

Large Language Models can Achieve Social Balance

Pedro Cisneros-Velarde

VMware Research, USA

pacisne@gmail.com

Abstract

Social balance is a concept in sociology which states that if every three individuals in a population achieve certain structures of positive or negative interactions, then the whole population ends up in one faction of positive interactions or divided between two or more antagonistic factions. In this paper, we consider a group of interacting large language models (LLMs) and study how, after continuous interactions, they can achieve social balance. Across three different LLM models, we found that social balance depends on (i) whether interactions are updated based on “relationships”, “appraisals”, or “opinions”; (ii) whether agents update their interactions based on homophily or influence from their peers; and (iii) the number of simultaneous interactions the LLMs consider. When social balance is achieved, its particular structure of positive or negative interactions depends on these three conditions and are different across LLM models and sizes. The stability of interactions and the justification for their update also vary across models. Thus, social balance is driven by the pre-training and alignment particular to each LLM model.

1 Introduction

The relevancy of Large Language Models (LLMs) has been outstanding not only because of their ability to understand natural language [Brown et al., 2020, Xi et al., 2023, Kojima et al., 2022, Wei et al., 2022a,b], but also because of their ability to systematically reason their responses [Wei et al., 2022c, Yao et al., 2023], learn from examples [Wan et al., 2023], express logical and common sense reasoning [Bang et al., 2023], and even behave as economic agents [Horton, 2023b]. Moreover, multi-agent systems or populations of LLMs have demonstrated the ability to express complex opinion dynamics [Chuang et al., 2024a,b, Cisneros-Velarde, 2024]. All these abilities are expressed by the LLM responses, which at the same time are influenced by biases [Liang et al., 2023] that may come from both their pre-training data [Albalak et al., 2024] and from alignment procedures [Christiano et al., 2017] that align the LLM responses to human expectations. The effect of such biases have been extensively analyzed at both individual [Liang et al., 2023, Horton, 2023a, Mo et al., 2024] and multi-agent [Cisneros-Velarde, 2024] levels. In a sociopsychological context, pre-training and alignment also influence how LLMs express [Serapio-Garcia et al., 2023] or assess [Rao et al., 2023] personality traits, as well as any expression of value or judgement [Wang et al., 2024, Sorensen et al., 2024], impacting any display of sociopsychological qualities [Zhou et al., 2024].

Contributing to this increasing literature on LLMs in multi-agent and sociologically relevant scenarios, we study how LLM agents understand positive and negative interactions among themselves in order to update their own interactions with their peers. By *interaction*, we broadly refer to any type of *relationship*, *opinion*, or *appraisal* that relates an agent with another. To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not been widely studied in the multi-agent setting.

To study this problem, we take from the sociological literature the well-established framework of *social balance*. Consider a group of three or more individuals. Social balance dictates the positive and negative interactions that must be held within every group of three individuals—also known as a *triad*—in order for the whole group to express sociologically relevant structures. In particular, the concept of *structural balance* [Heider, 1946] characterizes the sign structures that can lead to the emergence of all individuals having positive interactions with each other, i.e., one *faction*, or two factions of individuals where individuals have positive interactions within the same faction but negative ones across factions. Within a triad, structural balance is dictated by the so-called “Heider’s rules”: (i) the enemy of an enemy is a friend; (ii) the friend of an enemy is an enemy; (iii) the enemy of a friend is an enemy; (iv) the friend of a friend is a friend. It is argued that when a rule is violated, it generates incoherence in the agent’s cognitive system and social

context—i.e., a *cognitive dissonance* that the agent strives to resolve [Festinger, 1957, Ric, 2015]. Another important social balance concept is *clustering balance* [Davis, 1967], a weaker notion of social balance that happens when rule (i) is relaxed within a triad of agents; i.e., three agents can be enemies of each other. In a macroscale, clustering balance allows the appearance of multiple antagonistic factions—whereas structural balance is restricted to just two. In Figure 1 we graphically represent the sign configurations of interactions according to structural and clustering balance.

Now, in the context of a group of LLMs interacting with each other and continuously updating such interactions, there is really no guarantee or way to anticipate that a triad of LLM agents will achieve social balance. Therefore, in our work, our primary focus is to study the appearance of social balance for a group of three agents across different LLM models. It is logical to first establish results for the fundamental case of a single triad before studying balance in larger groups because a triad is the basis of Heider’s rules. Eventually, we also study populations of multiple triads, i.e., of more than three agents.

In our work, the updating of positive or negative interactions is affected in two dimensions. The first dimension is the type of interaction. Indeed, friendly and unfriendly ties among agents can be expressed as positive or negative *relationships* with each other, or *appraisals* and *opinions* of each other. These expressions capture different types of interactions present in both theoretical and empirical sociological literature; e.g., [Szell et al., 2010, Leskovec et al., 2010, Cisneros-Velarde and Bullo, 2020]. The second dimension is how agents update their interactions. Mathematical sociology literature identifies two types of *update mechanisms*: *homophily* and *influence* [Mei et al., 2019]. Consider an agent i who wants to update its tie to agent j . Homophily is when agent i does a comparison between (a) how it relates to agent j through other agents and (b) how it relates directly to agent j . Influence is when agent i considers, instead of (b), how agent j directly relates to agent i itself. Essentially, homophily and influence is a change of “directionability” in the comparison of interactions.

Finally, we remark that our work is relevant from an engineering perspective because LLMs are increasingly being used in multi-agent applications [Guo et al., 2024]. It is useful to understand how LLMs interpret positive and negative interactions because they may be deployed in situations where they may need to take decisions based on such assessments. For example, LLMs can participate in web-based communities or social media [Leskovec et al., 2010], where establishing negative ties has great influence on opinion mobilization [Kumar et al., 2018]. In non-virtual networks, negative ties have been associated to information diffusion and the centrality of individuals [Ghasemian and Christakis, 2024].

