

Large Language Model based Situational Dialogues for Second Language Learning

Shuyao Xu, Long Qin, Tianyang Chen,
Zhenzhou Zha, and Bingxue Qiu, Weizhi Wang
Alibaba Group

{xushuyao.xsy, ql362507, wangweizhi.wwz}@alibaba-inc.com
{chentianyang.cty, zhazhenzhou.zzz, mihe.cbx}@taobao.com

Abstract

In second language learning, scenario-based conversation practice is important for language learners to achieve fluency in speaking, but students often lack sufficient opportunities to practice their conversational skills with qualified instructors or native speakers. To bridge this gap, we propose situational dialogue models for students to engage in conversational practice. Our situational dialogue models are fine-tuned on large language models (LLMs), with the aim of combining the engaging nature of an open-ended conversation with the focused practice of scenario-based tasks. Leveraging the generalization capabilities of LLMs, we demonstrate that our situational dialogue models perform effectively not only on training topics but also on topics not encountered during training. This offers a promising solution to support a wide range of conversational topics without extensive manual work. Additionally, research in the field of dialogue systems still lacks reliable automatic evaluation metrics, leading to human evaluation as the gold standard (Smith et al., 2022), which is typically expensive. To address the limitations of existing evaluation methods, we present a novel automatic evaluation method that employs fine-tuned LLMs to efficiently and effectively assess the performance of situational dialogue models.

1 Introduction

Research in second language acquisition has emphasized the significance of engaging in relevant exercises within the language being learned (Van Patten et al., 2020). However, the shortage of quality language education resources, such as experienced teachers, is a major challenge, especially in some developing countries. Second language acquisition theories suggest that a significant amount of practice is necessary to achieve fluency in speaking (DeKeyser and DeKeyser, 2007). Unfortunately, many students do not have the chance to practice their conversational skills in their target language

with a qualified instructor or a native speaker. The significantly improved language learning technologies, powered by advances in natural language processing and AI, such as grammatical error correction (Bryant et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2019), automated essay scoring (Taghipour and Ng, 2016; Dong et al., 2017), and automatic speech assessment (Chen et al., 2018), have the potential to mitigate the inequity challenge in language learning. However, most of such language learning technologies are designed to help learners improve their vocabulary, grammar, writing, and pronunciation, though conversational skills remain an area where the development of these technologies could further improve.

Educational dialogue systems, particularly those aimed at helping students improve their conversational skills, have been designed as task-oriented dialogue systems (Huang et al., 2017; Kwon et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020, 2022a). Designing these systems requires substantial effort from experts to define the state and action spaces. Moreover, the interactions they produce can often become tedious and repetitive due to limited variability and personalization (Li et al., 2022b). Consequently, this undermines their effectiveness in engaging learners and hampers their ability to deliver a personalized learning experience.

Due to the outstanding language understanding and generation capacity of large language models (LLMs) (Kasneci et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022), open-ended dialogue systems based on LLMs have been increasingly popular. However, open-ended dialogue systems are not directly suitable for use in the field of language education. A major drawback is their lack of focus on targeted scenario-based practice. When learning a second language, it is beneficial for beginners to start with concrete and practical communication scenarios, which can help them understand and practice the use of the language in specific contexts (Nunan, 2004). Open-

ended dialogue systems are typically designed to handle a wide range of topics and types of communication, which means they may not inherently focus on specific scenarios critical for language practice.

To address the issues mentioned above, we propose a topic-based situational dialogue task and situational dialogue models based on LLMs. A situational dialogue task involves interactions confined to specific scenarios or topics, providing a structured yet flexible framework for dialogue. This approach offers a higher degree of freedom compared to task-oriented dialogue, making dialogue more engaging and interesting. Unlike open-ended dialogue, which allows conversation to flow in any direction without topical constraints, situational dialogue confines the interaction to specific topics and focuses language training on these topics to enhance relevance and coherence in those contexts.

The generalization ability of LLMs has been widely noted (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Chung et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2023). In the context of situational dialogues, we not only expect models to perform well on topics covered in the training data (in-domain topics), but we also anticipate that they can generalize to topics not present in the training data (out-of-domain topics), thereby reducing the need for complex manual design. Our experiments demonstrate that our situational dialogue models leveraging the generalization abilities of LLMs have the potential to perform well on out-of-domain topics.

Additionally, we show a baseline that employs a prompt-based approach using ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023) as the dialogue model. Although dialogue systems based on general-purpose LLMs, like GPT-3.5, which usually have hundreds of billions of parameters demonstrate strong performance, the proposed dialogue models based on fine-tuned LLMs with tens of billions of parameters can achieve comparable results.

