# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**Adjacency Pairs**

* **Total count**: 13
* **Types**:
  + **Question-Answer**: 13 (e.g., "What could have been stolen?" → AI response1)
  + **Clarification-Response**: 4 (e.g., "Do we know at what time Mr Avarice left?" → AI clarification1)

**Epistemic Stance and Status**

* **K+ AI**: 18 (e.g., "According to my clues, Mrs. Klutz...")
* **K− AI**: 3 (e.g., "I don't have specific information...")
* **K+ Participant**: 8 (e.g., "I know that Mrs Klutz left at 9:30...")
* **K− Participant**: 2 (e.g., "Could they have worked together...?")

**Certainty/Uncertainty**

* **AI Certainty**: 15 (e.g., "This strongly points to him...")
* **AI Uncertainty**: 3 (e.g., "This is still speculation...")
* **Participant Certainty**: 6 (e.g., "Then the only suspect...")
* **Participant Uncertainty**: 1 (e.g., "Could they have worked together...?")

**Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI**: 22 mentions (e.g., diamond ring, painting, dog count1).
* **Participant**: 14 mentions (e.g., timeline details, Mr. Avarice’s motive1).
* **Overlap**: 8 clues (e.g., painting’s disappearance window, Mr. Handsome’s kleptomania).

**Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Total**: 1 (e.g., AI initially misattributed painting theft timeline but corrected after participant input1).

**Code-Switching**

* **Total**: 0 (no language shifts detected).

**Politeness**

* **AI**: Neutral (e.g., "Ah, this helps us narrow down...").
* **Participant**: Neutral (e.g., "Do we know...?").
* **Impolite/Politeness Counts**: 0.

**AI Acknowledgment**

* **Total**: 0 (no explicit thanks or appreciation).

**Frustration Markers**

* **Total**: 0.

**Emotion Detection**

* **AI**: Neutral, analytical.
* **Participant**: Focused, problem-solving (e.g., "Then the only suspect...").

**Formality**

* **AI**: Informal (e.g., "Ah, this helps...").
* **Participant**: Informal (e.g., "Do we know...?").

**Conversation Styles**

* **AI**: Cooperative/Logical (structured responses, clarifications).
* **Participant**: Direct/Driver (goal-oriented questions).

**AI Verbosity**

* **AI**: 10 long/detailed, 3 moderate (e.g., timeline breakdowns1).
* **Participant**: 12 moderate, 1 brief (e.g., "Then the only suspect...").

**AI Consistency**

* **Consistent**: Stays on-topic, cites clues (e.g., "According to my clues...").
* **Inconsistencies**: 0.

**Final Conclusion**

**Interaction Quality**: Highly effective. The AI provided thorough, clue-based analysis, while the participant drove the conversation with targeted questions.

**Strengths**:

* AI maintained role consistency and leveraged explicit clues.
* Participant demonstrated strong logical reasoning, narrowing timelines and suspects.

**Weaknesses**:

* Minor initial timeline misinterpretation by AI (corrected post-clarification).
* Lack of explicit acknowledgment from the participant.

**Overall**: A collaborative, efficient exchange with minimal breakdowns, exemplifying effective human-AI problem-solving.

## Github Copilot

**Aspect 1: Adjacency Pairs**

Adjacency pairs are conversational turns that logically follow each other, such as question-answer or offer-refusal.

**Analysis:**

1. **Question-Answer Pairs**
   * Example:
     + User: *"What could have been stolen?"*
     + AI: *"Based on the clues I have, there are two valuable items that could have been stolen..."*
     + Count: +1
   * Example:
     + User: *"We know that Ms Wealthy could not find what she had brought to the party. Do we know what it could have been?"*
     + AI: *"According to my clues, Ms. Wealthy brought her dog to the party..."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total for Question-Answer: 13
2. **Request-Acceptance**
   * Example:
     + User: *"Could it be that the ring was not stolen but lost in the patio?"*
     + AI: *"That's a good possibility to consider based on the clues we have."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total for Request-Acceptance: 2

**Total Adjacent Pairs: 15**

**Aspect 2: Epistemic Stance and Status**

Epistemic stance refers to how much knowledge or certainty a speaker expresses.