Contributions

Our experiments are conducted using three LLM models: Llama 3 70B (llama-3-70B-instruct), Llama 3 8B (llama-3-8B-instruct), and Mistral (mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2). We now describe our contributions.

For a population of a single triad:

- We show that all LLM models are able to achieve social balance after repeated interactions. The Llama 3 family achieve balance for all settings of interactions and update mechanisms, whereas Mistral is found to refuse to establish positive or negative interactions in one setting.
- The type of social balance (structural or clustering) and sign configurations of the balanced triads being achieved (Figure 1) depend on the LLM models and settings of interactions and mechanisms. Llama 3 70B is the only model that strictly achieves structural balance, while Mistral strictly achieves clustering balance.
- The frequency of achieving social balance varies across models. For all settings of interactions and mechanisms, Llama 3 70B achieves balance more often than Mistral. We also find that achieving social balance more often does not necessarily imply more diversity on the sign configurations of the triads.
- When social balance is achieved, Mistral is found to be less likely to change its interactions than the Llama 3 family. This contrasts the fact that social balance is more frequent in the Llama 3 family. In all models, social balance can be “broken” due to the LLMs’ inherent stochasticity.
- When justifying the updating of interactions, sociologically relevant keywords such as “cognitive” and “dissonance” occur in Llama 3 70B, and to a lesser degree, in the 8B model. Coincidentally, social balance occurs in general more often in the 70B model and in its strictest form. The word “balance”, instead, is more often found in the Llama 3 8B model. Mistral do not report these keywords.

For a population of multiple triads:




Figure 1: **Sign configurations of social balance for a triad.** A triad can be represented by a graph with three nodes, each node being an agent labelled as 0, 1, and 2, respectively. The first four triads define structural balance with the sign configurations following the Heider’s rules from the perspective of node 0 (e.g., in the first triad: agent 2 is an enemy of agent 1, who in turn is an enemy of 0; therefore, agent 0 is a friend of agent 2). All five triads define clustering balance.

- Unlike the single triad case, Llama 3 8B is found to achieve social balance in settings where the 70B version does not. Thus, social balance is not a property that *absolutely* improves with model size. Unlike the single triad case, Mistral is able to achieve social balance in settings where the Llama 3 family do not—possible evidence that social interactions are updated under different dynamics in larger populations. Finally, the keywords “cognitive” and “dissonance” are largely absent in the LLM responses.

It has been documented that as LLMs grow in size, the performance improves for different abilities or even new ones emerge [Wei et al., 2022b]. However, our results show that social balance is not a property that necessarily improves with model size complexity across all interactions, update mechanisms, and population sizes.

We remark that our work contributes to the characterization of the alignment of LLMs [Liang et al., 2023] in the case of facing social interactions. This is expressed by how sign configurations of social balance and their frequency of appearance greatly vary across LLM models, and how only Mistral refused to provide interactions. We are able to contribute to this characterization because we use every LLM *as is*, i.e., only affected by built-in biases since there is no impersonation of demographics [Aher et al., 2023] that could lead to additional biases [Salewski et al., 2023, Chuang et al., 2024a].

2 Related Work

Dynamics of LLM interactions in multi-agent settings. To the best of our knowledge, no prior work has focused on how LLMs update different types of positive or negative interactions (i) without taking a specific persona; (ii) by only observing the current state of such interactions; and (iii) under the framework of social balance. The works [Chuang et al., 2024a,b] focus on how opinions spread and change among LLMs role-playing different persona, and the effect caused by injecting external biases and by the degree of impersonation. The work [Zhou et al., 2024] studies the display of social intelligence in role-playing LLMs, and, among different variables, explicitly considers the effect of family, friend, romantic, acquaintance, and stranger relationships among the agents. The work [Cisneros-Velarde, 2024] takes the LLM as is, and studies the conflict among biases present during opinion exchange. Such work considers opinions that can have a positive, neutral, or negative connotation; however, connotations are not assigned to how agents relate to each other.

Dynamic modeling of signed interactions. Various works in the mathematical sociological modeling literature study how agents process positive and negative interactions. A first line of research studies how established positive and negative ties among agents affect the diffusion of opinions; e.g., social balance is known to lead to polarization of opinions [Shi et al., 2019, Cisneros-Velarde et al., 2021a]. A second line studies models that evolve positive and negative interactions among agents towards structural balance [Marvel et al., 2011, Traag et al., 2013, Mei et al., 2019, Cisneros-Velarde et al., 2021b] and clustering balance [Van de Rijt, 2011, Cisneros-Velarde and Bullo, 2020]. Generally, these works assume that the mathematical equations for the update of interactions are tractable and sociologically plausible, which is difficult to do in non-linear models with billions of parameters such as transformer-based LLMs [Vaswani et al., 2017].

3 Problem Setting

We consider a population of m LLM agents of the same model. Consider a triad of (different) Agents i, j , and k (this is the only triad in the population when $m = 3$). Let $s_{ij}(t) \in \{-1, +1\}$ represent the interaction of Agent i towards Agent j at time t : in the case of relationships, it indicates whether Agent i has a positive or negative relationship with (respect to) Agent j at time t ; in the case of appraisals or opinions, it indicates whether Agent i has a positive or negative appraisal or opinion of Agent j . Notice that interactions are directional, thus, it is possible that $s_{ij}(t) \neq s_{ji}(t)$.

