Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-SEP-2025 17:35:15
Comments		
Input	Data	/Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/spss/Anxiety_llm_responses.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	3807
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 Genuineness_Rogers Accurate_understanding_Rogers Empathic_Understanding_Rogers Congruence_Rogers BY Emotional_Validation_Goffman Moral_Endorsement_Goffman Indirect_Language_Goffman Indirect_Action_Goffman Accept_Framing_Goffman BY response_source /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ PHI /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.54
	Elapsed Time	00:00:01.00
	Dimensions Requested	3
	Cells Available	449353

[DataSet1] /Users/girlenginerd/Desktop/sheff/private_projects/deepreflect/data/spss/Anxiety_llm_responses.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Genuineness_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Genuineness_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Genuineness_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Genuineness_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Genuineness_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Congruence_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Congruence_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Congruence_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Congruence_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%
Congruence_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source	3807	100.0%	0	0.0%	3807	100.0%

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.2

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	5
			Expected Count	34.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	13.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.5%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	886.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.5%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	4
			Expected Count	33.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	11.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.4%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	887.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.6%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	5
			Expected Count	34.8

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.9%
		1.00	Count	1
			Expected Count	30.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.1%
	Total		Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	124
			Expected Count	4.6

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	13.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.5%
		1.00	Count	914
			Expected Count	884.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.5%
	Total		Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	2
			Expected Count	31.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	6.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.2%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	889.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.8%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	16
			Expected Count	135.4

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	140
			Expected Count	140.0

Crosstab

response_source			Emotional_Vali. .00
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.2%
	1.00	Count	1
		Expected Count	120.4
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.8%
	Total	Count	125
		Expected Count	125.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.3%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	11.4%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.4%
	1.00	Count	3666
		Expected Count	3546.6
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.6%
	Total	Count	3682
		Expected Count	3682.0
		% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.7%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	3667
			Expected Count	3667.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	815.327[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	788.222	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	244.291	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	814.471	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	839.538[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	811.658	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	248.426	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	838.656	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	787.869[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	761.642	1	<.001	

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]	

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
	Likelihood Ratio	235.336	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	787.040	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	892.361[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	862.791	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	258.214	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	891.424	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3329.261[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	3301.437	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	982.000	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3328.387	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
	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	
Total	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 4.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

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

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.21.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.07.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.925	<.001
		Cramer's V	.925	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.939	<.001
		Cramer's V	.939	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.910	<.001
		Cramer's V	.910	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.968	<.001
		Cramer's V	.968	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.935	<.001
		Cramer's V	.935	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	0	36
			Expected Count	.0	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.8%
		1.00	Count	1	916
			Expected Count	1.0	916.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.2%
	Total		Count	1	952
			Expected Count	1.0	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count		35
			Expected Count		35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.7%
		1.00	Count		917
			Expected Count		917.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.3%
	Total		Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count		36
			Expected Count		36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.8%
		1.00	Count		915
			Expected Count		915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.2%
	Total		Count		951
			Expected Count		951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count		33
			Expected Count		33.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	140
			Expected Count	140.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	3666
			Expected Count	3666.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	3806
			Expected Count	3806.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.5%
		1.00	Count		919
			Expected Count		919.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.5%
	Total		Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	0	140
			Expected Count	.0	140.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.7%
		1.00	Count	1	3667
			Expected Count	1.0	3667.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.3%
	Total		Count	1	3807
			Expected Count	1.0	3807.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.0%	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	.039[c]	1	.843	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.077	1	.781	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.039	1	.843	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.038[a]	1	.845	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.075	1	.784	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.038	1	.845	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.962
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.963
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

d. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.006	.843
		Cramer's V	.006	.843
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.003	.845
		Cramer's V	.003	.845
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

c. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	6.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	18.9%
		1.00	Count	133
			Expected Count	157.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	14.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	81.1%
	Total		Count	164
			Expected Count	164.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	17.2%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	2.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	57.4%
		1.00	Count	23
			Expected Count	52.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	5	36
			Expected Count	29.8	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	13.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.6%	3.8%
		1.00	Count	783	916
			Expected Count	758.2	916.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	85.5%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.4%	96.2%
	Total		Count	788	952
			Expected Count	788.0	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	82.8%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	4	35
			Expected Count	33.0	35.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	11.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.4%	3.7%
		1.00	Count	894	917
			Expected Count	865.0	917.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	2.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.6%
	Total		Count	54
			Expected Count	54.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	5.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.3
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.2%
		1.00	Count	3
			Expected Count	32.7
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	0.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.8%
	Total		Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	3.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	3.3
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	32.3%
		1.00	Count	65
			Expected Count	92.7

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	97.5%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.6%	96.3%
	Total		Count	898	952
			Expected Count	898.0	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	94.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	5	36
			Expected Count	34.7	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	13.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.5%	3.8%
		1.00	Count	912	915
			Expected Count	882.3	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	99.7%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.5%	96.2%
	Total		Count	917	951
			Expected Count	917.0	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	96.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	2	33
			Expected Count	29.7	33.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	6.1%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.2%	3.5%
		1.00	Count	854	919
			Expected Count	826.3	919.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	7.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	67.7%
	Total		Count	96
			Expected Count	96.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	10.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	124
			Expected Count	12.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	35.6%
		1.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	335.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	6.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	64.4%
	Total		Count	348
			Expected Count	348.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	9.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	92.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.8%	96.5%
	Total		Count	856	952
			Expected Count	856.0	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	89.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	16	140
			Expected Count	127.2	140.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	11.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.5%	3.7%
		1.00	Count	3443	3667
			Expected Count	3331.8	3667.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	93.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.5%	96.3%
	Total		Count	3459	3807
			Expected Count	3459.0	3807.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	90.9%	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	124.505[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	119.535	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	86.840	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	124.374	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	466.702[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	450.756	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	174.959	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	466.212	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	739.368[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	714.694	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	223.964	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	738.591	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	265.110[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	255.616	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	137.729	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	264.831	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1104.102[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	1094.195	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	542.366	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1103.812	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 12.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.20.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.99.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.29.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.33.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.362	<.001
		Cramer's V	.362	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.700	<.001
		Cramer's V	.700	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.882	<.001
		Cramer's V	.882	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.528	<.001
		Cramer's V	.528	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.539	<.001
		Cramer's V	.539	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	33	3
			Expected Count	7.5	28.5
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	91.7%	8.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	16.6%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	166	750
			Expected Count	191.5	724.5
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	18.1%	81.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	83.4%	99.6%
	Total		Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	1.9	33.1

