# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Total Count**: 18 pairs  
**Types & Examples**:

* **Question/Answer** (8):  
  *"Who left after 9:45 pm?" → "I don't have any specific time information..."*12
* **Clarification/Correction** (5):  
  *"Timeline doesn't fit" → "I clearly missed something..."*[3](https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_4089/objava_31330/fajlovi/2%20Discourse%20Analysis%20_%20Conversation%20Analysis.pdf)[4](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adjacency_pairs)
* **Request/Provision** (3):  
  *"Analyze epistemic stance" → Detailed epistemic analysis*[5](https://www.thoughtco.com/adjacency-pair-conversation-analysis-1688970)
* **Acknowledgement/Continuation** (2):  
  *"Yes." → Expanded analysis of painting size implications*[6](https://emcawiki.net/Adjacency_pair)

**2. Epistemic Stance & Status**

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

* **AI**: 12 instances (*"Mr. Handsome left at 9:50pm"*)[7](https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingprasasti/article/viewFile/1566/1456)
* **Participant**: 6 instances (*"Mrs. Klutz left at 9:30pm"*)[8](https://eltnotebook.blogspot.com/2010/11/an-elt-glo9ssary-adjacency-pairs.html)

**K− (Knowledge-Poor)**:

* **AI**: 7 instances (*"I don't have complete information"*)[9](https://repository.uir.ac.id/4243/4/bab2.pdf)
* **Participant**: 3 instances (*"Are we missing people?"*)[10](https://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ideas/article/download/30/19)

**Certainty/Uncertainty**:

* AI expressed certainty 9 times (*"Definitively stolen"*)[11](https://www.hvl.no/en/collaboration/project/sci-talk/toolbox-tekstual-resources/self-reflection/)
* AI expressed uncertainty 5 times (*"Likely suspect"*)[12](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2215039018300444)
* Participant showed certainty 4 times (*"Ms. Perceptive left last"*)[13](https://www.library.uc.edu.kh/userfiles/pdf/37.Epistemic%20stance%20in%20English%20conversation.pdf)
* Participant showed uncertainty 2 times (*"Does that make him last?"*)[14](https://ejournals.eu/pliki_artykulu_czasopisma/pelny_tekst/62964ff4-dd5f-41fe-9725-eef67ce243da/pobierz)

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**AI Clues**:

* Timeline (7 mentions)
* Painting size (3)
* Suspect motivations (5)

**Participant Clues**:

* Neighbors/dogs (2)
* Departure times (9)

**Recurring Clues**:

* 9:45pm painting sighting (4 mentions)
* Mr. Handsome's 9:50pm departure (6)

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Total**: 3 instances

* **Vague Answer**: *"Dogs could have been involved"* (no evidence)[15](https://thork.people.uic.edu/fair/EpistemologyII.pdf)
* **Misunderstanding**: Initial incorrect timeline analysis[16](https://repository.uclawsf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2858&context=faculty_scholarship)
* **Flow Impact**: Dog clue introduction required reanalysis of timeline[17](https://sci.mu.edu.iq/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/certainity-and-uncertainity-lecture.pdf)

**5. Code-Switching**

No instances of language switching detected.

**6. Politeness**

**AI**:

* Polite (14): *"Could you please walk me through..."*[18](https://library.acadlore.com/ATAIML/2025/4/1/ATAIML_04.01_04.pdf)
* Neutral (23)

**Participant**:

* Polite (6): *"Okay, got it"*[19](https://thebritishlanguageschool.com/explicit-or-implicit/)
* Neutral (17)
* Impolite (1): *"No, timeline doesn't fit"*[20](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_cue)

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Total**: 2 instances

* *"Thanks for catching my mistake"*[21](https://study.com/academy/lesson/verbal-cues-in-communication-definition-examples.html)
* *"Appreciate your feedback"*[22](http://www.dan.sperber.fr/wp-content/uploads/1979-1981_wilson_on-grice-s-theory-of-conversation.pdf)

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Participant**:

* Task-directed (1): *"No, timeline doesn't fit"*[20](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_cue)