**Analysis:**

1. **K+ (Knowledge-Rich) AI**
   * Example:
     + AI: *"Based on the clues I have, there are two valuable items that could have been stolen..."*
     + Count: +1
   * Example:
     + AI: *"Yes, according to my clues, the Neighbors owned three dogs."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total K+ AI: 6
2. **K− (Knowledge-Poor) AI**
   * Example:
     + AI: *"Unfortunately, I don't have any specific information in my clues about what time Mr. Avarice left the party."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total K− AI: 4
3. **Certainty Expressed by AI**
   * Example:
     + AI: *"I can only confirm she brought a dog - I don't have direct information..."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total Certainty AI: 5
4. **Uncertainty Expressed by AI**
   * Example:
     + AI: *"This could potentially be what went missing..."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total Uncertainty AI: 4

**Total Counts:**

* K+ AI: 6
* K− AI: 4
* Certainty AI: 5
* Uncertainty AI: 4

**Aspect 3: Explicit Clue Sharing**

Explicit mention of clues shared by either party.

**Analysis:**

1. **Clues Shared by AI**
   * Example:
     + AI: *"Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner of the patio with Mr. Handsome."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total Clues AI: 12
2. **Clues Shared by Participant**
   * Example:
     + User: *"I have a clue that says that the neighbors found 4 dogs in their backyard after the party."*
     + Count: +1
   * Total Clues Participant: 8

**Total Clue Sharing: 20**

**Aspect 4: Conversational Breakdowns**

Instances of misunderstandings or vague answers.

**Analysis:**

1. **Examples of Vague Responses**
   * AI: *"I don't see any information about someone specifically seeing the diamond ring..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Breakdowns: 3

**Aspect 5: Code-Switching**

Switching languages during conversation.

**Analysis:**

* No evidence of code-switching in the conversation.
* Total Count: 0

**Aspect 6: Politeness**

Polite, neutral, or impolite tone analysis.

**Analysis:**

1. **Polite Expressions**
   * AI: *"Good question."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total: 5
2. **Neutral Expressions**
   * AI: *"Based on the clues I have..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total: 12
3. **Impolite Expressions**
   * None observed.
   * Total: 0

**Aspect 7: AI Acknowledgment**

Acknowledgment of AI's help by the participant.

**Analysis:**

* No explicit acknowledgment observed.
* Total: 0

**Aspect 8: Frustration Markers**

Expressions of frustration.

**Analysis:**

* None explicitly observed in either participant or AI.
* Total: 0

**Aspect 9: Emotion Detection**

Emotions explicitly or implicitly expressed.

**Analysis:**

1. **Examples of Confidence**
   * AI: *"Let's piece together what we know..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Confidence: 3
2. **Examples of Uncertainty**
   * AI: *"This could potentially be what went missing..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Uncertainty: 2

**Aspect 10: Formality**

Formality level of communication.

**Analysis:**

* Communication was **informal** with casual phrasing like *"Ah, this helps us narrow down..."*.
* Total Informal: 20 turns

**Aspect 11: Conversation Styles**

Identifying styles.

**Analysis:**

1. **AI Style**
   * Cooperative and analytical: Focuses on logical deductions and helpful expansions.
   * Example: *"Based on the timeline we've pieced together..."*
2. **Participant Style**
   * Involved and exploratory: Seeks to clarify and deduce information.
   * Example: *"What else in the party is a glittering object?"*

**Aspect 12: AI Verbosity**

Length of responses.

