

Why Synthetic Isn't Real Yet: A Diagnostic Framework for Contact Center Dialogue Generation

Rishikesh Devanathan, Varun Nathan, and Ayush Kumar
{rishikesh.devanathan, varun.nathan, ayush}@observe.ai
Observe.AI
Bangalore, India

Abstract

Synthetic transcript generation is critical in contact center domains, where privacy and data scarcity limit model training and evaluation. Unlike prior synthetic dialogue generation work on open-domain or medical dialogues, contact center conversations are goal-oriented, role-asymmetric, and behaviorally complex, featuring disfluencies, ASR noise, and compliance-driven agent actions. In deployments where transcripts are unavailable, standard pipelines still yield derived call attributes such as Intent Summaries, Topic Flow, and QA Evaluation Forms. We leverage these as supervision signals to guide generation. To assess the quality of such outputs, we introduce a diagnostic framework of 18 linguistically and behaviorally grounded metrics for comparing real and synthetic transcripts. We benchmark four language-agnostic generation strategies, from simple prompting to characteristic-aware multi-stage approaches, alongside reference-free baselines. Results reveal persistent challenges: no method excels across all traits, with notable deficits in disfluency, sentiment, and behavioral realism. Our diagnostic tool exposes these gaps, enabling fine-grained evaluation and stress testing of synthetic dialogue across languages.

1 Introduction and Related Work

Large Language Models (LLMs) are foundational for building conversational agents across domains such as healthcare, finance, and customer support. However, training and evaluating these models still require large volumes of high-quality conversational data. In regulated environments like contact centers, access to such data is limited due to privacy constraints, linguistic diversity, and the sparsity of structured dialogue features (e.g., rare call intents, Quality-Assurance (QA) signals) (Zhang et al., 2023; Yeh et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2025). As a result, generating domain-aligned synthetic

transcripts has become a practical necessity for augmenting both training and evaluation pipelines.

Recent works such as NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024) and ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025) synthesize dialogues in a multi-agent setup, conditioning on elements like persona or domain-specific inputs such as clinical notes. SDialog (Burdizzo et al., 2025) offers controllable synthetic dialogue generation for research applications. Other systems such as DiaSynth (Suresh et al., 2025), and SpeechDialogueFactory (Wang et al., 2025) target multi-turn or speech-level synthesis. Further efforts target persona-grounded dialogue (Jandaghi et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2022; Abbasiantaeb et al., 2023), and QA-based interactions (Abbasiantaeb et al., 2023). While these approaches span open-domain, medical, and other specialized settings, they are **not tailored to the goal-oriented, behaviorally rich, and acoustically noisy environments of contact centers**, which demand fidelity to disfluencies, adversarial turns, ASR noise, and compliance-driven agent behavior.

Synthetic dialogue generation in most prior methods relies on loosely structured conditioning such as personas, scenarios, or natural prompts. While effective for open-domain or social chat, these techniques fall short in enterprise contexts like contact centers, where strict privacy regulations often prohibit transcript retention (Laskar et al., 2023; Dao et al., 2025). Instead, structured metadata—such as intent summaries, topic sequences, and QA forms—are commonly available and offer privacy-preserving proxies for supervision. Though underexplored in contact center settings, similar structured supervision has shown promise in clinical and educational domains (Das et al., 2024; Binici et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025), motivating our use of such signals for reference-free generation.

Evaluating the quality of such synthetic data remains equally challenging. Common text similarity

metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002a) or ROUGE (Lin, 2004), though effective for surface-level comparisons, do not capture behavioral or interactional nuance. Prior works propose targeted evaluation for specific phenomena, such as fillers (Hassan et al., 2024), ASR noise (Binici et al., 2025), or QA accuracy (Abdullin et al., 2024), but these remain limited in scope and do not assess broader behavioral realism in structured, goal-oriented settings. While Kumar et al. (2021) identify latent features like disfluency and question type, and Arco et al. (2022) explore symbolic modeling, these approaches stop short of offering comparative realism evaluation. **Our work closes this gap** by transforming such latent traits into formal evaluation metrics.

Several recent works have explored multilingual dialogue synthesis and evaluation, but none focus explicitly on the requirements of contact center domain. Chen et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024 support dialogue generation in multiple languages but do not assess linguistic variation in dialogue behaviors across languages.

To overcome the limitations of multi-agent, open-ended prompting in capturing the structural, multilingual, and behavioral fidelity of contact center dialogues, we introduce a supervision-driven generation pipeline guided by structured inputs such as intent summaries, topic flows, and QA question–answer pairs. Complementing this, we design a domain-specific evaluation framework where realism is assessed through 18 metrics grouped into two categories: *behavioral metrics* (e.g., sentiment shifts, proactivity, question types) and *linguistic metrics* (e.g., disfluencies, repetition, ASR noise). We benchmark four generation strategies against baselines like ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025) and NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024) across four languages. Results show that no method consistently replicates real transcript distributions, with widespread challenges in sentiment fidelity, disfluency, and behavioral realism. **Our core contribution is a diagnostic framework** that enables principled evaluation and supervision of synthetic dialogue generation in multilingual contact center settings.

2 Structured Supervision for Synthetic Dialogue Generation

To address challenges in synthetic contact center transcript generation and limitations of existing methods, our pipeline conditions generation

on modular, interpretable supervision signals derived from real transcripts and routinely produced in call center operations, such as summarization (Nathan et al., 2023), QA auto-answering (Ingle et al., 2024), and call segmentation (Malkiel et al., 2023). We focus on four supervision types commonly available in structured call attributes: intent-specific summaries, topic flows, and QA scores as question–response pairs, providing consistent semantic and behavioral guidance across datasets. We also inject ASR noise and disfluencies, which are characteristic of real-world transcripts but typically absent in clean, LLM-generated outputs.

1. **Intent-Specific Summaries** capture the semantic backbone of a conversation, such as complaints, key events, or resolutions. They ensure inclusion of core content and act as anchors that prevent hallucinations.
2. **Topic Flow** provides a global discourse plan, such as a progression from greeting to complaint to troubleshooting and resolution. This supports coherent turn transitions, enhances discourse structure, and models speaker role changes over time.
3. **Quality assurance (QA)** forms supply structured behavioral annotations for each call. In routine QA processes, every interaction is evaluated against questions such as “Did the agent demonstrate empathy with the customer?” or “Did the agent propose a solution without prompting?” These scores capture how agents actually perform across dimensions like empathy, proactivity, and script adherence. Because different agents often exhibit distinct behaviors even when handling the same call intent, we use these QA-derived labels to induce behavioral variation in generation. Conditioning on these annotations enables our pipeline to produce a diverse set of synthetic transcripts that faithfully reflect the range of real-world agent interactions. Please refer section A.1 for more information on this.
4. **Disfluency and ASR Noise Injection** is applied after initial generation to simulate realistic ASR conditions. It captures hesitations, repairs, and transcription noise while preserving the intended content through post-processing.

Additionally, a **target length** signal—based on turn count distributions (Refer Table 35) grouped

by call length categories in the tuning data - is used to guide conversation extension during generation.

These components collectively support the generation of synthetic data that is faithful to the structural, stylistic, and ASR characteristics of real contact center conversations. Examples of these attributes are shown in Tables 9 - 11, and detailed descriptions are provided in section A.2.

3 Methodology

3.1 Synthetic Transcript Generation Pipeline

As shown in Figure 1, our methodology for generating synthetic call center transcripts involves four pipelines of increasing procedural depth, designed to produce realistic and characteristically diverse conversational data. The pipelines are as follows:

1. Single-Stage Base Transcript Generation

Referred to as **Single Stage** in Tables 1 to 4, this foundational step in our methodology uses an LLM conditioned on a set of input call attributes A , comprising the elements outlined in 2, to produce a coherent and contextually relevant conversation.

The base generation model, denoted as G_{base} , takes these attributes as input to generate a base transcript T_{base} .

The output T_{base} is a sequence of utterances $U = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N)$, where each utterance u_i is a tuple of the speaker and the text ($u_i = (\text{speaker}_i, \text{text}_i)$)

This single-stage process produces a clean, logically consistent transcript that adheres to the high-level constraints defined in the input attributes. It serves as the starting point for the advanced pipelines described next.

2. Dual-Stage Enhancement Pipeline Based on Turn Count

Referred to as **Dual Stage - Turn Count** in Tables 1 to 4, this pipeline builds on the base transcript to address the limitations of direct, single-pass prompting of 3.1. While the earlier approach produces coherent and contextually aligned conversations, it often lacks the surface irregularities and ASR characteristic of real speech, and may deviate from desired transcript lengths. By splitting the conversation into smaller, semantically coherent segments and enhancing each independently, the method reduces the risk of long-context drift and hallucination, while enabling fine-grained insertion of conversational phenomena such as disfluencies, interruptions, and ASR noise. This targeted en-

hancement yields transcripts that better reflect the noisy, imperfect, and interactive qualities of real-world spoken dialogue. From the output of the single-stage process A , the following steps are applied:

1. **Semantic Segmentation:** The base transcript is segmented into semantically coherent chunks $C_{\text{chunk}} = (\chi_1, \chi_2, \dots, \chi_k)$ by obtaining chunk boundaries from an LLM: $C_{\text{chunk}} = LLM(T_{\text{base}})$
2. **Combined Enhancement:** Each chunk χ_j is enhanced using an LLM function E , which performs:
 - *Conversation Extension:* Inserts contextually relevant exchanges. The number of turns to extend is specified in the LLM prompt which is sampled from a target distribution based on call size categories (very short to long) derived from real transcripts in the prompt tuning dataset. Details of the distribution can be found in Table 35.
 - *Disfluency Insertion:* Adds speech disfluencies (e.g., fillers, stutters) using a dictionary D (Details in Tables 13 - 14), with a uniformly sampled subset D_j .
 - *Interruptions:* Simulates overlapping interaction.
 - *ASR Noise Simulation:* Introduces plausible ASR-related errors.

Hence, the enhanced chunk becomes: $\chi'_j = E(\chi_j, D_j)$

3. **Recombination:** The final transcript is constructed by concatenating the enhanced chunks: $T_{\text{final}} = \chi'_1 \oplus \chi'_2 \oplus \dots \oplus \chi'_k$

This dual-stage process yields a transcript that is both contextually accurate and exhibits the noisy, imperfect, and interactive qualities of a genuine spoken conversation.

3. Dual-Stage Enhancement Pipeline Based on Call Length

Dual Stage - Call Length, as reported in Tables 1 to 4, follows the same structure as **Dual Stage - Turn Count** but omits explicit turn counts in the LLM prompt during *conversation extension*. Instead, chunk extension is guided implicitly by call size categories.




Figure 1: End-to-end framework for generating synthetic call center transcripts. (1) A base transcript is generated using a prompt-conditioned LLM. (2) The transcript is segmented into semantically coherent chunks. (3) Each chunk undergoes targeted perturbations via ASR noise simulation, disfluency insertion, or characteristic-aware editing using probabilistic sampling. (4) Modified chunks are recombined to form the final synthetic transcript.

4. Characteristic-Aware Generation Pipeline

Characteristic Aware, as reported in Tables 1 to 4, aims to generate synthetic transcripts whose turn-level features mirror those observed in real-world data. It conditions generation on both standard call attributes and high-level characteristics (e.g., emotion, vocabulary complexity) obtained from the prompt tuning data, followed by chunk-level extension to improve interactivity. Compared to the dual-stage approaches, this method is more targeted, as it explicitly identifies specific turns and applies the selected characteristics to them. Turn-level traits are then applied through a controlled process involving candidate identification, probabilistic sampling based on real-data distributions, and targeted rewriting. This enables fine-grained control over stylistic and structural aspects of the output. Full details are provided in Section A.3.

The prompts used for the different pipelines can be found in Tables 6 and 7.

3.2 Tuning Prompts For Generation Pipelines

We define a composite **Reconstruction Score** to evaluate how well a synthetic transcript reflects its intended structure, content, and conversational style. It combines multiple LLM evaluated metrics: topic flow, intent fulfillment, QA consistency, and speech realism into a single score via weighted aggregation after normalization. This score serves both as an evaluation benchmark and as the objec-

tive function for prompt optimization. Full metric definitions and computation details are provided in Sections A.4 and A.4.5.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Dataset

The **in-house** multilingual synthetic transcripts dataset¹ was created by sampling real call center conversations across diverse domains (e.g., retail, logistics, telecom) in four languages (English, Spanish, French, French-Canadian) and across call length categories to ensure both linguistic and domain coverage. It includes a test set of 200 examples (50 per language) and a tuning set of 400 examples (100 per language), with a 70-30 split used for prompt tuning based on reconstruction score. Details on how structured call attributes are obtained are provided in Section A.2.

4.2 Models used for Generation and Evaluation

All synthetic transcript generation pipelines use **GPT-4.1-mini** (OpenAI, 2025a), while **Claude-3.5-Sonnet** (Anthropic, 2024a) is used for computing evaluation metrics and reconstruction loss. Separate models are used for generation and evaluation to reduce model-specific biases and ensure a

¹Due to proprietary restrictions, this dataset cannot be released.

more reliable assessment of output quality. LLM configuration details are provided in Table 33.

4.3 Baselines

We adapt two recent methods for synthetic dialogue generation to the call center domain: **NoteChat** (Wang et al., 2024), originally designed for clinical conversations, and **ConvoGen** (Gody et al., 2025), a multi-agentic approach for synthetic conversation generation. Rationale for choosing them and their full adaptation details are provided in Section A.6.

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

To assess the quality and realism of synthetic call center conversations, we propose a comprehensive, multi-dimensional evaluation framework that goes beyond traditional lexical similarity metrics. The framework spans five core dimensions:

1. **Emotional and Sentiment Arcs:** Captures affective and tonal dynamics at both the transcript and turn level. This includes metrics such as agent and customer emotion/sentiment arcs (at the transcript level) and turn-level sentiment classification.
2. **Linguistic Complexity and Content Density:** Assesses the richness, density, and accessibility of the language used. Metrics under this dimension include language and vocabulary complexity, technical density, sentence complexity, discourse flow, and overall readability.
3. **Interaction Style:** Measures the nature of engagement between participants using metrics like proactivity, emphasis, and question type.
4. **Conversational Properties:** Evaluates the naturalness and surface-level characteristics of the conversation through metrics such as repetition, disfluency, and the presence/type of ASR noise.
5. **Outcome Orientation:** Reflects the effectiveness and resolution status of a conversation, captured via a single metric—solution presence.

These metrics are computed automatically using LLM-based classifiers applied at both the turn and transcript levels, enabling fine-grained, quantitative comparisons across generation methods.