The evaluation of dialogue models is also a challenge. Although human evaluation methods tend to perform well, they are too costly and slow to be feasible for the rapid iteration of models. On the other hand, automatic evaluation metrics such as BLEU, METEOR and ROUGE are often not reliable enough due to the open-ended nature of conversations (Liu et al., 2016). In this work, we propose novel evaluation metrics, including the re-

sponse success rate, which measures a dialogue model’s ability to generate appropriate individual responses within a dialogue, and the session success rate, which assesses a dialogue model’s ability to produce coherent and consistent conversations. Using these metrics, we can assess dialogue interactions at the level of individual utterances as well as the overall conversation. Furthermore, we introduce an automatic evaluation approach employing LLMs that enables efficient and reliable evaluation of situational dialogue models, thereby supporting rapid model optimization.

Overall, our contributions in this work are as follows:

- We introduce a situational dialogue approach based on LLMs for second language learning, and release a situational dialogue dataset. Our experiments show that an LLM with 14 billion parameters, fine-tuned on the dataset, can achieve good performance in the situational dialogue task, outperforming a strong baseline based on GPT-3.5, with the advantage of lower computational costs.
- Through rigorous testing on diverse unseen topics, we show that our proposed situational dialogue models possess strong generalization capabilities. This is a significant advantage over traditional educational dialogue systems, as we can easily broaden the scope of situational topics without requiring extensive manual effort.
- We present a novel automatic evaluation method that can evaluate situational dialogue models efficiently and reliably for the situational dialogue task, thereby facilitating convenient and rapid development of situational dialogue models.

2 Related Work

Li et al. (2022a) propose a dialogue system for language learning built on the Gunrock 2.0 framework (Liang et al., 2020). This system employs a task-oriented approach that typically includes modules for natural language understanding, dialogue management, and natural language generation. The system treats each topic as a separate task, with each one being a finite state machine, in which the transitions and states are typically predefined,




Figure 1: Overview of the Dialogue System. The dialogue agent consists of a dialogue model which generates responses and suggestions and an end-of-dialogue detector. In the dialogue agent, "R" and "S" refer to the response generation branch and the suggestion generation branch respectively. In the response generation branch, the end-of-dialogue detector is applied twice: first, to determine whether the user input concludes the conversation, and second, to assess if the model's response has ended the dialogue.

meaning that the dialogue follows a set of predefined rules and paths that determine the conversation flow. Another approach for chatbots designed for language learning is the use of rule-based systems (Ehsani et al., 2000), where the conversation flow can be directed into different paths based on the user's selections from a predetermined list of utterances. The main limitations of these systems include the restricted flexibility in conversation and the substantial amount of effort needed from experts to develop them. Different from the work mentioned above, the proposed system employs LLMs as a core component of the dialogue system, which can facilitate conversations on specific topics while simultaneously offering users considerable flexibility.

Using automatic evaluation metrics can speed up the progress of conversational system development, but the method for automatically evaluating dialogue models still remains an open question. The commonly used automatic metrics for other natural language generation tasks, like BLEU, have been shown to have a weak correlation with human judgment (Liu et al., 2016). Therefore, human evaluation remains the gold standard in the development of dialogue models (Zhu et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023a). Unfortunately, how to conduct human evaluation is also an open problem (Smith et al., 2022). The two commonly used approaches, which are the single-turn pairwise evaluation and the multi-turn Likert scale assessment, are both flawed (Li et al., 2019). A recent emerging trend involves using trained metrics: Lowe et al. (2017) suggest training a model to imitate human judgment when eval-

uating dialogue responses. Ghandeharioun et al. (2019) suggest an automated evaluation approach with trained scoring models for open-domain dialogue systems, where the dialogue system engages in conversation with itself. However, these systems may not generalize well to data that is different from the data on which they were trained (Smith et al., 2022). In contrast to open-ended dialogue, in the context of a situational conversation task, the dialogue needs to revolve around the required topic of conversation. Based on this characteristic, the evaluation of situational dialogue models needs to be tested across all target topics, which often requires the model to handle topics that fall outside the scope of its training data. Therefore, methods that are trained and evaluated solely on in-domain data are not well-suited for the evaluation of situational dialogue tasks. Zheng et al. (2023) propose to prompt strong LLMs like GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) to assess the quality of dialogue models' responses on a set of challenging multi-turn open-ended questions, while their approach is intended for evaluating general-purpose chat assistants. Thus, their approach is not well-suited for the situational dialogue task.

