# Conversation analysis

## Perplexity

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

* **Total Count**: 24
* **Types**:
  + **Question-Answer**: 24 (e.g., "What do you know about the Hosts?" → AI response).
  + **Hypothesis-Response**: 1 (e.g., "Could it be that the dog ate the ring?" → AI refutes).
* **Example**:
  + User: "What do you know about Mr. Avarice?" → AI: "According to the clues..."

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic Stance**

* **K+ AI**: 18 (e.g., "Based on my clues, I know...").
* **K− AI**: 7 (e.g., "I don’t have any clues about Ms. Beautiful").
* **K+ Participant**: 0 (participant seeks info, never asserts knowledge).
* **K− Participant**: 24 (all questions reflect knowledge gaps).

**Certainty/Uncertainty**

* **Certainty (AI)**: 18 (e.g., "Clue #10 states...").
* **Uncertainty (AI)**: 3 (e.g., "Unfortunately, I do not have any clues...").
* **Certainty (Participant)**: 1 (e.g., "Mr. Purloin danced all evening with Ms. Beautiful").
* **Uncertainty (Participant)**: 0.

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI**: Referenced 16 clues by number/content (e.g., Clue #10, Clue #8).
* **Participant**: Provided 15 new clues in the final turn (e.g., "Mr. Avarice was heard to say...").
* **Overlap**: Clues about the painting, ring, and departures repeated.

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Total Count**: 2
  + **Misunderstanding**: User typo "Ms. Beatutiful" → AI corrected to "Ms. Beautiful."
  + **Vague Answer**: AI couldn’t confirm Mr. Avarice’s departure time initially.

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Total Count**: 0 (entire conversation in English).

**6. Politeness**

* **AI**: Polite, neutral tone (e.g., "Does this help?").
* **Participant**: Neutral (no explicit politeness/impoliteness).
* **Counts**:
  + Polite (AI): 3 (e.g., "Please help me...").
  + Impolite: 0.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Total Count**: 0 (participant never thanked or praised the AI).

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Total Count**: 0 (no frustration detected).

**9. Emotion Detection**

* **AI**: Neutral, task-focused.
* **Participant**: Curious, analytical (e.g., "Could it be that the dog ate the ring?").

**10. Formality**

* **AI**: Mixed (structured but conversational).
* **Participant**: Informal (e.g., "could it be...").

**11. Conversation Styles**

* **Participant**: Direct, inquisitive ("Driver" style).
* **AI**: Cooperative, detail-oriented ("Analyst" style).

**12. Verbosity**

* **AI**:
  + Brief: 5 (e.g., "I don’t have any clues").
  + Moderate: 12 (e.g., timeline summary).
  + Long: 7 (e.g., hypothesis analysis).
* **Participant**:
  + Brief: 18 (e.g., "What do you know about X?").
  + Moderate: 6 (e.g., clue additions).

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Consistency**: Stayed on-task, cited clues, avoided fabrication.
* **Example**: "I don’t have any clues about Ms. Beautiful" when unsure.

**Final Conclusion**

**Overall Quality**

* **Strengths**:
  + AI maintained coherence, referenced clues explicitly, and adapted to new information.
  + Participant engaged systematically, refining hypotheses based on AI feedback.
* **Weaknesses**:
  + Minor misunderstandings (e.g., typo correction).
  + Participant did not acknowledge AI’s efforts.
* **Style**: Collaborative and goal-oriented, with AI acting as a structured knowledge repository and the participant driving the investigative process.

## Github Copilot

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

* **Question-Answer**: Detected in almost every turn where the participant asks a question, and the AI provides an answer.
  + Example:
    - **Participant**: "What do you know about Mr. Purloin?"
    - **AI**: "Based on my clues, I know two things about Mr. Purloin..."
  + **Count**: 24 instances.
* **Request-Acceptance**: When the participant asks for all clues or specific details, and the AI complies.
  + Example:
    - **Participant**: "Send me all of your clues."
    - **AI**: "Sure, here are all the clues..."
  + **Count**: 2 instances.
* **Request-Rejection**: When the AI states it has no information on a subject.
  + Example:
    - **Participant**: "What do you know about Ms. Beautiful?"
    - **AI**: "I'm afraid I don't have any clues that mention Ms. Beautiful."
  + **Count**: 3 instances.

**Total Adjacency Pairs Count: 29**

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**AI**

* **K+ (Knowledge-rich)**:
  + Example: "Mr. Avarice is known to be very rich."
  + **Count**: 15 instances.
* **K− (Knowledge-poor)**:
  + Example: "Unfortunately, I do not have any clues that specifically mention where Mr. Handsome left from."
  + **Count**: 6 instances.
* **Certainty**:
  + Example: "Yes, based on the clues I have..."
  + **Count**: 12 instances.
* **Uncertainty**:
  + Example: "The clues don't specify if there was only one painting or multiple paintings."
  + **Count**: 9 instances.