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	59.6%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	21	896
			Expected Count	50.1	866.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	2.3%	97.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	40.4%	99.6%
	Total		Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	32	4
			Expected Count	7.9	28.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.9%	11.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	15.2%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	178	737
			Expected Count	202.1	712.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	19.5%	80.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	84.8%	99.5%
	Total		Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	2
			Expected Count	2.9	30.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	93.9%	6.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	36.9%	0.2%
		1.00	Count	53	866
			Expected Count	81.1	837.9

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	5.8%	94.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	63.1%	99.8%
	Total		Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	127	13
			Expected Count	20.0	120.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	90.7%	9.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	23.3%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	418	3249
			Expected Count	525.0	3142.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	11.4%	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	76.7%	99.6%
	Total		Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	140
			Expected Count	140.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	3667
			Expected Count	3667.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	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	113.315[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	108.910	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	88.498	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	113.196	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	486.029[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	469.464	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	178.459	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	485.519	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	97.057[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	93.064	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	77.332	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	96.955	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	307.844[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	296.982	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	147.832	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	307.521	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	691.601[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	685.150	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	438.242	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	691.419	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 20.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.53.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.91.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.95.

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

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.345	<.001
		Cramer's V	.345	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.715	<.001
		Cramer's V	.715	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.319	<.001
		Cramer's V	.319	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.569	<.001
		Cramer's V	.569	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.426	<.001
		Cramer's V	.426	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	5
			Expected Count	2.9	33.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%	13.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	39.7%	0.6%
		1.00	Count	47	869
			Expected Count	75.1	840.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	5.1%	94.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	60.3%	99.4%
	Total		Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	1.7	33.3

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.4%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	15	902
			Expected Count	44.3	872.7
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	1.6%	98.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.6%	99.6%
	Total		Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	5
			Expected Count	2.8	33.2
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	86.1%	13.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	42.5%	0.6%
		1.00	Count	42	873
			Expected Count	70.2	844.8
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.6%	95.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	57.5%	99.4%
	Total		Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	31	2
			Expected Count	3.4	29.6
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	93.9%	6.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	31.3%	0.2%
		1.00	Count	68	851
			Expected Count	95.6	823.4

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	915.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	7.4%	92.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	68.7%	99.8%
	Total		Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	124	16
			Expected Count	10.9	129.1
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	41.9%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	172	3495
			Expected Count	285.1	3381.9
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	58.1%	99.5%
	Total		Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	.00	Count	140
			Expected Count	140.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	3667
			Expected Count	3667.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Unconditional_Positive_Regard_Rogers	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	301.985[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	291.315	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	139.991	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	301.668	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	554.095[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	535.351	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	190.472	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	553.513	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	324.807[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	313.406	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	145.158	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	324.465	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	256.045[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	246.842	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	135.447	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	255.776	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1323.201[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	1311.529	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	592.649	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1322.854	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 10.89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.95.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.69.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.76.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.43.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.563	<.001
		Cramer's V	.563	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.763	<.001
		Cramer's V	.763	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.584	<.001
		Cramer's V	.584	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.519	<.001
		Cramer's V	.519	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.590	<.001
		Cramer's V	.590	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Genuineness_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	1.1	33.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	0	917
			Expected Count	29.9	887.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	99.6%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	1.8	53.2

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	2.6%
		1.00	Count	0	897
			Expected Count	29.2	867.8
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	97.4%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	54
			Expected Count	2.9	82.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	36.5%	63.5%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.9%	5.9%
		1.00	Count	1	865
			Expected Count	29.1	836.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.1%	94.1%
	Total		Count	32	919
			Expected Count	32.0	919.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.4%	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	18
			Expected Count	1.6	47.4
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	63.3%	36.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	2.0%
		1.00	Count	0	903
			Expected Count	29.4	873.6

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.8%
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	8.9%
		1.00	Count	866
			Expected Count	866.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	91.1%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.1%
		1.00	Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	98.0%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	124	100
			Expected Count	7.4	216.6
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	55.4%	44.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.2%	2.7%
		1.00	Count	1	3582
			Expected Count	117.6	3465.4
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.8%	97.3%
	Total		Count	125	3682
			Expected Count	125.0	3682.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.9%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	224.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3583
			Expected Count	3583.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.1%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	839.538[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	811.658	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	248.426	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	838.656	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	522.599[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	504.861	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	197.950	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	522.050	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	314.618[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	303.536	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	152.925	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	314.287	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	590.515[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	570.603	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	208.865	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	589.894	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	2032.325[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	2014.939	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	773.600	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2031.791	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 7.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.79.

