

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:41
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_IIIm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers BY Genuineness_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Genuineness_Rogers	
				.00	1.00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32	122
			Expected Count	5.4	148.6
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	20.8%	79.2%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	14.0%
		1.00	Count	0	751
			Expected Count	26.6	724.4
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	86.0%
	Total		Count	32	873
			Expected Count	32.0	873.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.5%	96.5%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	34	1
			Expected Count	2.1	32.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	97.1%	2.9%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	63.0%	0.1%
		1.00	Count	20	850
			Expected Count	51.9	818.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	2.3%	97.7%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	37.0%	99.9%
	Total		Count	54	851
			Expected Count	54.0	851.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	6.0%	94.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32	26
			Expected Count	2.5	55.5
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	55.2%	44.8%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	82.1%	3.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	154
			Expected Count	154.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	17.0%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	751.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	83.0%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.9%
		1.00	Count	870
			Expected Count	870.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	96.1%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	58
			Expected Count	58.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	6.4%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Genuineness_Rogers	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	7	838
		Expected Count	36.5	808.5
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.8%	99.2%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	17.9%	97.0%
	Total	Count	39	864
		Expected Count	39.0	864.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.3%	95.7%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers .00	Count	35	14
		Expected Count	2.3	46.7
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	71.4%	28.6%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	83.3%	1.6%
	1.00	Count	7	849
		Expected Count	39.7	816.3
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.8%	99.2%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	16.7%	98.4%
	Total	Count	42	863
		Expected Count	42.0	863.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.6%	95.4%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Genuineness_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Total
	1.00	Count	845
		Expected Count	845.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	93.6%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
Ilama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers .00	Count	49
		Expected Count	49.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.4%
	1.00	Count	856
		Expected Count	856.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	94.6%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	161.772 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	155.737	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	119.363	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	161.593	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	539.427 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	522.655	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	209.630	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	538.831	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	387.880 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	374.841	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	160.546	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	387.451	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	522.157 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	506.323	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	200.060	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	521.580	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.09.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.50.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.27.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.423	<.001
		Cramer's V	.423	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.772	<.001
		Cramer's V	.772	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.655	<.001
		Cramer's V	.655	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.760	<.001
		Cramer's V	.760	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:42
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers BY Accurate_understanding_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.07
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Roger.	
			.00	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	5.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	22.1%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	28.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
	Total	Count	34	
		Expected Count	34.0	
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.8%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	1.3
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	97.1%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	32.7
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
	Total	Count	34	
		Expected Count	34.0	
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.8%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Rogers	
			1.00	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	120
			Expected Count	148.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	77.9%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	13.8%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	722.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	86.2%
	Total		Count	871
			Expected Count	871.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.2%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	1
			Expected Count	33.7
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	2.9%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.1%
		1.00	Count	870
			Expected Count	837.3
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.9%
	Total		Count	871
			Expected Count	871.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.2%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	154
			Expected Count	154.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	17.0%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	751.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	83.0%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.9%
		1.00	Count	870
			Expected Count	870.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.1%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Rogers.	
			.00	
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	2.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	55.2%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
	Total		Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.5%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	1.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	71.4%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	33.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
	Total		Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.9%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Rogers	
			1.00	
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	26
			Expected Count	55.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	44.8%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.0%
		1.00	Count	845
			Expected Count	815.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	97.0%
	Total		Count	871
			Expected Count	871.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.5%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	14
			Expected Count	47.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	28.6%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	1.6%
		1.00	Count	856
			Expected Count	822.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	98.4%
	Total		Count	870
			Expected Count	870.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.1%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source				Total
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	58
			Expected Count	58.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.4%
		1.00	Count	845
			Expected Count	845.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.6%
	Total			
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.4%
		1.00	Count	856
			Expected Count	856.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	94.6%
	Total			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	172.277 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	166.226	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	127.263	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	172.087	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	878.134 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	851.473	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	280.772	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	877.163	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	483.335 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	467.329	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	196.828	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	482.800	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	636.026 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	616.959	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	237.679	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	635.323	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.31.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.06.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.90.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.436	<.001
		Cramer's V	.436	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.985	<.001
		Cramer's V	.985	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.732	<.001
		Cramer's V	.732	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.838	<.001
		Cramer's V	.838	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:42
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers BY Empathic_Understanding_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Warnings

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=claude. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=gpt-4o. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=gpt-oss. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=llama. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

Cases		Total Percent
response_source		
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	
			.00	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	154
			Expected Count	154.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	17.0%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	751.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	83.0%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	154
			Expected Count	154.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	17.0%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	751.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	83.0%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source			Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		
			.00		
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%		
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.9%		
		1.00	Count	870	
		Expected Count	870.0		
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%		
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.1%		
	Total	Count	905		
		Expected Count	905.0		
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%		
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%		
	gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	58
			Expected Count	58.0	
% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers			100.0%		
% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers			6.4%		
1.00			Count	845	
Expected Count			845.0		
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%		
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	93.6%		
		Total	Count	903	
			Expected Count	903.0	
% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers			100.0%		
% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers			100.0%		
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	49	
		Expected Count	49.0		

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source				Total
		1.00	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.9%
			Count	870
			Expected Count	870.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.1%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	58
			Expected Count	58.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	6.4%
		1.00	Count	845
			Expected Count	845.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	93.6%
	Total		Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source		Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
		.00
	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.4%
	1.00 Count	856
	Expected Count	856.0
	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	94.6%
	Total Count	905
	Expected Count	905.0
	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%

**Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source		Total
1.00	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.4%
	Count	856
	Expected Count	856.0
	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	94.6%
	Count	905
	Expected Count	905.0
	% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
Total		

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	903
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		903
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a ...