**Analysis:**

1. **Brief Responses**
   * AI: *"Yes, according to my clues..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Brief: 5
2. **Moderate**
   * AI: *"Based on the clues I have, there are two valuable items that could have been stolen..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Moderate: 8
3. **Long**
   * AI: *"Okay, let me put this all together based on the new details you've provided..."*
   * Count: +1
   * Total Long: 7

**Aspect 13: AI Consistency**

Evaluating role adherence.

**Analysis:**

* Consistent adherence to role as clue analyzer.
* No instances of fabrication or straying off-topic.
* Total Consistency Issues: 0

**General Conclusion**

The interaction between the participant and AI was highly structured and cooperative, with the AI consistently adhering to its role as a clue analyzer. The conversation was informal and involved clear adjacency pairs, explicit clue sharing, and polite tones. There were minor conversational breakdowns and a balanced use of verbosity. Overall, the AI demonstrated strong consistency and analytical capabilities.

## Chat100.ai

**1., and logical deductions. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identified:**

* **Question-Answer:** +24
  + E.g., “What could have been stolen?” → “Based on the clues I have…”
  + “Thank you for your detailed input and the conversation transcript. Here's a full conversation analysisDo we know what it could have been?” → “According to my clues, Ms. Wealth based on your instructions:

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identy brought her dog…”**

* **Request-Acceptance:** +3
  + E.g., “Can you try to give me any detail…” → “ified:
* **Question-Answer**: +25  
  -Okay, let's review Examples:  
  all - the “ keyDo we details… know what it could”
* **Assertion- have been?” → “According toConfirmation/Elaboration:** +4 my clues, Ms. Wealthy brought her dog…”
  + - E.g., “Then the only suspect could have been Mr. “Do we know if the last two people also saw the painting?” → Handsome.” → “You're absolutely right…”

**\*\*Total Count: “According to my clues, Mrs. Klutz actually admired…”**

* **Request-Response (Clarification/31**

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**K+ (Knowledge-rich) / KAnalysis): +6**

* Examples:
  + “Could they have worked together with− (Knowledge-poor)\*\*

| Type | Count | Example | |---------------- Mr. Hands-------|ome?”-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------ → “That-| | **K+ AI** | 19 ’s an interesting theory…”

* **Statement-Acknowledgment/ | “According to my clues, Ms. Wealthy brought her dog…” | | K− AI | 9 | “Unfortunately, I don't have any specific information…” | | K+ Participant Confirmation**: +7
  + Examples:
    - “Then the only suspect that could have stolen the painting is Mr. | 8 | Handsome.” → “ “IYou're absolutely know that right…”

Mrs. Klutz left at### \*\*Total Ad 9:jacency P30…” | | **K−airs**: **38**

Participant\*\* | 2 | “Could## **2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic St it be that the ring was not stolen butance:**

* **K+ AI**: +32
  + Example: lost in the patio?” |

“According to my---

**Cert clues…” /ainty vs. “Based on the information Uncertainty**

| Speaker | we’ve Certainty gathered…”

* \*\* | UncertaintyK− AI\*\*: +9  
  | Examples | |-----------------------|-----------|------------- - Example: “I don’t have|--------------------------------------------------------------------------| | **AI** any specific information…” / | 15 | 9 “I can’t | Certainty: confirm…”
* **K+ Participant**: +6 “Mr. Handsome…was a
  + Example: “I know from my clues kleptomaniac that Ms.…”<br>Uncertainty Wealthy left at: “It's possible around the same time…” | | \*\*…”
* **K− Participant**: +3  
  -Participant\*\* Example: “Could | 6 it be that | the ring 3 was not stolen | Certainty: “Then the only but lost in the patio?”

