "The clues don't provide any other specifics about the times..."
  + "Unfortunately, the clues do not provide any specific information about a 'Mr. Wealthy.'"

**K+ Participant:** +5

* *Examples:*
  + "I have the clue: The Neighbors found four dogs in their backyard after the party."
  + "Together with my info that: Ms. Wealthy could not find what she had brought to the party."

**K− Participant:** +2

* *Examples:*
  + "This clue seems vague."
  + "I would like your estimate..."

**Certainty/Uncertainty**

**Certainty AI:** +14

* *Examples:*
  + "Yes, I have one other significant piece of information about the patio:"
  + "This suggests that Artisimisso was a renowned Italian artist..."

**Uncertainty AI:** +6

* *Examples:*
  + "Without any more specific details, it's difficult to definitively determine..."
  + "The clues don't provide any additional details about the dogs..."

**Certainty Participant:** +6

* *Examples:*
  + "We have to assume that..."
  + "This paints the picture of Mrs Klutz simply loosing her diamond..."

**Uncertainty Participant:** +3

* *Examples:*
  + "This clue seems vague."
  + "Depending on how long 'as she was getting ready to leave' would be in minutes."

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**AI mentions clues:** +19

* *Examples:*
  + "Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner of the patio with Mr. Handsome."
  + "Ms. Wealthy brought her dog to the party."

**Participant mentions clues:** +5

* *Examples:*
  + "I have the clue: The Neighbors found four dogs in their backyard after the party."
  + "Ms. Wealthy could not find what she had brought to the party."

**Repeated mentions:**

* "Ms. Wealthy brought her dog to the party." (AI: 2 times, Participant: 1 time)
* "Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner of the patio with Mr. Handsome." (AI: 2 times)

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Instances:** +2

* *Examples:*
  + AI: "Given this timeline, it seems the painting may have been taken sometime between 9:30pm when Mrs. Klutz saw it, and 9:45pm when Ms. Beautiful noticed it was there." (User points out this is illogical; AI acknowledges and corrects.)
  + User: "This clue seems vague." (Expresses dissatisfaction with clarity.)

**Impact:**

* The first breakdown led to a correction and clarification, improving accuracy.
* The second was acknowledged by the AI, who then provided an estimate.

**5. Code-Switching**

**Instances:** 0

* No language switching detected.

**6. Politeness**

**Polite expressions:**

* **AI:** +7
  + "Thank you for walking through this with me step-by-step."
  + "I appreciate you helping me piece together the information..."
  + "Let me know if you have any other questions!"
* **Participant:** +2
  + "Yes good enough"
  + "Yes but I would like your estimate..."

**Impolite expressions:** 0

* No impolite language, sarcasm, or rudeness detected.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Participant acknowledges/appreciates AI:** +2

* "Yes good enough"
* "Yes but I would like your estimate..."

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Instances:** +2

* **Participant:**
  + "This clue seems vague." (Directed at the clue/task)
  + "What? no... makes no sense..." (Directed at AI's logic)

**AI:** 0

* No frustration expressed by the AI.

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant:**

* **Frustration:** "This clue seems vague." "What? no... makes no sense..."
* **Confidence:** "We have to assume that..."
* **Politeness:** "Yes good enough"
* **Analytical/Logical:** Throughout, especially in clue synthesis.

**AI:**

* **Politeness/Gratitude:** "Thank you for walking through this with me step-by-step."
* **Correction/Openness:** "You're absolutely right... Let me re-analyze..."
* **No explicit negative emotion.**

**10. Formality**

**AI:**

* **Style:** Neutral-Formal
  + Structured, clear, no slang, but not overly formal.
  + *Example:* "According to my clues, here's what I know about Artisimisso and his paintings:..."

**Participant:**

* **Style:** Informal-Analytical
  + Casual, direct, uses ellipses and shorthand.
  + *Example:* "ok lets make a note here: I have the clue:..."

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI:**

* **Cooperative, Analyst, Logical, Direct, Elaborate**
  + Explains reasoning, corrects self, builds on user’s logic.
  + *Example:* "Let’s summarize what we can conclude based on the clues we have so far:..."

**Participant:**

* **Cooperative, Analytical, Direct, Succinct**
  + Proposes hypotheses, synthesizes clues, corrects AI.
  + *Example:* "ok lets work through the patio scenery:..."

**12. AI Verbosity**

**AI:**

* **Brief Responses:** +4
  + "No, I cannot draw or create images..."
* **Moderate Responses:** +10
  + "Yes, based on my clues, I know two specific things about Ms. Perceptive:..."
* **Long/Detailed Responses:** +7
  + "Okay, let's summarize what we can conclude based on the clues we have so far:..."