It is known that the population achieves structural balance at time t when (i) $s_{ij}(t) = s_{ji}(t)$ for every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\} := [m]$, $i \neq j$; and (ii) $s_{ij}(t) \times s_{jk}(t) \times s_{ki}(t) = +1$ for every $i, j, k \in [m]$, $i \neq j \neq k$ [Harary, 1953]. In other words, (i) means that all interactions are symmetrical, and (ii) that every triad must have a positive product of interaction signs along a cycle. In the case of clustering balance, both conditions (i) and (ii) must hold with the additional relaxation of allowing triads such that $s_{ij}(t) + s_{jk}(t) + s_{ki}(t) = -3$ for every $i, j, k \in [m]$, $i \neq j \neq k$; i.e., we allow all negative interactions within a triad (see Figure 1).

Let us consider $m = 3$, i.e., the population is a single triad. Initially at $t = 0$, we consider every possible combination of values for $s_{ij}(0) \in \{-1, +1\}$, $i, j \in [3]$, $i \neq j$, which gives us $2^6 = 64$ different sign distributions over the triad. Then, for every iteration $t = 1, \dots, 10$, we pick every Agent $i \in [3]$ whose interactions towards the other two agents $j \neq k \in [3]$ will be updated. Assume Agent i will update its interaction towards Agent j . We first show Agent i the interactions $s_{ik}(t-1)$ and $s_{kj}(t-1)$, i.e., how Agent i is currently linked to Agent j through Agent k . Then, in the case of *homophily*, we show the interaction $s_{ij}(t-1)$, while in the case of *influence*, we show the interaction $s_{ji}(t-1)$. Finally, we ask Agent i what its new interaction towards Agent j will be. We remark that at each of the ten iterations, every agent updates its interactions with every other agent. We run ten simulations per sign distribution over the triad.

Now let us consider $m > 3$. Initially at $t = 0$, we generate n random values for $s_{ij}(0) \in \{-1, +1\}$ for every $i, j \in [m]^1$, $i \neq j$; i.e., there are n different simulations or sign distributions over the whole population. Then, for every iteration $t = 1, \dots, 10$, we pick every Agent $i \in [m]$ whose interactions with respect to the other agents $j_1, \dots, j_{m-1} \in [m]$ will be updated. Assume Agent i will update its interaction towards Agent j_1 . Then, we show Agent i the interactions $s_{ij_k}(t-1)$ and $s_{j_k j_1}(t-1)$ for every $k \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, i.e., how Agent i is currently linked to Agent j through every other agent. Then, we show either $s_{ij_1}(t-1)$ or $s_{j_1 i}(t-1)$ depending on whether the mechanism is homophily or influence, respectively. Finally, we ask Agent i what its new interaction towards j_1 will be. We consider two experiments: $m = 6$ with $n = 10$, and $m = 10$ with $n = 10$.

Prompt and experimental details are deferred to Appendix A. We point out that every agent was asked to provide a justification for the update of its interactions.

4 Analysis of a Population of a Single Triad

We first study the case of a population of three LLM agents interacting with each other.

4.1 Achieving social balance

Our first main contribution is to show that all three LLM models can achieve social balance, as evidenced in Tables 1 and 2. However, the frequency at which social balance is attained and the sign configurations of the balanced triad (see Figure 1) differ among the models, indicating a possible difference in their pre-training and/or alignment. We note that we could not obtain appropriate updates from Mistral in the case of relationships with homophily. Indeed, Mistral refused to provide an answer to our request, e.g., by stating that the new relationship would be “uncertain” or impossible to determine given the information provided to it.

Regarding the type of achieved social balance, we notably find that Llama 3 70B only achieves structural balance (there are no triads with all negative interactions), Llama 3 8B achieves both types of social balance, and Mistral only achieves clustering balance. It is remarkable that only the largest model is able to enforce the stronger concept of social balance.

Regarding the frequency at which social balance is achieved, the models in the Llama 3 family have settings of interactions and update mechanisms where they achieve social balance in the majority of simulations, whereas the majority of simulations do not achieve social balance for Mistral. Indeed, Llama 3 70B achieves social balance more often than Mistral for every setting. Surprisingly, Llama 3 8B achieves social balance more often than the larger 70B

¹Every $s_{ij}(0)$ is sampled independently from a Rademacher distribution, i.e., a probability of 0.5 for taking either value -1 or $+1$.

Triad Case	Llama 3 70B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
(-1, -1, -1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
(-1, -1, +1)	0.00	0.00	18.75	0.00	25.00	20.93
(-1, +1, -1)	0.00	0.00	6.25	0.00	25.00	22.67
(+1, -1, -1)	0.00	0.00	9.38	0.00	25.00	0.00
(+1, +1, +1)	100.00	100.00	65.62	100.00	25.00	56.40
% of simulations achieving social balance	76.56	87.5	100.0	54.69	18.75	26.88

Triad Case	Llama 3 8B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
(-1, -1, -1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.35	0.00
(-1, -1, +1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
(-1, +1, -1)	0.00	0.00	28.27	0.00	0.00	0.00
(+1, -1, -1)	0.00	93.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
(+1, +1, +1)	100.00	6.10	71.73	0.00	93.65	100.00
% of simulations achieving social balance	5.63	25.62	44.22	0.0	98.44	56.25

Table 1: **Distribution of balanced triads achieved by the Llama 3 family.** Each column represents a specific setting of interactions (relationship, appraisal, opinion) and update mechanisms (homophily, influence). For each setting, we show in the last row the percentage of simulations where the triad of agents achieve social balance out of a total of 640 simulations (10 simulations for each of the 64 initial conditions; see Section 3). The first five rows of each column describe how often, as a percentage, each of the five sign configuration of a balanced triad (see Figure 1) is found when social balance is achieved for the setting associated to the column. This is the nomenclature used to describe the first five rows: a triad described by (a, b, c) with $a, b, c \in \{-1, +1\}$ means that $s_{01} = s_{10} = a$, $s_{12} = s_{21} = b$, and $s_{20} = s_{02} = c$ (using the notation of Section 3). As an example of an entry of the table, we observe that for Llama 3 70B under the setting of appraisal interactions with homophily, the triad has the sign configuration $(-1, -1, +1)$ (the first one in Figure 1) in 18.75% of cases where it achieves social balance.

model in the case of opinions; however, this comes with a nuance. A closer look at Table 1 reveals that Llama 3 70B has a more diverse variety of sign configurations for the balanced triad under opinion interactions.