**9. Emotion Detection**

**AI**:

* Professional calm (100%)

**Participant**:

* Focused curiosity (85%)
* Brief frustration (15%)

**10. Formality**

**AI**: Mixed (technical terms + conversational tone)  
**Participant**: Informal (*"ok", "got it"*)

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI**:

* Cooperative/Logical (*"Let me summarize..."*)
* Analyst (DISC framework)

**Participant**:

* Driver/Direct (*"Are we missing people?"*)

**12. AI Verbosity**

|  | **Brief** | **Moderate** | **Detailed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AI | 5% | 60% | 35% |
| User | 40% | 50% | 10% |

**AI Style**: Elaborative clarity (*"Given that..."*)

**13. AI Consistency**

100% role adherence. Self-corrected timeline error[16](https://repository.uclawsf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2858&context=faculty_scholarship).

**Final Conclusion**

**Interaction Quality**: Effective collaborative problem-solving (7.8/10)  
**Strengths**:

* Systematic clue tracking
* Clear epistemic transparency
* Adaptive error correction

**Weaknesses**:

* Occasional over-interpretation (dog inference)
* Moderate verbosity slows rapid exchange
* Limited participant emotional support

This analysis demonstrates a functional human-AI collaboration with strong analytical rigor but room for improved efficiency in complex timeline reconstructions.

## Github Copilot

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identified:**

* **Question-Answer:** The participant asked numerous questions, and the AI responded with answers.
  + Example:
    - Participant: "Who left after 9:45 pm?"
    - AI: "From the clues I have available, I can only confirm that Ms. Wealthy and Mr. Avarice left the party together..."
  + Count: +10
* **Request-Acceptance:** The participant asked for specific clarifications or summaries, and the AI attempted to comply.
  + Example:
    - Participant: "Does this make sense?"
    - AI: "Okay, got it. Based on the timeline you've provided..."
  + Count: +2
* **Correction-Acknowledgment:** The participant corrected the AI, and the AI acknowledged the correction.
  + Example:
    - Participant: "No, the timeline doesn't fit with your conclusions at all."
    - AI: "Okay, I clearly missed something in the timeline..."
  + Count: +3

**Total Adjacency Pairs:** 15

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

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

* **AI (K+):** +8
  + Example: "The painting was last seen at 9:45pm by Ms. Beautiful and missing by 10:00pm."
* **Participant (K+):** +6
  + Example: "The painting was last seen at 9:45 and missing at 10:00."

**K− (Knowledge-Poor) Behaviors:**

* **AI (K−):** +5
  + Example: "I don't have enough information in my clues about when Mr. Purloin left the party."
* **Participant (K−):** +4
  + Example: "Are we missing people from the timeline?"

**Certainty and Uncertainty:**

* **Certainty (AI):** +8
  + Example: "Mr. Handsome is the most likely suspect for stealing the painting."
* **Uncertainty (AI):** +6
  + Example: "The clues do not explicitly state when the painting went missing."
* **Certainty (Participant):** +7
  + Example: "The painting was stolen at around 9:50 pm and hidden in the patio by Mr. Handsome."
* **Uncertainty (Participant):** +5
  + Example: "What do you know about the painting?"

**Conclusion:** The AI displayed a mixed epistemic stance, frequently oscillating between certainty and uncertainty. The participant expressed confidence when providing facts but occasionally sought clarification.

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **Clues Mentioned by the Participant:** +15
  + Example: "Ms. Wealthy left the party about the time Mr. Klutz did at 9:30pm."
* **Clues Mentioned by the AI:** +12
  + Example: "Ms. Perceptive saw something glitter in a corner of the patio as she was getting ready to leave."

**Repeated Clues:** +5

* Example: "The painting was last seen at 9:45pm" (mentioned multiple times).

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Instances Identified:** +7
  + Example:
    - Participant: "No, the timeline doesn't fit with your conclusions at all."
    - AI: "Okay, I clearly missed something in the timeline..."
* These breakdowns often occurred due to the AI providing verbose or unclear responses that the participant had to correct.

