

Group	Dyad	3 status Qs, out of 6pts			2 language Qs, out of 4pts			Why was this dyad chosen for first-round annotation?
		Fit	Contradict	Equal	Fit	Contradict	Equal	
1	HL	4**	0	2	2	0	2	High score for "Fit"
	HB	1	0	5**	1	1	2	H from this group displayed some behaviors indicating a high-status mindset
	BL	2	0	4**	1	0	3	Prioritizing complete triads; this group already had 2 dyads selected
2	HL	3	2	1	1	1	2	
3	HL	2	0	4**	1	0	3	
	HB	3	0	3	3	0	1	
	BL	0	0	6**	0	2	2	Only dyad in perfect agreement about being equal on the status Qs
4	HL	5**	0	1	2	0	2	Tied (with 10HL) for highest score for "Fit" on status Qs
5	HB	0	4**	2	0	0	4**	Most extreme contradiction of the predicted status relationship; this tracked with my impressions
6	BL	3	0	3	0	0	4**	
7	HB	0	1	4**	1	1	2	
8	HL	2	0	4**	1	0	3	
	HB	1	0	5**	1	0	3	
	BL	4**	0	2	1	0	3	
9	HL	2	0	4**	2	0	2	
10	HL	5**	0	1	2	0	2	HL tied (with 4HL) for highest "Fit" score on status Qs, and was the only top-scoring dyad to be part of a complete triad. Additionally, this group seemed to fit the prediction better than the other complete triads, overall.
	HB	2	1	3	2	0	2	
	BL	2	1	3	1	1	2	

Key

** Values greater than or equal to 4

Bold dyads: Selected for first-round annotation

H: Participant who was predicted to be of relatively highest status in their triad

B: Participant who was predicted to rank between the H and L participants in their triad


L: Participant was were predicted to be of relatively lowest status in their triad

Fit: How many times participant responses "fit" the relative status prediction


	Contradict: How many times participant responses "contradicted" the relative status prediction	
	Equal: How many times participants responded that they were equal	
	Notes to self:	
	- These calculations are in GSheet "Charts for Post-Chat Analysis";	
	Tab "Recreating Annotation Prioritization"	
	- Recreated from the original messy tables in Keynote "GRP Data & Dataplay"	
	- All rely on GSheet "Annotation/Analysis Notes"	

Group	Dyad	Group + Dyad	3 status Qs, out of 6pts			2 language Qs, out of 4pts			FPS discrepancy rate	(remove outlier)
			Fit	Contradict	Equal	Fit	Contradict	Equal		
3	HL	3HL	2	0	4	1	0	3	262%	
3	BL	3BL	0	0	6	0	2	2	64%	64%
4	HL	4HL	5	0	1	2	0	2	60%	60%
1	HL	1HL	4	0	2	2	0	2	54%	54%
10	HL	10HL	5	0	1	2	0	2	53%	53%
5	HB	5HB	0	4	2	0	0	4	48%	48%
1	BL	1BL	2	0	4	1	0	3	19%	19%
8	BL	8BL	4	0	2	1	0	3	11%	11%
8	HL	8HL	2	0	4	1	0	3	9%	9%
1	HB	1HB	1	0	5	1	1	2	5%	5%
8	HB	8HB	1	0	5	1	0	3	0%	0%
10	BL	10BL	2	1	3	1	1	2	0%	0%
10	HB	10HB	2	1	3	2	0	2	-6%	-6%
2	HL	2HL	3	2	1	1	1	2	-12%	-12%
3	HB	3HB	3	0	3	3	0	1	-13%	-13%
7	HB	7HB	0	1	4	1	1	2	-18%	-18%
6	BL	6BL	3	0	3	0	0	4	-19%	-19%
9	HL	9HL	2	0	4	2	0	2	-24%	-24%
Key										
Red numbers are values greater than or equal to 4										
Fit = How many times participant responses "fit" the relative status prediction										
Contradict = How many times participant responses "contradicted" the relative status prediction										
Equal = How many times participants responded that they were equal										
Note to self:										
- These calculations are in GSheet "Charts for Post-Chat Analysis";										
Tab "Recreating Annotation Prioritization"										
- Recreated from the original messy tables in Keynote "GRP Data & Dataplay"										
- All rely on GSheet "Annotation/Analysis Notes"										
- The Status fit score is not a viable variable, since it does not account for participant										


n = 18



n = 17 (outlier removed)




Histogram of Status fit score



3 status Qs, out of 6pts/Fit

Histogram of FPS discrepancy rate

(sans outlier)



FPS discrepancy rate

agreement.

--	--

[illegible]

[illegible]


[illegible]


	Total	# of participants who used	mean	median	min	max
IX_1	4320	36	120.0	113.5	44	245
%	87.6%	100%	87.6%	88.3%	74.3%	96.9%
POSS_1	537	36	14.9	12.5	2	55
%	10.9%	100%	10.9%	10.4%	1.9%	25.5%
SELF_1	49	20	1.4	1.0	0	6
%	1.0%	55.6%	0.9%	0	0%	4%
I	4	3	0.1	0	0	2
%	0.1%	8.3%	0.1%	0%	0%	2%
ONLY-SELF_1	15	6	0.4	0	0	7
%	0.3%	16.7%	0.3%	0%	0%	3%
THUMB_1	0	-	-	-	-	-
%	0	-	-	-	-	-
HONORIFIC_1	6	5	0.2	0	0	2
%	0.1%	13.9%	0.1%	0	0	0
Total: Main tab	4931		137.0	130.5	47	311
Total: SUM here	4931					
Match?	TRUE					

Group + Dyad	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	Role	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS (count)	FPS x-axis
3HL	3	HL	H	22	h	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	2
3HL	3	HL	L	23	l	1st	22	37		311	1
3BL	3	BL	B	30	h	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	2
3BL	3	BL	L	23	l	2nd	20	25		199	1
4HL	4	HL	H	8	h	1st	20	00	20.00	81	1.97
4HL	4	HL	L	4	l	1st	20	00		70	0.95
1HL	1	HL	H	13	h	1st	19	25	19.42	154	2
1HL	1	HL	L	39	l	1st	19	25		159	0.97
10HL	10	HL	H	3	h	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	1.98
10HL	10	HL	L	10	l	2nd	22	13		153	1
5HB	5	HB	H	31	h	1st	20	12	20.20	99	2
5HB	5	HB	B	36	l	1st	20	12		167	0.97
1BL	1	BL	B	20	h	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	2.05
1BL	1	BL	L	39	l	2nd	20	31		105	0.97
8BL	8	BL	B	29	h	1st	20	11	20.18	105	2.03
8BL	8	BL	L	18	l	1st	20	11		161	1.03
8HL	8	HL	H	19	h	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	1.95
8HL	8	HL	L	18	l	2nd	22	26		215	1
1HB	1	HB	H	13	h	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	1.97
1HB	1	HB	B	20	l	1st	20	11		73	1
8HB	8	HB	H	19	h	1st	20	9	20.15	230	2
8HB	8	HB	B	29	l	2nd	20	9		263	1
10BL	10	BL	B	14	h	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	2
10BL	10	BL	L	10	l	1st	18	50		135	1
10HB	10	HB	H	3	h	1st	20	11	20.18	131	2.03
10HB	10	HB	B	14	l	1st	20	11		100	0.97
2HL	2	HL	H	9	h	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	2.03
2HL	2	HL	L	32	l	2nd	20	24		101	1.03

Group + Dyad	FPS (count)	Raw FPS discrepancy	Raw FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns x-axis
3HL		264	5.62	524.987	8.75	2.03
3HL				938.941	15.65	1
3BL		126	1.73	485.467	8.09	2
3BL				806.213	13.44	1.03
4HL		-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	1.98
4HL				464.951	7.75	1
1HL		5	0.03	757.469	12.624	2
1HL				507.344	8.456	1
10HL		46	0.43	709.712	11.83	2.03
10HL				661.376	11.02	1
5HB		68	0.69	598.726	9.98	2
5HB				684.287	11.40	1
1BL		4	0.04	724.780	12.08	2
1BL				634.619	10.58	1
8BL		56	0.53	628.282	10.47	2
8BL				865.727	14.43	1.03
8HL		112	1.09	523.207	8.72	1.98
8HL				1000.509	16.68	1
1HB		-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	2
1HB				369.164	6.15	1
8HB		33	0.14	659.144	10.99	2
8HB				752.881	12.55	1
10BL		-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	1.98
10BL				557.396	9.29	1
10HB		-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	1.97
10HB				575.228	9.59	1
2HL		20	0.25	566.281	9.44	2.03
2HL				797.936	13.30	0.98

Group + Dyad	Turn time	Turns: h > l	Turns: % of chat	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepancy rate	FPS/min	FPS/min x-axis
3HL		-6.90	0.39	1.08	0.79	5.37	1.98
3HL		-6.90	0.69			19.87	1
3BL		-5.35	0.40	1.05	0.66	9.02	1.98
3BL		-5.35	0.66			14.81	1.05
4HL		6.61	0.72	1.11	-0.46	5.64	2.03
4HL		6.61	0.39			9.03	1.03
1HL		4.17	0.65	1.09	-0.33	12.20	1.98
1HL		4.17	0.44			18.80	1
10HL		0.81	0.53	1.03	-0.07	9.05	2.03
10HL		0.81	0.50			13.88	1
5HB		-1.43	0.49	1.06	0.14	9.92	1.95
5HB		-1.43	0.56			14.64	1
1BL		1.50	0.59	1.10	-0.12	8.36	1.98
1BL		1.50	0.52			9.93	1
8BL		-3.96	0.52	1.23	0.38	10.03	2
8BL		-3.96	0.71			11.16	1
8HL		-7.96	0.39	1.13	0.91	11.81	2
8HL		-7.96	0.74			12.89	1
1HB		9.46	0.77	1.08	-0.61	11.27	1.98
1HB		9.46	0.30			11.86	1.03
8HB		-1.56	0.55	1.17	0.14	20.94	2
8HB		-1.56	0.62			20.96	1
10BL		0.27	0.51	1.00	-0.03	14.54	2.03
10BL		0.27	0.49			14.53	0.95
10HB		2.22	0.59	1.06	-0.19	11.09	2.03
10HB		2.22	0.48			10.43	1.03
2HL		-3.86	0.46	1.11	0.41	8.58	2.03
2HL		-3.86	0.65			7.59	1





