

Modelling Human Values for AI Reasoning

Nardine Osman^a, Mark d’Inverno^{b,a}

^a*Artificial Intelligence Research Institute (IIIA-CSIC), Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain*

^b*Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK*

Abstract

One of today’s most significant societal challenges is building AI systems whose behaviour, or the behaviour it enables within communities of interacting agents (human and artificial), aligns with human values. To address this challenge, we detail a formal model of human values for their explicit computational representation. To our knowledge, this has not been attempted as yet, which is surprising given the growing volume of research integrating values within AI. Taking as our starting point the wealth of research investigating the nature of human values from social psychology over the last few decades, we set out to provide such a formal model. We show how this model can provide the foundational apparatus for AI-based reasoning over values, and demonstrate its applicability in real-world use cases. We illustrate how our model captures the key ideas from social psychology research and propose a roadmap for future integrated – and interdisciplinary - research into human values in AI. The ability to automatically reason over values not only helps address the value alignment problem but also facilitates the design of AI systems that can support individuals and communities in making more informed, value-aligned decisions. More and more, individuals and organisations are motivated to understand their values more explicitly and explore whether their behaviours and attitudes properly reflect them. Our work on modelling human values will enable AI systems to be designed and deployed to meet this growing need.

Keywords: human values, value representation, formal modelling, social psychology

1. Introduction

Across governments, industry and the general public, there is an increasing recognition of the urgency for ethical approaches to AI (as evidenced by

February 12, 2024

the numerous publications of ethics guidelines, e.g. [25, 26, 36, 37, 86]). In academia, a growing body of research investigates the role of human values in designing ethical AI [12, 31, 74, 90]. Indeed, one of our leading AI research luminaries, Stuart Russell, believes the overarching goal of AI should change from “intelligence” to “intelligence provably aligned with human values” [74]. This call to arms gave birth to the *value alignment problem*.

This challenge of engineering values into AI in response to the value alignment problem has resulted in a range of research areas: how human values can be learnt [43, 44, 45, 91]; how individual values can be aggregated to the level of groups [41]; how arguments that explicitly reference values can be made [7]; how decision making can be value-driven [14, 17, 21]; how online institutions can ensure value-aligned behaviours in hybrid communities [56, 57]; and how norms are selected or synthesised to maximise value-alignment [55, 80, 83].

Yet despite these efforts, no formal model of values exists today that provides a concrete foundational platform from which data structures and algorithms can be designed to build AI architectures that address the value-alignment problem. In response, we propose such a model built on the following guiding principles:

- 1) we employ a formal language to be precise about modelling values and related concepts [23, 47];
- 2) we construct the formal components of this model to provide the foundations for the data structures and algorithmic design that will enable value-based reasoning;
- 3) we design the model to be agnostic on any specific implementation of values, though we do provide example implementation scenarios to illustrate the model’s ubiquity and practical applicability;
- 4) we set out the model to subsume and relate to established concepts in AI research as much as possible;
- 5) we provide illustrative examples of building data structures and algorithms enabling value-based reasoning taken from our ongoing research applied to real-world use cases;
- 6) we ensure the model draws upon the wealth of work from within social psychology and explicitly demonstrate the grounding of our model within this research; and

- 7) as with AI research, we also design the model to remain agnostic on any specific theory of values from social psychology but demonstrate how our model incorporates the agreed conceptual underpinnings of this field.

The ongoing impact of this work comes through our partnership with a team of medical doctors at Hospital del Mar, Barcelona. Through this collaboration, we make use of our formal model of values to interrogate and develop a greater structural understanding of their four overarching bio-ethical values [6] (beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice). With those four values formally defined, we are now developing AI that provides feedback on the value alignment of medical decisions, leading to better value-aware decision-making in the hospital. We are also developing mechanisms to analyse their medical protocols and their resulting behaviours from the perspective of alignment with these four basic values, allowing us to provide feedback on when and how these protocols can evolve to improve greater value alignment. This partnership, along with other ongoing value-identifying “research in the wild” collaborations, helps us ensure the practicality of our proposed formal model —theory and practice are thus tightly coupled.

The narrative of this paper is set out as follows. Section 2 motivates using values as critical modelling and architectural concepts for symbolic AI systems. It outlines why values are considered vital to understanding human behaviour and why explicit modelling and computational reasoning of human values is needed in AI. Section 3 explores the nature of human values from social psychology, providing the background and canvas for us to engineer a new formal model into existence. We analyse definitions of human values from this work and consider their commonalities and distinctions. Armed with this knowledge, we then set out the details of our formal model in Section 4. We formally define values by introducing value taxonomies, which cover concepts including value relations, value importance, and value semantics. We discuss how individuals or groups may hold values, how values change with context and time, and how our proposed model can support reasoning about the value alignment of behaviours. With the formal model in place, we undertake, in Section 5, a detailed mapping back to social psychology to assess the relationship of our modelling choices with this research. This is a critical step in ensuring and demonstrating exactly how our model is consistent with the research in this field. In Section 6, we present a roadmap of AI research that needs to be undertaken to achieve value-aligned behaviour. We close with a reflection on the contributions and

further work in Section 7 along with some concluding remarks in Section 8.

2. Promoting Values as a fundamental construct for AI

Human values have been heavily investigated within the humanities and social sciences to understand their role in behaviour choice and our attitudes towards various states of affairs. Schwartz, one of the prominent social psychologists working in the field of human values and well-recognised for theories of intrinsic human values, stated that “theorists have long considered values central to understanding social behaviour... because they view values as deeply rooted, abstract motivations that guide, justify, and explain attitudes, norms, opinions, and actions” [75].

Like Scharwtz and many AI researchers, we recognise the criticality of factoring in values for automated reasoning. This is necessary both to guide the operation of AI itself and to build AI systems that support individual and collective human decision-making. Traditionally, AI has used different human-associated qualities to guide behaviour, from calculating reward or utility (such as game theory [11, 58]), or following (or not) the norms of a community or society (normative systems [1, 82]), to the internal beliefs, goals and intentions inspired by cognitive sciences (agent BDI models [20, 22, 68]), to name a few. However, as AI becomes increasingly prevalent in our everyday lives and issues arise around the trust we have in AI systems, it is becoming increasingly critical to consider how we design AI systems that can explicitly reason over human values. Significant research has made a compelling case for using human values in the design of ethical artificial systems [12, 31, 74, 90]. There is a need to design artificial systems that can explicitly reason about values to determine behaviour choices and, subsequently, communicate to various stakeholders how that value-based reasoning occurred. But how can we best incorporate values into the range of other primary constructs in AI that guide behaviour, such as norms or beliefs, for example?

In Scharwtz’s article on the Theory of Basic Values [77], he asks, “How do values relate to attitudes, beliefs, traits and norms”? He states, “[w]hen trying to explain why individuals behave as they do, people often refer to attitudes, beliefs, traits, or norms.” We agree that the constructs guiding human behaviour are numerous, resulting in complex decision-making processes that select certain behaviours over others. As we illustrate in Figure 1, there are many factors, both at the individual and at the collective level, which influence action choice and the resulting behaviour.

Examples are an individual’s traits, beliefs, goals, norms and values, or the values and norms of collectives. This list is not exhaustive, but it aims to illustrate the complexity of the decision-making process individually and collectively.

Investigating the dynamics between the constructs influencing behaviour is an issue that requires further scrutiny, as we later discuss in our roadmap in Section 6. Here, we argue that values should be elevated to a primary construct alongside beliefs, intentions, and norms (some of the constructs traditionally considered in AI-driven decision-making). We do so by drawing on the range and depth of investigations into values from social psychology.

We introduce values as a critical motivator of behaviour choice in Figure 1. In the past, research into AI considered mechanisms for behaviour choice with respect to beliefs, goals and intentions, as well as norms and maximising utility. One question was how behaviours can be understood in terms of (or aligned with) these key constructs. Now, research efforts aim to understand how values influence decisions about behaviour and how this behaviour aligns with human values.

But how can value alignment of behaviour with values be analysed? Figure 1 illustrates how the actions of human or artificial agents change the world. They result in observable outcomes that can be used to evaluate chosen behaviour. Note that we use the words action and behaviour interchangeably in this paper.

If the outcome of a chosen behaviour results in a state of the world that




Figure 1: Influencers of behaviour, and evaluating behaviour w.r.t. its alignment with values

respects, upholds or promotes a given value, we say that the behaviour that brought about that outcome is *aligned* with that value. Furthermore, it means that the processes which selected that action/behaviour —i.e. whatever constructs were used to make that behaviour choice, be it a norm, a personal belief, some combination, and so on— are also aligned with that value. In other words, by evaluating the outcome of behaviour (bottom layer in Figure 1), we can extrapolate to assess the behaviour itself (middle layer) and the constructs bringing about that behaviour (top layer).

Evaluating a given behaviour and the decision-making process that produces it opens the door to AI (as well as AI-supported human) deliberation about why decisions were made and how they should be made in the future by considering the role of values.

We end this section by noting that the motivation for introducing values into AI reasoning and decision-making, as presented in the discussion above, is based on assuming the capability of evaluating outcomes (or states of the world) with respect to values. However, an explicit computational model for values is needed to achieve this. This is precisely the aim of this paper and will be presented in Section 4. But before we do, we first consider research into values from social psychology to help us understand what values are and which will provide the foundation from which we design our computational model.

3. Understanding Investigations in Human Values from Social Psychology

A significant body of work has set out to define or characterise values from the humanities and social sciences. Rohan [71] acknowledges that “[d]efinitional inconsistency has been epidemic in values theory and research”, and that “[t]he status of values theory and research suffers because the word values is open to abuse and overuse by non-psychologists and psychologists alike.” Kluckhohn [38] expands further on this:

“Reading the voluminous, and often vague and diffuse, literature on the subject in the various fields of learning, one finds values considered as attitudes, motivations, objects, measurable quantities, substantive areas of behavior, affect-laden customs or traditions, and relationships such as those between individuals, groups, objects, events.”

As such, before proposing our formal model for values, we first investigate the range of different value definitions from the values literature. Figure 2

provides a selection of those definitions from two review papers from social psychology [13, 71]. We have set out to colour code this diagram to identify the various qualities characterising values and to support the reader in understanding where consensus lies or does not.

- The text highlighted in yellow identifies the different characterisations of values as either conceptions [34, 38], beliefs [27, 72, 76], principles [9], or convictions [88].
- The text highlighted in orange illustrates how theorists agree on values referring to either outcomes or actions. Within outcomes, the different terminology used includes end states [72, 76] or goals [9, 27] (also referred to as ends of action [34, 38]). Within actions, the different terminology used includes referring directly to actions [35, 9] or ways of behaving [27] (also referred to as modes of conduct [9, 72, 76], or modes and means of action [34, 38]).
- The text in green highlights the various proposals on the purpose of values. It includes guiding or influencing behaviour [42]. This is also referred to as influencing the selection of modes, means and ends of actions [38, 34], or guiding selection or evaluation of behaviour, people, and events [76]. Other values-related purposes include leading a good life or realising a good society [88].
- The blue text identifies how researchers describe what is desirable, preferable or important [9, 27, 30, 34, 38, 72, 76].
- The text highlighted in pink illustrates how values apply to the level of the individual and to that of groups, communities or collectives [9, 30, 34, 38, 72, 88].

In our proposal for defining values, we remain neutral on whether values are considered beliefs, principles, convictions, or anything else identified above or in other research. However, we adopt the other aspects of values outlined above, as many theorists’ outputs show significant agreement. Namely, values guide behaviour by considering what actions or outcomes are desirable or essential for either individuals or collectives.

In other words, we propose our formal model for value representation by distilling the consensus of social psychology and building from there. This will allow us to meet one of our guiding principles described in the introduction; we do not identify with any specific theory of values (principle 7). We do not, for example, take Schwartz’s defined set of ten “universal”

Kluckhohn [38, p.395]. A value is “a **conception**, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an **individual**, or characteristic of a **group**, of the **desirable** which **influences the selection** from available **modes, means, and ends of action**”.

Lewin [42, p.41]. “Values **influence behavior** but have not the character of a goal (i.e., of a force field)... the individual does not try to ‘reach’ the value of fairness, but fairness is **‘guiding’ his behavior**... values are not force fields but they “induce” force fields.”

Guth and Tagiuri [34, p.124–125]. “A value can be viewed as a **conception**, explicit or implicit, of what an **individual** or a **group** regards as **desirable**, and in terms of which he or they **select**, from among alternative available **modes, the means and ends of action**”.

Hutcheon [35, p.184]. “... values are not the same as ideals, norms, desired objects, or espoused beliefs about the ‘good’, but are, instead, **operating criteria** for **action**...”.

Rokeach [72, p.5]. “A value is an enduring **belief** that a specific **mode of conduct** or **end-state of existence** is **personally** or **socially preferable** to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”.

Schwartz [76, p.20]. A value is “a **belief** pertaining to **desirable end states** or **modes of conduct** that transcends specific situations; **guides selection or evaluation of behavior, people, and events**; and is ordered by the **importance** relative to other values to form a system of value priorities”.