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:42
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/AITAH_IIIm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers BY Congruence_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.07
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Congruence_Rogers	
				.00	1.00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32	122
			Expected Count	5.6	148.4
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	20.8%	79.2%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	97.0%	14.0%
		1.00	Count	1	750
			Expected Count	27.4	723.6
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.0%	86.0%
	Total		Count	33	872
			Expected Count	33.0	872.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.6%	96.4%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	34	1
			Expected Count	2.1	32.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	97.1%	2.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	61.8%	0.1%
		1.00	Count	21	849
			Expected Count	52.9	817.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	2.4%	97.6%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	38.2%	99.9%
	Total		Count	55	850
			Expected Count	55.0	850.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	6.1%	93.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32	26
			Expected Count	2.6	55.4
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	55.2%	44.8%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	80.0%	3.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	154
			Expected Count	154.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	17.0%
		1.00	Count	751
			Expected Count	751.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	83.0%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.9%
		1.00	Count	870
			Expected Count	870.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	96.1%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	58
			Expected Count	58.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	6.4%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Congruence_Rogers	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	8	837
		Expected Count	37.4	807.6
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.9%	99.1%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	20.0%	97.0%
	Total	Count	40	863
		Expected Count	40.0	863.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.4%	95.6%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers .00	Count	36	13
		Expected Count	2.4	46.6
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	73.5%	26.5%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	80.0%	1.5%
	1.00	Count	9	847
		Expected Count	42.6	813.4
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	1.1%	98.9%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	20.0%	98.5%
	Total	Count	45	860
		Expected Count	45.0	860.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	5.0%	95.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
	1.00	Count	Expected Count	845
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%	93.6%
	Total	Count	Expected Count	903
Ilama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	Count	Expected Count	49
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%	5.4%
	1.00	Count	Expected Count	856
	Total	Count	Expected Count	905

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	155.043 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	149.223	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	110.701	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	154.872	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	528.957 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	512.492	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	207.676	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	528.373	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	376.974 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	364.274	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	157.283	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	376.557	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	514.399 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	499.187	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	201.247	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	513.831	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.13.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.57.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.44.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.414	<.001
		Cramer's V	.414	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.765	<.001
		Cramer's V	.765	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.646	<.001
		Cramer's V	.646	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.754	<.001
		Cramer's V	.754	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Genuineness_Rogers BY Accurate_understanding_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.07
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

			Accurate_understanding_Rogers	
response_source			.00	
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	1.2
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	94.1%
		1.00	Count	2
			Expected Count	32.8
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.2%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.9%
	Total		Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.8%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	2.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	63.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
	Total		Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.8%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	1.4
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	82.1%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

				Accurate_understanding_Rogers...	
response_source				1.00	Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	0	32
			Expected Count	30.8	32.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	3.5%
		1.00	Count	871	873
			Expected Count	840.2	873.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	99.8%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	96.5%
	Total		Count	871	905
			Expected Count	871.0	905.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	96.2%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	20	54
			Expected Count	52.0	54.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	37.0%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	2.3%	6.0%
		1.00	Count	851	851
			Expected Count	819.0	851.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	97.7%	94.0%
	Total		Count	871	905
			Expected Count	871.0	905.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	96.2%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	7	39
			Expected Count	37.6	39.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	17.9%	100.0%
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.8%	4.3%

Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Rogers	
			.00	
	1.00	Count	0	
		Expected Count	30.6	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	
	Total	Count	32	
		Expected Count	32.0	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.5%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
Ilama	Genuineness_Rogers .00	Count	35	
		Expected Count	1.6	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	83.3%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
	1.00	Count	0	
		Expected Count	33.4	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	
	Total	Count	35	
		Expected Count	35.0	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.9%	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	

Genuineness_Rogers * Accurate_understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Accurate_understanding_Rogers...	Total
			1.00	
	1.00	Count	864	864
		Expected Count	833.4	864.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.2%	95.7%
	Total	Count	871	903
		Expected Count	871.0	903.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	96.5%	100.0%
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Genuineness_Rogers .00	Count	7	42
		Expected Count	40.4	42.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.8%	4.6%
	1.00	Count	863	863
		Expected Count	829.6	863.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.2%	95.4%
	Total	Count	870	905
		Expected Count	870.0	905.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	96.1%	100.0%
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	849.813 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	822.444	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	261.543	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	848.874	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	556.731 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	539.453	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	218.665	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	556.115	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	734.968 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	711.160	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	239.904	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	734.155	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	748.099 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	725.852	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	258.463	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	747.272	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.03.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.38.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.62.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.969	<.001
		Cramer's V	.969	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.784	<.001
		Cramer's V	.784	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.902	<.001
		Cramer's V	.902	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.909	<.001
		Cramer's V	.909	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Genuineness_Rogers BY Congruence_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.07
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Congruence_Rogers		
			.00	1.00	
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32	0
			Expected Count	1.2	30.8
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	97.0%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	1	872
			Expected Count	31.8	841.2
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	33	872	
		Expected Count	33.0	872.0	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.6%	96.4%	
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	54	0
			Expected Count	3.3	50.7
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	98.2%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	1	850
			Expected Count	51.7	799.3
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	1.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	55	850	
		Expected Count	55.0	850.0	
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	6.1%	93.9%	
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	39	0
			Expected Count	1.7	37.3
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	97.5%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	1	863
			Expected Count	38.3	825.7
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	2.5%	100.0%

Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.5%
		1.00	Count	873
			Expected Count	873.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	96.5%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	54
			Expected Count	54.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	6.0%
		1.00	Count	851
			Expected Count	851.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	94.0%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	39
			Expected Count	39.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	4.3%
		1.00	Count	864
			Expected Count	864.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	95.7%

Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source		Congruence_Rogers	
		.00	1.00
Total	Count	40	863
	Expected Count	40.0	863.0
	% within Genuineness_Rogers	4.4%	95.6%
	% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Genuineness_Rogers .00	Count	42
		Expected Count	2.1
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	93.3%
	1.00	Count	3
		Expected Count	42.9
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.3%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	6.7%
	Total	Count	45
		Expected Count	45.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Genuineness_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
Total			Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
Ilama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	42
			Expected Count	42.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	4.6%
		1.00	Count	863
			Expected Count	863.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	95.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	876.571 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	848.372	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	267.793	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	875.602	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	887.501 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	870.089	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	399.162	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	886.521	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	879.406 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	855.970	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	312.027	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	878.432	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	841.730 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	820.773	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	317.879	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	840.800	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.28.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.73.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.09.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.984	<.001
		Cramer's V	.984	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.990	<.001
		Cramer's V	.990	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.987	<.001
		Cramer's V	.987	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.964	<.001
		Cramer's V	.964	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Accurate_understanding_Rogers BY Empathic_Understanding_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Warnings

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=claude. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=gpt-4o. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=gpt-oss. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

No measures of association are computed for the crosstabulation of Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers for split file response_source=llama. At least one variable in each 2-way table upon which measures of association are computed is a constant.

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	
			.00	
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.8%
	1.00	Count	871	
		Expected Count	871.0	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.2%	
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0

**Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source		Total	
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	34
		Expected Count	34.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.8%
	1.00	Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.2%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	34
		Expected Count	34.0

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source		Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	
		.00	
	1.00	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.8%
		Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.2%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		Count	32
		Expected Count	32.0
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.5%
		Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.5%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	llama	Count	35
		Expected Count	35.0

**Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source		Total	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.8%
	1.00	Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.2%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	32
		Expected Count	32.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.5%
	1.00	Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.5%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	35
		Expected Count	35.0

**Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
Crosstabulation**

response_source		Empathic_Understanding_Rogers
		.00
	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.9%
	1.00 Count	870
	Expected Count	870.0
	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.1%
	Total Count	905
	Expected Count	905.0
	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Empathic_Understanding_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source		Total
1.00	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.9%
	Count	870
	Expected Count	870.0
	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.1%
	Total	
	Count	905
	Expected Count	905.0
	% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
	% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	903
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases	905

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		903
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	. ^a
	N of Valid Cases		905

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a ...

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/AITAH_11m_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Accurate_understanding_Rogers BY Congruence_Rogers /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source		Congruence_Rogers	
		.00	1.00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	32
		Expected Count	1.2
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	94.1%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	97.0%
	1.00	Count	1
		Expected Count	31.8
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.1%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	3.0%
	Total	Count	33
		Expected Count	33.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.6%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	34
		Expected Count	2.1
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	61.8%
	1.00	Count	21
		Expected Count	52.9
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	2.4%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	38.2%
	Total	Count	55
		Expected Count	55.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	32
		Expected Count	1.4
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	80.0%
			0.0%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Total	
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.8%
		1.00	Count	871
			Expected Count	871.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	96.2%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.8%
		1.00	Count	871
			Expected Count	871.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	96.2%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.5%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Congruence_Rogers	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	8	863
		Expected Count	38.6	832.4
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.9%	99.1%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	20.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	40	863
		Expected Count	40.0	863.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	4.4%	95.6%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	35	0
		Expected Count	1.7	33.3
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	77.8%	0.0%
	1.00	Count	10	860
		Expected Count	43.3	826.7
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	1.1%	98.9%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	22.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	45	860
		Expected Count	45.0	860.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.0%	95.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	100.0%

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Congruence_Rogers Crosstabulation

response_source			Total
	1.00	Count	871
		Expected Count	871.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	96.5%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
Ilama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers .00	Count	35
		Expected Count	35.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	3.9%
	1.00	Count	870
		Expected Count	870.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	96.1%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	822.995 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	796.457	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	252.585	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	822.086	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	545.966 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	529.003	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	216.709	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	545.363	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	715.765 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	692.552	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	236.579	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	714.972	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	695.798 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	675.035	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	248.636	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	695.029	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.24.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.07.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.42.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.74.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.954	<.001
		Cramer's V	.954	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.777	<.001
		Cramer's V	.777	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.890	<.001
		Cramer's V	.890	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.877	<.001
		Cramer's V	.877	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Emotional_Validation_Goffman BY Moral_Endorsement_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goff man * Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		Emotional_Validation_Goffman	
claude	man	.00	Count	36	
			Expected Count	36.3	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	85.7%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	4.6%	
		1.00	Count	747	
			Expected Count	746.7	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	86.6%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	95.4%	
	Total		Count	783	
			Expected Count	783.0	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	86.5%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-4o	man	.00	Count	31	
			Expected Count	29.3	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.6%	
		1.00	Count	825	
			Expected Count	826.7	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.4%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.4%	
	Total		Count	856	
			Expected Count	856.0	
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.6%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	man	.00	Count	30	
			Expected Count	25.2	