To determine whether synthetic transcripts exhibit the deeper behavioral and discourse-level traits found in real conversations, we design an evaluation pipeline targeting the latent conversational characteristics described above. This involves stratified sampling of turns from real and synthetic transcripts, followed by LLM-based classification across dimensions such as emotion, proactivity, and disfluency (see prompts in Table 8). We then construct empirical frequency distributions for each trait and perform statistical comparisons using the Chi-square test (Pearson, 1900), G-test (McDonald, 2014), and Jensen–Shannon divergence (Menéndez et al., 1997). To ensure statistical robustness, low-frequency categories are merged based on label distributions from the prompt tuning dataset before conducting these comparisons (refer to Tables 15–32 in the Appendix). Full definitions of all metrics and detailed evaluation procedures are provided in Table 12 and sections A.7 and A.5, respectively.

Implementation Overview

Our generation and evaluation pipelines are implemented in Python and run entirely on local infrastructure for reproducibility. Prompt optimization is performed using DSPy (Khatab et al., 2023) with the MIPROv2 optimizer (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), while model access is managed via Bedrock and LiteLLM. Turn-level evaluation uses stratified sampling with context windows, and all LLM configurations and hyperparameters are detailed in Section A.8.

5 Results

We evaluate six methods - Single Stage, Dual Stage - Turn Count / Call Length, Characteristic Aware, ConvoGen, and NoteChat—across four languages (English, Spanish, French, French-Canadian) and four categories: (a) Sentiment/Emotion, (b) Linguistic Complexity, (c) Interaction Style, and (d) Conversational Properties.

Generated transcript from each method is compared to real transcripts using p-values (chi-square (Pearson, 1900) (0–1, ↑ better) or G-test (McDonald, 2014)) (depending on the number of categories) and Jensen–Shannon (JS) Divergence (Menéndez et al., 1997) (0–1, ↓ better).

5.1 Sentiment and Emotion Fidelity

From table 1, we observe the following key patterns: **(a) Dual Stage methods outperform baselines.** Dual Stage - Turn Count and Call Length

Language	Method	Sentiment		Customer Emotion		Agent Emotion		Customer Sentiment		Agent Sentiment	
		Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence								
English	Single Stage	0.000	0.041	0.033	0.053	0.001	0.107	0.082	0.063	0.000	0.134
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.031	0.050	0.038	0.063	0.057	0.467	0.023	0.048	0.061
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.024	0.318	0.014	0.034	0.068	0.119	0.064	0.045	0.064
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.030	0.037	0.055	0.001	0.127	0.017	0.087	0.001	0.127
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.063	0.030	0.043	0.005	0.091	0.029	0.077	0.004	0.096
	NoteChat	0.000	0.036	0.007	0.096	0.000	0.151	0.000	0.219	0.001	0.132
Spanish	Single Stage	0.000	0.049	0.171	0.019	0.013	0.049	0.040	0.068	0.011	0.051
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.018	0.797	0.011	0.072	0.034	0.824	0.006	0.198	0.021
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.024	0.581	0.013	0.229	0.019	0.024	0.084	0.290	0.016
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.018	0.780	0.007	0.156	0.025	0.034	0.084	0.144	0.026
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.036	0.028	0.126	0.423	0.010	0.002	0.177	0.184	0.036
	NoteChat	0.000	0.024	0.340	0.022	0.002	0.082	0.000	0.193	0.010	0.060
French	Single Stage	0.000	0.036	0.061	0.043	0.005	0.062	0.004	0.091	0.006	0.059
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.032	0.071	0.041	0.949	0.001	0.032	0.054	0.854	0.002
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.025	0.888	0.001	0.519	0.008	0.001	0.114	0.113	0.030
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.024	0.550	0.012	0.017	0.047	0.017	0.062	0.004	0.067
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.056	0.033	0.087	0.051	0.038	0.004	0.109	0.328	0.019
	NoteChat	0.000	0.027	0.182	0.028	0.001	0.085	0.000	0.144	0.001	0.083
French-Canadian	Single Stage	0.000	0.060	0.000	0.130	0.002	0.076	0.021	0.050	0.000	0.176
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.040	0.101	0.045	0.199	0.042	0.435	0.019	0.100	0.048
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.034	0.070	0.063	0.089	0.033	0.079	0.049	0.095	0.049
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.052	0.067	0.050	0.002	0.117	0.304	0.025	0.001	0.122
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.071	0.182	0.032	0.141	0.044	0.025	0.075	0.0172	0.085
	NoteChat	0.000	0.033	0.012	0.093	0.000	0.219	0.000	0.164	0.000	0.262

Table 1: Comparison of methods for transcript generation across multiple languages and metrics in the **Sentiment and Emotion** category.

Language	Method	Language Complexity		Vocabulary Complexity		Technical Density		Sentence Complexity		Overall Readability Score		Discourse Flow	
		Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence										
English	Single Stage	0.000	0.027	0.357	0.012	0.033	0.041	0.000	0.267	0.000	0.326	0.000	0.43
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.011	0.131	0.027	0.021	0.049	0.000	0.157	0.037	0.042	0.036	0.077
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.017	0.973	0.000	4.273	0.016	0.000	0.152	0.001	0.087	0.011	0.114
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.033	0.252	0.017	0.962	0.000	0.044	0.051	0.03	0.047	0.006	0.101
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.041	0.045	0.037	0.056	0.034	0.001	0.121	0.000	0.15	0.007	0.111
	NoteChat	0.000	0.016	0.469	0.01	0.756	0.008	0.260	0.028	0.041	0.047	0.001	0.167
Spanish	Single Stage	0.000	0.029	0.003	0.086	0.054	0.065	0.000	0.195	0.000	0.426	0.000	0.368
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.133	0.008	0.103	0.001	0.158	0.019	0.069	0.016	0.071
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.027	0.034	0.056	0.240	0.043	0.004	0.117	0.04	0.069	0.163	0.032
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.035	0.848	0.002	4.898	0.011	0.011	0.096	0.003	0.098	0.034	0.059
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.023	0.016	0.107	0.301	0.038	0.022	0.133	0.001	0.222	0.039	0.088
	NoteChat	0.000	0.016	0.858	0.005	0.026	0.084	0.038	0.073	0.083	0.046	0.086	0.043
French	Single Stage	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.18	0.000	0.251	0.000	0.349	0.000	0.446	0.000	0.443
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.229	0.000	0.261	0.000	0.277	0.000	0.296	0.019	0.085
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.026	0.000	0.122	0.000	0.192	0.000	0.245	0.000	0.267	0.041	0.076
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.04	0.047	0.047	0.02	0.068	0.000	0.139	0.000	0.2	0.000	0.302
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.146	0.000	0.243	0.000	0.196	0.000	0.299	0.000	0.24
	NoteChat	0.000	0.011	0.390	0.017	0.005	0.089	0.000	0.158	0.000	0.165	0.000	0.254
French-Canadian	Single Stage	0.000	0.046	0.000	0.276	0.096	0.038	0.000	0.243	0.000	0.38	0.000	0.37
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.31	0.116	0.041	0.000	0.35	0.000	0.395	0.000	0.375
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.037	0.000	0.154	0.088	0.045	0.000	0.32	0.000	0.356	0.000	0.28
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.06	0.005	0.075	0.053	0.053	0.001	0.122	0.000	0.32	0.000	0.372
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.04	0.000	0.295	0.002	0.099	0.000	0.325	0.000	0.455	0.000	0.446
	NoteChat	0.000	0.028	0.017	0.075	0.095	0.01	0.000	0.197	0.000	0.464	0.000	0.437

Table 2: Comparison of methods for transcript generation across multiple languages and metrics in the **Linguistic Complexity and Content Density** categories.

Language	Method	Proactivity		Emphasis		Question Type		Solution		
		Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence							
English	Single Stage		0.626	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.012	0.000	0.034
	Dual Stage - Turn Count		0.04	0.001	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.032
	Dual Stage - Call Length		0.570	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.035
	Characteristic Aware		0.096	0.001	0.000	0.01	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.036
	ConvoGen		0.782	0.000	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.02	0.000	0.044
	NoteChat		0.008	0.001	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.01	0.000	0.012
Spanish	Single Stage		0.922	0.000	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.015	0.000	0.029
	Dual Stage - Turn Count		0.404	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.039
	Dual Stage - Call Length		0.165	0.001	0.000	0.01	0.000	0.015	0.000	0.031
	Characteristic Aware		0.007	0.002	0.000	0.012	0.000	0.015	0.000	0.049
	ConvoGen		0.075	0.002	0.000	0.01	0.000	0.031	0.000	0.04
	NoteChat		0.01	0.001	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.018
French	Single Stage		0.015	0.002	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.024	0.000	0.024
	Dual Stage - Turn Count		0.007	0.002	0.000	0.015	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.034
	Dual Stage - Call Length		0.000	0.006	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.02	0.000	0.038
	Characteristic Aware		0.000	0.01	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.026
	ConvoGen		0.017	0.002	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.04	0.000	0.038
	NoteChat		0.089	0.001	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.01
French-Canadian	Single Stage		0.082	0.001	0.000	0.042	0.000	0.02	0.000	0.033
	Dual Stage - Turn Count		0.012	0.002	0.000	0.029	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.046
	Dual Stage - Call Length		0.091	0.001	0.000	0.015	0.000	0.026	0.000	0.037
	Characteristic Aware		0.332	0.000	0.000	0.039	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.037
	ConvoGen		0.513	0.000	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.042	0.000	0.038
	NoteChat		0.001	0.002	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.017

Table 3: Comparison of methods for transcript generation across multiple languages and metrics in the **Interaction Style and Operational** categories.

achieve the best performance in three of four languages, suggesting that separating structural planning from surface realization enhances emotional coherence. **(b) Baselines lack alignment and fi-**

delity. ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025) and NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024) though adapted with structured supervision, underperform - likely due to the lack of constraint adherence mechanisms or optimiza-

Language	Method	Disfluency		Repetition		ASR Noise	
		Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence	Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence	Chi-Square / G-Test P-Value	JS Divergence
English	Single Stage	0.000	0.26	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.019
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.157	0.01	0.001	0.000	0.009
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.136	0.048	0.001	0.000	0.007
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.08	0.352	0.000	0.002	0.002
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.278	0.003	0.002	0.367	0.000
	NoteChat	0.000	0.109	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.005
Spanish	Single Stage	0.000	0.202	0.073	0.001	0.000	0.047
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.091	0.012	0.002	0.000	0.051
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.107	0.05	0.001	0.000	0.039
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.047	0.660	0.000	0.000	0.032
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.24	0.007	0.004	0.000	0.035
	NoteChat	0.000	0.083	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.042
French	Single Stage	0.000	0.312	0.047	0.001	0.000	0.051
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.165	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.04
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.151	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.034
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.1	0.139	0.001	0.000	0.037
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.332	0.405	0.000	0.000	0.037
	NoteChat	0.000	0.17	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.035
French-Canadian	Single Stage	0.000	0.241	0.004	0.002	0.000	0.149
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.000	0.193	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.164
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.000	0.252	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.162
	Characteristic Aware	0.000	0.146	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.157
	ConvoGen	0.000	0.358	0.435	0.000	0.000	0.188
	NoteChat	0.000	0.214	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.166

Table 4: Comparison of methods for transcript generation across multiple languages and metrics in the **Conversational Properties** categories.

tion via evaluation-guided prompting used in our methods. **(c) Characteristic Aware generation is language-dependent.** It matches Dual Stage performance in Spanish - possibly due to distinct emotional cues and cleaner supervision but underperforms in English, French, and French-Canadian, suggesting issues with prompt interpretability or tuning-data overfitting. **(d) Turn-level sentiment remains challenging.** No method achieves statistical similarity on the *Sentiment (turn level)* metric, highlighting the difficulty of capturing local emotional nuance despite better global alignment. **(e) Better alignment in Spanish and French-Canadian.** These languages show stronger emotional alignment (more p-values > 0.05), possibly due to clearer affective patterns, fewer idiomatic variations, or better supervision mapping. These findings highlight the benefits of structural supervision while emphasizing persistent challenges in modeling fine-grained affect, especially at the turn level.

5.2 Linguistic Complexity and Content Density

Table 2 summarizes the linguistic fidelity of synthetic transcripts across dimensions such as language complexity, vocabulary difficulty, technical density, sentence structure, and discourse coherence. Key findings: **(a) Overall performance is limited; NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024) is mod-**

estly stronger. NoteChat leads in English, Spanish, and French but achieves statistical similarity on only half of the metrics in English and Spanish. In French, it’s the only method with acceptable performance on Vocabulary Complexity. For French-Canadian, all but ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025) align on Technical Density, with no method succeeding on other traits. This points to the challenge of modeling syntactic variation, lexical sophistication, and discourse cohesion - factors likely underrepresented in current supervision. **(b) Characteristic-Aware generation shows limited advantage.** Despite aiming to control linguistic traits via tuning distributions, it performs well on just two of six metrics in English and Spanish—underperforming NoteChat. This suggests prompt-based control is insufficient without richer inductive signals or stronger scaffolding. **(c) Language Complexity and related traits are hardest to replicate.** No method matches the *Language Complexity* distribution in any language. Only one language per metric reaches similarity thresholds for Sentence Complexity, Readability, or Discourse Flow, reflecting the difficulty of modeling stylistic nuance and discourse structure with structured guidance. In summary, this category shows the largest fidelity gap. Future improvements may require syntactic/semantic control signals or style-aware constraints grounded in linguistic analysis.

5.3 Interaction Style and Operational Traits

Table 3 presents results for interaction-level traits: *Emphasis*, *Question Type*, *Solution*, and *Proactivity*. **(a) Most methods struggle with key interaction traits.** No method consistently aligns with real data on *Emphasis*, *Question Type*, or *Solution* across all languages. Even Characteristic-Aware generation shows no reliable advantage, indicating that prompting alone is insufficient for realistic interaction modeling. These traits likely require finer-grained signals beyond QA or summary prompts—e.g., control over dialogue acts or mid-turn reasoning. **(b) Proactivity is easier to model.** Most methods, including Single Stage, align well with real data on *Proactivity* in English, Spanish, and French-Canadian. Only French proves more difficult, where NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024) is the sole method to exceed the statistical threshold. This suggests QA supervision provides sufficient cues for modeling agent initiative. Overall, this category reveals a gap between traits that are measurable and those that are generatively controllable. Addressing it may require richer structural or sequential supervision beyond prompt-based guidance.