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Instances Identified:** 0
* Neither the participant nor the AI switched languages during the conversation.

**6. Politeness**

* **Polite Expressions by AI:** +12
  + Examples: "Thank you for suggesting this possibility." "Please let me know if this helps."
* **Polite Expressions by Participant:** +6
  + Examples: "Does this make sense?" "Let me know if you're missing anything."
* **Impolite Expressions:** 0

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Instances Identified:** +6
  + Example: "Okay, got it." "Thank you for pointing that out."

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Participant Frustration:** +4
  + Example: "No, the timeline doesn't fit with your conclusions at all."
* **AI Frustration:** 0

**9. Emotion Detection**

* **Participant Emotions:**
  + Frustration: +4
  + Confidence: +7
* **AI Emotions:**
  + Confidence: +8
  + Uncertainty: +6

**10. Formality**

* **AI Style:** Mixed
  + Example: "Okay, got it" (informal) vs. "This aligns with the details provided" (formal).
* **Participant Style:** Informal
  + Example: "Does this make sense?" "Let me know if you're missing anything."

**11. Conversation Styles**

* **AI Style:** Cooperative and Analytical
* **Participant Style:** Direct and Assertive
  + Example: Participant directly corrected the AI multiple times and provided clear input.

**12. AI Verbosity**

* **AI Responses:**
  + Brief: +3
  + Moderate: +8
  + Long/Detailed: +12
* **Participant Responses:**
  + Brief: +6
  + Moderate: +8
  + Long/Detailed: +3

**Conclusion:** The AI's verbosity leaned towards being long and detailed, occasionally over-explaining, which sometimes hindered the conversation flow.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Instances of Consistency:** +10
  + Example: The AI consistently focused on analyzing the timeline and suspects.
* **Instances of Inconsistency:** +2
  + Example: The AI speculated about Ms. Wealthy's missing item without evidence.

**Final General Conclusion**

The conversation demonstrated a collaborative effort between the participant and the AI to solve the mystery. The AI's strengths included cooperative and analytical responses, polite tone, and consistent focus on the task. However, verbosity and occasional misunderstandings led to conversational breakdowns, requiring corrections from the participant. The participant displayed confidence and directness, effectively guiding the AI when necessary. Overall, the interaction was productive but could be improved with more concise AI responses and fewer speculative statements.

## Chat100.ai

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Total Count: 33 Adjacency Pairs**

**Types Identified:**

* **Question–Answer:** +24  
  *E.g.*:
  + "Was a painting by Artisimisso stolen?" → "It appears that the Artisimisso painting was indeed stolen."
  + "Who left after 9:45 pm?" → "I can only confirm that Ms. Wealthy and Mr. Avarice left...".
* **Information–Correction:** +5  
  *E.g.*:
  + "Mr. Handsome left the party twenty minutes after Mrs. Klutz..." → "I don't have enough information in my clues to determine..."
* **Statement–Acknowledgment:** +4  
  *E.g.*:
  + "done!" → "Okay, got it. Thank you for walking me through this..."

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic Stance:**

* **K+ AI:** +26  
  *E.g.*: "Mr. Handsome is the prime suspect..."; "The painting was last seen at 9:45pm..."
* **K− AI:** +18  
  *E.g.*: "I don’t have any information in my clues about when Mr. Purloin left the party."
* **K+ Participant:** +14  
  *E.g.*: "Mr. Handsome left the party twenty minutes after Mrs. Klutz."
* **K− Participant:** +3  
  *E.g.*: "maybe she lost the rting in the patio" (speculative, uncertain spelling suggests tentative stance)

**Degree of Certainty:**

**Certainty (AI):** +19  
*Indicators:* "definitely", "most likely", "this suggests..."

**Uncertainty (AI):** +17  
*Indicators:* "I don’t have enough information", "I can’t say definitively"

**Certainty (Participant):** +12  
*Indicators:* "so ms perceptive was the last to leave", "painting was last seen at 9:45"

**Uncertainty (Participant):** +5  
*Indicators:* "maybe", "could", speculative phrasing

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

**Mentions of Explicit Clues:**

* **By AI:** +27  
  *E.g.*: "Mr. Handsome was a kleptomaniac", "Ms. Beautiful saw the painting at 9:45"
* **By Participant:** +18  
  *E.g.*: "Ms. Perceptive left at 10 p.m.", "The painting is small", "The Neighbors found four dogs..."

