**Appendix**

1. **Previous methodologies for reciprocity**
2. ***Previous methodologies for reciprocity in the level of interactional structures***

To measure reciprocity at the structural level, scholars usually focus on the *proportion of responses* (Bächtiger et al., 2009; Jensen, 2003; Kies, 2010; Stromer-Galley, 2007). In this approach, scholars identify if each utterance (whether it is a speech in a face-to-face discussion, or a post or comment in an online discussion) starts a new thread or responds to someone. Take a Facebook post, for example. A comment can simply be an answer to the post or a reply to other users’ previous comment. Analysis of variation of these types of input (comments x replies) enable us to understand posts with higher or lower levels of interactions (responses) between users, and therefore more or less structural reciprocity. In this line, Jensen (2003) uses a category named *dialogue* - which identifies if the post starts a new topic, replies to another post or is a monologue (p. 355). Stromer-Galley (2007) speaks in terms of *engagement*, which, at the *turn level*, identifies whether the user starts a new topic, responds to another participant, responds to the moderator, or continues conversation by himself/herself. Bächtiger et al. (2009) classify *interactivity* (which they associate with reciprocity), as “how much participants engage with each other” and “how much participants refer to other participants and their arguments” (p. 6). Also, Kies (2010) uses a category called *reciprocity at the basic level*, which quantifies how many responses each post or comment received.

A second measure of reciprocity at the structural level observes if the utterance is a response, and, if so, to whom or to what message it is addressed to (Collins & Nerlich, 2015; Schneider, 1997). This approach is important because it tells us if responses are addressed only to a certain user or to several ones. According to Collins & Nerlich (2015), a scenario monopolized by few users and with low interactivity indicates the absence or lack of reciprocity. Schneider (1997), in one of the first studies on online deliberation, considers the user as the unit of analysis to capture how much a user responded to other messages (followed messages) and how much his/her messages were answered (led messages). This study demonstrates the variety of speakers that this user responded to, the variety of others that responded to him/her and the difference between the two groups. Collins & Nerlich (2015) also use individual or user-centered units of analysis to measure “those usernames mentioned most frequently in the discussion, the number of different contributors, and the number of contributions made by each user” (p. 194).

A third type of analysis of structural reciprocity is based on network analysis. Here it is possible to observe who responds to whom, who interacts with whom, and what is the flow or level of interaction (Aragón et al., 2017; Graham & Witschge, 2003; Shapiro & Park, 2018). As Shapiro & Park (2018, p. 117) argue, network analysis is widely used to “explain many different phenomena, including how people in communities form social bonds with others”; and it is specially fit “to determine the extent of reciprocity” in interactions between individuals. In line, we find network analysis ranging from small datasets of a single discussion to large datasets of conversational flows in various online pages or hashtags (Aragón et al., 2017; Graham & Witschge, 2003). Some studies define a person as the unit of analysis in each node of the network. This is a *participant-participant network*, that is, the user of a social network and each edge is an interaction between people. Other studies define the message or utterance as the unit of analysis, and the edge indicates an interaction between the two messages (one is responding to the other). This is a *message-message network*. In the case of nodes based on participants, edges can be unidirectional or bidirectional (since users can reply to each other). In the case of nodes built on messages, edges are only unidirectional. The network analysis can be performed through observation and/or calculation of network parameters and characteristics. Some calculations establish the network density, the clustering coefficient, and the length of the paths. However, these measures are only possible when there is accurate data about the network. In some situations, data are difficult or risky to obtain, and therefore more general visual characterizations of how the network is structured are important (Siegel, 2009, p. 130). The studies of Graham & Witschge (2003) and Shapiro & Park (2018) fit into this situation, as the authors sought to identify the visual structure of the discussions to understand how certain leaders and/or elites were or were not able to monopolize communication.

1. ***Previous methodologies for reciprocity at the level of behaviors***

To observe reciprocity as a behavior, content analysis is widely used. It should be noted, though, that several slightly distinct categories were developed, such as: *respectful listening* (Steenbergen et al., 2003; Steiner, 2012; Steiner et al., 2005), *ideal role taking* (Dahlberg, 2004), *engagement* (Stromer-Galley, 2007)*,* *continuity of critical-rational debate* (Graham & Witschge, 2003), *contingency interactivity* (Sundar et al, 2003; Nekmat & Lee, 2018). Some scholars explicitly use the term *reciprocity* (Esau et al., 2017; Esau & Friess, 2022). All these categories share a common concern, i.e., observing if a discussion participant is in fact responding to others.

