

# *Don't Stop the Multi-Party!* On Generating Synthetic Multi-Party Conversations with Constraints

Nicolò Penzo<sup>1,2</sup>, Marco Guerini<sup>1</sup>, Bruno Lepri<sup>1</sup>, Goran Glavaš<sup>3</sup>, Sara Tonelli<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Italy

<sup>2</sup> University of Trento, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Center For Artificial Intelligence and Data Science, University of Würzburg, Germany

## Abstract

Multi-Party Conversations (MPCs) are widely studied across disciplines, with social media as a primary data source due to their accessibility. However, these datasets raise privacy concerns and often reflect platform-specific properties. For example, interactions between speakers may be limited due to rigid platform structures (e.g., threads, tree-like discussions), which yield overly simplistic interaction patterns (e.g., as a consequence of "reply-to" links). This work explores the feasibility of generating diverse MPCs with instruction-tuned Large Language Models (LLMs) by providing deterministic constraints such as dialogue structure and participants' stance. We investigate two complementary *strategies* of leveraging LLMs in this context: (I.) *LLMs as MPC generators*, where we task the LLM to generate a whole MPC at once and (II.) *LLMs as MPC parties*, where the LLM generates one turn of the conversation at a time, provided the conversation history. We next introduce an analytical framework to evaluate compliance with the constraints, content quality, and interaction complexity for both strategies. Finally, we assess the quality of obtained MPCs via human annotation and LLM-as-a-judge evaluations. We find stark differences among LLMs, with only some being able to generate high-quality MPCs. We also find that turn-by-turn generation yields better conformance to constraints and higher linguistic variability than generating MPCs in one pass. Nonetheless, our structural and qualitative evaluation indicates that both generation strategies can yield high-quality MPCs.

## 1 Introduction

Multi-Party Conversations (MPCs), i.e., conversations involving more than two participants (Braničan, 2006), have been studied across multiple disciplines. Research in conversational analysis and linguistics has focused on modeling interaction dynamics (Sacks et al., 1974; Wilson et al., 1984),

identifying participant roles (Malouf, 1995), or mapping emergent structural patterns in discourse (Gibson, 2003). These studies highlight both complexity and diversity of real-world MPCs, where factors like turn-taking, speaker alignment, and social context shape the flow of conversation.

The collection of MPC data has, however, strongly shifted from in-person and online meetings to social media platforms (Mahajan and Shaikh, 2021), where large-scale data is more accessible. However, this shift has introduced several confounding factors. Social media platforms often enforce a one-to-one reply structure, overlooking implicit addressees and simplifying interaction dynamics; in natural conversations, in contrast, a turn is often directed to multiple participants and the conversational structure is more dynamic. As a result, MPC corpora derived from social media platforms often lack structural diversity, which severely limits their utility in analyzing real-world conversational phenomena (Wei et al., 2023). This, in turn, affects generation capabilities of current Large Language Models (LLMs). For LLMs, trained on conversations from social media and predominantly used in two-party interactions (i.e. human-assistant use-cases), MPCs represent a distributional shift, resulting in their underwhelming performance in natural MPC contexts (Tan et al., 2023; Penzo et al., 2024). The next generation of LLMs is, however, expected to engage in MPCs and excel in tasks like identifying the appropriate speaker to respond to (Wei et al., 2023), summarizing meetings (Kirstein et al., 2024) or even managing multi-agent scenarios (Wu et al., 2023). Recent studies have explored their performance in social contexts (Ziems et al., 2024; Chang et al., 2024), emphasizing the need for large, representative datasets to train this novel generation of LLMs and to ensure robustness across diverse and less frequent interaction patterns (Lee et al., 2024). Zhou et al. (2024) explicitly highlight multi-party interactions as a key challenge for

future LLM research.

One possible remedy for the lack of structural diversity in MPCs derived from social media data is to synthesize MPCs, by *explicitly constraining LLMs* to generate MPCs with specific characteristics. In particular, generated MPCs should include diverse conversations, encompass various interaction structures, topics and contexts and capture rich speaker-addressee relationships, allowing for multi-addressee interactions, in order to reflect real-world conversational complexity.

In this paper, we propose generating synthetic MPCs using LLMs guided by constraints related to the above capabilities. We explore two generation strategies: (I.) One-Long (OL) generation, where the LLM produces an entire MPC in a single step, and (II.) Turn-by-Turn (TT) generation, which constructs the conversation sequentially, one turn at a time. A comparison of resulting MPCs from both strategies highlights the (potential) discrepancies between (I.) what LLMs believe human MPCs look like (OL) and (II.) how they behave as participants in an MPC (TT). We propose a novel evaluation framework that combines several quantitative and qualitative dimensions of generated MPCs, focusing on the extent of LLMs’ compliance to provided content and structural constraints.

We address the following three key research questions:

**RQ(1):** Can LLMs be leveraged to generate large synthetic MPC datasets while maintaining compliance with predefined constraints on dialogue structure and participants’ stance?

**RQ(2):** Which generation strategy (One-Long vs. Turn-by-Turn) produces higher-quality MPCs?

**RQ(3):** How can we effectively evaluate the variety and quality of the generated MPCs?

We test four popular LLMs and identify Llama3.1 (Dubey et al., 2024) and Qwen2.5 (Yang et al., 2024) as the best MPCs for complying the most with constraints. Turn-by-Turn seems to generate more constraint-compliant MPCs than One-Long. Moreover, the MPCs produced by TT exhibit greater lexical variability and semantic coherence. The generated MPCs also present a higher structural complexity than a widely-used corpus of ‘real’ conversations (Ouchi and Tsuboi, 2016). Finally, a qualitative evaluation shows that both TT and OL can produce high-quality MPCs, rendering the choice of the LLM more important than the choice

of generation strategy.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Related Work

Mahajan and Shaikh (2021) categorize MPC corpora into three types: Spoken Unscripted, Spoken Scripted, and Written. In this work, we address Spoken Unscripted and Written MPCs. Spoken Unscripted MPCs typically occur in in-person discussions, with spontaneous interactions. Written MPCs, on the other hand, are characteristic of online platforms: here conversations unfold asynchronously, often due to platform-specific constraints. While social media allow for rapid collection of large-scale written MPCs, these datasets often come with incomplete interaction metadata. Many datasets record only explicit reply-to relationships, neglecting implicit addressees and richer conversational dynamics (Ouchi and Tsuboi, 2016; Zhang et al., 2018; Chang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, 2019). Wei et al. (2023) point out that well-known MPC corpora (Ritter et al., 2010; Baumgartner et al., 2020; Lowe et al., 2015) are useful for response generation, but not for more interactive tasks. Only most recent efforts focus on capturing conversational dynamics (i.e., go beyond text content) (Hua et al., 2024).

Structural analyses of social communication networks have primarily focused on interaction patterns across multiple conversations (Panzarasa et al., 2009; Coletto et al., 2017; Garimella et al., 2018; Felmlee et al., 2021). This confirms the relevance of such structures in studying conversation dynamics. However, our focus is on interactions emerging within a single conversation rather than across multiple discussions, applying the same structural analysis techniques.

To the best of our knowledge, the only existing attempt at generating synthetic MPCs was made by Chen et al. (2023). However, their work primarily focused on conversations involving at most three participants, limiting the complexity of interactions. In contrast, our study explores the generation of MPCs with four or more participants, leading to more elaborate discussion dynamics. While this increased complexity allows for richer conversational structures, it also introduces a higher likelihood of generation errors, necessitating a rigorous evaluation process to assess the quality and consistency of the generated dialogues.