Feather [27, p.222]. “I regard values as **beliefs** about **desirable or undesirable ways of behaving** or about the desirability or otherwise of general **goals**.”

Braithwaite and Blamey [9, p.364]. “Values... are **principles** for **action** encompassing abstract **goals in life** and **modes of conduct** that an **individual** or a **collective** considers **preferable** across contexts and situations”.

Friedman et al. [30, p.349]. “A value refers to what a **person** or **group** of people consider **important** in life”.

van de Poel and Royackers [88, p.72]. Values are “lasting **convictions** or **matters that people feel should be strived for** in general and **not just for themselves** to be able to **lead a good life** or **realize a good society**”.

Figure 2: A selection of value definitions, adapted from [13, 71]. Text highlighted in yellow describes the nature of values, orange describes what values refer to or the issues they address, green describes the purpose of values or what they are for, blue highlights the notion of what is important or desirable, and pink describes who holds values or to whom they apply.

human values [77], or any other value theory [13], as the definitive theory. We follow in the footsteps of some value-sensitive design approaches [19], which argue that values are open-ended and should be elicited bottom-up from stakeholders. Whilst there is evidence for humans sharing fundamental human values (as illustrated by Schwartz [77]), there is also evidence that new values are continuously emerging with new application domains and technologies (as shown by van de Poel [87]). Our ongoing fieldwork and collaboration with stakeholders in real-life use cases from various domains further validated this. For example, Subsection 4.2.2 illustrates how a social networking app can prioritise different values for different communities, and our work with firefighters illustrates how values may also change from one geographical location to another (such as the values of the firefighters in Costa Rica being categorically different than those in Catalonia). In summary, the view that values may change is central to our model; hence, we must remain agnostic toward the selected value theory and accommodate value change.

We now move to a presentation of our formal model in Section 4. This will then be followed by a thorough analysis of the alignment of our proposal with selected works from social psychology in Section 5.

4. A Formal Computational Model for Human Values

Taking as our starting point the body of research from social psychology described in the previous section, we set out to build a formal computational model for representing human values. This computational approach for representing values provides the foundations for future developments of computational mechanisms that reason over values, promoting the ability of artificial systems to make value-aware decisions.

The proposed computational model of human values is presented in four subsections. The first subsection details a formal definition of values through the notion of value taxonomies, which covers concepts like value relations, value importance, and value semantics. The second subsection extends our model to consider the widely held belief that values change over time, providing an initial account of the dynamic nature of values. To achieve this, we introduce the notion of contexts, enabling agents to evaluate their current values within their current situation to determine future behaviour. The third discusses modelling values for individuals and groups of individuals, which we call collectives. In our proposal, a collective is a hybrid multiagent system containing artificial and human individuals, such as online communities or other organisational setups. The final subsection considers

the problem of ensuring the extent (or degree) to which the behaviours of individuals or collectives are aligned with an agreed set of values; the *value alignment problem*. A formal description of value alignment is then specified, demonstrating some of the utility of our model, which is the capability to formally capture some of the key research questions in our research field.

Each of those four subsections is divided into three parts: our proposal, a discussion of implementation choices arising from the model, and a running descriptive example of a system we have developed that demonstrates a concrete implementation choice. The running example is introduced to support the reader in understanding our proposed foundational model and its significance.

4.1. What are human values? A computational response to value representation

As per Section 3, we take values to be human abstract concepts that guide behaviour and whose exact meaning and interpretation vary both with the current context and over time. However, a concrete computational representation of values requires a machine to reason with values. For example, while one may talk about fairness in general, for a specific application supporting a mutual aid community, fairness might be understood as “one does not ask for help more than what they volunteer”. That is, the abstract concept of fairness acquires a concrete definition (grounding semantics) through a *property* whose satisfaction (or degree of satisfaction) can be automatically verified in a given system (more on this example in Subsection 4.1.2). In this case, the property specifies that a user does not ask for more help than that which they volunteer.

Of course, there may be different levels of abstraction and grounding semantics for a value. For example, say the application was to be adopted by another community where volunteers explicitly support older people. The new community might find the old view of fairness—that one only asks for help precisely what they have volunteered—unsuitable because this community expects to have volunteers who support older people. In contrast, older people usually only ask for help with their day-to-day tasks without volunteering. As such, this new community should state that fairness is not about balanced give and take but about balanced volunteer workload division. Here, we encounter different levels of abstraction and grounding properties, illustrated in Figure 3.

The top node in Figure 3 presents the abstract concept of fairness; the middle nodes show different concepts of fairness that are more specific than the top node, (such as reciprocity, which is understood as balanced give and




Figure 3: Different levels of abstraction for the value fairness, with various grounding semantics: numbers indicate node importance

take, or fair treatment that may be defined in terms of balanced division of workload), highlighting different abstraction levels and interpretations, and the bottom nodes present properties that ground the semantics of abstract concepts and allow for a computational evaluation of values. For example, the bottom left node represents the grounding semantics of fairness for the mutual aid community. Conversely, the bottom right node represents the grounding semantics of fairness for the community supporting older people. We use square nodes for nodes that ground the semantics of abstract concepts.

This interplay between the abstract and the grounding semantics of values is reflected through the relations between nodes, as shown in Figure 3. Different abstraction levels may exist for value concepts and grounding semantics that enable computational approaches over values.

Another key concept in social psychology is that of value priority, which determines how *important* a value is for individuals or collectives. In other words, it is not just the semantics of fairness that influences the behaviour of an individual or a group, but how important fairness as a value is for that individual or group. As Schwartz articulates in [77]: “Values influence action when they are relevant in the context... and important to the actor”. We model *value importance* by attaching a measure of *importance* to each node of Figure 3. As for Schwartz’s reference to value relevance, that is defined in terms of value importance, as we illustrate in Subsection 4.2.

Given our view of values having different abstraction levels and different grounding semantics, we propose values to be defined through taxonomies where the general concept becomes more specific as one travels down the taxonomy, and it becomes concrete and computational at (some) leaf nodes. This is consistent with research in value-sensitive design on value change taxonomies [87], as well as more traditional value theories that introduce

value hierarchies, such as Schwartz’s Theory of Basic Values [77] (Subsection 5.2 elaborates in detail on the alignment of our proposed taxonomy with some of the works in social psychology).

Furthermore, using taxonomies allows for easy navigation between abstract and concrete grounding semantics of values, which is especially useful when deciding how to define values, how they evolve, and how to deliberate and negotiate with others about these values (more on this in Section 6). It may be argued that all a machine requires are the property nodes to ensure behaviour alignment with values (as illustrated in Subsection 4.4). However, in the case of a new community emerging, such as the community of volunteers supporting older people, we saw how the new community had its local and distinct view of the fairness value. A taxonomy representation makes the deliberation process on the different semantics of fairness and the evolution of these semantics over time and context possible. We expect semantics to continuously evolve with new interaction requirements, as seen in Subsection 4.2. Moreover, a taxonomy can support the deliberation process over values and their importance.

We conclude this discussion with Definition 1, which proposes representing values through taxonomies by defining a value taxonomy \mathcal{V} as a triple of nodes N (where nodes can be of two types, nodes representing abstract concepts N_l and property nodes that ground abstract concepts N_ϕ), edges between those nodes E that describe the relations between value concepts (which is more general/specific than which), and an importance function I which is a total or a partial mapping from the nodes to a number.

Definition 1 (Value taxonomy). *A value taxonomy $\mathcal{V} = (N, E, I)$ is defined as a directed acyclic graph, where:*

1. *The set of nodes $N = N_l \cup N_\phi$ represents value concepts, and it is composed of two types of nodes: i) those that are specified through labels, with $N_l \subset \mathbf{L}$ representing the set of label nodes and \mathbf{L} is the set of all value labels representing abstract value concepts like ‘fairness’ or ‘reciprocity’; and ii) those that are specified through concrete properties, with $N_\phi \subset \Phi$ representing the set of property nodes and Φ is the set of all value properties whose satisfaction can be automatically verified at different world states, such as having the number of times one offers help in a mutual aid community to be greater than the number of times one asks for help.*
2. *The set of edges $E : N \times N$ is a set of directed edges $(n_p, n_c) \in E$ that represent the relation between value concepts n_p and n_c (the parent*

and child nodes, respectively) illustrating that the value concept n_p is a more general concept than n_c .

3. The importance function $I : N \rightarrow CD_{\perp}$ either assigns an importance measure from the codomain CD to value concepts in N , or assigns \perp to value concepts when their importance measure is undefined.

Note that we specify the value taxonomy as a directed acyclic graph, as opposed to the more traditional taxonomy tree, because certain value concepts (nodes) may be used to narrow the understanding of more than one general concept: i.e. one value concept (node) may have more than one parent node. For example, the value ‘equal treatment’ in the taxonomy of Figure 4 can act as a more specific concept for both the ‘social justice’ and ‘equality’ values (where the social justice and equality values and their being examples of the universalism value are taken from Schwartz’s value hierarchies [77]).




Figure 4: Some value concepts may have more than one parent node

We also require property nodes to be restricted to leaf nodes. In other words, the concrete grounding semantics of a value concept (specified as a property node) cannot be more general than another value concept (specified as another property or label node). For example, in Figure 3, the property of having one’s help requests proportionate to their volunteering offers cannot be more general than abstract concepts such as balanced give and take. This requirement is defined formally as follows by stating that there is no pair of parent/child nodes in any set of edges where the parent node is a property node:

$$\nexists (n_p, n_c) \in E \cdot n_p \in N_{\phi}$$

As we illustrate next, we introduce this condition to simplify the construction and interpretation of value taxonomies. Recall that the children nodes of any parent are more specific than that parent. Conceptually speaking, it is arguably paradoxical for concrete property nodes to be parents of abstract value concepts specified through labels. However, we may allow a

property node to be a parent node of another property node if we ensure that the parent node’s property subsumes the child node’s property. This, however, would require mechanisms that check the subsumption of properties. Furthermore, we illustrate in Subsection 4.4 how property nodes are used to assess value alignment. Value alignment is computed based on the satisfaction of the different property nodes. Suppose property nodes may appear anywhere in a taxonomy. In that case, a question that arises is whether all property nodes should be treated equally or whether the depth of a property node might affect its weight and, hence, the value alignment computation. For all these reasons, we choose to simplify the structure of value taxonomies for the time being by restricting property nodes to leaf nodes. Future work may relax this requirement if property subsumption mechanisms are introduced and value alignment mechanisms are designed to consider the location of property nodes in a taxonomy.

Coherence is an important property regarding value importance within a well-defined taxonomy. We articulate this coherence by requiring that a parent node’s importance be aligned with the importance of its child nodes. For example, if the importance of all children nodes is low, then the importance of the parent node cannot be high, and vice versa. We formally define the coherence of value importance to hold in a taxonomy if and only if all parent nodes’ importance measures are an aggregation of their children nodes’ measures:

Definition 2 (Coherence of value importance). *Importance within a value taxonomy $\mathcal{V} = (N, E, I)$ is said to be coherent if and only if, for all nodes $n \in N$ with children nodes (there exists $(n, n_c) \in E$), the importance of the parent node is an aggregation of the importance of its children nodes:*

$$\forall n \in \{n_p \mid (n_p, n_c) \in E\} \cdot I(n) = \mathbf{A}_{n' \in X_n} I(n') \quad (1)$$

where $X_n = \{n_c \mid (n, n_c) \in E\}$ is the set of all children nodes of n , and $\mathbf{A} : CD^m \rightarrow CD$ is an aggregation function that takes a set of size $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ of importance measures in CD (specified as CD^m) and returns an aggregation of those measures, where the aggregation also falls in the same range CD .

The importance measures of some of the taxonomy nodes might either be provided manually by humans or learned from other sources, such as past interactions or experiences. A coherence mechanism is then needed to ensure importance measures are coherent within a taxonomy. Furthermore, propagation mechanisms could be constructed to calculate the importance of

nodes that have not been provided, building on existing propagation mechanisms [60, 61]. Any propagation mechanism must respect the coherence of value importance within the taxonomy.

Let us now consider the aggregation function \mathbf{A} . We argue that symmetry, idempotence and monotonicity, which we define below, are some of the desirable properties to be held by any such function. Symmetry states that the ordering of the importance measures being aggregated does not matter; it is precisely what we require from our model. For instance, when calculating a parent node's importance, ordering its children nodes' importance measures should not affect the aggregation (symmetry). Idempotence states that the aggregation of several instances of the same measure results in that measure, which is also what we require from our model. If we assume all children nodes of some parent node to have the same importance i , then we believe the parent node should share that importance too (idempotence). It should neither be more important nor less important than i . Monotonicity states that any increase in the importance of aggregated measures implies a non-decrease with respect to the aggregated value, which is, again, what we require from our model. Increasing any importance measure of the children nodes should not decrease the parent node's importance (monotonicity).

Formal definitions of these properties follow.

Property 1 (Symmetry of aggregation). *The aggregation function \mathbf{A} is symmetric if, for all sets of importance measures $\lambda \in CD^m$ and all permutations $\pi \in \Pi_\lambda$ of those sets (where Π_λ is the set of all permutations of λ), we have:*

$$\mathbf{A}(\lambda) = \mathbf{A}(\pi)$$

The symmetry property states that the ordering of aggregated values does not matter.