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Moral_Endorse...	
				1.00	Total
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	6	42
			Expected Count	5.7	42.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	14.3%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	4.9%	4.6%
		1.00	Count	116	863
			Expected Count	116.3	863.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	13.4%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	95.1%	95.4%
	Total	Count	122	905	
		Expected Count	122.0	905.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	13.5%	100.0%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	0	31
			Expected Count	1.7	31.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.4%
		1.00	Count	49	874
			Expected Count	47.3	874.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.6%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.6%
	Total	Count	49	905	
		Expected Count	49.0	905.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.4%	100.0%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	0	30
			Expected Count	4.8	30.0

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Moral_Endorse.	
			.00	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.9%	
		1.00	Count	730
		Expected Count	734.8	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	83.6%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.1%	
	Total	Count	760	
		Expected Count	760.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	84.2%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31
		Expected Count	27.1	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.9%	
		1.00	Count	761
		Expected Count	764.9	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	87.1%	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.1%	
		Total	Count	792
			Expected Count	792.0
% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	87.5%			
% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%			

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Moral_Endorse...	
			1.00	Total
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.3%
		1.00 Count	143	873
		Expected Count	138.2	873.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	16.4%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.7%
	Total	Count	143	903
		Expected Count	143.0	903.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	15.8%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	Count	0	31
		Expected Count	3.9	31.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.4%
		1.00 Count	113	874
		Expected Count	109.1	874.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	12.9%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.6%
	Total	Count	113	905
		Expected Count	113.0	905.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.024 ^a	1	.876	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.024	1	.877	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.818
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.024	1	.876	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	1.837 ^c	1	.175	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.906	1	.341	
	Likelihood Ratio	3.513	1	.061	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.406
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.835	1	.175	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	5.839 ^d	1	.016	
	Continuity Correction ^b	4.674	1	.031	
	Likelihood Ratio	10.536	1	.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.009
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5.832	1	.016	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	4.580 ^e	1	.032	
	Continuity Correction ^b	3.473	1	.062	
	Likelihood Ratio	8.424	1	.004	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.025
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4.575	1	.032	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.509
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.173
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.005
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.015
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.66.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.68.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.75.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.87.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.005	.876
		Cramer's V	.005	.876
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.045	.175
		Cramer's V	.045	.175
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.080	.016
		Cramer's V	.080	.016
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.071	.032
		Cramer's V	.071	.032
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Emotional_Validation_Goffman BY Indirect_Language_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Lang.	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	38
			Expected Count	19.2
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	90.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	9.2%
		1.00	Count	376
			Expected Count	394.8
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	43.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	90.8%
	Total	Count	414	
		Expected Count	414.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	45.7%	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.9
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	56.4%
		1.00	Count	24
			Expected Count	53.1
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	2.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	43.6%
	Total	Count	55	
		Expected Count	55.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	6.1%	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	30
			Expected Count	2.4

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Indirect_Lang...	Total
				1.00	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	4	42
			Expected Count	22.8	42.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	9.5%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.8%	4.6%
		1.00	Count	487	863
			Expected Count	468.2	863.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	56.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.2%	95.4%
	Total		Count	491	905
			Expected Count	491.0	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	54.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	0	31
			Expected Count	29.1	31.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.0%	3.4%
		1.00	Count	850	874
			Expected Count	820.9	874.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	97.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	96.6%
	Total		Count	850	905
			Expected Count	850.0	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	93.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	0	30
			Expected Count	27.6	30.0