Studies on *interactivity* have used the differentiation between the *functional view* and *contingency view* of this concept (Sundar et al, 2003). Whereas in the first one it matters the functions allowed by the platform or structure where the communication is based on, in the latter it matters how users respond to one another forming or not a “sense of dialogue and conversationality” (Nekmat & Kee, 2018, p. 6. - for more details on the concept of interactivity, see Rafaeli, 1988; Sundar et al, 2003). The contingency view can be measured by the presence of references to previous users or comments (Nekmat & Kee, 2018).

One of the most well-known methods to study deliberation, the DQI (*Discourse Quality Index*), developed by Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli & Marco Steenbergen (2003-2005), employs a list of codes to assess different aspects of deliberation, such as participation, level of justification, the content of arguments, respect, and reflexivity. Originally designed to study plenary and committee meetings in Parliaments, the first version of DQI (Steenbergen et al. 2003) divides the norm of ​​respect into three categories: a) respect for groups, that is, positive or negative statements about the groups at stake and b) respect for demands, that is, positive or negative statements about the demands at stake; c) respect for counter arguments. This last category is based on the idea of reciprocity, since classification is based on presence/absence of counterarguments. This observation is rather crucial in our opinion because not only respect for the other as someone worthy of participating in the discussion is at stake, but also reciprocity. Observing the presence or absence of a response that is actually addressed to the other raises the question of mutual, reciprocally cooperative discussions. The authors identify the following coding possibilities:

(0) Counterarguments ignored: There are counterarguments, but the speaker ignores these.

(1) Counterarguments included but degraded: This code applies when a speaker acknowledges a counterargument, but then explicitly degrades it by making a negative statement about it or the individuals and groups that propose the argument. A single negative statement is sufficient to assign code 1, unless the speech also contains positive statements about a counterargument (in which case a code of 3 applies). If neutral statements accompany a negative statement (and there are no positive statements), a code of 1 also applies.

(2) Counterarguments included — neutral: We use this code if a counterargument is acknowledged and if there are no explicit negative or positive statements about it.

(3) Counterarguments included and valued: This code applies if the counterargument is acknowledged and is explicitly valued. We assign this code even if there are also negative statements.

(Steenbergen et al., 2003, pp. 29–30)

In the recent version of the DQI, Steiner (2012) conceives respect divided into three categories, by refining and clarifying coding instructions. They are: a) presence or absence of Foul Language; b) presence or absence of Respectful Language and, finally, c) respect as the action of listening, partially similar to the Respect for Counter-Arguments of the first version. In last category can be classified into the following variables:

(1) The speaker ignores arguments and questions addressed to him or her by other participants. Code the names of these other participants.

(2) The speaker does not ignore arguments and questions addressed to him or her by other participants but distorts these arguments and questions. Code the names of these other participants.

(3) The speaker does not ignore arguments and questions addressed to him or her by other participants and engages these arguments and questions in a correct and undistorted way. Code the names of these other participants.

(4) No arguments and questions are addressed to other speakers.

(Steiner, 2012, p. 269)

By looking at the participants’ behavior in the debate through the content of their messages, this sub-division enables us to discern whether the respondent is actually responding in a meaningful positive or negative way or ignoring or distorting what was said earlier.

Similar to Respectful Listening, Dahlberg (2004) develops the idea of Ideal Role Taking. According to Dahlberg’s definition, this category is meant to capture the extent to which participants in a debate “consider and are sensitive to other participants and positions” (Dahlberg, 2004, p. 33). Here, reciprocity appears associated with components of respect and empathy, that is, “[consideration and sensitivity] not just to those immediately present in the forum, but all affected by the problem considered” (Dahlberg, 2004, p. 33). To operationalize the concept through content analysis, Dahlberg (2004, p. 34) distinguishes between three attitudes: (1) when someone synthesizes the opinions of others, showing that they have read/heard and are interested in talking about they; (2) when someone asks questions asking for clarification on some point; and (3) when someone claims the right of everyone to have the right to speak. While the two first examples fit into what we call reciprocity at the level of behavior, the category 3, being more closely linked to respect and empathy, does not illustrate this conception.