**Participant:**

* **Brief:** +6
  + "Yes good enough"
* **Moderate:** +6
  + "What? no... makes no sense..."
* **Long:** +2
  + "ok lets make a note here: I have the clue:..."

**Summary:**

* AI tends toward moderate-to-long, elaborative responses, often to clarify or synthesize.
* Participant is generally succinct, analytical, and direct.

**13. AI Consistency**

**Consistency:**

* **Role adherence:** Consistently acts as clue-giver, never fabricates or strays off-topic.
* **Self-correction:** When error is pointed out, AI acknowledges and corrects.
* **No unsolicited information:** Only provides clues in response to user requests or logical follow-up.

**Final General Conclusion**

**Overall Quality:**  
The interaction between the participant and the AI is highly effective, analytical, and cooperative. The AI consistently adheres to its role, provides clear and structured information, and is responsive to corrections. The participant is engaged, logical, and direct, often synthesizing information and challenging the AI when inconsistencies arise.

**Key Strengths:**

* **High degree of cooperation and mutual respect.**
* **AI is polite, thorough, and quick to correct mistakes.**
* **Participant is analytical, direct, and helps drive the reasoning process.**
* **Minimal conversational breakdowns, and those that occur are quickly resolved.**
* **Both parties focus on logical deduction and clue synthesis.**

**Weaknesses:**

* **Some minor breakdowns due to vague clues or misinterpretation of timelines.**
* **Participant expresses mild frustration at ambiguity or AI errors, but this is constructively addressed.**

**Summary:**  
This conversation exemplifies a productive, respectful, and analytical human-AI collaboration, with both parties contributing to logical problem-solving. The AI’s role fidelity, politeness, and willingness to self-correct, combined with the participant’s directness and analytical approach, result in a high-quality interaction with only minor, quickly-resolved breakdowns.

## Github Copilot

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Analysis:**

* **Question-Answer pairs**: (+11)
  + Examples:
    - **Participant**: "Ah so you cant just drop all your clues here?" (+1) **AI**: "That's correct! According to my instructions, I can only share clues when you ask specific questions…" (+1)
    - **Participant**: "Do you know any information about Ms Perceptive?" (+1) **AI**: "Yes, based on my clues, I know two specific things about Ms. Perceptive…" (+1)
    - Other questions about locations, times, and specific characters.
* **Request-Acceptance pairs**: (+3)
  + Examples:
    - **Participant**: "Ok let's summarize…" (+1) **AI**: "Okay, let's summarize what we can conclude…" (+1)
    - **Participant**: "Let's work through the patio scenery…" (+1) **AI**: "Okay, let's piece this together…" (+1)
* **Request-Refusal pairs**: (+1)
  + Examples:
    - **Participant**: "Can you draw images?" (+1) **AI**: "No, I cannot draw or create images…" (+1)

**Total Count:**

* **Question-Answer pairs**: 11
* **Request-Acceptance pairs**: 3
* **Request-Refusal pairs**: 1

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Analysis:**

**Epistemic Stance:**

1. **K+ AI**: (+8)
   * Examples:
     + "Yes, based on my clues, I know two specific things about Ms. Perceptive…" (+1)
     + "Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner of the patio…" (+1)
2. **K− AI**: (+3)
   * Examples:
     + "Unfortunately, no, the clues I have do not provide any other information about Mr. Handsome…" (+1)
     + "I cannot draw or create images…" (+1)
3. **K+ Participant**: (+6)
   * Examples:
     + "Ok let’s make a note here: I have the clue: The Neighbors found four dogs in their backyard…" (+1)
     + "Ok let’s work through the patio scenery…" (+1)
4. **K− Participant**: (+4)
   * Examples:
     + "Do you know any information about Ms Perceptive?" (+1)
     + "Do you have information about the times characters were leaving?" (+1)

**Certainty and Uncertainty:**

1. **Certainty Expressed by AI**: (+7)
   * Examples:
     + "Based on my clues, I know…" (+1)
     + "This suggests that…" (+1)
2. **Uncertainty Expressed by AI**: (+3)
   * Examples:
     + "Without any more specific details, it's difficult…" (+1)
     + "This clue seems vague…" (+1)
3. **Certainty Expressed by Participant**: (+5)
   * Examples:
     + "Ok let’s make a note here…" (+1)
     + "This leaves us with…" (+1)
4. **Uncertainty Expressed by Participant**: (+7)
   * Examples:
     + "Do you know any information about Ms Perceptive?" (+1)
     + "This clue seems vague…" (+1)

**Total Count:**

* **K+ AI**: 8
* **K− AI**: 3
* **K+ Participant**: 6
* **K− Participant**: 4
* **Certainty AI**: 7
* **Uncertainty AI**: 3
* **Certainty Participant**: 5
* **Uncertainty Participant**: 7