[illegible]

Group + Dyad	FPS (count)		Raw FPS discrepancy	Raw FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns x-axis
3HB	LowRoleHighRole		-44	-0.34	784.533	13.08	2.03
3HB				595.950	9.93	1	
7HB			-19	-0.10	784.655	13.08	1.97
7HB				855.547	14.26	0.98	
6BL	350		-64	-0.38	796.313	13.27	2
6BL				612.226	10.20	1	
9HL			-107	-0.60	867.538	14.46	2.03
9HL				448.727	7.48	1	
	300		V	V		V	
			19.50	0.45	mean	11.40	
	250		4.50	0.04	median	11.21	
			371	6.22	range	10.52	
			-107	-0.60	min	6.15	
			264	5.62	max	16.68	
	200		88.19	1.42	sd	2.58	
	150						
	100						
	50						

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]


Group + Dyad	FPS (count)	Raw FPS discrepan cy	Raw FPS discrepan cy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns x-axis


Group + Dyad	Turn time	Turns: h > l	Turns: % of chat	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepa ncy rate	FPS/min	FPS/ min x- axis

Group + Dyad	FPS/min

Group + Dyad	

Group + Dyad	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	Role	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min	Chat length: in min	FPS (count)	Raw FPS discrepancy	Raw FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > l	Turns: % of chat
1HL	1	HL	H	13	h	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	1	HL	L	39	l	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46	4.17	0.44
1HB	1	HB	H	13	h	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	1	HB	B	20	l	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15	9.46	0.30
1BL	1	BL	B	20	h	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	1	BL	L	39	l	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58	1.50	0.52
3HL	3	HL	H	22	h	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	3	HL	L	23	l	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65	-6.90	0.69
3HB	3	HB	H	22	h	1st	20	33	20.55	130	-44	-0.34	784.533	13.08	3.14	0.64
3HB	3	HB	B	30	l	1st	20	33		86			595.950	9.93	3.14	0.48
3BL	3	BL	B	30	h	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	3	BL	L	23	l	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44	-5.35	0.66
8HL	8	HL	H	19	h	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	8	HL	L	18	l	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68	-7.96	0.74
8HB	8	HB	H	19	h	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	8	HB	B	29	l	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55	-1.56	0.62
8BL	8	BL	B	29	h	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	8	BL	L	18	l	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43	-3.96	0.71
10HL	10	HL	H	3	h	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	10	HL	L	10	l	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02	0.81	0.50
10HB	10	HB	H	3	h	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	10	HB	B	14	l	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59	2.22	0.48
10BL	10	BL	B	14	h	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	10	BL	L	10	l	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29	0.27	0.49
										V	V	V		V		
									mean	149	62.00	0.99	mean	11.44		
									median	131	51.00	0.48	median	11.42		
									range	264	308	5.96	range	8.58		
									min	47	-44	-0.34	min	8.09		





Group + Dyad	(buffer for chart)
1HL	
1HL	
1HB	
1HB	
1BL	
1BL	
3HL	
3HL	
3HB	
3HB	
3BL	
3BL	
8HL	
8HL	
8HB	
8HB	
8BL	
8BL	
10HL	
10HL	
10HB	
10HB	
10BL	
10BL	

Group + Dyad	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	Role	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min	Chat length: in min	FPS (count)	Raw FPS discrepan cy	Raw FPS discrepan cy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > l	Turns: % of chat
									max	311	264	5.62	max	16.68		
									sd	74	98.47	1.94	sd	2.50		

Group + Dyad	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepa ncy rate	FPS/min	x-axis: all triads	4 Triads	x-axis	FPS/min: Triad 1
		max	20.96				
		sd	4.58				

Group + Dyad	Triad 1	x-axis	FPS/min: Triad 3

Group + Dyad	Triad 3	x-axis	FPS/min: Triad 8

Group + Dyad	Triad 8	x-axis	FPS/min: Triad 10

Group + Dyad	Triad 10


Group + Dyad	(buffer for chart)






	Turns: sec		FPS (count)		Turns (minutes)		Turns (%)		FPS/min		FPS/min: Round 1 annotation only	
Group + Dyad	Low Role	High Role	LowRole	HighRole	LowRole	HighRole	LowRole	HighRole	LowRole	HighRole	LowRole	HighRole
3HL	938.941	524.987	311	47	15.65	8.75	44%	65%	19.87	5.37		
3BL	806.213	485.467	199	73	13.44	8.09	30%	77%	14.81	9.02	14.81	9.02
4HL	464.951	861.830	70	81	7.75	14.36	52%	59%	9.03	5.64	9.03	5.64
1HL	507.344	757.469	159	154	8.46	12.62	65%	46%	18.80	12.20	18.80	12.20
10HL	661.376	709.712	153	107	11.02	11.83	69%	39%	13.88	9.05	13.88	9.05
5HB	684.287	598.726	167	99	11.40	9.98	48%	64%	14.64	9.92	14.64	9.92
1BL	634.619	724.780	105	101	10.58	12.08	66%	40%	9.93	8.36	9.93	8.36
8BL	865.727	628.282	161	105	14.43	10.47	39%	72%	11.16	10.03		
8HL	1000.509	523.207	215	103	16.68	8.72	56%	49%	12.89	11.81		
1HB	369.164	936.724	73	176	6.15	15.61	50%	64%	11.86	11.27	11.86	11.27
8HB	752.881	659.144	263	230	12.55	10.99	63%	58%	20.96	20.94		
10BL	557.396	573.727	135	139	9.29	9.56	74%	39%	14.53	14.54	14.53	14.54
10HB	575.228	708.625	100	131	9.59	11.81	62%	55%	10.43	11.09	10.43	11.09
2HL	797.936	566.281	101	81	13.30	9.44	71%	52%	7.59	8.58		
3HB	595.950	784.533	86	130	9.93	13.08	38%	73%	8.66	9.94		
7HB	855.547	784.655	168	187	14.26	13.08	50%	53%	11.78	14.30		
6BL	612.226	796.313	105	169	10.20	13.27	48%	59%	10.29	12.73		
9HL	448.727	867.538	70	177	7.48	14.46	49%	51%	9.36	12.24		
			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
		mean	147	127	11.23	11.57	0.54	0.56	12.81	10.95	13.10	10.12
		median	144	119	10.80	11.82	0.51	0.56	11.82	10.56	13.88	9.92
		range	241	183	10.52	7.52	0.44	0.39	13.36	15.56	9.77	8.90
		min	70	47	6.15	8.09	0.30	0.39	7.59	5.37	9.03	5.64
		max	311	230	16.68	15.61	0.74	0.77	20.96	20.94	18.80	14.54
		sd	68	47	2.96	2.20	0.13	0.12	3.91	3.54	3.08	2.54
Tests below run on StatsKingdom.com using default parameters (e.g., α : 0.05, digits: 4)											Hypothetical for	

[illegible]


	Turns: sec		FPS (count)			Turns (min)			Turns (%)				
Group + Dyad	Low Role	High Role	LowRole	HighRole	Simple difference	LowRole	HighRole	Simple difference	LowRole	HighRole	Total	Simple difference	
1HL	507.344	757.469	159	154	5	8.46	12.62	-4.17	44%	65%	109%	-21%	
1HB	369.164	936.724	73	176	-103	6.15	15.61	-9.46	30%	77%	108%	-47%	
1BL	634.619	724.780	105	101	4	10.58	12.08	-1.50	52%	59%	110%	-7%	
2HL	797.936	566.281	101	81	20	13.30	9.44	3.86	65%	46%	111%	19%	
3HL	938.941	524.987	311	47	264	15.65	8.75	6.90	69%	39%	108%	31%	
3HB	595.950	784.533	86	130	-44	9.93	13.08	-3.14	48%	64%	112%	-15%	
3BL	806.213	485.467	199	73	126	13.44	8.09	5.35	66%	40%	105%	26%	
4HL	464.951	861.830	70	81	-11	7.75	14.36	-6.61	39%	72%	111%	-33%	
5HB	684.287	598.726	167	99	68	11.40	9.98	1.43	56%	49%	106%	7%	
6BL	612.226	796.313	105	169	-64	10.20	13.27	-3.07	50%	64%	114%	-15%	
7HB	855.547	784.655	168	187	-19	14.26	13.08	1.18	63%	58%	120%	5%	
8HL	1000.509	523.207	215	103	112	16.68	8.72	7.96	74%	39%	113%	35%	
8HB	752.881	659.144	263	230	33	12.55	10.99	1.56	62%	55%	117%	8%	
8BL	865.727	628.282	161	105	56	14.43	10.47	3.96	71%	52%	123%	20%	
9HL	448.727	867.538	70	177	-107	7.48	14.46	-6.98	38%	73%	111%	-35%	
10HL	661.376	709.712	153	107	46	11.02	11.83	-0.81	50%	53%	103%	-4%	
10HB	575.228	708.625	100	131	-31	9.59	11.81	-2.22	48%	59%	106%	-11%	
10BL	557.396	573.727	135	139	-4	9.29	9.56	-0.27	49%	51%	100%	-1%	
		mean	147	127	20	11.23	11.57	-0.34	54%	56%	110%	-2%	
		median	144	119	5	10.80	11.82	-0.54	51%	56%	110%	-3%	
		range	241	183	371	10.52	7.52	17.41	44%	39%	23%	82%	
		min	70	47	-107	6.15	8.09	-9.46	30%	39%	100%	-47%	
		max	311	230	264	16.68	15.61	7.96	74%	77%	123%	35%	
		sd	68	47	88	2.96	2.20	4.85	13%	12%	6%	23%	
	FPS (count) HighRole					Turns (min) HighRole					Turns (%) HighRole		
	8 <div></div>					8 <div></div>					5 <div></div>		