Another important example of operationalization of reciprocity at the level of behavior in content analysis is provided by Stromer-Galley’s (2007) study. Under the term *engagement*, she proposes three measures. The first indicates (1) whether the message constitutes a response to previous users’ posts or comments, referring to what we call structural reciprocity, already discussed in the previous section. The second and third measures seek to observe components of participants' behavior when interacting with others: (2) identification of the presence of genuine questions and inquiries, as to understand the other, clarify positions and obtain more information and (3) identification meta-conversation, that is, “the conversation about the conversation” (p.12). In this later case, four types of reciprocal behavior are distinguished:

(1) the message indicates some consensus;

(2) the message indicates some conflict;

(3) the message clarifies the speaker's previous expressions of opinion; or

(4) the message clarifies the earlier expressions of opinion of some other speaker (Stromer-Galley, 2007, p. 12)

Dahlberg’ study (2004) also instructs observing the presence of questions, enquiries, and meta-conversations. These categories help to show if a user is reading/listening, responding and if attempts to understand the other are present. Stromer-Galley’s analytical scheme

further identify the “source” employed in the message as an indicator of engagement/reciprocity. This category refers to situations when participants use as a source what others said in order to support their own positions (p. 11). This is an important aspect of reciprocity because it demonstrates, to use Stromer-Galley’s words, the extent to which participants “support what previous participants have said, [and] this indicates that participants are listening to each other” (p. 11).

Graham & Witschge (2003) explicitly sought to assess reciprocity, continuity of critical-rational debate and reflexivity, understood as dimensions of deliberation. In their research in online settings, each utterance was initially categorized as an *initial topic*, an *answer*, or as an *irrelevant message*. The *answers* were divided into (a) statements containing arguments and (b) statements without arguments. Non-argumentative statements can be classified as: (a.1) an informative answer, i.e. a response providing information, clarifying an opinion, asking a question, etc.; (a.2) an affirmative answer, that is, an answer that “seeks to affirm another position, statement and/or opinion” (p. 182); or (a.3) a counter-affirmation, that is, “messages that are critical of another message” (p. 182). Argumentative statements can be classified as: (b.1) an answer that explicitly addresses another message in a justified way indicating the user argues critically (that is, they present a counterargument, rebut the refutation, and insist in the refutation) or (b.2) an answer that reiterate critically (that is, they justify a previous position or rational statement). Interestingly, Graham & Witschge highlight two related dimensions: the rational and the critical. The rational dimension refers to the use of arguments, and the critical dimension refers to disagreement.

In their study of four dimensions of deliberation - rationality, reciprocity, respect, and constructiveness, Esau et al. (2017) observe reciprocity organized into 3 categories. In the same path tracked by Graham and Witschge (2003) and Stromer-Galley (2007), these scholars define reciprocity as:

(1) General engagement - This measure captures whether a comment addresses another comment.

(2) Argumentative engagement - This measure captures whether a comment addresses a specific argument made in another comment.

(3) Critical engagement - This measure captures whether a comment is critical of another comment.

(Esau et al., 2017)

It should be noted a renewed effort to develop listening measures in the literature of deliberation (Scudder, 2020a, 2020b, 2022). Listening is closely linked to reciprocity, as we can only be reciprocal in a discussion if we effectively listen to what is said by others. Scholars often capture this dimension through questions asked to forum participants in post-discussion questionnaires. Still, it is recognized that investigating actual discussion practices, at the speeches themselves, is also important (Scudder, 2020b, 2022). The perceptions reported by the speakers constitute “a useful, albeit limited, measure for identifying whether democratic performative listening has been achieved” - the responses given during the discussions help the act of fair consideration to be observable (Scudder, 2020b, p. 135).

Scudder (2022) presents the LQI - Listening Quality Index, which is built on different analysis methods, including content analysis and post-discussion questionnaires. To assess the listening quality on a seven-level scale, some levels are determined by perceptions of speakers and listeners themselves about how much they felt heard and how they report what they heard. However, at more advanced levels of listening, it is also relevant that the listeners give a response to speakers (active listening) and that this response is a substantive one (responsive listening). This differentiation between the existence of a response and the existence of a substantive response is in line with our interests in differentiating levels of reciprocity.