<sup>1</sup>The code for generation and evaluation of the MPCs is available at the Github repository: <https://github.com/dhfbk/Constrained-SyntheticMPC>.




Figure 1: Example of a turn in a synthetic MPC.

### 3 Synthetic MPCs Generation

In our framework, a Multi-Party Conversation (MPC) consists of an ordered sequence of turns, where each turn includes the speaker information (*who* wrote the turn), the message (*what* the textual content of the turn is), and the addressees (to *whom* the turn is directed), see for example Figure 1. In this section, we first introduce the two generation strategies we test (Section 3.1), followed by the topics chosen for the MPCs (Section 3.2), and finally the constraints specified in the instructions for generating MPCs (Section 3.3).

#### 3.1 Generation Strategies

We test two strategies for generating MPCs using instruction-based models. Our main goal is to determine whether LLMs behave differently when asked to generate an MPC as a unique narrative compared to acting as an interactive participant within the conversation. With this motivation, we use each LLM in two generation strategies:

**One-Long generation strategy (OL).** The LLM is prompted to generate the entire conversation in one pass. In this strategy, generation starts with a system input prompt that defines all the constraints and the task, asking then to generate the entire conversation. This strategy follows a one-step, long-generation process, based on a single input context.

**Turn-by-Turn generation strategy (TT).** Here the LLM is prompted to generate the conversation incrementally, provided the conversation history. The model is prompted multiple times to perform one of three tasks: (I.) generate a speaker, (II.) generate interactions between a speaker and addressees (given the speaker), or (III.) generate a message (given the interaction). The process begins with a system prompt specifying the constraints and these three tasks. The model is first prompted to generate each speaker and assign them a stance on a controversial topic. Then, the LLM generates a sequence of interactions and messages (one at a time), iteratively augmenting the MPC: this means that the context provided to the LLM increases monotonically in size with consecutive turns.

#### 3.2 Topics

To generate a controlled set of synthetic MPCs, we identify a set of controversial topics to encourage more polarized and clear statements from speakers based on their assigned stance. Specifically, following Li et al. (2024a), we select 38 topics and create two stance statements for each topic: one reflecting a *progressive* perspective and the other a *conservative* perspective. The statements are created trying to avoid potential biases such as framing statements negatively or using specific terms exclusively in one category. Finally, we instruct the LLMs to generate conversations based on each of the resulting 76 statements. We provide the full list of topics in Appendix B.1.

#### 3.3 Conversation Constraints

To ensure that the generated conversations feature rich interaction patterns with diverse dynamics, we instruct the model to follow specific constraints (we provide details about how this was operationalized in prompts in Appendix A).

**Output Format:** to enable automated analysis, the generated output must respect a structured JSON format with all the information needed. So, each generated MPC must be a dictionary with two primary keys, namely *conversation* and *speakers*. The *conversation* field must include a list of dictionaries, each with specific fields such as speaker’s name, turn message and addressees, i.e. the list of participants in the conversation to whom the message is directed. The *speakers* field includes the speaker’s name and the stance with respect to the conversation topic.

**Interactions:** these constraints refer to three requirements in the generated MPCs – all speakers appearing in the interactions must be present in the speakers’ list (i.e., the LLM should not invent a new speaker half way through the conversation); addressees must cover at least once also the role of speaker; self-interactions, i.e. speakers sending a message to themselves, are not admitted.

**Speaker’s Contribution:** all speakers in the speakers’ field must be authors of at least one turn in the conversation.

**Number of Speakers:** In order to enable complex interaction structures, each MPC must involve between 4 and 6 speakers.

**Number of Messages:** Each generated MPC must include 15 messages across all speakers, with a maximum of 50 words per message.

**Speaker’s Stance:** We specify the exact number of speakers for each stance (e.g., 2 with the *pro* and 3 with *against* stance).

We additionally request that the first turn always addresses all participants: this ensures that the generated interaction graph is connected, as required for structural analysis (see Section 4.3).

## 4 Evaluation Framework

We design an evaluation framework aimed at assessing different aspects of the generated MPCs. It is composed of four blocks, which we detail below.

### 4.1 Compliance with Constraints

The first dimension considered in the evaluation framework is to what extent the synthetic MPCs comply with the format and structural constraints given in the prompt. For each generated MPC, this framework must verify: (I.) the correctness of the *Output Format*; (II.) the correctness of the *Interactions*; (III.) the *Contribution* of each speaker; (IV.) the *Number of Speakers*; (V.) the *Number of Messages*; (VI.) the distribution of the *Stance of the Speakers*.

All the computed values must be compliant with the constraints presented in Section 3.3. Only for the Number of Messages, we relax the constraint by considering valid MPCs including less than 15 turns if they contain at least 2 messages per speaker. Indeed, after a manual check of the generated MPCs, we noticed that shorter or longer conversations may still represent high-quality data. Each value is computed separately and then used to identify how many MPCs comply with *all* these constraints.

### 4.2 Analysis of Language Variability

A key risk for synthetic datasets is to suffer from low linguistic variability, due to repetitive examples obtained when using similar prompts (even if stochastic decoding is used), an issue already highlighted for dialogical settings (Occhipinti et al., 2024). On the other hand, while generated MPCs should ideally be lexically rich, they should also be semantically coherent, i.e. different MPCs about the same topic should exhibit a certain degree of semantic similarity.

To control for these aspects, we compute the following three metrics:

**Repetition Rate** (Bertoldi et al., 2013), which has already been used in synthetic conversational

scenarios in the past (Bonaldi et al., 2022), measures the rate of non-singleton n-grams within a cluster of MPCs.

**String Similarity** between pairs of turns is computed using thefuzz library<sup>2</sup> and is based on Levenshtein distance.

**Semantic Coherence** between pairs of turns is computed by first embedding each turn with SentenceBERT-all-MiniLM-L6-v2 (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) and then calculating pairwise cosine similarity.

The above metrics are computed across all generated MPCs about the same topic. More specifically, Repetition Rate is computed among all MPCs in the same topic-based cluster and then averaged across all clusters to assess linguistic diversity. String Similarity and Semantic Coherence are calculated across all turns in all possible conversation pairs on the same topic, following an all-vs-all comparison strategy. For each topic we keep only the 5 highest similarity scores and average them, then we compute the average of all topic-level scores.

### 4.3 Interaction Structure Analysis

To describe and quantify the structural complexity of interactions in the generated MPCs, we compute a series of network metrics, focusing on node-level properties, dyads (pairs of nodes) and triads (triplets of nodes), according to standard practices in interaction network analysis (Paukaszat et al., 2011; Felmler et al., 2021). Following Penzo et al. (2024), we represent MPC interactions with an *unweighted undirected graph*  $G_u$  and a *weighted directed graph*  $G_d$ .

To measure the average activity of a node in the conversation, we compute two metrics. First, the **Average Degree Centrality** in  $G_u$ , denoted as  $deg_{avg}(G_u)$ , represents the average number of speakers each participant interacts with, regardless of direction. Second, the **Average Out-going Degree** in  $G_d$ , denoted as  $outdeg_{avg}(G_d)$ , captures the average number of speakers each participant interacts with having a specific direction. Figure 2 provides a visual representation of  $deg_{avg}(G_u)$  (graph A) and  $outdeg_{avg}(G_d)$  (graph B). Both averages are computed across all the nodes in the conversation and normalized according to their maximum possible values.

