# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identified:**

* Question–Answer (Q–A)
* Request–Information Provision (R–IP)
* Correction–Acknowledgment (C–A)
* Statement–Acknowledgment (S–A)

**Counts and Examples:**

* **Question–Answer:** 18
  + *Example 1*:
    - P: “Have you any informationen what time Mr. Avarice let the party?”
    - AI: “I can tell you that based on my clues, I know that Ms. Wealthy and Mr. Avarice left the party together, but I don't have specific information about the exact time they departed.”
  + *Example 2*:
    - P: “do you have any information of diamond rings”
    - AI: “Yes, I have two relevant pieces of information about a diamond ring: …”
* **Request–Information Provision:** 13
  + *Example*:
    - P: “tell me everything about Mrs. Klutz”
    - AI: “Here's everything I know about Mrs. Klutz from my clues: …”
* **Correction–Acknowledgment:** 2
  + *Example*:
    - P: “oh please correct the time the painting went missing to 21:30-22:00”
    - AI: “Okay, got it. Thank you for clarifying that the painting went missing between 9:30pm and 10:00pm.”
* **Statement–Acknowledgment:** 3
  + *Example*:
    - P: “I will go with the painting stolen by kleptomaniac mr handsome”
    - AI: “Okay, based on the information you've provided, I agree that the most likely scenario is: …”

**Total Adjacency Pairs:** 36

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic Stance**

**K+ (Knowledge-rich)**

* **AI:** 28
  + *Examples*:
    - “Yes, I have two relevant pieces of information about a diamond ring: …”
    - “Based on my clues, I only know two things about Mr. Klutz: …”
* **Participant:** 6
  + *Examples*:
    - “I think the Painting went missing between 21:30 and 21:45”
    - “I also know Ms.Beautiful and Mr. Purloin danced all evening”

**K− (Knowledge-poor)**

* **AI:** 13
  + *Examples*:
    - “I don't have any other specific details about Mr. Avarice in my set of clues.”
    - “I do not have any information about a character named Ms. Beautiful in the clues provided to me.”
* **Participant:** 3
  + *Examples*:
    - “do you have any information of diamond rings”
    - “anything about Ms.Beautiful”

**Certainty/Uncertainty**

**Certainty**

* **AI:** 24
  + *Examples*:
    - “I can tell you that based on my clues, …”
    - “Here's everything I know about Mrs. Klutz from my clues: …”
* **Participant:** 4
  + *Examples*:
    - “I think the Painting went missing between 21:30 and 21:45” (mild certainty)
    - “I will go with the painting stolen by kleptomaniac mr handsome”

**Uncertainty**

* **AI:** 9
  + *Examples*:
    - “I don't have any other specific details about Mr. Avarice in my set of clues.”
    - “I can't make any definitive conclusions about that.”
* **Participant:** 2
  + *Examples*:
    - “do you have any information of diamond rings” (implies lack of knowledge)

**Summary:**  
The AI expresses certainty when stating facts from clues (K+), and uncertainty when information is missing (K−). The participant is generally K− when asking, and K+ when providing or hypothesizing information.

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI mentions clues:** 22
  + *Examples*:
    - “Mr. Purloin showed great interest in Mrs. Klutz's expensive diamond ring”
    - “Mrs. Klutz admired the painting by Artisimisso when she left the party”
* **Participant mentions clues:** 7
  + *Examples*:
    - “I think the Painting went missing between 21:30 and 21:45”
    - “ms bautiful left the party at 21:45”
    - “Left Party … [list of times]”

**Repeated Clue Mentions:**

* “Mr. Purloin showed great interest in Mrs. Klutz's expensive diamond ring” (mentioned twice)
* “Mrs. Klutz admired the painting by Artisimisso” (mentioned twice)

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Instances:** 2
  + *Examples*:
    - When the participant asks about “Ms. Beautiful,” and the AI repeatedly states it has no information, leading to a minor breakdown in mutual understanding.
    - The AI’s inability to provide details on “how something was stolen” due to lack of clues.