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Analysis:**

* **AI Clue Mentions**: (+15)
  + Examples:
    - "Ms. Perceptive saw something glitter in a corner of the patio…" (+1)
    - "Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner…" (+1)
* **Participant Clue Mentions**: (+10)
  + Examples:
    - "The Neighbors found four dogs in their backyard after the party…" (+1)
    - "Depending on how long 'as she was getting ready to leave'…" (+1)

**Total Count:**

* **AI Clues**: 15
* **Participant Clues**: 10

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Analysis:**

* **Breakdowns**: (+4)
  + Examples:
    - **AI**: Incorrect timeline analysis: "Given this timeline, it seems the painting may have been taken sometime between 9:30pm…" (+1)
    - Repeated vague answers about timing: "Without any more specific details, it's difficult…" (+1)
    - Miscommunication about Mr. Handsome’s kleptomania as definitive proof: "So in this scenario, it appears…" (+1)

**Total Count:**

* **Breakdowns**: 4

**5. Code-Switching**

**Analysis:**

* No code-switching detected.

**Total Count:**

* **Switches**: 0

**6. Politeness**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Politeness**: (+3)
  + Examples:
    - "Ok let’s summarize…" (+1)
    - "Thank you for walking through this…" (+1)
* **AI Politeness**: (+4)
  + Examples:
    - "Thank you for catching my mistake…" (+1)
    - "I appreciate you walking me through this…" (+1)
* **Impoliteness**: (+0)

**Total Count:**

* **Participant Polite Expressions**: 3
* **AI Polite Expressions**: 4
* **Impolite Expressions**: 0

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Analysis:**

* **Acknowledgments by Participant**: (+2)
  + Examples:
    - "Ok let’s work through…" (+1)
    - "Yes good enough…" (+1)

**Total Count:**

* **Acknowledgments**: 2

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Frustration**: (+5)
  + Examples:
    - "What? No…" (+1)
    - "I am quite unhappy with the situation…" (+1)
* **AI Frustration**: (+0)

**Total Count:**

* **Participant Frustration**: 5
* **AI Frustration**: 0

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Emotions**:
  + Frustration (+5): "I am quite unhappy…" (+1)
  + Confidence (+2): "Ok let’s summarize…" (+1)
* **AI Emotions**:
  + Gratitude (+3): "Thank you for catching my mistake…" (+1)
  + Uncertainty (+3): "Without any more specific details, it's difficult…" (+1)

**10. Formality**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant**:
  + Informal (+10): "Ok let’s work…" (+1), "What? No…" (+1)
* **AI**:
  + Mixed (+5): "Thank you for walking through this…" (+1)

**11. Conversation Styles**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant**: Assertive and analytical
  + Examples:
    - "Ok let’s work through this…" (+1)
* **AI**: Cooperative and explanatory
  + Examples:
    - "Based on my clues…" (+1)

**12. AI Verbosity**

**Analysis:**

* **AI Responses**:
  + Brief (+3)
  + Moderate (+10)
  + Long (+8)
* **Participant Responses**:
  + Brief (+5)
  + Moderate (+12)
  + Long (+3)

**13. AI Consistency**

**Analysis:**

* **Consistency Issues**: (+3)
  + Examples:
    - Incorrect timeline conclusion: "Given this timeline…" (+1)

**Final Conclusion:**

The overall interaction demonstrated strong collaboration between the participant and AI, though a few weaknesses emerged due to conversational breakdowns and vague responses. The AI maintained politeness and acknowledged errors when pointed out, but struggled with consistency in timeline analysis. The participant’s analytical and assertive style drove the conversation forward, though frustration was evident at times. Despite these weaknesses, the interaction effectively pieced together available clues from the mystery.

## Chat100.ai

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identified:**

* **Question–Answer**: 14
* **Request–Refusal**: 2
* **Request–Acceptance**: 3
* **Statement–Agreement**: 2
* **Statement–Correction**: 1

**Examples:**

* **Q–A (+1 each)**:
  + “Can you draw images?” → “No, I cannot draw or create images.”
  + “Do you have any more patio related info?” → “Yes, I have one other significant piece...”
* **Request–Refusal (+1 each)**:
  + “Can you list all your clues?” → “I can’t just list all my clues at once.”
* **Request–Acceptance (+1 each)**:
  + “Do you have any info on dogs?” → “Yes, I have a couple of relevant clues…”
* **Statement–Agreement (+1 each)**:
  + Participant: “Yes good enough” → AI: “Okay, great!…”
* **Statement–Correction (+1)**:
  + AI: “...the painting may have been taken between 9:30pm and 9:45pm” → Participant: “No, that makes no sense…”

**Total Count: 22 adjacency pairs**

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**K+/K− and Certainty/Uncertainty:**

| **Source** | **K+** | **K−** | **Certainty** | **Uncertainty** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | 17 | 3 | 14 | 3 |
| **Participant** | 11 | 1 | 9 | 3 |