5.4 Conversational Properties

Table 4 reports structural and acoustic fidelity metrics: *Repetition*, *Disfluency*, and *ASR Noise Type*. **(a) Characteristic-Aware excels in modeling Repetition.** It achieves the best *Repetition* alignment across all four languages, indicating that turn-level induction effectively captures patterns like agent echoing or customer self-repetition. ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025) also performs well in French and French-Canadian, while even Single Stage aligns strongly in Spanish—suggesting some repetition traits emerge naturally from conversational flow. **(b) Disfluency and ASR Noise remain difficult to replicate.** No method performs well on *Disfluency*, and only ConvoGen shows similarity on *ASR Noise* in English. These traits stem from spoken modality—prosody, hesitations, and transcription artifacts—poorly captured by text-only prompts or post-expansion heuristics. While repetition benefits from structural supervision and characteristic-aware generation, modeling speech-driven artifacts like disfluency and ASR noise remains a key challenge. Addressing this may require multimodal inputs, phonetic modeling, or tighter ASR integration with ASR systems.

5.5 Reconstruction Score Analysis

Table 5 reports *Reconstruction Score*, a weighted composite metric (see Section A.4.5) measuring how well generated transcripts reflect the structured inputs: intent summaries, topic flows, QA evaluations, disfluencies, ASR noise, and interruptions. **(a) Sub-Score Breakdown.** Dual Stage - Turn Count leads on disfluency, ASR noise, and interruptions, showing strong modeling of structural noise. Characteristic-Aware Generation scores best on QA (except English), while Single Stage Prompting performs best on intent and topic flow. All models exceed 0.90 on intent summary fidelity, suggesting global semantic alignment is easier than capturing behavioral or acoustic traits. **(b) Weak Correlation with Evaluation Metrics.** High reconstruction scores do not imply stronger realism. For example, Dual Stage - Call Length achieves strong disfluency reconstruction but underperforms in turn-level evaluation. Similarly, high QA reconstruction from Characteristic-Aware Generation does not boost behavioral fidelity—highlighting mismatches between tuning signals and evaluation traits. Overall, while reconstruction confirms input alignment, it fails to predict realism—suggesting a need for evaluation-aware tuning or more granular behavioral and ASR guidance.

6 Conclusion

We introduced a diagnostic framework to evaluate synthetic transcript generation in contact center settings, grounded in 18 behavioral and linguistic metrics. Using this framework, we benchmarked four reference-free generation strategies designed by us along with two baselines—NoteChat and ConvoGen—all of which are conditioned on structured supervision signals such as summaries, topic flows, QA annotations, and call length categories.

Results show no single method consistently outperforms others across all metrics or languages. The dual-stage variant with call length guidance performs better on sentiment and emotion fidelity in Spanish and French-Canadian, while NoteChat better captures linguistic complexity. However, all approaches fall short on key dimensions like disfluency, emphasis, and question types - highlighting the limitations of current prompting and supervision strategies. Rather than a one-size-fits-all solution, our contribution is a robust evaluation tool that surfaces the specific gaps in synthetic dialogue realism and guides future improvements.

7 Limitations

While our structured pipeline surfaces several useful insights into multilingual synthetic transcript generation, it is not without limitations. First, all generation experiments were conducted using GPT-4.1-mini (OpenAI, 2025a), a compact model chosen for its cost-efficiency. The performance of more powerful models such as Claude-3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic, 2024b) or GPT-4.5 (OpenAI, 2025b) remains unexplored and could lead to improved alignment, especially on harder metrics like turn-level sentiment and linguistic complexity. Second, although we evaluate multiple prompting strategies in isolation, we do not investigate hybrid approaches that selectively combine their strengths—e.g., using single-stage prompting for semantic fidelity and characteristic-aware generation for behavioral induction.

Third, our modular pipeline currently applies rule-based supervision and sequential prompting but does not leverage reinforcement learning or differentiable objectives to induce traits like disfluency, noise, or emotion more robustly. Future work could explore policy-gradient methods to iteratively refine these characteristics. Fourth, we limit our analysis to four languages due to resource constraints. Extending the pipeline to lower-resource or morphologically rich languages would test its generalizability. Lastly, our structured supervision—though diverse—may not cover all latent cues necessary for high-fidelity generation, especially for nuanced metrics like emphasis and ASR noise. Additional metadata, acoustic signals, or fine-grained annotation might be needed to bridge this gap.

References

- Zahra Abbasiantaeb, Yifei Yuan, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Mohammad Aliannejadi. 2023. *Let the llms talk: Simulating human-to-human conversational qa via zero-shot llm-to-llm interactions*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.02913.
- Yelaman Abdullin, Diego Molla-Aliod, Bahadorreza Ofoghi, John Yearwood, and Qingyang Li. 2024. *Synthetic dialogue dataset generation using llm agents*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.17461.
- Anthropic. 2024a. *Claude-3.5-sonnet*. API Model.
- Anthropic. 2024b. *Introducing claude 3.5 sonnet*. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>. Accessed: 2024-07-05.
- Leticia Arco, Carlos Mosquera, Fabjola Braho, Yisel Clavel, and Johan Loeckx. 2022. *Evaluation of call centre conversations based on a high-level symbolic representation*. In *Interspeech 2022*, pages 3663–3664.
- Kuluhan Binici, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap, Viktor Schlegel, Andy T. Liu, Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Thanh-Tung Nguyen, Xiaoxue Gao, Nancy F. Chen, and Stefan Winkler. 2025. *Medsage: Enhancing robustness of medical dialogue summarization to asr errors with llm-generated synthetic dialogues*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.14418.
- Sergio Burdisso, Esaú Villatoro-Tello, and Petr Motliceck. 2025. *Sdialog: A python toolkit for synthetic dialogue generation and analysis*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2506.10622.
- 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*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.03269.
- Ha Dao, Gaurav Chawla, Raghu Banda, and Caleb DeLeeuw. 2025. *Real-world en call center transcripts dataset with pii redaction*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2507.02958.
- Trisha Das, Dina Albassam, and Jimeng Sun. 2024. *Synthetic patient-physician dialogue generation from clinical notes using llm*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.06285.
- Kavita Ganesan. 2018. *Rouge 2.0: Updated and improved measures for evaluation of summarization tasks*. *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.01937.
- Reem Gody, Mahmoud Goudy, and Ahmed Y. Tawfik. 2025. *Convogen: Enhancing conversational ai with synthetic data: A multi-agent approach*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.17460.
- Syed Zohaib Hassan, Pierre Lison, and Pål Halvorsen. 2024. *Enhancing naturalness in llm-generated utterances through disfluency insertion*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.12710.
- Digvijay Anil Ingle, Aashraya Sachdeva, Surya Prakash Sahu, Mayank Sati, Cijo George, and Jithendra Vepa. 2024. *Probing the depths of language models’ contact-center knowledge for quality assurance*. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 790–804, Miami, Florida, US. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pegah Jandaghi, XiangHai Sheng, Xinyi Bai, Jay Pujara, and Hakim Sidahmed. 2023. *Faithful persona-based conversational dataset generation with large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.10007.
- Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T.

- Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. 2023. *Dspy: Compiling declarative language model calls into self-improving pipelines*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.03714.
- Hyunwoo Kim, Jack Hessel, Liwei Jiang, Peter West, Ximing Lu, Youngjae Yu, Pei Zhou, Ronan Bras, Malihe Alikhani, Gunhee Kim, Maarten Sap, and Yejin Choi. 2023. *SODA: Million-scale dialogue distillation with social commonsense contextualization*. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12930–12949, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ayush Kumar, Mukuntha Narayanan Sundararaman, and Jithendra Vepa. 2021. *What bert based language models learn in spoken transcripts: An empirical study*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2109.09105.
- Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, Cheng Chen, Xue-yong Fu, Mahsa Azizi, Shashi Bhushan, and Simon Corston-oliver. 2023. *AI coach assist: An automated approach for call recommendation in contact centers for agent coaching*. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track)*, pages 599–607, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Young-Jun Lee, Chae-Gyun Lim, Yunsu Choi, Ji-Hui Lm, and Ho-Jin Choi. 2022. *PERSONACHATGEN: Generating personalized dialogues using GPT-3*. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Customized Chat Grounding Persona and Knowledge*, pages 29–48, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haoyi Li, Angela Yifei Yuan, Soyeon Caren Han, and Christopher Leckie. 2025. *Spade: Structured prompting augmentation for dialogue enhancement in machine-generated text detection*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.15044.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. *ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries*. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Itzik Malkiel, Uri Alon, Yakir Yehuda, Shahar Keren, Oren Barkan, Royi Ronen, and Noam Koenigstein. 2023. *Gpt-calls: Enhancing call segmentation and tagging by generating synthetic conversations via large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.07941.
- John H. McDonald. 2014. *Handbook of Biological Statistics*, 3rd edition. Sparky House Publishing, Baltimore.
- M.L. Menéndez, J.A. Pardo, L. Pardo, and M.C. Pardo. 1997. *The jensen-shannon divergence*. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 334(2):307–318.
- Varun Nathan, Ayush Kumar, Digvijay Ingle, and Jithendra Vepa. 2023. *Towards probing contact center large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.15922.
- OpenAI. 2025a. *Gpt-4.1-mini*. API Model. Available from OpenAI API <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/>.
- OpenAI. 2025b. *Gpt-4.5: A research preview*. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-4-5/>. Accessed: 2025-07-05.
- Krista Opsahl-Ong, Michael J Ryan, Josh Purtell, David Broman, Christopher Potts, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. 2024. *Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.11695.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002a. *Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation*. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002b. *Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation*. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karl Pearson. 1900. *X. on the criterion that a given system of deviations from the probable in the case of a correlated system of variables is such that it can be reasonably supposed to have arisen from random sampling*. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 50(302):157–175.
- Sathya Krishnan Suresh, Wu Mengjun, Tushar Pranav, and Eng Siong Chng. 2025. *Diasynth: Synthetic dialogue generation framework for low resource dialogue applications*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.19020.
- Junda Wang, Zonghai Yao, Zhichao Yang, Huixue Zhou, Rumeng Li, Xun Wang, Yucheng Xu, and Hong Yu. 2024. *Notechat: A dataset of synthetic patient-physician conversations conditioned on clinical notes*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, page 15183–15201. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minghan Wang, Ye Bai, Yuxia Wang, Thuy-Trang Vu, Ehsan Shareghi, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2025. *Speechdialoguefactory: Generating high-quality speech dialogue data to accelerate your speech-llm development*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.23848.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu 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.
- Yi-Ting Yeh, Maxine Eskenazi, and Shikib Mehri. 2021. *A comprehensive assessment of dialog evaluation metrics*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2106.03706.

Chen Zhang, Luis D’Haro, Chengguang Tang, Ke Shi, Guohua Tang, and Haizhou Li. 2023. [xDial-eval: A multilingual open-domain dialogue evaluation benchmark](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5579–5601, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

Language	Method	Intent Summary Score	Topic Flow Score	QA Eval Score	Disfluency Score	ASR Noise Score	Interruption Score	Overall Score
English	Single Stage	0.97	0.86	0.86	0.24	0.08	0.17	0.74
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.97	0.68	0.83	0.88	0.66	0.76	0.8
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.97	0.8	0.88	0.8	0.6	0.64	0.83
	Characteristic Aware	0.95	0.84	0.86	0.55	0.36	0.44	0.8
	ConvoGen	0.77	0.66	0.86	0.78	0.49	0.35	0.67
	NoteChat	0.91	0.8	0.8	0.79	0.55	0.65	0.79
Spanish	Single Stage	0.98	0.88	0.72	0.23	0.11	0.19	0.68
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.96	0.67	0.69	0.89	0.65	0.75	0.76
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.98	0.81	0.69	0.84	0.62	0.65	0.78
	Characteristic Aware	0.96	0.84	0.75	0.68	0.44	0.55	0.80
	ConvoGen	0.85	0.68	0.61	0.74	0.41	0.39	0.65
	NoteChat	0.95	0.82	0.71	0.81	0.54	0.63	0.80
French	Single Stage	0.98	0.90	0.94	0.25	0.14	0.21	0.75
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.97	0.74	0.93	0.91	0.71	0.78	0.82
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.98	0.83	0.88	0.89	0.69	0.71	0.84
	Characteristic Aware	0.96	0.88	0.94	0.65	0.51	0.5	0.84
	ConvoGen	0.85	0.70	0.87	0.75	0.46	0.35	0.71
	NoteChat	0.96	0.87	0.90	0.85	0.6	0.64	0.86
French-Canadian	Single Stage	0.98	0.85	0.82	0.34	0.15	0.24	0.73
	Dual Stage - Turn Count	0.97	0.68	0.82	0.88	0.69	0.75	0.79
	Dual Stage - Call Length	0.97	0.77	0.78	0.86	0.67	0.67	0.79
	Characteristic Aware	0.97	0.82	0.82	0.63	0.43	0.48	0.8
	ConvoGen	0.88	0.73	0.82	0.83	0.54	0.35	0.74
	NoteChat	0.92	0.84	0.8	0.86	0.59	0.67	0.81

Table 5: Reconstruction score (0–1, ↑ better) for generating synthetic transcripts in the evaluation dataset, reported by language and method. For each language and metric, the highest score is highlighted in bold and color to indicate the top-performing method. The overall score is used to optimize prompts during prompt tuning and is computed as a weighted sum of the individual reconstruction scores. Details on the computation of the overall score are provided in Section A.4.