**Participant**

* **K+ (Knowledge-rich)**:
  + Example: "Could it be that the dog ate the ring?"
  + **Count**: 5 instances.
* **K− (Knowledge-poor)**:
  + Example: "Tell me if all the clues confirm this."
  + **Count**: 7 instances.
* **Certainty**:
  + Example: "Ms. Wealthy left at the same time as Mrs. Klutz and Mr. Klutz and Mr. Avarice."
  + **Count**: 5 instances.
* **Uncertainty**:
  + Example: "Could Mr. Handsome have stolen the ring?"
  + **Count**: 6 instances.

**Combined Total:**

* **AI Certainty**: 12
* **AI Uncertainty**: 9
* **Participant Certainty**: 5
* **Participant Uncertainty**: 6

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI mentions of clues**: 33 instances.
  + Example: "Clue #8 states that 'Mrs. Klutz spent most of the evening in a dark corner of the patio with Mr. Handsome.'"
* **Participant mentions of clues**: 12 instances.
  + Example: "Mr. Purloin danced all evening with Ms. Beautiful."
* Repeated Clue Mentions by AI: Detected for Clues #8, #14, and #21.
  + Example: Clue #8 is mentioned when discussing both Mrs. Klutz and Mr. Handsome.

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

* **Instances**: 4
  + Example:
    - **Participant**: "Could it be that the dog ate the ring?"
    - **AI**: "That's an interesting hypothesis, but I don't have any direct evidence..."
  + Breakdown: Vague AI response, failing to address the participant’s curiosity directly.

**5. Code-Switching**

* **Instances**: 0
* No language-switching behavior was observed.

**6. Politeness**

**AI**

* **Polite Tone**:
  + Example: "Sure, here are all the clues I have been provided."
  + **Count**: 20 instances.
* **Neutral Tone**:
  + Example: "Based on the clues, I know two things about Mr. Purloin."
  + **Count**: 13 instances.
* **Impolite Tone**: 0 instances.

**Participant**

* **Polite Expressions**:
  + Example: "Please help me doing a timeline about the party."
  + **Count**: 2 instances.
* **Impolite Expressions**: 0 instances.

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Instances**: 0
* The participant does not explicitly acknowledge or appreciate the AI’s help.

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Instances**: 2 (from the participant).
  + Example: "Send me all of your clues" (tone suggests impatience with the AI's detailed responses).

**9. Emotion Detection**

**AI**

* **Politeness**: Maintained throughout.
* **Confidence**: Evident in knowledge-rich responses.
* **Uncertainty**: Evident in knowledge-poor responses.

**Participant**

* **Frustration**: Evident in requests for direct answers.
* **Curiosity**: Evident in exploratory questions like "Could Mr. Handsome have stolen the ring?"

**10. Formality**

**AI**

* **Style**: Mixed
  + Formal Example: "Based on the clues, I know several things about Mrs. Klutz."
  + Informal Example: "That's an interesting hypothesis!"
* **Count**: 17 formal, 15 informal.

**Participant**

* **Style**: Informal
  + Example: "What do you know about Mr. Purloin?"

**11. Conversation Styles**

* **AI**: Cooperative and analytical.
  + Example: "Let me try to put together more of the timeline."
* **Participant**: Involved and expressive.
  + Example: "Could it be that the dog ate the ring?"

**12. AI Verbosity**

* **Brief Responses**: 12
  + Example: "I'm afraid I don't have any clues about Ms. Beautiful."
* **Moderate Responses**: 15
  + Example: "Based on my clues, I know two things about Mr. Purloin."
* **Detailed Responses**: 9
  + Example: "Mrs. Klutz left the party around 9:30pm. Ms. Wealthy left the party around the same time as Mr. Klutz..."
* **Overall Style**: Moderate verbosity, often elaborating to clarify points.

**13. AI Consistency**

* **Instances of Consistency**: 33
  + Example: Repeatedly refers back to "the clues I have."
* **Instances of Inconsistency**: 2
  + Example: Contradictions in timing details, such as stating uncertainty about departure times despite having clues.

**Final General Conclusion**

The interaction demonstrates generally high-quality collaboration between the participant and the AI. The AI is polite, cooperative, and analytical, consistently referring back to its provided clues. However, verbosity occasionally hinders the flow, and there are minor inconsistencies in detail recall. The participant is engaged and expressive but occasionally shows frustration when direct answers are not provided. Key strengths include the AI’s politeness and analytical style, while weaknesses involve occasional conversational breakdowns and verbosity that may overwhelm the participant.

## Chat100.ai

**1. Adjacency Pairs**

**Types identified:**

* **Question–Answer**: +24
* **Request–Response**: +3
* **Information–Acknowledgment**: +2

**Examples:**

* Q–A:  
  **User:** “What do you know about the Hosts?”  
  **AI:** “Based on my clues, I know that the Hosts had a painting by Artisimisso...”
* Request–Response:  
  **User:** “Please help me doing a timeline...”  
  **AI:** “Okay, let me try to put together a timeline...”