3 Data Generation

We design 51 situational topics based on topics commonly covered in English textbooks for Chinese elementary and middle schools, such as hobbies, vacation plans and environmental protection, and corresponding prompts for data generation. The full list of the topics can be found in Table 6

in Appendix. We use OpenAI’s GPT-3.5-turbo¹ to generate 150 dialogues for each topic, resulting in a total of 7,650 dialogues. In the process of dialogue generation, we also add instructions to encourage the model to use simple words and sentences, as our target users are second language learners. Subsequently, we manually refine the generated dialogue data²; for example, we filter dialogues that contain errors against basic factual knowledge or logical inconsistencies. This process resulted in approximately 3,000 high-quality dialogue entries, selected based on criteria such as relevance to the topic, linguistic accuracy, and simplicity of language suitable for second language learners. We present a prompt example for data generation and an example of generated dialogue in Figure 4 and Figure 5 respectively in Appendix.

We hypothesize that situational dialogue models also have the ability to generalize to topics that they have not been trained on. To assess the model’s generalization ability, we devise an additional 20 topics that are significantly different from the aforementioned topics, including the Renaissance, the influence of COVID-19, globalization, and other topics detailed in Table 7 in Appendix. For these topics, we did not employ an LLM to generate dialogue data; instead, these topics serve exclusively to test the model’s performance on out-of-domain content.

4 Dialogue Models

As illustrated in Figure 1, our system is composed of a dialogue agent paired with a dialogue state tracker. The dialogue state tracker updates the conversation history with the user’s latest utterance, and then passes the updated dialogue state, including the agent’s responses, user replies, the topic and whether the conversation has terminated, to the dialogue agent. If a user requests a suggestion on his/her behalf, the dialogue state is directly passed to the dialogue model, which in turn produces a suggestion. Once the user has received the suggestion, the dialogue state tracker removes both the suggestion request and the generated suggestion from the dialogue history to avoid confusing the dialogue agent. Otherwise, the dialogue state is sent to an end-of-dialogue detector which is employed to check whether the user has ended the chat. If the dialogue is still ongoing, the dialogue state is

fed into the dialogue model for response generation. The newly formed response, along with the dialogue state, is then re-evaluated by the end-of-dialogue detector to see whether the conversation has reached its end.

4.1 Response Generation

We implement dialogue models by fine-tuning LLMs on the situational dialogue dataset. To preserve the LLMs’ ability to follow instructions during fine-tuning, we have additionally included 10% Alpaca data³ (Taori et al., 2023) in our training dataset. In our experiments, we utilize the Qwen series as base models, specifically selecting the 1.8-billion-parameter version (Qwen-1.8B-Chat), the 7-billion-parameter version (Qwen-7B-Chat), and the 14-billion-parameter version (Qwen-14B-Chat)⁴ (Bai et al., 2023).

Given a multi-turn conversation:

$$C = \{(U_1, A_1), (U_2, A_2), \dots, (U_N, A_N)\}, \quad (1)$$

where U and A represent utterances from a user and a dialogue agent respectively, with (U_n, A_n) forming one dialogue turn.

$$U_n = (x_1^n, x_2^n, \dots, x_{u_n}^n), \quad (2)$$

$$A_n = (y_1^n, y_2^n, \dots, y_{a_n}^n), \quad (3)$$

where u_n and a_n denote the number of tokens of U_n and A_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Throughout the training process, we optimize the model by employing the vanilla next token prediction loss with the teacher forcing strategy. Specifically, the loss function is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\sum_{n=1}^N a_n} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^{a_n} \log p(\hat{y} = y_k^n | X, \theta), \quad (4)$$

where,

$$X = \{(U_1, A_1), \dots, (U_{n-1}, A_{n-1}), (U_n, A'_n)\}, \quad (5)$$

$$A'_n = (y_1^n, y_2^n, \dots, y_{k-1}^n) \quad (6)$$

³The dataset is CC BY NC 4.0 (allowing only non-commercial use).

⁴QwenLM/Qwen is licensed under the Apache License 2.0.

¹<https://openai.com/chatgpt>

²The human annotators are the authors of this paper.




Figure 2: Suggestion data formulation. Agent utterances are in blue boxes and user utterances are in orange boxes. Suggestion turns are randomly inserted into dialogues for training dialogue models to acquire suggestion generation capability.

4.2 Suggestion Generation

Unlike open-ended conversations, situational dialogues, are designed to help students practice speaking in their target language. In these exercises, students might sometimes require the dialogue agent to offer constructive suggestions and support in case they encounter difficulties due to their restricted language skills, such as searching for the right vocabulary or constructing grammatically correct sentences.