	FPS/min						
Group + Dyad	LowRole	HighRole	Simple difference	LowRole vs. HighRole	HighRole vs. LowRole	Diff/ Sum	Diff/ Mean
1HL	18.80	12.20	6.61	54%	-35%	21%	43%
1HB	11.86	11.27	0.59	5%	-5%	3%	5%
1BL	9.93	8.36	1.57	19%	-16%	9%	17%
2HL	7.59	8.58	-0.99	-12%	13%	-6%	-12%
3HL	19.87	5.37	14.50	270%	-73%	57%	115%
3HB	8.66	9.94	-1.28	-13%	15%	-7%	-14%
3BL	14.81	9.02	5.79	64%	-39%	24%	49%
4HL	9.03	5.64	3.39	60%	-38%	23%	46%
5HB	14.64	9.92	4.72	48%	-32%	19%	38%
6BL	10.29	12.73	-2.44	-19%	24%	-11%	-21%
7HB	11.78	14.30	-2.52	-18%	21%	-10%	-19%
8HL	12.89	11.81	1.08	9%	-8%	4%	9%
8HB	20.96	20.94	0.02	0%	0%	0%	0%
8BL	11.16	10.03	1.13	11%	-10%	5%	11%
9HL	9.36	12.24	-2.88	-24%	31%	-13%	-27%
10HL	13.88	9.05	4.83	53%	-35%	21%	42%
10HB	10.43	11.09	-0.66	-6%	6%	-3%	-6%
10BL	14.53	14.54	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%
	12.81	10.95	1.86	28%	-10%	8%	15%
	11.82	10.56	0.84	7%	-7%	3%	7%
	13.36	15.56	17.38	294%	104%	71%	142%
	7.59	5.37	-2.88	-24%	-73%	-13%	-27%
	20.96	20.94	14.50	270%	31%	57%	115%
	3.91	3.54	4.28	67%	27%	18%	35%
				FPS/min HighRole			
				12			



Group + Dyad	FPS/min						
	LowRole	HighRole	Simple difference	LowRole vs. HighRole	HighRole vs. LowRole	Diff/ Sum	Diff/ Mean
							
							
							


Group + Dyad	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	Role	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS	FPS discrepancy: Raw	FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > 1	Turns: % of chat
3HL	3	HL	H	22	h	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	3	HL	L	23	l	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65		0.69
3BL	3	BL	B	30	h	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	3	BL	L	23	l	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44		0.66
4HL	4	HL	H	8	h	1st	20	00	20.00	81	-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	6.61	0.72
4HL	4	HL	L	4	l	1st	20	00		70			464.951	7.75		0.39
1HL	1	HL	H	13	h	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	1	HL	L	39	l	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46		0.44
10HL	10	HL	H	3	h	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	10	HL	L	10	l	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02		0.50
5HB	5	HB	H	31	h	1st	20	12	20.20	99	68	0.69	598.726	9.98	-1.43	0.49
5HB	5	HB	B	36	l	1st	20	12		167			684.287	11.40		0.56
1BL	1	BL	B	20	h	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	1	BL	L	39	l	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58		0.52
8BL	8	BL	B	29	h	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	8	BL	L	18	l	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43		0.71
8HL	8	HL	H	19	h	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	8	HL	L	18	l	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68		0.74
1HB	1	HB	H	13	h	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	1	HB	B	20	l	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15		0.30
8HB	8	HB	H	19	h	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	8	HB	B	29	l	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55		0.62
10BL	10	BL	B	14	h	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	10	BL	L	10	l	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29		0.49
10HB	10	HB	H	3	h	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	10	HB	B	14	l	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59		0.48
2HL	2	HL	H	9	h	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	20	0.25	566.281	9.44	-3.86	0.46



	L vs. H							
Group + Dyad	FPS/min Discrepancy (L vs. H)	x-axis (L vs. H)	Rank (L vs. H)	Data Viz (L vs. H)	FPS/min Discrepancy (H vs. L)	x-axis (H vs. L)	Rank (H vs. L)	
3HL	270%	0.00	1	<div>Dyad-level FPS/minute discrepancies: LowRole vs. HighRole</div>	-73%	0.00	18	
3HL								
3BL	64%	0.00	2			-39%	-0.01	17
3BL								
4HL	60%	0.00	3			-38%	0.01	16
4HL								
1HL	54%	-0.01	4			-35%	-0.01	15
1HL								
10HL	53%	0.01	5			-35%	0.01	14
10HL								
5HB	48%	0.00	6			-32%	0.00	13
5HB								
1BL	19%	0.00	7			-16%	0.00	12
1BL								
8BL	11%	0.00	8			-10%	0.00	11
8BL								
8HL	9%	0.00	9			-8%	0.00	10
8HL								
1HB	5%	0.00	10			-5%	0.00	9
1HB								
8HB	0%	-0.01	11			0%	-0.01	8
8HB								
10BL	0%	0.01	12			0%	0.01	7
10BL								
10HB	-6%	0.00	13			6%	0.00	6
10HB								
2HL	-12%	-0.01	14			13%	0.00	5

	H vs. L	Symmetrized Perc		
Group + Dyad	Data Viz (H vs. L)	FPS/min Discrepancy (diff/sum)	x-axis (diff/sum)	Rank (diff/sum)
3HL	Dyad-level FPS/minute discrepancies: HighRole vs. LowRole 	57%	1	1
3HL				
3BL		24%	1.01	2
3BL				
4HL		23%	0.99	3
4HL				
1HL		21%	1.02	4
1HL				
10HL		21%	0.98	5
10HL				
5HB		19%	1	6
5HB				
1BL		9%	1	7
1BL				
8BL		5%	0.99	8
8BL				
8HL		4%	1.02	9
8HL				
1HB		3%	1	10
1HB				
8HB		0%	1.01	11
8HB				
10BL		0%	0.98	12
10BL				
10HB		-3%	1	13
10HB				
2HL		-6%	1.01	14

Percent Difference (SPD) from Berry & Ayers (2006) - diff/sum		Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD); difference/sum		
Group + Dyad	Data Viz (diff/sum)	FPS/min Discrepancy (diff/mean)	x-axis (diff/mean)	Rank (diff/mean)
3HL	<div> <div>FPS/minute discrepancies: Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD); difference/sum</div> </div>	115%	1	1
3HL				
3BL		49%	1.01	2
3BL				
4HL		46%	0.99	3
4HL				
1HL		43%	1.02	4
1HL				
10HL		42%	0.98	5
10HL				
5HB		38%	1	6
5HB				
1BL		17%	1	7
1BL				
8BL		11%	0.99	8
8BL				
8HL		9%	1.02	9
8HL				
1HB		5%	1	10
1HB				
8HB		0%	1.01	11
8HB				
10BL		0%	0.98	12
10BL				
10HB		-6%	1	13
10HB				
2HL		-12%	1.01	14



[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]


[illegible]

[illegible]

Calculation	Dyad	FPS/min Discrepancy	FPS/min Discrepancy, with H vs. L adjusted/flipped	x-axis from other sheet	adjustment	x-axis, adjusted by group	
L vs. H	3HL	270%	270%	0.00	0	0.00	Correlation (same) FPS/min discrepancies
	3BL	64%	64%	0.00	0	0.00	
	4HL	60%	60%	0.00	0	0.00	
	1HL	54%	54%	-0.04	0	-0.04	
	10HL	53%	53%	0.04	0	0.04	
	5HB	48%	48%	0.00	0	0.00	
	1BL	19%	19%	0.00	0	0.00	
	8BL	11%	11%	0.02	0	0.02	
	8HL	9%	9%	-0.02	0	-0.02	
	1HB	5%	5%	0.00	0	0.00	
	8HB	0%	0%	-0.04	0	-0.04	
	10BL	0%	0%	0.04	0	0.04	
	10HB	-6%	-6%	0.00	0	0.00	
	2HL	-12%	-12%	-0.04	0	-0.04	
	3HB	-13%	-13%	0.04	0	0.04	
	7HB	-18%	-18%	-0.04	0	-0.04	
	6BL	-19%	-19%	0.04	0	0.04	
	9HL	-24%	-24%	0.00	0	0.00	
H vs. L	3HL	-73%	73%	0.00	1	1.00	
	3BL	-39%	39%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	4HL	-38%	38%	0.04	1	1.04	
	1HL	-35%	35%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	10HL	-35%	35%	0.06	1	1.06	
	5HB	-32%	32%	0.00	1	1.00	
	1BL	-16%	16%	0.00	1	1.00	
	8BL	-10%	10%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	8HL	-8%	8%	0.04	1	1.04	
	1HB	-5%	5%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	8HB	0%	0%	-0.04	1	0.96	

Need to add L vs. H 262% outlier!!	POINT: The choice of formula influences the intuitive interpretation of the data...seeing all of them allows for an underlying pattern							
▲主介 2								

Comparing results of 4 different discrepancy formulas
(is *LvH* outlier at 270%)



to be gleaned

	10BL	0%	0%	0.04	1	1.04	
	10HB	6%	-6%	0.00	1	1.00	
	2HL	13%	-13%	0.04	1	1.04	
	3HB	15%	-15%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	7HB	21%	-21%	0.04	1	1.04	
	6BL	24%	-24%	-0.04	1	0.96	
	9HL	31%	-31%	0.00	1	1.00	
Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD) from Berry & Ayers (2006) <i>diff/sum</i>	3HL	57%	57%	1	1	2	
	3BL	24%	24%	1.04	1	2.04	
	4HL	23%	23%	0.96	1	1.96	
	1HL	21%	21%	1.06	1	2.06	
	10HL	21%	21%	0.93	1	1.93	
	5HB	19%	19%	1	1	2	
	1BL	9%	9%	1	1	2	
	8BL	5%	5%	0.96	1	1.96	
	8HL	4%	4%	1.07	1	2.07	
	1HB	3%	3%	1	1	2	
	8HB	0%	0%	1.07	1	2.07	
	10BL	0%	0%	0.94	1	1.94	
	10HB	-3%	-3%	1	1	2	
	2HL	-6%	-6%	1.04	1	2.04	
	3HB	-7%	-7%	0.96	1	1.96	
	7HB	-10%	-10%	1.04	1	2.04	
	6BL	-11%	-11%	0.95	1	1.95	
	9HL	-13%	-13%	1	1	2	
	3HL	115%	115%	1	2	3	
	3BL	49%	49%	1.04	2	3.04	
	4HL	46%	46%	0.96	2	2.96	
	1HL	43%	43%	1.04	2	3.04	
	10HL	42%	42%	0.96	2	2.96	
	5HB	38%	38%	1	2	3	