In a recent study, Esau & Friess (2022) differentiate two types of reciprocity: the simple act of responding and deliberative reciprocity. The former is defined as “an interaction between participants that is reciprocal but lacks coherence, justification, and respect”, while deliberative reciprocity “is a more demanding concept defined as a reciprocal comment that is on topic, respectful in tone, and justified” (Esau & Friess, 2022, p. 9). This study combines a structural dimension and a content dimension, through a Relational Content Analysis methodology. This method helps to apprehend reciprocity in a more complex way than in previous studies. However, this approach still does not systematically capture the substantive meaning itself encoded in communication (arguments, frames, etc.). This is the level that we explore below.

1. ***Previous methodologies for reciprocity in the level of discourses***

The analysis of substantive content of discourses is still incipient in the field of political communication and deliberation. While there is a general agreement about the importance of looking at the content of communication, most scholars make inferences only about the procedural dimension of discussions (for instance, what we named reciprocity at the level of participants’ behavior in this study), but the meaning itself is not converted into categories. Coding substantive content can follow different theoretical guidelines and corresponding code schemes, most notably argument analysis and frame analysis. Working through these empirical studies, with an eye to the purpose of our research, is useful to offer a more general perspective of how to capture this level of communication and transform it into a measurable category.

First, let us consider argumentative analysis. A given argument, that is, “Y why X should or should not be done” (Steiner, 2012 p. 270) carries a propositional content. Mapping the substantive content of the justifications (according to a general list of pro and con arguments) allows one to reconstruct topics under discussion, and the arguments delivered by the categories of actors in an issue-specific controversy. The focus here is the content of the assertion through which the listener can accept, contest, reject or develop claims in other directions. To operationalize this analysis, investigators usually build an extensive list of pro and con arguments on the chosen topic. Previous research has mapped arguments of public controversies over abortion (Ferree et al., 2002; author), gun control (author), same-sex marriage (O'Connor, 2017), voting (Pilon, 2009), educational policy (Saraisky, 2015) and technology use (Peters et al., 2008; Schneider, 2008). Typically, this list of arguments is produced both inductively, by reading the material under analysis (such as transcripts of legislative discussions, news, social media material, etc.), and deductively, by reviewing the specialized literature and empirical studies on the subject. Scholars have examined reciprocity by mapping the set of arguments mobilized by debate sides over time, in order to assess if considerations and responses (counter-argumentation) addresses concerns to render responses intelligible to meet problems, demands or criticisms raised by opponents (Mendonça et al., 2014, author; Weale et al., 2012).

Another way of looking at reciprocity in this level is through *frames* (author; Mendonça & Santos, 2009; Mendonça et al., 2014; Mendonça & Simões, 2022). Mendonça et al. (2014) present a differentiation between two types of reciprocity that they name *direct* and *discursive*: the first refers to interpersonal interactions between interlocutors, and the last refers to the public clash of frames. Looking at the discursive dimension of reciprocity is meant to “rebuild a network that shows how certain discourses collide and respond to each other” (Mendonça et al., 2014, pp. 248–249). This study employs frame analysis on discussions about a political reform in a Brazilian state (Minas Gerais), based on the idea that “understanding and reconstructing the frames of a debate allows mapping the discursive flows that guide the discussion” (Mendonça et al., 2014, p. 251). In this line, we follow the idea that observing how issues are apprehended and addressed in discourses helps to understand whether there is reciprocity: participants’ statements should exhibit some reference to other’s views, considerations, and conclusions to answer questions or move to new explanations.

Here it is worth mentioning the Weale et al. (2012)’ study on reciprocity through a discursive dimension, based on speeches in the UK Parliament debate on abortion over two decades. Following Gutmann and Thompson's (1996) view of reciprocity, this study applies automated content analysis, via a software called Alceste, to group speeches having similarity of words. In the sequence, the authors performed correspondence analysis to verify connection between the classes of sentences to the speaker's position. This analysis tells us whether or not speakers’ considerations are grounded on (and foster) mutual referentiality. According to Weale and colleagues, "if speakers from different sides of the debate are clustered around the same groups of sentences, we have evidence of a necessary condition of reciprocal involvement". But if, on the contrary, "speakers from different sides are disproportionately associated with particular themes, we have evidence of a debate in which participants do not speak to each other" (Weale, Bocquelet & Bara, 2012, p. 648). In this case, reciprocity is at the level of discourse, that is, in the way in which the issue is approached, argued, and elaborated.