Property 2 (Idempotence of aggregation). *An aggregation function \mathbf{A} is idempotent if, for all importance measures $i \in CD$, we have:*

$$\mathbf{A}(i, \dots, i) = i$$

The idempotence property states that aggregating several instances of the same measure will return that same measure.

Property 3 (Monotonicity of aggregation). *An aggregation function \mathbf{A} is monotonous if, for all sets of importance measures $\lambda, \lambda' \in CD^m$, we have:*

$$(\forall 0 < p \leq m \cdot \lambda_p \leq \lambda'_p) \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\lambda) \leq \mathbf{A}(\lambda')$$

where λ_p represents the element in position p of the set λ .

The monotonicity property states that if the measures in set λ are smaller than or equal to the measures of λ' (per position), then the aggregation of the measures of λ should be smaller than or equal to the aggregation of the measures of λ' .

Our requirements for Properties 1–3 help define the type of aggregation operator, as we show next. First, from [49, p. 14], we know that the idempotence and monotonicity properties imply compensativeness.

Proposition 1. *If an aggregation function \mathbf{A} satisfies the idempotence and monotonicity properties (Properties 2 and 3), then \mathbf{A} is a compensative aggregation.*

Compensative operators are the class of aggregation operators that fall outside the classes of conjunctive and disjunctive operators. These operators are limited between the min and max, which are the bounds of the t-norm and t-conorm families (the operations that generalise the logical conjunction and logical disjunction). This implies that for any set of importance measures (for all $\lambda \in CD^m$), the aggregation will fall between the minimum and maximum measures in that set:

$$\min \lambda \leq \mathbf{A}(\lambda) \leq \max \lambda$$

We believe falling between the minimum and maximum is appropriate for our context: a parent node should not be more important than its most important child node nor less important than its least important child node.

Furthermore, from [49, p. 13], we also know that compensative aggregation operators that satisfy the symmetry and monotonicity properties are averaging operators.

Proposition 2. *If a compensative aggregation function \mathbf{A} satisfies the symmetry and monotonicity properties (Properties 1 and 3), then \mathbf{A} is an averaging operator.*

As such, we propose \mathbf{A} to be an averaging operator, though the exact choice of this operator is left for implementation.

4.1.1. Implementation Choices

Specifying property nodes. We use properties to specify the grounding semantics of values, as properties have traditionally been used to describe the world state, and their satisfaction can be computed [84]. The exact language used for specifying properties is an implementation decision. Our proposal is agnostic regarding the choice of language: we intentionally do not attach our

proposal to any implementation language or decision. Our framework can encompass any theory written in propositional, first-order, deontic, modal and other logics.

We note that the use of properties might initially appear to embody a consequentialist view, where only the outcome of behaviour is what matters. However, in our model, properties can be designed to evaluate not only action outcomes but also attached to actions themselves (such as whether an action is permitted, e.g. lying is never acceptable). The expressiveness of the chosen language for implementing properties plays a significant role here.

However, in this paper, and as illustrated in our example in Subsection 4.1.2, we expressly limit the examples to propositional logic and, more specifically, simple propositions to improve readability. Complex languages with higher expressivity can be chosen. Alternative and more simplified approaches may also be investigated. For example, one may choose to describe the world state through percepts instead of properties, where the detection of percepts can also be verified or checked. Again, this is an implementation choice. The bottom line is that the satisfaction of property nodes must be computationally verifiable.

Choosing the codomain of value importance. Concerning the importance measure of a value concept, choosing the codomain CD that evaluates this importance I is also an implementation decision. Schwartz, for instance, uses the range $\{-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ for people to specify the importance of a value, such as ‘equality’ (equal opportunity for all) or ‘pleasure’ (gratification of desires), as a guiding principle in their lives, where -1 represented opposing a value, 0 represented considering the value to be non-important, and positive numbers meant different degrees of supporting a value (‘supreme importance’, ‘very important’, ‘important’, and so on) [77]. Other ranges may be considered. For example, importance could be specified as a number in the range $[0, 1]$, where 0 represents complete non-importance of a value, and 1 represents its utmost importance, or a number in the range $[-1, 1]$, where -1 represents opposing a value, 1 represents utmost importance, and 0 represents indifference; or even a number from the set of integers \mathbb{Z} that does not limit the degree of importance/opposition.

Of course, alternative approaches, such as defining importance measures as ranges instead of specific numbers or even a normal distribution, may also be considered. Another possible approach is to define importance as a partial or total order instead of having a codomain. In fact, Schwartz argues that this order (the relevant importance) should be used when reasoning

about values, where the order is deduced from the importance assigned by people [77].

A partial order might be more intuitive for humans to provide, as opposed to giving numerical importance measures. Human stakeholders may use partial orders to specify importance measures when this is the case. As partial orders can easily be translated into numeric values, this fits our proposal in Definition 1. An example of translating partial orders into numerical values is provided by Serramia et al. [81].

The implementation choice must depend on the specific application’s requirements. For example, when discussing the values of a medical use case, all three doctors involved in the discussion concurred that (at least at their hospital) justice was the most important value (understood as requiring appropriate distribution of benefits, risks, and costs fairly), followed by non-maleficency (requiring not causing harm to others), then autonomy (requiring respect for the decision-making capacities of autonomous persons) and finally beneficence (requiring the prevention of harm, providing benefits, and balancing benefits against risks and costs).

In the example of this paper, we set the codomain to $[-1, 1]$ as reasoning with numbers is computationally easier than reasoning with partial orders. Furthermore, the range $[-1, 0]$ is more intuitive for describing opposition to a value. This expands Schwartz’s opposition measures, as there may also be degrees in opposing a value, like there are degrees in supporting a value. The choice to limit the range to $[-1, 1]$, as opposed to (say) \mathbb{Z} , is an arbitrary choice. Recall that partial orders provided by stakeholders can easily be translated into the chosen range $[-1, 1]$, as illustrated above.

Ensuring the coherence of value importance. As for the aggregation function \mathbf{A} that ensures the coherence of value importance within a taxonomy, different averaging operators may be investigated. In this paper, we propose a simple average:

$$I(n_p) = \frac{\sum_{n_c \in X_{n_p}} I(n_c)}{|X_{n_p}|} \quad (2)$$

As argued above, we assume the importance measure of some of the nodes to either be provided manually or learned from ongoing behaviour. A propagation mechanism may then be implemented to calculate the importance of nodes that still need to be manually provided or learned. Different propagation mechanisms may be investigated to check the coherence of existing importance measures as they propagate those measures to other

nodes while ensuring the overall coherence of value importance within the taxonomy (following Definition 2). One sample propagation mechanism is presented in Algorithm 1.

The algorithm starts with the PROPAGATE function (line 1), by obtaining all root nodes and then commencing the propagation process with each of these nodes. This is achieved by calling the PROPAGATE2 function (lines 2 and 3). This function is recursive. After it propagates importance measures with respect to a given node, it moves on to continue the propagation with respect to the children nodes (lines 29 and 43). When propagating for a given node, either we attempt to propagate the importance measure down to its children nodes if the node already has an importance measure assigned to it (case of lines 12–29), or we attempt to propagate the importance measures of the children up if the node does not have an importance measure assigned to it (case of lines 30–43).

Nothing must be done when propagating down if the node has no children nodes (line 13). If the node has no children nodes with no assigned importance measures, then nothing needs to be propagated, but the algorithm checks whether the parent node’s importance measure is coherent with those of its children nodes. If it is not, the algorithm prints an error message and halts (case starting with line 14). If there is exactly one child node with no assigned importance, and regardless of how many children nodes do have assigned importance measures, then the child node with no importance measure is assigned the measure that makes the parent node’s importance measure the average of those of its children (case starting with line 19). Suppose there are several (more than one) children nodes with no assigned importance measures, and all of those nodes do not have any descendants with assigned importance measures. In that case, we calculate the sum of those nodes so that the parent node’s importance measure is the average of those of its children. Then, we assume that the sum is divided equally amongst all the children nodes with no assigned importance measures (case starting with line 22). Finally, if there are several (more than one) children nodes without assigned importance measures, and at least one of those nodes does have a descendant with an assigned importance measure, then no propagation takes place (case starting with line 27). This is because those specific nodes require careful consideration to ensure their coherence with both their ancestor and descendant nodes. So, calculating their importance measure is postponed.

Nothing must be done when propagating up if the node has no children nodes (line 31). If all the children nodes have assigned importance measures, then the importance of the parent node becomes the average of its children

Algorithm 1 Propagation algorithm for value importance

Require: N to be a set of nodes, E to be set of edges between nodes ($E : N \times N$), and I to describe the importance assigned to nodes in N ($I : N \times [-1, 1]$).

Require: $\text{GETROOTS}(N, E)$ returns roots in N , given edges E ; $\text{CHILDREN}(n)$ returns children of n ; $\text{VAL}(n)$ returns importance of n ; $\text{VSUM}(N)$ returns sum of the importance of nodes in N , and $\text{DVW}(N)$ returns true if some descendant of N has its importance set, false otherwise.

```
1: function PROPAGATE( $N, E, I$ )
2:    $Roots \leftarrow \text{GETROOTS}(N, E)$ ;
3:    $I^t \leftarrow \text{PROPAGATE2}(Roots, E, I)$ ;
4:   return  $I^t$ 
5: end function
6: function PROPAGATE2( $Nodes, E, I$ )
7:   do
8:     for  $n \in Nodes$  do
9:        $C \leftarrow \text{CHILDREN}(n)$ ;
10:       $C' \leftarrow \{c' \in C \mid \text{VAL}(c') \neq \text{nil}\}$ ;
11:       $C'' \leftarrow C \setminus C'$ ;
12:      if  $\text{VAL}(n) \neq \text{nil}$  then
13:        if  $C == \emptyset$  then ▷ do nothing
14:          else if  $|C''| == 0$  then
15:            if  $\text{VAL}(n) \neq (\text{VSUM}(C)/|C|)$  then
16:              output "ERROR with  $n$ 's value"
17:              return nil
18:            end if
19:          else if  $C'' == \{c''\}$  then
20:             $imp \leftarrow (\text{VAL}(n) \times |C|) - \text{VSUM}(C')$ ;
21:             $I^t = (c'', imp) \cup I^t$ ;
22:          else if  $|C''| > 1 \wedge \neg \text{DWV}(C'')$  then
23:             $imp \leftarrow ((\text{VAL}(n) \times |C|) - \text{VSUM}(C')) / |C''|$ ;
24:            for  $c'' \in C''$  do
25:               $I^t = (c'', imp) \cup I^t$ ;
26:            end for
27:          else ▷ do nothing
28:          end if
29:           $I^t \leftarrow \text{PROPAGATE2}(C, E, I^t)$ ;
30:        else
31:          if  $C == \emptyset$  then ▷ do nothing
32:          else if  $|C''| == 0 \wedge |C'| > 0$  then
33:             $imp \leftarrow \text{VSUM}(C') / |C'|$ ;
34:             $I^t = (n, imp) \cup I^t$ ;
35:          else if  $|C'| > 0 \wedge \neg \text{DWV}(C')$  then
36:             $imp \leftarrow \text{VSUM}(C') / |C'|$ ;
37:             $I^t = (n, imp) \cup I^t$ ;
38:            for  $c'' \in C''$  do
39:               $I^t = (c'', imp) \cup I^t$ ;
40:            end for
41:          else ▷ do nothing
42:          end if
43:           $I^t \leftarrow \text{PROPAGATE2}(C, E, I^t)$ ;
44:        end if
45:      end for
46:      while  $I^t \neq I$ 
47: end function
```

nodes (case starting with line 32). Suppose some of the children nodes have an assigned importance measure, and some do not, and all of the latter’s descendants have no descendants with assigned importance measures. In that case, there is no information from the descendants, and as such, we can only use the information from the children nodes with assigned importance measures. So, we take the average of the available measures of children nodes and assign it to the parent node. Then we propagate downwards again by assigning that importance measure to those children nodes with no assigned importance (case starting with line 35). In all other cases, we do nothing.

The algorithm repeats until no new importance measures are propagated (line 46).

Please note that Algorithm 1 has been implemented in Prolog, and the code is available on SWISH.¹

4.1.2. The Running uHelp Example

The running example that we use throughout this subsection is uHelp. uHelp is a fully implemented app² developed at IIIA-CSIC within a team which includes the first author of this article. It is available on Google Play³ and the Apple Store.⁴ The app is a social networking app that was initially designed to support people in finding help within their social network with their day-to-day activities, such as finding someone to substitute another at work tomorrow or someone to lend chairs for a party [40, 39, 59].

To support the reader’s better understanding of our formal model described in this subsection, we will specifically consider the value *fairness*. This value emerged as essential in the participatory design meetings we held with potential app users.

As mentioned, we choose not to confine our model to predefined value systems, like Schwartz’s renowned universal human values [77], but opt for values that may emerge from different stakeholders. In our case, fairness arose as a candidate value through various discussions with uHelp’s potential users.