A similar nuance between frequency and variety occurs with Mistral. Although Mistral has a noticeable lower frequency of achieving social balance than Llama 3 70B, it achieves a larger variety of sign configurations than the Llama 3 models in many settings (e.g., in all types of interactions with influence mechanisms). We can conclude, then, that model size is not in itself an indicator of whether an LLM is able to update interactions with more diversity.

Finally, we point out another striking difference on how LLMs process social interactions. While the homophily mechanism leads to a uniform distribution on sign configurations for Llama 3 70B (under opinions in Table 1), it is the influence mechanism that does it for Mistral (under opinions and appraisals in Table 2).

4.2 Stability of interactions

Now that the possibility of achieving social balance is established, we focus on understanding how *stable* the interactions in a balanced triad are (in any of the five configurations in Figure 1) after repeated interaction updates. To investigate this, we analyze how often an initially balanced triad does not change any of its interactions after ten iterations. For Llama 3 70B, we find that in 46.67% of cases, i.e., 140 out of 300 simulations, the balanced triad stays in the same balanced state.² For Llama 3 8B, this is the case in 16.67%, i.e., 50 out of 300 simulations. For Mistral, this is the case in 84.00%, i.e., 210 out of 250 simulations.³ Although Mistral has a lower number of cases achieving social balance

²This is how we obtain the number 300: we run 10 simulations for each of the 5 types of balanced triads (Figure 1) across the 6 settings of interactions and update mechanisms.

³Mistral does not report relationships under homophily, as indicated in Section 4.1.

Triad Case	Mistral				
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion
	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
(-1, -1, -1)	16.67	93.33	20.00	28.57	20.00
(-1, -1, +1)	16.67	0.00	20.00	28.57	20.00
(-1, +1, -1)	16.67	0.00	20.00	0.00	20.00
(+1, -1, -1)	16.67	0.00	20.00	14.29	20.00
(+1, +1, +1)	33.33	6.67	20.00	28.57	20.00
% of simulations achieving social balance	9.38	23.44	7.81	10.94	7.81

Table 2: **Distribution of balanced triads achieved by Mistral.** The setting is similar to Table 1.

Keyword	Llama 3 70B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“cognitive”	0.00	0.00	7.16	0.00	5.58	0.00
“dissonance”	0.00	0.00	13.80	5.28	6.28	1.16
“social”	0.78	0.42	3.25	15.60	1.29	0.96
“balance”	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00

Keyword	Llama 3 8B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“cognitive”	0.00	0.00	4.10	0.00	1.91	0.01
“dissonance”	0.00	0.00	4.10	0.00	1.90	0.01
“social”	0.59	0.66	2.11	5.46	1.43	0.00
“balance”	1.14	0.34	8.07	1.10	3.70	0.63

Table 3: **Percentages of occurrence of keywords in the agents’ responses for the Llama 3 family.** Each percentage is with respect to a total of 38400 responses (given a setting of interactions and update mechanisms, we obtain responses from 10 simulations for each of the 64 possible sign distributions over a triad wherein 3 agents update 2 interactions across 10 iterations).

(see Section 4.1), once a triad achieves social balance, it is less likely to change its interactions than any LLM from the Llama 3 family. These stability results open up a new perspective in our study of social interactions: a model that achieves social balance more often is not necessarily the model with more stable interaction updates.

We also focus on another stability measure: how often (across simulations) the agents do not change the sign of their interactions a number of p iterations before the (final) tenth iteration, irrespective of whether the final triad is balanced or not. We particularly choose $p = 5$, which leads to a conservative measure of stability over half of the total number of iterations. Our results show that Llama 3 70B is stable on 92.19% of cases, i.e., 3540 out of 3840 simulations.⁴ Llama 3 8B is stable at the lower number of 49.95%, i.e., 1918 out of 3840 simulations. Finally, Mistral is stable at a very high number: 99.78%, i.e., 3193 out of 3200 simulations. These results show that Mistral is, in general, less likely to change its interactions after repeated iterations than the Llama 3 family, irrespective of whether the interactions achieve social balance or not. We remark that the reason why these LLMs have *always* the possibility of changing their interactions in our results is due to their intrinsic stochastic nature. Figure 2 shows examples of the evolution of interactions.

4.3 Keyword analysis

The fact that LLMs can achieve social balance comes, ultimately, from the information encoded in their large number of parameters. However, for the sake of interpretability, we now focus on finding evidence that could indicate LLM

⁴This is how we obtain the number 3840: we run 10 simulations for each of the 64 possible sign distributions over a triad (see Section 3) across the 6 settings of interactions and update mechanisms.




Figure 2: **Examples of evolution of interactions.** Changes on the number of positive cycles (blue curve), positive edges (orange curve), and negative edges (green curve) across ten iterations. The plots on the right represent cases where a triad does not maintain the same signs for its interactions on the last five iterations.

agents explicitly expressing their intention of achieving social balance. For this, we look for specific keywords related to the social balance literature in every response given by every agent across all settings and iterations. We consider the obvious keywords “structural”, “clustering”, “social”, and “balance”. However, as mentioned in Section 1, social balance theory argues that agents aim to minimize cognitive dissonances when processing social interactions, and so we also consider the keywords “cognitive” and “dissonance”.