In our experiments, we facilitate suggestion generation by fine-tuning on the dialogue training data with randomly inserted suggestion turns as illustrated in Figure 2. We incorporate suggestion turns by replacing a selected user’s utterance with a predefined instruction that seeks suggestions. The original utterance is considered as the ideal suggestion and is used as the target output for the dialogue models to predict during the training phase, thereby teaching the model to produce contextually appropriate suggestions on the user’s behalf.

4.3 End-of-Dialogue Detector

Situational dialogues are often briefer than open-domain conversations because they are typically focused on specific tasks or contexts, and there is a finite amount of relevant information that can be exchanged about a particular topic. To this end, we employ an end-of-dialogue detector, which is designed to determine when a conversation has naturally concluded and no further relevant information can be exchanged.

Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
0.987	0.991	0.983	0.987

Table 1: End-of-Dialogue Detector performance. We take complete dialogues as positive samples.

We formulate the end-of-dialogue detection as a binary classification problem based on dialogue history. We fine-tune an extra Qwen-1.8b-Chat model to serve as the end-of-dialogue detector. We construct 2,000 and 500 dialogues for training and testing respectively from our situational dialogue dataset with balanced positive samples (completed dialogues) and negative samples (incomplete dialogues). The performance of the detector on the test set, as detailed in Table 1, demonstrates its ability to accurately predict the completion of dialogues, achieving an accuracy of 98.7%.

4.4 Prompt-based Dialogue Models

Building conversational systems through prompts with general LLMs is a popular approach (Lee et al., 2023b). We use GPT-3.5-turbo (as of Dec. 2023) as baseline and generate responses and suggestions by interacting with the dialogue model through its API. Utterances generated in the role of the agent are categorized as responses, and those generated in the role of the user are treated as suggestions. An illustrative example of a prompt used for calling the model’s API is provided in Figure 6 in Appendix.




Figure 3: Overview of the automatic evaluation pipeline. The evaluation system consists of a judge and a talker model. The judge is employed to assess whether the output of the dialogue agent is an appropriate response to the given context.

	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
Response	0.989	0.981	0.996	0.989
Suggestion	0.980	0.966	0.994	0.979

Table 2: Judge performance on the response testing set and the suggestion testing set.

5 Evaluation

5.1 Automatic Metrics

For the situational dialogue task, in which each conversation typically consists of several turns of interactions between a dialogue agent and a user, we propose three metrics: response success rate, suggestion success rate, and session success rate. The response success rate, defined as the proportion of correct agent responses to total agent responses, reflects the dialogue model’s ability to generate contextually and semantically appropriate agent responses. The suggestion success rate, defined as the proportion of correct suggestions to total suggestions, indicates the model’s capability to provide appropriate suggestions on behalf of the user. For automatic evaluation, we train a talker model, as described in Section 5.2.2, to simulate a user engaging in a conversation with a dialogue agent. A session refers to a conversation between the dialogue agent and the talker model, which ends either when the conversation naturally concludes (determined by the end-of-dialogue detector), or when the judge detects an incorrect response or an incorrect suggestion from the dialogue agent. A session is deemed successful if it contains no response errors and no suggestion errors throughout the entire conversation. The session success rate,

	In-domain Topics			
	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
Response	0.971	0.977	0.993	0.985
Suggestion	0.977	0.985	0.991	0.988

	Out-of-domain Topics			
	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
Response	0.982	0.985	0.996	0.990
Suggestion	0.970	0.972	0.996	0.984

Table 3: Manual inspection on judge performance on in domain-topics and out-of-domain topics.

defined as the proportion of successful sessions to the total number of sessions conducted, evaluates the dialogue agent’s performance at the conversation level, providing a holistic view of the agent’s effectiveness in engaging in coherent dialogues.

5.2 Automatic Evaluation Method

We propose an automatic evaluation pipeline as depicted in Figure 3. During the evaluation process, a set of initial prompts is provided, where each prompt initiates a conversation on a specific topic. Conversations take place between the dialogue agent and the talker model, with the dialogue state tracker recording the dialogue history. To also evaluate the dialogue agent’s ability to generate suggestions, we introduce a random variable, the suggestion rate, within the talker model. This variable determines whether the talker should send a suggestion request to the dialogue agent or generate a user response.

