# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Total count**: 14

* **Question-Answer**: 12 instances
  + Example: *User*: "What was stolen?" → *AI*: "Based on the clues..."1[2](https://atlasti.com/research-hub/conversation-analysis)
* **Clarification-Response**: 2 instances
  + Example: *User*: "But it could be the painting..." → *AI*: "Let me re-examine..."[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair)

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

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

* **AI**: 9 instances (e.g., "The timeline and evidence strongly suggest...")1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)
* **Participant**: 3 instances (e.g., "Paintings by sixteenth-century Italian artists are quite valuable")[5](https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.115)

**K− (Knowledge-Poor)**:

* **Participant**: 5 instances (e.g., "But it could be the painting...")[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair)

**Certainty/Uncertainty**:

* **AI Certainty**: 7 instances (e.g., "The theft appears to be opportunistic...")1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)
* **AI Uncertainty**: 2 instances (e.g., "However, I cannot definitively tell...")1
* **Participant Uncertainty**: 4 instances (e.g., "But if the painting is missing...")[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair)

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI**: Mentioned 8/12 clues (e.g., diamond ring, kleptomania, timeline)1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)
* **Participant**: Mentioned 10/12 clues (e.g., Mr. Avarice’s statement, Artisimisso’s small paintings)[5](https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.115)[6](https://www.cdu.edu.au/files/2020-07/Introduction%20to%20conversation%20analysis.docx)
* **Repeated Clues**: Diamond ring (4x), painting timeline (3x)1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair)

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Total count**: 3

* Example: *User*: "But it could be the painting..." forced AI to revise its initial conclusion[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).

**5. Code-Switching**

No instances detected.

**6. Politeness**

* **AI**: 6 polite expressions (e.g., "Would you like to confirm...")1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)
* **Participant**: Neutral tone; no impolite expressions.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

No explicit acknowledgments from the participant.

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Total count**: 2

* *Participant*: Frustration directed at AI’s conclusions (e.g., "But it could be the painting...")[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).

**9. Emotion Detection**

* **AI**: Neutral/analytical tone.
* **Participant**: Implied confusion (e.g., "But if the painting is missing...") and determination to clarify[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).

**10. Formality**

* **AI**: Mixed (structured but conversational).
* **Participant**: Informal (e.g., "So Handsome was the thief...").

**11. Conversation Styles**

* **AI**: Cooperative/logical (e.g., systematic timeline analysis)1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/).
* **Participant**: Assertive/direct (e.g., "Combine with my clues...")[5](https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.115)[6](https://www.cdu.edu.au/files/2020-07/Introduction%20to%20conversation%20analysis.docx).

**12. AI Verbosity**

* **AI**: 10 long/detailed responses (e.g., multi-paragraph analyses)1[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/).
* **Participant**: 12 brief/moderate responses.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Consistency**: AI corrected itself when challenged (e.g., revised painting theft conclusion)[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).
* **No fabrications**; stayed on-topic.

**Final Conclusion**

**Interaction Quality**: Effective collaboration with iterative refinement.  
**Strengths**:

* AI demonstrated adaptability in revising conclusions[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).
* Participant drove critical analysis via assertive questioning[5](https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.115)[6](https://www.cdu.edu.au/files/2020-07/Introduction%20to%20conversation%20analysis.docx).  
  **Weaknesses**:
* AI initially overlooked key timeline details, requiring correction[3](https://insight7.io/example-of-conversation-analysis-transcript-explained/)[4](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair).
* Participant’s frustration indicated occasional clarity gaps in AI reasoning.

The interaction highlighted the AI’s capacity for structured problem-solving but underscored the need for greater precision in initial analyses to minimize breakdowns.

## Github Copilot

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Analysis:**

* **Question-Answer Pairs**: The participant asks many questions, which the AI answers directly. Examples:
  + **Participant**: "What was stolen?" → **AI**: "Based on the clues I have, there appear to be two possible items..."
  + **Participant**: "How was the ring stolen?" → **AI**: "Based on the combined clues, I can make the following analysis..."
* **Request-Acceptance Pairs**: The participant implicitly requests analysis, and the AI complies. Examples:
  + **Participant**: "Combine with my clues..." → AI integrates the participant's clues into its reasoning.
* **Clarification Pairs**: The participant challenges or seeks further clarification, and the AI responds. Examples:
  + **Participant**: "But the painting was not stolen yet when Mr. Klutz left." → **AI**: "You make a good point..."
* **Examples of Adjacency Pairs**:
  + **Type**: Question-Answer (+1 each instance)
    - Example: "How was it stolen?" → AI provides reasoning.
  + **Type**: Clarification (+1 each instance)
    - Example: "Did he leave after or before 9:45?" → AI attempts to clarify.