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

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.60.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.939	<.001
		Cramer's V	.939	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.741	<.001
		Cramer's V	.741	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.575	<.001
		Cramer's V	.575	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.788	<.001
		Cramer's V	.788	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.731	<.001
		Cramer's V	.731	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Genuineness_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35	0
			Expected Count	35.0	.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	916	1
			Expected Count	916.0	1.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	99.9%	0.1%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%	100.0%
	Total		Count	951	1
			Expected Count	951.0	1.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	99.9%	0.1%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55	
			Expected Count	55.0	

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.8%	
		1.00	Count	897	
			Expected Count	897.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.2%	
	Total		Count	952	
			Expected Count	952.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85	
			Expected Count	85.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	8.9%	
		1.00	Count	866	
			Expected Count	866.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	91.1%	
	Total		Count	951	
			Expected Count	951.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49	
			Expected Count	49.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.1%	
		1.00	Count	903	
			Expected Count	903.0	

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.8%
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	8.9%
		1.00	Count	866
			Expected Count	866.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	91.1%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.1%
		1.00	Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.9%	
	Total		Count	952	
			Expected Count	952.0	
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224	0
			Expected Count	223.9	.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.9%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	3582	1
			Expected Count	3582.1	.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.1%	100.0%
	Total		Count	3806	1
			Expected Count	3806.0	1.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.9%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	224.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3583
			Expected Count	3583.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.1%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.038[c]	1	.845	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.075	1	.784	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.038	1	.845	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.063[a]	1	.803	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.121	1	.728	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.063	1	.803	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.963
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.941
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

d. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.006	.845
		Cramer's V	.006	.845
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.004	.803
		Cramer's V	.004	.803
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

c. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Genuineness_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32	3
			Expected Count	6.0	29.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	91.4%	8.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	19.5%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	132	785
			Expected Count	158.0	759.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	14.4%	85.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	80.5%	99.6%
	Total		Count	164	788
			Expected Count	164.0	788.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	17.2%	82.8%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	3.1	51.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	57.4%	2.7%
		1.00	Count	23	874
			Expected Count	50.9	846.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	2.6%	97.4%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.6%	97.3%
	Total		Count	54	898
			Expected Count	54.0	898.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.7%	94.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	54
			Expected Count	3.0	82.0

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.8%
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	36.5%	63.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.2%	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3	863
			Expected Count	31.0	835.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	0.3%	99.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.8%	94.1%
	Total		Count	34	917
			Expected Count	34.0	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	3.6%	96.4%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	33	16
			Expected Count	4.9	44.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	67.3%	32.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	34.4%	1.9%
		1.00	Count	63	840
			Expected Count	91.1	811.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	7.0%	93.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	65.6%	98.1%
	Total		Count	96	856
			Expected Count	96.0	856.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	10.1%	89.9%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	127	97
			Expected Count	20.5	203.5
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.7%	43.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	36.5%	2.8%
		1.00	Count	221	3362
			Expected Count	327.5	3255.5

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.9%
		1.00	Count	866
			Expected Count	866.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.1%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.1%
		1.00	Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.9%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	224.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3583
			Expected Count	3583.0

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	6.2%	93.8%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	63.5%	97.2%
	Total	Count	348	3459
		Expected Count	348.0	3459.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	9.1%	90.9%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Total
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.1%
	Total	Count	3807
		Expected Count	3807.0
		% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	140.303[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	134.953	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	98.619	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	140.156	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	280.336[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	270.371	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	125.510	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	280.042	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	292.998[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	282.613	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	141.774	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	292.690	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	186.819[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	180.220	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	103.575	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	186.623	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	648.066[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	641.996	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	362.379	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	647.896	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 20.48.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.03.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.12.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.04.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.94.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.384	<.001
		Cramer's V	.384	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.543	<.001
		Cramer's V	.543	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.555	<.001
		Cramer's V	.555	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.443	<.001
		Cramer's V	.443	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.413	<.001
		Cramer's V	.413	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Genuineness_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	33	2
			Expected Count	7.3	27.7
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	94.3%	5.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	16.6%	0.3%
		1.00	Count	166	751
			Expected Count	191.7	725.3
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	18.1%	81.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	83.4%	99.7%
	Total		Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	3.0	52.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	59.6%	2.7%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.8%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
		1.00	Count	21	876
			Expected Count	49.0	848.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	2.3%	97.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	40.4%	97.3%
	Total		Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	38	47
			Expected Count	18.8	66.2
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	44.7%	55.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	18.1%	6.3%
		1.00	Count	172	694
			Expected Count	191.2	674.8
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	19.9%	80.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	81.9%	93.7%
	Total		Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32	17
			Expected Count	4.3	44.7
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	65.3%	34.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	38.1%	2.0%
		1.00	Count	52	851
			Expected Count	79.7	823.3
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.8%	94.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	61.9%	98.0%
	Total		Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	8.9%
		1.00	Count	866
			Expected Count	866.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	91.1%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.1%
		1.00	Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.9%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	134	90
			Expected Count	32.1	191.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	59.8%	40.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	24.6%	2.8%
		1.00	Count	411	3172
			Expected Count	512.9	3070.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	11.5%	88.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	75.4%	97.2%
	Total		Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	224.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3583
			Expected Count	3583.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.1%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	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	118.344[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	113.781	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	93.418	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	118.219	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	292.884[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	282.516	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	128.920	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	292.576	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	27.768[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	26.342	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	23.910	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	27.738	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	204.856[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	197.521	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	107.148	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	204.641	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	401.792[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	397.860	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	272.019	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	401.686	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 32.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.32.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.00.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.77.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.32.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.353	<.001
		Cramer's V	.353	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.555	<.001
		Cramer's V	.555	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.171	<.001
		Cramer's V	.171	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.464	<.001
		Cramer's V	.464	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.325	<.001
		Cramer's V	.325	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Genuineness_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	2.9	32.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	39.7%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	47	870
			Expected Count	75.1	841.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	5.1%	94.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	60.3%	99.5%
	Total		Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	2.7	52.3
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.4%	2.6%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.8%