Stage	Inputs Considered	Prompt
Base Conversation Generation	call_duration, language, key_events, next_steps, reason_for_call, customer_complaints, key_entities, hold_and_transfer, resolution, topic_flow and qa_evaluation	Generate a realistic, conversational call transcript based on the provided call attributes. The transcript must accurately reflect the topic flow, incorporate details from the QA evaluation, and intent summaries, match the expected call duration, and be in the specified language. IMPORTANT: YOU MUST INCORPORATE ALL AND THE GIVEN CALL ATTRIBUTES. Consider cultural nuances, appropriate sentiment expressions, and formal/informal registers (e.g., 'tu' vs. 'vous' in French, 'tú' vs. 'usted' in Spanish) suitable for the language and call center context. If relevant for the language and context, include domain-specific vocabulary (e.g., banking, telecom) and be mindful of potential mixed-language use or code-switching (e.g., English terms in Spanish/French/Turkish conversations). Note that the transcript should resemble a output from an ASR system so the transcript should contain numbers only in words. Crucially, the transcript should include natural human conversational disfluencies like filler words ('um', 'uh', 'like'), pauses (represented as '...'), repetitions, and self-corrections to mimic a real conversation.
Transcript Segmentation	current_transcript	You are an AI assistant who can segment call center conversations between an agent and a customer into coherent topics. List each topic along with its name, brief description, and the start and end turn indices that define its chunk in the conversation. Important rules for segmentation: 1. Topics must be in disjoint chunks - no overlapping turns between topics 2. All the turns in the transcript should be included 3. Each chunk should be defined by a start_turn and end_turn index (inclusive) 4. Chunks must be sequential - there should be no gaps between chunks 5. A topic can appear multiple times in the conversation, but as separate non-overlapping chunks 6. Try to maximize the size of each chunk (atmost 25 turns) by categorizing turns into the most appropriate topic Response format should be standard across all input conversations and should be json parsable programmatically. The input transcript is given as a json array of turns. Each topic should have: name, description, start_turn, and end_turn.
Candidate Turn Identification - Characteristic Aware approach	transcript_chunk, characteristic_type and characteristic_categories	Analyze a transcript chunk and identify which turns can be categorized into each class of the given characteristic type. For the characteristic type characteristic_type, examine each turn and classify it into one of the available categories. Provide the turn numbers (as they appear in the transcript) for each category. Important: - Consider the speaker context (agent vs customer) when relevant - A turn can only belong to one category per characteristic type - Provide turn numbers as they appear in the transcript (with parentheses) - If no turns fit a category, return an empty list for that category
Characteristic Application To Identified Turns - Characteristic Aware approach	transcript_chunk, modification_instructions and language	Apply specific characteristics to designated turns in a transcript chunk. You will receive a transcript chunk and specific instructions for which turns should be modified with which characteristics. CRITICAL RULES: 1. Only modify the turns specified in the modification instructions 2. Non-target turns must remain exactly unchanged 3. Apply the characteristics naturally and authentically for the target language 4. Maintain conversation flow and context 5. Each turn can have multiple characteristics applied simultaneously For each characteristic, follow these guidelines: - DISFLUENCIES: Insert natural speech patterns, fillers, hesitations appropriate for the language - ASR_NOISE: Introduce plausible speech recognition errors - QUESTION_TYPE: Ensure the turn exhibits the specified question type - SENTIMENT: Adjust language to reflect the specified sentiment - etc.

Table 6: Prompts used in the transcript generation pipeline

Stage	Inputs Considered	Prompt
Combined Transcript Enhancement	stage_1_transcript, disfluency_types and language	<p>Enhance a transcript chunk by extending it and incorporating interruptions, disfluencies, and ASR noise in a single step. The goal is to make the transcript more natural, noisy, and reflective of real-world spoken interaction. DO NOT ADD MADE UP EXCHANGES THAT IS NOT PRESENT IN THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT OR TRY TO COMPLETE THE CONVERSATION. FOR EXAMPLE, DON'T EXTEND THE CONVERSION BY ENDING THE CALL. ONLY END THE CALL IF THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT ENDS.</p> <p># Extend Conversation: Naturally extend a conversation transcript chunk by adding more interactive turns 1. Insert new exchanges that logically fit within the existing dialogue flow. 2. Split longer monologues into interactive exchanges where appropriate 3. DO NOT EXTEND THE FIRST AND LAST TURNS. ONLY THE MIDDLE TURNS SHOULD BE MODIFIED.</p> <p># Add Interruptions: Include natural-sounding interruptions and overlapping speech where one speaker starts talking before the other finishes. 1. Create new turns and surround them with subsequent turns that indicate the interruption or overlapping speech. 2. End turns abruptly and continue after the other speaker finishes.</p> <p># Add Disfluencies: Insert disfluencies based on provided descriptions and examples (adopt the example to the target language). YOU MUST INCORPORATE ALL THE PROVIDED DISFLUENCIES. DON'T OVERUSE THE SAME DISFLUENCY TYPE. 1. Do not add parenthetical notes or explanations. Insert the disfluencies directly into the dialogue naturally, as if the speakers are actually speaking with these disfluencies. 2. Critically, use disfluencies that are authentic and natural for the target language - the filler words, hesitations, and speech patterns should reflect how native speakers of that language actually speak ('euh', 'ben', 'bah' in French; 'em', 'eh', 'pues' in Spanish). 3. Create turns to indicate the agent or customer is thinking/hesitating/listening by creating turns like: "Agent (1): Ok", "Customer (1): Yes", "Agent (2): Umm", "Customer (2): ahh" etc.</p> <p># Add ASR Noise: Introduce plausible Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) errors into a transcript to simulate imperfect speech-to-text conversion by the ASR system. 1. Consider language-specific ASR error patterns, such as mis-segmentation or omitted diacritics. 2. Factor in how regional accents might contribute to ASR errors. For example: - "c'est drôle de compte" (instead of "c'est le nom du compte") - "jean" (misrecognized for "jones") - "u o deux way bottles with" (nonsensical ASR segment from accented English) 3. The ASR errors should be authentic to the target language, reflecting the common speech recognition challenges specific to that language (e.g., phoneme confusions, homophones, dialectal variations).</p>
Measuring Adherence of Topic Flow in Synthetic Transcript	synthetic_transcript and topic_flow	<p>Evaluate how well a generated synthetic transcript aligns with the expected topic flow of a conversation. The 'topic_flow' input is a structured description of how topics are expected to progress in the call, listed in sequential order. The goal is to determine whether the synthetic transcript accurately covers all these topics and maintains the correct sequence and transitions between them. A perfect score of 10 means: - All expected topics are present. - They appear in the correct order. - Transitions between topics are logical and coherent. - No significant off-topic digressions. A lower score should be given if: - Some expected topics are missing or only partially addressed. - Topics appear out of order. - There are abrupt or incoherent transitions. - Irrelevant topics are introduced. Use the rationale field to perform a detailed comparison, noting any deviations or strong alignments.</p>

Table 7: Prompts used in the transcript generation pipeline (Contd.)

Stage	Inputs Considered	Prompt
Measuring Fulfillment of Intent Summary in Synthetic Transcript	synthetic_transcript, key_events, next_steps, reason_for_call, customer_complaints, key_entities, hold_and_transfer and resolution	Evaluate how well a synthetic transcript aligns with each provided intent summary (e.g., key events, next steps, resolution, etc.). Each intent summary describes a specific aspect of the call. The evaluator should compare the provided summary with the synthetic transcript and assign a score from 1 to 10 based on how completely and accurately the intent is reflected. **Scoring Guide (per intent):** - Score of 10: All and only the elements described in the intent summary are clearly and accurately reflected in the transcript. - Score of 1-9: Partial or incorrect coverage (e.g., missing, paraphrased incorrectly, added extra content). For each missing/partially missing or extra element, reduce the score by 1. - Score of 0: The input summary for this intent is empty or unavailable.
Replication of QA Scenario in Synthetic Transcript	synthetic_transcript and qa_evaluation	Evaluate whether specific QA evaluation scenarios are reflected in the transcript. QA evaluation is a list of questions regarding the call quality and the corresponding answers. The output is a list of scores for each question. The score is 1 if the evaluated answer is matching with the provided answer in the qa_evaluation.
Naturalness Assessment in Synthetic Transcript	synthetic_transcript	Evaluate the overall naturalness of a transcript by assessing three key speech characteristics: 1. Interruptions: Where one speaker starts talking before the other finishes, creating overlapping speech 2. Disfluencies: Natural speech patterns like fillers, hesitations, repetitions, and self-corrections. 3. ASR Noise: Plausible speech recognition errors that would occur in real transcription systems A high-quality transcript should incorporate these elements naturally to simulate realistic human conversation. Examples to look for: # Interruptions: - Speaker overlaps where one person starts talking before another finishes - Turn sequences that indicate interruption patterns (e.g abrupt ending of one's turn) - Truncated sentences or phrases that suggest someone was cut off # Disfluencies: - Filler words appropriate to the language (e.g., 'um', 'uh', 'euh', 'ben' in French, 'em', 'eh' in Spanish) - Repetitions of words or phrases ("I think, I think we should...") - Self-corrections ("We'll send it on Monday- I mean Tuesday") - Hesitations indicated by pauses or incomplete thoughts - Short acknowledgment turns ("Ok", "Yeah", "Mhmm") that show active listening # ASR Noise: - Phonetically similar word substitutions (e.g., "two" vs "too") - Plausible homophone errors - Slight word deletions or insertions - Mis-segmentations or omitted diacritics (in applicable languages) - Regional accent-based misrecognitions (e.g., "twos day" for "Tuesday") The assessment should consider both the presence and the natural integration of these elements.

Table 8: Prompts used in the transcript generation pipeline (Contd.)

Stage	Inputs Considered	Output of Stage
Topic Flow Generation	original_transcript	Initial Greeting → Life Insurance Verification → Policy Quote Discussion → Call Transfer Preparation → Life Insurance Application → Accidental Death Insurance → Closing Conversation
Intent Summary Input Generation: Key Events	original_transcript	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agent contacts customer to discuss life insurance options. - Customer confirms personal details and existing coverage. - Customer agrees to new \$25k policy with monthly premium. - Additional accidental death policy added. - Beneficiaries designated; agent confirms application details.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Next Steps	original_transcript	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer will receive policy documents by mail. - Initial premiums to be drafted in next 3 business days. - Coverage confirmation via email. - Contact info shared for follow-up or questions.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Reason for Call	original_transcript	Agent initiates call to review customer's current life insurance status and offer updated, more affordable policy options.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Customer Complaints	original_transcript	Customer expresses concern about having sufficient coverage to leave for their children. Requests increased policy value.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Key Entities	original_transcript	Names: [REDACTED], Policy IDs, Contact Info, DOBs, Addresses: [MASKED FOR PRIVACY] Used for validation and beneficiary designation steps.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Hold and Transfer	original_transcript	Class: Transfer Evidence: Initial agent offers to transfer call to licensed Illinois agent. Next speaker is a different agent, indicating successful transfer.
Intent Summary Input Generation: Resolution	original_transcript	Class: Resolved Customer successfully applies for new insurance policies. Agent confirms submission and provides policy numbers.
Intent Summary Generation	original_transcript	agent intends to verify customer information and share updated life insurance options. customer expresses interest in understanding rate changes and verifying recent charges.
Topic Flow Generation	original_transcript	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) agent greeting and identification, (2) introduction of updated insurance offerings, (3) customer inquiries about recent charges, (4) verification process, (5) resolution and call closure.

Table 9: Example of the various generation stages for Dual Stage - Turn Count

Stage	Inputs Considered	Output of Stage
Base Conversation Generation	call_duration, language, key_events, next_steps, reason_for_call, customer_complaints, key_entities, hold_and_transfer, resolution, topic_flow, qa_evaluation	agent: hello, may i speak with robin frederick, please? this is natalie calling from ins insure life. customer: yes, this is robin. how can i help you? agent: hi robin, i'm reaching out because we've recently updated our life insurance rates, and i wanted to make sure you have the most affordable coverage that fits your needs. ... customer: no, that covers everything for now. agent: alright, thank you for your time. have a great day! customer: you too, goodbye.
Transcript Segmentation	base_transcript	chunk 1: agent: hello, may i speak with robin frederick, please? this is natalie calling from ins insure life. customer: yes, this is robin. how can i help you? agent: hi robin, i'm reaching out because we've recently updated our life insurance rates, and i wanted to make sure you have the most affordable coverage that fits your needs. ... chunk 7: customer: no, that covers everything for now. agent: alright, thank you for your time. have a great day! customer: you too, goodbye.
Combined Transcript Enhancement	transcript_chunks, disfluency_types, language	chunk 1: agent: hello may i speak with robin frederick please this is natalie calling from ins insure life agent: hi robin i'm reaching out because we've recently updated our life insurance rates agent: and i wanted to make sure you have the most affordable coverage that fits your needs chunk 2: agent: so um first we need to we need to verify your account details to make sure everything is up to date customer: sorry i'm a bit lost could you repeat that
Final synthetic transcript	transcript_chunks	agent: hello may i speak with robin frederick please this is natalie calling from ins insure life customer: yes this is robin how can i help you today agent: hi robin i'm reaching out because we've recently updated our life insurance rates agent: and i wanted to make sure you have the most affordable coverage that fits your needs customer: okay that sounds good what do you need from me agent: so um first we need to we need to verify your account details to make sure everything is up to date ... agent: sorry i'm a bit lost could you repeat that customer: sure i thought i saw a charge last week but maybe it was something else agent: ah okay let me check that for you agent: umm just a moment please

Table 10: Example of the various generation stages for Dual Stage - Turn Count (Contd.)

Stage	Inputs Considered	Output of Stage
Measuring Adherence of Topic Flow in Synthetic Transcript	generated_transcript	<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The synthetic transcript closely follows the expected topic flow. - The agent begins with a clear greeting and confirms the customer's identity. - The flow progresses naturally into verification, quote explanation, and transfer. - Life insurance application and accidental death coverage are discussed in depth. - Call concludes with next steps and contact info. - Minor issues include slight redundancy and small off-topic remarks. <p>Final Score: 0.89</p>
Measuring Fulfillment of Intent Summary in Synthetic Transcript	generated_transcript	<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key customer concerns about increasing coverage are well represented. - The transcript reflects the handover between agents accurately. - However, some details are missing: no mention of policy numbers or payment timelines. - Some extra info appears, such as commentary on regional rates. - Overall, intent is preserved but with omissions and additions. <p>Final Score: 0.81</p>
Replication of QA Scenario in Synthetic Transcript	generated_transcript	<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agent adheres to compliance by following required protocols. - Proper transfer to a licensed representative is documented. - No misleading or aggressive tactics are used. - One QA item has no evaluation match, but no major issues detected. - QA checks passed with no risk signals. <p>Final Score: 1.00</p>

Table 11: Example of the various generation stages for Dual Stage - Turn Count (Contd.)