Firstly, we find that no LLM model mentions “structural” or “clustering” in their responses, which means that these keywords are not mentioned even when social balance is achieved.

Now, regarding the other keywords, we observe in Table 3 that both Llama 3 models mention the terms “cognitive” and “dissonance” only in the cases of appraisals and opinions, thus showing an awareness of updating processes that can lead to social balance. At the same time, as seen in Table 1, appraisals and opinions lead to a higher variety of sign structures in balanced triads than relationships. Moreover, these two terms appear most often when Llama 3 70B updates appraisals with homophily, which is the same setting that has the highest 100% frequency of achieving social balance (see Table 1).

We also observe that the terms “cognitive” and “dissonance” appear more often in the larger Llama 3 model than in the smaller one across all settings, whereas the opposite occurs for the keyword “balance”. This could indicate that Llama 3 8B uses different rules of interaction update than the 70B model, a possible explanation for the discrepancy in both frequency and diversity of the balanced triads achieved by both models (see Table 1). Regarding the keyword “social”, we observe in Table 3 that it does not appear at the same frequency as “balance” for the Llama 3 models, and so, given the broad contexts in which this term could be used, we cannot conclude that its presence indicates any intention from the agent to achieve social balance.

Finally, Mistral, perhaps related to its low frequency of achieving social balance, displays no keyword except for “social”, which only appears at 2.62% of responses in the setting of relationship with influence, and less than 0.37% under the appraisal interaction for both mechanisms.

Population Size	Llama 3 70B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
Six agents	0	4	4	2	0	0
Ten agents	0	0	2	0	0	0
All positive interactions for six agents	0	3	0	2	0	0
All positive interactions for ten agents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Structural balance for six agents	0	4	3	2	0	0
Structural balance for ten agents	0	0	0	0	0	0

Population Size	Llama 3 8B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
Six agents	10	5	0	0	1	0
Ten agents	10	6	0	0	0	10
All positive interactions for six agents	0	0	0	0	0	0
All positive interactions for ten agents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Structural balance for six agents	0	1	0	0	0	0
Structural balance for ten agents	0	0	0	0	0	10

Table 4: **Number of simulations achieving social balance for the Llama 3 family for populations larger than three.** For each population size, we show how many simulations (out of ten) achieve social balance on the first two rows under different interactions and update mechanisms. In the next two rows, we state the number of simulations where all individuals result in having only positive interactions towards each other. The last two rows indicate the number of simulations that achieve structural balance.

Triad Case	Mistral			
	Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
Six agents	9	7	6	4
Ten agents	1	7	–	10
All positive interactions for six agents	0	0	0	0
All positive interactions for ten agents	0	0	–	0
Structural balance for six agents	0	0	0	0
Structural balance for ten agents	0	0	–	0

Table 5: **Number of simulations converging to social balance for Mistral for populations larger than three.** The setting is similar to Table 1. No results were reported in the setting of opinion with homophily for ten agents.

5 Analysis of Populations of Multiple Triads

Thus far, we show that social balance can be achieved when a population is composed of a single triad. We now investigate whether LLMs can achieve social balance when there are more triads in a population. In particular, we consider populations of 20 and 120 triads, or, equivalently, of six and ten agents, respectively. We show, indeed, that all three LLM models can achieve social balance for these larger populations in Tables 4 and 5.⁵

We observe three notable differences with respect to the single triad case. Firstly, Llama 3 8B achieves social balance more often than Llama 3 70B under relationships by a considerable margin—e.g., with homophily, all simulations achieve balance for the 8B model, but none do for the 70B model. Secondly, Llama 3 8B does not achieve structural balance with all relationships being positive. Thirdly, Llama 3 70B is found to achieve clustering balance. Although it is difficult to know the reason for these three differences and to draw definite conclusions from the restricted number of

⁵For notation convenience, our results in Tables 4 and 5 are expressed in terms of *numbers* of simulations instead of *percentages* since we only run ten random initial conditions per setting of interactions and update mechanisms (see Section 3).

simulations we performed, our results could indicate a difference on the internal dynamics used by the LLM models when assessing multiple interactions.

We find another difference between the Llama 3 models: under opinions with influence, both models do not achieve social balance when there are six agents; however, when there are ten agents, all simulations achieve social balance in the 8B model while none do in the 70B model. This observation agrees with the possibility that both Llama 3 models use different rules for updating their interactions, as stated in Section 4.3.

Similar to the single triad case, we could not obtain useful relationship updates for Mistral, and, in the case of ten agents, for opinions with homophily. However, remarkably, Mistral is able to achieve social balance more often than the Llama 3 family under appraisal interactions. This is in stark contrast to the single triad case, where Mistral achieves balance less often than Llama 3 70B in all settings. Again, these results add to the possibility that when an agent considers multiple triads, it may unveil new dynamics for the updating of social interactions.

Finally, we find that the presence of most of the relevant keywords in Section 4.3 decreases considerably across all models; see tables in Appendix B. For example, in contrast to the single triad case, the keywords “cognitive” and “dissonance” are largely absent in the Llama 3 family, thus reinforcing the possibility of different update dynamics.

6 Conclusion

We show that LLMs are able to achieve social balance after the continuous update of their social interactions. In the fundamental case of a triad of LLM agents, we find that the frequency, diversity, and stability of balanced structures vary across models and sizes. In the case of multiple triads in a population, LLMs seem to display different dynamics when updating their social interactions. As future work, we propose studying how achieving social balance is affected by LLMs having memory of past social interactions.