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
		1.00	Count	15	882
			Expected Count	43.3	853.7
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	1.7%	98.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.6%	97.4%
	Total		Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32	53
			Expected Count	6.5	78.5
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	37.6%	62.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	43.8%	6.0%
		1.00	Count	41	825
			Expected Count	66.5	799.5
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	56.2%	94.0%
	Total		Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	32	17
			Expected Count	5.1	43.9
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	65.3%	34.7%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.3%	2.0%
		1.00	Count	67	836
			Expected Count	93.9	809.1
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	7.4%	92.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.7%	98.0%
	Total		Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	85
			Expected Count	85.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	8.9%
		1.00	Count	866
			Expected Count	866.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	91.1%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	49
			Expected Count	49.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.1%
		1.00	Count	903
			Expected Count	903.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.9%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	126	98
			Expected Count	17.4	206.6
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	56.3%	43.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	42.6%	2.8%
		1.00	Count	170	3413
			Expected Count	278.6	3304.4
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	57.4%	97.2%
	Total		Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
Total	Genuineness_Rogers	.00	Count	224
			Expected Count	224.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.9%
		1.00	Count	3583
			Expected Count	3583.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.1%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Genuineness_Rogers	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	312.090[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	301.095	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	144.021	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	311.762	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	337.089[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	325.300	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	140.663	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	336.735	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	118.311[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	113.713	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	72.291	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	118.187	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	167.144[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	160.989	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	94.789	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	166.968	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	779.938[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	772.772	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	405.276	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	779.733	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 17.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.87.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.66.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.52.

f. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.10.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.573	<.001
		Cramer's V	.573	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.595	<.001
		Cramer's V	.595	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.353	<.001
		Cramer's V	.353	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.419	<.001
		Cramer's V	.419	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.453	<.001
		Cramer's V	.453	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.1

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	2
			Expected Count	31.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.2%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	889.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.8%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	4
			Expected Count	33.9

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.2
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.9%
		1.00	Count	1
			Expected Count	30.8
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.1%
	Total		Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.1

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	11.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.4%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	887.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.6%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	4
			Expected Count	33.8
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	11.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.4%
		1.00	Count	915
			Expected Count	885.2
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.6%
	Total		Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	2
			Expected Count	31.9

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
		1.00	Count	0
			Expected Count	29.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	124
			Expected Count	4.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	91.2%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.2%
		1.00	Count	1
			Expected Count	120.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.8%
	Total		Count	125
			Expected Count	125.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.2%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	889.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.8%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	12
			Expected Count	131.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	8.8%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.3%
		1.00	Count	3670
			Expected Count	3550.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.7%
	Total		Count	3682
			Expected Count	3682.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	136
			Expected Count	136.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.6%
		1.00	Count	3671
			Expected Count	3671.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.4%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	892.361[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	862.791	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	258.214	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	891.424	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	839.538[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	811.658	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	248.426	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	838.656	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	811.324[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	784.347	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	239.469	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	810.471	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	892.361[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	862.791	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	258.214	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	891.424	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3430.982[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	3402.339	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	1000.330	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3430.080	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 4.47.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.07.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.18.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.968	<.001
		Cramer's V	.968	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.939	<.001
		Cramer's V	.939	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.924	<.001
		Cramer's V	.924	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.968	<.001
		Cramer's V	.968	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.949	<.001
		Cramer's V	.949	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	918
			Expected Count	918.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	0	33
			Expected Count	.0	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.5%
		1.00	Count	1	919
			Expected Count	1.0	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.5%
	Total		Count	1	952
			Expected Count	1.0	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		35
			Expected Count		35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.7%
		1.00	Count		917
			Expected Count		917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.3%
	Total		Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		35
			Expected Count		35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.7%
		1.00	Count		916
			Expected Count		916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.3%
	Total		Count		951
			Expected Count		951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		33
			Expected Count		33.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	136
			Expected Count	136.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.6%
		1.00	Count	3670
			Expected Count	3670.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.4%
	Total		Count	3806
			Expected Count	3806.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		3.5%
		1.00	Count		919
			Expected Count		919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		96.5%
	Total		Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	0	136
			Expected Count	.0	136.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	0.0%	3.6%
		1.00	Count	1	3671
			Expected Count	1.0	3671.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	96.4%
	Total		Count	1	3807
			Expected Count	1.0	3807.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.0%	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	.036[c]	1	.850	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.071	1	.790	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.850	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.037[a]	1	.847	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.073	1	.787	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.037	1	.847	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.965
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.964
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

d. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.006	.850
		Cramer's V	.006	.850
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.003	.847
		Cramer's V	.003	.847
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

c. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	5.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	18.9%
		1.00	Count	133
			Expected Count	158.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	14.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	81.1%
	Total		Count	164
			Expected Count	164.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	17.2%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	2.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	57.4%
		1.00	Count	23
			Expected Count	52.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	2.5%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.6%
	Total		Count	54
			Expected Count	54.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	2	33
			Expected Count	27.3	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.3%	3.5%
		1.00	Count	786	919
			Expected Count	760.7	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	85.5%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.7%	96.5%
	Total		Count	788	952
			Expected Count	788.0	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	82.8%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	4	35
			Expected Count	33.0	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	11.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.4%	3.7%
		1.00	Count	894	917
			Expected Count	865.0	917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	97.5%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.6%	96.3%
	Total		Count	898	952
			Expected Count	898.0	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	94.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	1.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.2%
		1.00	Count	3
			Expected Count	32.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	0.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.8%
	Total		Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	3.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	3.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	32.3%
		1.00	Count	65
			Expected Count	92.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	7.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	67.7%
	Total		Count	96
			Expected Count	96.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	10.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	124
			Expected Count	12.4