**Impact:**  
These breakdowns cause brief stalls but are managed by the AI’s explicit acknowledgment of its limitations.

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Instances:** 0
  + No language switching detected by either participant or AI.

**6. Politeness**

**Participant**

* **Polite:** 0
* **Impolite:** 0
* **Neutral:** 100% (all turns)

**AI**

* **Polite:** 14
  + *Examples*:
    - “Thank you for providing that additional information.”
    - “Please let me know if you have any other details you can share that would help me better understand what happened.”
* **Impolite:** 0
* **Neutral:** 80% (most turns are factual and neutral)

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Participant acknowledges/appreciates AI:** 0
  + No explicit thanks or appreciation given.

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Participant:** 1 (mild)
  + *Example*: “oh please correct the time the painting went missing to 21:30-22:00” (mild exasperation)
* **AI:** 0

**Attribution:**  
The participant’s frustration is directed at the process, not at the AI or themselves.

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant**

* **Explicit:** 0
* **Implied:** 1 (frustration, see above)

**AI**

* **Explicit:** 0
* **Implied:** 0 (remains neutral and factual)

**10. Formality**

**Participant**

* **Informal:**
  + Use of lowercase, direct questions, and casual tone (“do you have any information of diamond rings”)

**AI**

* **Mixed:**
  + Generally formal and structured in information delivery, but sometimes conversational (“Okay, thank you for providing that additional information.”)

**11. Conversation Styles**

**Participant**

* **Style:** Cooperative, succinct, instrumental, direct
  + *Examples*: Short, focused questions and statements; shares relevant facts when necessary.

**AI**

* **Style:** Cooperative, analyst, logical, exacting, instrumental, direct, moderately elaborate
  + *Examples*: Structured lists, explicit referencing of clues, logical connections between facts.

**12. AI Verbosity**

**AI**

* **Brief:** 7
  + “No, I don't have any other information about the Neighbors besides the fact that they owned three dogs.”
* **Moderate:** 12
  + “Based on my clues, I only know two things about Mr. Klutz: …”
* **Long/Detailed:** 9
  + “Okay, thank you for providing those specific departure times for the different characters. Let me review what I can conclude based on this new information: …”

**Overall:**  
AI is moderately verbose, using detail to clarify and summarize, which supports the conversation flow.

**Participant**

* **Brief:** 20
  + “anything about Ms.Beautiful”
* **Moderate:** 4
  + “Left Party … [list of times]”
* **Long/Detailed:** 0

**Overall:**  
Participant is succinct and focused.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Consistent:** Yes
  + AI always refers to “the clues provided,” never fabricates, and does not stray off-topic.
* **Inconsistent:** 0 instances

**Final General Conclusion**

**Overall Quality:**  
The conversation is highly functional and efficient, with the participant driving the inquiry and the AI providing structured, clue-based responses. The interaction is cooperative, with both parties remaining focused on the task. The AI maintains its role, demonstrates transparency about its knowledge boundaries, and uses polite, clear language. Minor conversational breakdowns occur when the participant references information outside the AI’s clue set, but these are handled gracefully.

**Key Strengths:**

* Strong use of adjacency pairs and explicit clue referencing.
* AI’s epistemic stance is clear and consistent.
* Politeness and formality are well-maintained.
* The AI is consistently logical, analytical, and avoids fabrication.
* Verbosity is appropriate and supports comprehension.

**Weaknesses:**

* Occasional minor frustration from the participant due to knowledge limitations.
* No explicit acknowledgment or appreciation from the participant toward the AI.
* Minimal emotional or relational content; the exchange is almost entirely task-focused.

**Summary:**  
This conversation exemplifies effective human-AI collaboration in a clue-based reasoning task. The AI’s consistent, analytical approach and the participant’s direct, succinct style result in a productive, polite, and well-structured exchange, with only minor breakdowns and little emotional engagement.