We note here that recognising the relevant high-level values (root nodes

¹The code is available at: <https://gitlab.iiia.csic.es/-/snippets/32>. The `nodes`, `edges`, and `importance` predicates help define the value taxonomy. Running `?-propagate(X)` will return the importance of the remaining nodes, satisfying coherence. If there is any incoherence in the input values, the user is informed and propagation halts.

²<https://uhelpapp.com>

³<https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=es.csic.iiia.uhelpapp>

⁴<https://itunes.apple.com/es/app/uhelp/id1089461370>

in the taxonomy) may be achieved either through a bottom-up approach, with the relevant values emerging from discussing the context with the relevant stakeholders, or through a top-down approach, with a given stakeholder handing the relevant values from prior knowledge. While fairness arose in a bottom-up approach within the uHelp application domain, in another use case within the medical field domain (specifically, in our discussions with doctors from Hospital del Mar, Barcelona), relevant values were pre-defined by the hospital. These were the four universal values of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice agreed upon within the medical profession [6, 5]. Though these four values were pre-defined, additional values such as cost efficiency, pain control, and quality of life emerged in our discussions with doctors. Our interactions with uHelp users, doctors, and firefighters (from yet another real-life use case with a fire department in Barcelona) provide evidence of how some relevant values are predefined by the relevant institutions and supplied in a top-down approach. In contrast, others emerge through discussions in a bottom-up approach.

After recognising the relevant high-level values, the rest of the taxonomy emerges from contemplating them and how they are understood in a given context. With new contexts, the taxonomy gets updated to consider the requirements of these contexts. For example, in the uHelp case, when discussing the application with a community of single parents (from Barcelona’s Association of Monoparental Families), fairness was understood as balanced give and take (see Figure 5). In other words, the users wanted members to refrain from being able to act in greedy ways by constantly asking for help and never offering it. But when we later considered uHelp for a community that supports older people, it was clear that this balanced give and take was against their values. This was because the community was designed to have volunteers who help members (older people) who (in the eyes of the stakeholders) should feel free and be able to volunteer themselves. A new understanding of fairness emerged: the balanced division of labour over volunteers. That is, while some community members will ask for help and others will provide it, the workload among those providing help should be balanced. This is a crucial lesson in how the higher-level values can remain the same (such as fairness), but the decision-making strategy for enacting those values changes in different contexts (balanced give-and-take versus balanced division of labour). As such, uHelp’s initial value taxonomy had the leftmost branch of Figure 5 specified. But when the community supporting older people appeared, the branch with a balanced division of labour emerged. For illustrative purposes and to present a richer taxonomy, we have added the rightmost branch that introduces fair reward as




Figure 5: uHelp’s value taxonomy for the value *fairness*

another aspect of fairness, which would fall along with the balanced division of labour under the abstract concept of proper treatment. Fitting reward reflects the idea that not all tasks should be considered equal, as some are more demanding than others. So, fair rewards would be considered. But as this value concept was never specified for uHelp, it does not have a property node that grounds it. This illustrates how uHelp’s value taxonomy for fairness has been shaped over time and contexts so that fairness is understood in terms of reciprocity and fair treatment, where reciprocity is understood as a balanced give and take and fair treatment is understood in terms of balanced division of labour as well as fitting reward. We follow by defining some of the grounding semantics of those abstract concepts, i.e., the property leaf nodes. Property nodes are presented as squares, whereas label nodes are shown as circles.

For illustrative purposes, we provide two different computational approaches defining balanced give and take in terms of properties p_1 and p_2 . The first states that one’s help requests are proportionate to the number of times the user offered help, whereas the second states that one’s help requests are proportional to the number of times the user was chosen to help (because not all those offering help get selected). One straightforward approach to specifying p_1 and p_2 is through the ratio of requests to offers/volunteering being greater than 1, as illustrated in property definitions 3 and 4. Of course, we provide simple properties for better readability. Still, we note that properties can get as complex as the language allows (remember that the choice of language for specifying properties is an implementation choice, and one may choose to work with highly expressive languages).

$$p_1 \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{\#requests}{\#offers} > 1 \quad (3)$$

$$p_2 \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{\#requests}{\#volunteering} > 1 \quad (4)$$

The two different properties for ‘balanced give and take’ illustrate how different semantics may be provided for the same abstract value. In this specific case, one can imagine p_2 to have been initially defined. However, some users are never chosen after some interactions despite volunteering. As such, the system prevents them from asking for help so that balanced give and take is respected. To compensate for this, p_1 gets added to the taxonomy so that balanced give and take considers the offers for help instead of being chosen. This illustrates how the taxonomy may evolve by learning from experience what the best grounding semantics (property) of a given abstract concept for a given context are.

The computational approach, or the property node, describes the balanced division of labour through property p_3 , which states that tasks are equally distributed amongst volunteers. One approach to specifying p_3 is through the difference between the uniform distribution U and the distribution D of the numbers of tasks assigned to each volunteer, where this difference should be smaller than a predefined threshold ϵ (property definition 5).

$$p_3 \stackrel{def}{=} \text{difference}(D, U) < \epsilon \quad (5)$$

The difference between two distributions may be calculated using approaches like the Kullback–Leibler divergence [48] or the earth mover’s distance [73].

This taxonomy does not specify the property node providing the grounding semantics for fair reward. Some abstract concepts may remain abstract for a while.

We note that while stakeholders discuss and agree on abstract concepts of values, engineers must define the properties that ground the semantics of those values. Alternatively, AI may be used to support constructing and updating these value taxonomies, such as by learning from past interactions. The construction of these taxonomies is one of the envisaged lines for future work, as discussed in Subsection 6.1.

A crucial feature of the value taxonomy is the importance of nodes. We imagine each context to have its own taxonomy with associated importance measures (see Subsection 4.2). As such, an adapted uHelp taxonomy for fairness will be made available for the community of single parents and another for the community supporting older people. However, whether importance measures are available for the general taxonomy of uHelp is application-dependent. uHelp may or may not define importance measures

for its general taxonomy for fairness. Nevertheless, for illustration purposes, we assume that it does.

Getting stakeholders to specify the importance of all nodes is usually challenging. Even if a partial order was provided, it might only cover some nodes. As such, we give an example where importance is assigned to a subset of these nodes. In this example (Figure 5), we represent importance measures explicitly provided through bold underlined numbers. From those, our propagation mechanism (Algorithm 1) can then calculate possible coherent importance measures for the remaining nodes, presented in regular font and non-underlined.

Finally, we have provided in this subsection the value taxonomy of one uHelp value, fairness. We imagine applications to have several relevant values and several such taxonomies. For example, for the medical case, doctors at Hospital del Mar have already recognised seven relevant values (as mentioned earlier). We then expect concurrent processing over these various taxonomies.

4.2. How do values change with context? Context-based value taxonomies

Our stance is that values are context-dependent and change over time. This is the stance of value-sensitive design [87], as well as the stance of many social psychologists before them [71]. We all have a general view of what a value is, defined through its taxonomy, and this view evolves with our experiences, where new nodes (label-based and property-based) are continuously added. If a new context requires adding new nodes, those are added to the general taxonomy. This is how these general taxonomies evolve with experiences. Suppose a new context necessitates eliminating existing nodes. This is achieved by setting their importance to zero for that specific context (if zero is the neutral-based measure of the chosen codomain). Moving from a general taxonomy to a context-based one is implemented by simply revisiting the importance measures of the general taxonomy (whether they were defined or not), making some nodes or branches more prominent than others. We note that if property-based leaf nodes did not exist for a prominent branch, they must be added to the general taxonomy. Otherwise, a computational approach considering those branches will not be possible.

A definition of a context-based value taxonomy is presented next, which states formally that a context-based taxonomy is an alteration of a general taxonomy where the importance measures are updated for the relevant context:

Definition 3 (Context-based value taxonomy). *A context-based taxonomy $\mathcal{V}_c = \{N, E, I_c\}$ is an alteration of a general taxonomy $\mathcal{V} = \{N, E, I\}$ where the importance of nodes are updated for the given context. The importance of nodes in the context-based taxonomy \mathcal{V}_c is independent of the importance of those nodes in the general taxonomy \mathcal{V} . The function calculating the importance of nodes with respect to a context c is defined as $I_c : N \rightarrow COD_{\perp}$, where COD_{\perp} defines the union of COD with the undefined variable (\perp).*

We reiterate that if new nodes need to be introduced, they are introduced to the general taxonomy before the context-based one is constructed.

Last, we say a context c may be defined by a set of properties $P_c \subseteq P$. The context c is then considered to hold ($holds(c)$)—that is, we can say that we are in that context—when its properties are satisfied: $(\forall p \in P_c (\models p)) \implies \models holds(c)$. Whilst this paper does not investigate the ramifications of this context definition further, we include it to give a high-level sense of how a system may set about detecting its current context in general.

4.2.1. Implementation Choices

Constructing Context-Based Taxonomies. Different mechanisms for evaluating the importance of nodes in context-based taxonomies may be developed. One implementation (Algorithm 2) is a bottom-up approach where only the importance of property nodes for the given context is evaluated (regardless of how they are obtained, whether they are provided manually by stakeholders or learnt from similar past experiences of similar contexts). The idea is that one can better assess the importance of concrete property nodes in specific contexts. Lines 3–6 assign new importance measures to the property nodes, assuming those measures have already been provided for this context, regardless of how they are obtained. The mechanisms for obtaining these measures, specified through function `GETIMPORTANCE`, are left for future work, as illustrated in Subsection 6.1. Then, to calculate the importance of the remaining nodes in the taxonomy, line 7 propagates importance measures to the rest of the taxonomy, following Algorithm 1 of Subsection 4.1.1.

Alternative implementations may be investigated. Rather than starting with property nodes and following a bottom-up approach, a top-down approach may be implemented to assess abstract concepts regardless of their grounding semantics. Sometimes, a mix of bottom-up/top-down approaches might be appropriate. The domain might suggest which approach is best.

Finally, we note that inconsistencies may arise between general and context-based taxonomies. This is expected and entirely normal. For example, while reciprocity might be considered very important as an abstract concept for the uHelp app, it might be regarded as less important for a specific context, such as for the community of volunteers supporting older people (see Subsection 4.2.2).

Visualising Taxonomies. In addition to constructing context-based taxonomies through updating importance measures and for improved visualisation, we propose an approach (Algorithm 3) that chops off parts of the taxonomy that are deemed irrelevant for a given context. This step is unnecessary but may be helpful when imagining growing taxonomies for a given context. This also helps stakeholders quickly ascertain the relevant nodes for any given context.

Different approaches may be followed when deciding which branches are relevant and may be visualised. Algorithm 3’s approach uses the importance of property nodes to determine the relevant branches of the taxonomy. The algorithm maintains the branches that lead to relevant property nodes and eliminates those that lead to irrelevant ones.

Again, different approaches may be followed when deciding which property nodes are relevant. In Algorithm 3, the irrelevant nodes are those with an importance of zero (lines 3–7). But based on the application, one can

Algorithm 2 Constructing context-based value taxonomies

Require: a general value taxonomy $\mathcal{V} = (N, E, I)$
Require: $N_\phi \subset N$ to be the set of property nodes in N
Require: a set of properties $P_c \in P$ that define the context c
Require: GETIMPORTANCE(n, P_c) to be a function that obtains the importance of node n within context c (the specification of this function is left for future work)

- 1: **function** CONTEXTTAXONOMY(\mathcal{V}, P_c)
- 2: $I_c^0 \leftarrow \emptyset$;
- 3: **for** $n \in N_\phi$ **do**
- 4: $I_c(n) \leftarrow \text{GETIMPORTANCE}(n, P_c)$;
- 5: $I_c^0 \leftarrow I_c(n) \cup I_c^0$;
- 6: **end for**
- 7: $I_c \leftarrow \text{PROPAGATE}(N, E, I_c^0)$;
- 8: **return** $(N, E, I_c^0 \cup I_c)$;
- 9: **end function**

imagine alternative implementations. For example, it could be decided that only property nodes with a positive importance are relevant. (It would also be possible to set another predefined threshold, other than 0, to filter relevant importance values.) An alternative would be using the k -means clustering algorithm [67] over the importance measures of all property nodes. With the parameter $k = 2$, the nodes will be divided into two sets, with the most important nodes grouped without needing a pre-defined threshold. These are just examples of possible implementations for deciding on relevant property nodes.

Going back to Algorithm 3, after selecting the relevant property nodes, the algorithm visualises the prominent branches of the taxonomy in lines 11–20 by keeping only the branches that lead to those relevant nodes.

