
EXTRACTING TRIPLES FROM DIALOGUES FOR CONVERSATIONAL SOCIAL AGENTS

Piek Vossen, Selene Báez Santamaría, Lenka Bajčetić, and Thomas Belluci

Computational Linguistics and Text Mining Lab,
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Amsterdam

{s.baezsantamaria, piek.vossen}@vu.nl
lenka.bajcetic@ic.etf.bg.ac

ABSTRACT

Obtaining an explicit understanding of communication within a Hybrid Intelligence collaboration is essential to create controllable and transparent agents. In this paper, we describe a number of Natural Language Understanding models that extract explicit symbolic triples from social conversation. Triple extraction has mostly been developed and tested for Knowledge Base Completion using Wikipedia text and data for training and testing. However, social conversation is very different as a genre in which interlocutors exchange information in sequences of utterances that involve statements, questions, and answers. Phenomena such as co-reference, ellipsis, coordination, and implicit and explicit negation or confirmation are more prominent in conversation than in Wikipedia text. We therefore describe an attempt to fill this gap by releasing data sets for training and testing triple extraction from social conversation. We also created five triple extraction models and tested them in our evaluation data. The highest precision is 51.14 for complete triples and 69.32 for triple elements when tested on single utterances. However, scores for conversational triples that span multiple turns are much lower, showing that extracting knowledge from true conversational data is much more challenging.

Keywords Information extraction · Social Conversations · Conversational AI

1 Introduction

In a Hybrid Intelligence context in which humans and agents need to collaborate, social information exchange is crucial. Recently, generative Large Language Models (LLMs) [1, 2] excel in having social conversations with people; yet the knowledge exchanged remains implicit. Our goal is to develop conversational agents that explicitly represent the information exchanged in a way that can function as an episodic memory, for example, as Knowledge Graphs (KGs) [3]. This will give an agent more control over the goals of the interaction and allow for explicit symbolic reasoning. Especially in collaborative scenarios, such an explicit representation can provide transparency and explainability. In order for social conversational agents to create such KGs, they need to detect information and perspectives expressed in dialogue as RDF¹ triples that can be added to the memory graph.

People often talk about each other in social conversations. Most conversations are therefore homodiegetic [4], telling a story from the perspective of the speaker. It is not surprising that the most frequent subjects and objects in conversational utterances are the pronouns "I" and "you" referring to the speakers [5]. However, little is known about the information that is exchanged during such conversations. Hence, we also do not know what conversational social agents need to understand from such conversations. Most of the state-of-the-art technology for extracting explicit knowledge concentrates on Wikipedia texts, primarily because of resource availability.

However, social conversation contains a mixture of facts and personal perspectives [5] that are expressed through sequential dialogue turns between interlocutors. As partial information is provided by different speakers, it is important

¹Resource Description Framework: <https://www.w3.org/RDF/>

to deal with coreference across these utterances, ellipsis, coordination, implicit and explicit negation, as well as speaker perspectives such as certainty, judgments, and emotions. This makes it challenging to develop conversational agents that can have social conversations with humans and extract the explicit knowledge that is provided.

In this work, we focus on the knowledge exchanged in social conversation. We define training and test data for the task of triple extraction. We compare several models, ranging from dedicated context-free-grammars, dependency parsing, to fine-tuned and prompted Large Language Models (LLMs).

Our contributions are as follows.

- An English test suite for dialogue turns annotated with social facts and perspectives as triples, categorized by dialogue acts and types of knowledge.
- Training data for dialogue turn sequences extracted from PersonaChat, DailyDialog, and Circa annotated with fact triples and perspectives.
- Five models for the triple extraction of social conversations.

Our data and models are freely available on GitHub²

2 Related work

Information extraction is the task of identifying factual information in unstructured data and representing this knowledge in a structured form. Knowledge graphs (KG) are one of such forms, where nodes represent entities and edges represent relationships between these entities. In that framework, a fact is then represented as a triple: *subject - predicate - object* [6].

Types of information extraction Information extraction may be divided into two categories: Closed Information Extraction (CIE) and Open Information Extraction (OIE). On the one hand, CIE aligns the extracted information with existing entities, relations, or attributes in a predefined KG. This approach relies on (semi-)supervised methods to extract triples, often combining Named Entity Recognition, Entity Linking, and Relation Extraction. CIE systems are typically tailored to a specific domain and KG schema, such as SKOS or DBpedia [7]. Therefore, the KG schema determines the set of recognizable entities and relations a priori.

In contrast, OIE is not limited to a predefined set of entities and relations. Instead, it involves extracting spans from text that represent entities and their relationships without prior alignment to a KG. This open nature makes OIE suitable for extracting new or domain-independent knowledge.

Historical perspective Information extraction is a well-established research area that has evolved significantly over time. The early work was manual-intensive and rule-based methods were developed primarily out of linguistic insight[8]. Most of these rule-based systems focused on extracting is-a relations, thus forming taxonomies in specialized domains. Over time, the field has shifted to feature-based systems, with the emergence of OIE. Recent advances in deep learning have introduced powerful architectures capable of tackling subtasks like NER and RE with greater generality.

Despite advances, relation extraction remains a significant bottleneck, often yielding lower accuracy compared to NER. Developing robust general-purpose relation extractors continues to be an open challenge in the field [9].