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Indirect_Lang. .00	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.3%
		1.00 Count	41
		Expected Count	68.6
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	4.7%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	57.7%
	Total	Count	71
		Expected Count	71.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	7.9%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Ilama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	Count	31
		Expected Count	7.3
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	14.6%
		1.00 Count	181
		Expected Count	204.7
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	20.7%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	85.4%
	Total	Count	212
		Expected Count	212.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	23.4%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Indirect_Lang...	Total
		1.00	
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.0%	3.3%
	1.00	Count	832
		Expected Count	873
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	804.4	873.0
	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	95.3%	100.0%
Total	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	96.7%
	Count	832	903
	Expected Count	832.0	903.0
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	92.1%	100.0%
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0	31
		23.7	31.0
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.0%	3.4%
	1.00	Count	693
		Expected Count	874
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	669.3	874.0
	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	79.3%	100.0%
Total	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	96.6%
	Count	693	905
	Expected Count	693.0	905.0
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	76.6%	100.0%
	% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	35.506 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	33.642	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	39.564	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	35.467	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	496.084 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	479.192	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	194.758	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	495.536	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	363.630 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	350.594	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	166.548	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	363.227	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	104.929 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	100.555	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	93.681	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	104.813	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.88.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.36.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.26.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.198	<.001
		Cramer's V	.198	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.740	<.001
		Cramer's V	.740	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.635	<.001
		Cramer's V	.635	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.341	<.001
		Cramer's V	.341	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:43
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Emotional_Validation_Goffman BY Indirect_Action_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:01.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Action_Goffman		
			.00	1.00	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	39	3
			Expected Count	30.5	11.5
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	92.9%	7.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.9%	1.2%
		1.00	Count	618	245
			Expected Count	626.5	236.5
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	71.6%	28.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.1%	98.8%
	Total	Count	657	248	
		Expected Count	657.0	248.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	72.6%	27.4%	
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31	0
			Expected Count	2.9	28.1
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	36.5%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	54	820
			Expected Count	82.1	791.9
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	6.2%	93.8%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	63.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	85	820	
		Expected Count	85.0	820.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	9.4%	90.6%	
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	30	0
			Expected Count	14.0	16.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	7.1%	0.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	42
			Expected Count	42.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	4.6%
		1.00	Count	863
			Expected Count	863.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	95.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.4%
		1.00	Count	874
			Expected Count	874.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.6%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	30
			Expected Count	30.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.3%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Action_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	391	482
		Expected Count	407.0	466.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	44.8%	55.2%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	92.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	421	482
		Expected Count	421.0	482.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	46.6%	53.4%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Count	31	0
		Expected Count	10.9	20.1
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	9.7%	0.0%
	1.00	Count	287	587
		Expected Count	307.1	566.9
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	32.8%	67.2%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	90.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	318	587
		Expected Count	318.0	587.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	35.1%	64.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Total
	1.00	Count	873
		Expected Count	873.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.7%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
Ilama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Count	31
		Expected Count	31.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.4%
	1.00	Count	874
		Expected Count	874.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.6%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	9.088 ^a	1	.003	
	Continuity Correction ^b	8.051	1	.005	
	Likelihood Ratio	11.551	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	9.078	1	.003	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	309.666 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	298.740	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	158.577	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	309.324	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	35.527 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	33.343	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	46.968	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	35.488	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	59.253 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	56.343	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	66.896	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	59.187	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.91.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.99.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.89.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.100	.003
		Cramer's V	.100	.003
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.585	<.001
		Cramer's V	.585	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.198	<.001
		Cramer's V	.198	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.256	<.001
		Cramer's V	.256	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Emotional_Validation_Goffman BY Accept_Framing_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW ...
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman		
			.00	1.00	
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	36	6
			Expected Count	4.5	37.5
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	85.7%	14.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	37.5%	0.7%
		1.00	Count	60	803
			Expected Count	91.5	771.5
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	7.0%	93.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	62.5%	99.3%
	Total	Count	96	809	
		Expected Count	96.0	809.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	10.6%	89.4%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31	0
			Expected Count	1.6	29.4
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	66.0%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	16	858
			Expected Count	45.4	828.6
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	1.8%	98.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	34.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	47	858	
		Expected Count	47.0	858.0	
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.2%	94.8%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	30	0
			Expected Count	2.1	27.9
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	46.9%	0.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	42
			Expected Count	42.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	4.6%
		1.00	Count	863
			Expected Count	863.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	95.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.4%
		1.00	Count	874
			Expected Count	874.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.6%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	30
			Expected Count	30.0
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.3%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	34	839
		Expected Count	61.9	811.1
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.9%	96.1%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	53.1%	100.0%
		Total		
		Count	64	839
		Expected Count	64.0	839.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	7.1%	92.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	llama Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Count	31	0
		Expected Count	2.1	28.9
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	50.0%	0.0%
		1.00		
		Count	31	843
		Expected Count	59.9	814.1
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.5%	96.5%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	50.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	62	843
		Expected Count	62.0	843.0
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	6.9%	93.1%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Emotional_Validation_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Total		
	1.00	Count	873		
		Expected Count	873.0		
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%		
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.7%		
	Total	Count	903		
		Expected Count	903.0		
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%		
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%		
	llama	Emotional_Validation_Goffman	.00	Count	31
				Expected Count	31.0
% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman				100.0%	
% within Accept_Framing_Goffman				3.4%	
1.00		Count	874		
		Expected Count	874.0		
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%		
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.6%		
Total		Count	905		
		Expected Count	905.0		
	% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%			
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	262.011 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	253.771	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	142.098	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	261.722	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	585.987 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	566.219	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	209.827	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	585.340	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	406.796 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	392.333	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	174.791	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	406.346	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	436.450 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	421.467	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	184.160	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	435.968	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.46.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.61.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.13.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.12.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.538	<.001
		Cramer's V	.538	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.805	<.001
		Cramer's V	.805	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.671	<.001
		Cramer's V	.671	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.694	<.001
		Cramer's V	.694	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Moral_Endorsement_Goffman BY Indirect_Language_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Lang. .00	
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	381
			Expected Count	358.2
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	48.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	92.0%
		1.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	55.8
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	27.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.0%
	Total		Count	414
			Expected Count	414.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	45.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	52.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	6.4%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	3.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	6.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	67
			Expected Count	59.8