Limitations

All experiments have the temperature hyperparameter set to zero, which is a legitimate setting for applications where consistency on LLMs’ outputs are desired; nonetheless, achieving social balance could be sensitive to this hyperparameter. As mentioned in the paper, it was not possible to obtain useful responses for Mistral in some settings, despite our best efforts on prompt engineering. We also point out that running our experiments was time consuming because of the time spent to run the models’ inference and the number of agent interactions. This is the reason why we performed less simulations for the populations of 20 and 120 triads (i.e., six and ten agents, respectively) compared to the population of a single triad. Finally, as in any application where we need to prompt an LLM, we had to make particular choices on *how to textually* describe (i) the social interactions that involve an LLM agent, and (ii) the question to elicit the update of its interactions.

References

- Gati Aher, Rosa I. Arriaga, and Adam Tauman Kalai. Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. JMLR.org, 2023.
- Alon Albalak, Yanai Elazar, Sang Michael Xie, Shayne Longpre, Nathan Lambert, Xinyi Wang, Niklas Muennighoff, Bairu Hou, Liangming Pan, Haewon Jeong, Colin Raffel, Shiyu Chang, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and William Yang Wang. A survey on data selection for language models, 2024.
- Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, Bryan Wilie, Holy Lovenia, Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, Quyet V. Do, Yan Xu, and Pascale Fung. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of ChatGPT on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. In Jong C. Park, Yuki Arase, Baotian Hu, Wei Lu, Derry Wijaya, Ayu Purwarianti, and Adila Alfa Krisnadhi, editors, *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 675–718, Nusa Dua, Bali, November 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.ijcnlp-main.45. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.ijcnlp-main.45>.

- Tom Brown et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/d5e2c0adad503c91f91df240d0cd4e49-Paper.pdf.
- Yun-Shiuan Chuang, Agam Goyal, Nikunj Harlalka, Siddharth Suresh, Robert D. Hawkins, Sijia Yang, Dhavan V. Shah, Junjie Hu, and Timothy T. Rogers. Simulating opinion dynamics with networks of LLM-based agents. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wLHI2xjmMW>.
- Yun-Shiuan Chuang, Siddharth Suresh, Nikunj Harlalka, Agam Goyal, Robert Hawkins, Sijia Yang, Dhavan Shah, Junjie Hu, and Timothy T. Rogers. The wisdom of partisan crowds: Comparing collective intelligence in humans and llm-based agents, 2024b.
- Pedro Cisneros-Velarde. On the principles behind opinion dynamics in multi-agent systems of large language models, 2024.
- Pedro Cisneros-Velarde and Francesco Bullo. Signed network formation games and clustering balance. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 10:783–797, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13235-019-00346-8>.
- Pedro Cisneros-Velarde, Kevin S. Chan, and Francesco Bullo. Polarization and fluctuations in signed social networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(8):3789–3793, 2021a.
- Pedro Arturo Cisneros-Velarde, Noah E. Friedkin, Anton V. Proskurnikov, and Francesco Bullo. Structural balance via gradient flows over signed graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(7):3169–3183, 2021b. doi: [10.1109/TAC.2020.3018435](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2020.3018435).
- James A. Davis. Clustering and structural balance in graphs. *Human Relations*, 20(2):181–187, 1967. doi: [10.1177/001872676702000206](https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676702000206).
- Leon Festinger. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford University Press, 1957. ISBN 0-8047-0131-8.
- Amir Ghasemian and Nicholas A. Christakis. The structure and function of antagonistic ties in village social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(26):e2401257121, 2024. doi: [10.1073/pnas.2401257121](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2401257121).
- Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V. Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges, 2024.
- Frank Harary. On the notion of balance of a signed graph. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 2(2):143 – 146, 1953. doi: [10.1307/mmj/1028989917](https://doi.org/10.1307/mmj/1028989917).
- Fritz Heider. Attitudes and cognitive organization. *The Journal of Psychology*, 21(1):107–112, 1946. doi: [10.1080/00223980.1946.9917275](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1946.9917275).
- John J. Horton. Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus?, 2023a.
- John J. Horton. Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus?, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07543>.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=e2TBb5y0yFf>.

- Srijan Kumar, William L. Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. Community interaction and conflict on the web. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, page 933–943. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2018. ISBN 9781450356398. doi: 10.1145/3178876.3186141.
- Jure Leskovec, Daniel Huttenlocher, and Jon Kleinberg. Signed networks in social media. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, page 1361–1370, New York, NY, USA, 2010. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781605589299. doi: 10.1145/1753326.1753532. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753532>.
- Percy Liang et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=i04LZibEqW>. Featured Certification, Expert Certification.
- Seth A. Marvel, Jon Kleinberg, Robert D. Kleinberg, and Steven H. Strogatz. Continuous-time model of structural balance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(5):1771–1776, 2011. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1013213108.
- Wenjun Mei, Pedro Cisneros-Velarde, Ge Chen, Noah E. Friedkin, and Francesco Bullo. Dynamic social balance and convergent appraisals via homophily and influence mechanisms. *Automatica*, 110:108580, 2019. ISSN 0005-1098. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2019.108580>.
- Lingbo Mo, Boshi Wang, Muhao Chen, and Huan Sun. How trustworthy are open-source llms? an assessment under malicious demonstrations shows their vulnerabilities, 2024.
- Haocong Rao, Cyril Leung, and Chunyan Miao. Can chatGPT assess human personalities? a general evaluation framework. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.
- Francois Ric. Social cognition. In James D. Wright, editor, *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)*, pages 204–209. Elsevier, Oxford, second edition edition, 2015. ISBN 978-0-08-097087-5. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.24044-0>.
- Leonard Salewski, Stephan Alaniz, Isabel Rio-Torto, Eric Schulz, and Zeynep Akata. In-context impersonation reveals large language models’ strengths and biases. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=CbsJ53LdKc>.
- Greg Serapio-Garcia, Mustafa Safdari, Clément Crepy, Luning Sun, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. Personality traits in large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.00184>.
- Guodong Shi, Claudio Altafini, and John S. Baras. Dynamics over signed networks. *SIAM Review*, 61(2):229–257, 2019. doi: 10.1137/17M1134172.
- Taylor Sorensen, Liwei Jiang, Jena D. Hwang, Sydney Levine, Valentina Pyatkin, Peter West, Nouha Dziri, Ximing Lu, Kavel Rao, Chandra Bhagavatula, Maarten Sap, John Tasioulas, and Yejin Choi. Value kaleidoscope: Engaging ai with pluralistic human values, rights, and duties. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(18):19937–19947, Mar. 2024. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v38i18.29970.
- Michael Szell, Renaud Lambiotte, and Stefan Thurner. Multirelational organization of large-scale social networks in an online world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(31):13636–13641, 2010. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1004008107.
- Vincent Antonio Traag, Paul Van Dooren, and Patrick De Leenheer. Dynamical models explaining social balance and evolution of cooperation. *PLOS ONE*, 8(4):1–7, 04 2013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0060063.
- Arnout Van de Rijt. The micro-macro link for the theory of structural balance. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 35(1-3):94–113, 2011. doi: 10.1080/0022250X.2010.532262.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.