1. **Data collection and Corpus**

To collect broad discussions about abortion on Facebook, we followed a multiple-step process: first, we identified the pages that could talk about the topic; then we identify the posts on those pages, and then collect the comments on the identified posts. Finally, a last step was used in the corpus’ construction: the identification and organization of *discussion chains* based on the comments collected.

1. ***First step: pages’ identification and selection***

On political minority rights issues, such as the criminalization/legalization of abortion, there are two main types of Facebook pages that host discussions: media pages and activist pages.

Mainstream media pages, while not impartial, does not claim a clear and specific position on most political issues. The content is produced to reach, a priori, a heterogeneous audience; and the position can lean to one side or the other. In contrast, activist pages typically take a stand and try to defend a given position over time. Our first step, therefore, was to identify the most relevant pages of media and of activism (supporting and contesting the legalization of abortion). To map the pages, three sequential mechanisms were used: a) first, a search for keywords on related subjects in the Facebook search; b) then, a bibliographic review of Brazilian literature about abortion and studies on political debates on Facebook (Alves, 2019, 2021; Holanda, 2020; Prudêncio et al., 2019; Ramos, 2017); and c) finally, the list of pages shared, and pages linked by the pages already mapped. All pages containing some content about abortion were classified in four groups (media, anti-legalization activism, pro-legalization activism, and others). Media pages consisted of those owned by media and/or journalism companies that do not explicitly advocate for or against the legalization of abortion. Activist pages are those organized by social movements, NGOs, activists, collectives, religious civic groups, advocacy agents, activist content creators - that is, any page that is civil society-led, non-journalistic, and advocates for or against the legalization of abortion. Other pages are considered of the *other* type and were not selected for analysis. Our corpus is composed by the two most popular pages of media outlets and groups of activism-pro and activism-con legalization. The criterion used was the number of page followers. Table 1 shows the selected pages.

*Table 01: Selected Facebook pages regarding the debate about the legalization of abortion in Brazil*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Page Name on Facebook | Number of followers  |
| Media | *Portal R7* | 13,3 millions |
| Media | *G1 - O Portal de Notícias da Globo* | 11,6 millions |
| Activism-pro | *Quebrando o Tabu* | 12 millions |
| Activism-pro | *TODAS Fridas* | 1,4 millions |
| Activism-con | *Nossa Senhora cuida de mim* | 5,4 millions |
| Activism-con | *Papa Francisco - Amigos e Amigas* | 4,3 millions |

The two most relevant media pages are *Portal R7* and *G1 - O Portal de Notícias da Globo*. These are two news portals linked to two different media companies, two of the main ones in the country (*Grupo Globo* and *Grupo Record*). The pages *Nossa Senhora Cuida de Mim* and *Papa Francisco - Amigos e Amigas*, with religious themes, act strongly in certain conservative political agendas. Both pages are not officially linked to religious institutions - they belong to groups of ordinary citizens who are religious. Both pages firmly and frequently oppose the legalization of abortion. The activist-pro pages *Quebrando o Tabu* and *TODAS Fridas* strongly defend different liberal and in favour of social and human rights agendas, such as programs to combat economic inequality, rights for black people, LGBTQIA+ population, etc., in addition to frequently defending the legalization of abortion.

1. ***Posts’ identification and discussions’ collection***

We conducted a search on each of the six pages to collect all posts about abortion between January 2013 and December 2019. The search engine linked to the public Facebook pages was used, by employing the following key words: *abortion*, *fetus*, *pregnancy interruption*. Posts containing keywords but not related to the topic were ignored (for example, news about a miscarriage suffered by a celebrity). All posts within the theme were identified, totaling 994 posts. Then, all comments on the 994 posts were collected. We used a data scraping approach with our own script made in Python programming language, using primarily the Selenium library. In total, the 571,123 comments made on all posts were collected and organized in a dataset.