Com
(sans

epancies

-75%

LoRo v HiRo HiRo v LoRo diff/sum diff/mean

Comparing results of 4 different discrepancy formulas

(; *LvH outlier at 270%*)


125%

75%




Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD) from Cole & Altman (2017a) <i>diff/mean</i>	1BL	17%	17%	1	2	3	
	8BL	11%	11%	0.96	2	2.96	
	8HL	9%	9%	1.04	2	3.04	
	1HB	5%	5%	1	2	3	
	8HB	0%	0%	1.04	2	3.04	
	10BL	0%	0%	0.96	2	2.96	
	10HB	-6%	-6%	1	2	3	
	2HL	-12%	-12%	1.04	2	3.04	
	3HB	-14%	-14%	0.96	2	2.96	
	7HB	-19%	-19%	1.04	2	3.04	
	6BL	-21%	-21%	0.96	2	2.96	
	9HL	-27%	-27%	1	2	3	


FPS/min discr



--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Calculation	Dyad	FPS/min Discrepancy	x-axis from other sheet	adjustment	x-axis, adjusted by group			
Round 1 only Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD) from Berry & Ayers (2006) <i>diff/sum</i>								
	3BL	49%	1.04	0	1.04			
	4HL	46%	0.96	0	0.96			
	1HL	43%	1.04	0	1.04			
	10HL	42%	0.96	0	0.96			
	5HB	38%	1	0	1			
	1BL	17%	1	0	1			
	1HB	5%	1	0	1			
	10BL	0%	1	0	1			
	10HB	-6%	1	0	1			
Complete data set Symmetrized Percent Difference (SPD) from Cole & Altman (2017a)	3HL	115%	1	1	2			
	3BL	49%	1.04	1	2.04			
	4HL	46%	0.96	1	1.96			
	1HL	43%	1.04	1	2.04			
	10HL	42%	0.96	1	1.96			
	5HB	38%	1	1	2			
	1BL	17%	1	1	2			
	8BL	11%	0.96	1	1.96			
	8HL	9%	1.04	1	2.04			
	1HB	5%	1	1	2			
	8HB	0%	1.04	1	2.04			
	10BL	0%	0.96	1	1.96			





diff/mean	10HB	-6%	1	1	2	<div>-60% <div>Round 1</div></div>		
	2HL	-12%	1.04	1	2.04			
	3HB	-14%	0.96	1	1.96			
	7HB	-19%	1.04	1	2.04			
	6BL	-21%	0.96	1	1.96			
	9HL	-27%	1	1	2			

complete data set

Understanding Self-Report Scores			Understanding Self-Rep	
With status understood as zero-sum and measured on a 7-point Likert scale			With status understood as zero-sum and meas Self lower (1), Both equal (2), Se	
P1's self-report	P1 says P2 is	Implied dominance discrepancy	P1's self-report	P1 says P2 is
1	7	-6	1	3
2	6	-4	2	2
3	5	-2	3	1
4	4	0		
5	3	2		
6	2	4		
7	1	6		
P2's self-report	P2 says P1 is	Implied dominance discrepancy	P2's self-report	P2 says P1 is
1	7	6	1	3
2	6	4	2	2
3	5	2	3	1
4	4	0		
5	3	-2		
6	2	-4		
7	1	-6		
Converting 7-point Scores				
<i>These rounded values are for explanation purposes only. The scores are multiplied by (3/7) in the calculations</i>				
Self-reported score	conversion factor	Converted score for calculations		
1	3/7	0.4285714		
2	3/7	0.8571429		
3	3/7	1.2857143		
4	3/7	1.7142857		
5	3/7	2.1428571		
6	3/7	2.5714286		

Port Scores

asured on a **3-point** scale:

If higher (3)

Implied dominance discrepancy

-2

0

2

Implied dominance discrepancy

2

0

-2

7	3/7	3.0000000		
---	-----	-----------	--	--

Understanding Agreements

Colors are used here to visually connect the dyads between the charts; Shapes and

As an example, look at the top chart, specifically the row for Agreeer

The corresponding hypothetical dyad can be seen in the bottom chart, in the row with the

Hypothetical score combinations

For each possible total (2-14), possible combinations are shown as pairs of same-color symbols (i.e., #, X, &, @)

Likert Score >>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7								
Agreement score															
14							XX								
13						X	X	<< How to read: One person reported 6 and the other reported 6							
12					#	XX	#								
11				#	X	X	#								
10			&	#	XX	#	&								
9		&	#	X	X	#	&	<< Reasonable agreement = 9							
8	@	&	#	XX	#	&	@	<< Ideal agreement = 8							
7	&	#	X	X	#	&		<< Reasonable agreement = 9							
6	&	#	XX	#	&										
5	#	X	X	#				<< How to read (green Xs): One person reported 1 and the other reported 1							
4	#	XX	#												
3	X	X													
2	XX														

Interpreting the

					Is the status variable reliable?	Agreement score	A says			B says		
							A =	B =	dom dif	A =	B =	dom dif
						11 is unacceptable, so not charting the more extreme scores (12-14)						
					unacceptable	11	5	3	2	2	6	-4
						11	4	4	0	1	7	-6
					no	10	5	3	2	3	5	-2
						10	4	4	0	2	6	-4

t: 7-point Scale (ASL data)

d/or labels also distinguish differences even when colors are unavailable to the viewer

nent scores of 8. The two blue &s indicate Likert scores of 2 and 6.

e blue 8 in the "Ideal" section, along with the interpretation of the reported 2 and 6 scores

ted 7	Of the 5 questions used in my conceptual replication of Study 3, there is only one 7-point question, and it is only used in the 2Q paradigm: <i>"How much control did you have in the conversation?"</i>
	As such, for the 2Q paradigm, scores from the 7-point question are included after being multiplied by (3/7), so that the two questions are evenly weighted. This preserves the slightly more precise distinctions gathered from this question without giving it additional weight.
re explained in the elow	However, this not meant to imply that any of the questions used are somehow inherently equal in weight, practically speaking.
other reported 4	

e Likert scores and agreement scores

Degree to which they disagree	Narrative: What's going on here?
6	Disgree who is higher, and to what degree // A thinks themself a bit higher; B thinks themself even higher
6	Equal vs extreme dif // A thinks they're equal; B thinks themself highest possible
4	They both think themselves a bit higher than the other
4	A thinks they're equal; B thinks themself significantly higher

[illegible]

4	Agree who is higher, but to diff degrees // A thinks themself a bit lower, so B a bit higher; B thinks themself highest possible
2	A thinks they're equal; B thinks themself a bit higher
2	They agree who is higher, but B sees it as a bit bigger diff than A does
2	They agree who is higher, but B sees it as a bit bigger diff than A does
0	Agree that they're equal
0	Agree who is higher and to what degree
0	
0	
-2	Same as 9s, but flip A and B
-2	
-2	
-4	Same as 10s, but flip A and B
-4	
-4	
-6	Same as 11s, but flip A and B
-6	

Understanding Agreement: 3-point Scale (ASL)

Colors are used here to visually connect the dyads between the charts

As an example, look at the top chart, specifically the row for Agreement scores of 4. The **two green #s** in

The corresponding hypothetical dyad can be seen in the bottom chart, in the row with the **green 4** in the "Ideal" section, along

Hypothetical score combinations

For each possible total (2-6), possible combinations are shown as pairs of same-color symbols (i.e., #, X, &)

Likert Score >>	1	2	3
Agreement score			
6			XX
5		&	&
4	#	XX	#
3	&	&	
2	XX		

<< Reasonable agreement = 5

<< Ideal agreement = 4

<< Reasonable agreement = 3

These designations are explained
in the chart below

Interpreting the Likert scores and agreement sc

This 3-point scale is less precise than the 7-point scale, making it the less desirable choice.

Unfortunately, I did not realize this until after the data had been collected.