Metric Name	Brief Description	Original Labels
1. Emotional & Sentiment Metrics		
Customer/Agent Emotion Arc	Captures the emotional trajectory from the start to the end of the call.	An arc from 8 start emotions to 8 end emotions. (gratitude, relief, factual, curiosity, confusion, frustration, anger, anxiety)
Customer/Agent Sentiment Arc	Captures the tonal trajectory from the start to the end of the call.	An arc from 5 start sentiments to 5 end sentiments. (See below)
Sentiment (Turn-Level)	Analyzes the sentiment of each individual turn.	negative, neutral, positive, very negative, very positive
2. Linguistic Complexity & Content Density		
Language Complexity	Identifies one or more patterns of linguistic complexity.	acronym_abbreviation_heavy, complex_compound_sentences, empathetic_softened_tone, formal_professional_register, high_lexical_density, idiomatic_colloquial_expressions, informal_conversational_register, jargon_heavy_language, low_lexical_density, passive_voice_dominant, simple_plain_language, technical_domain_specific_language
Vocabulary Complexity	Evaluates the difficulty of the vocabulary used.	Score from 1–10
Technical Density	Measures the prevalence of technical terminology.	Score from 1–10
Sentence Complexity	Assesses the structural complexity of sentences.	Score from 1–10
Discourse Flow	Evaluates the logical coherence and smoothness.	Score from 1–10
Overall Readability	Provides a single, combined score for ease of reading.	Score from 1–10
3. Interaction Style		
Proactivity	Classifies the agent's proactivity level.	neutral, overstated_proactivity, understated_proactivity
Emphasis	Identifies if the turn is focused on emotion or facts.	emotion_focused, fact_focused, other
Question Type	Classifies the type of question asked.	boolean, choice_based, clarification_descriptive, connect_behavioral, entity_objective, no_question, repeat, request_suggestion
4. Conversational Properties		
Repetition	Classifies patterns of information repetition.	agent_repeats_customer, agent_self_repetition, customer_repeats_agent, customer_self_repetition, no_repetition
Disfluency	Detects one or more conversational disfluencies.	ambiguity, corrections, could_you_repeat_that, disagreements, false_starts, failure_to_understand_vocabulary, fillers, hesitations, ignoring, incomplete_sentences, interruptions, misunderstandings, not_hearing_each_other, overlapping_speech, pardon_me, phonological_errors, prolongations, repeated_words_or_phrases, revision, self_repair, silence_awkward_pauses, stuttering, talking_over_each_other, talking_too_fast, talking_too_slow, tangents, understanding_failure, word_substitution
ASR Noise Type	Detects simulated ASR errors.	substitution, insertion, deletion, no_noise
5. Outcome-Oriented Metrics		
Solution	Categorizes the turn based on the solution discussed.	advisory_recommendation, advisory_self_help_guidance, diagnostic_explanation, escalation_instruction, expectation_setting, follow_up_commitment, no_solution_provided, partial_solution_provided, preventive_guidance, reassurance_or_soft_closure, root_cause_analysis, solution_offered_but_declined, transactional_directive

Table 12: Comprehensive Evaluation Metrics and Their Original Labels

Name	Description	Example
Stuttering	This involves the unnecessary repetition or prolongation of sounds, syllables, or words. It might occur when a person is trying to think about what to say next.	I-I-I think we should proceed with the order
False Starts	This is when a person begins to speak, stops, and then starts to speak again.	I want to- actually, I want to ...
Fillers	These are sounds or words that are spoken to fill gaps in utterances. Examples include 'umm', 'uh', 'like', 'so' and 'you know'.	So, um, the issue with your account is, uh, resolved now
Overlapping Speech	This occurs when two people start speaking at the same time or one person begins speaking before the other person has finished.	Agent: So what I can do is- Customer: Can you just tell me how much it costs?
Interruptions	This happens when one person cuts off the other person while they are still speaking.	Customer: I've been waiting for this refund for three- Agent: I understand your frustration sir
Hesitations	This is when a person pauses for a while before speaking or between words, generally to think.	I'm... not sure if that's... possible right now
Corrections	This is when a speaker corrects something they said earlier in the conversation.	Your order will arrive by Thursday. Actually, checking again, it will be Friday.
Repeated words or phrases	Sometimes a speaker might repeat words or phrases, either for emphasis or due to uncertainty about what to say next.	We need to, we need to verify your account details first
Self-repair	This is when a speaker corrects themselves after making a mistake in their speech.	We'll send the package on Monday- I mean Tuesday
Prolongations	This disfluency involves the lengthening of word sounds.	I'm soooo sorry about that inconvenience
Phonological errors	Mispronunciations or slips of the tongue also count as disfluencies.	Let me just get that serial numeral- I mean serial number
Not Hearing Each Other	This occurs when one person is unable to hear what the other one is saying due to environmental noise or a weak signal.	Customer: Sorry, could you repeat that? I didn't catch what you said
Silence/Awkward pauses	Periods of inactivity in the conversation can arise from a range of factors such as the participants thinking, feeling uncomfortable, or waiting for the other to respond.	Agent: And what did you think of our service? Customer: ... Agent: Hello, are you still there?
Incomplete Sentences	Sometimes, a person might start a sentence without finishing it.	I was thinking that maybe we could... never mind, let's try something else
Word Substitution	This is when a person substitutes one word for another, which may affect the fluency of the conversation.	Please check the terms and conditions on our website- I mean our portal
Revision	This is when a speaker changes their sentence midway.	The payment will be processed in three- you should expect it within two business days
Understanding Failure	This occurs when one person does not comprehend what the other person is saying.	Customer: I don't understand what you mean by processing period
Failure to Understand Vocabulary	This happens when a person encounters a word or term they do not know the meaning of.	What does 'depreciation' mean in this context?
Pardon me	This is used to politely ask someone to repeat what they said.	Pardon me, I didn't quite catch that
Could you repeat that?	This is a request for the speaker to repeat what they just said.	Sorry, could you repeat that? The line cut out for a second
Talking over Each Other	Both speakers are speaking at the same time, making it difficult to understand either.	Agent: So your order number is- Customer: I already have the order number, I need to know about-
Misunderstandings	This happens when one person interprets what the other person said incorrectly.	Agent: So you want to cancel the entire order? Customer: No, just the second item

Table 13: Descriptions and examples of disfluency types used in the synthetic transcript generation pipeline

Name	Description	Example
Ignoring	This occurs when one person deliberately ignores what the other person is saying.	Customer: I've been asking about this for weeks. Agent: Let me check your account details...
Tangents	A speaker goes off on a tangent, veering away from the main topic of conversation.	So about that refund... you know, I had a similar issue last year with a different company
Ambiguity	Using vague or unclear language that can be interpreted in multiple ways.	The thing with the stuff isn't working right
Disagreements	When two or more people have opposing views or opinions on a topic, leading to conflict or tension in the conversation.	Customer: That's not what I was told last time. Agent: Our policy has always been the same

Table 14: Descriptions and examples of disfluency types used in the synthetic transcript generation pipeline (Contd.)

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	factual_to_factual	25.58%	23.26%	40.48%	35.71%	51.16%	36.59%	21.05%	26.3%
English	factual_to_gratitude	30.23%	65.12%	30.95%	40.48%	34.88%	58.54%	71.05%	31.5%
English	gratitude_to_factual	16.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.2%
English	other	27.91%	11.63%	28.57%	23.81%	13.95%	4.88%	7.89%	29.0%
French	factual_to_factual	44.74%	11.11%	46.15%	34.29%	43.48%	15.79%	9.52%	25.0%
French	factual_to_gratitude	55.26%	86.11%	51.28%	65.71%	56.52%	84.21%	90.48%	58.3%
French	other	0.00%	2.78%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
French-Canadian	factual_to_confusion	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.0%
French-Canadian	factual_to_factual	79.17%	100.00%	100.00%	90.91%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	70.0%
French-Canadian	factual_to_frustration	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.0%
Spanish	factual_to_factual	42.11%	18.60%	24.14%	22.22%	40.91%	22.22%	15.79%	33.3%
Spanish	factual_to_gratitude	44.74%	72.09%	44.83%	63.89%	50.00%	58.33%	84.21%	50.0%
Spanish	other	13.16%	9.30%	31.03%	13.89%	9.09%	19.44%	0.00%	16.7%

Table 15: Frequency distribution of **Agent Emotion** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines, used for Chi-square test and G-test. Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	neutral_to_neutral	32.56%	27.91%	40.48%	42.86%	55.81%	36.59%	21.05%	33.2%
English	neutral_to_positive	37.21%	72.09%	33.33%	45.24%	41.86%	63.41%	76.32%	37.3%
English	positive_to_neutral	16.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.3%
English	other	13.95%	0.00%	26.19%	11.90%	2.33%	0.00%	2.63%	13.2%
French	neutral_to_neutral	44.19%	13.33%	45.45%	30.23%	40.00%	15.91%	9.09%	25.0%
French	neutral_to_positive	55.81%	84.44%	47.73%	69.77%	60.00%	84.09%	90.91%	58.3%
French	other	0.00%	2.22%	6.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
French-Canadian	neutral_to_negative	24.14%	0.00%	11.11%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.0%
French-Canadian	neutral_to_neutral	75.86%	100.00%	88.89%	88.24%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	70.0%
Spanish	neutral_to_neutral	41.46%	17.78%	32.35%	25.00%	40.00%	21.05%	15.79%	33.3%
Spanish	neutral_to_positive	46.34%	73.33%	41.18%	62.50%	52.00%	60.53%	84.21%	50.0%
Spanish	other	12.20%	8.89%	26.47%	12.50%	8.00%	18.42%	0.00%	16.7%

Table 16: Frequency distribution of **Agent Sentiment** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi Square test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	factual_to_frustration	13.95%	0.00%	2.38%	4.76%	2.33%	0.00%	10.53%	13.9%
English	factual_to_gratitude	20.93%	30.23%	11.90%	23.81%	9.30%	21.95%	0.00%	20.9%
English	other	65.12%	69.77%	85.71%	71.43%	88.37%	78.05%	5.26%	65.2%
French	frustration_to_factual	8.70%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
French	frustration_to_frustration	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
French	frustration_to_gratitude	21.74%	58.33%	33.33%	30.77%	38.10%	41.67%	34.62%	33.3%
French	other	69.57%	41.67%	62.96%	69.23%	61.90%	58.33%	65.38%	33.3%
French-Canadian	confusion_to_frustration	28.57%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	9.52%	14.29%	0.00%	30.0%
French-Canadian	confusion_to_relief	53.57%	80.00%	62.50%	81.82%	66.67%	42.86%	59.09%	20.0%
French-Canadian	frustration_to_relief	17.86%	20.00%	31.25%	18.18%	23.81%	42.86%	40.91%	10.0%
Spanish	anxiety_to_relief	10.53%	24.00%	18.75%	44.44%	55.56%	35.29%	70.83%	25.0%
Spanish	confusion_to_relief	15.79%	8.00%	12.50%	16.67%	33.33%	5.88%	12.50%	16.7%
Spanish	factual_to_frustration	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
Spanish	factual_to_gratitude	47.37%	68.00%	43.75%	38.89%	11.11%	47.06%	8.33%	25.0%
Spanish	other	15.79%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	8.33%	16.7%

Table 17: Frequency distribution of **Customer Emotion** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	negative_to_negative	11.63%	4.65%	2.38%	0.00%	2.33%	31.71%	0.00%	11.6%
English	negative_to_positive	11.63%	11.63%	16.67%	19.05%	41.86%	7.32%	65.79%	11.6%
English	neutral_to_negative	20.93%	2.33%	16.67%	9.52%	9.30%	0.00%	0.00%	20.9%
English	neutral_to_neutral	11.63%	16.28%	45.24%	11.90%	11.63%	48.78%	5.26%	11.6%
English	neutral_to_positive	37.21%	55.81%	19.05%	50.00%	30.23%	12.20%	26.32%	37.2%
English	other	6.98%	9.30%	0.00%	9.52%	4.65%	0.00%	2.63%	7.0%
French	negative_to_negative	16.28%	0.00%	2.33%	2.33%	2.50%	2.33%	0.00%	16.7%
French	negative_to_neutral	9.30%	0.00%	11.63%	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
French	negative_to_positive	48.84%	76.74%	72.09%	74.42%	80.00%	67.44%	84.44%	50.0%
French	other	25.58%	23.26%	13.95%	23.26%	15.00%	30.23%	15.56%	16.6%
French-Canadian	negative_to_negative	32.35%	5.88%	13.79%	6.67%	20.00%	12.90%	0.00%	70.0%
French-Canadian	negative_to_positive	67.65%	94.12%	86.21%	93.33%	80.00%	87.10%	100.00%	30.0%
Spanish	negative_to_positive	26.19%	41.86%	35.29%	55.56%	68.00%	47.06%	77.50%	41.7%
Spanish	neutral_to_negative	11.90%	0.00%	8.82%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.7%
Spanish	neutral_to_positive	45.24%	53.49%	50.00%	41.67%	20.00%	50.00%	22.50%	33.3%
Spanish	other	16.67%	4.65%	5.88%	0.00%	12.00%	2.94%	0.00%	8.3%

Table 18: Frequency distribution of **Customer Sentiment** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-square test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	no_noise	94.15%	99.90%	98.92%	98.63%	95.08%	97.78%	98.02%	94.2%
English	other	5.85%	0.10%	1.08%	1.37%	4.92%	2.22%	1.98%	5.8%
French	no_noise	85.97%	100.00%	99.24%	98.73%	98.89%	99.39%	98.87%	90.93%
French	other	14.03%	0.00%	0.76%	1.27%	1.11%	0.61%	1.13%	9.07%
French-Canadian	substitution	32.61%	1.81%	0.62%	0.56%	0.00%	0.96%	0.58%	27.49%
French-Canadian	deletion	10.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.17%	0.80%	0.13%	20.68%
French-Canadian	no_noise	56.70%	98.19%	99.38%	99.07%	99.66%	97.11%	99.29%	51.58%
French-Canadian	other	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.17%	1.13%	0.00%	0.24%
Spanish	no_noise	85.39%	99.70%	99.77%	99.23%	98.98%	98.33%	98.91%	91.38%
Spanish	other	14.61%	0.30%	0.23%	0.77%	1.02%	1.67%	1.09%	8.62%

Table 19: Frequency distribution of **ASR noise type** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	1	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00%
English	2	11.63%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	9.50%
English	3	32.56%	0.00%	38.10%	19.05%	11.63%	9.76%	5.26%	28.00%
English	4	51.16%	16.28%	57.14%	69.05%	60.47%	51.22%	81.58%	49.50%
English	5	2.33%	83.72%	0.00%	11.90%	25.58%	39.02%	13.16%	10.00%
French	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French	2	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%
French	3	24.44%	0.00%	20.45%	16.28%	2.50%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
French	4	53.33%	11.11%	77.27%	69.77%	50.00%	43.18%	77.78%	58.33%
French	5	0.00%	88.89%	2.27%	13.95%	47.50%	56.82%	22.22%	0.00%
French-Canadian	1	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%
French-Canadian	2	45.24%	2.38%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%
French-Canadian	3	23.81%	2.38%	62.16%	56.76%	22.50%	16.22%	2.63%	10.00%
French-Canadian	4	14.29%	35.71%	37.84%	37.84%	62.50%	54.05%	78.95%	0.00%
French-Canadian	5	0.00%	59.52%	0.00%	2.70%	15.00%	29.73%	18.42%	0.00%
Spanish	1	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	2	8.89%	2.22%	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	3	22.22%	0.00%	46.15%	17.50%	12.00%	10.53%	5.00%	16.67%
Spanish	4	66.67%	6.67%	53.85%	70.00%	44.00%	44.74%	80.00%	83.33%
Spanish	5	0.00%	91.11%	0.00%	10.00%	44.00%	44.74%	15.00%	0.00%