When two speakers,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , reply to each other, they form a *cycle* (Coletto et al., 2017), rep-

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/seatgeek/thefuzz>






Figure 2: Overview of the metrics considered in our structural analysis.

represented by a directed edge  $e_1$  from  $s_1$  to  $s_2$  and a reciprocal edge  $e_2$  from  $s_2$  to  $s_1$  (graph C in Figure 2). If this back-and-forth exchange continues multiple times, the edge weights  $w(e_1)$  and  $w(e_2)$  will both become  $> 1$ . We refer to such recurring exchange as *consistent cycles* (graph D in Figure 2). Based on this, we compute the **Reciprocity**  $R(G_d)$ , i.e., the total number of cycles between two nodes over all pairs of nodes in  $G_d$ , and the **Consistent Reciprocity**  $R^w(G_d)$ , i.e. the number of consistent cycles between two nodes over all pairs of nodes in  $G_d$ . Finally, to quantify how often speakers build "triads" of interactions, we compute the **Transitivity**  $T(G_u)$  (graph E in Figure 2).

For all these metrics, higher values indicate more complex interactions in a conversation. Indeed, higher reciprocity (consistent or not) suggests more frequent back-and-forth exchanges. Again, higher average degree values means that speakers engage with more participants, while greater transitivity reflects denser connections, leading to the creation of more interconnected speaker groups (Pauksztat et al., 2011).

#### 4.4 Qualitative Evaluation

As a final assessment, we evaluate MPCs qualitatively. We run both a small-scale human evaluation and an "LLM as a judge" assessment (Gu et al., 2024) for analyses on a large scale.

We ask an expert human annotator and an LLM to rate a given MPC along the following dimensions with a Likert Scale from 1 to 5, inspired by the scores proposed in Chen et al. (2023): (I.) *naturalness*, i.e., the quality of the overall flow, tone, and word choice in the conversation; (II.) *argumentability*, i.e., how well the conversation presents reasoned and well-argued positions; (III.) *speaker's stance consistency*, i.e., whether all speakers maintain their assigned stance at the beginning of the conversation; (IV.) *speaker's stance evolution*, i.e., whether speakers demonstrate a realistic and logical evolution of their stance during the

conversation or maintain their stance consistently; (V.) *addressee correctness*, i.e., whether the assigned addressees align with the conversation context and are logically appropriate; (VI.) *addressee preciseness*, i.e., whether addressees are precise and contextually appropriate (messages should target the smallest relevant group of individuals).

## 5 Experimental settings

To generate synthetic MPCs, we compare four different instruction-based models, chosen for their comparable parameter sizes and compatibility with the same prompt design. The models include Llama3.1-8B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct (Yang et al., 2024), Ministral-8B-Instruct<sup>3</sup>, and OLMo-2-7B-Instruct (OLMo et al., 2024). For each generation strategy (One-Long or Turn-by-Turn, see Section 3.1) we develop three distinct system prompts combining a more or less schematic task description and different examples of the output format. For details we refer to Appendix A. For each combination of constraints, topic and system prompt, we generate 75 conversations to account for the potential variety of structures. As hyperparameters, we use temperature 0.7, mixed top p and top k decoding with  $p = 0.9$  and  $k = 40$ . In total we obtained 102 600 synthetic MPCs for each model and generation strategy.

## 6 Evaluation Results

We evaluate the generated MPCs for each dimension included in the evaluation framework (Section 4).

### 6.1 Evaluation of Compliance with Constraints

We first address **RQ(1)**, aimed at assessing whether synthetic MPCs can comply with the predefined constraints described in Section 4.1. The results of the analysis are reported in Table 1. We compare

<sup>3</sup><https://mistral.ai/news/ministraux/>

Model	Llama3.1		Qwen2.5		Ministral		OLMo2	
	OL	TT	OL	TT	OL	TT	OL	TT
Output Format	81 026	99 524	93 136	<b>102 164</b>	16 045	35 918	440	93 529
Interactions	80 963	95 916	93 082	<b>102 110</b>	16 020	13 524	437	72 660
Number of Messages	80 978	72 072	93 016	<b>102 160</b>	15 971	13 444	439	73 546
Number of Speakers	30 332	99 524	40 201	<b>102 156</b>	10 490	13 381	217	73 747
Stance of the Speakers	20 167	<b>99 328</b>	23 550	86 214	4 538	1 067	92	63 727
Contribution	74 760	<b>97 763</b>	87 006	92 777	15 936	18 674	168	30 860
All Constraints	15 550	68 246	20 853	<b>79 740</b>	4 452	897	46	19 893

Table 1: Number of generated MPCs that are compliant with each constraint, out of the full set 102 600 generations for each LLM and strategy (i.e. OL = One-Long generation, TT = Turn-by-Turn generation). The final amount of MPCs (last row) is the amount of generations that satisfy all the constraints.

Model	Llama3.1		Qwen2.5	
	OL	TT	OL	TT
Gener. Strategy				
Avg. # words	11.94	26.58	9.67	14.15
RepetitionRate ( $\downarrow$ )	18.08	11.07	14.43	13.35
StringSimilarity ( $\downarrow$ )	65.51	53.88	63.22	58.38
SemanticCoherence ( $\uparrow$ )	0.496	0.565	0.475	0.529

Table 2: Results of language variability analysis.

the output generated by the four different LLMs, each following two strategies for generation (i.e. One-Long vs. Turn-by-Turn). We report the number of generated MPCs, out of the 102 600 in the initial set, that were generated in compliance with the given constraint.

This first evaluation shows that Qwen2.5 is the best model to comply with the constraints, followed by Llama3.1. Indeed, focusing on the best generation strategy, 77% of the MPCs generated by the former comply with all constraints, while for Llama 3.1 this percentage drops to 66%. Ministral and OLMo2, instead, fail to satisfy all constraints in the vast majority of generated conversations. Concerning the generation strategy, TT generation is overall better at complying with almost all the constraints.

The constraints where most settings encountered significant challenges were the *Number of Speakers* and *Stance of the Speakers*. However, TT seems to be able to mitigate these issues for LLMs except Ministral. Based on these findings, in the remainder of this work we will focus on Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5 and perform all analyses on the subset of MPCs that satisfy all constraints.

## 6.2 Results of Language Variability

Table 2 summarizes the results on language variability (as described in Section 4.2).

The analysis shows that linguistic variability at surface level is lower when MPCs are generated in a single pass (OL generation) and also semantic coherence is lower compared to Turn-by-Turn gen-

eration (TT) for both models, i.e., Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5. This is probably due to the fact that in TT settings, the LLM is explicitly required to generate a turn by taking into account what immediately precedes it, building a coherent conversation step by step. Llama3.1 generates less repetitive MPCs at surface level, despite their turns being on average longer than Qwen2.5’s. Also semantic coherence is better for Llama3.1 in all settings.

## 6.3 Results of Structure Analysis

We report the results of the structure analysis for Qwen2.5 – TT, i.e. the model providing the highest number of synthetic MPCs, in Figure 3. Results for Qwen2.5 – OL and for Llama3.1 exhibit similar patterns, which are detailed in the Appendix B.3.