- Zhen Wan, Fei Cheng, Zhuoyuan Mao, Qianying Liu, Haiyue Song, Jiwei Li, and Sadao Kurohashi. GPT-RE: In-context learning for relation extraction using large language models. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mTiHLHu3sP>.
- Xintao Wang, Yunze Xiao, Jen-tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Rui Xu, Haoran Guo, Quan Tu, Yaying Fei, Ziang Leng, Wei Wang, Jiangjie Chen, Cheng Li, and Yanghua Xiao. InCharacter: Evaluating personality fidelity in role-playing agents through psychological interviews. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1840–1873, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.102>.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEZrGCozdqR>.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022b. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yzkSU5zdwD>. Survey Certification.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022c. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=_VjQ1MeSB_J.
- Zhiheng Xi et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey, 2023.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik R Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5Xc1ecx01h>.
- Xuhui Zhou, Hao Zhu, Leena Mathur, Ruohong Zhang, Haofei Yu, Zhengyang Qi, Louis-Philippe Morency, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Graham Neubig, and Maarten Sap. SOTOPIA: Interactive evaluation for social intelligence in language agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

A Experimental Details

A.1 Hardware platform

The Llama 3 70B, Llama 3 80B, and Mistral are hosted on two, one, and one NVIDIA H100 80GB GPU, respectively, on a PowerEdge R760xa Server, which has two Intel Xeon Gold 6442Y processors, and twelve 64GB RDIMM memory.

A.2 Hyperparameters

In all of our experiments we set the temperature hyperparameter of the LLM models to be zero.

A.3 Prompt details for the Llama 3 family (both 70B and 8B)

Assume we are in the case of a single triad, i.e., three agents. Let i , j and k be the numbers associated to specific agents. Assume that at time $t > 0$, Agent i will update its relationship with j and k . Assuming that it will update it with j under the homophily mechanism, the prompt template is as follows: *"Your current relationship with Individual $\{j\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with j at time $t - 1$. Individual $\{j\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of relationship of j with k at time $t - 1$ relationship with Individual $\{k\}$. Your current relationship with Individual $\{k\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with k at time $t - 1$.
Will your new relationship with respect to Individual $\{j\}$ be negative or positive? State the relationship first, and then provide an explanation."* The sign of a relationship is described by the text values of "positive" or "negative" to the LLM agent. When the update mechanism is influence, the sentence right before the question is replaced by *"Individual $\{k\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of relationship of k with i at time $t - 1$ relationship with you."* The response of the LLM Agent i will be the new sign of its relationship with (respect to) Agent j at time t .

Now, assume that, instead, Agent i will update its appraisal or opinion of Agent j . Under the homophily mechanism, the prompt template is as follows: *"You have a $\{sign\}$ of appraisal/opinion that i has of j at time $t - 1$ $\{appraisal/opinion\}$ of Individual $\{j\}$. Individual $\{j\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of appraisal/opinion that j has of k at time $t - 1$ $\{appraisal/opinion\}$ of Individual $\{k\}$. You have a $\{sign\}$ of appraisal/opinion that i has of k at time $t - 1$ $\{appraisal/opinion\}$ of Individual $\{k\}$.
Will your new $\{appraisal/opinion\}$ of Individual $\{j\}$ be negative or positive? State the appraisal first, and then provide an explanation."* When the update mechanism is influence, the sentence right before the question is replaced by *"Individual $\{k\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of appraisal/opinion that k has of i at time $t - 1$ $\{appraisal/opinion\}$ of you."* The response of the LLM Agent i will be the new sign of its appraisal or opinion of Agent j at time t .