Extracting personal knowledge The task of DialogNLI was introduced by Welleck et al. [10] to determine whether pairs of utterances from social conversations entail, contradict or are unrelated to one another. For this purpose, they annotated single sentences from the PersonaChat dataset [11] with triples and possibly negation values, e.g., <I, like_drink, espresso>. However, Welleck et al. did not train a triple extractor from this data but used the triple annotations to train a classifier to infer the NLI relationship between turns represented through these triples. Wang et al. [12], on the other hand, did use the annotated DialogNLI data to fine-tune GPT-2 to extract structured information about a person, such as their hobbies, pets, family, likes and dislikes, which we define here as **social facts**, in the form of triples. Their approach comes closest to our work, but whereas they consider single turns to extract implicit properties, we consider both single turns and conversational sequences of turns that are more complex. Furthermore, they propose a single generative model, and we experimented with various smaller models and produced a new data set both for turn-level and conversation-level extraction.

²<https://github.com/leolani/cltl-knowledgeextraction>

3 Conversational information exchange

The extraction of world knowledge and personal information from dialogue presents unique challenges from a linguistic point of view. Although alternative domains, such as news and Wikipedia articles, can be presumed to consist of complete grammatical sentences, dialogues are often highly fragmented and can give rise to many kinds of ungrammatical non-sentential constructions [13, 14]. Dialogue is defined as a joint activity involving two or more participants in which information or ideas are exchanged through natural spoken or written language [15, 13]. In this view, the primary purpose of dialogue is simply to provide a means to share information, build common ground, and allow one to learn about others, their beliefs, and the world around them. In particular, the perspectives of the interlocutors on social facts as defined in the GRaSP model [16, 17, 18] add another layer of complexity, both in terms of language structure and status of information. Interlocutors can express their epistemic beliefs (confirm or denial), their feelings and emotions, and the certainty of any belief using more complex linguistic constructs. For example, "I think it could be nice to stay at home and rest instead of going to work" expresses 1) uncertainty, 2) emotion, and 3) the claims of (a) staying at home to rest, and (b) not to go to work; all in one utterance.

In the following examples, we highlight several noteworthy dialogue phenomena including ellipsis, the use of anaphora, and the speaker's perspective. Consider the following example dialogues taken from the DailyDialog data set.

Explicit Negation In the next example, "Speaker 2" asks a direct question to "Speaker 1" and receives a negative answer (polarity=-1) with a negative sentiment expressed (-1), showing different perspective values for the claim of having kids. We see here that social facts and perspectives are mixed and need to be inferred from multiple turns across interlocutors.

- Explicit-no :

Speaker 1: Ow wow now that will be hard task

Speaker 2: Yeah do you have kids?

Speaker 1: No, I sadly do not. I never been one to hold a steady relationship

triple: <speaker1, have, kids>

perspective: polarity=-1, certainty=01, sentiment=-1

Implicit Negation The two examples below are more complex, showing two dialogues with implicit negation. In the first, "Speaker 1" states that they do not have time to watch a new drama, which only indirectly negates watching it (polarity=-1) with high, not absolute, certainty (0.8). The sentiment is still positive (1) as we can assume that "Speaker 1" would like to see it. In the second fragment, "Speaker 1" does not directly answer the question of "Speaker 2" but makes another statement that makes it unlikely that "Speaker 1" likes living there. In this case the polarity is also negative, but certainty can be expected to be lower, and, in general, "Speaker 1" expresses negative sentiment towards living there.

- Implicit-no :

Speaker 1: I do work! I waitress during the day, then I do side jobs during the evening.

Speaker 2: Will you be watching that new drama this evening?

Speaker 1: I do not have any time to start a new series today

triple: <speaker1, watch, new_drama>

perspective: polarity=-1, certainty=0.8, sentiment=1

- Implicit-no, coreference, coordination :

Speaker 1: Yup been to new york city 3 times this year

Speaker 2: Do you want to live in New York city?

Speaker 1: The city is too busy and loud

triple: <speaker1, like, living_in_NY>

perspective: polarity=-1, certainty=0.5, sentiment=-1

Note that triple elements are spread over the different turns, such as "watching" and "like living_in_NY" in turn 2 of both conversations. We also observe coreference of "the city" with "New York city" and coordination of two claims about NY, being both too busy and too loud.

To capture phenomena such as the above, we created two data sets with conversational utterances. The social facts expressed are annotated as triples, along with the perspective information of the sources. We first describe a test suite with single turns and, second, annotations of existing conversational data between crowdworkers annotated in a similar way over sequences of turns.

3.1 Test suite of turns

We built a dedicated dataset with single-turn statements and questions given human and agent speaker roles. The data were specifically designed to capture distinct domains and linguistic phenomena. For example, we created datasets for open verb questions and WH-questions separately. This diverse collection allowed us to test the capabilities of each extractor on a wider range of conversational topics. In total, nine manually curated test sets were created, where each test item consists of the text and a representation of the triple as in the following examples, where the human speaker is called "Lenka":

1. I have three white cats: lenka have three-white-cats
2. can I make a cake: lenka make a-cake
3. who is from Mexico: ? be-from Mexico
4. what do you enjoy: agent enjoy ?

Example 1 is a statement, which posts RDF statements to the Knowledge Graph. Example 2 is treated as a verb-question, posted as a SPARQL query to retrieve an answer (yes/no). Examples 3 and 4 are WH-questions with one variable in the triple, also to be converted to SPARQL queries resulting in a(possibly empty) list of answers.

In total, 88 statements and 63 verb-questions are created with aligned triples, and 66 WH-questions were created with at least one variable. We also created a specific series of 86 turns that focus on statements about activities, feelings, kinship and friends, locations, and professions. Finally, we created 28 turns in which perspectives are expressed in relation to social facts. In that case, we add the perspective values for certainty, polarity, and sentiment as scored values in the respective order, as shown below:

- john doesn't hate fashion: john hate fashion: 1 -1 -1
- I think that birds like flying: birds like flying: 0.75 1 0.75
- Bob might be from england: bob be-from england 0.5 1 0

In total, we generated 331 test items divided over nine subsets for turn-level evaluation. More examples are given in the Appendix 9.1.