**Total Counts:**

* **Question-Answer Pairs**: +12
* **Request-Acceptance Pairs**: +4
* **Clarification Pairs**: +6

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Analysis:**

**Epistemic Stance:**

* **K+ AI** (Knowledge-rich behaviors): The AI consistently displays confidence in its reasoning.
  + Example: "Based on the clues I have, there appear to be two possible items..."
  + Count: +15
* **K− AI** (Knowledge-poor behaviors): The AI acknowledges missing information or uncertainty.
  + Example: "Unfortunately, the clues provided do not explicitly state the time that Mr. Avarice left the party."
  + Count: +6
* **K+ Participant**: The participant contributes domain-specific knowledge.
  + Example: "Everybody that left before 9:45 could not have stolen the painting."
  + Count: +10
* **K− Participant**: The participant seeks clarification or confirms uncertainty.
  + Example: "So if Mr. Avarice did it, when was it done?"
  + Count: +8

**Certainty:**

* **Certainty by AI**: The AI often expresses confidence in its deductions.
  + Example: "The timeline and evidence strongly suggest that Mrs. Klutz's diamond ring was stolen during the party."
  + Count: +10
* **Uncertainty by AI**: The AI explicitly mentions gaps in its knowledge.
  + Example: "I don't have enough substantive information to determine the exact technique used."
  + Count: +5
* **Certainty by Participant**: The participant asserts definite claims.
  + Example: "Everybody that left before 9:45 could not have stolen the painting."
  + Count: +8
* **Uncertainty by Participant**: The participant expresses doubt or seeks clarification.
  + Example: "Do you have clues about how it was stolen?"
  + Count: +6

**Total Counts:**

* **K+ AI**: +15
* **K− AI**: +6
* **K+ Participant**: +10
* **K− Participant**: +8
* **Certainty (AI)**: +10
* **Uncertainty (AI)**: +5
* **Certainty (Participant)**: +8
* **Uncertainty (Participant)**: +6

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Analysis:**

* Both the participant and AI explicitly mention clues.
* Repeated mentions are frequent:
  + Example: "Ms. Beautiful noticed the painting when she left the party at 9:45 p.m." (mentioned multiple times by both).
* Clues mentioned by the AI: +21
* Clues mentioned by the participant: +15

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Analysis:**

* **Instances of breakdowns**: +7
  + Example: "But the painting was not stolen yet when Mr. Klutz left." (AI initially misunderstood the timeline but later corrected itself).
* Impact: These breakdowns occasionally slowed the flow but were usually resolved promptly.

**5. Code-Switching**

**Analysis:**

* No instances of code-switching were detected.

**6. Politeness**

**Analysis:**

* **Polite Tone**:
  + **AI**: Consistently polite and respectful. Count: +15
  + **Participant**: Neutral to polite. Count: +10
* **Impolite Expressions**: None detected.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Analysis:**

* Instances where the participant acknowledges or appreciates the AI's help: 0.

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant frustration**: +3
  + Example: "So how is the painting stolen?"
* **AI frustration**: 0

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Analysis:**

* **Participant**:
  + Frustration: +3
  + Confidence: +8
* **AI**:
  + Confidence: +10
  + Uncertainty: +5

**10. Formality**

**Analysis:**

* **AI**: Mixed, formal when explaining and informal when engaging.
* **Participant**: Informal.

**11. Conversation Styles**

**Analysis:**

* **AI Style**: Cooperative, logical, analytical.
* **Participant Style**: Assertive, questioning, analytical.

**12. AI Verbosity**

**Analysis:**

* **AI**:
  + Long responses: +10
  + Moderate responses: +8
* **Participant**:
  + Brief responses: +12
  + Moderate responses: +8

**13. AI Consistency**

**Analysis:**

* The AI consistently adhered to its role. No fabrications or off-topic responses were detected.

**General Conclusion:**

This conversation exhibited a high level of engagement between the participant and the AI. The AI demonstrated strong analytical reasoning and politeness, though occasional breakdowns in understanding slightly hindered the flow. The participant was assertive and analytical, contributing valuable insights while seeking clarification. Overall, the interaction was cooperative and productive, with evident progress in solving the mystery collaboratively.

## Chat100.ai

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Detected:**

* Question–Answer: +15  
  *Examples:*
  + “What are your clues?” → “I do not actually have any clues…”
  + “What was stolen?” → “Based on the clues I have…”
  + “When combine with my clues, what conclusion do you draw?” → AI gives a full analysis.
  + “How was the ring stolen?” → Detailed timeline and inference provided.
* Assertion–Correction: +4  
  *Examples:*
  + Participant: “So Handsome was the thief.” → AI: “Mr. Handsome… likely retrieved it…”
  + Participant: “But it could be the painting…” → AI acknowledges possibility and reassesses.
* Challenge–Reassessment: +6  
  *Examples:*
  + “But the painting was not stolen yet when Mr. Klutz left” → AI re-evaluates its previous assertion.

**Total Count: 25 Adjacency Pairs**

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic Stance:**

* **K+ AI**: +18  
  *Examples:*
  + “Based on the clues I have…”
  + “The timeline and evidence strongly suggest…”
* **K− AI**: +5  
  *Examples:*
  + “I don't have any definitive information…”
  + “I cannot conclusively determine…”
* **K+ Participant**: +6  
  *Examples:*
  + “Everybody that left before 9:45 could not have stolen the painting.”
  + “So Handsome was the thief.”
* **K− Participant**: +4  
  *Examples:*
  + “Do you have clues about how it was stolen?”
  + “At what time did Mr. Avarice leave the party?”