Table 20: Frequency distribution of **Discourse Flow** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	fillers	22.83%	40.98%	54.87%	52.44%	83.91%	37.06%	56.91%	23.56%
English	incomplete_sentences	42.56%	0.00%	2.54%	4.56%	0.11%	10.66%	8.66%	40.12%
English	repeated_words_or_phrases	14.39%	0.00%	8.26%	8.47%	0.56%	9.64%	6.81%	14.77%
English	other	20.22%	59.02%	34.32%	34.53%	15.41%	42.64%	27.62%	21.55%
French	fillers	12.09%	4.92%	43.44%	45.42%	75.79%	28.57%	53.90%	12.14%
French	incomplete_sentences	44.04%	0.00%	2.92%	4.41%	0.00%	7.79%	4.83%	45.66%
French	repeated_words_or_phrases	15.89%	0.00%	8.75%	9.49%	0.20%	14.29%	7.81%	15.03%
French	other	27.98%	95.08%	44.90%	40.68%	24.02%	49.35%	33.46%	27.17%
French-Canadian	incomplete_sentences	52.40%	0.78%	6.37%	1.90%	0.32%	10.81%	4.47%	68.67%
French-Canadian	repeated_words_or_phrases	21.33%	17.05%	10.25%	10.03%	0.48%	18.24%	11.66%	13.73%
French-Canadian	other	26.26%	82.17%	83.38%	88.08%	99.21%	70.95%	83.87%	17.60%
Spanish	fillers	19.40%	22.22%	48.29%	47.19%	67.04%	27.93%	53.09%	27.98%
Spanish	incomplete_sentences	29.45%	0.00%	4.78%	2.55%	0.28%	14.86%	7.92%	19.05%
Spanish	repeated_words_or_phrases	24.28%	3.70%	14.58%	12.50%	1.40%	10.36%	10.42%	31.55%
Spanish	other	26.87%	74.07%	32.35%	37.76%	31.28%	46.85%	28.57%	21.43%

Table 21: Frequency distribution of **Disfluency Types** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	fact_focused	94.37%	86.75%	84.54%	86.77%	82.46%	86.40%	87.47%	93.95%
English	other	5.63%	13.25%	15.46%	13.23%	17.54%	13.60%	12.53%	6.05%
French	fact_focused	94.69%	81.87%	84.19%	87.27%	79.63%	85.11%	87.97%	94.12%
French	other	5.31%	18.13%	15.81%	12.73%	20.37%	14.89%	12.03%	5.88%
French-Canadian	fact_focused	94.74%	74.72%	78.76%	83.77%	77.41%	75.61%	82.86%	95.18%
French-Canadian	other	5.26%	25.28%	21.24%	16.23%	22.59%	24.39%	17.14%	4.82%
Spanish	fact_focused	93.65%	83.72%	85.85%	85.55%	83.50%	84.45%	86.07%	93.81%
Spanish	other	6.35%	16.28%	14.15%	14.45%	16.50%	15.55%	13.93%	6.19%

Table 22: Frequency distribution of **Emphasis Types** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	formal_professional_register	10.52%	25.69%	13.61%	19.76%	9.65%	28.05%	58.94%	11.02%
English	simple_plain_language	74.78%	54.26%	61.50%	57.80%	50.69%	51.33%	41.06%	74.46%
English	other	14.70%	20.05%	24.89%	22.44%	39.66%	20.61%	0.00%	14.52%
French	formal_professional_register	11.46%	26.08%	12.92%	22.19%	15.20%	30.39%	22.06%	12.28%
French	simple_plain_language	72.12%	47.73%	61.70%	49.60%	53.68%	45.41%	61.68%	78.77%
French	other	16.43%	26.19%	25.38%	28.21%	31.12%	24.20%	16.25%	8.95%
French-Canadian	simple_plain_language	79.60%	51.19%	58.88%	54.76%	53.01%	45.83%	58.94%	84.80%
French-Canadian	other	20.40%	48.81%	41.12%	45.24%	46.99%	54.17%	41.06%	15.20%
French-Canadian	formal_professional_register	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Spanish	formal_professional_register	12.59%	31.74%	17.80%	25.42%	17.87%	29.42%	26.64%	11.94%
Spanish	simple_plain_language	73.11%	53.88%	61.54%	51.58%	52.88%	47.97%	58.62%	80.16%
Spanish	other	14.29%	14.38%	20.66%	23.01%	29.25%	22.61%	14.75%	7.89%

Table 23: Frequency distribution of **Language Complexity** Types for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
English	2	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
English	3	27.91%	0.00%	4.76%	2.38%	0.00%	11.11%	5.71%	25.50%
English	4	69.77%	95.24%	95.24%	95.24%	97.44%	88.89%	94.29%	72.00%
English	5	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	2.38%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%
French	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French	2	4.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%
French	3	71.11%	0.00%	4.55%	6.98%	5.00%	13.64%	16.28%	58.33%
French	4	24.44%	92.68%	95.45%	93.02%	95.00%	86.36%	83.72%	33.33%
French	5	0.00%	7.32%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	1	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	2	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
French-Canadian	3	59.52%	0.00%	0.00%	5.41%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	50.00%
French-Canadian	4	16.67%	87.18%	100.00%	94.59%	100.00%	94.59%	100.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	5	0.00%	12.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	2	2.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	3	29.55%	0.00%	0.00%	7.50%	0.00%	4.55%	10.26%	25.00%
Spanish	4	68.18%	82.93%	100.00%	92.50%	86.36%	92.11%	89.74%	75.00%
Spanish	5	0.00%	17.07%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 24: Frequency distribution of **Overall Readability Score** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning)
English	neutral	95.43%	94.95%	93.54%	95.90%	95.75%	93.66%	97.44%	100.00%
English	other	4.57%	5.05%	6.46%	4.10%	4.25%	6.34%	2.56%	0.00%
French	neutral	95.56%	92.84%	92.25%	89.45%	92.22%	87.69%	96.89%	96.99%
French	other	4.44%	7.16%	7.75%	10.55%	7.78%	12.31%	3.11%	3.01%
French-Canadian	neutral	92.68%	94.72%	89.77%	90.11%	91.55%	91.28%	95.60%	93.20%
French-Canadian	other	7.32%	5.28%	10.23%	9.89%	8.45%	8.72%	4.40%	6.80%
Spanish	neutral	94.06%	94.24%	93.16%	92.39%	95.43%	90.62%	95.83%	96.98%
Spanish	other	5.94%	5.76%	6.84%	7.61%	4.57%	9.38%	4.17%	3.02%

Table 25: Frequency distribution of **Proactivity Level** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the tuning set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning)
English	no question	82.74%	69.40%	72.11%	71.84%	65.36%	72.41%	72.25%	96.32%
English	other	17.26%	30.60%	27.89%	28.16%	34.64%	27.59%	27.75%	3.68%
French	no question	88.35%	71.05%	73.10%	72.73%	64.81%	74.32%	72.97%	93.15%
French	other	11.65%	28.95%	26.90%	27.27%	35.19%	25.68%	27.03%	6.85%
French-Canadian	no question	89.24%	73.89%	70.54%	71.08%	66.03%	77.22%	75.36%	92.44%
French-Canadian	other	10.76%	26.11%	29.46%	28.92%	33.97%	22.78%	24.64%	7.56%
Spanish	no question	80.76%	65.32%	65.20%	65.42%	59.14%	66.45%	70.22%	84.88%
Spanish	other	19.24%	34.68%	34.80%	34.58%	40.86%	33.55%	29.78%	15.12%

Table 26: Frequency distribution of **Question Type** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the tuning set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning)
English	no repetition	93.65%	98.00%	91.14%	91.31%	96.54%	94.65%	87.12%	95.30%
English	other	6.35%	2.00%	8.86%	8.69%	3.46%	5.35%	12.88%	4.70%
French	no repetition	94.52%	96.64%	88.69%	87.34%	96.11%	92.68%	88.47%	93.70%
French	other	5.48%	3.36%	11.31%	12.66%	3.89%	7.32%	11.53%	6.30%
French-Canadian	no repetition	91.77%	87.92%	87.09%	86.54%	92.57%	91.44%	87.27%	89.67%
French-Canadian	other	8.23%	12.08%	12.91%	13.46%	7.43%	8.56%	12.73%	10.33%
Spanish	no repetition	93.09%	94.94%	90.18%	90.82%	96.70%	92.15%	87.95%	91.97%
Spanish	other	6.91%	5.06%	9.82%	9.18%	3.30%	7.85%	12.05%	8.03%

Table 27: Frequency distribution of **Repetition Type** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the tuning set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
English	2	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
English	3	23.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.63%	21.05%	20.00%
English	4	65.12%	46.51%	78.57%	71.43%	62.79%	70.73%	76.32%	75.00%
English	5	9.30%	53.49%	21.43%	28.57%	37.21%	14.63%	2.63%	5.00%
French	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French	2	4.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%
French	3	53.33%	0.00%	0.00%	2.33%	2.50%	9.09%	15.56%	33.33%
French	4	42.22%	71.11%	79.55%	86.05%	77.50%	84.09%	84.44%	58.33%
French	5	0.00%	28.89%	20.45%	11.63%	20.00%	6.82%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	1	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	2	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%
French-Canadian	3	61.90%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	16.22%	18.42%	70.00%
French-Canadian	4	28.57%	42.86%	86.49%	97.30%	87.50%	81.08%	81.58%	20.00%
French-Canadian	5	4.76%	57.14%	13.51%	0.00%	12.50%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	3	37.78%	0.00%	0.00%	2.50%	4.00%	10.53%	22.50%	58.33%
Spanish	4	53.33%	66.67%	79.49%	80.00%	64.00%	78.95%	77.50%	41.67%
Spanish	5	8.89%	33.33%	20.51%	17.50%	32.00%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 28: Frequency distribution of **Sentence Complexity** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning)
English	neutral	85.56%	61.72%	66.43%	68.29%	54.78%	64.91%	63.55%	85.56%
English	positive	10.78%	33.73%	30.19%	27.06%	40.09%	27.24%	31.25%	10.78%
English	other (negative, very negative, very positive)	3.65%	4.55%	3.38%	4.65%	5.13%	7.84%	5.20%	3.65%
French	neutral	84.18%	60.37%	61.70%	64.47%	54.04%	65.45%	64.16%	85.40%
French	positive	11.29%	28.55%	28.89%	23.87%	32.74%	22.13%	27.36%	12.40%
French	other (negative, very negative, very positive)	4.53%	11.08%	9.42%	11.65%	13.21%	12.42%	8.49%	2.20%
French-Canadian	neutral	83.92%	52.82%	59.49%	60.42%	49.47%	55.76%	60.86%	86.36%
French-Canadian	other (negative, positive, very negative, very positive)	16.08%	47.18%	40.51%	39.58%	50.53%	44.24%	39.14%	13.64%
Spanish	neutral	81.66%	53.72%	65.21%	62.37%	56.03%	64.49%	61.64%	85.50%
Spanish	positive	13.59%	39.89%	30.06%	27.63%	34.85%	27.13%	31.97%	11.69%
Spanish	other (negative, very negative, very positive)	4.76%	6.38%	4.73%	10.00%	9.12%	8.38%	6.38%	2.81%

Table 29: Frequency distribution of **Turn-Level Sentiment** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the tuning set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	ConvoGen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning)
English	no solution provided	87.66%	66.16%	67.19%	65.91%	62.35%	64.92%	76.41%	85.75%
English	other	12.34%	33.84%	32.81%	34.09%	37.65%	35.08%	23.59%	14.25%
French	no solution provided	82.55%	63.30%	59.36%	57.82%	58.70%	61.85%	70.55%	82.74%
French	other	17.45%	36.70%	40.64%	42.18%	41.30%	38.15%	29.45%	17.26%
French-Canadian	no solution provided	85.07%	62.92%	57.61%	60.82%	61.90%	61.07%	69.93%	91.18%
French-Canadian	other	14.93%	37.08%	42.39%	39.18%	38.10%	38.93%	30.07%	8.82%
Spanish	no solution provided	87.10%	67.04%	63.46%	66.24%	61.93%	59.72%	72.49%	85.75%
Spanish	other	12.90%	32.96%	36.54%	33.76%	38.07%	40.28%	27.51%	14.25%

Table 30: Frequency distribution of **Solution Type** for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the tuning set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
English	2	6.98%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	7.32%	2.63%
English	3	44.19%	27.91%	38.10%	47.62%	42.86%	25.58%	53.66%	52.63%
English	4	44.19%	67.44%	59.52%	50.00%	47.62%	69.77%	34.15%	39.47%
English	5	4.65%	4.65%	2.38%	2.38%	4.76%	4.65%	4.88%	5.26%
French	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French	2	55.56%	2.22%	4.55%	4.55%	6.98%	5.00%	22.73%	33.33%
French	3	31.11%	48.89%	56.82%	54.55%	67.44%	40.00%	50.00%	58.33%
French	4	11.11%	44.44%	34.09%	36.36%	20.93%	45.00%	20.45%	8.33%
French	5	2.22%	4.44%	4.55%	4.55%	4.65%	10.00%	6.82%	0.00%
French-Canadian	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	2	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	30.00%
French-Canadian	3	11.90%	11.90%	5.26%	13.51%	18.92%	12.50%	18.92%	20.00%
French-Canadian	4	64.29%	54.76%	73.68%	67.57%	48.65%	37.50%	54.05%	30.00%
French-Canadian	5	14.29%	33.33%	21.05%	18.92%	32.43%	50.00%	24.32%	20.00%
Spanish	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	2	15.56%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	7.50%	4.00%	7.89%	0.00%
Spanish	3	46.67%	31.11%	35.71%	25.64%	32.50%	16.00%	47.37%	75.00%
Spanish	4	33.33%	55.56%	57.14%	71.79%	52.50%	56.00%	39.47%	16.67%
Spanish	5	4.44%	13.33%	4.76%	2.56%	7.50%	24.00%	5.26%	8.33%

Table 31: Frequency distribution of **Technical Density** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Language	Category	Original (Evaluation Set)	Single Stage	Dual Stage - Turn Count	Dual Stage - Call Length	Convogen	Characteristic Aware	NoteChat	Original (Tuning Set)
English	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
English	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.44%	0.00%
English	3	11.63%	0.00%	0.00%	2.38%	7.14%	2.33%	21.95%	13.16%
English	4	86.05%	93.02%	95.24%	97.62%	88.10%	90.70%	75.61%	86.84%
English	5	2.33%	6.98%	4.76%	0.00%	4.76%	6.98%	0.00%	0.00%
French	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French	2	11.11%	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	2.33%	5.00%	6.82%	13.33%
French	3	55.56%	6.67%	11.36%	6.82%	16.28%	10.00%	29.55%	35.56%
French	4	33.33%	91.11%	88.64%	93.18%	81.40%	85.00%	63.64%	51.11%
French	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
French-Canadian	2	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	10.00%
French-Canadian	3	14.29%	0.00%	2.63%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	8.11%	7.89%
French-Canadian	4	80.95%	97.62%	94.74%	100.00%	97.30%	100.00%	86.49%	92.11%
French-Canadian	5	0.00%	2.38%	2.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%
Spanish	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	2	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	4.00%	2.63%	2.50%
Spanish	3	20.00%	2.22%	4.76%	0.00%	5.00%	4.00%	15.79%	25.00%
Spanish	4	77.78%	82.22%	92.86%	100.00%	90.00%	92.00%	81.58%	72.50%
Spanish	5	0.00%	15.56%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 32: Frequency distribution of **Vocabulary Complexity** categories for real and synthetic transcripts on the evaluation dataset across generation pipelines (used for G-test and Chi-Square Test). Distributions from the training set of original transcripts are also provided for reference.