3.2 Test suite of conversations

Most triple extraction solutions only consider single sentences or, in the case of conversation, the information expressed in a single turn. However, as explained above, conversations are often more complex than written text such as Wikipedia or news, while information is also exchanged over multiple turns. We therefore annotated a dataset with triples that span sequences of three turns. We sampled data from three complementary sources: PersonaChat [11], DailyDialog [19] and Circa [20]. PersonaChat contains approximately 10.907 dialogues and 162.000 utterances obtained through Amazon Mechanical Turk. The crowd workers were randomly paired and assigned a persona, that is, a description of a fake identity, including lines such as 'I am an artist' or 'I live in Amsterdam'. Using a chat interface, workers were tasked to hold a natural conversation with their dialogue partner, whilst conditioning their responses on their assigned persona. DailyDialog is a multiturn open-domain dialogue corpus of spoken English covering a broad range of topics. The dialogues were mined from websites for English language learning. Circa is a data set of polar questions with associated implicit responses collected using crowd annotations. The crowdworkers were asked to imagine questions for ten predefined social situations, which were subsequently posed to other crowdworkers to respond, along with a binary label indicating whether their response confirms or denies the implied statement.

We randomly selected 941 short dialogue fragments of three consecutive utterances: 442 dialogues from Circa, 374 dialogues from DailyDialog and 301 from PersonaChat. The utterances approximately have a length of 29 tokens, excluding end-of-turn markers. Three annotators (authors) annotated the dialogues for social facts by marking the subject, predicate, and object tokens, representing triples claimed by one of the interlocutors. In addition, the annotators could mark any tokens expressing the polarity and certainty of the interlocutor making the claim. Table 1 shows an overview of the data and annotations.

Total Dialogues	1,117	Annotators	3
Turns per Dialogue	3	Total Triples	4,786
Total Utterances	3,351		
Total Tokens	32,877		
Tokens per Dialogue	29.43	Triples per Dialogue	4.28
Tokens per Utterance	9.81	Triples per Utterance	1.38

Table 1: Overview of the conversational dataset with triple annotations

The 941 dialogues contained 2,823 utterances, which received a total of 3,899 annotations of triples and perspectives. We calculated the Inter-Annotator Agreement (IAA) on a pilot set in terms of the Jaccard index and average F measure across the annotators, averaging over all annotator pairs and dialogues in the dataset. Annotation agreement was measured at two levels; the level of triple elements (that is, the sets of subjects, predicates, and objects marked in a dialogue) and the level of triples, as shown in Table 2. As can be seen, we achieved a respectable agreement of 0.688 and 0.773 on the identification of whole triples by the Jaccard and F-measure, respectively. When analyzing the triple elements separately, we do see a slight drop in performance on predicates and objects. However, the quality of the annotations was found to be satisfactory within the time constraints of the annotation effort.

	Jaccard Index (%)	Pairwise F-measure (%)
Subjects	0.871	0.916
Predicates	0.79	0.872
Objects	0.823	0.894
Triples	0.688	0.773

Table 2: Inter-annotator agreement on pilot annotation

The annotated data set is divided into training and test sets with a 9:1 ratio per dialogue, to ensure that overlapping fragments of the same dialogue fall within the same set. We manually selected 179 dialogues (537 utterances) for testing, exhibiting different linguistic phenomena that characterize conversational information exchange: answer ellipsis, coordination, coreference, statements, negated statements, explicit no-answers and explicit yes-answers. Each of these constitutes a separate test set. A few examples are shown next, where three turns are separated by "<eos>" tokens in the order of "speaker1", "speaker2" and "speaker1". The next line gives the triple, optionally followed by perspective labels for polarity and certainty:

- dailydialogs-train-012081
 - Yes , it’s me.<eos>Do you have a cold ?<eos>No. Worse than that. I have a flu. I’m in bed with a fever.
 - speaker1,have,a cold,negative
- circa-train-002436
 - alot really, i enjoy going out to eat with family, going to the movies<eos>would you like to go to the movies tonight ?<eos>no, i’m busy
 - speaker1,like to,go to the movies,negative
- personachat-valid-000114
 - ow wow now that will be hard task<eos>yeah do you have kids?<eos>no i sadly do not. i never been one to hold a steady relationship
 - speaker1,have,kids,negative
- circa-train-010351
 - we could put on some christian edm and party once your taller to celebrate<eos>do you like edm ?<eos>no, i don’t know them
 - speaker1,like,edm,negative

4 Triple extraction models

We developed different triple extraction models to extract both factual information and perspectives expressed in dialogues. In particular, we tested five triple extraction approaches:

1. Tailored Context-Free Grammar (CFG)
2. spaCy Dependency Parser
3. Stanford OpenIE tool
4. Two fine-tuned BERT-based models
5. Llama 3.2 prompted with few shot learning

Each of these triple extractors utilizes different NLP techniques to extract subject-predicate-object triples and their associated perspective values. Table 3 shows an overview of the capabilities of each extractor. In the following subsections, we explain in detail each triple extractor.

Triple Extractor	Language	Perspective extraction?	Question extraction?	Contextual?	Requires training?
CFG	English	Yes	Yes	No	No
Spacy	Multilingual	No	No	No	No
openIE	English	No	No	No	No
conversational	Multilingual	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Llama	Multilingual	Yes	Yes	Depends on prompt	No

Table 3: Overview of triple extractors.