The judge is used to assess whether the dialogue agent’s responses or suggestions are contextually appropriate for each turn of conversation. The con-

	Talker Success Rate
In-domain	0.994
Out-of-domain	0.994

Table 4: Talker performance on the 51 in-domain topics and 20 out-of-domain topics. Talker success rate is defined as a proportion of contextually and semantically appropriate talker responses to total talker responses.

versation continues until either the end-of-dialogue detector determines that the conversation has concluded, or the judge determines that the dialogue agent has provided a response or suggestion that is either factually incorrect or contextually inappropriate.

5.2.1 Judge

Dialogue evaluation is conducted at the utterance level by framing the task as a binary classification problem. In this task, a judge is provided with a conversational context and an utterance and is tasked with predicting whether the utterance is an appropriate response by ensuring that it is sensible, coherent, and consistent with the given context.

We divided the situational dialogue dataset by topics, randomly selecting 41 topics for the training set to cover a diverse range of conversations and reserving the remaining 10 topics for the testing to ensure the judge can generalize to new, unseen topics. From the training topics, we construct 4,000 context and utterance pairs with balanced positive and negative pairs, while from the testing topics, we create 2,000 pairs including a subset of 1,000 response pairs dedicated to assessing the judge performance on responses, and another subset of 1,000 suggestion pairs used to evaluate the judge performance on suggestions. We consider the samples where context and utterance are coherent, sensible and consistent as positive examples. For negative pairs, we randomly select utterances either from different conversations or from the same conversation, provided they are not the ground truth.

We obtain the judge by fine-tuning the Qwen-14B-Chat model on the aforementioned training pairs. The test results presented in Table 2 demonstrate that the judge is capable of making accurate predictions in both response and suggestion scenarios. A higher recall compared to precision shows that the system is biased towards making positive predictions, which is preferable. The negative impact of mistakenly ending a proper conversation is

larger than the impact of not ending a conversation that should be terminated. Empirically, a dialogue model is more prone to generating an incorrect response if the dialogue history already contains an incorrect utterance. Therefore, when the judge mistakenly assesses an incorrect utterance as correct, leading to an erroneous response generated by the dialogue model due to the inclusion of incorrect conversational history, it allows the judge to have more opportunities to correct its previous misjudgments at the conversation level.

To further assess the judge’s performance in actual dialogue evaluation, we manually verified approximately 2,000 pair samples, each consisting of a dialogue context and an utterance, randomly selected from a dataset of conversations previously evaluated by the judge, with 1,000 coming from in-domain topics and another 1,000 coming from out-of-domain topics. The results in Table 3 demonstrate that judge exhibits reliable performance in actual dialogue evaluation process, both on in-domain topics and out-of-domain topics. Additionally, we explore the use of GPT-3 prompted with few-shot examples as the judge; however, our experiments did not achieve promising results, and we will conduct further research to investigate potential factors contributing to these outcomes.

5.2.2 Talker Model

We also obtain the talker model by fine-tuning Qwen-14B-Chat. The key distinction in training methods is that the talker model is trained solely for generating user responses, in contrast to the dialogue models, which are optimized primarily for producing agent responses.

We evaluate the performance of the talker model by the judge described in Section 5.2.1. The approach for assessing the talker is similar to the process outlined in Section 5.2, with the difference being that the judge evaluates the talker’s utterances and the probability of requesting suggestions is set to 0. In this evaluation, we exclude any sessions that contain erroneous responses from the dialogue agent. As the results presented in Table 4, the talker model is capable of producing reliable responses for both in-domain and out-of-domain topics.

5.3 Results

We evaluate the performance of dialogue agents across 51 in-domain topics. During our experiments, we conduct 30 sessions for each topic, with a suggestion rate of 0.5 in the talker model. As

	In-domain Topics			Out-of-domain Topics		
	Response	Suggestion	Session	Response	Suggestion	Session
Qwen-1.8B	0.928	0.855	0.174	0.924	0.892	0.232
Qwen-7B	0.980	0.976	0.776	0.979	0.982	0.812
Qwen-14B	0.988	0.990	0.882	0.990	0.982	0.875
GPT-3.5-turbo	0.987	0.982	0.834	0.990	0.987	0.860

Table 5: Response success rate, Suggestion success rate and Session success rate on 51 in-domain topics and 20 out-of-domain topics. Qwen-1.8B, Qwen-7B and Qwen-14B refer to situational dialogue agents based on Qwen-1.8B-Chat, Qwen-7B-Chat and Qwen-14B-Chat respectively, and GPT-3.5-turbo is the prompt-based dialogue model.

shown in Table 5, larger models achieve better performance. The Qwen-1.8B based dialogue agent, which performs significantly worse than the Qwen-7B based model and the Qwen-14B based model, is not capable of maintaining coherent and relevant dialogue throughout most sessions without encountering response errors or suggestion errors. In comparison, the Qwen-7B and Qwen-14B based agents can reliably generate reasonable responses and suggestions, resulting in most conversations being error-free.