Since one of our goals is to assess how synthetic MPCs compare to *real* MPCs in terms of structural complexity, we perform the same structure analysis on 13 714 MPCs extracted from the UbuntuIRC dataset (Ouchi and Tsuboi, 2016), a widely used corpus of conversations from an online forum about software issues and troubleshooting. This subset was extracted using the strategy in Penzo et al. (2024) to obtain all non-overlapping conversations with 15 messages and 4, 5, or 6 speakers, ensuring each conversation formed a single connected-component interaction. For each of the five network metrics introduced in Section 4.3, we plot in Figure 3 the Empirical Cumulative Density Function (ECDF) obtained by analysing synthetic MPCs with 4, 5 or 6 speakers (i.e. nodes) and on all generated MPCs, and we compare them with ECDF for UbuntuIRC.

For all metrics, higher values indicate more complex interactions. As shown by the median values, the UbuntuIRC dataset consistently exhibits lower values across all statistics. Compared to UbuntuIRC, speakers in our synthetic MPCs tend to interact with more participants. Also, pairs of




Figure 3: Empirical Cumulative Density Function (ECDF) of structural analysis of synthetic MPCs from Qwen2.5-TT. All the boxes goes from 0 to 1 on both vertical axis (density) and horizontal axis (value of the metric).

speakers tend to have more back-and-forth dynamics and groups of speakers tend to be more interconnected. Additionally, in our dataset, the distribution of conversations with varying numbers of participants closely mirrors the overall average, with no notable deviations. This finding holds for all the model-strategy combinations and all metrics.

#### 6.4 Qualitative Evaluation

The last analysis focuses on the quality of the generated conversations and is conducted both manually and automatically. Ideally, using LLM-as-a-judge would allow us to quickly evaluate all synthetic MPCs with limited effort. However, we could not be sure about the quality of this multi-dimensional evaluation when performed automatically. So, we first select 96 MPCs (24 per model and generation strategy) via stratified sampling balanced across topic and stance. We then ask an expert annotator with background in philosophy and extensive experience with linguistic annotation to evaluate for each MPC the six dimensions described in Section 4.4 such as addressee correctness, stance consistency, etc. After annotating a first batch of 32 MPCs, a discussion phase took place in which doubts were clarified with the help of a second annotator and reconciliations took place if needed. The average values assigned to each dimension on a Likert scale between 1 (poor quality) and 5 (perfect quality) on the 96 MPCs are reported in Table 3. We observe that all dimensions have been evaluated positively, especially *Naturalness* and

Model	Llama3.1		Qwen2.5	
	OL	TT	OL	TT
Naturalness	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.30</b>	3.92	3.75
Argumentability	<b>4.00</b>	3.92	3.67	3.21
Addressee Correctness	3.96	4.04	3.92	<b>4.25</b>
Addressee Preciseness	3.54	<b>3.83</b>	3.71	3.29
Stance Consistency	4.08	3.63	3.63	<b>4.17</b>
Stance Evolution	4.38	<b>4.83</b>	4.50	4.63

Table 3: Results from expert human annotator on 96 MPCs (24 for each model-strategy combination).

*Speaker’s Stance Evolution*. The most challenging dimension is *Addressee Preciseness*, which is the only item with an average score below 4. Neither of the two LLMs is consistently better. Neither of the generation strategies (OL vs. TT) is superior to the other w.r.t all evaluation dimensions either.

We complement this manual analysis with a large-scale one using LLM-as-a-judge with OpenAI’s o3-mini model.<sup>4</sup> We first assess whether it can be reliably used to evaluate all six dimensions above. We therefore launch LLM-as-a-judge on the same 96 MPCs which were manually evaluated and measure human-LLM agreement via Krippendorff’s alpha (Krippendorff, 2011) and Spearman’s correlation (full details in Table 7 in Appendix D). While Spearman’s correlation highlights a positive correlation between LLM and human annotator on all dimensions except for *Addressee Preciseness*, Krippendorff’s alpha results are less consistent. However, for both measures the two dimensions that show the highest agreement

<sup>4</sup><https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini/>

between human annotator and LLM-as-a-judge are *Speaker Stance Consistency* (Krippendorff’s alpha 0.78, Spearman’s correlation 0.76 with  $p < 0.001$ ), i.e. whether the speakers comply with the assigned stance when entering the conversation, and *Speaker’s Stance Evolution* (Krippendorff’s alpha 0.29, Spearman’s correlation 0.25 with  $p < 0.05$ ), i.e. whether the speakers follow a logical and realistic evolution of their stance throughout the conversation. We therefore carry out a large-scale evaluation only for these two aspects using LLM-as-a-judge on 800 conversations (200 per model and generation strategy). Results are reported in Table 4 and, similar to the human evaluation, show that Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5 are comparable in terms of performance and that they are able to generate MPCs that present realistic evolution of speakers’ stance with both generation strategies.

Model	Llama3.1		Qwen2.5	
	OL	TT	OL	TT
Generation Strategy				
Stance Consistency	<b>4.15</b>	3.76	3.99	3.64
Stance Evolution	4.64	4.46	4.62	<b>4.68</b>

Table 4: Results with LLM as a judge on 800 MPCs (200 for each model-strategy combination).

## 7 Discussion

The analyses from the previous sections allow us to address the three research questions from Section 1. With respect to **RQ(1)**, targeting the possibility to generate synthetic MPCs following predefined constraints, our evaluation shows that models with comparable parameter sizes can yield very different performances. In this respect, Qwen2.5 is by far the best performing LLM in our pool followed by Llama3.1. Indeed, Qwen2.5 is able to generate 77% MPCs compliant with *all* the constraints given in the prompt (with Ministral this percentage drops to less than 1%). The reason behind this difference in performance cannot be clearly identified but it is likely to depend on the quality of pretraining data. Looking at other dimensions, however, there is no clear winner between Qwen2.5 and Llama3.1. Although Llama generates less repetitive and semantically more coherent MPCs, our qualitative evaluation does not favor either model.

As regards **RQ(2)**, aimed at finding the best generation strategy between OL and TT, we observe that generating MPCs in a Turn-by-Turn fashion is consistently better in terms of compliance with given constraints. This can be related to recent advancements in handling long contexts: generat-

ing shorter, multi-step outputs can be more precise and reduce errors compared to relying on a single, long-generation output. However, this advantage comes at the cost of longer computational times (in our experiments, TT took around 12 times more than OL). Using TT reduces also the repetitiveness of MPCs while generating conversations that are more semantically coherent than OL. Our qualitative evaluation, in contrast, renders TT and OL similarly viable.

To address **RQ(3)**, concerning how we can effectively evaluate the quality of generated MPCs along different dimensions, we present a framework composed by four evaluation blocks, each targeting a specific aspect of MPCs. Beside linguistic variety, coherence and qualitative dimensions such as naturalness and stance evolution, we introduce a novel assessment of the structure of synthetic MPCs. We consider five network metrics and compute empirical cumulative density function to compare them with the same values calculated from real MPCs. We show that it is possible to steer the interaction structure in generated conversations, which paves the way to the large-scale creation of high-quality MPCs with much more complex interactions than what social media datasets offer.