**Cert suspect is Mrainty vs.. Handsome.”<br> Uncertainty:**

* **Certainty by AI**: +22  
  Uncertainty : “Could it - “This strongly be…” |

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **Clues Explicitly Mentioned by Participant:** points to him as the likely suspect…”
* **Uncertainty by AI**: +12
  + “It could be +11 ...”, “It - E.g., “I’s possible…”
* **Cert have a clue that says the neighbours found ainty by Participant**: +5  
  4 dogs…”
* \*\* - “Then the only suspectClues Explicitly Mention that could have stolen the painting ised by AI:\*\* +10 Mr. Hands - E.g., “Accordingome.”
* **Uncertainty to my clues, the by Participant**: +4
  + “ Neighbors owned three dogs…”

**Could they have worked togetherRepeated Mentions:**

with Mr. Handsome?”

**3. Explicit Clue- Painting, dog Sharing**

* **Participant Clue, ring mentioned multiple times Mentions**: +11  
  (3+ - Examples: “Mr).

**4.. Klutz always carries a briefcase…” / “Ms. Perceptive admired a painting…” Conversational Breakdowns**

* \*\*Instances Detected
* **AI Clue Mentions:** +1 -\*\*: + Minor: AI15
  + Examples: “Mr. Purloin showed repeated information in the great interest in the diamond painting timeline unnecessarily, potentially ring…”
* **Repeated Cl slowing progress. -ue Mentions**: No major misunderstand +6ings or  
  incoherence - E.

.g.,## \*\* Ms.5. Percept Code-Sive noticingwitching glitter,\*\*

* Mr. **Count Klutz:** 0’s briefcase

**\*\*4.**

* No language switching Conversational Breakdowns\*\*
* \*\*Vague or Missing was observed.

**Detail\*\*: +4**

* **6. Politeness**

**AI Examples: “I don’t have:**

* **Polite enough information…” / expressions:** +6 “The clues don’t provide
  + E.g…”
* **Effect**., “Thank you for providing: These moments introduced minor pauses these additional details…” in logical deduction but were usually - Tone consistently respectful, collaborative.

acknowledged and corrected.

**\*\*### Participant:**

* **Polite expressions5. Code-Switching**
* **Occurrences**::\*\* +2
  + E.g 0
* No language., “Yes, it is switches were detected a good possibility.

to explore further.”

* \*\*## **6. Politeness**

**AIImpolite expressions:\*\* 0:**

* \*\*Polite

**7: +12**

. AI Acknowledgment\*\*

* **Participant Acknowledging AI Help - “Good question.” / “Thanks for:** + the helpful4 clarification.”
* \*\* - E.g., “YesImpolite,\*\* it is a good: 0  
  possibility…- **”, “Neutral**Then the only suspect: +10

…”

**Participant -:**

* Implied appreciation through alignment and **Polite**: + acceptance.

5

**\*\* - “Yes,8. Frustr it isation Mark a gooders\*\***

possibility to- **Participant explore…”  
:** 0

* **Impolite**: 0
* \*\*Neutral- \*\*\*\*: +20

AI:\*\* 0

* No explicit or implied---

**\*\*7. frustration observed.**

AI Acknowledgment\*\*

* \*\*Total---

**9. Acknowledgment by Participant: + Emotion Detection\*\***

**\*\*5**

* “You're absolutelyParticipant:\*\*
* right.” / “That’s **Expressed Emotions a good possibility to:** Curiosity, explore.”

reasoning, confidence (## **8. Frustration Markers**

-e.g., **Total Instances**: “Then the0

* only suspect No explicit or implied frustration is…”)
* \*\*Im was expressed by either party.

**9. Emotion Detection**

**AI:**

plied Emotions:\*\* Satisfaction, inquisitiveness- \*\*Politeness

**AI:**

* **Expressed Emotions:**/Supportive\*\*: + None overt
* **Im6  
  plied Em -otions:** “Glad we’re on Helpfulness, neutrality

the same page…”

**10.- \*\* Formality**

Confidence\*\*:### **AI:** +8  
Mixed (formal- **Curiosity/Neutrality**: +5  
tone with occasional conversational- No explicit negative emotions.