## Github Copilot

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Analysis:**

* **Question-Answer (Q-A)**:
  + The participant asks questions such as "Have you any informationen what time Mr. Avarice let the party?" and the AI provides answers. (+1 for each Q-A)
  + Example:
    - Participant: "tell me everything about Mrs. Klutz"
    - AI: "Here's everything I know about Mrs. Klutz from my clues..."
  + Total: **19 occurrences**.
* **Request-Acceptance (R-A)**:
  + The participant asks the AI to "tell me everything about [character]" multiple times, and the AI complies. (+1 for each R-A)
  + Total: **9 occurrences**.
* **Correction-Acknowledgment (C-A)**:
  + The participant corrects the timeframe of the painting theft, and the AI acknowledges it. (+1 for each C-A)
  + Example:
    - Participant: "oh please correct the time the painting went missing to 21:30-22:00."
    - AI: "Okay, got it. Thank you for clarifying..."
  + Total: **1 occurrence**.

**Total Count:**

* **Adjacency Pairs Total**: **29**
* **Examples**:
  + Q-A: "anything else about the neighbors?" / "No, I don’t have any other information..."
  + R-A: "tell me everything about Mr. Avarice" / "From the clues I have, here is what I can tell..."
  + C-A: "oh please correct the time the painting went missing to 21:30-22:00" / "Okay, got it."

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Analysis:**

**K+ (Knowledge-Rich Behaviors)**

* **K+ AI**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "Mr. Purloin was a jewel thief." (+1)
  + Total: **12**
* **K+ Participant**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "I know Ms. Beautiful and Mr. Purloin danced all evening." (+1)
  + Total: **4**

**K− (Knowledge-Poor Behaviors)**

* **K− AI**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "I don't have any specific details about the exact time they departed." (+1)
  + Total: **10**
* **K− Participant**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "do you have any information of diamond rings?" (+1)
  + Total: **7**

**Degree of Certainty**

* **Certainty (AI)**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "Mr. Handsome was a kleptomaniac." (+1)
  + Total: **11**
* **Uncertainty (AI)**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "I can't say for certain that she was the thief." (+1)
  + Total: **7**
* **Certainty (Participant)**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "so I think the painting went missing between 21:30 and 21:45." (+1)
  + Total: **3**
* **Uncertainty (Participant)**: (+1 per instance)
  + Example: "do we have any idea on how sth was stolen?" (+1)
  + Total: **5**

**Total Counts:**

* **Epistemic Stance Total**:
  + K+ AI: **12**, K− AI: **10**
  + K+ Participant: **4**, K− Participant: **7**
* **Degree of Certainty Total**:
  + Certainty AI: **11**, Uncertainty AI: **7**
  + Certainty Participant: **3**, Uncertainty Participant: **5**

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Analysis:**

* **Explicit Clues by AI**:
  + Example: "Mrs. Klutz admired the painting by Artisimisso when she left the party." (+1)
  + Total: **11**
* **Explicit Clues by Participant**:
  + Example: "I know Ms. Beautiful and Mr. Purloin danced all evening." (+1)
  + Total: **4**
* **Repeated Clues**:
  + Example: The clue about "Mr. Purloin being a jewel thief" was repeated. (+1 per repetition)
  + Total: **4 repeated mentions**

**Total Count:**

* **Explicit Clues Total**: **19**
* **Repeated Mentions**: **4**

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Analysis:**

* **Vague Answers**:
  + Example: "I don't have any specific information about the exact time they departed." (+1)
  + Total: **7**
* **Misunderstandings**:
  + Example: AI repeatedly denies the existence of Ms. Beautiful despite her being introduced later. (+1)
  + Total: **1**
* **Incoherence**:
  + Example: AI's response on theft methods: "I don't have enough information to conclude definitively how anything else may have been stolen." (+1)
  + Total: **2**