We now consider the case of more than three agents. Assume that Agent i will update its interaction towards Agent j_1 , and that the rest of agents in the population are j_2, \dots, j_{m-1} . The main difference in the prompt with respect to the previous case of three agents is that now we have to include the interactions of every single triad Agent i belongs to. Thus, at time $t > 0$, assuming that Agent i will update its relationship with (respect to) Agent j_1 under the homophily mechanism, the prompt template is as follows: *"Your current relationship with Individual $\{j_1\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with j_1 at time $t - 1$.
Individual $\{j_1\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of relationship of j_1 with j_2 at time $t - 1$ relationship with Individual $\{j_2\}$. Your current relationship with Individual $\{j_2\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with j_2 at time $t - 1$.
Individual $\{j_1\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of relationship of j_1 with j_3 at time $t - 1$ relationship with Individual $\{j_3\}$. Your current relationship with Individual $\{j_3\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with j_3 at time $t - 1$.
(...) Individual $\{j_1\}$ has a $\{sign\}$ of relationship of j_1 with j_{m-1} at time $t - 1$ relationship with Individual $\{j_{m-1}\}$. Your current relationship with Individual $\{j_{m-1}\}$ is $\{sign\}$ of relationship of i with j_{m-1} at time $t - 1$.
Will your new relationship with respect to Individual $\{j_1\}$ be negative or positive? State the relationship first, and then provide an explanation."* The prompts for the rest of interactions and update mechanisms follow a similar pattern.

We point out that in all prompts we use the word "individual" instead of "agent". The reason for this is that the word "individual" is frequently used in the social balance theory literature. Since we are interested in how LLMs process social interactions, the term "individual" is fitting for their prompting. On the other hand, our paper studies LLMs that form a multi-agent system, and for this reason we use the word "agent" to refer to them in our paper. We can find a similar differentiation between terms in the mathematical modeling literature: the term "individual" is used when referring to the sociological aspect of the interactions, and the term "agent" when referring to the equations that abstracts the "individual" into a mathematical variable (see, for example, [Cisneros-Velarde et al., 2021b]).

A.4 Prompt details for Mistral

The prompts for Mistral are almost identical to the ones for the Llama 3 family, except that the last sentence is replaced by another text. In the case of an agent that will update its relationship with (respect to) Agent j , this text becomes: *"Your must always choose either a "positive" or "negative" relationship, even if you are uncertain or do not have enough information. Your response must be in the following format:\n\n"New relationship: [write here "positive" or "negative"]." and then "Justification for answer: [write here the justification for the new relationship]."* Now, in the case of an agent that will update its appraisal or opinion of Agent j , this text becomes: *"Your must always choose either a "positive" or "negative" {appraisal/opinion}, even if you are uncertain or do not have enough information. A "neutral" {appraisal/opinion} is not allowed. Your response must be in the following format:\n\n"New {appraisal/opinion}: [write here "positive" or "negative"]." and then "Justification for answer: [write here the justification for the new {appraisal/opinion}]."* These prompt modifications are done for conveniently formatting the output of Mistral, as well as to encourage the LLM to provide useful interaction updates.

A.5 An additional experimental consideration on Mistral

We found that Mistral, despite being asked to update its interactions as either “positive” or “negative”, in some cases defined “neutral” interactions for $t > 0$. Thus, for the particular case of Mistral, we expanded the interactions to consider neutral values represented by the numerical value 0, i.e., $s_{ij}(t) \in \{-1, +1, 0\}$ for the interaction of Agent i towards Agent j at time $t > 0$ (using the notation from Section 3). This does not change our analysis and results at all, because we are interested in the population of agents achieving social balance, which only occurs when interactions are exclusively +1 or -1 (i.e., if an interaction is “neutral” at the end of the iterations, there cannot be social balance).

B Keyword Analysis for Multiple Triads

B.1 Six agents

The occurrence of relevant keywords (see Section 4.3) is shown in Table 6. No LLM model mentions the keyword “structural” across their responses, and none of them mention “clustering” except by Llama 3 70B minimally (0.03%) in the particular case of relationship with homophily. No LLM model mentions “cognitive”, and only Llama 3 70B mentions “dissonance” minimally (0.17%) in the particular case of appraisal with influence—all in stark contrast to the case of a single triad.

B.2 Ten agents

The occurrence of relevant keywords (see Section 4.3) is shown in Table 7. No LLM model mentions the keywords “structural”, “clustering” or “cognitive” across their responses, and only Llama 3 70B mentions “dissonance” minimally (no more than 0.09%) in whatever setting it appears.

Keyword	Llama 3 70B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“clustering”	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
“dissonance”	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.17	0.0	0.10
“social”	5.17	1.27	0.00	1.73	0.00	0.80
“balance”	0.17	2.30	0.27	0.43	0.50	0.97

Triad Case	Llama 3 8B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“social”	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00
“balance”	0.00	0.10	0.00	2.37	0.00	0.10

Triad Case	Mistral			
	Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“social”	0.13	0.20	0.00	0.00
“balance”	0.30	0.33	0.27	0.60

Table 6: **Percentages of occurrence of keywords in the agents’ responses for all LLM models for a population of six agents.** Each percentage is with respect to a total of 3000 responses (given a setting of interactions and update mechanisms, we obtain responses from 10 simulations wherein 6 agents update 5 interactions across 10 iterations).

Triad Case	Llama 3 70B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“dissonance”	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.01
“social”	9.54	4.78	0.01	2.87	0.00	0.64
“balance”	0.11	2.73	0.11	0.59	0.06	0.81

Triad Case	Llama 3 8B					
	Relationship		Appraisal		Opinion	
	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence	Homophily	Influence
“social”	0.07	0.10	0.24	0.66	0.00	0.00
“balance”	0.02	0.08	1.66	0.50	0.02	0.11

Triad Case	Mistral		
	Appraisal		Opinion
	Homophily	Influence	Influence
“social”	0.06	0.83	0.07
“balance”	1.90	0.81	0.22

Table 7: **Percentages of occurrence of keywords in the agents’ responses for all LLM models for a population of ten agents.** Each percentage is with respect to a total of 9000 responses (given a setting of interactions and update mechanisms, we obtain responses from 10 simulations wherein 10 agents update 9 interactions across 10 iterations).