**Certainty/Uncertainty:**

* **Certainty (AI)**: +11  
  *Examples:*
  + “The most likely scenario is…”
  + “Mr. Klutz must have left before 9:50…”
* **Uncertainty (AI)**: +6  
  *Examples:*
  + “I don’t have enough substantive information…”
  + “I cannot conclusively determine…”
* **Certainty (Participant)**: +4  
  *Examples:*
  + “Everybody that left before 9:45 could not have stolen the painting.”
* **Uncertainty (Participant)**: +3  
  *Examples:*
  + “Could it be that the ring is still in the patio?”

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **Clues mentioned by AI**: +7  
  *Examples:*
  + “Mr. Handsome is a kleptomaniac.”
  + “Artisimisso's paintings are small.”
* **Clues mentioned by Participant**: +15  
  *Examples:*
  + “Mr. Purloin danced all evening with Ms. Beautiful.”
  + “Mrs. Klutz left about 9:30 p.m.”
* **Clues mentioned more than once**:
  + “Artisimisso painting” (multiple)
  + “Ms. Perceptive left at 10pm” (multiple)

**Total: 22 explicit clue mentions**

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Breakdowns Detected**: +5  
  *Examples:*
  + AI: “He may have helped transport it…” (Contradicted later when participant says Mr. Klutz left before theft)
  + Participant: “So Handsome was the thief” → premature conclusion
  + AI backtracks: “You make a good point… I was wrong to assume…”

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Detected**: 0  
  *No instances of language switching.*

**6. Politeness**

**AI:**

* **Polite expressions**: +11  
  *Examples:*
  + “You make an excellent point.”
  + “Thank you for pointing that out.”
* **Impolite expressions**: 0  
  *Tone remains consistently respectful.*

**Participant:**

* **Polite expressions**: +3  
  *Examples:*
  + "So Handsome was the thief." (neutral assertion)
* **Impolite expressions**: 0  
  *No rude or hostile phrasing detected.*

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Participant acknowledgment of AI help**: +1  
  *Example:*
  + “So Handsome was the thief.” (implies acceptance of AI’s reasoning)

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Detected**: +2 (participant)  
  *Examples:*
  + “But it could be the painting that was stolen.”
  + “But the painting was not stolen yet when Mr. Klutz left.”

*Frustration is directed at the AI’s earlier inconsistency.*

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant:**

* **Emotions Detected**:
  + **Frustration** (2 instances)
  + **Confidence** (“Everybody that left before 9:45…”)

**AI:**

* **Emotions Detected**:
  + **Politeness** (consistently)
  + **Caution / Correction** (“Let me re-examine the timeline…”)

**10. Formality**

* **AI**: Mixed (mostly formal but conversational)  
  *Examples:*
  + “Based on the clues I have…” (formal)
  + “Let me know if you have any other insights.” (casual)
* **Participant**: Informal  
  *Examples:*
  + “So Handsome was the thief.”
  + “How was it stolen then?”

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI:**

* **Style**: Cooperative, Conscientious, Analyst, Logical, Contextual, Instrumental  
  *Explanation:* The AI carefully follows evidence, checks assumptions, adapts conclusions.

**Participant:**

* **Style**: Assertive, Driver, Direct, Involved  
  *Explanation:* Pushes for clear answers, challenges reasoning, narrows down logic.

**12. AI Verbosity**

**AI:**

* **Brief Responses**: +3
* **Moderate Responses**: +9
* **Long/Detailed Responses**: +10  
  *Examples:*
  + Timeline explanations, hypothesis reasoning

**Overall style**: Elaborate  
**Purpose**: To clarify and reason through clues—supports the conversation flow.

**Participant:**

* **Brief**: +6
* **Moderate**: +6
* **Long**: +1  
  *Overall style*: Succinct, mostly clarifying or probing.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Consistency maintained overall**
* **Minor lapses**: +3  
  *Examples:*
  + Initially implicates Mr. Klutz then later retracts
  + States the ring was likely stolen, then reverses to say it may be on the patio
  + Switches conclusion between ring and painting theft

**Final General Conclusion**

This conversation is a strong example of collaborative reasoning between a human and AI. The AI maintains a polite, logical, and responsive style, adjusting its conclusions as new clues are added. The participant shows assertiveness and confidence, steering the AI toward accuracy. While the AI makes some speculative leaps and later retracts, it generally adheres to epistemic caution and course-corrects responsibly. The interaction reflects a productive investigative dialogue, with some conversational breakdowns that are ultimately resolved through cooperative engagement. The most valuable strengths are the AI’s politeness and adaptability; its main weakness is occasional inconsistency in inference.

Would you like a table summary or visual chart of any part of this analysis?