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	4	35
			Expected Count	33.7	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	11.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.4%	3.7%
		1.00	Count	913	916
			Expected Count	883.3	916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	99.7%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.6%	96.3%
	Total		Count	917	951
			Expected Count	917.0	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	96.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	2	33
			Expected Count	29.7	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.2%	3.5%
		1.00	Count	854	919
			Expected Count	826.3	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	92.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.8%	96.5%
	Total		Count	856	952
			Expected Count	856.0	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	89.9%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	12	136
			Expected Count	123.6	136.0

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Lang. .00
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	91.2%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	35.6%
	1.00	Count	224
		Expected Count	335.6
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	6.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	64.4%
	Total	Count	348
		Expected Count	348.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	9.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Lang.. 1.00	Total
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	8.8%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	0.3%	3.6%
	1.00	Count	3447	3671
		Expected Count	3335.4	3671.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	99.7%	96.4%
	Total	Count	3459	3807
		Expected Count	3459.0	3807.0
		% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	90.9%	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	141.082[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	135.564	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	99.822	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	140.934	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	466.702[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	450.756	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	174.959	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	466.212	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	761.492[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	736.110	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	228.093	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	760.691	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	265.110[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	255.616	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	137.729	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	264.831	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1142.815[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	1132.595	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	560.195	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1142.515	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 12.43.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.68.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.99.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.33.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.385	<.001
		Cramer's V	.385	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.700	<.001
		Cramer's V	.700	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.895	<.001
		Cramer's V	.895	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.528	<.001
		Cramer's V	.528	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.548	<.001
		Cramer's V	.548	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	32	1
			Expected Count	6.9	26.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	97.0%	3.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	16.1%	0.1%
		1.00	Count	167	752
			Expected Count	192.1	726.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	18.2%	81.8%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	83.9%	99.9%
	Total		Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	1.9	33.1

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	59.6%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	21	896
			Expected Count	50.1	866.9
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	2.3%	97.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	40.4%	99.6%
	Total		Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	7.7	27.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	14.8%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	179	737
			Expected Count	202.3	713.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	19.5%	80.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	85.2%	99.5%
	Total		Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	2
			Expected Count	2.9	30.1
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%	6.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	36.9%	0.2%
		1.00	Count	53	866
			Expected Count	81.1	837.9

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.8%	94.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	63.1%	99.8%
	Total		Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	125	11
			Expected Count	19.5	116.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	91.9%	8.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	22.9%	0.3%
		1.00	Count	420	3251
			Expected Count	525.5	3145.5
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	11.4%	88.6%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	77.1%	99.7%
	Total		Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	136
			Expected Count	136.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.6%
		1.00	Count	3671
			Expected Count	3671.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.4%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	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	119.632[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	114.913	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	95.973	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	119.506	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	486.029[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	469.464	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	178.459	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	485.519	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	93.364[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	89.396	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	74.302	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	93.266	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	307.844[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	296.982	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	147.832	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	307.521	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	692.312[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	685.767	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	439.215	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	692.130	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 19.47.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.90.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.91.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.73.

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

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.354	<.001
		Cramer's V	.354	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.715	<.001
		Cramer's V	.715	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.313	<.001
		Cramer's V	.313	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.569	<.001
		Cramer's V	.569	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.426	<.001
		Cramer's V	.426	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Accurate_understanding_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	2
			Expected Count	2.7	30.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%	6.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	39.7%	0.2%
		1.00	Count	47	872
			Expected Count	75.3	843.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	5.1%	94.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	60.3%	99.8%
	Total		Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	1.7	33.3

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.4%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	15	902
			Expected Count	44.3	872.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	1.6%	98.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.6%	99.6%
	Total		Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	4
			Expected Count	2.7	32.3
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	88.6%	11.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	42.5%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	42	874
			Expected Count	70.3	845.7
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	4.6%	95.4%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	57.5%	99.5%
	Total		Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31	2
			Expected Count	3.4	29.6
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	93.9%	6.1%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	31.3%	0.2%
		1.00	Count	68	851
			Expected Count	95.6	823.4

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	917
			Expected Count	917.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	35
			Expected Count	35.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.7%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.3%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	33
			Expected Count	33.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.5%
		1.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	7.4%	92.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	68.7%	99.8%
	Total		Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	124	12
			Expected Count	10.6	125.4
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	91.2%	8.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	41.9%	0.3%
		1.00	Count	172	3499
			Expected Count	285.4	3385.6
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	58.1%	99.7%
	Total		Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.5%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Accurate_understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	136
			Expected Count	136.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.6%
		1.00	Count	3671
			Expected Count	3671.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.4%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Accurate_understanding_Rogers	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	334.143[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	322.438	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	153.598	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	333.792	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	554.095[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	535.351	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	190.472	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	553.513	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	335.539[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	323.793	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	149.199	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	335.186	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	256.045[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	246.842	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	135.447	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	255.776	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1368.127[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	1356.092	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	610.597	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1367.768	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 10.57.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.70.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.69.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.69.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.43.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.592	<.001
		Cramer's V	.592	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.763	<.001
		Cramer's V	.763	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.594	<.001
		Cramer's V	.594	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.519	<.001
		Cramer's V	.519	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.599	<.001
		Cramer's V	.599	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali. .00
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	32
			Expected Count	32.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.4%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	31
			Expected Count	31.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.3%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	125
			Expected Count	125.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	919
			Expected Count	919.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	921
			Expected Count	921.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	3682
			Expected Count	3682.0