4.1 Dependency parser

We used the spaCy dependency parser and simple dependency patterns mapped to semantic relations as a baseline system. Patterns of frequent phrase structures [12] with these dependency relations are converted into subject-predicate-object triples. We extract triples for active and passive variants of subject-predicate-object ("John likes cats"), subject-predicate-adjectival-complement ("John is sick"), subject-predicate-prepositional-object ("John goes to school").

4.2 Context Free Grammar

We developed a dedicated Context Free Grammar (CFG) specifically targeting phrase structures of simple statements and questions as single turns. The CFG-based extractor is a rule-based system designed to process individual utterances and identify subject-predicate-object triples. It starts by tokenizing the input and replacing contractions with their long-form equivalents, such as converting "can't" to "cannot". This preprocessing ensures consistency in sentence structure. Next, Part-of-Speech (POS) tagging is applied using both NLTK and Stanford taggers. The processed tokens are then passed through a manually designed context-free grammar, which parses the sentence structure to identify triples. The grammar has 12 rewriting rules to define basic phrase structures and is shown in the appendix 9.2.

The output of the CFG parsing is mapped to subject-predicate-object triples following predefined rules. Tokens are further lemmatized using NLTK, and modal verbs are analyzed with a lexicon to capture additional perspective values, such as uncertainty or temporality. Multiword expressions, such as New York or ice-cream, are detected as collocations and treated as single entities.

Finally, from the phrase structure, we extract triples using specific patterns and a lexicon with 1) lexical categories such as pronouns, (auxiliary) verbs, determiners, quantifiers, 2) semantic categories such as activities, professions, and kinship terms, and 3) sentiment. This detailed semantic analysis ensures that each triple is enriched with meaningful contextual information.

4.3 Conversational analyzer

We fine-tuned two BERT models (multilingual BERT-based and Albert) with the annotated sequences of three alternating turns between interlocutors described in Section 3. These models are specifically trained for IOB-style triple extraction and are adapted for conversational contexts by incorporating sequences of three utterances: speaker-agent-speaker turn. The IOB extractor generates all candidates for subjects, predicates, and objects from the three utterances and ranks all possible triple combinations using a trained ranker. This approach is particularly suited to conversational settings, capturing the nuances of how people exchange knowledge. Using the contextual capabilities of BERT, it is expected to excel in detecting triples in diverse and dynamic dialogue scenarios.

4.4 Few-shot Llama prompting for triple extraction.

We also used an open source generative model Llama3.2 to extract both triples and perspectives at the turn level. We created a specific prompt for generating a JSON output. The prompt is shown in the Appendix 9.3. We gave examples for statements (4), WH-questions (5) and a verb-question (1) from our turn-level test set for few shot learning.

4.5 Stanford Open Information Extraction

For comparison, we also tested a state-of-the-art triple extractor that was trained on Wikipedia data on our test data. The Stanford OpenIE extractor is designed to extract general relationships from text. Unlike traditional IE tools that rely on a broad set of patterns, this approach simplifies the process by using a smaller set of patterns tailored for canonically structured sentences [21].

To handle longer and more complex sentences, the extractor employs a classifier that isolates self-contained clauses. These clauses are then processed using natural logic inference to identify the most specific arguments for each candidate triple. This approach ensures that the extracted triples are both precise and contextually relevant.

Although the model is trained on Wikipedia, and thus is encyclopedic, it tends to produce a high volume of triples, including noisy or irrelevant ones. Common issues include the extraction of unnecessary modifiers or articles. Post-processing is applied to refine the triples and filter out such noise, improving the overall quality of the output.

5 Results

In this section, we present the result on our turn-level and conversation-level test set. Only our conversational models could be applied to the latter. Adapting the Llama prompt for conversational contexts is left for future work.

5.1 Turn level

Table 4 shows the results of the extractors over the nine turn-level test sets, where we calculate the precision by taking the number of correct triples divided by correct+incorrect triples.³ We consider the precision in extracting the complete triple, the elements of the triples regardless of the combination, and the precision for each element: subject, object and predicate. For most test sets, the CFG model performs best closely followed by the mBERT triple extractor. The latter performed best for triple elements and objects of statements. Remarkably, the Llama model performed best in extracting predicates. OpenIE and the baseline spaCy clearly underperform, which is expected as both have not been created for this genre and specific task. All models suffered mainly from detecting the correct predicate, which is due to the fact that it is not trivial to represent the predicate with a token. Properties are often expressed by longer expressions or even complete texts. Notably, the mBERT model clearly outperformed the Albert model, which may point to multilingual models being more robust for other genres than monolingual models trained on clean texts.

When we consider the specific domains of the statements, we see in Table 5 that the CFG and mBERT models score more similar and both, again, mostly outperform the others. Exceptions are kinship-friendship relations where Llama and openIE outperform the others, and spaCy performs best on activity triple elements. Again, we see that all models struggle most with predicting the tokens for the predicates.

This two-sided evaluation highlights a key trade-off between the systems. Structure-based approaches, such as CFG and spaCy, are effective in extracting individual triple elements but struggle to assemble correct complete triples and specifically the predicates. Neural models like BERT and Llama, on the contrary, do a better job on complex relations such as the predicates but fail to get the complete triple correct. Finally, we observed that the CFG extractor significantly outperformed the other models to handle questions, whether verb or WH-questions. This suggests that rule-based approaches are particularly suited to the structured nature of interrogative sentences.

We further tested the models on statements that also explicitly express perspectives on social facts such as polarity, certainty, and sentiment. The results are shown in Table 6. Statements with perspectives have values for both the triples and the perspectives.