Is the status variable reliable?	Agreement score	A says			B says		
		A =	B =	dom dif	A =	B =	dom dif
unacceptable	6	3	1	2	1	3	-2
reasonable	5	2	2	0	1	3	-2
ideal	4	2	2	0	2	2	0
	4	1	3	-2	1	3	-2
reasonable	3	1	3	-2	2	2	0
unacceptable	2	1	3	-2	3	1	2

data)

ndicate Likert scores of 1 and 3.

with the interpretation of the reported 1 and 3 scores

rores

Degree to which they disagree	Narrative: What's going on here?
4	They contradict one another; they both think they are higher
2	No direct contradiction
0	Agree they are equal
0	Agree who is higher
-2	No direct contradiction
-4	They contradict one another; they both think they are lower

Group + Dyad	Role	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS	FPS discrepancy: Raw	FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > 1	Turns: % of chat
3HL	h	3	HL	H	22	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	l	3	HL	L	23	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65	-6.90	0.69
3BL	h	3	BL	B	30	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	l	3	BL	L	23	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44	-5.35	0.66
4HL	h	4	HL	H	8	1st	20	00	20.00	81	-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	6.61	0.72
4HL	l	4	HL	L	4	1st	20	00		70			464.951	7.75	6.61	0.39
1HL	h	1	HL	H	13	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	l	1	HL	L	39	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46	4.17	0.44
10HL	h	10	HL	H	3	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	l	10	HL	L	10	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02	0.81	0.50
5HB	h	5	HB	H	31	1st	20	12	20.20	99	68	0.69	598.726	9.98	-1.43	0.49
5HB	l	5	HB	B	36	1st	20	12		167			684.287	11.40	-1.43	0.56
1BL	h	1	BL	B	20	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	l	1	BL	L	39	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58	1.50	0.52
8BL	h	8	BL	B	29	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	l	8	BL	L	18	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43	-3.96	0.71
8HL	h	8	HL	H	19	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	l	8	HL	L	18	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68	-7.96	0.74
1HB	h	1	HB	H	13	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	l	1	HB	B	20	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15	9.46	0.30
8HB	h	8	HB	H	19	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	l	8	HB	B	29	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55	-1.56	0.62
10BL	h	10	BL	B	14	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	l	10	BL	L	10	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29	0.27	0.49
10HB	h	10	HB	H	3	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	l	10	HB	B	14	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59	2.22	0.48
2HL	h	2	HL	H	9	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	20	0.25	566.281	9.44	-3.86	0.46

Group + Dyad	Role	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepancy rate	FPS/min	FPS/min Discrepancy: Raw	FPS/min Discrepancy: rate	Question: Control				Question
							"How much control did you have in the conversation?" 1-7	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 7-9)	Control Q scores (weighted to a 3-pt scale)	
3HL	h	1.08	0.79	5.37	14.50	2.70	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
3HL	l		0.79	19.87			4			1.71	We had equal status
3BL	h	1.05	0.66	9.02	5.79	0.64	5	9	9	2.14	We had equal status
3BL	l		0.66	14.81			4			1.71	We had equal status
4HL	h	1.11	-0.46	5.64	3.39	0.60	6	9	9	2.57	We had equal status
4HL	l		-0.46	9.03			3			1.29	My partner
1HL	h	1.09	-0.33	12.20	6.61	0.54	6	10	disagreed	disagreed	Me
1HL	l		-0.33	18.80			4				We had equal status
10HL	h	1.03	-0.07	9.05	4.83	0.53	3	7	7	1.29	We had equal status
10HL	l		-0.07	13.88			4			1.71	My partner
5HB	h	1.06	0.14	9.92	4.72	0.48	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
5HB	l		0.14	14.64			4			1.71	We had equal status
1BL	h	1.10	-0.12	8.36	1.57	0.19	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
1BL	l		-0.12	9.93			4			1.71	We had equal status
8BL	h	1.23	0.38	10.03	1.13	0.11	5	9	9	2.14	Me
8BL	l		0.38	11.16			4			1.71	We had equal status
8HL	h	1.13	0.91	11.81	1.08	0.09	2	6	disagreed	disagreed	We had equal status
8HL	l		0.91	12.89			4				We had equal status
1HB	h	1.08	-0.61	11.27	0.59	0.05	4	7	7	1.71	We had equal status
1HB	l		-0.61	11.86			3			1.29	We had equal status
8HB	h	1.17	0.14	20.94	0.02	0.00	4	6	disagreed	disagreed	We had equal status
8HB	l		0.14	20.96			2				We had equal status
10BL	h	1.00	-0.03	14.54	0.00	0.00	6	10	disagreed	disagreed	Me
10BL	l		-0.03	14.53			4				My partner
10HB	h	1.06	-0.19	11.09	-0.66	-0.06	4	9	9	1.71	We had equal status
10HB	l		-0.19	10.43			5			2.14	We had equal status
2HL	h	1.11	0.41	8.58	0.00	0.12	4	8	8	1.71	My partner

Group + Dyad	ion: Status during chat				2Q status - individuals, filtering out unqualified dyads	Coin toss to randomize P1-P2	2Q Status Discrepancy			2Q FPS Discrepancy			Cleaned up to remo	
	Role	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score (all 3-5)	ChatStat scores (none disagreed)			P1 stat	P2 stat	2Q status discrep, P1 minus P2	P1 FPS	P2 FPS	2Q FPS discrep, P1 minus P2	2Q status discrep, P1 minus P2	RANK for Spearman
3HL	h	2	4	2	3.71	P2	3.71	3.71	0.00	19.87	5.37	14.50	0.00	9.0
3HL	l	2		2	3.71	P1								
3BL	h	2	4	2	4.14	P1	4.14	3.71	0.43	9.02	14.81	-5.79	0.43	6.0
3BL	l	2		2	3.71	P2								
4HL	h	2	3	2	4.57	P2	2.29	4.57	-2.29	9.03	5.64	3.39	-2.29	11.0
4HL	l	1		1	2.29	P1								
1HL	h	3	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.57	4.0
1HL	l	2		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
10HL	h	2	3	2	3.29	P1	3.29	2.71	0.57	9.05	13.88	-4.83	0.00	9.0
10HL	l	1		1	2.71	P2								
5HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	P1	3.71	3.71	0.00	9.92	14.64	-4.72	0.00	9.0
5HB	l	2		2	3.71	P2								
1BL	h	2	4	2	3.71	P2	3.71	3.71	0.00	9.93	8.36	1.57	1.43	2.0
1BL	l	2		2	3.71	P1								
8BL	h	3	5	3	5.14	P1	5.14	3.71	1.43	10.03	11.16	-1.13	0.43	6.0
8BL	l	2		2	3.71	P2								
8HL	h	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.43	6.0
8HL	l	2		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
1HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	P1	3.71	3.29	0.43	11.27	11.86	-0.59	1.00	3.0
1HB	l	2		2	3.29	P2								
8HB	h	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.86	1.0
8HB	l	2		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
10BL	h	3	4	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
10BL	l	1		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
10HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	P2	4.14	3.71	0.43	10.43	11.09	-0.66		
10HB	l	2		2	4.14	P1								
2HL	h	1	3	1	2.71	P2	3.71	2.71	1.00	7.59	8.58	-0.99		

Excluded dyads				Quick look at the data		
Group + Dyad	Role	2Q FPS discrep, P1 minus P2	RANK for Spearman			
3HL	h	14.50	1.0	<div>Scatterplot of dyad-level discrepancies, n=11</div>		
3HL	l					
3BL	h	-5.79	11.0			
3BL	l					
4HL	h	3.39	2.0			
4HL	l					
1HL	h	-4.83	10.0			
1HL	l					
10HL	h	-4.72	9.0			
10HL	l					
5HB	h	1.57	3.0			
5HB	l					
1BL	h	-1.13	7.0			
1BL	l					
8BL	h	-0.59	4.0	Discrepancy in dominance scores		Discrepancy in FPS rates
8BL	l			(P1 minus P2)		(P1 minus P2)
8HL	h	-0.66	5.0	Min	-2.29	-5.79
8HL	l			Max	1.86	14.50
1HB	h	-0.99	6.0	Range	4.15	20.29
1HB	l			Mean	0.35	-0.16
8HB	h	-2.52	8.0	Median	0.43	-0.99
8HB	l					
10BL	h					
10BL	l					
10HB	h					
10HB	l					
2HL	h					

Group + Dyad	Role	Checking for normality	Correlation		
3HL	h	<div>Frequency Histogram: 2Q Status Discrepancies</div> <div>P1 minus P2</div>	Correlation		Notes
3HL	l				
3BL	h		Pearson	-0.341	Since the data are not normally distributed, Pearson should not be used
3BL	l		<i>t</i>	-1.087	
			<i>p</i>	0.305	
4HL	h		Spearman	-0.528	Since the data are not normally distributed, Spearman should be used
4HL	l		<i>t</i>	-1.865	
			<i>p</i>	0.095	
1HL	h				
1HL	l				
10HL	h				
10HL	l				
5HB	h		The correlation is not statistically significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=11$		
5HB	l		It seems the correlation would have needed to be at -0.605 to be considered significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=11$ See below:		
1BL	h	Mean			
1BL	l	0.35			
8BL	h	SD		-0.605	hypothetical correlation
8BL	l	1.06		-2.280	hypothetical <i>t</i>
8HL	h	<div>Frequency Histogram: 2Q FPS Discrepancies</div> <div></div>		0.049	hypothetical <i>p</i>
8HL	l				
1HB	h				
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

Group + Dyad	Role	Regression info			
3HL	h				
3HL	l				
3BL	h				
3BL	l	Slope (gradient) of the line	-1.7937	0.4685	Standard error for the y estimate
4HL	h	y-intercept	1.6501	1.7680	F statistic
4HL	l	Standard error value for the slope value	0.1161	5.5404	Number of degrees of freedom
1HL	h	Standard error value for the y-intercept	1.1816	9	Regression sum of squares
1HL	l	Coefficient of determination	36.2697	276.2649	Residual sum of squares
10HL	h				
10HL	l	Interpretation (even though the correlation is not statistically significant):			
5HB	h	If there's no status difference, they will naturally have an FPS difference of 1.64 percentage points			
5HB	l	If the status difference increases by 1 point, the FPS difference will decrease by 1.79 percentage points			
1BL	h	<i>This doesn't cover the direction of the differences though</i>			
1BL	l				
8BL	h				
8BL	l	Copied over values only for LINEST function			
8HL	h		2Q stat dis	2Q FPS dis	
8HL	l		0.00	14.50	
1HB	h		0.43	-5.79	
1HB	l		-2.29	3.39	
8HB	h		0.57	-4.83	
8HB	l		0.00	-4.72	
10BL	h		0.00	1.57	
10BL	l		1.43	-1.13	
10HB	h		0.43	-0.59	
10HB	l		0.43	-0.66	
2HL	h		1.00	-0.99	

[illegible]

[illegible]


[illegible]



[illegible]