1. ***Discussion chains’ identification and sampling***

There are two types of comments on Facebook posts: *comments* and *comment replies*. We consider a *chain* the initiator comment and its respective responses. Of course, there are smaller chains - with just the initiating comment and a reply to it, totaling two entries - and larger chains, with up to 1,000+ entries. In the case of the abortion discussions studied here (2013 to 2019 on Facebook), in general, there is a significant number of participations in interaction *chains*, indicating that users care about conversations between users, and not just about responding to posts. 52% of entries (action of commenting, either through a comment or through a response to a comment) are inserted in a chain of interaction, and 48% are comments “alone” (they do not respond in a chain and are not responded to).

*Table 02: Participation in discussion chains
(answers and/or is answered in a chain)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Occurrence |
| Participates in a chain of discussion | 299,981(51,9%) |
| Does not participate | 278,142(48,1%) |
| Total |  578,123(100%) |

We identified the existence of 43,396 chains (N = 43,393). The 299,981 entries are distributed across these 43,396 chains, with an average of approximately 7 entries per chain. For this paper, we took a random sample (95% reliability, 5% sampling error) of chains for analysis (n = 381).

*Table 03: Sample of chains for analysis*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total number(*N*) | Sample (*n*) |
| Chains | 43,396 | 381 |
| Entries (comments and responses) | 299,981 | 2,510 |

1. **Results/Full Tables**

*Structure x Behaviour*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | StructurallyNon-Reciprocal | Structurally Reciprocal | *Total* |
| Behaviorally Strongly Non-Reciprocal (*Refusal*) | 145(-3.2281)P = .0012 \*\* | 115(3.2281)P = .0012 \*\* | *260* |
| Behaviorally Non-Reciprocal (*Monologue*) | 119(1.0222) P = .3067 | 55(-1.0222)P = .3067 | *260* |
| Behaviorally Reciprocal (*Simple* *Response*) | 923(8.0712)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 352(-8.0712)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *1,275* |
| Behaviorally Strongly Reciprocal (*Meaningful* *Response*) | 440(-7.1031)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 361(7.1031)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *801* |
| *Total* | *1,627* | *883* |  |
| *χ2 = 76.7202**P value < .0001**Note: Values in parentheses are adjusted residual scores based on the chi-square* |

*Structure x Discourse*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | StructurallyNon-Reciprocal | Structurally Reciprocal | *Total* |
| Discursively Null | 550(14.8514)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 63(-14.8514)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *613* |
| Discursively Non-Reciprocal | 375(-4.4211)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 275(4.4211)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *650* |
| Discursively Partially Reciprocal | 459(-9.1082)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 409(9.1082)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *868* |
| Discursively Reciprocal  | 243(-0.3118)P = .7552 | 136(0.3118)P = .7552 | *379* |
| *Total* | *1,627* | *883* |  |
| *χ2 = 235.5342**P value < .0001**Note: Values in parentheses are adjusted residual scores based on the chi-square* |

*Discourse x Behaviour*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Behaviorally Strongly Non-Reciprocal (*Refusal*) | Behaviorally Non-Reciprocal (*Monologue*) | Behaviorally Reciprocal (*Simple* *Response*) | Behaviorally Strongly Reciprocal (*Meaningful* *Response*) | *Total* |
| Discursively Null | 18(-6.9368)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 31(-2.1025)P = .0355 \* | 437(11.6735)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 127(-6.8395)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *613* |
| Discursively Non-Reciprocal | 125(8.6231)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 47(0.3480)P = .7278 | 383(4.8140)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 95(-10.9899)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *650* |
| Discursively Partially Reciprocal | 88(-0.2633)P = .7923 | 80(3.2758)P = .0011 \*\* | 333(-9.0586)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 367(8.1026)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *868* |
| Discursively Reciprocal  | 29(-1.8768)P = .0605 | 16(-2.2548)P = .0241 \* | 122(-7.8636)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | 212(10.8894)P < .0001 \*\*\*\* | *379* |
| *Total* | *260* | *174* | *1275* | *801* |  |
| *χ2 = 392.6286**P value < .0001**Note: Values in parentheses are the adjusted residual scores based on the chi-square* |