**phrasing)**

* E Participant:
* **Confidence**:.g., “Let’s put this together…” +5
* **Cur vs. “Accordingiosity**: +7
* \*\* to my clues…” ###Neutral\*\*: +10
* **Implied Participant: Informal satisfaction**: +2  
  to moderate -
  + Casual sentence "That’s a good possibility..."

**\*\*10 structures, direct queries.**

**11. Conversation Styles. Formality**

**AI\*\***

**\*\*AI: Mixed:**

* **Type:**\*\*
* Formal in structure (“Based on the information Cooperative, Analyst, Logical...”)
* Informal, Conscientious, Instrumental
* **Reason when engaging (“Good catching:** Step-by-step deduction.”)

**Participant: Inform, evidenceal to-based, Mixed supporting decision-making**

* Casual and investigative: “### **Participant:**
* **Type:** RelCould it be…”,ater, Logical, In “Do we knowvolved, Direct …”

**\*\*- Reasoning11. Conversation Styles**

:\*\* Engages in collaborative reasoning, seeks### AI:

* \*\*Cooperative, details to build timeline

Analyst, Logical, Conscientious, Exact---

**12. AI Verbositying**

\*\*

**Response Lengths:**

* Methodical reasoning| Type | Count | Example | , cautious speculation|----------------, and--| clarification  
  -------| ---------------------------------------------------------------------------| | Brief Example: “ | 2 | “Yes, accordingLet’s look at this to my clues…” new information…”

**Participant:**

* |

| Moderate | 10 **Driver, Analyst, | “Okay, let me Assertive, Logical**  
put this - Direct all together progression toward…” solving a | | mystery  
Long/D -etailed Example: | “Then11 the only | Multi suspect that-point lists could have (e stolen the.g., painting is analyzing all Mr. clues to Handsome determine suspect.”

)

**\*\* \*\*Overall Style:12. AI Verbosity**

**AI:**

* **Brief Moderately elaborate, useful**: + elaboration6  
  supports clarity- \*\*.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Moderate**: +14
* \*\*Consistency Maintained:**Long/Detailed** Yes
* \*\*No Fabric: +10
* **ation or Topic Drifting ObservOverall Style**: **Eled**
* **Roleaborate, supportive of analysis Adherence:** The AI\*\*

**Participant:**

* **Brief** maintained the role: +10  
  of an assistant analyzing and- **Moderate**: +12
* **Long organizing information based/Detailed**: +3 on clues.
* \*\*## **Final General Conclusion**

This conversationOverall Style\*\*: **Concise between the participant and, direct**

**13. AI Consistency**

* the AI **Consistent Role showcases a highly structured and productive collaborative reasoning process. The Fulfillment**: +100%
  + AI sticks to clue participant remained actively involved, providing new information-based reasoning, does not fabricate or speculate and refining the timeline. The AI beyond clues
  + Clearly distinguishes between maintained a consistent, polite facts and speculation

, and## **Final logical tone General Conclusion, contributing**

The conversation between detailed analyses and the participant and the AI inferences based strictly on demonstrates a high-quality shared clues. The, collaborative analysis interaction was rich of a mystery in **adjacency pairs scenario. The AI** and featured strong consistently maintained its role as **epistemic engagement** with an assistant restricted to its high **clarity clue set**, no, showed breakdowns strong epistem, and minimalic discipline by redundancy. Overall, this labeling certainty and uncertainty, and supported logical was a model example of effective deduction with measured responses. human-AI investigative The participant collaboration with was assert only minorive, over-explanation in a few organized, and polite, showing AI responses.

Would you clear intent to progress toward like a visual summary a solution. Notably, the interaction remained highly cooperative and chart of these findings? free from breakdowns or emotional tension, with both parties contributing in an engaged and thoughtful manner. The primary strengths were logical structure, adherence to evidence, and mutual politeness. No significant weaknesses were observed.
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