We evaluate the generalization ability of dialogue agents on the 20 out-of-domain topics, listed in Table 7 in Appendix. Compared to the results on the in-domain topics, we do not observe a significant performance drop on the out-of-domain topics. Our experiments demonstrate that the situational dialogue models based on Qwen models have the potential to generalize to out-of-domain topics.

The prompt-based approach based on GPT-3.5-turbo is a strong baseline for the situational dialogue task, achieving better performance than Qwen-7B but weaker than Qwen-14B. However, this GPT-3.5-turbo-based approach may incur higher inference costs, which is a concern in practical applications.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we introduce a situational dialogue approach based on fine-tuned LLMs for enhancing the conversational skills of students learning a second language. For evaluation, we employ three metrics: response success rate, suggestion success rate, and session success rate. These metrics allow us to evaluate situational dialogues at both the individual utterance level and the overall conversation level. Additionally, we propose an automatic evaluation method to efficiently and reliably evaluate situational dialogue models. Our

experiments demonstrate that fine-tuned 7B or 14B LLMs perform well on the situational dialogue task. Moreover, we show that our proposed situational dialogue models generalize well on topics that do not appear in the training data. Therefore, we can support more topics without requiring extensive manual effort. This is a significant advantage over task-oriented educational dialogue systems (Li et al., 2022a), which typically require experts to define the dialogue spaces.

7 Limitations

The proposed metrics, response success rate, suggestion success rate, and session success rate can only reflect whether a conversation is contextually appropriate, coherent and consistent, but cannot assess the conversations comprehensively, for example, in terms of interestingness (Lee et al., 2024). In teaching practice, it is essential for conversations to adapt to the learner’s language proficiency level. This adaptation should align with the educational content, avoiding using complex vocabulary, phrases or grammatical structures that exceed learners’ language capacity. However, we have limited ability to precisely control the language level of content generated by LLMs, and further advancements are needed.

8 Ethical Statement

There are concerns regarding the potential toxicity and bias associated with language generation from LLMs. The fine-tuned version of these LLMs in our work may also pose risks of generating offensive or controversial outputs. Considering our target users include a significant number of young students, ensuring a safe deployment and interaction is of utmost importance.

References

- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. [Qwen technical report](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Christopher Bryant, Zheng Yuan, Muhammad Reza Qorib, Hannan Cao, Hwee Tou Ng, and Ted Briscoe. 2023. Grammatical error correction: A survey of the state of the art. *Computational Linguistics*, 49(3):643–701.
- Lei Chen, Jidong Tao, Shabnam Ghaffar zadegan, and Yao Qian. 2018. End-to-end neural network based automated speech scoring. In *2018 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6234–6238. IEEE.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Robert M. DeKeyser and Robert DeKeyser. 2007. *Study abroad as foreign language practice*, Cambridge Applied Linguistics, page 208–226. Cambridge University Press.
- Fei Dong, Yue Zhang, and Jie Yang. 2017. Attention-based recurrent convolutional neural network for automatic essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 21st conference on computational natural language learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 153–162.
- Farzad Ehsani, Jared Bernstein, and Amir Najmi. 2000. [An interactive dialog system for learning japanese](#). *Speech Communication*, 30(2):167–177.
- Asma Ghandeharioun, Judy Hanwen Shen, Natasha Jaques, Craig Ferguson, Noah Jones, Agata Lapedriza, and Rosalind Picard. 2019. Approximating interactive human evaluation with self-play for open-domain dialog systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Jin-Xia Huang, Kyung-Soon Lee, Oh-Woog Kwon, and Young-Kil Kim. 2017. A chatbot for a dialogue-based second language learning system. *CALL in a climate of change: adapting to turbulent global conditions—short papers from EUROCALL*, pages 151–156.
- Enkelejda Kasneci, Kathrin Seßler, Stefan Küchemann, Maria Bannert, Daryna Dementieva, Frank Fischer, Urs Gasser, Georg Groh, Stephan Günemann, Eyke Hüllermeier, et al. 2023. Chatgpt for good? on opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and individual differences*, 103:102274.
- Oh-Woog Kwon, Young-Kil Kim, and Yunkeun Lee. 2018. Task graph based task-oriented dialogue system using dialogue map for second language learning. *Future-proof CALL: language learning as exploration and encounters—short papers from EUROCALL 2018*, pages 153–159.
- Gibbeum Lee, Volker Hartmann, Jongho Park, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. 2023a. [Prompted LLMs as chatbot modules for long open-domain conversation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4536–4554, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gibbeum Lee, Volker Hartmann, Jongho Park, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. 2023b. [Prompted llms as chatbot modules for long open-domain conversation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mina Lee, Megha Srivastava, Amelia Hardy, John Thickstun, Esin Durmus, Ashwin Paranjape, Ines Gerard-Ursin, Xiang Lisa Li, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Rose E. Wang, Minae Kwon, Joon Sung Park, Hancheng Cao, Tony Lee, Rishi Bommasani, Michael Bernstein, and Percy Liang. 2024. [Evaluating human-language model interaction](#).
- Kuo-Chen Li, Maiga Chang, and Kuan-Hsing Wu. 2020. Developing a task-based dialogue system for english language learning. *Education Sciences*, 10(11):306.
- Margaret Li, Jason Weston, and Stephen Roller. 2019. Acute-eval: Improved dialogue evaluation with optimized questions and multi-turn comparisons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03087*.
- Yu Li, Chun-Yen Chen, Dian Yu, Sam Davidson, Ryan Hou, Xun Yuan, Yinghua Tan, Derek Pham, and Zhou Yu. 2022a. [Using chatbots to teach languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale, L@S '22*. ACM.
- Yu Li, Chun-Yen Chen, Dian Yu, Sam Davidson, Ryan Hou, Xun Yuan, Yinghua Tan, Derek Pham, and Zhou Yu. 2022b. [Using chatbots to teach languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale*, pages 451–455.
- Kaihui Liang, Austin Chau, Yu Li, Xueyuan Lu, Dian Yu, Mingyang Zhou, Ishan Jain, Sam Davidson, Josh Arnold, Minh Nguyen, et al. 2020. Gunrock 2.0: A