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Indirect_Lang...	Total
				1.00	
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	402	783
			Expected Count	424.8	783.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	51.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	81.9%	86.5%
		1.00	Count	89	122
			Expected Count	66.2	122.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	73.0%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	18.1%	13.5%
	Total		Count	491	905
			Expected Count	491.0	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	54.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	801	856
			Expected Count	804.0	856.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	93.6%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.2%	94.6%
		1.00	Count	49	49
			Expected Count	46.0	49.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.8%	5.4%
	Total		Count	850	905
			Expected Count	850.0	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	93.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	693	760
			Expected Count	700.2	760.0

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Indirect_Lang.	
				.00	
		1.00	% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	8.8%	
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.4%	
			Count	4	
			Expected Count	11.2	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	2.8%	
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.6%	
		Total		Count	71
				Expected Count	71.0
				% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	7.9%
				% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	211	
			Expected Count	185.5	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	26.6%	
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.5%	
		1.00	Count	1	
			Expected Count	26.5	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.9%	
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.5%	
	Total		Count	212	
			Expected Count	212.0	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	23.4%	
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Language_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .	
				1.00	Total
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	91.2%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	83.3%	84.2%
		1.00	Count	139	143
			Expected Count	131.8	143.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	97.2%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	16.7%	15.8%
	Total	Count	832	903	
		Expected Count	832.0	903.0	
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	92.1%	100.0%	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	581	792
			Expected Count	606.5	792.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	73.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	83.8%	87.5%
		1.00	Count	112	113
			Expected Count	86.5	113.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	99.1%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	16.2%	12.5%
	Total	Count	693	905	
		Expected Count	693.0	905.0	
% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		76.6%	100.0%		
% within Indirect_Language_Goffman		100.0%	100.0%		

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	19.861 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	18.999	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	20.698	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	19.839	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	3.352 ^c	1	.067	
	Continuity Correction ^b	2.321	1	.128	
	Likelihood Ratio	6.323	1	.012	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.067
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.348	1	.067	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	6.018 ^d	1	.014	
	Continuity Correction ^b	5.216	1	.022	
	Likelihood Ratio	7.530	1	.006	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.011
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6.011	1	.014	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	36.573 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	35.151	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	55.675	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	36.532	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.042
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.006
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.81.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.98.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.24.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.47.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.148	<.001
		Cramer's V	.148	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.061	.067
		Cramer's V	.061	.067
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.082	.014
		Cramer's V	.082	.014
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.201	<.001
		Cramer's V	.201	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Moral_Endorsement_Goffman BY Indirect_Action_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

				Indirect_Action_Goffman	
response_source				.00	1.00
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	577	206
			Expected Count	568.4	214.6
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	73.7%	26.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	87.8%	83.1%
		1.00	Count	80	42
			Expected Count	88.6	33.4
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	65.6%	34.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	12.2%	16.9%
	Total		Count	657	248
			Expected Count	657.0	248.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	72.6%	27.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	79	777
			Expected Count	80.4	775.6
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	9.2%	90.8%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	92.9%	94.8%
		1.00	Count	6	43
			Expected Count	4.6	44.4
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	12.2%	87.8%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	7.1%	5.2%
	Total		Count	85	820
			Expected Count	85.0	820.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	9.4%	90.6%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	355	405
			Expected Count	354.3	405.7
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	46.7%	53.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	84.3%	84.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	783
			Expected Count	783.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	86.5%
		1.00	Count	122
			Expected Count	122.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	13.5%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	856
			Expected Count	856.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.6%
		1.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	760
			Expected Count	760.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	84.2%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Action_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	66	77
		Expected Count	66.7	76.3
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	46.2%	53.8%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	15.7%	16.0%
		Total		
		Count	421	482
		Expected Count	421.0	482.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	46.6%	53.4%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	.00	Count	285	507
		Expected Count	278.3	513.7
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	36.0%	64.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	89.6%	86.4%
		Total		
		Count	33	80
		Expected Count	39.7	73.3
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	29.2%	70.8%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	10.4%	13.6%
Ilama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	Count	318	587
		Expected Count	318.0	587.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	35.1%	64.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
		Total		
		Count	318	587
		Expected Count	318.0	587.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	35.1%	64.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	318	587
		Expected Count	318.0	587.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	35.1%	64.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
	1.00	Count	Expected Count	143
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	143.0
	Total	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	15.8%	903
Ilama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	Count	Expected Count	792
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	792.0
	1.00	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	87.5%	113
	Total	Count	Expected Count	905