## 8 Conclusion

MPCs are widely studied using social media data because of its abundance and accessibility. Due to platform constraints and inherently asynchronous communication, however, such datasets poorly reflect the structural diversity of natural MPCs. In this work, we investigated the viability of generating varied MPCs with LLMs, showing that (some) LLMs can indeed generate MPCs that conform to structural constraints (e.g., number of speakers and their stances). Models such as Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5 can yield high-quality MPCs under varied constraints, both when prompted to (I.) generate the whole MPC at once or (II.) one turn at a time, given all preceding turns in context. This makes LLMs suitable for synthesizing large-scale datasets for various types of conversations, addressing the diversity of real-world MPCs. Synthesized data can then be further leveraged to fine-tune smaller models for various discriminative tasks (e.g., next speaker or addressee prediction). Our future efforts will exactly focus on synthesizing use-case-specific MPCs and evaluating their utility when used as fine-tuning data for smaller discriminative models.



## Limitations

Our work presents some limitations. First of all, we focus only on English, and the topics we select are typical of US-centric polarized debates such as universal healthcare, right to abortion and death penalty. It is possible that precisely because of these divisive topics, speakers in generated MPCs were able to discuss in a consistent way w.r.t. the assigned stance. In the future, it would be interesting to extend our analysis also to topics on which speakers can have more nuanced views, that are probably more challenging for LLMs to imitate.

In this first set of experiments, we generated MPCs with 4, 5 or 6 speakers, and with a maximum length of 15 turns. It may be worth investigating whether looser constraints, allowing more or less speakers, or longer and shorter conversations, can lead to the creation of more ‘natural’ MPCs and whether the evaluation results would still hold.

## Ethical Statement

One of the main reasons behind research on synthetic data is the need to comply with privacy concerns, especially when working with conversations extracted from social media. We share the same concern and we argue that generated MPCs could alleviate ethical issues related to sharing personal information online. This applies in particular to conversations about sensitive topics such as abortion or death penalty, like the ones that we generate in our experiments. Still, we acknowledge that the problem is not fully solved since basically all best performing LLMs are currently trained on social media data, and synthetic MPCs could include personal data as well (Li et al., 2024b). Also, the creation of synthetic MPCs is not exempt from possible negative impact, for instance when used for training malicious agents in social conversation scenarios. This is a drawback applicable to the whole research field of synthetic corpora generation for conversational AI and we advocate for more discussions on such risks within the NLP community.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Sebastiano Vecellio Salto for his contribution to the evaluation activities.

The work of BL was partially supported by the NextGenerationEU Horizon Europe Programme, grant number 101120237 - ELIAS and grant number 101120763 - TANGO. BL and ST were also supported by the PNRR project FAIR - Future AI

Research (PE00000013). NP’s activities are part of the network of excellence of the European Laboratory for Learning and Intelligent Systems (ELLIS). The work is a result of his research visit at the Chair for Natural Language Processing, Center For Artificial Intelligence and Data Science, University of Würzburg, Germany, under the supervision of GG. The visiting has been partially funded by the Erasmus+ Traineeship programme.

## References

- Jason Baumgartner, Savvas Zannettou, Brian Keegan, Megan Squire, and Jeremy Blackburn. 2020. [The pushshift reddit dataset](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2001.08435.
- Nicola Bertoldi, Mauro Cettolo, and Marcello Federico. 2013. [Cache-based online adaptation for machine translation enhanced computer assisted translation](#). In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit XIV: Papers*, Nice, France.
- Helena Bonaldi, Sara Dellantonio, Serra Sinem Tekiroğlu, and Marco Guerini. 2022. [Human-machine collaboration approaches to build a dialogue dataset for hate speech countering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8031–8049, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Holly Branigan. 2006. Perspectives on multi-party dialogue. *Research on Language and Computation*, 4:153–177.
- Santiago Castro. 2017. Fast Krippendorff: Fast computation of Krippendorff’s alpha agreement measure. <https://github.com/pln-fing-udelar/fast-krippendorff>.
- Jonathan P. Chang and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2019. [Trouble on the horizon: Forecasting the derailment of online conversations as they develop](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4743–4754, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Serina Chang, Alicja Chaszczewicz, Emma Wang, Maya Josifovska, Emma Pierson, and Jure Leskovec. 2024. [Llms generate structurally realistic social networks but overestimate political homophily](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.16629.
- Maximillian Chen, Alexandros Papangelis, Chenyang Tao, Seokhwan Kim, Andy Rosenbaum, Yang Liu, Zhou Yu, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2023. [PLACES: Prompting language models for social conversation synthesis](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 844–868,

Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mauro Coletto, Kiran Garimella, Aristides Gionis, and Claudio Lucchese. 2017. A motif-based approach for identifying controversy. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 11, pages 496–499.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Al-lonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Celebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Raparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun

Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhotia, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian

- Khabisa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Her-moso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Mun-ish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pa-van Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratan-chandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Mah-eswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lind-say, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agar-wal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiao-jian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Diane Felmlee, Cassie McMillan, and Roger Whitaker. 2021. Dyads, triads, and tetrads: a multivariate simulation approach to uncovering network motifs in social graphs. *Applied network science*, 6(1):63.
- Kiran Garimella, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Aristides Gionis, and Michael Mathioudakis. 2018. [Political discourse on social media: Echo chambers, gatekeepers, and the price of bipartisanship](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, WWW '18, page 913–922, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE. International World Wide Web Con-ferences Steering Committee.
- David R. Gibson. 2003. [Participation shifts: Order and differentiation in group conversation\\*](#). *Social Forces*, 81(4):1335–1380.
- Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. 2024. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594*.
- Aric Hagberg, Pieter J. Swart, and Daniel A. Schult. 2008. [Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using networkx](#). Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States).
- Yilun Hua, Nicholas Chernogor, Yuzhe Gu, Seoyeon Jeong, Miranda Luo, and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2024. [How did we get here? summarizing conversation dynamics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7452–7477, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Frederic Kirstein, Terry Ruas, Robert Kratel, and Bela Gipp. 2024. [Tell me what I need to know: Exploring LLM-based \(personalized\) abstractive multi-source meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 920–939, Miami, Florida, US. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Klaus Krippendorff. 2011. Computing krippendorff’s alpha-reliability. *Computing*, 1:25.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Sangmin Lee, Minzhi Li, Bolin Lai, Wenqi Jia, Fiona Ryan, Xu Cao, Ozgur Kara, Bikram Boote, Weiyang Shi, Diyi Yang, et al. 2024. [Towards social ai: A survey on understanding social interactions](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.15316*.
- Ming Li, Jiu-hai Chen, Lichang Chen, and Tianyi Zhou. 2024a. [Can LLMs speak for diverse people? tuning LLMs via debate to generate controllable controversial statements](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 16160–16176, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qinbin Li, Junyuan Hong, Chulin Xie, Jeffrey Tan, Rachel Xin, Junyi Hou, Xavier Yin, Zhun Wang, Dan Hendrycks, Zhangyang Wang, et al. 2024b. [Llm-pbe: Assessing data privacy in large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12787*.
- Ryan Lowe, Nissan Pow, Iulian Serban, and Joelle Pineau. 2015. [The Ubuntu dialogue corpus: A large dataset for research in unstructured multi-turn dialogue systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 285–294, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Khyati Mahajan and Samira Shaikh. 2021. [On the need for thoughtful data collection for multi-party dialogue: A survey of available corpora and collection methods](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 338–352, Singapore and Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robert Malouf. 1995. Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse. *online*, <http://hpsg.stanford.edu/rob/talk/node2.html>.
- Daniela Occhipinti, Michele Marchi, Irene Mondella, Huiyuan Lai, Felice Dell’Orletta, Malvina Nissim, and Marco Guerini. 2024. [Fine-tuning with HED-IT: The impact of human post-editing for dialogical language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11892–11907, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Team OLMo, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, Nathan Lambert, Dustin Schwenk, Oyvind Tafjord, Taira Anderson, David Atkinson, Faeze Brahman, Christopher Clark, Pradeep Dasigi, Nouha Dziri, Michal Guerquin, Hamish Ivison, Pang Wei Koh, Jiacheng Liu, Saumya Malik, William Merrill, Lester James V. Miranda, Jacob Morrison, Tyler Murray, Crystal Nam, Valentina Pyatkin, Aman Rangapur, Michael Schmitz, Sam Skjonsberg, David Wadden, Christopher Wilhelm, Michael Wilson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Ali Farhadi, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. [2 olmo 2 furious](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.00656.
- Hiroki Ouchi and Yuta Tsuboi. 2016. [Addressee and response selection for multi-party conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2133–2143, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pietro Panzarasa, Tore Opsahl, and Kathleen M Carley. 2009. Patterns and dynamics of users’ behavior and interaction: Network analysis of an online community. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(5):911–932.
- Birgit Pauksztat, Christian Steglich, and Rafael Wittek. 2011. Who speaks up to whom? a relational approach to employee voice. *Social Networks*, 33(4):303–316.
- Nicolò Penzo, Maryam Sajedinia, Bruno Lepri, Sara Tonelli, and Marco Guerini. 2024. [Do LLMs suffer from multi-party hangover? a diagnostic approach to addressee recognition and response selection in conversations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11210–11233, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alan Ritter, Colin Cherry, and Bill Dolan. 2010. [Un-supervised modeling of Twitter conversations](#). In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 172–180, Los Angeles, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4):696–735.
- Chao-Hong Tan, Jia-Chen Gu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2023. [Is ChatGPT a good multi-party conversation solver?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 4905–4915, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C J Carey, Ilhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore, Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. 2020. [SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python](#). *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272.
- Jimmy Wei, Kurt Shuster, Arthur Szlam, Jason Weston, Jack Urbanek, and Mojtaba Komeili. 2023. [Multi-party chat: Conversational agents in group settings with humans and models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.13835.
- Thomas P Wilson, John M Wiemann, and Don H Zimmerman. 1984. Models of turn taking in conversational interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3(3):159–183.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jiayu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ryen W White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. 2023. [Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.08155.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin



Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10671.

Justine Zhang, Jonathan Chang, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Lucas Dixon, Yiqing Hua, Dario Taraborelli, and Nithum Thain. 2018. [Conversations gone awry: Detecting early signs of conversational failure](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1350–1361, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xuhui Zhou, Zhe Su, Tiwalayo Eisape, Hyunwoo Kim, and Maarten Sap. 2024. [Is this the real life? is this just fantasy? the misleading success of simulating social interactions with LLMs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 21692–21714, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2024. [Can large language models transform computational social science?](#) *Computational Linguistics*, 50(1):237–291.

## A System Prompts

We report in Figure 4 and Figure 5 respectively the two versions of the Task Description and the two versions of the Output Format (same structure, just different example) for the One-Long (OL) generation strategy. In Figure 6 and Figure 7 we report the same for the Turn-by-Turn (TT) generation strategy.

For both strategies, the three System Prompts are obtained by concatenating: (I.) Task Description 1 + Output Format 1; (II.) Task Description 2 + Output Format 1; (III.) Task Description 1 + Output Format 2.

Finally, in Figure 8 we report a synthetic Multi-Party-Conversation according to the guidelines (the topic field has been added in post-processing for context). In the System Prompt, the assignment of stance among the speakers has 6 possible distributions (pro-topic vs counter-topic): 2 vs 2, 3 vs 2, 2 vs 3, 2 vs 4, 3 vs 3, 4 vs 2.

## B Further Analysis

### B.1 List of Topics

The topics on which LLMs were prompted to generate MPCs (see Section 3.2) are reported in Table 5. They consist in 76 paired statements based on 38 topics, in which each statement reflects a more conservative or progressive point of view with respect to the given topic.

The 38 topics were manually selected from the ones provided by Li et al. (2024a) (freely available in the related Github repository).<sup>5</sup> Specifically, we picked the most polarizing topics, in order to foster more clear-cut stances during the generation of MPCs.

### B.2 General Statistics of Final Set of Synthetic MPCs

In Figure 9 we report the general statistics of the synthetic MPCs that satisfy the constraints according to Section 6.1. We report for each model-strategy combination: (I.) the average number of addressees per turn; (II.) the number of users; (III.) the stance assignment; (IV.) the number of turns.

Most of the combinations satisfy the strict requirements of exactly 15 messages. Only Llama3.1-TT tends to generate a lot of examples of shorter conversations.

### B.3 Extended Results from Global s Structure Analysis

In Figure 10 we report all the plots related to the 5 structural metrics presented in Section 4.3, for all the model-strategy combinations (where the models are Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5). All the plots show similar shapes, and all the combinations present a more complex structure than MPCs in the UbuntuIRC dataset (Ouchi and Tsuboi, 2016).

## C Technical Report

All the experiments have been run on Ampere A40 GPUs, which present 48GB of VRAM. We used the vLLM library (Kwon et al., 2023) for speeding up the inference time. In Table 6 we report the links to the models and the repositories we used.

In order to compute the structural metrics, we used the tools from the NetworkX<sup>6</sup> library (Hagberg et al., 2008). Instead, for computing the

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/tianyi-lab/DEBATune>

<sup>6</sup><https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/>




Figure 4: The two versions of Task Description for the One-Long generation strategy

Krippendorff-alpha we used the implementation from Castro (2017) for interval data. For the Spearman correlation, we used the SciPy library (Virtanen et al., 2020). For the human evaluation, we used Argilla<sup>7</sup> for creating the annotation platform and we used the User Interface provided on HuggingFace spaces.<sup>8</sup> For the LLM-as-a-judge evaluation, we employed the OpenAI API for reasoning models.<sup>9</sup> We also used the official guide to perform prompt refinement.<sup>10</sup> Our results can be rerun by paying less than \$20.00. We used both ChatGPT<sup>11</sup> and Copilot<sup>12</sup> for help in the coding process.

## D Human and LLM-as-a-judge Agreement

As reported in Section 6.4, we compute the Inter-Annotator Agreement on a batch of 96 MPCs with Krippendorff’s alpha and Spearman correlation between the human expert annotator and the LLM (results in Table 7). For the two scores with higher Krippendorff’s alpha, i.e., *Speaker Stance Consistency* and *Speaker Stance Evolution*, we employed the LLM-as-a-judge on large scale.

## E Guidelines for Human Evaluation

For human annotation, we designed a careful documentation to be used as guidelines. We report in Figure 11 the introduction, in Figure 12 the Plat-

form Description (with a screenshot of the view), in Figure 13 the Scores Description. One annotator performed his task as part of an internship, while the second annotator is regularly employed at the authors’ institution. The effort required, on average, 2.5 hours for a batch of 32 items.