- user adaptive social conversational system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08906*.
- Chia-Wei Liu, Ryan Lowe, Iulian V Serban, Michael Noseworthy, Laurent Charlin, and Joelle Pineau. 2016. How not to evaluate your dialogue system: An empirical study of unsupervised evaluation metrics for dialogue response generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.08023*.
- Ryan Lowe, Michael Noseworthy, Iulian Vlad Serban, Nicolas Angelard-Gontier, Yoshua Bengio, and Joelle Pineau. 2017. Towards an automatic turing test: Learning to evaluate dialogue responses. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1116–1126.
- David Nunan. 2004. *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- OpenAI. 2023. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue. <https://chat.openai.com>. Accessed: 2023-12-01.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*.
- Eric Smith, Orion Hsu, Rebecca Qian, Stephen Roller, Y-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2022. [Human evaluation of conversations is an open problem: comparing the sensitivity of various methods for evaluating dialogue agents](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI*, pages 77–97, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaveh Taghipour and Hwee Tou Ng. 2016. A neural approach to automated essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1882–1891.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Bill VanPatten, Gregory D Keating, and Stefanie Wulff. 2020. *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Shuyao Xu, Jiehao Zhang, Jin Chen, and Long Qin. 2019. Erroneous data generation for grammatical error correction. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 149–158.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena](#).
- Andrew Zhu, Karmanya Aggarwal, Alexander Feng, Lara Martin, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. [Fireball: A dataset of dungeons and dragons actual-play with structured game state information](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4171–4193, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Prompt Templates and Situational Dialogue Topics

We present a prompt example for dialogue generation in Figure 4 and an example of generated dialogue in Figure 5. An example of a prompt template for the prompt-based dialogue model is shown in Figure 6.

The 51 in-domain topics and 20 out-of-domain topics are presented in Table 6 and Table 7 respectively.

B Training Details

In this work, we utilize the Qwen series⁵ as our base models. Our training framework builds upon FastChat⁶. All models, including the dialogue models, the end-of-dialogue detector, the judge, and the talker model, are trained using the same hyperparameters. We employ a batch size of 128, a learning rate of $2e-5$, and a sequence length of 4,096. Each model is trained on its specific training data (dialogue data for dialogue models and the talker model, the end-of-dialogue training set for the end-of-dialogue detector, and the judge training set for the judge model) with an additional 10% of the Alpaca instruction-following data⁷. We train each model for a specific number of training steps: 70 steps for the dialogue models, 140 steps for the talker model, and 210 steps for both the end-of-dialogue detector and the judge. The training is done with 2x A100 GPUs and the longest single training run takes around 12 hours.