Algorithm 3 Visualising value taxonomies

Require: a context-based value taxonomy $\mathcal{V}_c = (N, E, I_c)$

Require: $N_\phi \subset N$ to be the set of property nodes in N

```

1: function VISUALISETAXONOMY( $\mathcal{V}_c$ )
2:    $relevantNodes \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3:   for  $n \in N_\phi$  do
4:     if  $I_c(n) \neq 0$  then
5:        $relevantNodes \leftarrow \{n\} \cup relevantNodes$ ;
6:     end if
7:   end for
8:    $N_v \leftarrow relevantNodes$ ;
9:    $E_v \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
10:   $I_v \leftarrow \{I(n) \mid n \in relevantNodes\}$ ;
11:  do
12:     $N'_v \leftarrow N_v$ ;
13:    for  $n \in N_v$  do
14:      if  $(p, n) \in E \wedge p \notin N_v$  then
15:         $N_v \leftarrow p \cup N_v$ ;
16:         $E_v \leftarrow (p, n) \cup E_v$ ;
17:         $I_v \leftarrow I(p) \cup I_v$ ;
18:      end if
19:    end for
20:    while  $N'_v \neq N_v$ 
21:      return  $(N_v, E_v, I_v)$ ;
22:  end function

```

4.2.2. The Running uHelp Example

Figure 5 presented uHelp’s general taxonomy for fairness. This subsection presents examples of context-based taxonomies for different uHelp communities. As illustrated in Subsection 4.1.2, the first community to adopt uHelp was the community of single parents (whose context is specified as c_s). For them, fairness implied a balanced give and take. We can imagine that at the beginning, both the general and context-based taxonomy for the c_s community were defined through the taxonomy of Figure of fig:single-mothers-1. But as a new context is considered, which is that of the community supporting older people (whose context is specified as c_e), new nodes were added to the general taxonomy, resulting in (say) the taxonomy of Figure 5.

With this new general taxonomy for fairness, the community supporting older people decides that the requirement of having a proportionate number of help requests with respect to the number of help offers (p_1) or actual volunteering (p_2) is considered irrelevant. In contrast, the requirement that labour should be divided in a balanced way amongst all volunteers is of utmost importance. As such, the importance of the different property nodes of Figure 5 is specified accordingly:


$$I_{c_e}(p_1) = 0 \quad ; \quad I_{c_e}(p_2) = 0 \quad ; \quad I_{c_e}(p_3) = 0.9$$

The context-based taxonomy of this new community \mathcal{V}_{c_e} is constructed by Algorithm 2, and is visualised by Algorithm 3, which eliminates all branches leading to property nodes with zero importance, leaving us with one single branch leading to property node p_3 . The resulting taxonomy is presented in Figure 6c. The importance of the upper nodes inherits the importance of the property node, following Algorithm 1.


Now assume that with this new general taxonomy (Figure 5), the community of single parents decides to revisit their context-based taxonomy. They have become interested in the new grounding semantics that has emerged and decided that having requests proportionate to offers (p_1) and equally distributed amongst volunteers (p_3) are both essential properties. This new view is reflected in the importance measures they assign to the property nodes of Figure 5:

$$I_c(p_1) = 0.8 \quad ; \quad I_c(p_2) = 0 \quad ; \quad I_c(p_3) = 0.7$$


Algorithm 2 builds the new taxonomy \mathcal{V}'_{c_s} . Again, for visual clarity, Algorithm 3 eliminates the branches that lead to property nodes with zero importance. The result is the taxonomy presented in Figure 6b. As before, the importance of the upper nodes is calculated following Algorithm 1.



(a) \mathcal{V}_{c_s} for the community of single parents, which happens to be the same as the initial general uHelp taxonomy \mathcal{V}



(b) \mathcal{V}'_{c_s} for the updated context-based taxonomy for the community of single parents



(c) \mathcal{V}_{c_e} for a community of volunteers supporting the elderly

Figure 6: Different context-based value taxonomies for fairness in uHelp

4.3. Who holds values? Individuals versus collectives

Our stance is that entities hold values; values do not exist in isolation. In other words, there is no universal value taxonomy for the fairness value. Different people or groups will hold different views on values, leading to different taxonomies. We use the notation \mathcal{V}^x to represent the value taxonomy held by entity x , where x may represent an individual i_j or a collective $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$. We use the word collective to describe a group of interacting individuals (usually called members), which may be a community, an organisation, an institute, a society, or a culture. When a collective holds a value taxonomy, this is understood as the value taxonomy describing the values of the collective as a whole and not its individuals (or interacting members). Individuals may not all have their value taxonomy aligned with the collective's. The issue of how the collective agrees on its taxonomy is left for future work, as our proposed roadmap illustrates in Subsection 6.2. To simplify notation, in the rest of the paper, we drop the x from \mathcal{V}^x when it is clear who holds the taxonomy.

Humans and value-aware AI agents (as our model proposes) not only understand their own values or the values of the collectives they belong to, but they also observe others and form beliefs about the values of others. We use the notation $\mathcal{V}^{x>y}$ to represent what x believes to be the values of y , where each of x and y may represent an individual or a collective.

4.3.1. Implementation Choices

The issue at stake here is how to implement mechanisms that would take in the value taxonomies of a set of individuals and compute the taxonomy of the collective. This is a complex task, and the domain may dictate how collective values are specified. For example, in some cases, the company developing an assistive robot may pre-define the value taxonomy governing the behaviour of that robot. In another case, such as a hospital, a board of elected medical personnel will convene to collectively agree on the important values of their hospital and how they are lived out in practice. Yet, in other cases, such as with the uHelp application, one can imagine the entire community of users coming together to vote on their values. In other words, the rules dictating whose view should be considered when specifying the value taxonomies of a collective are dependent and left for future development (see Subsection 6.2).

Different mechanisms may be developed to construct collective values from individual ones. For example, negotiation and argumentation mechanisms can help individuals reach collective agreements on their values. Computational social choice may also be used to aggregate individual values into




Figure 7: Individual and collective value taxonomies for fairness in uHelp’s community of single parents

collective ones. We point the interested reader to ongoing work on this topic by Lera-Leri et al. [41], where the aggregation takes into consideration various ethical principles, such as utilitarian (maximum utility) or egalitarian (maximum fairness).

4.3.2. The Running uHelp Example

This subsection highlights how both individuals and collectives can hold value taxonomies. For example, imagine three uHelp members from the community of single parents who hold the taxonomies of Figures 7a–7c. Of course, more members would exist in reality, each with their own taxonomy, but for simplicity, we only show the taxonomies of three individuals. Given these taxonomies, the social choice mechanism of Lera-Leri et al. [41] can then be used to compute the importance of each property node for the collective. With those, the propagation mechanism of Algorithm 1 can propagate those to the rest of the tree. The resulting and final taxonomy is then shown in Figure 7d.

4.4. Why hold values? The value alignment problem

As presented in Section 2, it is well established that values are one of the primary motivators of behaviour. The main objective of the work on values in AI has been to ensure value-aligned behaviour by assessing the alignment of behaviour with values.

The property-based nodes of a value taxonomy introduce the foundations for linking abstract value concepts to concrete computational constructs that can help formally assess the alignment of behaviour with those values. The value alignment of an entity’s behaviour becomes the degree of satisfaction of the property-based value nodes of the relevant taxonomy that this behaviour brings about. In Definition 3, we have seen how importance is assigned to different nodes of a context-based taxonomy (we believe value alignment will be assessed within specific contexts, working with context-based value taxonomies as opposed to general ones). The evaluation of value alignment should consider these essential measures: the more important a property-based node is, the higher its satisfaction contributes to the value alignment of the evaluated behaviour, and vice versa. The alignment of an entity e ’s behaviour with a context-based value taxonomy \mathcal{V}_c is then defined accordingly, which formally states that the alignment of e ’s behaviour with the value taxonomy \mathcal{V}_c is an aggregation of the satisfaction of all property nodes of the taxonomy, taking into consideration the importance of each property node, as we present below. We note, however, that context-based value taxonomies are expected to describe the values held by some entity. For the sake of simplifying notation, we drop the holder x (and possibly x ’s view of y ’s values, if that was the case) and replace \mathcal{V}_c^x with \mathcal{V}_c (or $\mathcal{V}_c^{x>y}$ with \mathcal{V}_c). We also note that x (or even y) does not necessarily have to be the same entity e whose behaviour is being assessed. In other words, if $x \neq e$, then this describes the process of assessing how much is e aligned with the values of x .

$$\mathcal{A}(e, \mathcal{V}_c) = \bigoplus_{p \in N_{\phi,c}} f(sd(p, e), I_c(p)) \quad (6)$$

where $N_{\phi,c}$ represents the property nodes of the taxonomy \mathcal{V}_c , $sd(p, e)$ represents the degree of satisfaction of property p with respect to the behaviour of entity e , and $I_c(p)$ represents the importance of the property-node p within the context-based value taxonomy \mathcal{V}_c . The function f is used to factor in the importance of property nodes when considering their degree of satisfaction, whereas \bigoplus is used to aggregate the degree of satisfaction of all property nodes in \mathcal{V}_c (with value importance factored in).

With Equation 6, we provide the basis for calculating value alignment

and supporting value-based reasoning and decision-making, which are the main objectives of the work on values in AI.

4.4.1. Implementation Choices

One issue is how the satisfaction of property nodes $sd(p, e)$ is calculated. In other words, given an entity e , how do we assess to what degree the behaviour of e results in the satisfaction of property p ? This requires knowledge about how e behaves, and different implementation approaches for specifying this knowledge can be followed. For example, suppose e is a complex system of communicating entities. In that case, e 's model (usually specified via a process calculi) will describe its behaviour through a labelled transition system where the satisfaction of specific properties at different states can be evaluated [84]. If e is a normative system, then the norms can help map out the state diagram of the possible interaction outcome and evaluate the satisfaction of relevant properties accordingly [52, 1, 16]. If e was an agent with a BDI model, then BDI reasoning mechanisms can help assess the degree to which specific properties will be satisfied by e 's behaviour [69].

In summary, a model of e describing its behaviour is necessary to assess $sd(p, e)$. As illustrated above, this issue has already been addressed in many fields. To ensure our proposal is not limited to one modelling choice, we omit the choice of modelling e 's behaviour and assume the degree of satisfaction $sd(p, e)$ to be attainable.

Returning to the alignment function \mathcal{A} , there are other implementation choices, such as the function f that factors in the importance of a property node and the aggregation operator \oplus . In this paper, we propose a straightforward implementation that follows a weighted average approach that uses the importance of properties as the weight of their degree of satisfaction (so f is implemented as a multiplication operator) and the aggregation over all relevant properties (\oplus) is implemented as a simple average:

$$\mathcal{A}(e, \mathcal{V}_c) = \frac{\sum_{p \in N_{\phi, c}} I_c(p) \cdot sd(e, p)}{|N_{\phi, c}|} \quad (7)$$

If we assume the range of value importance I to be $[-1, 1]$, and the degree of satisfaction $sd(e, p)$ to be a percentage with the range $[0, 1]$, then the range of \mathcal{A} becomes $[-1, 1]$ where negative results describe the degree of misalignment (or an alignment with detested values) and positive results illustrate the degree of alignment with aspired values.

Of course, alternative and more sophisticated approaches to alignment can be explored. For example, one may consider not only the importance of a property when assessing the satisfaction of properties but also its weight in the value taxonomy, represented by the number of paths that lead to this property node. In other words, the larger the number of paths that lead to a property node, the larger its impact on alignment: that is, replacing $I(p) \cdot sd(e, p)$ in Equation 7 with $paths(p) \cdot I(p) \cdot sd(e, p)$, where $paths(p)$ is the number of paths in the value taxonomy that lead to the property node p .

4.4.2. The Running uHelp Example

Let us return to our example and examine the context-based value taxonomy \mathcal{V}'_{c_s} for a mutual aid community represented by Figure 6b. The concrete definitions of properties p_1 and p_3 (property definitions 3 and 5) illustrate what it means, computationally, for the behaviour of some entity to be aligned with the value ‘fairness’ in this context. Next, we illustrate how the exact degree of satisfaction of properties p_1 and p_3 can be computed according to these definitions. Equation 8 formally states that the degree of satisfaction of p_1 is the actual ratio of requests to offers, normalised to fall into the range $[-1, 1]$.

$$sd(e, p_1) = \begin{cases} \frac{(R - 1)}{(\max R) - 1} & , \text{ if } R > 1 \\ R - 1 & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $R = \#requests/\#offers$ represents the ratio of requests to offers, and $\max R$ is the maximum possible value for R . While the range of R is $[0, \infty)$, a maximum value must be selected for our equations. We argue that $\max R$ is domain-specific and should be selected for each context.

Equation 8 states that the degree of satisfaction is computed by mapping the ratio R of requests to offers to the range $[-1, 1]$. When this ratio is in the range $[1, \max R]$, then this gets normalised to the range $[0, 1]$ to describe a positive degree of satisfaction (where 1 gets mapped to 0 and $\max R$ gets mapped to 1). And when the ratio is in the range $[0, 1]$, then this gets translated to the range $[-1, 0]$ to describe a negative degree of satisfaction (where 0 gets mapped to -1 and 1 gets mapped to 0).

In summary, p_1 ’s degree of satisfaction depends on how far the ratio R is from 1. The larger it is relative to 1, the higher the satisfaction. The closer it is to 0, the higher the dissatisfaction.