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/argilla-io/argilla/>

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/argilla>

<sup>9</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/text-generation>

<sup>10</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompt-generation>

<sup>11</sup><https://openai.com/index/chatgpt/>

<sup>12</sup><https://github.com/features/copilot>

**OL- Output Format 1**

The output must follow the json format:

```
{ "conversation": [
  {
    "id": 1,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1, addressee2]
  },
  {
    "id": 2,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1]
  },
  {
    "id": 3,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1, addressee2, addressee3]
  }
],
"speakers": [
  {
    "name": speaker1,
    "stance": stance_speaker_1,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker2,
    "stance": stance_speaker_2,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker3,
    "stance": stance_speaker_3,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker4,
    "stance": stance_speaker_4,
  }
]
}
```

The "stance" can be only "positive" or "negative".

You will be given the command:

Generate a conversation.

Be concise.  
Don't give further details.

**OL- Output Format 2**

The output must follow the json format:

```
{ "conversation": [
  {
    "id": 1,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1, addressee2]
  },
  {
    "id": 2,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1]
  },
  {
    "id": 3,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [address1, addressee2, addressee3]
  },
  {
    "id": 4,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1, addressee2]
  },
  {
    "id": 5,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1, addressee2, addressee3,
addressee4]
  },
  {
    "id": 6,
    "speaker": speaker,
    "message": message,
    "addressee": [addressee1]
  }
],
"speakers": [
  {
    "name": speaker1,
    "stance": stance_speaker_1,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker2,
    "stance": stance_speaker_2,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker3,
    "stance": stance_speaker_3,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker4,
    "stance": stance_speaker_4,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker5,
    "stance": stance_speaker_5,
  },
  {
    "name": speaker6,
    "stance": stance_speaker_6,
  }
]
}
```

The "stance" can be only "positive" or "negative".

You will be given the command:

Generate a conversation.

Be concise.  
Don't give further details.

Figure 5: The two examples of Output Format for the One-Long generation strategy




Figure 6: The two versions of Task Description for the Turn-by-Turn generation strategy




Figure 7: The two examples of Output Format for the Turn-by-Turn generation strategy



```

{"conversation": [
  {"id": 1, "speaker": "Alex", "message": "We need to talk about climate change. What are your thoughts?",
   "addressee": ["Emma", "Jack", "Lily", "Mike", "Oliver"]},
  {"id": 2, "speaker": "Emma", "message": "I think we should invest more in renewable energy sources.", "addressee": ["Alex"]},
  {"id": 3, "speaker": "Lily", "message": "Climate change is a serious issue, we need to take immediate action.",
   "addressee": ["Mike", "Oliver"]},
  {"id": 4, "speaker": "Jack", "message": "I agree with Emma, solar and wind power are the future.", "addressee": ["Alex", "Emma"]},
  {"id": 5, "speaker": "Mike", "message": "I don't think we should make drastic changes, it's too expensive.",
   "addressee": ["Lily", "Oliver"]},
  {"id": 6, "speaker": "Oliver", "message": "We should focus on economic growth, not environmental issues.",
   "addressee": ["Alex", "Emma", "Lily"]},
  {"id": 7, "speaker": "Alex", "message": "Economic growth and environmental protection are not mutually exclusive.",
   "addressee": ["Mike", "Oliver"]},
  {"id": 8, "speaker": "Emma", "message": "We can create jobs in the renewable energy sector.", "addressee": ["Jack"]},
  {"id": 9, "speaker": "Lily", "message": "We need to educate people about the consequences of climate change.",
   "addressee": ["Mike"]},
  {"id": 10, "speaker": "Jack", "message": "Renewable energy is becoming more efficient and affordable.", "addressee": ["Emma"]},
  {"id": 11, "speaker": "Mike", "message": "But what about the cost of transitioning to new energy sources?", "addressee": ["Lily"]},
  {"id": 12, "speaker": "Oliver", "message": "We should prioritize economic growth over environmental concerns.", "addressee": ["Alex"]},
  {"id": 13, "speaker": "Alex", "message": "That's a short-sighted view, Oliver.", "addressee": ["Oliver"]},
  {"id": 14, "speaker": "Emma", "message": "We can't afford to wait any longer to act on climate change.", "addressee": ["Lily", "Jack"]},
  {"id": 15, "speaker": "Lily", "message": "Let's work together to find a solution.", "addressee": ["Alex", "Emma", "Jack", "Mike", "Oliver"]}
],
"speakers": [
  {"name": "Alex", "stance": "positive"},
  {"name": "Emma", "stance": "positive"},
  {"name": "Jack", "stance": "positive"},
  {"name": "Lily", "stance": "positive"},
  {"name": "Mike", "stance": "negative"},
  {"name": "Oliver", "stance": "negative"}
],
"topic": "fight to climate change"
}

```

Figure 8: Example of Synthetic Multi-Party Conversation




Figure 9: General statistics of the resulting MPC for Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5 on both generation strategies. The statistics reported are (from the top): (I.) average number of addressees per turn, (II.) number of users, (III.) stance assignment, (IV.) number of turns.




Figure 10: Empirical Cumulative Density Function (ECDF) of structural analysis on the synthetic MPCs from Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5, with both generation strategies, i.e. One-Long and Turn-by-Turn generation. The statistics reported are (top to bottom): (I.) Average Degree Centrality, (II.) Average Out-Going Degree, (III.) Transitivity, (IV.) Reciprocity, (v.) Consistent Reciprocity. Average Degree Centrality and Average Out-Going Degree are normalized. In this way, all values on the vertical axis (density) and on the horizontal axis (value of the metric) are included between 0 and 1.

<b>Progressive</b>	<b>Conservative</b>
ban of targeted killing	allowance of targeted killing
ban of the death penalty	allowance of the death penalty
recognition of the right to abortion	ban of abortion
recognition of the right to euthanasia	ban of euthanasia
recognition of Palestinian state	non-recognition of Palestinian state
ban of mandatory military service	mandatory military service
ban of nuclear weapons	support for nuclear weapons
mandatory sex education in schools	optional sex education in schools
guarantee of online teaching	mandatory in-person teaching
fight to climate change	opposition to regulations for action on climate change
incentives for renewable energy	incentives for energy from fossil fuels
ban of facial recognition technology	incentives for facial recognition technology
incentives for AI research	opposition to AI research incentives
mandatory vaccination for children	optional vaccination for children
ban of animal testing	allowance of animal testing
incentives for organ donation	opposition to organ donation incentives
ban of racial profiling	allowance of racial profiling
incentives for immigration and asylum	support to immigration contrast and stricter asylum rules
universal healthcare	support to private healthcare
legalization of marijuana	ban of marijuana
legalization of same-sex marriage	ban of same-sex marriage
legalization of surrogate motherhood	ban of surrogate motherhood
programme for the reduction of the gender pay gap	increase of the gender pay gap in favor of men
limitation to gun ownership	right to unrestricted gun ownership
holocaust remembrance mandatory in schools	optional holocaust remembrance in schools
ban of zoos	support for zoos
protection of endangered species	opposition to endangered species protection
organization of pride parades	ban of pride parades
allowance of tattoos	ban of tattoos
cohabitation of couples before marriage	mandatory marriage before cohabitation
ban of arranged marriages	right to arranged marriages
US staying in NATO	US leaving NATO
Germany staying in EU	Germany leaving the EU
mandatory acceptance of mobile payments	ban of mobile payments
lowering university tuition fees	increase in university tuition fees
mandatory cameras on police officers	freedom of police officers to refuse cameras
freedom of blasphemy	punishment for blasphemy
legalization of adoption by same-sex couples	ban of adoption by same-sex couples

Table 5: List of topics, paired according to their Progressive and Conservative version.