⁵<https://github.com/QwenLM/Qwen>

⁶<https://github.com/lm-sys/FastChat>

⁷https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca

Animals	Best day	Best friend
Color	Daily routines	Dream house
China	Chinese food	Colleague
Family	Foreign language	In a restaurant
My hometown	Invention	Job
Self introduction	Sports	Spring festival
Travel plan	Vacation plan	Worst weather
Admired person	Advantages and disadvantages	Challenge
Free time	Gift received	Gift for someone
Scared thing	Seasons	Teacher
Emotions	Favorite book	Cities
Favorite movie	Environmental protection	My neighbourhood
Job interview	Favorite game	Most impressive thing
My pets	Superhero	Transportation
Your dreams	Check-in hotel	My birthday
Help	Lie	Choice
Weather	My hobbies	Free Talk

Table 6: In-domain topics for dialogue generation and model training.

2008 Economic crisis	Drug abuse	Influence of COVID-19
Online shopping	Artificial intelligence	Educational equity
Internet addiction	Pros and cons of self driving	Buying a new car
Extreme sports	nuclear weapons	The fall of Byzantine empire
Charity	Gardening	Obesity and keeping a diet
The Renaissance	Climate change	Globalization
Online learning	Traffic safety	

Table 7: Out-of-domain topics for evaluating generalization ability.

I want you to imitate a dialogue between two students, [A] and [B], talking about their favorite games. The student [A] is curious about [B]'s favorite game, this game can be video game, board game, card game, sports game, party game and so on. So [A] needs to ask questions to continue the conversation. This dialogue needs to follow the following requirements:

1. [B]'s vocabulary is limited to approximately 1000-1500 English words and can only understand basic English words and phrases. It is difficult for [B] to understand difficult words and complex sentences. In our conversation, you can only use simple English words and phrases to help [B] to better understand and participate in the conversation.
2. No explanation needed.
3. [A] needs to wait for [B] to answer the question before asking the next one.
4. In the dialogue, use [A] and [B] to refer to the names of the two students.
5. Be more creative with the question that [A] asks.

Figure 4: A prompt example for generating dialogue.

[A]: Hey! What's your favorite game?
[B]: Oh, uh...my favorite game is football.

[A]: Football, huh? That's cool! Do you play it with friends or just watch it on TV?
[B]: I play it with friends at school. I like being on a team and kicking the ball.

[A]: That sounds like a lot of fun! Is there a specific position you like to play?
[B]: I like to play as a striker. I try to score goals for my team.

[A]: Wow, that's impressive! Have you ever scored a goal in a real game?
[B]: Sometimes, yes! It makes me really happy when I score a goal.

[A]: I can imagine! Do you have a favorite football team that you support?
[B]: Yes, my favorite team is Barcelona. I like watching them play on TV.

[A]: Barcelona is a great team! Is there any particular player you admire?
[B]: Yes, I really like Lionel Messi. He is an amazing player and scores a lot of goals.

[A]: Messi is indeed one of the best! Is there any reason why you enjoy football so much?
[B]: I think it's because football makes me feel energetic and I have a lot of fun playing it.

[A]: That's wonderful! Do you play football every day or only on weekends?
[B]: I play football during recess at school and sometimes on weekends with my friends.

[A]: It's great that you get to play often! Is there any other game you enjoy besides football?
[B]: Yes, I also like playing video games. Mario Kart is one of my favorites.

[A]: Mario Kart is awesome! Do you have a favorite character that you use when playing?
[B]: I like using Mario because he is the main character and I think he's cool.

[A]: That's cool! Do you usually play alone or with others when you're playing Mario Kart?
[B]: I usually play with my brother or cousins. It's more fun when we can race against each other.

[A]: I agree, playing with others brings more excitement! Well, thanks for sharing. It was nice to know about your favorite games.
[B]: You're welcome! It was nice talking about games with you too.

Figure 5: An example of generated dialogue.

This is a conversation talking about buying a new car between [USER NAME] and [AI NAME].
Given the following context:

[AI NAME]: Hey, have you thought about getting a new car lately?
[USER NAME]: Yes, I have been considering it. What are your thoughts on what type of car I should get?

[AI NAME]: What are your priorities when it comes to a new car? Do you value fuel efficiency, safety features, or something else?
[USER NAME]: I prioritize fuel efficiency as I do a lot of driving for work. But I also want something safe and reliable.

[AI NAME]: What are some specific makes and models that meet your criteria for fuel efficiency and safety?

You are [USER NAME], and need to generate a short and simple utterance to continue this conversation naturally and consistently.

Figure 6: A prompt example for prompt-based baseline.