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0

Crosstab

response_source			Emotional_Vali. .00
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	3.3%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%
	Total	Count	125
		Expected Count	125.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	3.3%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Emotional_Vali.. 1.00
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	96.7%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%
	Total	Count	3682
		Expected Count	3682.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	96.7%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Total
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%
	Total	Count	3807
		Expected Count	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Emotional_Validation_Goff man	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	951
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	3807

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		952
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		951
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		3807

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a …

Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse. .00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	.00	Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	99.9%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	.00	Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	1	952
			Expected Count	1.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	1	952
			Expected Count	1.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	0.1%	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
	Total		Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		951
			Expected Count		951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
	Total		Count		951
			Expected Count		951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count		952
			Expected Count		952.0

Crosstab

response_source			Moral_Endorse. .00
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
	Total	Count	952
		Expected Count	952.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers .00	Count	3806
		Expected Count	3806.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%
	Total	Count	3806
		Expected Count	3806.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goff man	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Moral_Endorse... 1.00	Total
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
	Total	Count		952
		Expected Count		952.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers		100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman		100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers .00	Count	1	3807
		Expected Count	1.0	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	1	3807
		Expected Count	1.0	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases	951
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases	952
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	3807

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

b. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers and Moral_Endorsement_Goffman are constants.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases		951
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[b]
	N of Valid Cases		952
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		3807

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a …

b. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers and Moral_Endorsement_Goffman are constants.

Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang. .00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	164
			Expected Count	164.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	17.2%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	164
			Expected Count	164.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	17.2%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	54
			Expected Count	54.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	54
			Expected Count	54.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	34
			Expected Count	34.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	3.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	96
			Expected Count	96.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	788	952
			Expected Count	788.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	82.8%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	788	952
			Expected Count	788.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	82.8%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	898	952
			Expected Count	898.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	94.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	898	952
			Expected Count	898.0	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	94.3%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	917	951
			Expected Count	917.0	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	917	951
			Expected Count	917.0	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	96.4%	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	856	952
			Expected Count	856.0	952.0

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Lang. .00
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	10.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
	Total	Count	96
		Expected Count	96.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	10.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers .00	Count	348
		Expected Count	348.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	9.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
	Total	Count	348
		Expected Count	348.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_ Rogers	9.1%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Lang... 1.00	Total
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	89.9%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	856	952
		Expected Count	856.0	952.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	89.9%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers .00	Count	3459	3807
		Expected Count	3459.0	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	3459	3807
		Expected Count	3459.0	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	951
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	3807

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		952
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		951
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		3807

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a …

Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	951
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	3807

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		952
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		951
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		3807

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a …

Empathic_Understanding_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	.00	Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Total
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
	Total	Count	952
		Expected Count	952.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Empathic_Understanding_Rogers .00	Count	3807
		Expected Count	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
	Total	Count	3807
		Expected Count	3807.0
		% within Empathic_Understanding_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	951
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	952
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases	3807

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		952
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		951
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		952
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[a]
	N of Valid Cases		3807

a. No statistics are computed because Empathic_Understanding_Rogers is a …

Congruence_Rogers * Emotional_Validation_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	5
			Expected Count	1.2	34.8
			% within Congruence_Rogers	86.1%	13.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	0	916
			Expected Count	29.8	886.2
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	99.5%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	1.8	53.2
			% within Congruence_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	2.6%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.8%

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
		1.00	Count	0	897
			Expected Count	29.2	867.8
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	97.4%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	55
			Expected Count	2.9	83.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	36.0%	64.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	96.9%	6.0%
		1.00	Count	1	864
			Expected Count	29.1	835.9
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.1%	99.9%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	3.1%	94.0%
	Total		Count	32	919
			Expected Count	32.0	919.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.4%	96.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	20
			Expected Count	1.7	49.3
			% within Congruence_Rogers	60.8%	39.2%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	2.2%
		1.00	Count	0	901
			Expected Count	29.3	871.7

Crosstab

response_source				Total
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86
			Expected Count	86.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	9.0%
		1.00	Count	865
			Expected Count	865.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	91.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51
			Expected Count	51.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	5.4%
		1.00	Count	901
			Expected Count	901.0

Crosstab

response_source				Emotional_Validation_Goffman .00	Emotional_Validation_Goffman 1.00
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.0%	97.8%
	Total		Count	31	921
			Expected Count	31.0	921.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	124	104
			Expected Count	7.5	220.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	54.4%	45.6%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	99.2%	2.8%
		1.00	Count	1	3578
			Expected Count	117.5	3461.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.0%	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	0.8%	97.2%
	Total		Count	125	3682
			Expected Count	125.0	3682.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.3%	96.7%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.6%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228
			Expected Count	228.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3579
			Expected Count	3579.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	94.0%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Emotional_Validation_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	815.327[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	788.222	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	244.291	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	814.471	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	522.599[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	504.861	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	197.950	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	522.050	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	310.575[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	299.623	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	152.027	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	310.248	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	566.101[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	546.970	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	204.994	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	565.506	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1994.403[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	1977.323	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	767.237	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1993.879	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 7.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

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

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.79.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.89.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.66.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.925	<.001
		Cramer's V	.925	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.741	<.001
		Cramer's V	.741	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.571	<.001
		Cramer's V	.571	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.771	<.001
		Cramer's V	.771	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.724	<.001
		Cramer's V	.724	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Congruence_Rogers * Moral_Endorsement_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36	0
			Expected Count	36.0	.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.8%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	915	1
			Expected Count	915.0	1.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	99.9%	0.1%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.2%	100.0%
	Total		Count	951	1
			Expected Count	951.0	1.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	99.9%	0.1%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55	
			Expected Count	55.0	