We expect the extraction of the triples to be more complicated because the linguistic structure reflects different layers of information. In general, we see that the results for the triples are, in fact, lower for all models compared to the results for the statements in Table 4. Remarkably, spaCy is the only exception and performs better compared to plain statements. Apparently, the dependency patterns are more robust for other phrases such as adverbs or adjectives that enrich the statements with perspectives. Across the models, the mBERT conversational model performs the best for

³Recall is not calculated as there is only one triple per test instance

test	nr of utter.	model	no triples	Precision triples	Precision elements	Precision subjects	Precision objects	Precision predicates
statements	88	CFG	2	51.14	67.05	77.27	68.18	55.68
		CONV-mBERT	5	45.45	69.32	76.14	81.82	50.00
		CONV-albert	27	27.27	47.73	48.86	57.95	36.36
		LLAMA3.2	30	12.50	34.47	45.45	36.36	21.59
		openIE	17	0.00	27.65	47.73	27.27	7.95
		spaCy	40	11.36	34.85	42.05	23.86	38.64
verb-questions	63	CFG	0	46.03	73.02	87.30	79.37	52.38
		CONV-mBERT	8	38.10	61.38	65.08	69.84	49.21
		CONV-albert	14	38.10	53.97	57.14	55.56	49.21
		LLAMA3.2	5	12.70	43.92	34.92	50.79	46.03
		openIE	15	0.00	26.46	57.14	22.22	0.00
		spaCy	24	15.87	41.80	55.56	25.40	44.44
wh-questions	66	CFG	2	31.82	59.09	57.58	87.88	31.82
		CONV-mBERT	19	16.67	37.88	34.85	60.61	18.18
		CONV-albert	3	18.18	49.49	50.00	66.67	31.82
		LLAMA3.2	0	15.15	51.52	43.94	74.24	36.36
		openIE	58	0.00	4.04	7.58	4.55	0.00
		spaCy	64	3.03	3.03	3.03	3.03	3.03

Table 4: Results of the triple extraction on the utterance level test set for four models: CFG=Context Free Grammar, CONV-mBERT= multilingual BERT-base fine-tuned with conversational triples, CONV-Albert=Albert-base finetuned with conversaitons, Llama3.2=Llama3.2 prompted with few-shots, openIE=Stanford’s open information extraction, spaCy=spaCy dependency patterns. Three different test sets are given for statements, verb-questions and wh-questions. Precision is calculated for predicted complete triples, the triple elements combined and the separate subjects, predicates and objects by correct predictions divided by correct & wrong-predictions. The no triples column shows the number of utterances that did not receive a triple.

triples. However, CFG performs best when it comes to the specific perspective values. It is also interesting that the Albert conversational model outperforms mBERT for perspective values. This may be explained by its sensitivity to discourse relations due to the next-sentence-order learning objective. The LLama, openIE and spaCy models did not provide any output for the perspective values as they were not designed to do so.

5.2 Conversation level

Only the conversational models were designed to extract triples from contextual sequences of turns. Table 5.2 shows the results for the best model mBERT, where the test data is differentiated for separate linguistic phenomena.

Overall, the results are lower than for the turn-level evaluation, which is expected, as this is a more challenging task. The precision at the complete triple level is very low, and the precision for predicates is again the lowest from the elements. The subject elements score highest in most cases, except for conversations exhibiting coreference. Most of these subjects are expected to refer to the interlocutors, which are more easily detectable by mapping the pronouns "I" and "you" correctly. Finally, the extraction of perspectives scores fairly well overall compared to the result in Table 6. This is in part due to the fact that only negative polarity and uncertainty were annotated and tested, which are both often explicitly marked.

6 Conclusion

Triple extraction from social conversations is more difficult than extraction of information from news or Wikipedia texts, which is studied more extensively. First, information is exchanged differently and in a more complex way in conversation, spread over different turns across interlocutors, through incomplete sentences that exhibit ellipsis, coreference, coordination, and implicit statements. Second, the information itself is more complex in social exchange compared to news and Wikipedia facts. It involves a wider and more open range of properties and values that address social relationships, personal feelings, and history.

Extracting triples from dialogues

test	nr of utterances	Model	no triples	Precision triples	Precision elements	Precision subjects	Precision objects	Precision predicates
activities	24	CFG	0	0.00	41.67	91.67	33.33	0.00
		CONV-mBERT	1	0.00	37.50	79.17	33.33	0.00
		CONV-albert	4	0.00	30.56	70.83	20.83	0.00
		LLAMA3.2	10	0.00	19.44	54.17	4.17	0.00
		openIE	5	0.00	29.17	25.00	62.50	0.00
		spaCy	5	0.00	50.00	75.00	75.00	0.00
feelings	8	CFG	0	50.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	50.00
		CONV-mBERT	0	50.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	50.00
		CONV-albert	0	50.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	50.00
		LLAMA3.2	3	12.50	29.17	62.50	12.50	12.50
		openIE	0	0.00	58.33	50.00	100.00	25.00
		spaCy	0	50.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	50.00
kinship-friends	34	CFG	2	0.00	10.78	29.41	2.94	0.00
		CONV-mBERT	1	0.00	10.78	29.41	2.94	0.00
		CONV-albert	3	0.00	7.84	20.59	2.94	0.00
		LLAMA3.2	6	0.00	14.71	41.18	2.94	0.00
		openIE	0	0.00	12.75	35.29	2.94	0.00
		spaCy	8	0.00	9.80	29.41	0.00	0.00
locations	13	CFG	0	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		CONV-mBERT	0	0.00	58.97	100.00	76.92	0.00
		CONV-albert	1	0.00	53.85	92.31	69.23	0.00
		LLAMA3.2	11	0.00	10.26	15.38	15.38	0.00
		openIE	0	0.00	23.08	69.23	0.00	0.00
		spaCy	0	0.00	41.03	100.00	0.00	23.08
professions	7	CFG	0	71.43	85.71	100.00	85.71	71.43
		CONV-mBERT	0	57.14	71.43	100.00	57.14	57.14
		CONV-albert	1	42.86	57.14	85.71	42.86	42.86
		LLAMA3.2	4	0.00	23.81	42.86	14.29	14.29
		openIE	0	0.00	42.86	42.86	85.71	0.00
		spaCy	0	28.57	71.43	100.00	85.71	28.57