Group + Dyad	Role	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS	FPS discrepancy: Raw	FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > 1	Turns: % of chat
3HL	h	3	HL	H	22	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	l	3	HL	L	23	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65	-6.90	0.69
3BL	h	3	BL	B	30	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	l	3	BL	L	23	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44	-5.35	0.66
4HL	h	4	HL	H	8	1st	20	00	20.00	81	-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	6.61	0.72
4HL	l	4	HL	L	4	1st	20	00		70			464.951	7.75	6.61	0.39
1HL	h	1	HL	H	13	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	l	1	HL	L	39	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46	4.17	0.44
10HL	h	10	HL	H	3	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	l	10	HL	L	10	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02	0.81	0.50
5HB	h	5	HB	H	31	1st	20	12	20.20	99	68	0.69	598.726	9.98	-1.43	0.49
5HB	l	5	HB	B	36	1st	20	12		167			684.287	11.40	-1.43	0.56
1BL	h	1	BL	B	20	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	l	1	BL	L	39	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58	1.50	0.52
8BL	h	8	BL	B	29	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	l	8	BL	L	18	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43	-3.96	0.71
8HL	h	8	HL	H	19	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	l	8	HL	L	18	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68	-7.96	0.74
1HB	h	1	HB	H	13	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	l	1	HB	B	20	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15	9.46	0.30
8HB	h	8	HB	H	19	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	l	8	HB	B	29	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55	-1.56	0.62
10BL	h	10	BL	B	14	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	l	10	BL	L	10	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29	0.27	0.49
10HB	h	10	HB	H	3	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	l	10	HB	B	14	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59	2.22	0.48
2HL	h	2	HL	H	9	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	20	0.25	566.281	9.44	-3.86	0.46

Group + Dyad	Role	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepancy rate	FPS/min	FPS/min Discrepancy: Raw	FPS/min Discrepancy: rate	Question: Control				Question
							"How much control did you have in the conversation?" 1-7	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 7-9)	Control Q scores (weighted to a 3-pt scale)	
3HL	h	1.08	0.79	5.37	14.50	2.70	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
3HL	l		0.79	19.87			4			1.71	We had equal status
3BL	h	1.05	0.66	9.02	5.79	0.64	5	9	9	2.14	We had equal status
3BL	l		0.66	14.81			4			1.71	We had equal status
4HL	h	1.11	-0.46	5.64	3.39	0.60	6	9	9	2.57	We had equal status
4HL	l		-0.46	9.03			3			1.29	My partner
1HL	h	1.09	-0.33	12.20	6.61	0.54	6	10	disagreed	disagreed	Me
1HL	l		-0.33	18.80			4				We had equal status
10HL	h	1.03	-0.07	9.05	4.83	0.53	3	7	7	1.29	We had equal status
10HL	l		-0.07	13.88			4			1.71	My partner
5HB	h	1.06	0.14	9.92	4.72	0.48	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
5HB	l		0.14	14.64			4			1.71	We had equal status
1BL	h	1.10	-0.12	8.36	1.57	0.19	4	8	8	1.71	We had equal status
1BL	l		-0.12	9.93			4			1.71	We had equal status
8BL	h	1.23	0.38	10.03	1.13	0.11	5	9	9	2.14	Me
8BL	l		0.38	11.16			4			1.71	We had equal status
8HL	h	1.13	0.91	11.81	1.08	0.09	2	6	disagreed	disagreed	We had equal status
8HL	l		0.91	12.89			4				We had equal status
1HB	h	1.08	-0.61	11.27	0.59	0.05	4	7	7	1.71	We had equal status
1HB	l		-0.61	11.86			3			1.29	We had equal status
8HB	h	1.17	0.14	20.94	0.02	0.00	4	6	disagreed	disagreed	We had equal status
8HB	l		0.14	20.96			2				We had equal status
10BL	h	1.00	-0.03	14.54	0.00	0.00	6	10	disagreed	disagreed	Me
10BL	l		-0.03	14.53			4				My partner
10HB	h	1.06	-0.19	11.09	-0.66	-0.06	4	9	9	1.71	We had equal status
10HB	l		-0.19	10.43			5			2.14	We had equal status
2HL	h	1.11	0.41	8.58	0.00	0.12	4	8	8	1.71	My partner

Group + Dyad	ion: Status during chat				2Q status - individuals, filtering out unqualified dyads	2Q Status Discrepancy			2Q FPS Discrepancy			Cleaned up to remo	
	Role	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score (all 3-5)	ChatStat scores (none disagreed)		HighRole stat	LowRole stat	2Q status discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	HighRole FPS	LowRole FPS	2Q FPS discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	2Q status discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	RANK for Spearman
3HL	h	2	4	2	3.71	3.71	3.71	0.00	equal	equal	N/A	-0.43	2.0
3HL	l	2		2	3.71							-2.29	8.0
3BL	h	2	4	2	4.14	4.14	3.71	-0.43	9.02	14.81	5.79	-0.57	4.0
3BL	l	2		2	3.71							-1.43	6.0
4HL	h	2	3	2	4.57	4.57	2.29	-2.29	5.64	9.03	3.39	-0.43	2.0
4HL	l	1		1	2.29							-0.43	2.0
1HL	h	3	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.00	5.0
1HL	l	2		2	-							-1.86	7.0
10HL	h	2	3	2	3.29	3.29	2.71	-0.57	9.05	13.88	4.83		
10HL	l	1		1	2.71								
5HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	3.71	3.71	0.00	equal	equal	N/A		
5HB	l	2		2	3.71								
1BL	h	2	4	2	3.71	3.71	3.71	0.00	equal	equal	N/A		
1BL	l	2		2	3.71								
8BL	h	3	5	3	5.14	5.14	3.71	-1.43	10.03	11.16	1.13		
8BL	l	2		2	3.71								
8HL	h	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
8HL	l	2		2	-								
1HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	3.71	3.29	-0.43	11.27	11.86	0.59		
1HB	l	2		2	3.29								
8HB	h	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
8HB	l	2		2	-								
10BL	h	3	4	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
10BL	l	1		1	-								
10HB	h	2	4	2	3.71	4.14	3.71	-0.43	10.43	11.09	0.66		
10HB	l	2		2	4.14								
2HL	h	1	3	1	2.71	3.71	2.71	-1.00	7.50	8.58	0.99		



Group + Dyad	Role	Checking for normality	Correlation		
3HL	h	<p>Frequency Histogram: 2Q Status Discrepancies</p>  <p>LowRole minus HighRole</p>	Correlation		Notes
3HL	l				
3BL	h		Pearson	0.015	Since the data are not normally distributed, Pearson should not be used
3BL	l		<i>t</i>	0.037	
			<i>p</i>	0.971	
4HL	h				
4HL	l				
1HL	h				
1HL	l				
10HL	h				
10HL	l				
5HB	h		The correlation is not statistically significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=8$		
5HB	l				
1BL	h	Mean	<i>It seems the correlation would have needed to be at -0.709 to be considered significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=8$. See below:</i>		
1BL	l	-1.06			
8BL	h	SD		-0.709	hypothetical correlation
8BL	l	0.73		-2.463	hypothetical <i>t</i>
8HL	h	<p>Frequency Histogram: 2Q FPS Discrepancies</p> 		0.049	hypothetical <i>p</i>
8HL	l				
1HB	h				
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

Group + Dyad	Role	Regression info			
3HL	h				
3HL	l				
3BL	h				
3BL	l	Slope (gradient) of the line	0.0421	2.5325	Standard error for the y estimate
4HL	h	y-intercept	1.1241	1.4123	F statistic
4HL	l	Standard error value for the slope value	0.0002	2.1693	Number of degrees of freedom
1HL	h	Standard error value for the y-intercept	0.0014	6	Regression sum of squares
1HL	l	Coefficient of determination	0.0066	28.2352	Residual sum of squares
10HL	h				
10HL	l	Interpretation (even though the correlation is not statistically significant):			
5HB	h	If there's no status difference, they will naturally have an FPS difference of 1.12 percentage points			
5HB	l	If the status difference increases by 1 point, the FPS difference will INcrease by 0.04 percentage points			
1BL	h	<i>This doesn't cover the direction of the differences though</i>			
1BL	l				
8BL	h				
8BL	l				
8HL	h				
8HL	l				
1HB	h				
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]


[illegible]

Group + Dyad	Role	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS	FPS discrepancy: Raw	FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > 1	Turns: % of chat
3HL	h	3	HL	H	22	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	l	3	HL	L	23	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65	-6.90	0.69
3BL	h	3	BL	B	30	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	l	3	BL	L	23	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44	-5.35	0.66
4HL	h	4	HL	H	8	1st	20	00	20.00	81	-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	6.61	0.72
4HL	l	4	HL	L	4	1st	20	00		70			464.951	7.75	6.61	0.39
1HL	h	1	HL	H	13	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	l	1	HL	L	39	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46	4.17	0.44
10HL	h	10	HL	H	3	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	l	10	HL	L	10	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02	0.81	0.50
5HB	h	5	HB	H	31	1st	20	12	20.20	99	68	0.69	598.726	9.98	-1.43	0.49
5HB	l	5	HB	B	36	1st	20	12		167			684.287	11.40	-1.43	0.56
1BL	h	1	BL	B	20	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	l	1	BL	L	39	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58	1.50	0.52
8BL	h	8	BL	B	29	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	l	8	BL	L	18	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43	-3.96	0.71
8HL	h	8	HL	H	19	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	l	8	HL	L	18	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68	-7.96	0.74
1HB	h	1	HB	H	13	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	l	1	HB	B	20	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15	9.46	0.30
8HB	h	8	HB	H	19	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	l	8	HB	B	29	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55	-1.56	0.62
10BL	h	10	BL	B	14	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	l	10	BL	L	10	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29	0.27	0.49
10HB	h	10	HB	H	3	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	l	10	HB	B	14	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59	2.22	0.48
2HL	h	2	HL	H	9	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	20	0.25	566.281	9.44	-3.86	0.46

