**Terminology:**

By *transition* I mean a collection of edges that occupy the same stage of the story. E.g. Initial conflict, victim reacts, aggressor backlashes, victim retaliates, aggressor’s final move, deserts.

**2 edges per node**

I have no questions at this stage that requires testing on a node with 3 edges.

**2 possible distributions (.9, .8)**

I wonder whether I should have .9 and .7 instead, that would allow me to ask whether there is a difference. .9 and .8 might be too close. I don’t want to have too many distributions because in the analysis I will collapse these. I might have .9 .8 .7 when we start norming on Mturk.

**9/15 transitions are conditioned on properties**

As we agreed on, it is more likely that subjects will actually put in the effort to model the situation if the properties extracted from the situation are have predictive power. The beginning and ending are unconditional, and then there are a few others to simplify the graph.

**2 consequential agents (victim, aggressor) and 2 consequential properties (male/female, violent/non-violent).**

This means there are four possible conditionings: victim male, victim violent, aggressor male, aggressor violent. Every transition has one consequential agent-property pair. E.g. after being (i) yelled at or (ii) shoved, the probability that the victim will (a) yell or (b) shove, depends only whether the victim is violent – it does not depend on whether the aggressor is violent, whether the aggressor is male, nor whether the victim is male.

*Hidden versus surface*: When an agent is introduced we know their gender, but we can only discover whether they are violent or not by the effect this has on their behavior. This makes violent a hidden latent cause and gender a surface latent cause (we still say it is latent because it’s causal influence is discovered a posteriori). I intentionally picked these two because I am curious whether there is a difference in our ability to track between *hidden* (violent) latent causes and *surface* (male) latent causes.

**Major change proposal: consequential versus inconsequential agents.**

Currently every agent filler (Nick, Vera, Ben…) can enact any role (aggressor, victim, policeman, barista). I propose we have 4 fillers (Nick, Ben, Vera, Silvia) to be aggressor or victims, these would be the *consequential filler agents*. The other two 2 fillers (Jack, Olivia) would always be instantiated as barista and cop, they would be the *inconsequential fillers* because their properties have no predictive power.