Table 5: Results of the triple extraction on different test sets for activities, feelings, kinship-friend relations, locations, and professions. Results for four models: CFG=Context Free Grammar, CONV-mBERT= multilingual BERT-base fin-tuned with conversational triples, CONV-Albert=Albert-base fine-tuned with conversations, Llama3.2=Llama3.2 prompted with few-shots, openIE=Stanford’s open information extraction, spaCy=spaCy dependency patterns. Precision is calculated for predicted complete triples, the triple elements combined and the separate subjects, predicates and objects by correct predictions divided by correct & wrong-predictions. The no triples column shows the number of utterances that did not receive a triple.

Model	no triples	Precision triples	Precision elements	Precision subjects	Precision objects	Precision predicates	Precision perspective
CFG	0	32.14	45.24	57.14	46.43	32.14	66.67
CONV-mBERT	4	35.71	58.33	60.71	78.57	35.71	51.85
CONV-albert	15	21.43	34.52	35.71	46.43	21.43	60.00
LLAMA3.2	17	10.71	23.81	28.57	25.00	17.86	
openIE	19	0.00	15.48	28.57	17.86	0.00	
spaCy	13	35.71	45.24	53.57	39.29	42.86	

Table 6: Results of the triple extraction on dedicated test set (28 utterances) expressing various perspectives (certainty, denial, sentiment) of speakers on the claims in utterances. Results for four models: CFG=Context Free Grammar, CONV-mBERT= multilingual BERT-base fine-tuned with conversational triples, CONV-Albert=Albert-base fine-tuned with conversations, Llama3.2=Llama3.2 prompted with few-shots, openIE=Stanford’s open information extraction, spaCy=spaCy dependency patterns. Precision is calculated for predicted complete triples, the triple elements combined and the separate subjects, predicates and objects by correct predictions divided by correct & wrong-predictions. The no triples column shows the number of utterances that did not receive a triple.

We released two data sets for training and testing the triple extraction of social conversation. We also developed several models, among which two models for the difficult task of extracting social facts and perspectives from ongoing

test	nr. of utterances	no triples	Precision triples	precision elements	precision subjects	precision objects	precision predicates	precision perspectives
answer_ellipsis	101	4	1.98	28.05	61.39	10.89	11.88	66.67
coordination	82	1	6.10	46.75	76.83	32.93	30.49	66.67
coreference	78	0	1.28	24.79	29.49	35.90	8.97	66.67
statements	91	1	2.20	37.36	76.92	24.18	10.99	66.67
negated statements	79	1	3.80	45.15	79.75	40.51	15.19	66.24
explicit no answers	47	0	4.26	43.26	78.72	25.53	25.53	65.96
explicit yes answers	59	0	3.39	36.16	74.58	11.86	22.03	66.67
Total	537	7	3.29	37.36	68.24	25.97	17.87	66.50

Table 7: Results of the conversation level evaluation for the conversational model. The test is divided over different conversational phenomena such as ellipsis, coordination, coreference, statements, negations of statements, no answers and yes answers. The no triples column shows the number of utterances that did not receive a triple.

conversations involving sequences of turns. We hope that this enables future research to model social conversations more explicitly.

7 Limitations

The turn-level evaluation is based on an artificial data set with simple utterances. The Context-Free Grammar (CFG) was optimized for this test set, whereas the other models were not. The CFG should therefore be seen as an upper ceiling of performance, whereas the spaCy model is a baseline. The conversational data are more natural, but are created by crowd workers having a conversation among them, which is different from people having a conversation with an artificial agent. This makes the conversation-level evaluation less representative, and the performance is also lower than expected for the human-agent interaction, where humans will adapt to systems. Both evaluation data sets are written chat data. In the case of spoken data, we expect the performance to be lower. Only the CFG and conversational models were created to extract perspective values in addition to the triples, but both were not optimized for perspective value detection either.

We have not used any prompt engineering for the Llama model. Fine-tuning and prompt engineering could greatly improve Llama’s results. We also did not provide the Llama model with the previous dialog history to extract triples from the current utterance. In turn-level tests, no dialog context is provided. We could also prompt Llama for conversational data as in the conversation-level test.

So far we tested the models only on English. The Llama and the multilingual BERT model could also be applied to test data in other languages. In future work, we plan to extend the evaluation and training data to other languages.

8 Ethics

The data used in the conversation-level test are created by crowd-workers. This may have created some bias in the data. Furthermore, all the data are acted on and are not supposed to contain true personal information. However, there is no guarantee that crowdworkers did not communicate personal information. Since the data are publicly available, we did not consider it necessary to consult an ethics committee.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) through the *Hybrid Intelligence Centre* via the *Zwaartekracht* grant (024.004.022), and the *Spinoza* grant (SPI 63-260) awarded to Piek Vossen.

References

- [1] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.