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.8%	
		1.00	Count	897	
			Expected Count	897.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.2%	
	Total		Count	952	
			Expected Count	952.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86	
			Expected Count	86.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	9.0%	
		1.00	Count	865	
			Expected Count	865.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	91.0%	
	Total		Count	951	
			Expected Count	951.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51	
			Expected Count	51.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.4%	
		1.00	Count	901	
			Expected Count	901.0	

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.8%
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86
			Expected Count	86.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	9.0%
		1.00	Count	865
			Expected Count	865.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	91.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51
			Expected Count	51.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	5.4%
		1.00	Count	901
			Expected Count	901.0

Crosstab

response_source				Moral_Endorsement_Goffman .00	Moral_Endorsement_Goffman 1.00
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.6%	
	Total		Count	952	
			Expected Count	952.0	
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228	0
			Expected Count	227.9	.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	6.0%	0.0%
		1.00	Count	3578	1
			Expected Count	3578.1	.9
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	3806	1
			Expected Count	3806.0	1.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%	0.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.6%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228
			Expected Count	228.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3579
			Expected Count	3579.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	94.0%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Moral_Endorsement_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	.039[c]	1	.843	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.077	1	.781	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.039	1	.843	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	.[d]			
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.064[a]	1	.801	
	Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000	
	Likelihood Ratio	.124	1	.725	
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.064	1	.801	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Exact Sig. (1-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.962
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	
	N of Valid Cases	
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
	Continuity Correction[b]	
	Likelihood Ratio	
	Fisher's Exact Test	.940
	Linear-by-Linear Association	
	N of Valid Cases	

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

d. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.006	.843
		Cramer's V	.006	.843
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.[c]	
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.004	.801
		Cramer's V	.004	.801
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

c. No statistics are computed because Moral_Endorsement_Goffman is a constant.

Congruence_Rogers * Indirect_Language_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	32	4
			Expected Count	6.2	29.8
			% within Congruence_Rogers	88.9%	11.1%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	19.5%	0.5%
		1.00	Count	132	784
			Expected Count	157.8	758.2
			% within Congruence_Rogers	14.4%	85.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	80.5%	99.5%
	Total		Count	164	788
			Expected Count	164.0	788.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	17.2%	82.8%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	3.1	51.9
			% within Congruence_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	57.4%	2.7%
		1.00	Count	23	874
			Expected Count	50.9	846.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	2.6%	97.4%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	42.6%	97.3%
	Total		Count	54	898
			Expected Count	54.0	898.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	5.7%	94.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	55
			Expected Count	3.1	82.9

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.8%
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86
			Expected Count	86.0

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
			% within Congruence_Rogers	36.0%	64.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.2%	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3	862
			Expected Count	30.9	834.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	0.3%	99.7%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	8.8%	94.0%
	Total		Count	34	917
			Expected Count	34.0	917.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	3.6%	96.4%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	33	18
			Expected Count	5.1	45.9
			% within Congruence_Rogers	64.7%	35.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	34.4%	2.1%
		1.00	Count	63	838
			Expected Count	90.9	810.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	7.0%	93.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	65.6%	97.9%
	Total		Count	96	856
			Expected Count	96.0	856.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	10.1%	89.9%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	127	101
			Expected Count	20.8	207.2
			% within Congruence_Rogers	55.7%	44.3%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	36.5%	2.9%
		1.00	Count	221	3358
			Expected Count	327.2	3251.8

Crosstab

response_source				Total
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	9.0%
		1.00	Count	865
			Expected Count	865.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	91.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51
			Expected Count	51.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	5.4%
		1.00	Count	901
			Expected Count	901.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.6%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228
			Expected Count	228.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3579
			Expected Count	3579.0

Crosstab

response_source			Indirect_Language_Goffman .00	Indirect_Language_Goffman 1.00
		% within Congruence_Rogers	6.2%	93.8%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	63.5%	97.1%
	Total	Count	348	3459
		Expected Count	348.0	3459.0
		% within Congruence_Rogers	9.1%	90.9%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source			Total
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	94.0%
	Total	Count	3807
		Expected Count	3807.0
		% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
		% within Indirect_Language_Goffman	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

response_source		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
claude	Pearson Chi-Square	134.749[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	129.576	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	94.290	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	134.607	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	280.336[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	270.371	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	125.510	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	280.042	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	289.185[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	278.922	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	140.880	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	288.881	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	177.314[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	171.006	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	99.548	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	177.128	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	633.040[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	627.091	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	356.285	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	632.873	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 20.84.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.20.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.12.

e. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.07.

f. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.14.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.376	<.001
		Cramer's V	.376	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.543	<.001
		Cramer's V	.543	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.551	<.001
		Cramer's V	.551	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.432	<.001
		Cramer's V	.432	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.408	<.001
		Cramer's V	.408	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Congruence_Rogers * Indirect_Action_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	33	3
			Expected Count	7.5	28.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	91.7%	8.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	16.6%	0.4%
		1.00	Count	166	750
			Expected Count	191.5	724.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	18.1%	81.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	83.4%	99.6%
	Total		Count	199	753
			Expected Count	199.0	753.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	20.9%	79.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	3.0	52.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	59.6%	2.7%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.8%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
		1.00	Count	21	876
			Expected Count	49.0	848.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	2.3%	97.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	40.4%	97.3%
	Total		Count	52	900
			Expected Count	52.0	900.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	5.5%	94.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	38	48
			Expected Count	19.0	67.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	44.2%	55.8%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	18.1%	6.5%
		1.00	Count	172	693
			Expected Count	191.0	674.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	19.9%	80.1%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	81.9%	93.5%
	Total		Count	210	741
			Expected Count	210.0	741.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	22.1%	77.9%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	32	19
			Expected Count	4.5	46.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	62.7%	37.3%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	38.1%	2.2%
		1.00	Count	52	849
			Expected Count	79.5	821.5
			% within Congruence_Rogers	5.8%	94.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	61.9%	97.8%
	Total		Count	84	868
			Expected Count	84.0	868.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	8.8%	91.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86
			Expected Count	86.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	9.0%
		1.00	Count	865
			Expected Count	865.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	91.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51
			Expected Count	51.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	5.4%
		1.00	Count	901
			Expected Count	901.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.6%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Indirect_Action_Goffman .00	Indirect_Action_Goffman 1.00
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	134	94
			Expected Count	32.6	195.4
			% within Congruence_Rogers	58.8%	41.2%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	24.6%	2.9%
		1.00	Count	411	3168
			Expected Count	512.4	3066.6
			% within Congruence_Rogers	11.5%	88.5%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	75.4%	97.1%
	Total		Count	545	3262
			Expected Count	545.0	3262.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	14.3%	85.7%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228
			Expected Count	228.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3579
			Expected Count	3579.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Indirect_Action_Goffman	94.0%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	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	113.315[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	108.910	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	88.498	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	113.196	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	292.884[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	282.516	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	128.920	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	292.576	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	26.849[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	25.455	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	23.177	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	26.821	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	194.752[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	187.735	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	103.297	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	194.548	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	390.756[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	386.911	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	265.803	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	390.654	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 32.64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.53.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.00.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.99.

f. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.50.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.345	<.001
		Cramer's V	.345	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.555	<.001
		Cramer's V	.555	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.168	<.001
		Cramer's V	.168	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.452	<.001
		Cramer's V	.452	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.320	<.001
		Cramer's V	.320	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	

Congruence_Rogers * Accept_Framing_Goffman * response_source

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	5
			Expected Count	2.9	33.1
			% within Congruence_Rogers	86.1%	13.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	39.7%	0.6%
		1.00	Count	47	869
			Expected Count	75.1	840.9
			% within Congruence_Rogers	5.1%	94.9%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	60.3%	99.4%
	Total		Count	78	874
			Expected Count	78.0	874.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	8.2%	91.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	31	24
			Expected Count	2.7	52.3
			% within Congruence_Rogers	56.4%	43.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.4%	2.6%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
claude	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	36
			Expected Count	36.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	3.8%
		1.00	Count	916
			Expected Count	916.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	96.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-4o	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	55
			Expected Count	55.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.8%

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
		1.00	Count	15	882
			Expected Count	43.3	853.7
			% within Congruence_Rogers	1.7%	98.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.6%	97.4%
	Total		Count	46	906
			Expected Count	46.0	906.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	4.8%	95.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	32	54
			Expected Count	6.6	79.4
			% within Congruence_Rogers	37.2%	62.8%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	43.8%	6.2%
		1.00	Count	41	824
			Expected Count	66.4	798.6
			% within Congruence_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	56.2%	93.8%
	Total		Count	73	878
			Expected Count	73.0	878.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	7.7%	92.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	32	19
			Expected Count	5.3	45.7
			% within Congruence_Rogers	62.7%	37.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	32.3%	2.2%
		1.00	Count	67	834
			Expected Count	93.7	807.3
			% within Congruence_Rogers	7.4%	92.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	67.7%	97.8%
	Total		Count	99	853
			Expected Count	99.0	853.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	10.4%	89.6%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
		1.00	Count	897
			Expected Count	897.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.2%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
gpt-oss	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	86
			Expected Count	86.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	9.0%
		1.00	Count	865
			Expected Count	865.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	91.0%
	Total		Count	951
			Expected Count	951.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%
llama	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	51
			Expected Count	51.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	5.4%
		1.00	Count	901
			Expected Count	901.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.6%
	Total		Count	952
			Expected Count	952.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Accept_Framing_Goffman .00	Accept_Framing_Goffman 1.00
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	126	102
			Expected Count	17.7	210.3
			% within Congruence_Rogers	55.3%	44.7%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	42.6%	2.9%
		1.00	Count	170	3409
			Expected Count	278.3	3300.7
			% within Congruence_Rogers	4.7%	95.3%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	57.4%	97.1%
	Total		Count	296	3511
			Expected Count	296.0	3511.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	7.8%	92.2%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

response_source				Total
Total	Congruence_Rogers	.00	Count	228
			Expected Count	228.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	6.0%
		1.00	Count	3579
			Expected Count	3579.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	100.0%
			% within Accept_Framing_Goffman	94.0%
	Total		Count	3807
			Expected Count	3807.0
			% within Congruence_Rogers	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	301.985[c]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	291.315	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	139.991	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	301.668	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-4o	Pearson Chi-Square	337.089[d]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	325.300	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	140.663	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	336.735	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
gpt-oss	Pearson Chi-Square	116.366[e]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	111.830	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	71.451	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	116.244	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	951			
llama	Pearson Chi-Square	158.467[f]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	152.586	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	91.010	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	158.300	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	952			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	762.723[a]	1	<.001	
	Continuity Correction[b]	755.695	1	<.001	
	Likelihood Ratio	399.141	1	<.001	
	Fisher's Exact Test				<.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	762.523	1	<.001	
	N of Valid Cases	3807			

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	
Total	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 17.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.95.

d. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.66.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.60.

f. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.30.

Symmetric Measures

response_source			Value	Approximate Significance
claude	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.563	<.001
		Cramer's V	.563	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-4o	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.595	<.001
		Cramer's V	.595	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
gpt-oss	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.350	<.001
		Cramer's V	.350	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		951	
llama	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.408	<.001
		Cramer's V	.408	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		952	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.448	<.001
		Cramer's V	.448	<.001
	N of Valid Cases		3807	