Next, Equation 9 defines the satisfaction of property p_3 similarly by formally stating that the degree of satisfaction of p_3 is the actual difference between the uniform distribution U and the distribution of tasks over volunteers D , normalised to the range $[-1,1]$.

$$sd(e, p_3) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\Delta}{\epsilon} & , \text{ if } \Delta < \epsilon \\ -\frac{(\Delta - \epsilon)}{((\max \Delta) - \epsilon)} & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta = \text{difference}(D, U)$ represents the difference between the distribution of tasks over volunteers (D) and the uniform distribution (U), and $\max \Delta$ is the maximum possible value for Δ . The range of Δ , whether we use the earth mover's distance or the Kullback–Leibler divergence, is $[0, \infty)$, but a maximum value must be selected for our equations. Again, we argue that $\max \Delta$ is domain-specific and must be chosen for each context.

Equation 9 states that the degree of satisfaction is computed by mapping the difference Δ to the range $[-1, 1]$. When this difference is in the range $[0, \epsilon]$, then this gets inversely normalised to the range $[0, 1]$ to describe a positive degree of satisfaction (where 0 gets mapped to 1 and ϵ gets mapped to 0). And when the ratio is in the range $[\epsilon, \max \Delta]$, then this gets inversely normalised to the range $[-1, 0]$ to describe a negative degree of satisfaction (where ϵ gets mapped to 0 and $\max \Delta$ gets mapped to -1).

In summary, the degree of satisfaction of p_3 depends on how far is the difference Δ from ϵ . The larger it is with respect to ϵ , the higher the degree of dissatisfaction. The closer it is to 0, the higher the satisfaction.

Suppose a mutual aid community e provides incentives that motivate people to volunteer and already have norms ensuring tasks are spread equally among volunteers. Suppose that these regimented norms result in a high degree of satisfaction for p_3 , whereas the incentives result in a mediocre degree of satisfaction for p_1 :

$$sd(e, p_1) = 0.5 \quad ; \quad sd(e, p_3) = 0.9$$

And say the importance of p_1 is set to be twice that of p_2 , as follows:

$$I_c(p_1) = 1 \quad ; \quad I_c(p_3) = 0.5$$

Following Equation 7, it is evident that the alignment of the mutual aid community e with its understanding of the value fairness \mathcal{V}'_{c_s} (Figure 6b) becomes:

$$\mathcal{A}(e, \mathcal{V}_c) = 0.475$$

4.5. Naming our model

To our knowledge, we have presented the first formal proposal for the explicit computational representation of human values, which provides the foundations for computational reasoning and value-aligned AI engineering. From now on, we will refer to this model as the *Value Taxonomy Model* (VTM). VTM can represent the values of humans, AI systems, and hybrid communities of AI systems and humans. The value system of any of these comprises a set of value taxonomies specified in VTM.

In the next section, we demonstrate how the attributes of our proposal are consistent with research from social psychology.

5. Aligning our Model with Social Psychology Research

Here, we aim to assess the alignment of VTM with research from social psychology. To undertake this, we specifically choose the highly influential and continually well-cited work of Rohan because It provides a thorough review of values-related theory and research. She highlights five main aspects of the values construct discussed in the literature before proposing a stance on each aspect accordingly. Subsections 5.1–5.5 carefully examine how our proposal for value representation is aligned with the discussion on each value aspect. In Subsection 5.6, we then extend our analysis through the lens of Rohan’s to an additional aspect, the context of values, that we believe is crucial even though it did not receive a thorough discussion in Rohan’s work.

As we show our consistency with the review of values from Rohan, we also make sure to compare to Schwartz’s work [77], since his theory of basic human values is considered to be “one of the most commonly used and tested transcultural theories in the field of behavioural research” [32], and also because Schwartz’s view on values has become a reference within the artificial intelligence and multiagent systems communities.

5.1. On the use of the word values

The first aspect identified by Rohan is the issue of using the word value as a verb versus using the word value as a noun.

Values as a noun. When discussing value as a noun, Rohan summarises Schwartz and Bilsky’s five features recurrently mentioned in the literature to define values. In this sense, values have the following properties:

“(a) are concepts or beliefs, (b) pertain to desirable end states or behaviors, (c) transcend specific situations, (d) guide selection or

evaluation of behavior and events, and (e) are ordered by relative importance” [78].

Our proposed value taxonomy model aligns with this view. In our model, values are abstract constructs specified through label nodes on concepts like fairness, reciprocity and equality (which could fall at any level in our taxonomy). We deliberately choose not to get into the nature of values and equate them to beliefs (first feature) because there might be some discord regarding the nature of values, as we have seen in Section 3. The relation of values to constructs like beliefs or principles is left for future work, especially when we set out to introduce values into agents’ BDI models (see Subsection 6.3). However, our proposal defines the semantics of values through desirable end states (second feature), which we implement via the property nodes of our taxonomy. The overarching focus of research into values for AI is concerned with guiding behaviour (fourth feature), as discussed in Subsection 4.4. Our proposed value alignment mechanism assesses to what extent behaviour is aligned with selected values. Value importance forms an integral part of our approach (fifth feature), where each node has an importance measure that impacts the computation of value alignment (see Equation 6). While the third feature states that values transcend specific situations, we concur that value taxonomies do not change frequently. Still, we argue for the evolution of these taxonomies over context and time, following in the footsteps of van de Poel [87], as illustrated in Subsection 4.2 and reiterated in Subsection 5.6.

In addition to these five features, Rohan discusses how values are formed from experiences. She recognises the need for more research to analyse the link between values and affect, where affect is understood as the display or experience of emotion. Schwartz also mentions a link between values and affect, though neither scholar gets beyond pointing out the link. Our example has illustrated how values arise from experiences (Subsection 4.2.2) without getting into the formal mechanisms of where values come from. We also recognise the criticality of understanding value emergence and adaptation (how they change over time), along with the issue of linking values to affect and set it out in our proposed research roadmap in (Subsection 6.3).

Values as a verb. When discussing the word value used as a verb, Rohan states it refers to a high-level evaluation of entities that relates them to the relevant set of values (values as a noun). (Note that this is an issue not explicitly addressed by Schwartz.) While very little attention has been given to this evaluation (referred to as a ‘valuing process’), Feather [27] describes this process best: “We relate possible actions and outcomes within

particular situations to our value systems, testing them against our general conceptions about what we believe is desirable or undesirable in terms of our own individual value priorities.”

Relating actions and outcomes to what is desirable with respect to value priorities (which we refer to as value importance) is precisely the objective of our work, as illustrated in Subsection 4.4 and formalised in Equations 6 and 7. While Rohan argues that the crucial link between behaviour and values has been missing from many works and that the value construct later lost its influence with the rise of behaviourism, Our computational approach for value alignment revives and strengthens the link between values and behaviour in a concrete and explicit way. The property-based nodes of the value taxonomy introduce the foundations for linking abstract value concepts to concrete computational constructs that can be evaluated algorithmically to help formally assess behaviour (actions and outcomes) with respect to a set of given values.

5.2. On values, value types, value priorities, and value systems

The second aspect identified by Rohan is understanding the difference between values, value types, value priorities, and value systems. Again, these aspects are explicitly modelled within VTM, as discussed here.

Values and value types. Rohan takes the stance that values are grouped into value types, like those of Schwartz [77]. Examples of two of Schwartz’s value types are presented in Figure 8, with a selection of values that fall under each type. We argue that limiting values’ categorisation (or grouping) to only two levels (values and values types) is restrictive. Even Schwartz argues that different value types can be further organised into a set of higher-order groups. For example, for Schwartz, universalism and benevolence fall under the self-transcendence group, which our taxonomy can happily represent (see the dashed node and edges in Figure 8). In the field of value-sensitive design [87], value taxonomies (referred to as value change taxonomies) have been proposed to aid the evolution of values over time and contexts, and our understanding is that these value taxonomies are not limited to two levels (values and value types). Our proposal is aligned with Rohan’s and Schwartz’s in that selected values can be grouped into more general concepts, but we follow the work of van de Poel [87] in not limiting the number of levels of a value taxonomy to two.

Schwartz was able to limit his value system to a fixed number of levels because he proposed a predefined, universal value system structure that does not change with context.




Figure 8: Values and value types

Our proposal is more general for representing value systems, as it allows them to evolve with new contexts and experiences, and where new values and value interpretations may continuously be added (both as label or property nodes in our taxonomy) and updated. This is not only aligned with the work on value change taxonomies in the field of value-sensitive design [87] but also supported by the work of many social scientists who have proposed different value systems for different contexts [13]. For instance, in one approach, values for management decisions are proposed based on what is good for different groups: the business firm, the economy, the society, and the individual [8]. A different value system is presented for focusing on the values most relevant for business managers [24], while another proposal emphasises the relationship between individual values and their relationship to organisational needs [50].

By not restricting our value taxonomy to two levels, the naming ‘value types’ (the name given to a group of values by Schwartz and adopted by Rohan) no longer applies in our proposal as we refer to all the taxonomy nodes as values. We only differentiate between abstract values (label nodes) and grounding semantics (property nodes).

Value priorities (or value importance). Another key concept that has gained a lot of attention in the field is value priorities, which describe the importance of a value. While Rohan uses the term value priorities, Schwartz talks about value importance, which maps with our terminology. We remind the reader that value importance and value priority are used interchangeably as they both identify the same concept.

However, Rohan limits assigning value priorities to value types only. As we adopt the multi-levelled taxonomy approach, we argue that nodes in the taxonomy represent different levels of abstraction (they could be label or property nodes), and they should all get assigned a priority (importance). For example, looking at the value taxonomy of the value *fairness* in Figure 5, one can imagine how importance can be assigned to any of these nodes,

including the property-based leaf nodes.

Of course, our only condition is for the assignment of importance measures to be coherent: for example, we say that if the importance of all children nodes is low, then the importance of the parent node cannot be high, and vice versa. Rohan does not address the issue of value coherence, possibly because not enough attention is given to the relations between those types in her model. Our proposal for coherence ensures that the importance of any parent node is specified as some average over the importance of its children nodes (see Definition 2 and the corresponding properties and propositions). Our work on coherence is fully aligned with that of Schwartz, who also happens to calculate the importance of value types as an average of the importance of the individual values of that type [77, p.11].

Value systems. Rohan and Schwartz both talk about value systems that include value types and priorities and relationships (such as adjacency) between those value types. Our proposed value taxonomy serves to represent these notions as they specify the relations between value nodes and the importance of those nodes. Furthermore, context-based taxonomies only consider relevant values with respect to a given context, which maps with Rohan’s view of value systems. However, to simplify the value specification process, we argue that a value system may comprise more than one value taxonomy. In other words, we do not force the specification of relations between *all* root nodes of existing value taxonomies. Some root nodes may not be related to others.

5.3. On value priorities and “best possible living”

The **third aspect** identified by Rohan is understanding the factors upon which value priorities depend. After a lengthy discussion referencing different views, including Schwartz’s view that value importance depends on three universal human requirements (the biological needs of organisms, the requisites of coordinated social interaction, and the survival and welfare needs of groups), Rohan concludes that value importance should be assessed with respect to enabling “best possible living”. She argues this is a more general and integrative approach grounded in the Aristotelian wisdom that eudaimonia —human flourishing— is the ultimate human goal.

To Rohan, a value system is viewed as “providing a way to order which requirements or desires are more or less important to best possible living”. She gives the example that if one has a high priority for the power value, then “a new car” may be viewed as necessary for that person to maintain

their social superiority. For them, maintaining social superiority contributes to their best possible living, achieved through having a new car.

Rohan’s example catches our attention by linking the power value with attaining the world state of owning a new car. This is captured in VTM by linking, through its taxonomies, abstract values (such as the power value) with concrete, measurable properties (such as owning a car), where these properties describe the “requirements or desires” contributing (or otherwise) to the notion of “best possible living”. Furthermore, the importance of property nodes in a VTM helps specify “which requirements or desires are more or less important to best possible living”.

We note that VTM not only links abstract concepts (e.g. power value) with concrete property nodes (e.g. having a new car) but also ensures the coherence of value importance between abstract values and their concrete property nodes. In other words, if the power value is given high importance, as in Rohan’s example, then its grounding property node will be aligned with that and will be considered of high importance, too (assuming no other property nodes were at play). The opposite is also true. If having a new car is considered very important, then its ancestor value node, the power value, will also be of high importance (again, under the proviso that no other property nodes are at play).

Our proposal is fully aligned with Rohan’s. The property nodes and their importance specify the requirements and desires that define the best possible life. We do not restrict the selection of those requirements and desires to Schwartz’s three categories: the biological needs, the requisites of coordinated social interaction, and the survival and welfare needs of groups. Following in Rohan’s footsteps, we leave this selection open to the stakeholders’ interpretation.

5.4. From personal values to collective values

Rohan confirms that “contemporary values theorists investigate the values construct always from the perspective of the person who evaluates entities in his or her environment” and never from the entity’s perspective. In her fourth aspect [71], on personal, social, and cultural value systems, she clarifies that a personal value system refers to a value system that considers the individual’s value priorities. This aligns with our proposal, as illustrated in Subsection 4.3, where we state that value systems cannot exist in isolation and must be held by entities. We use the notation \mathcal{V}^i to describe the value system held by individual i .