Stage	Model	Provider	Temp.	Top-p	Max Tokens	Freq. Pen.	Pres. Pen.
Generation							
Convogen	GPT-4.1-mini	OpenAI	0.7	1.0	32,768	0.0	0.0
Notechat	GPT-4.1-mini	OpenAI	0.7	1.0	32,768	0.0	0.0
Dual-Stage	GPT-4.1-mini	OpenAI	0.7	1.0	32,768	0.0	0.0
Char.-Aware	GPT-4.1-mini	OpenAI	0.7	1.0	32,768	0.0	0.0
Optimization							
Task Model	GPT-4.1-mini	OpenAI	0.7	1.0	32,768	0.0	0.0
Prompt/Eval	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	Anthropic	1.0	1.0	8192	0.0	0.0
Evaluation							
Latents / Recon.	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	Anthropic	1.0	1.0	8192	0.0	0.0

Table 33: LLM configurations used across the pipeline stages, including default generation parameters.

Hyperparameter	Value	Description
max_bootstrapped_demos	1	Number of bootstrapped demonstrations to generate for each program.
max_labeled_demos	0	Number of human-labeled demonstrations to use.
num_candidates	5	Number of prompt candidates to generate at each optimization step.
num_threads	4	Number of parallel threads for optimization.
num_trials	10	Number of optimization trials to run.

Table 34: DSPy MIPROv2 Optimization Hyperparameters

Language	Very Short	Short	Medium	Long
English	65.07	188.50	421.73	495.54
French	99.42	111.13	304.00	558.75
French_Canadian	66.87	173.33	283.00	637.00
Spanish	79.61	173.67	201.17	385.00

Table 35: Mean number of turns in the tuning data of real transcripts for different call length categories across languages. Call lengths are grouped into four bins: *Very Short*, *Short*, *Medium*, and *Long*.

A.1 Call Evaluation Forms in Contact Centers

Call evaluation forms are structured assessment templates used by Quality Assurance (QA) teams in contact centers to systematically evaluate agent performance during customer interactions. These forms are designed by QA experts and supervisors, typically based on business rules, compliance requirements, and customer service quality standards. Each form contains a set of predefined questions, often grouped by dimensions such as professionalism, problem resolution, empathy, adherence to script, escalation handling, and closing behavior. Each question is paired with a limited set of answer choices—usually in the form of Likert scales, binary options (Yes/No), or categorical ratings.

In operational settings, every completed interaction is either randomly sampled or algorithmically selected for quality review, and the corresponding call (or interaction) is mapped to one of the evaluation forms. Trained evaluators manually or semi-automatically fill out the answers based on call recordings or transcripts, which are then used for agent training, performance analytics, and compliance tracking.

These evaluation forms are also increasingly leveraged in AI workflows to both benchmark and steer generation. In our work, they serve as supervision scaffolds: for each sampled interaction in our generation and evaluation datasets, we retrieve its associated evaluation form and extract all question-answer pairs to guide synthetic transcript generation. This process ensures that key behavioral and functional traits - such as adherence to resolution procedures or maintenance of a professional tone - are embedded into the generated dialogue. While in-house systems (Ingle et al., 2024) can automatically generate answers to QA questions, detailing these systems is beyond our scope; our focus is on leveraging these attributes to produce synthetic transcripts without relying on the original transcripts.

A.2 What Do Structured Inputs Mean and How are They Obtained?

1. **Intent-Specific Summaries:** We sample a set of carefully chosen intents and obtain their summaries using in-house systems (Nathan et al., 2023) capable of automatically generating intent-specific summaries. The details of these systems are beyond the scope of this work.

The selected intents are diverse enough to collectively capture key characteristics of contact center conversations while minimizing overlap. These intents include:

- (a) *Customer Complaints:* Summary of any complaints raised by the customer, if any.
- (b) *Key Events:* Summary of key events that occurred during the call.
- (c) *Next Steps:* Summary of the next steps or actions agreed upon, if any.
- (d) *Reason for Call:* Summary of the primary reason the customer initiated the call.
- (e) *Key Entities:* Summary of the key entities mentioned in the call.
- (f) *Hold and Transfer:* Summary related to holds or transfers that occurred.
- (g) *Resolution:* Summary of the call’s resolution or outcome, if any.

2. **Topic Flow:** We obtain the ordered sequence of meaningful topics using in-house systems capable of automatically segmenting calls into topic sequences. Each identified topic is accompanied by a name and a corresponding description. The details of these internal systems are beyond the scope of this work.
3. **QA Evaluation:** The questions are sourced from call evaluation forms, each designed to assess various aspects of agent performance during interactions. The answers are obtained from in-house systems (Ingle et al., 2024), the details of which are beyond the scope of this work. For both the generation (prompt tuning) and evaluation datasets, we first sampled a set of real contact center interactions and used their mapped evaluation forms to retrieve all applicable QA question-answer pairs for that call. Further details about the construction and purpose of call evaluation forms are described in section A.1 in appendix.

Examples of the formatted input attributes used can be found in Tables 9 - 11.

A.3 Characteristic-Aware Generation Pipeline

This advanced pipeline generates synthetic transcripts \mathcal{T}_S whose turn-level linguistic features match those of a real-world corpus \mathcal{T}_R , by systematically controlling the distribution of conversational characteristics.

Stage 1: Characteristic-Aware Base Generation

A modified generation model G'_{base} is conditioned on both standard call attributes and sampled transcript-level characteristics (e.g., `vocabulary_complexity`, `customer_emotion`) to produce a base transcript T'_{base} with the desired global tone and structure.

Stage 2: Chunking and Conversational Extension

The transcript T'_{base} is segmented into coherent chunks $\mathcal{C}_{\text{chunk}} = (\chi_1, \chi_2, \dots, \chi_k)$, and each chunk undergoes conversational extension. This increases interactivity by adding natural back-and-forth exchanges and breaking down long monologues.

Stage 3: Controlled Application of Turn-Level Characteristics

A set of turn-level features are applied in three steps:

1. **Candidate Identification:** For each characteristic dimension $C_d \in \mathcal{C}$ (e.g., Sentiment, Question Type), an LLM identifies eligible turns:

$$\text{Cand}(c_{d,j}) \subseteq \text{Turns}, \quad \forall c_{d,j} \in C_d$$

2. **Global Probabilistic Sampling:** Let P_{target} denote the desired distribution of characteristics derived from real data. For each $c_{d,j} \in C_d$, sample a set of turns $\mathcal{U}_S(c_{d,j}) \subseteq \text{Cand}(c_{d,j})$ such that:

$$\frac{|\mathcal{U}_S(c_{d,j})|}{|\mathcal{U}_S|} \approx P_{\text{target}}(c_{d,j}) \quad \forall c_{d,j} \in C_d, \forall C_d \in \mathcal{C}$$

3. **Targeted Application:** Each selected turn in $\mathcal{U}_S(c_{d,j})$ is modified to exhibit the characteristic $c_{d,j}$, while preserving context. Unselected turns remain unchanged.

Stage 4: Recombination

The modified chunks are recombined to yield the final synthetic transcript:

$$T_{\text{final}} = \chi'_1 \oplus \chi'_2 \oplus \dots \oplus \chi'_k$$

This characteristic-aware pipeline provides an explicit mechanism for generating synthetic data with verifiable linguistic properties aligned with a target dataset. It is a powerful tool for constructing high-fidelity training and evaluation corpora for robust speech and language models.

A.4 Reconstruction Score

To systematically measure how accurately synthetic transcripts reflect the explicit call attributes provided as input during generation, we introduce a comprehensive evaluation framework centered on reconstruction accuracy and conversational realism. Unlike traditional surface-level comparisons, this framework evaluates structural, semantic, and stylistic fidelity to assess whether the generated conversation fulfills the intended goals and content. Reconstruction accuracy focuses on how well the transcript adheres to provided specifications—such as key events, topic sequence, and summarized intents—while conversational realism captures the naturalness of speech patterns. These dimensions are quantified using automated LLM-based evaluations, orchestrated via the `dspy` framework (Khattab et al., 2023), and combined into a single, interpretable **Reconstruction Score**. This score serves as a grounded, attribute-aware measure of generation quality.

A.4.1 Topic Flow Adherence

This metric evaluates whether the synthetic transcript follows a predefined narrative structure. It is calculated by having an LLM assess the synthetic transcript to confirm the presence and correct sequencing of all specified topics, assigning a raw score, $S_{TS_{raw}}$, on a scale of 1 to 10. A perfect score indicates that all topics are covered in the correct order with logical transitions. The prompt used for calculating this metric can be found in Table 7.

A.4.2 Intent Summary Fulfillment

This metric verifies that the synthetic transcript contains the specific information detailed in various intent summaries. To calculate the score, we distinguish between primary and secondary intents. The adherence to “Key Events” yields a raw score, $S_{KE_{raw}}$. The adherence to other intents (e.g., *next steps*, *resolution*) are also scored from 1 to 10, and their scores are averaged to produce an *Average Score per Summary Intent*, $S_{Summ_Intent_{raw}}$. The evaluation penalizes both missing information and the inclusion of extraneous details. The prompt used for calculating this metric can be found in Table 8.

A.4.3 QA Scenario Replication

This metric ensures the synthetic transcript is factually consistent from an external reviewer’s perspec-

tive by measuring its alignment with a set of pre-defined Quality Assurance (QA) question-answer pairs. It is calculated by having an LLM assign a binary score (1 for a match, 0 for a mismatch) for each QA pair based on the synthetic transcript content. These individual scores are then averaged to produce the final QA score, S_{QA} , which ranges from 0 to 1. The final QA score can be interpreted as the proportion of QA questions for which there’s alignment with respect to the synthetic transcript. The prompt used for calculating this metric can be found in Table 8.

A.4.4 Conversational Realism Metrics

A transcript can be factually correct but sound artificial. The **Conversational Realism** metrics assess the naturalness of the dialogue by measuring key speech characteristics.

- **Input:** The synthetic transcript.
- **Evaluation:** An LLM assesses the transcript for three characteristics of natural human speech:
 1. **Interruptions:** The presence of natural, well-placed speaker overlaps.
 2. **Disfluencies:** The use of filler words, hesitations, and self-corrections.
 3. **ASR Noise:** The inclusion of plausible artifacts typical of Automatic Speech Recognition systems (e.g., homophone errors).

Each characteristic is scored from 1 to 10. These three scores are then averaged to produce the *Average Score per Speech Characteristic*, $S_{Speech_Char_{raw}}$. The prompt used for calculating this metric can be found in Table 8.

A.4.5 Score Normalization and Aggregation

To combine these diverse metrics into a single Reconstruction Score, we first normalize them to a common scale of [0, 1]. Scores originally on a 1–10 scale are normalized using min-max scaling:

$$S_{norm} = \frac{S_{raw} - 1}{9}$$

This is applied to $S_{TS_{raw}}$, $S_{KE_{raw}}$, $S_{Summ_Intent_{raw}}$, and $S_{Speech_Char_{raw}}$. The QA score, S_{QA} , is already in a [0, 1] range and requires no normalization.

The final **Reconstruction Score** is a weighted sum of the normalized component scores, reflecting

their relative importance in our evaluation framework:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Score}_{\text{Recon}} = & w_{TS} \cdot S_{TS_{norm}} + w_{QA} \cdot S_{QA} + w_{KE} \cdot S_{KE_{norm}} \\ & + w_{Summ} \cdot S_{Summ_Intent_{norm}} \\ & + w_{Speech} \cdot S_{Speech_Char_{norm}} \end{aligned}$$

Where the weights are defined as:

- $w_{TS} = 0.25$ (Topic Sequence)
- $w_{QA} = 0.15$ (QA Scenario)
- $w_{KE} = 0.25$ (Key Events)
- $w_{Summ} = 0.15$ (Average Summary Intent)
- $w_{Speech} = 0.20$ (Average Speech Characteristic)

The composite score was tuned on the test split of the prompt tuning dataset and was also used to optimize prompts for the generation pipelines in Section 3.1. It balances fidelity to source attributes with linguistic realism to provide a holistic measure of synthetic transcript quality.

A.5 Methodology - Evaluation pipeline

To evaluate how well synthetic transcripts capture the deeper, implicit qualities of real call center conversations, we propose a dedicated analysis framework focused on latent conversational characteristics. These are properties not explicitly provided as input during generation—such as emotion shifts, discourse flow, and speaker behavior patterns—but are integral to the realism and authenticity of natural conversations. The framework assesses whether the synthetic data mirrors the nuanced statistical distribution of these latent features in real, human-generated transcripts. The analysis proceeds in four stages: (1) stratified sampling of turns, (2) LLM-based annotation of latent features, (3) construction of empirical frequency distributions, and (4) statistical comparison of these distributions between synthetic and real data.

A.5.1 Turn Sampling Strategy

The foundation of the analysis rests on a representative subset of conversational turns. Let the corpus of real transcripts be denoted by $\mathcal{T}_R = \{t_{r,1}, t_{r,2}, \dots, t_{r,N}\}$ and the corresponding set of synthetic transcripts be $\mathcal{T}_S = \{t_{s,1}, t_{s,2}, \dots, t_{s,N}\}$. Each transcript t is an ordered sequence of turns, $t = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m)$, where m is the total number of turns in the transcript.

To ensure a fair and balanced comparison, a fixed number of turns, k , are sampled from each transcript. This stratified sampling approach mitigates biases from transcripts of varying lengths. For each pair of real and synthetic transcripts, $(t_{r,i}, t_{s,i})$, we determine the number of turns to sample, k_i , based on the minimum length of the two, capped by a predefined maximum k_{\max} . A set of k_i turns is then randomly sampled without replacement from both $t_{r,i}$ and $t_{s,i}$.