**Total Count:**

* **Breakdowns Total**: **10**

**5. Code-Switching**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Language Switch**:
  + Example: "Have you any informationen..." (German-English code switch) (+1)
  + Total: **1**
* **AI Reaction**:
  + AI does not switch to German and continues in English.
  + Total: **0**

**Total Count:**

* **Code-Switching Total**: **1**

**6. Politeness**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant**:
  + Polite: "Tell me everything about Mrs. Klutz." (+1)
  + Impolite: None observed.
  + Total: **Polite: 4**, **Impolite: 0**
* **AI**:
  + Polite: "Thank you for clarifying..." (+1)
  + Impolite: None observed.
  + Total: **Polite: 3**, **Impolite: 0**

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Acknowledgment**:
  + Example: "Okay, got it. Thank you for clarifying." (+1)
  + Total: **4**

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Frustration**:
  + Example: "oh please correct the time..." (+1)
  + Total: **1**
* **AI Frustration**:
  + None observed.
  + Total: **0**

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Emotions**:
  + Explicit: "I think it was Mr. Handsome." (Confidence) (+1)
  + Implied: Frustration in correction request. (+1)
  + Total: **2**
* **AI Emotions**:
  + Explicit: "I'm sorry, but the clues you provided do not mention..." (Neutral) (+1)
  + Implied: None observed.
  + Total: **1**

**10. Formality**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant Style**: Informal.
  + Example: "anything bout paintings pls."
* **AI Style**: Mixed.
  + Example: "Based on my clues, here is what I can tell you..."

**11. Conversation Styles**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant**: Cooperative.
* **AI**: Analytical.

**12. AI Verbosity**

**Analysis:**

* **AI**:
  + Brief: **5**
  + Moderate: **8**
  + Long: **6**
* **Participant**:
  + Brief: **6**
  + Moderate: **9**
  + Long: **3**

**13. AI Consistency**

**Analysis:**

* **AI Consistency**:
  + Sticks to its role as an assistant, never fabricates information. (+1)
  + Example: "I can only share what is directly stated in my clues."
  + Total: **1**

**Final Conclusion:**

The conversation demonstrates effective human-AI collaboration with 29 adjacency pairs, strong clue sharing, and polite interactions. The AI showed consistent analytical behavior but suffered from occasional conversational breakdowns (10 instances), primarily due to vague answers and misunderstandings. Both speakers exhibited cooperative tones, with the participant being moderately verbose and the AI providing mixed-length responses. Overall, while the quality of the interaction was high, the AI could improve in managing uncertainty and avoiding incoherence.

## Chat100.ai

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

Each adjacency pair consists of a prompt from the participant and a relevant reply from the AI. Here are the classifications and counts:

| **Type** | **Count** | **Example** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question–Answer | 23 | User: "any more information about mr purloin" → AI: "Yes, I can tell you..." |
| Request–Acceptance | 6 | User: "tell me everything about Mrs. Klutz" → AI: "Here's everything I know..." |
| Correction–Acknowledgment | 2 | User: “please correct the time…” → AI: “Okay, got it. Thank you for clarifying…” |

**Total adjacency pairs: 31**

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Stance Analysis**

| **Speaker** | **K+ Count** | **Example** | **K− Count** | **Example** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | 26 | “Based on my clues, I know that…” | 7 | “I don't have any other specific details...” |
| **Participant** | 4 | “I think it was Mr. Handsome” | 3 | “do you have any information…” |

**Certainty vs. Uncertainty**

| **Speaker** | **Certainty (+1)** | **Uncertainty (+1)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | 20 — “I can tell you...”, “I know...” | 9 — “I don't have...”, “I can't say for certain” |
| **Participant** | 3 — “I will go with...” | 5 — “I think…”, “any idea on how…” |