Rohan [71] also talks about social value systems as systems that contain one’s perceptions of the value priorities of others. She clarifies that “people

may have perceptions of the value systems of all people and groups with whom they interact”. We acknowledge the need to describe such social value systems, as illustrated in Subsection 4.3, and we use the notation $\mathcal{V}^{i>j}$ to describe i ’s view of j ’s value system, where j may represent an individual or a collective.

Rohan distinguishes social value systems from cultural value systems, where the latter describes the “values that a group endorses or promotes”. We refer to these as the *collective’s value taxonomy*, specified in Subsection 4.3 as \mathcal{V}^x , where x represents a collective $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$.

Rohan does not go into the details of how the structure of collective (or cultural) value systems differ from the others but hints that they may hold the same structure. From a computational perspective, the formal definition of value taxonomies of the individual, the individual’s view of others, or the collective should all be the same (that is, the same model for value taxonomies applies to all). The difference is essentially in how value taxonomies are created, which brings us to Rohan’s discussion that follows.

Rohan mentions the difficulties in conceptualising the value systems that groups endorse. He clarifies that there needs to be more consensus about whether to understand these in terms of the average of the group members’ personal value priorities or, for example, group leaders’ or other significant members’ beliefs about the groups’ value priorities should be”. Again, the VTM model aligns with this analysis. In the case of the collective’s value system, who decides the value taxonomy? An individual, a group of individuals, or all individuals? How does a group agree on the collective value taxonomy if it is the latter? If it is an individual or some subset of individuals, how is this individual or group determined? We argue that, just as in human societies, norms must define how a collective’s group taxonomy is created and managed. Precisely how these norms are specified and decided upon is important for future research, and as such, we capture it within our proposed research roadmap in Subsection 6.2.

We further extend Rohan’s proposal to have personal, social and cultural value systems by introducing the notion of a collective’s view of some entity’s value system: $\mathcal{V}^{x>y}$, where x is a collective i_1, \dots, i_n and y may either represent an individual or a collective. As with the discussion immediately above, how the collective’s view of others formed is important for future research. As such, we capture it within our research roadmap in Subsection 6.3.

Finally, VTM aligns with Rohan’s and Schwartz’s views on personal, social, and cultural value systems. While Schwartz does not mention an individual’s view of the value systems of others (referred to as social value

systems by Rohan), he does believe that both individuals and groups can hold values. He states that while the nature of values and their structure may be universal, values held by individuals or groups differ only in the relative importance attributed to each. In other words, this implies that the value taxonomies of all individuals and groups share the same structure but differ regarding the importance assigned to each node. Again, this is an acceptable assumption for Schwartz because he focuses on universal values shared across cultures and contexts. As we expect values to evolve with experiences, assuming all individuals and collectives share the same structure for value taxonomies becomes difficult.

5.5. On worldviews, ideologies, and other value-relevant concepts

In Rohan’s fifth aspect [71], she proposes the notion of worldviews and ideologies. According to Rohan, worldviews can refer to beliefs about how the world is or should be that are a function of value priorities. In contrast, ideologies can refer to value-laden linguistic constructions that people use for or after decision-making. Rohan explicitly introduces these concepts because her literature review highlighted that values have been used in such scenarios.

Specifically looking at worldviews, Rohan states that people’s value priorities influence their perceptions. For example, it has been observed that right-wing authoritarians believe that authority and conventions are crumbling so quickly that civilisation will collapse. They believe they will be eaten in the resulting jungle. Whereas people with social dominance orientation see life as “dog eat dog” and are determined to do the eating [3, p. 75].

But value priorities do change as circumstances change. For example, constant interaction with people with different personal value priorities may change one’s beliefs about the world and, hence, one’s personal value priorities. In our work, we neither analyse (yet) the impact of value priorities on people’s perceptions and beliefs nor the impact of experiences on value priorities. The dynamics between experiences, beliefs and values are worth investigating, as we set out in our research roadmap (Subsection 6.3).

Turning her attention to ideologies, Rohan states that associated value systems are used to support and justify more complex decision-making, and where this complexity requires greater conscious, deliberative and justifiable reasoning processes. She argues that the rhetoric associated with ideologies can be manipulated to connect almost anything (behavioural choice or state of affairs) to any constructed set of value priorities.

As a result, Rohan states ideologies can be manipulated to be relevant to a wide variety of contexts, making them “remarkably slippery social constructions that take on different meanings over time and across political cultures” [85, p. 34]. One impact of our proposal and others working in AI and the value alignment problem is that AI provides the opportunity to reason automatically -with clear rules- about values. It has the potential to help address the pitfalls of Rohan’s identification/categorisation of human ideologies.

We recognise that not all decision-making can be fully coherent with the range of relevant individual and collective value systems in any given context. However, AI systems can support analysing the degree of alignment of behaviours with various value systems openly and systematically. This supports achieving more informed and effective value-aligned decision-making and behaviour.

To our knowledge, Schwartz’s work on values did not address world-views or ideologies, although he did mention other value-relevant concepts. For example, when defining values, he states that “values are beliefs linked inextricably to affect” and that “when values are activated, they become infused with feeling” [77, p. 3]. Again, we agree that a strong relationship exists between affect and value priorities. Future work should consider the role of affect on value priorities (or value importance), as we propose in the roadmap (see Subsection 6.3).

Schwartz also mentions different concepts people use when justifying their behaviour: attitudes, beliefs, traits, and norms. Attitudes are understood as evaluations of things in light of our values. Schwartz’s example is that if someone values stimulation highly while giving little importance to the security value, then they are likely to have a positive attitude toward bungee jumping. Beliefs are about how accurate some statements are, like “war never solves problems,” and they refer to subjective probabilities. Schwartz does not explicitly link beliefs to values but mentions them as one of the concepts used in justifying actions. Norms are the rules that dictate behaviour. Schwartz argues that because norms work on steering the outcome of behaviour, we usually accept them (or not) depending on how aligned they are with our values. Traits are our consistent tendency to think, feel, and behave in a certain way. They differ from values: while valuing wisdom highly, one may act foolishly. Like beliefs, Schwartz does not directly link traits to values.

This discussion highlights the complexity of the decision-making process and the role of other concepts in this process, such as traits and norms, which supports the view presented in Section 2. We argue that future work

should carefully assess the relation of these different concepts to decision-making, their justification, and their relation to values, as presented in our roadmap in Subsection 6.3.

5.6. On the context dependency of values

While Rohan and Schwartz hint at the context-dependency of values, neither of their investigations discusses the topic in depth. Rohan [71], for instance, states that “personal value priorities will change when circumstances change,” explaining that changing circumstances do not need to be physical; they may reflect the impact of the people in one’s environment: “Constant interaction with people who have different personal value priorities may change people’s beliefs about the world; changes in people’s beliefs about the world will be reflected in changes to their personal value priorities”. Our work reflects this as we have discussed how value taxonomies may evolve with experiences. This aligns with the view of those, like Rohan, who believe that values may be understood in terms of Bartlett’s schemata [4, p. 201]: “active organisations of past experience”.

Our proposed model is also aligned with the work on value change taxonomy in value-sensitive design [87], which discusses the different ways in which values may change over time: (1) new values may emerge, (2) the relevance of a value may change for a given context, (3) the importance of a value may change, and (4) there may be changes in how values are conceptualised, as well as (5) changes in how values are specified, and translated into norms and design requirements. All these different types of change are reflected in our model through the possible addition of new abstract value concepts, new property nodes, or changes in the importance of existing value nodes.

The novelty of our proposal, however, is in visualising and hiding irrelevant branches of the taxonomy based on the current context. This enables taxonomies to evolve and grow with experience over time into larger and increasingly complex taxonomies that encode learnings through experiences in related contexts, which then are temporarily pruned to match the current context. This allows focusing on relevant values based on context.

As for Schwartz, he has argued that his theory of basic values transcends specific actions and situations. This is expected as his focus has been on universal human values that do not change, like security, power, benevolence, etc. For Schwartz, the structure of these universal values is fixed. In our representation, this is understood as fixing the nodes and edges. However, Schwartz does note that the relative importance attributed to values differs from one person to another or from one group to another and that “values

influence action when they are relevant in the context (hence likely to be activated) and important to the actor”. That is, the importance does not only change for the different people holding these values but also depends on the context, which fully aligns with our proposal.

In our case, however, it is not just value importance that may change with context but also the nodes and edges of the taxonomy. With new experiences, new value nodes may be added to the taxonomy. This is evidenced by the numerous domain-specific value systems that have been proposed by different social scientists [13], as well as our work with stakeholders (see the example of the evolving value taxonomy for uHelp in Subsection 4.2.2 and Figure 6). Again, this is also aligned with the value-sensitive design work on value change taxonomies [87].

Now that we have shown the relationship of our research on VTM with that from social psychology, we next move to consider how our experiences in developing the formal model and working with a range of stakeholders on designing value-aware AI enable us to set out a roadmap for building successful AI systems that can explicitly reason about values.

6. A Research Roadmap for Reasoning about Value-Aligned Behaviour

This section presents a roadmap of what we believe are the key research challenges for achieving provable value-aligned behaviour. The overarching objective of the research presented in this paper is to start an integrated process to put ourselves in a position where we can design AI systems that can explicitly reason about their behaviour and the behaviour of others from the perspective of human values. The different types of systems whose behaviour we wish an AI system to be able to analyse can be 1) a stand-alone AI system (such as a robot working with a patient); 2) a human system (such as a group of doctors who would like feedback from the AI on the alignment of their potential actions with different relevant values); and 3) a hybrid system of interacting human and AI agents (such as a factory in which robots and human are working together, where the AI needs to explicitly represent the values of the organisation so that continued negotiation and understanding can take place).

Three key factors drive the design of our research roadmap [63]: a) understand the needs of the research on values and AI; b) readily assess the current state of research; and c) identify key research goals and plan their research studies (strategies) accordingly. Furthermore, proposing this

research roadmap can support researchers in understanding the big picture of this field, maintaining focus on the vital research goals and priorities.

From our experience working in this field, which includes an investigation into social psychology, working with different stakeholders to identify and formally specify their relevant values and developing value alignment mechanisms, we identify four key challenges: 1) the value identification and representation challenge, 2) the value aggregation & agreement challenge, 3) the value-aware decision-making challenge, and 4) the value-aligned multi-agent system challenge.

We address each of these challenges in the following four subsections, that are structured as follows: 1) describes the research challenge, 2) presents the key work in this area, and 3) set out the research roadmap by detailing the research goals within each challenge and some associated proposals for research strategies. VTM would benefit these research goals and strategies and the potential integration of that research, which we reiterate in the fifth and final subsection.

6.1. The value identification and representation challenge

For any reasoning over values to be possible, the relevant values in which the AI system will operate should first be identified and then computationally represented to allow for automatic reasoning. This is typically broken down into two stages. The first is known as *value identification*. It is the challenge of establishing the relevant values for a given individual or collective in the operating context within which the AI is being developed. In our own real-world experiences and looking at key work in this field (as presented shortly), this includes understanding what words are used as abstract value concepts, such as “fairness” or “transparency”. The second stage is called *value representation*. It is the challenge of providing formal computational models of those values and their underlying structure, including identifying their inter-relationships and relative importance and representing their grounding semantics.

Broadly, three different approaches may be followed for value identification and representation: 1) offline approaches, where relevant stakeholders manually identify and specify their values; 2) online approaches, where AI mechanisms like machine learning are used to identify and possibly specify values; and 3) mixed approaches, where AI mechanisms collaborate with users to help identify and represent values.

All these approaches aim to identify the relevant human values for an individual or a collective. Whether values are manually provided or the AI has learned those values from observing human behaviours, we stress that

these values always represent what is significant for the human stakeholders rather than what is significant for the AI.

Key research in this area. Current AI work on this topic has focused chiefly on value identification, eliciting and learning relevant values from (typically, written records of) the interactions of human agents. Natural language processing techniques are being used to estimate underlying human values from text in a (semi-) automatic manner. For instance, Liu et al. [45] analyses values based on words used in e-commerce reviews, and Lin et al. [43] estimates relevant values in tweets by combining textual features and context knowledge from Wikipedia. Brugnoli et al. [10] uses a neural network model to label tweets according to the Moral Foundations Theory [33]. However, these techniques are employed only once a predefined high-level value list has been selected, such as the well-known Schwartz value system [77]. Using any pre-defined fixed list is a limitation not only in the assumption that the list is appropriate for the context but also prevents values from changing over time, a view we share with the value-sensitive design community [87]. Amongst the approaches not starting with a predefined value list but setting out to identify the relevant values can be found in the work of Wilson et al. [91], which presents a crowd-powered algorithm to generate a hierarchy of general values. Another is Axies [44], which uses human and automatic techniques for identifying context-specific values using natural language processing.