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	3.496 ^a	1	.062	
	Continuity Correction ^b	3.100	1	.078	
	Likelihood Ratio	3.361	1	.067	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.064
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.492	1	.062	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.495 ^c	1	.482	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.204	1	.651	
	Likelihood Ratio	.459	1	.498	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.450
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.495	1	.482	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.015 ^d	1	.903	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.001	1	.975	
	Likelihood Ratio	.015	1	.903	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.927
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.903	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	1.995 ^e	1	.158	
	Continuity Correction ^b	1.709	1	.191	
	Likelihood Ratio	2.046	1	.153	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.172
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.993	1	.158	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.041
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.308
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.488
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.094
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.43.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.60.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 66.67.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.71.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.062	.062
		Cramer's V	.062	.062
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.023	.482
		Cramer's V	.023	.482
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.004	.903
		Cramer's V	.004	.903
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.047	.158
		Cramer's V	.047	.158
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Moral_Endorsement_Goffman BY Accept_Framing_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW ...
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman		
				.00	1.00
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	46	737
			Expected Count	83.1	699.9
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.9%	94.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	47.9%	91.1%
		1.00	Count	50	72
			Expected Count	12.9	109.1
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	41.0%	59.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	52.1%	8.9%
	Total		Count	96	809
			Expected Count	96.0	809.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	10.6%	89.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	35	821
			Expected Count	44.5	811.5
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	4.1%	95.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	74.5%	95.7%
		1.00	Count	12	37
			Expected Count	2.5	46.5
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	24.5%	75.5%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	25.5%	4.3%
	Total		Count	47	858
			Expected Count	47.0	858.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.2%	94.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	37	723
			Expected Count	53.9	706.1
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	4.9%	95.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	57.8%	86.2%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	783
			Expected Count	783.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	86.5%
		1.00	Count	122
			Expected Count	122.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	13.5%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	856
			Expected Count	856.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.6%
		1.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	760
			Expected Count	760.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	84.2%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	27	116
		Expected Count	10.1	132.9
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	18.9%	81.1%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	42.2%	13.8%
	Total	Count	64	839
		Expected Count	64.0	839.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	7.1%	92.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Ilama Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	38
			Expected Count	754
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	54.3
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	737.7
		1.00	Count	4.8%
			Expected Count	95.2%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	61.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	89.4%
	Total	.00	Count	24
			Expected Count	89
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	7.7
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	105.3
		1.00	Count	21.2%
			Expected Count	78.8%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	38.7%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	10.6%
	Total	.00	Count	62
			Expected Count	843
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	62.0
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	843.0
		1.00	Count	6.9%
			Expected Count	93.1%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
	1.00	Count		143
		Expected Count		143.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman		15.8%
	Total	Count		903
		Expected Count		903.0
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman		100.0%
Ilama	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	.00	Count	792
			Expected Count	792.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	87.5%
	1.00		Count	113
			Expected Count	113.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	12.5%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	137.209 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	133.531	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	97.050	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	137.057	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	39.177 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	35.144	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	22.661	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	39.134	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	35.887 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	33.791	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	27.757	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	35.847	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	41.888 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	39.351	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	30.248	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	41.841	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.54.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.14.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.74.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.389	<.001
		Cramer's V	.389	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.208	<.001
		Cramer's V	.208	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.199	<.001
		Cramer's V	.199	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.215	<.001
		Cramer's V	.215	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Indirect_Language_Goffman BY Indirect_Action_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Indirect_Action_Goffman	
		.00	1.00
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	406
		Expected Count	300.6
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	98.1%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	61.8%
	1.00	Count	251
		Expected Count	356.4
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	51.1%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	38.2%
	Total	Count	657
		Expected Count	657.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	72.6%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	35
		Expected Count	5.2
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	63.6%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	41.2%
	1.00	Count	50
		Expected Count	79.8
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	58.8%
	Total	Count	85
		Expected Count	85.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	9.4%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	65
		Expected Count	33.1
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.5%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	15.4%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	414
			Expected Count	414.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	45.7%
		1.00	Count	491
			Expected Count	491.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	54.3%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	6.1%
		1.00	Count	850
			Expected Count	850.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	93.9%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	71
			Expected Count	71.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	7.9%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Indirect_Action_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	356	476
		Expected Count	387.9	444.1
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.8%	57.2%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	84.6%	98.8%
	Total	Count	421	482
		Expected Count	421.0	482.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	46.6%	53.4%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Ilama	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	167	45
		Expected Count	74.5	137.5
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	78.8%	21.2%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	52.5%	7.7%
	1.00	Count	151	542
		Expected Count	243.5	449.5
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	21.8%	78.2%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	47.5%	92.3%
	Total	Count	318	587
		Expected Count	318.0	587.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	35.1%	64.9%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Indirect_Action_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Total
	1.00	Count	832
		Expected Count	832.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	92.1%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
Ilama	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	212
		Expected Count	212.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	23.4%
	1.00	Count	693
		Expected Count	693.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	76.6%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	248.850 ^a	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	246.496	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	303.474	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	248.575	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	202.470 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	195.741	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	111.429	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	202.247	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	62.500 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	60.556	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	70.542	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	62.431	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	231.293 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	228.799	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	227.655	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	231.037	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 113.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.10.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 74.49.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.524	<.001
		Cramer's V	.524	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.473	<.001
		Cramer's V	.473	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.263	<.001
		Cramer's V	.263	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.506	<.001
		Cramer's V	.506	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Indirect_Language_Goffman BY Accept_Framing_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW ...
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman		
			.00	1.00	
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	49	365
			Expected Count	43.9	370.1
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	11.8%	88.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	51.0%	45.1%
		1.00	Count	47	444
			Expected Count	52.1	438.9
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	9.6%	90.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	49.0%	54.9%
	Total	Count	96	809	
		Expected Count	96.0	809.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	10.6%	89.4%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	2.9	52.1
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	66.0%	2.8%
		1.00	Count	16	834
			Expected Count	44.1	805.9
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	1.9%	98.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	34.0%	97.2%
	Total	Count	47	858	
		Expected Count	47.0	858.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.2%	94.8%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	30	41
			Expected Count	5.0	66.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	46.9%	4.9%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	414
			Expected Count	414.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	45.7%
		1.00	Count	491
			Expected Count	491.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	54.3%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-4o	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	6.1%
		1.00	Count	850
			Expected Count	850.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	93.9%
	Total	Count	905	
		Expected Count	905.0	
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Indirect_Language_Goffman	.00	Count	71
			Expected Count	71.0
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	7.9%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Accept_Framing_Goffman	
			.00	1.00
	1.00	Count	34	798
		Expected Count	59.0	773.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	4.1%	95.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	53.1%	95.1%
		Total		
		Count	64	839
		Expected Count	64.0	839.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	7.1%	92.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	llama Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	32	180
		Expected Count	14.5	197.5
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	15.1%	84.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	51.6%	21.4%
		1.00		
		Count	30	663
		Expected Count	47.5	645.5
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	4.3%	95.7%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	48.4%	78.6%
	Total	Count	62	843
		Expected Count	62.0	843.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	6.9%	93.1%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Indirect_Language_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source			Total
	1.00	Count	832
		Expected Count	832.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	92.1%
	Total	Count	903
		Expected Count	903.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
Ilama	Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Count	212
		Expected Count	212.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	23.4%
	1.00	Count	693
		Expected Count	693.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	76.6%
	Total	Count	905
		Expected Count	905.0
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	1.214 ^a	1	.271	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.987	1	.321	
	Likelihood Ratio	1.209	1	.272	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.280
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.212	1	.271	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	311.415 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	300.448	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	135.373	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	311.071	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	144.712 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	138.974	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	81.413	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	144.551	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	29.482 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	27.819	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	25.078	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	29.449	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.160
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.86.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.03.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.52.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.037	.271
		Cramer's V	.037	.271
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.587	<.001
		Cramer's V	.587	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.400	<.001
		Cramer's V	.400	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.180	<.001
		Cramer's V	.180	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 18:54:44
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/sps/s/AITAH_llm_responses....
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	response_source
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3618
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=Indirect_Action_Goffman BY Accept_Framing_Goffman /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW ...
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Notes