Model	Repository
Llama-3.1-8B	<a href="https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B">https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B</a>
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	<a href="https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct">https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct</a>
Minstral-8B-Instruct	<a href="https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Minstral-8B-Instruct-2410">https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Minstral-8B-Instruct-2410</a>
OLMo2-7B-Instruct	<a href="https://huggingface.co/allenai/OLMo-2-1124-7B-Instruct">https://huggingface.co/allenai/OLMo-2-1124-7B-Instruct</a>

Model	Context length
Llama-3.1-8B	128k
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	131k
Minstral-8B-Instruct	131k
OLMo2-7B-Instruct	4k

Table 6: Upper - repositories of the model used for generating the synthetic MPCs. Lower - context length of each model.



### Annotation Guidelines for Multi-Party Conversations

You will annotate multi-party conversations involving from **4 to 6 users**, each discussing a specific topic. The **topic** and each user's **initial stance** will be provided.

#### Key Concepts to Understand

##### 1. Addressee

The addressee refers to the **intended recipient** of a message in the conversation.

An addressee can be:

- **Directly and explicitly addressed** (e.g., a user's name or a clear reference is mentioned).
- **Implied but inferred from context** (e.g., the message implicitly responds to someone's argument).
- **Multiple users at once** (e.g., the message addresses the group).

**Important:** The addressee is distinct from an "**overhearer**": an overhearer is a participant who reads the message but is **not the intended recipient**.

**Note:** Simply reporting the name of someone (e.g., "I agree/disagree with X") does not automatically mean that **X is the addressee**. Always consider the **context** to identify the correct addressee.

##### 2. Stance

The stance reflects the **speaker's opinion about the topic**, i.e. they can either support or counter a topic.

- Example 1:
  - Topic: ban of mandatory military service
  - Pro: support the ban of mandatory military service
  - Con: counter the ban of mandatory military service
- Example 2:
  - Topic: mandatory military service
  - Pro: support the mandatory military service
  - Con: counter the mandatory military service
- Speakers **can change** their stance during the conversation, but such changes must arise logically through the course of argumentation and counterargumentation.

**Illogical or abrupt stance changes** that lack reasoning within the discussion are not acceptable

Figure 11: Overview of guidelines for human evaluation

### How Conversations Are Presented

#### 1. Chronological Order

- The conversation will be displayed in the order the messages were exchanged.

#### 2. Topic Information

- Before the first message, the **topic of the conversation** will be shown for context.

#### 3. Message Display

- Each message appears in a **colored box** with the **speaker's name** clearly labeled.
- On the **right side of each message box**, the **addressees** of the message are listed. These addressee names will also appear in colored boxes corresponding to their assigned colors.

#### 4. Speaker Color Coding

- Each speaker has a **consistent color** assigned to all their messages and addressee labels.
- **Hot colors** (e.g., red, orange) indicate speakers with an initial **countertopic** stance (opposition to the topic)
- **Cold colors** (e.g., blue, green) indicate speakers with an initial **protopic** stance (support for the topic).
- Remember, the stance should evolve logically through the conversation, but the color assigned will remain the same.




Figure 12: Platform description from human evaluation guidelines

### Annotation Task Overview

You will evaluate several aspects of a **multi-party conversation** based on the definitions provided. Each aspect will be rated on a specific scale.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### 1. Naturalness

- **Definition:** Assess the overall quality of the conversation's flow, tone, and word choice.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Completely unnatural – disjointed, incomprehensible.
  - **2:** Mostly unnatural – awkward, robotic, hard to follow.
  - **3:** Moderately natural – clear but with noticeable unnatural elements.
  - **4:** Mostly natural – fluent, minor issues, nearly native-like.
  - **5:** Fully natural – perfect flow, tone, and word choice, native-level.

#### 2. Argumentability

- **Definition:** Rate how well the conversation presents reasoned and well-argued positions.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Total lack of arguments – The conversation has no argumentative character.
  - **2:** Insufficient arguments – Mostly empty and generic assertions are presented.
  - **3:** Mediocre arguments – Arguments are few or poorly reasoned, and many messages lack argumentative depth.
  - **4:** Good arguments – Messages generally express sufficiently reasoned positions, with rare exceptions.
  - **5:** Excellent arguments – All messages present well-reasoned arguments.

#### 3. Speaker Stance Consistency

- **Definition:** Evaluate whether all speakers maintain the stance assigned at the beginning of the conversation. If the stance is uncertain, it does not mean the speaker is inconsistent with their assigned stance.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Completely inconsistent – all speakers fail to start with their assigned stance.
  - **2:** Mostly inconsistent – frequent misalignment with assigned stances at the start.
  - **3:** Moderately consistent – some speakers begin with their assigned stance, but others deviate.
  - **4:** Mostly consistent – rare deviations, most speakers start with their assigned stance.
  - **5:** Fully consistent – all speakers clearly and strictly start with their assigned stance.

#### 4. Speaker Stance Evolution

- **Definition:** Assess whether each speaker demonstrates a realistic and logical evolution of their stance during the conversation or keep logically their stance. If stance doesn't change at all, the evolution is considered totally realistic.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Completely illogical – all stance changes are unrealistic, inconsistent, or poorly justified.
  - **2:** Mostly illogical – frequent unrealistic or weakly justified changes in stance.
  - **3:** Moderately plausible – some stance changes are logical, others feel forced or unclear.
  - **4:** Mostly plausible – most stance changes are logical, with a few minor inconsistencies.
  - **5:** Fully plausible – all stance changes are realistic, logical, and follow a natural progression.

#### 5. Addressee Correctness

- **Definition:** Evaluate whether the assigned addressees align with the conversation context and are logically appropriate. A correct addressee is one that fits the intended recipient(s) based on the content of the message.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Completely Incorrect - addressees are random, irrelevant, or inappropriate.
  - **2:** Mostly Incorrect - frequent misalignments with the intended context or message.
  - **3:** Moderately Correct - some addressees are appropriate, but others are misaligned or unclear.
  - **4:** Mostly Correct - addressees are appropriate in most cases, with only minor errors.
  - **5:** Fully Correct - all addressees are logical and perfectly aligned with the conversation context.

#### 6. Addressee Preciseness

- **Definition:** Assess whether addressees are precise and contextually appropriate. Messages should target the smallest relevant group or individuals, avoiding unnecessary use of "everyone" unless truly relevant to all.
- **Scale:**
  - **1:** Completely Imprecise - addressees are mostly irrelevant or overly broad, frequently defaulting to "everyone."
  - **2:** Mostly Imprecise - addressees are often too broad, with few attempts at precision.
  - **3:** Moderately Precise - addressees are sometimes appropriate but often lack precision, with overuse of "everyone."
  - **4:** Mostly Precise - addressees are usually precise, with only minor lapses in targeting.
  - **5:** Fully Precise - addressees are always the most precise and contextually appropriate, using "everyone" only when necessary.

Figure 13: Description of the scores from the human evaluation guidelines

<b>Coefficients</b>	Krippendorf	Spearman
Naturalness	-0.24	0.05
Argumentability	0.14	0.22*
Addressee Correctness	0.18	0.30*
Addressee Preciseness	-0.08	-0.12
Stance Consistency	0.78	0.76**
Stance Evolution	0.29	0.25*

Table 7: LLM as a judge – human expert agreement/correlation. For Spearman’s correlation, (\*) highlights that the correlation is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). Instead, (\*\*) corresponds to a correlation that is highly statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).