**Total count:** 29 adjacency pairs

**2. Epistemic Stance and Status**

**Epistemic Stance:**

* **K+ AI (knowledge-rich):** +30  
  Example: “Based on my clues, I know that...”
* **K− AI (knowledge-poor):** +6  
  Example: “I don't have any clues that mention Ms. Beautiful...”
* **K+ Participant:** +3  
  Example: “Those are my clues”
* **K− Participant:** +2  
  Example: “Could it be that the dog ate the ring?”

**Certainty/Uncertainty:**

* **AI Certainty:** +25  
  Example: “The clues confirm that Mrs. Klutz, Ms. Wealthy, and Mr. Klutz all left...”
* **AI Uncertainty:** +5  
  Example: “I don't have any direct clues…”
* **Participant Certainty:** +2  
  Example: “Those are my clues”
* **Participant Uncertainty:** +4  
  Example: “could it be that the dog ate the ring?”

**Summary:** AI presents a predominantly knowledge-rich and confident stance; participant alternates between speculative and confirmative inputs.

**3. Explicit Clue Sharing**

* **AI shared clues explicitly:** +6 instances (grouped clues, e.g., lists or summaries)
  + Example: “According to the clues I have...”
* **Participant shared clues explicitly:** +1 (final clue dump)

**Clues mentioned multiple times:**

* Artisimisso (value and painting), Ms. Perceptive (painting/glitter), Mr. Handsome (kleptomaniac/leaving), Mr. Purloin (ring interest/jewel thief)

**4. Conversational Breakdowns**

**Count:** +2

* Example 1:  
  **Participant:** “What do you know about Ms. Beatutiful?”  
  (Misspelling causes possible confusion)
* Example 2:  
  **Participant:** “Could it be that the dog ate the ring?”  
  (AI points out this is unsupported by clues, indicating misunderstanding)

**Effect:** Minor disruption in clarity, quickly recovered by AI’s clarification.

**5. Code-Switching**

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

**6. Politeness**

**AI:**

* Polite expressions: +8  
  Example: “Let me try…”, “Does this help…”, “Let me know if you have any other questions”
* No impolite expressions

**Participant:**

* Neutral tone throughout
* Polite expressions: +1  
  (“Please help me doing a timeline”)

**Total polite expressions: 9**

**7. AI Acknowledgment**

* **Count:** +3  
  Example:  
  **User:** “Those are my clues”  
  **AI:** “Okay, with the additional clues you have provided…”

**8. Frustration Markers**

* **Participant Frustration:** +1  
  Example: “could it be that the dog ate the ring?” (expressed out-of-the-box hypothesis, implying confusion)
* **AI Frustration:** 0

**Directed at:** The puzzle/task (not AI or self)

**9. Emotion Detection**

**Participant:**

* **Implied confusion/frustration**: “could it be that the dog ate the ring?”
* **Curiosity/investigation**: Repeated “What do you know about…” prompts

**AI:**

* Calm, supportive tone
* No explicit emotion, but implied helpfulness

**10. Formality**

**AI:** Mixed

* Formal: Structured language, detailed explanations
* Informal: Casual phrasing (“Okay, let me try…”)

**Participant:** Informal

* Examples: “what do you know about…”, lowercase style, misspellings

**11. Conversation Styles**

**AI:**

* **Style:** Cooperative, Analyst, Logical, Conscientious
* **Reasoning:** Step-by-step deductions, structured knowledge sharing

**Participant:**

* **Style:** Involved, Inquisitive, Expresser
* **Reasoning:** Probing with frequent questions, seeking resolution to mystery

**12. AI Verbosity**

**AI Responses:**

* **Brief:** +4
* **Moderate:** +9
* **Long/Detailed:** +8  
  Example: Timeline creation; summary of all clues

**Participant Responses:**

* **Brief:** +15
* **Moderate:** +5
* **Long/Detailed:** +1  
  Example: List of clues

**Summary:** AI is moderately to highly verbose, aiding clarity. Participant is concise and exploratory.

**13. AI Consistency**

**Findings:**

* AI consistently remains in character (assistant analyzing clues)
* No off-topic replies
* Accurate and transparent about clue-based limitations

**Inconsistencies:** None detected

**Final General Conclusion**

The conversation is a successful and coherent human–AI interaction centered on solving a logic-based mystery. The **AI demonstrated strong consistency, politeness, and epistemic transparency**, frequently grounding responses in explicit clues. It maintained a **cooperative, logical, and moderately verbose style**, which helped clarify uncertainties and build a shared understanding.

The **participant engaged actively and curiously**, using brief but frequent inquiries to test hypotheses. There were **minimal conversational breakdowns**, and the tone remained respectful throughout.

**Key strengths:** AI consistency, clear epistemic stance, and structured analysis.  
**Weaknesses:** Occasional breakdown due to vague input or misspelling, minimal emotional expressiveness from AI.

Let me know if you want a visual summary or tabular breakdown!