- [2] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [3] Selene Baez Santamaria. Knowledge-centered conversational agents with a drive to learn. In Yang (Trista) Cao, Isabel Papadimitriou, Anaelia Ovalle, Marcos Zampieri, Francis Ferraro, and Swabha Swayamdipta, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, pages 83–92, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [4] Joshua Eisenberg and Michael Sherfff. Automatic extraction of personal events from dialogue. In *Proceedings of the First Joint Workshop on Narrative Understanding, Storylines, and Events*, pages 63–71, 2020.
- [5] Selene Báez Santamaría, Lea Krause, Lucia Donatelli, and Piek Vossen. The role of personal perspectives in open-domain dialogue. In *BNAIC’23: JOINT INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES ON AI AND MACHINE LEARNING*, 2023.
- [6] Ridho Reinanda, Edgar Meij, Maarten de Rijke, et al. Knowledge graphs: An information retrieval perspective. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 14(4):1–158, 2020.
- [7] Yi Luan, Dave Wadden, Luheng He, Amy Shah, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. A general framework for information extraction using dynamic span graphs. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 3036–3046, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [8] Marti A. Hearst. Automatic acquisition of hyponyms from large text corpora. In *COLING 1992 Volume 2: The 14th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1992.
- [9] Yi Yao Huang and William Yang Wang. Deep residual learning for weakly-supervised relation extraction. In Martha Palmer, Rebecca Hwa, and Sebastian Riedel, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1803–1807, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Sean Welleck, Jason Weston, Arthur Szlam, and Kyunghyun Cho. Dialogue natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3731–3741, 2019.
- [11] Saizheng Zhang. Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07243*, 2018.
- [12] Zhilin Wang, Xuhui Zhou, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Alex Marin, and Fei Xia. Extracting and inferring personal attributes from dialogue. In Bing Liu, Alexandros Papangelis, Stefan Ultes, Abhinav Rastogi, Yun-Nung Chen, Georgios Spithourakis, Elnaz Nouri, and Weiyang Shi, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI*, pages 58–69, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [13] Daniel Jurafsky and James H Martin. *Speech and language processing: An introduction to natural language processing, computational linguistics, and speech recognition*.
- [14] David Schlangen and Alex Lascarides. The interpretation of non-sentential utterances in dialogue. In *Proceedings of the Fourth SIGdial Workshop of Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 62–71, 2003.
- [15] Raquel Fernández, Jonathan Ginzburg, and Shalom Lappin. Classifying non-sentential utterances in dialogue: A machine learning approach. *Computational Linguistics*, 33(3):397–427, 2007.
- [16] Chantal van Son, Tommaso Caselli, Antske Fokkens, Isa Maks, Roser Morante, Lora Aroyo, and Piek Vossen. Grasp: A multilayered annotation scheme for perspectives. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 1177–1184, 2016.
- [17] Antske Fokkens, Piek Vossen, Marco Rospocher, Rinke Hoekstra, Willem R van Hage, and Fondazione Bruno Kessler. Grasp: grounded representation and source perspective. *Proceedings of Knowledge Resources for the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities associated with RANLP*, 17:19–25, 2017.
- [18] Piek Vossen and Antske Fokkens. Grasp: A model for the perspective web. *Creating a More Transparent Internet: The Perspective Web*, page 260, 2022.
- [19] Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. Daildialog: A manually labelled multi-turn dialogue dataset. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 986–995, 2017.

- [20] Annie Louis, Dan Roth, and Filip Radlinski. “i’d rather just go to bed”: Understanding indirect answers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7411–7425, 2020.
- [21] Gabor Angeli, Melvin Jose Johnson Premkumar, and Christopher D. Manning. Leveraging linguistic structure for open domain information extraction. In Chengqing Zong and Michael Strube, editors, *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 344–354, Beijing, China, July 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics.

9 Appendix

9.1 Turn-level evaluation data examples

- Statements
 - I know you: lenka know agent
 - where is she: she be ?
 - my best friend is he: lenka best-friend-is he
 - I have three white cats: lenka have three-white-cats
 - I think Selene doesn’t like cheese: selene like cheese
 - I think Selene hates cheese: selene hate cheese
 - selene might come today: selene might-come today
 - I don’t think selene likes cheese: selene like cheese
- Verb-questions:
 - can a bird sing a song: a-bird can-sing a-song
 - can I call you: Lenka can-call agent
 - can I make a cake: Lenka can-make a-cake
 - will you go to Paris: agent will-go-to paris
 - must you go home: agent must-go home
 - do you like amsterdam: agent like amsterdam
- Wh-Questions
 - who is your best friend: agent best-friend-is ?
 - who can sing: ? can-sing ?
 - who likes talking to people: ? like talking-to-people
 - who works at the university: ? work-at the-university
 - who have you seen: agent see ?
 - who is from Mexico: ? be-from Mexico
 - who does Selene know: Selene know ?
 - what is your favorite color: agent favorite-color-is ?
 - what is my favorite food: Lenka favorite-food-is ?
 - what do you enjoy: agent enjoy ?
 - where is selene from: Selene be-from ?
 - where is your friend: agent friend-is ?
- Perspectives
 - john doesn’t hate fashion: john hate fashion: 1 -1 -1
 - I think selene works in Amsterdam: selene work-in amsterdam: 0.75 1 0
 - I think john can’t come to school: john can-come-to school: 0.75 -1 0
 - you know I like coffee: lenka like coffee: 1 1 0.75
 - I think that birds like flying: birds like flying: 0.75 1 0.75
 - I know that you are not a human: agent be a-human: 1 -1 0