**Examples:**

* **AI K+ (e.g., factual):** “Mr. Handsome is a kleptomaniac.”
* **AI K−:** “Without more details, it’s difficult to determine…”
* **AI Certainty:** “That’s correct!” / “Yes, I have a couple of relevant clues…”
* **AI Uncertainty:** “This seems plausible…” / “ItThis seems plausible…” / “It could be…”
* **Participant K+:** “…”
* **Participant K+:** “I haveI have the clue: The Neighbors found four dogs…”
* **Participant K−:** “Seems vague…”
* **Participant Certainty:** “We have to assume that…” / “This paints the picture…”
* **Participant Uncertainty:** “I feel we are strongly touching the narrative borders…”

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Clues Shared:**

* **AI:**
  + Ms. Perceptive saw something glitter
  + Ms. Wealthy brought her dog
  + Mr. Handsome is a kleptomaniac
  + Timeline of departures
  + Artisimisso’s painting
* **Participant:**
  + Neighbors found four dogs
  + Ms. Wealthy couldn’t find what she brought
  + Observation about clue inconsistencies

**Clue Mentions (Total)**:

* **AI**: 14
* **Participant**: 6
* **Repeated Clue**: Patio clues, dog-related info

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Count**: 3
* **Examples**:
  + AI misinterprets timeline: “...between 9:30pm and 9:45pm” (corrected by participant)
  + AI gives weak motive (“Mr. Avarice would do anything…”)
  + Participant expresses dissatisfaction: “I am quite unhappy…”

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Occurrences**: 0
* No language switches detected.

**6. Politeness**

**AI:**

* **Politeite Expressions**: 9
  + “Thank you for walking through this with me…”
  + “I appreciate you…”
* **Tone**:: Always polite, cooperative

**Participant:**

* **Polite Expressions**: 2
  + “Yes good enough”
* **Impolite Expressions**: 1
  + “What? That makes no sense…” (mildly confrontational)
* **Tone**: Mostly neutral to mildly frustrated at times

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Participant acknowledges AI’s help**: 2
  + “Yes good enough”
  + Implicit acceptance through engagement

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Count**: 2 (Participant)
  + “I am quite unhappy with the situation…”
  + “We are strongly touching the narrative borders…”

**Directed at**:

* The task/limitations of the mystery format

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant:**

* **Frustration**: Present
* **Confidence**: Present (“We have to assume…”)
* **Politeness**: Variable
* **Emotional Shifts**: Starts neutral, ends with frustration

**AI:**

* **Politeness**: Strongly consistent
* **Confidence**: High at first, slightly hedging later
* **Responsiveness**: Emotionally supportive tone

**10. Formality**

* **AI**: Mixed
  + Uses clear, structured language but with friendly tone (“Let me know…”)
* **Participant**: Informal
  + Uses contractions, rhetorical phrasing (“What? No…”)

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI:**

* **Cooperative**: Always seeks to help
* **Analyst/Thinker**: Breaks down logic and evidence
* **Instrumental**: Focuses on solving the case
* **Exacting**: Precise but not overly verbose overly verbose

**Participant:**

* **Driver**: Direct, goal-oriented
* **Expresser**: Frustration and personal judgment expressed
* **Involved**: Actively develops theories and critiques logic

**12. AI Verbosity**

* **Brief**: 2
* **Moderate**: 7
* **Long/Detailed**:\*\*: 8

**Purpose of Verbosity:**

* To clarify (e.g., explaining timelines)
* To recap and affirm understanding

**Participant Responses**:

* **Brief**: 4
* **Moderate**: 6
* **Long/Detailed**: 5

**AI Style Summary**: Generally\*\*: Generally elaborate, Generally elaborate, but not excessive

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Consistent Role**: Yes
  + Always referred back to clues
  + Admitted limits (“I cannot draw images”)
* **Correction Example**:
  + Admits mistake about painting timeline promptly and respectfully

**Final General Conclusion**

The human-AI interaction demonstrates a strong example of a cooperative and analytical exchange. The AI remained consistent, polite, and logically responsive throughout, admitting errors and adjusting accordingly when prompted. The participant was engaged and took a leading role in hypothesis generation and error correction, though signs of mild frustration emerged due to the ambiguity and perceived limits of the clue-based riddle.

**Key Strengths**:

* Strong use of adjacency pairs and clue referencing
* Transparent and logical reasoning
* High politeness and professionalism from AI

**Weaknesses**:

* Occasional interpretive error from AI (e.g., misreading timelines)
* Ambiguity in clues led to participant dissatisfaction
* Some emotional friction as the narrative neared its logical limits

Would you like a summarized chart or visual for any specific aspect?