The final sets of sampled turns for analysis are the union of samples from all transcripts:

$$\mathcal{U}_R = \bigcup_{i=1}^N S(t_{r,i}, k_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_S = \bigcup_{i=1}^N S(t_{s,i}, k_i) \quad (1)$$

where $S(t, k)$ is the function that randomly samples k turns from a transcript t .

For contextual understanding, each sampled turn u_j is presented to the classification model along with its surrounding conversational context. A context window of size w is used, providing the model with the sequence $(u_{j-w}, \dots, u_j, \dots, u_{j+w})$. This allows the model to make more informed judgments based on the immediate dialog flow.

A.5.2 LLM-based Turn-level Feature Classification

A comprehensive, multi-dimensional taxonomy of conversational characteristics is employed to analyze the turns. This taxonomy, \mathcal{C} , consists of D distinct dimensions, $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_D\}$. Each dimension represents a specific aspect of the conversation, such as sentiment or proactivity.

Each dimension C_d is defined by a set of V_d discrete categories, $\{c_{d,1}, c_{d,2}, \dots, c_{d,V_d}\}$. For most dimensions, these categories are mutually exclusive (single-label classification). However, for complex phenomena like conversational disfluencies, multiple categories can be assigned to a single turn (multi-label classification).

The core of the classification is a Large Language Model (LLM) that functions as a classifier, f_{LLM} . For each sampled turn $u \in \mathcal{U}_R \cup \mathcal{U}_S$, the model assigns a category or a set of categories for each dimension.

- For single-label dimensions: $f_{\text{LLM}}(u, \text{context}) \rightarrow c_{d,j}$ where $c_{d,j} \in C_d$.
- For multi-label dimensions: $f_{\text{LLM}}(u, \text{context}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_j \subseteq C_d$.

The taxonomy includes the characteristics mentioned in section 4.4.

A.5.3 Empirical Frequency Distribution Construction

Following the classification of all turns in \mathcal{U}_R and \mathcal{U}_S , the results are aggregated to construct empirical frequency distributions for each conversational dimension.

For a given single-label dimension C_d , the observed frequency of a category $c_{d,j}$ in the real transcripts is the count of turns assigned to that category:

$$O_{d,j} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}_R} \mathbb{I}(f_{\text{LLM}}(u) = c_{d,j}) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. This produces a frequency vector for the real data, $\mathbf{O}_d = (O_{d,1}, O_{d,2}, \dots, O_{d,V_d})$. Similarly, a frequency vector is constructed for the synthetic data, $\mathbf{E}_d = (E_{d,1}, E_{d,2}, \dots, E_{d,V_d})$. The total number of observations is $N_R = \sum_{j=1}^{V_d} O_{d,j}$ and $N_S = \sum_{j=1}^{V_d} E_{d,j}$.

For multi-label dimensions, the frequency of each category is counted independently, and the sum of frequencies may exceed the total number of turns. The frequency distributions of each and every characteristic considered for evaluation can be found in Tables 15 to 32 in Appendix.

A.5.4 Statistical Comparison of Distributions

Before computing statistical divergence metrics, we apply a label grouping strategy to mitigate sparsity and instability in the distribution tails. For each dimension C_d , all categories whose frequency is less than 10% of the total in either \mathbf{O}_d or \mathbf{E}_d are grouped into a single ‘‘Other’’ category. This frequency based grouping is done based on the frequency distribution (Refer column ‘Original (Tuning)’ in Tables 15 to 32 in Appendix) in the language-specific dataset used for prompt tuning. This results in more stable and interpretable estimates, particularly when comparing small or imbalanced subsets of conversational features. The grouped frequency vectors are then used for all subsequent calculations.

The goal is to quantify the similarity between the frequency distributions of real and synthetic data for each dimension C_d . The null hypothesis H_0 assumes both distributions are statistically indistinguishable.

Pearson’s Chi-squared (χ^2) Test This test evaluates the goodness-of-fit between observed frequencies from real data (\mathbf{O}_d) and expected counts scaled from synthetic data:

$$\chi_d^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{V_d} \frac{(O_{d,j} - E'_{d,j})^2}{E'_{d,j}},$$

where $E'_{d,j} = E_{d,j} \cdot \frac{N_R}{N_S}$ (3)

The statistic follows a chi-squared distribution with $V_d - 1$ degrees of freedom. A low p-value indicates significant distributional differences.

G-test (Likelihood-Ratio Test) An alternative to the chi-squared test, the G-test uses the log-likelihood ratio:

$$G_d = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{V_d} O_{d,j} \ln \left(\frac{O_{d,j}}{E'_{d,j}} \right) \quad (4)$$

It shares the same asymptotic distribution and interpretability as the χ^2 statistic but is better suited for small counts.

Jensen-Shannon (JS) Divergence To assess distributional similarity more directly, we compute the JS divergence between normalized versions of \mathbf{O}_d and \mathbf{E}_d :

$$D_{JS}(\mathbf{P}_d || \mathbf{Q}_d) = \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(\mathbf{P}_d || \mathbf{M}_d) + \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(\mathbf{Q}_d || \mathbf{M}_d) \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{M}_d = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_d + \mathbf{Q}_d)$ and $D_{KL}(\mathbf{P} || \mathbf{Q}) = \sum_j P_j \log_2 \frac{P_j}{Q_j}$.

The JS score ranges from 0 (identical distributions) to 1 (fully dissimilar), offering an intuitive fidelity measure.

A.6 Baselines

Our work builds upon two prior methodologies for synthetic conversation generation, adapting them to the specific context of call center transcripts.

NoteChat (Wang et al., 2024): This framework was originally designed to generate synthetic patient-physician dialogues from clinical notes using a three-stage pipeline: Planning, Roleplay, and Polish. For our adaptation, we re-contextualized this system for customer service interactions. The input was changed from clinical notes to the structured call attributes (e.g., reason for call, key entities), and the roles were modified to "Agent" and

"Customer." The core logic of systematically covering predefined entities was preserved, while the final Polish module was repurposed to inject authentic spoken artifacts like disfluencies and simulated ASR errors.

ConvoGen (Gody et al., 2025): This approach leverages the AutoGen (Wu et al., 2023) framework to simulate diverse, multi-party conversations by first generating experiences (personas, context) and then having agents role-play within that scenario. We specialized this flexible system for the two-party structure of a customer service call. Instead of generating open-ended experiences, our implementation uses predefined call attributes to establish the call context. Furthermore, we enforced a strict, turn-by-turn, single-sentence dialogue format and integrated instructions for generating disfluencies and ASR noise directly into the agents’ prompts to produce a realistic call flow.

A.7 Evaluation Metrics: Full Descriptions

Evaluating the quality of synthetic conversational data presents a significant challenge, as traditional text-generation metrics (e.g., BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002b), ROUGE (Ganesan, 2018)) fail to capture the nuanced dynamics of human interaction. To address this gap, we introduce a comprehensive, multi-dimensional evaluation framework as a core contribution of this work. This suite of automated metrics is designed to dissect synthetic conversations far beyond surface-level lexical similarity, providing a granular assessment across five critical dimensions: emotional and sentiment arcs, linguistic complexity, interaction styles, conversational properties, and outcome orientation. This framework enables a robust, quantitative analysis of transcript realism and is essential to meaningfully compare different generation methodologies.

A.7.1 Emotional & Sentiment Metrics

This category captures the affective and tonal characteristics of the conversation at both the transcript and turn level.

- Agent & Customer Emotion Arc:** Assesses the emotional trajectory of each participant by identifying their respective emotions at the beginning and end of the conversation. Emotions are classified into one of eight categories: gratitude, relief, factual, curiosity, confusion, frustration, anger, or anxiety. This provides insight into the emotional resolution of the interaction (e.g., a shift from

frustration to relief).

2. **Agent & Customer Sentiment Arc:** Derived from the emotion arc, this metric maps the beginning and ending emotions to a three-point sentiment scale (positive, negative, neutral) to simplify the tonal shift over the course of the call.
3. **Sentiment (Turn-Level):** Evaluates the sentiment of each individual turn, classifying it as very positive, positive, neutral, negative, or very negative.

A.7.2 Linguistic Complexity & Content Density

This category measures the richness, density, and accessibility of the language used throughout the transcript.

1. **Language Complexity:** A multi-label classification for each turn that identifies one or more linguistic patterns from a set of 12, such as `simple_plain_language`, `technical_domain_specific_language`, or `informal_conversational_register`.
2. **Vocabulary Complexity:** A transcript-level score from 1 (highly complex) to 10 (very simple) that evaluates the difficulty of the vocabulary used.
3. **Technical Density:** A transcript-level score from 1 (high density) to 10 (low density) measuring the prevalence of technical or domain-specific terminology.
4. **Sentence Complexity:** A transcript-level score from 1 (highly complex) to 10 (very simple) assessing the structural complexity of sentences.
5. **Discourse Flow:** A transcript-level score from 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent) that evaluates the logical coherence and smoothness of the conversational progression.
6. **Overall Readability Score:** A holistic, transcript-level metric from 1 (very hard to read) to 10 (very easy to read), combining the above linguistic factors.

A.7.3 Interaction Style

This category focuses on how participants manage the conversation and engage with each other.

1. **Proactivity:** A turn-level assessment of the agent's initiative, clas-

sified as `overstated_proactivity`, `understated_proactivity`, or `neutral`.

2. **Emphasis:** A turn-level classification identifying the turn's primary focus as `emotion_focused`, `fact_focused`, or `other`.
3. **Question Type:** Classifies questions in each turn into one of eight functional categories, such as `entity_objective`, `clarification_descriptive`, or `boolean`, to analyze the nature of inquiries.

A.7.4 Conversational Properties

This category captures the naturalness, fluency, and surface-level characteristics of the dialogue.

1. **Repetition:** Identifies five distinct patterns of information repetition at the turn level, such as `agent_repeats_customer` or `customer_self_repetition`.
2. **Disfluency:** A multi-label classification that detects the presence of one or more of 28 specified conversational disfluencies (e.g., fillers, hesitations, interruptions) in each turn.
3. **ASR Noise Type:** Detects simulated Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) errors within each turn, classifying them as substitution, insertion, or deletion.

A.7.5 Outcome-Oriented Metrics

This category indicates the effectiveness or resolution status of the call.

1. **Solution:** A turn-level metric that categorizes the agent's contribution toward resolving the customer's issue into one of 13 specific action types, such as `diagnostic_explanation`, `transactional_directive`, `follow_up_commitment`, or `no_solution_provided`.

Together, this suite of metrics provides a holistic and fine-grained framework for the quantitative evaluation of synthetic call center transcripts. It enables an analysis that moves beyond simplistic measures to instead quantify the nuanced qualities that define authentic human conversation, from emotional trajectories to subtle disfluencies and interaction patterns. By applying this comprehensive evaluation protocol, we can rigorously compare the outputs of different generation models, leading to a deeper understanding of their respective strengths and weaknesses. The results of this analysis are presented in the subsequent section.

A.8 Implementation Details

Our synthetic transcript generation pipeline is implemented in Python, leveraging several open-source libraries and large language models (LLMs). The entire pipeline is designed to run on a local machine, ensuring reproducibility and control over the environment.

Prompt Engineering and Optimization with DSPy

A core component of our methodology is the use of DSPy (Khattab et al., 2023), a framework for programming with foundation models. Instead of manually crafting prompts, we define the steps of our pipeline as DSPy modules and use its automatic optimization capabilities to generate and refine high-quality prompts.

This process involves a MIPROv2 (Multi-prompt Instruction-driven Program Optimizer) optimizer (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), which explores various prompt candidates to maximize a given metric. The optimizer was configured with specific hyperparameters to guide the search for the most effective prompts for our generation task. The key DSPy hyperparameters used for prompt optimization are detailed in Table 34.

Hyperparameters Used in Turn Sampling for the Evaluation Pipeline

As detailed in Appendix A.5, turn-level metrics are computed by sampling an equal number of turns from each real–synthetic transcript pair, using the minimum of their lengths, capped at 100. For classification, each sampled turn is presented to the LLM along with its surrounding context—2 turns on both the left and right.

LLM and Infrastructure

The language models used in this research were accessed via Bedrock and LiteLLM, which provide a unified interface to various model providers. This setup allows for flexibility and easy substitution of models. Table 33 provides a comprehensive list of the LLMs used in different stages of our pipeline—along with their default parameters. The entire pipeline, including model inference and optimization, was executed on local infrastructure.

A.9 Reconstruction Score Analysis

We analyze the *Reconstruction Score*, a composite metric used during prompt tuning that aggregates

the fidelity of generated transcripts to structured inputs—namely, intent summaries, topic flows, QA evaluations, disfluencies, ASR noise, and interruptions. The score is computed as a weighted sum of these six components (details in Section A.4.5). This subsection compares the reconstruction performance across generation strategies and discusses its relationship to final evaluation outcomes.

(a) Breakdown of Reconstruction Sub-Scores.

Our results show that:

- **Dual Stage - Turn Count** achieves the highest scores across all languages for disfluency, ASR noise, and interruption—dimensions tied to ASR and structural noise modeling.
- **Characteristic-Aware Generation** performs best on QA evaluation in all languages except English, indicating its effectiveness at behavior-grounded synthesis.
- **Single Stage Prompting** leads in intent summary and topic flow adherence across all languages, suggesting that a single-step prompt is sufficient to generate structurally aligned conversations for these global inputs.

Most generation methods perform well on intent summary fidelity, with all scores exceeding 0.90 across languages, highlighting the relative ease of aligning generation with semantic skeletons compared to behavior or noise attributes.

(b) Lack of Correlation with Evaluation Metrics. Despite high reconstruction sub-scores, our evaluation results show limited correspondence with downstream evaluation metrics:

- **Disfluency and ASR Noise:** Dual Stage - Call Length, for example, has a disfluency reconstruction score exceeding 0.85 in all languages, yet performs poorly in the disfluency evaluation metric. This discrepancy likely stems from the mismatch in granularity: the reconstruction score evaluates disfluency at the transcript level, whereas the evaluation metric computes it at the turn level.
- **QA Evaluation:** Although Characteristic-Aware Generation excels in QA reconstruction scores for non-English languages, this advantage does not translate into higher behavioral fidelity scores (e.g., agent solution types, proactivity), indicating a weak alignment between reconstruction performance and fine-grained behavior traits.

These findings suggest that while reconstruction scores are useful for ensuring alignment with high-level supervision signals, they are not predictive of realism across stylistic, emotional, or acoustic dimensions. Future work should explore alternative tuning objectives or incorporate evaluation-aware feedback during training to better align prompt optimization with conversational fidelity.