Group + Dyad	Role	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepancy rate	FPS/min	FPS/min Discrepancy: Raw	FPS/min Discrepancy: rate	Question: ASLPI			
							"How do you think your partner would score on the ASLPI?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)
3HL	h	1.08	0.79	5.37	14.50	2.70	We would score the same	2	3	3
3HL	l		0.79	19.87			My partner would score higher than me	1		
3BL	h	1.05	0.66	9.02	5.79	0.64	My partner would score higher than me	1	3	3
3BL	l		0.66	14.81			We would score the same	2		
4HL	h	1.11	-0.46	5.64	3.39	0.60	My partner would score lower than me	3	4	4
4HL	l		-0.46	9.03			My partner would score higher than me	1		
1HL	h	1.09	-0.33	12.20	6.61	0.54	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
1HL	l		-0.33	18.80			We would score the same	2		
10HL	h	1.03	-0.07	9.05	4.83	0.53	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10HL	l		-0.07	13.88			We would score the same	2		
5HB	h	1.06	0.14	9.92	4.72	0.48	We would score the same	2	4	4
5HB	l		0.14	14.64			We would score the same	2		
1BL	h	1.10	-0.12	8.36	1.57	0.19	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
1BL	l		-0.12	9.93			We would score the same	2		
8BL	h	1.23	0.38	10.03	1.13	0.11	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
8BL	l		0.38	11.16			We would score the same	2		
8HL	h	1.13	0.91	11.81	1.08	0.09	We would score the same	2	3	3
8HL	l		0.91	12.89			My partner would score higher than me	1		
1HB	h	1.08	-0.61	11.27	0.59	0.05	We would score the same	2	5	5
1HB	l		-0.61	11.86			My partner would score lower than me	3		
8HB	h	1.17	0.14	20.94	0.02	0.00	We would score the same	2	3	3
8HB	l		0.14	20.96			My partner would score higher than me	1		
10BL	h	1.00	-0.03	14.54	0.00	0.00	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10BL	l		-0.03	14.53			We would score the same	2		
10HB	h	1.06	-0.19	11.09	-0.66	-0.06	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10HB	l		-0.19	10.43			We would score the same	2		
2HL	h	1.11	0.41	8.58	0.00	0.12	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5

Group + Dyad	Role	ASLPI scores	Question: Deaf Community					Question: GU		
			"Who has higher status in the Deaf community?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)	Deaf Community scores	"Who has higher status at Gallaudet?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score
3HL	h	2	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	5
3HL	l	1	We have equal status	2			2	We have equal status	2	
3BL	h	1	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	4
3BL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	We have equal status	2	
4HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	4
4HL	l	1	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
1HL	h	3	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	4
1HL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
10HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	4
10HL	l	2	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
5HB	h	2	My partner	1	4	4	1	My partner	1	4
5HB	l	2	Me	3			3	Me	3	
1BL	h	3	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	Me	3	4
1BL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
8BL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	5
8BL	l	2	My partner	1			1	We have equal status	2	
8HL	h	2	We have equal status	2	3	3	2	We have equal status	2	3
8HL	l	1	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
1HB	h	2	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	3
1HB	l	3	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
8HB	h	2	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	3
8HB	l	1	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
10BL	h	3	We have equal status	2	5	5	2	We have equal status	2	4
10BL	l	2	Me	3			3	We have equal status	2	
10HB	h	3	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	6
10HB	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	Me	3	
2HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	6

Group + Dyad	Role			3Q status, individual	Coin toss to randomize P1-P2	3Q Status Discrepancy			3Q FPS Discrepancy			Cleaned up to remove excluded c		
		Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)	GU scores			P1 stat	P2 stat	3Q status discrep, P1 minus P2	P1 FPS	P2 FPS	3Q FPS discrep, P1 minus P2	3Q status discrep, P1 minus P2	RANK for Spearman	3Q FPS discrep, P1 minus P2
3HL	h	5	3	8.0	P2	5.0	8.0	-3	19.87	5.37	14.50	-3	12.0	14.50
3HL	l		2	5.0	P1									
3BL	h	4	2	5.0	P1	5.0	6.0	-1	9.02	14.81	-5.79	-1	10.0	-5.79
3BL	l		2	6.0	P2									
4HL	h	4	3	9.0	P2	3.0	9.0	-6	9.03	5.64	3.39	-6	15.0	3.39
4HL	l		1	3.0	P1									
1HL	h	4	3	9.0	P1	9.0	5.0	4	12.20	18.80	-6.61	4	3.0	-6.61
1HL	l		1	5.0	P2									
10HL	h	4	3	9.0	P1	9.0	4.0	5	9.05	13.88	-4.83	5	1.0	-4.83
10HL	l		1	4.0	P2									
5HB	h	4	1	4.0	P1	4.0	8.0	-4	9.92	14.64	-4.72	-4	14.0	-4.72
5HB	l		3	8.0	P2									
1BL	h	4	3	8.0	P2	5.0	8.0	-3	9.93	8.36	1.57	-3	12.0	1.57
1BL	l		1	5.0	P1									
8BL	h	5	3	9.0	P1	9.0	5.0	4	10.03	11.16	-1.13	4	3.0	-1.13
8BL	l		2	5.0	P2									
8HL	h	3	2	6.0	P2	3.0	6.0	-3	12.89	11.81	1.08	-3	12.0	1.08
8HL	l		1	3.0	P1									
1HB	h	3	2	6.0	P1	6.0	6.0	0	11.27	11.86	-0.59	0	8.5	-0.59
1HB	l		1	6.0	P2									
8HB	h	3	2	6.0	P1	6.0	4.0	2	20.94	20.96	-0.02	2	5.5	-0.02
8HB	l		1	4.0	P2									
10BL	h	4	2	7.0	P2	7.0	7.0	0	14.53	14.54	0.00	0	8.5	0.00
10BL	l		2	7.0	P1									
10HB	h	disagreed	disagreed	disagreed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3.0	1.28
10HB	l				-									
2HL	h	disagreed	disagreed	disagreed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7.0	2.44



Group + Dyad	Role	Checking for normality	Correlation		
3HL	h	<div>Frequency Histogram: 3Q Status Discrepancies</div> <div>P1 minus P2</div>	Correlation		Notes
3HL	l		Pearson	-0.368	Since the data are not normally distributed, Pearson should not be used
3BL	h		t	-1.427	
3BL	l		p	0.177	
4HL	h		Spearman	-0.396	Since the data are not normally distributed, Spearman should be used
4HL	l		t	-1.557	
1HL	h		p	0.144	
1HL	l				
10HL	h				
10HL	l				
5HB	h				
5HB	l				
1BL	h	Mean	The correlation is not statistically significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=15$		
1BL	l	0.13			
8BL	h	SD	It seems the correlation would have needed to be at -0.515 to be considered significant at the $p<0.05$ level for $n=15$ See below:		
8BL	l	3.40			
8HL	h	<div>Frequency Histogram: 3Q FPS Discrepancies</div> <div></div>		-0.515	hypothetical correlation
8HL	l			-2.166	hypothetical t
1HB	h			0.049	hypothetical p
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

Group + Dyad	Role	Regression info			
3HL	h				
3HL	l				
3BL	h				
3BL	l	Slope (gradient) of the line	-0.5529	0.3039	Standard error for the y estimate
4HL	h	y-intercept	0.3874	1.2732	F statistic
4HL	l	Standard error value for the slope value	0.1354	4.9269	Number of degrees of freedom
1HL	h	Standard error value for the y-intercept	2.0367	13	Regression sum of squares
1HL	l	Coefficient of determination	49.4375	315.5601	Residual sum of squares
10HL	h				
10HL	l	Interpretation (even though the correlation is not statistically significant):			
5HB	h	If there's no status difference, they will naturally have an FPS difference of 0.39 percentage points			
5HB	l	If the status difference increases by 1 point, the FPS difference will decrease by 0.55 percentage points			
1BL	h	<i>This doesn't cover the direction of the differences though</i>			
1BL	l				
8BL	h				
8BL	l	Copied over values only for LINEST function			
8HL	h		stat dis	FPS dis	
8HL	l		-3	14.50	
1HB	h		-1	-5.79	
1HB	l		-6	3.39	
8HB	h		4	-6.61	
8HB	l		5	-4.83	
10BL	h		-4	-4.72	
10BL	l		-3	1.57	
10HB	h		4	-1.13	
10HB	l		-3	1.08	
2HL	h		0	-0.59	

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]


[illegible]

Group + Dyad	Role	Group	Dyad	HBL	Person	1st/2nd	Chat length: whole mm	Chat length: partial final min in sec	Chat length: in min	FPS	FPS discrepancy: Raw	FPS discrepancy: rate	Turns: sec	Turns: min	Turns: h > 1	Turns: % of chat
3HL	h	3	HL	H	22	2nd	22	37	22.62	47	264	5.62	524.987	8.75	-6.90	0.39
3HL	l	3	HL	L	23	1st	22	37		311			938.941	15.65	-6.90	0.69
3BL	h	3	BL	B	30	2nd	20	25	20.42	73	126	1.73	485.467	8.09	-5.35	0.40
3BL	l	3	BL	L	23	2nd	20	25		199			806.213	13.44	-5.35	0.66
4HL	h	4	HL	H	8	1st	20	00	20.00	81	-11	-0.14	861.830	14.36	6.61	0.72
4HL	l	4	HL	L	4	1st	20	00		70			464.951	7.75	6.61	0.39
1HL	h	1	HL	H	13	1st	19	25	19.42	154	5	0.03	757.469	12.62	4.17	0.65
1HL	l	1	HL	L	39	1st	19	25		159			507.344	8.46	4.17	0.44
10HL	h	10	HL	H	3	2nd	22	13	22.22	107	46	0.43	709.712	11.83	0.81	0.53
10HL	l	10	HL	L	10	2nd	22	13		153			661.376	11.02	0.81	0.50
5HB	h	5	HB	H	31	1st	20	12	20.20	99	68	0.69	598.726	9.98	-1.43	0.49
5HB	l	5	HB	B	36	1st	20	12		167			684.287	11.40	-1.43	0.56
1BL	h	1	BL	B	20	2nd	20	31	20.52	101	4	0.04	724.780	12.08	1.50	0.59
1BL	l	1	BL	L	39	2nd	20	31		105			634.619	10.58	1.50	0.52
8BL	h	8	BL	B	29	1st	20	11	20.18	105	56	0.53	628.282	10.47	-3.96	0.52
8BL	l	8	BL	L	18	1st	20	11		161			865.727	14.43	-3.96	0.71
8HL	h	8	HL	H	19	2nd	22	26	22.43	103	112	1.09	523.207	8.72	-7.96	0.39
8HL	l	8	HL	L	18	2nd	22	26		215			1000.509	16.68	-7.96	0.74
1HB	h	1	HB	H	13	2nd	20	11	20.18	176	-103	-0.59	936.724	15.61	9.46	0.77
1HB	l	1	HB	B	20	1st	20	11		73			369.164	6.15	9.46	0.30
8HB	h	8	HB	H	19	1st	20	9	20.15	230	33	0.14	659.144	10.99	-1.56	0.55
8HB	l	8	HB	B	29	2nd	20	9		263			752.881	12.55	-1.56	0.62
10BL	h	10	BL	B	14	2nd	18	50	18.83	139	-4	-0.03	573.727	9.56	0.27	0.51
10BL	l	10	BL	L	10	1st	18	50		135			557.396	9.29	0.27	0.49
10HB	h	10	HB	H	3	1st	20	11	20.18	131	-31	-0.24	708.625	11.81	2.22	0.59
10HB	l	10	HB	B	14	1st	20	11		100			575.228	9.59	2.22	0.48
2HL	h	2	HL	H	9	2nd	20	24	20.40	81	20	0.25	566.281	9.44	-3.86	0.46