- you must bring three books: agent must-bring three-books 1 1 0
- john might like reading books: john might-like reading-books 0.5 1. 0.75
- selene should come to the university: selene should-come-to the-university 0.75 1 0
- Bob might be from england: bob might-be-from england 0.5 1 0

9.2 Context-Free Grammar rules

```

U -> S | Q
Q -> W VP C | W NP C | W VP NP C | W VP NP VP C | W NP VP C | V NP C | V NP C C
W -> WRB | WP | WDT
S -> NP VP C | NP C | NP VP S
C -> NP | VP | PREP
NP -> N | JJ | J NP | D NP | N NP | RB NP | PREP NP
VP -> V VP | V RB | RB VP | V | V PREP VP | V PREP
PREP -> IN | TO
V -> VBD | VBP | VBZ | VBN | VBG | VB | MD
D -> DT | CD | PRPPOS
N -> NN | NNS | NNP | NNPS | PRP | DT
J -> JJ | JJR | JJS
    
```

9.3 Llama prompt and few shot examples

_INSTRUCT = {'role': 'system', 'content': 'You will analyze a dialogue and break it down into triples consisting of a subject, predicate, and object. Each triple should capture the essence of interactions between speakers. Replace the predicate by its lemma, for example "is" and "am" should become "be". Remove auxiliary verbs such as "be", "have", "can", "might" from predicates. If the object starts with a preposition, concatenate the preposition to the predicate separated by a hyphen, for example "be-from". Additionally, annotate each triple with:

- Sentiment (-1 for negative, 0 for neutral, 1 for positive)
- Polarity (-1 for negation, 0 for neutral/questioning, 1 for affirmation)
- Certainty (a scale between 0 for uncertain and 1 for certain)

Ensure that predicates are semantically meaningful.

Separate multi-word items with an underscore.

Save it as a JSON with this format:

```

{"dialogue": [{"sender": "human", "text": "I am from Amsterdam.",
"triples": [ { "subject": "I", "predicate": "be_from", "object": "Amsterdam",
"sentiment": 0, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 1}]}],
{"dialogue": [{"sender": "human", "text": "Lana is reading a book.",
"triples": [ { "subject": "Lana", "predicate": "read", "object": "a-book",
"sentiment": 0, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 1}]}],
{"dialogue": [{"sender": "human", "text": "You hate dogs.",
"triples": [ { "subject": "You", "predicate": "hate", "object": "dogs",
"sentiment": -1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.7}]}],
{"dialogue": [{"sender": "human", "text": "Selene does not like cheese.",
"triples": [ { "subject": "Selene", "predicate": "like", "object": "cheese",
"sentiment": -1, "polarity": -1, "certainty": 0.5}]}],
{"sender": "human", "text": "Who likes cats?",
"triples": [ { "subject": "", "predicate": "like", "object": "cats",
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}]}],
{"sender": "human", "text": "When did Selene come?",
"triples": [ { "subject": "Selene", "predicate": "come", "object": "",
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}]}],
{"sender": "human", "text": "Where can I go?",
"triples": [ { "subject": "I", "predicate": "go", "object": "",
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}]}],
{"sender": "human", "text": "Who likes cats?",
"triples": [ { "subject": "", "predicate": "like", "object": "cats",
    
```

Extracting triples from dialogues

```
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}}},
{"sender": "human", "text": " Are cats pets?",
"triples": [ {"subject": "cats", "predicate": "be", "object": "pets",
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}}]}
{"sender": "human", "text": " Do you like cats?",
"triples": [ {"subject": "you", "predicate": "like", "object": "cats",
"sentiment": 1, "polarity": 1, "certainty": 0.1}}]}
Do not output any other text than the JSON.'
}
```

9.4 Predicates detected by the conversational triple extractor

act	become	cut	find	know	occupy	recycle	socialize	waste
add	believe	dance	finish	lead	open	relationship	sort	watch
afford	betray	decide	fit	learn	order	relax	speak	water
agree	better than	depend on	fix	leave	owe	remain	spend	wear
aid	borrow	destroy	follow	light	own	remember	start	will
allow	break	devote	forget	like	paint	remove	starve	win
anticipate	break up	die	gain	limit	park	reserve	stay	work
arrest	bring	different	get	listen	pay	respond	steal	work with
arrive	burn	dislike	get in	live	pay attention	retire	stop	worry
ask	buy	distrust	give	live in	pick	return	study	would
be	call	do	go	located	plan	rule	survive	write
be angry	can	do badly	grow	lock out	play	run	swim	
be arrested	cancel	do well	handle	look	portray	save	take	
be at	care	draw	harder than	lose	practice	say	take off	
be available	catch	dress	have	love	pray	see	take out	
be certain	cause	drink	hear	made of	prefer	seek	talk	
be difficult	change	drive	help	make	prepare	seem	taste	
be free	check in	drop	hit	marry	pretend	sell	teach	
be from	choose	earn	hold	match	prevent	send	tell	
be happy	clean	eat	hope	mean	promise	share	think	
be in	close	enable	hurry	meet	propose	shoot	throw	
be in between	come	endure	hurt	miss	protect	should	tired	
be old	confuse	equal	include	misspell	pull	show	travel	
be on	consider	exchange	investigate	mix	put	sign	try	
be out	contact	exercise	involve	more expensive	rain	similar	use	
be over	cook	expect	join	motivate	raise	sing	visit	
be ready	copy	fall	joke	move	reach	sit	wait	
be scared	cost	feel	keep	must	read	sleep	wake up	
be with	could	fight	keep secret	need	recognize	smell	walk	
be wrong	count	fill	kill	None	recommend	smoke	want	