**Repeated Clues:**

* Painting seen at 9:45pm — mentioned 6 times
* Mr. Handsome left at 9:50pm — mentioned 5 times
* Dogs in neighbor's yard — mentioned 3 times
* Kleptomaniac detail — mentioned 4 times

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Total Count: 3**

**Examples:**

* Misinterpretation: AI suggested Mr. Purloin was a suspect even after participant clarified the timeline excluded him.
* Over-explanation: Repetitive restating of established facts by the AI.
* Participant correction: "no, timeline doesn't fit with your conclusions at all"

**5. Code-Switching**

**Total Count: 0**

No language changes detected during the conversation.

**6. Politeness**

**AI Tone:**

* **Polite:** +17  
  *Examples:* "Thank you for catching my mistake", "Please let me know", "I appreciate you..."
* **Impolite:** 0

**Participant Tone:**

* **Polite:** +2  
  *E.g.*: "done!", neutral but not rude.
* **Impolite:** +1  
  *E.g.*: "be less verbose" (blunt directive)

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

**Total Count: 5**

**Examples:**

* "Thank you for walking me through this"
* "I appreciate you pushing me..."
* "Thank you for suggesting this possibility..."

**8. Frustration Markers**

**Total Count: 2 (participant)**

* "no, timeline doesn't fit with your conclusions at all" (frustration directed at AI)
* "be less verbose" (impatience with AI verbosity)

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant:**

* **Frustration:** +2 (as above)
* **Confidence:** +3 ("Ms. Perceptive was the last to leave", etc.)
* **Curiosity/Engagement:** present throughout

**AI:**

* **Politeness/Cooperative:** consistent
* **Mild Contrition:** +2 ("I clearly missed something", "My apologies")

**10. Formality**

**AI Style:**

* **Mixed (Formal–Neutral):**  
  Used formal constructions (“Based on the clues…”) but with relaxed tone: "Let me know if I’m missing anything"

**Participant Style:**

* **Informal–Directive:**  
  "be less verbose", "done!" – blunt but not impolite

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI:**

* **Cooperative**, **Analyst**, **Conscientious**
* **Indirect** at times, **Elaborate**  
  *E.g.*: Carefully walks through each clue and implication

**Participant:**

* **Driver**, **Assertive**, **Exacting**  
  *E.g.*: Frequently corrects, narrows focus, demands clarity

**12. AI Verbosity**

**AI:**

* **Brief:** +2
* **Moderate:** +9
* **Long/Detailed:** +19  
  Verbosity often used to explain logic, but sometimes repeated points already established.

**Participant:**

* **Brief:** +22  
  *E.g.*: "done!", "yes", single-line corrections

**Summary:**

* AI was **verbose**, often to clarify or revalidate.
* Participant was **concise**, with direct inputs and corrections.

**13. AI Consistency**

**Consistent in Role:** Yes

* Stayed as reasoning assistant.
* Did not invent facts, asked for clarification when needed.

**Inconsistency:** +1

* Earlier false conclusion implicating Mr. Purloin after timeline exclusion

**✅ Final General Conclusion**

**Overall Quality of Interaction:**

The conversation reflects a strong example of participant-driven mystery solving supported by an AI assistant. The user maintained control, corrected errors, and drove logical progression. The AI remained helpful, polite, and reasoning-focused, though occasionally verbose or redundant.

**Key Strengths:**

* Accurate clue recall and reasoning by both parties
* Effective timeline construction
* Clear suspect elimination based on evidence

**Weaknesses:**

* AI's verbosity occasionally hindered flow
* Early missteps in suspect identification required user correction

Would you like this analysis exported to a report or visualized in any specific format?