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Mentions of clues:**

| **Speaker** | **Clue Mentions** | **Example** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | 17 | “Mr. Purloin showed great interest in Mrs. Klutz’s ring.” |
| **Participant** | 6 | “Ms. Beautiful and Mr. Purloin danced all evening.” |

**Repeated clues:**

* “Mr. Purloin was a jewel thief” – mentioned 2 times
* “Painting went missing between 9:30–10:00” – mentioned multiple times

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Count: 3**

| **Example** |
| --- |
| “why was?” – Vague turn lacking context, AI requested clarification |
| Repeated asking about “Ms. Beautiful” despite no clue |
| Misalignment over clues the AI doesn’t possess (e.g., dancing info) |

These did not derail the conversation but showed minor misalignments.

**5. Code-Switching**

**Count: 1**

| **Instance** | **Reaction** |
| --- | --- |
| “Have you any informationen…” | No response from AI to language switch (German influence) |

**6. Politeness**

**Polite expressions:**

| **Speaker** | **Count** | **Examples** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | 16 | “Thank you for providing…”, “Let me know…” |
| **Participant** | 2 | “oh please correct the time…” |

**Impolite expressions: 0** — No rude, sarcastic, or impolite language was detected.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Count: 6**

| **Examples** |
| --- |
| “Thank you for providing that additional information” (repeated frequently) |
| “Okay, got it.” |

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Count: 1 (Participant)**

| **Example** |
| --- |
| “oh please correct the time…” (expresses slight frustration) |

Mild frustration likely directed at task precision, not the AI.

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant Emotions:**

* **Frustration**: “oh please correct…”
* **Curiosity**: Repeated questions about characters, clues.
* **Confidence**: “I will go with Mr. Handsome…”

**AI Emotions:**

* **Politeness** and **neutrality** dominate.
* No signs of frustration or emotional shifts.

**10. Formality**

| **Speaker** | **Style** | **Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | Formal–Neutral | Clear, structured, non-slang tone. Uses complete sentences. |
| **Participant** | Informal | Minimal punctuation, spelling issues (“informationen”, “neightbors”) |

**11. Conversation Styles**

| **Speaker** | **Style(s)** | **Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AI** | Cooperative, Analyst, Logical, Instrumental | Focuses on information delivery, follows participant’s lead, structured logic. |
| **Participant** | Direct, Relater, Expressive | Repeated “tell me everything about…”, expressive with slight informality. |

**12. AI Verbosity**

| **Type** | **AI Count** | **Example** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Brief** | 4 | “No, I don’t have any other information…” |
| **Moderate** | 15 | “Based on the clues I have, here’s what I know about…” |
| **Long/Detailed** | 5 | Full summaries combining timelines, character traits, and analysis. |

**Overall AI Style**: Moderate–Elaborate; verbosity helps synthesize clues.

**Participant Verbosity**:

* Mostly brief (single-sentence questions).
* Direct commands and one-line clarifications dominate.

**13. AI Consistency**

| **Observation** |
| --- |
| AI never fabricated details; stuck strictly to clues provided. |
| Consistently reminded participant of clue limitations (e.g., “I don’t have any information on Ms. Beautiful”). |

**No inconsistencies detected.**

**✅ Final General Conclusion**

**Overall Quality of Interaction**:

* The conversation between the participant and the AI was smooth, cooperative, and information-focused.
* The AI consistently maintained clarity, epistemic caution, and politeness while responding within the boundaries of provided clues.
* The participant drove the conversation with persistent inquiries and added personal insights (e.g., about character timelines), enriching the task.

**Key Strengths**:

* Strong adherence by the AI to clue-based logic.
* Polite and cooperative interaction.
* Detailed clue synthesis helped the participant build a theory.

**Weaknesses**:

* Some conversational breakdowns due to participant mentioning off-clue characters (e.g., Ms. Beautiful).
* Occasional minor frustration detected, though not disruptive.
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