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Valid		Cases Missing		Total N
		N	Percent	N	Percent	
claude	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-4o	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905
gpt-oss	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	903	100.0%	0	0.0%	903
llama	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	905	100.0%	0	0.0%	905

Case Processing Summary

response_source		Cases Total Percent
claude	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman	
				.00	1.00
claude	Indirect_Action_Goffman .00		Count	71	586
			Expected Count	69.7	587.3
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	10.8%	89.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	74.0%	72.4%
		1.00	Count	25	223
			Expected Count	26.3	221.7
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	10.1%	89.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	26.0%	27.6%
	Total		Count	96	809
			Expected Count	96.0	809.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	10.6%	89.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Action_Goffman .00		Count	33	52
			Expected Count	4.4	80.6
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	38.8%	61.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	70.2%	6.1%
		1.00	Count	14	806
			Expected Count	42.6	777.4
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	1.7%	98.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	29.8%	93.9%
	Total		Count	47	858
			Expected Count	47.0	858.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.2%	94.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Action_Goffman .00		Count	44	377
			Expected Count	29.8	391.2
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	10.5%	89.5%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	68.8%	44.9%
		1.00	Count	20	462
			Expected Count	34.2	447.8
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	4.1%	95.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	31.3%	55.1%

Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source				Total
claude	Indirect_Action_Goffman	.00	Count	657
			Expected Count	657.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	72.6%
	1.00		Count	248
			Expected Count	248.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	27.4%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Indirect_Action_Goffman	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	9.4%
	1.00		Count	820
			Expected Count	820.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	90.6%
	Total		Count	905
			Expected Count	905.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Indirect_Action_Goffman	.00	Count	421
			Expected Count	421.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	46.6%
	1.00		Count	482
			Expected Count	482.0
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	53.4%

Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Accept_Framing_Goffman	
		.00	1.00
Total	Count	64	839
	Expected Count	64.0	839.0
	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	7.1%	92.9%
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama Indirect_Action_Goffman	.00	Count	39
		Expected Count	21.8
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	12.3%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	62.9%
	1.00	Count	23
		Expected Count	40.2
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	37.1%
Total	Total	Count	62
		Expected Count	62.0
		% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	6.9%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Indirect_Action_Goffman * Accept_Framing_Goffman Crosstabulation

response_source		Total
Total	Count	903
	Expected Count	903.0
	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Count	318
	Expected Count	318.0
	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	35.1%
	1.00 Count	587
	Expected Count	587.0
	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	64.9%
Total	Count	905
	Expected Count	905.0
	% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.100 ^a	1	.752	
	Continuity Correction ^b	.038	1	.845	
	Likelihood Ratio	.101	1	.751	
	Fisher's Exact Test				.810
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.100	1	.752	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	215.488 ^c	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	208.016	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	114.269	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	215.250	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	13.553 ^d	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	12.612	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	13.726	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	13.538	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	903			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	22.514 ^e	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction ^b	21.225	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	21.275	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	22.489	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	905			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.428
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction ^b	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.41.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.84.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.79.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.011	.752
		Cramer's V	.011	.752
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.488	<.001
		Cramer's V	.488	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.123	<.001
		Cramer's V	.123	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		903	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.158	<.001
		Cramer's V	.158	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		905	