Group + Dyad	Role	H + L turn %	Turn % discrepancy rate	FPS/min	FPS/min Discrepancy: Raw	FPS/min Discrepancy: rate	Question: ASLPI			
							"How do you think your partner would score on the ASLPI?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)
3HL	h	1.08	0.79	5.37	14.50	2.70	We would score the same	2	3	3
3HL	l		0.79	19.87			My partner would score higher than me	1		
3BL	h	1.05	0.66	9.02	5.79	0.64	My partner would score higher than me	1	3	3
3BL	l		0.66	14.81			We would score the same	2		
4HL	h	1.11	-0.46	5.64	3.39	0.60	My partner would score lower than me	3	4	4
4HL	l		-0.46	9.03			My partner would score higher than me	1		
1HL	h	1.09	-0.33	12.20	6.61	0.54	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
1HL	l		-0.33	18.80			We would score the same	2		
10HL	h	1.03	-0.07	9.05	4.83	0.53	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10HL	l		-0.07	13.88			We would score the same	2		
5HB	h	1.06	0.14	9.92	4.72	0.48	We would score the same	2	4	4
5HB	l		0.14	14.64			We would score the same	2		
1BL	h	1.10	-0.12	8.36	1.57	0.19	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
1BL	l		-0.12	9.93			We would score the same	2		
8BL	h	1.23	0.38	10.03	1.13	0.11	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
8BL	l		0.38	11.16			We would score the same	2		
8HL	h	1.13	0.91	11.81	1.08	0.09	We would score the same	2	3	3
8HL	l		0.91	12.89			My partner would score higher than me	1		
1HB	h	1.08	-0.61	11.27	0.59	0.05	We would score the same	2	5	5
1HB	l		-0.61	11.86			My partner would score lower than me	3		
8HB	h	1.17	0.14	20.94	0.02	0.00	We would score the same	2	3	3
8HB	l		0.14	20.96			My partner would score higher than me	1		
10BL	h	1.00	-0.03	14.54	0.00	0.00	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10BL	l		-0.03	14.53			We would score the same	2		
10HB	h	1.06	-0.19	11.09	-0.66	-0.06	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5
10HB	l		-0.19	10.43			We would score the same	2		
2HL	h	1.11	0.41	8.58	0.00	0.12	My partner would score lower than me	3	5	5

Group + Dyad	Role	ASLPI scores	Question: Deaf Community					Question: GU		
			"Who has higher status in the Deaf community?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)	Deaf Community scores	"Who has higher status at Gallaudet?"	Response coded as 1-3	Agreement score
3HL	h	2	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	5
3HL	l	1	We have equal status	2			2	We have equal status	2	
3BL	h	1	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	4
3BL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	We have equal status	2	
4HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	4
4HL	l	1	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
1HL	h	3	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	4
1HL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
10HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	4
10HL	l	2	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
5HB	h	2	My partner	1	4	4	1	My partner	1	4
5HB	l	2	Me	3			3	Me	3	
1BL	h	3	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	Me	3	4
1BL	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
8BL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	5
8BL	l	2	My partner	1			1	We have equal status	2	
8HL	h	2	We have equal status	2	3	3	2	We have equal status	2	3
8HL	l	1	My partner	1			1	My partner	1	
1HB	h	2	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	3
1HB	l	3	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
8HB	h	2	We have equal status	2	4	4	2	We have equal status	2	3
8HB	l	1	We have equal status	2			2	My partner	1	
10BL	h	3	We have equal status	2	5	5	2	We have equal status	2	4
10BL	l	2	Me	3			3	We have equal status	2	
10HB	h	3	Me	3	5	5	3	Me	3	6
10HB	l	2	We have equal status	2			2	Me	3	
2HL	h	3	Me	3	4	4	3	Me	3	6

Group + Dyad	Role	Filtering out those who disagreed (keep 3-5)	GU scores	3Q status, individual	3Q Status Discrepancy			3Q FPS Discrepancy			Cleaned up to remove excluded dyads			
					High Role stat	Low Role stat	3Q status discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	HighRole FPS	LowRole FPS	3Q FPS discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	3Q status discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	RANK for Spearman	3Q FPS discrep, LowRole minus HighRole	RANK for Spearman
3HL	h	5	3	8.0	8.0	5.0	-3	5.37	19.87	14.50	-3	6.0	14.50	1.0
3HL	l		2	5.0							-1	1.5	-5.79	13.0
3BL	h	4	2	5.0	6.0	5.0	-1	14.81	9.02	-5.79	-6	13.0	3.39	4.0
3BL	l		2	6.0							-4	9.5	6.61	2.0
4HL	h	4	3	9.0	9.0	3.0	-6	5.64	9.03	3.39	-5	12.0	4.83	3.0
4HL	l		1	3.0							-4	9.5	-4.72	12.0
1HL	h	4	3	9.0	9.0	5.0	-4	12.20	18.80	6.61	-3	6.0	1.57	5.0
1HL	l		1	5.0							-4	9.5	1.13	6.0
10HL	h	4	3	9.0	9.0	4.0	-5	9.05	13.88	4.83	-3	6.0	1.08	7.0
10HL	l		1	4.0							-2	3.5	0.02	8.0
5HB	h	4	1	4.0	8.0	4.0	-4	14.64	9.92	-4.72	-4	9.5	-1.28	9.0
5HB	l		3	8.0							-1	1.5	-2.44	10.0
1BL	h	4	3	8.0	8.0	5.0	-3	8.36	9.93	1.57	-2	3.5	-2.88	11.0
1BL	l		1	5.0										
8BL	h	5	3	9.0	9.0	5.0	-4	10.03	11.16	1.13				
8BL	l		2	5.0										
8HL	h	3	2	6.0	6.0	3.0	-3	11.81	12.89	1.08				
8HL	l		1	3.0										
1HB	h	3	2	6.0	6.0	6.0	0	equal	equal	N/A				
1HB	l		1	6.0										
8HB	h	3	2	6.0	6.0	4.0	-2	20.94	20.96	0.02				
8HB	l		1	4.0										
10BL	h	4	2	7.0	7.0	7.0	0	equal	equal	N/A				
10BL	l		2	7.0										
10HB	h	disagreed	disagreed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
10HB	l													
2HL	h	disagreed	disagreed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				



Group + Dyad	Role	Checking for normality	Correlation		
3HL	h	<p>Frequency Histogram: 3Q Status Discrepancies</p> <p>LowRole minus HighRole</p>	Correlation		Notes
3HL	l		Pearson	-0.390	Since the data are not normally distributed, Pearson should not be used
3BL	h		<i>t</i>	-1.405	
3BL	l		<i>p</i>	0.188	
4HL	h		Spearman	-0.531	Since the data are not normally distributed, Spearman should be used
4HL	l		<i>t</i>	-2.079	
1HL	h		<i>p</i>	0.062	
1HL	l				
10HL	h		The correlation is not statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for $n=13$		
10HL	l		<i>It seems the correlation would have needed to be at -0.555 to be considered significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for $n=13$</i> <i>See below:</i>		
5HB	h	Mean			
5HB	l	-3.23			
1BL	h	SD		-0.555	hypothetical correlation
1BL	l	1.48		-2.213	hypothetical <i>t</i>
8BL	h	<p>Frequency Histogram: 3Q FPS Discrepancies</p>		0.049	hypothetical <i>p</i>
8BL	l				
8HL	h				
8HL	l				
1HB	h				
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

Group + Dyad	Role	Regression info			
3HL	h				
3HL	l				
3BL	h				
3BL	l	Slope (gradient) of the line	-1.4142	-3.3368	Standard error for the y estimate
4HL	h	y-intercept	1.0064	3.5526	F statistic
4HL	l	Standard error value for the slope value	0.1522	5.1618	Number of degrees of freedom
1HL	h	Standard error value for the y-intercept	1.9748	11	Regression sum of squares
1HL	l	Coefficient of determination	52.6167	293.0876	Residual sum of squares
10HL	h				
10HL	l	Interpretation (even though the correlation is not statistically significant):			
5HB	h	If there's no status difference, they will naturally have an FPS difference of 1.00 percentage points			
5HB	l	If the status difference increases by 1 point, the FPS difference will decrease by 1.42 percentage points			
1BL	h	<i>This doesn't cover the direction of the differences though</i>			
1BL	l				
8BL	h				
8BL	l				
8HL	h				
8HL	l				
1HB	h				
1HB	l				
8HB	h				
8HB	l				
10BL	h				
10BL	l				
10HB	h				
10HB	l				
2HL	h				

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]