Key research goals with some suggested strategies. The representation of values in these existing approaches typically remains abstract. They are articulated through textual headings or labels (such as ‘fairness’) without further exploring the concrete relations, semantics, or importance of each value listed, and there is no mechanism for deliberating and reasoning about these values. The value representation we have presented uses property-based nodes to formally specify the semantics of values (as property nodes essentially define how a value may be interpreted and assessed) and explicitly specify value relations and importance.

The identified key research goals with associated strategies are presented next.

1. Extending existing research on value identification and elicitation (e.g. [44]) so that relations between those values initially identified by human/AI processes can be established. We argue that the relations between values are essential for deliberation. Once these relations are identified, value taxonomies can be constructed to reflect them.

2. Developing mechanisms for constructing property nodes for values and linking those property nodes to the abstract label nodes. This is crucial for achieving any computational approach to building AI systems that can explicitly reason about values, as property nodes make such reasoning possible. Obtaining those property nodes, however, is a challenging task, as we will illustrate shortly. Designers and engineers must specify such property nodes formally, or an AI mechanism must be designed to learn the property nodes that best describe a given abstract value concept.
3. Developing mechanisms for eliciting value importance, as the importance of values is critical when understanding what values influence which behaviours. As illustrated earlier, humans or AI may provide such measures of importance. For example, an AI can learn which values are more important than others from past interactions. Humans and AI can provide a partial order over a subset of the value nodes of a taxonomy. Transformation mechanisms, such as that presented by Serramia et al. [81], can transform a partial order into concrete measures for value importance assigned to each node appearing in that partial order. Propagation mechanisms (such as our proposed Algorithm 1) can then be developed to compute the importance measure of the remaining nodes of the taxonomy to ensure coherence of importance across the whole taxonomy. Such transformation and propagation mechanisms will be helpful in practice because obtaining the importance measure of every taxonomy node is usually only sometimes feasible (as per the discussion below).

These three research goals focus on identifying value relations, value semantics specified through property nodes, and value importance, which are crucial elements for deliberating and reasoning over values and aid the design of our value taxonomies.

However, if there is one thing we can learn from social psychology, it is that values are complex and nuanced. It is only sometimes straightforward for humans to specify their value taxonomies explicitly. While many research ethicists working in the field of value-sensitive design (e.g. [89]) have been explicitly eliciting relevant value concepts from stakeholders, asking that the users of technologies undertake such a process (as in the case of the uHelp app) may be too demanding in practice. In addition to identifying abstract value concepts, explicitly specifying value relations, importance, and formal semantics is an even more significant challenge.

Our experience demonstrates that some stakeholders are ready to specify various value aspects, such as value concepts, relations, and importance. This was the case of the medical doctors (see Subsections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2). However, such an exercise is not straightforward for all stakeholders. (Please note that when we use the word stakeholders, we include all users in that meaning.) When that is the case, our stance is that AI can be used to help learn some of these value aspects from past interactions. We can then expect stakeholders to have a broad understanding of what an AI system has learned of their value systems and the explicit way the AI has chosen to model them (i.e. the constructed value taxonomies). We can expect these stakeholders to approve or disapprove of various aspects of the learned value systems and guide the AI in learning and representing values. What is difficult, in general, is to have any expectation that all stakeholders will have the time, willingness or capability to specify the value importance of each node formally, the exact relationships between nodes, and the semantics of different abstract value concepts. Integrating AI with human stakeholders offers enormous potential benefits for helping individuals and organisations specify their value systems.

6.2. The value aggregation and agreement challenge

While the value identification and representation challenge focuses on identifying the relevant values of a single entity (e.g. individual, organisation, company) and their representation, the value aggregation and agreement challenge focuses on the mechanisms required for defining the values of a collective (a group of single entities). The objective is to move from a set of individual value systems (with each value system in our model defined as a set of value taxonomies) to a single collective one. That is, to identify and formalise the values that best represent a collective by analysing the values of the individuals in that collective. This is a challenging task, as there usually is no clear consensus, resulting in inconsistencies between the collective's value system and individual ones.

The research questions include: How do we move from a set of individual value systems to one representing the collective? How do we maintain some consistency between them (or not)? What does that consistency look like? How do we deal with inconsistencies?

Key research in this area. Gabriel [31] argues that we live in a pluralistic world with different entities holding different value systems. To ensure behaviour in a multiagent system (MAS) is aligned with human values, decisions are needed about the value system of the MAS as a whole. To arrive

at the MAS value system, potential conflicting value systems of individuals or subgroups of individuals need to be addressed. Gabriel [31] defines this problem as identifying the value system that receives “reflective endorsement despite widespread variation in people’s moral beliefs”. Pigmans et al. [65, 64] highlight the challenges of addressing conflicting individual interests in water policy-making and report on how deliberation around the value systems of different stakeholders can help address such conflicts. Other work in this field uses computational social choice to aggregate individual value systems and yield a consensus value system [41]. This approach considers a range of ethical approaches, from utilitarian (maximum utility) to egalitarian (maximum fairness).

Key research goals with some suggested strategies. Whilst research on value aggregation and agreements is beginning to emerge, many challenges remain. As with the value identification and representation challenge, the novelty and challenge here will be to focus on value relations, value semantics (specified through property nodes), and value importance, which are necessary for deliberating and reasoning over values.

The identified key research goals with associated strategies are presented next.

1. Developing value aggregation mechanisms based on computational social choice. These mechanisms must consider the value relations, semantics, and importance of the collective. In other words, complex aggregation mechanisms are needed, advancing the work of Lera-Leri et al. [41], not only to aggregate the value importance of individual value concepts but to aggregate entire value taxonomies.
2. Developing value agreement mechanisms based on agreement technologies [62]. As an alternative to aggregation mechanisms that compute the value system of a collective, agreement technologies that use mechanisms such as argumentation [66] and negotiation [46] can be used to support the constituent individual’s reaching an agreement on the adopted value system of a proposed collective by deliberating over the relations, semantics and importance of values. The objective is to collectively agree on the value taxonomy that *best* represents the collective as a whole.

We note that in both these research goals, an individual’s value system may or may not change. The focus here is on determining a value system for the collective. As such, conflicts between individual value systems and the

value system of the collective might arise. Suppose the degree of incoherence is sufficiently strong. This may trigger the individual to take no further part in that collective and look for alternative collectives better aligned with their value system. In other situations, an individual might find it justifiable to interact within the collective and recognise its value system, regardless of whether they decide to take actions that adhere to that value system.

Cases might also arise where the value agreement process or the experience of interacting within a new collective value system might provide evidence for individuals to update their own individual value systems. The *impact of experiences on the evolution of value systems over time* is an additional line of research that merits further study and analysis.

6.3. *The value-aware decision making challenge*

Identifying value systems of individuals and collectives (Subsections 6.1 and 6.2) provide the basis for reasoning over values. Armed with the knowledge of their own value system, that of the collective to which they belong, and those of fellow individuals in the collective, an agent can reason about how to behave accordingly. Based on this understanding, they can decide which actions to perform or not, including which groups or collectives to join or leave. The computational challenge concerns developing enhanced value-aware decision-making mechanisms considering different value systems.

Key research in this area. In value-driven decision-making, persuasion has been one approach to motivating an agent to act in a specific way. In the work of Bench-Capon and Atkinson [7], an argumentation framework is presented where the stance is that persuasion relies on the strength of arguments, which depends on advanced social values. In the work of di Tosto and Dignum [21], an agent model is described where agent actions are driven by their needs and values, where values are used to prioritise those needs.

In the work of Chhogyal et al. [14], trust has been explored as a mechanism for influencing decision-making, where the past reliability of an agent's actions is used to decide whether that agent can be trusted or not. The argument is made that when past experiences cannot be used to assess the reliability of others, the sharing of values between the trustor and trustee can help, and an approach is developed to evaluate trust based on the degree to which shared values can be established. In the work of Cranefield et al. [17], reasoning about values is used to help agents make choices over plans to adopt. Whereas in [70], values are used to help medical personnel make more value-aware decisions.

Key research goals with some suggested strategies. The main objective of the work on values in AI is to prove that behaviour aligns with human values: the value alignment problem. To achieve this, mechanisms for reasoning about values are needed, including decision-making and explainability mechanisms. Introducing property nodes to our values taxonomies provides the key construct for computational reasoning over values and, as such, the key to developing such mechanisms.

Next, we present the vital research goals and associated potential research strategies.

1. Developing mechanisms for reasoning about actions from the perspective of given value systems. Different approaches could be investigated here, such as adopting practical reasoning in cognitive agent models. One possibility is to extend existing BDI models to include value concepts (and taxonomies). As illustrated in Subsection 5.5, the relation between values and beliefs will require an in-depth multidisciplinary assessment.

Another approach could investigate a value-enhanced theory of mind, where agents can observe each others' actions, build a model of each other accordingly, and reason about those actions and their underlying intentions, as in [51, 54]. The main focus here would be on incorporating value taxonomies into the agent models to reason over the underlying values driving others' behaviour. Understanding the values driving others could help people make value-aware decisions. For example, people can improve their strategies when they better understand those they interact with. Also, as we discuss in our next challenge, understanding the value system of others can help us better persuade and influence them to modify their behaviour.

We reiterate here that while values have been chiefly used as labels in the literature, value taxonomies that specify value relations, semantics and importance are needed for enhanced value-aware reasoning mechanisms.

2. Developing value-driven deliberation mechanisms that influence behaviour through persuasion, argumentation, or negotiation. This would extend existing work, such as that of [7], with more sophisticated value-based reasoning by considering value relations, semantics and importance.

Furthermore, instead of persuading how one should act based on the value alignment of those actions, one could also try to persuade or

argue about the value system of another and how it could be updated. This is related to the *evolution of values*, mentioned at the end of Subsection 6.2. Convincing others to change their value taxonomies can be an indirect approach to influencing their behaviour. This could be achieved by developing negotiation/argumentation mechanisms that individuals can use to influence each other's value systems, either by introducing new values or changing the importance of existing values. Swaying individuals to modify their value systems can help find novel solutions for mutual agreements. Traditional negotiation and argumentation mechanisms try to find acceptable solutions for all parties involved. By modifying individuals' value systems, we can enhance the traditional mechanisms as new value systems can open the door to new solutions that would otherwise be off the table.

3. Developing value-based explainability mechanisms that help humans understand the implications of their actions regarding the values they promote or demote, as well as gain a better understanding of the values motivating other agents (human or software) to act in specific ways. This requires mechanisms for reasoning about the possible implications of chosen actions and understanding how value alignment is evaluated, which our value taxonomy provides through property nodes.
4. Conducting comprehensive interdisciplinary investigations into the role of emotions and other constructs in motivating or influencing behaviour. While we stress the importance of considering the role of values in guiding behaviour, Schwartz talks about the role of emotions and how behaviour can be explained in terms of one's attitudes, beliefs, traits and social norms. Emotions have received growing attention in the AI literature, and as such, relating affect (the display or experience of emotion) to values and/or behaviour could be one of the next steps in AI research on values. Schwartz [77], for example, states that “[w]hen values are activated, they become infused with feeling.” If the affect is linked to values and is not an independent motivator in guiding behaviour, then linking the proposed value taxonomies with that affect would constitute the first step in this novel research line.

However, in addition to studying the role of affect, one might learn other motivators, such as attitudes, traits, or beliefs, and how they relate to values, as already discussed in Subsection 5.5. This line of enquiry will require a critical multidisciplinary analysis from the social sciences and humanities.

6.4. *The value-aligned multiagent system challenge*

While the third challenge focuses on the value alignment of an individual’s reasoning and decision-making process, this fourth challenge concerns designing and developing MASs whose overall behaviour is provably aligned with some set of human values. The objective is to focus not on the individual agents (human or software) but on the system mediating those agents’ behaviour and whether its mediation results in better-aligned behaviour.

The research questions here are: how do we design a system that promotes value alignment? How can such a system evolve and adapt to maintain optimal alignment?

Key research in this area. The design of technologies aligned with our human values is a well-established field known as value-sensitive design (VSD) [29]. The VSD approach essentially runs conceptual investigations (usually through participatory design workshops with stakeholder groups) to understand the stakeholders of a given technology and their aspired values; empirical investigations to inform technology designers of those values; and technical investigations to evaluate the adherence of the system behaviour with the desired values and analyse how people use the technology. Sometimes, new considerations emerge due to how people use the technology, and the process is repeated. Whilst VSD relies on offline participatory design and offline evaluations, the proposed AI research complements this approach by providing an online verification mechanism that computationally assesses the degree to which these systems align with human values.

Since norms have been traditionally used in MAS to mediate behaviour, proposed mechanisms that assess a MAS’s alignment have been reduced to assessing the value alignment of the MAS’s norms. If a set of norms brings about outcomes more aligned with a given value system, the set of norms and its corresponding MAS are said to be aligned with that value system. The research in this field has focused chiefly on choosing an optimal set of norms that optimises the value alignment of the MAS [55, 80]. In the work of Serramia et al. [80], norm synthesis is automated and based on preliminary knowledge of which norms promote which values. The work of Montes and Sierra [55] proposes a value-promoting norm synthesis approach that, in essence, optimises the value alignment mechanism proposed by Sierra et al. [83]. In that work [83], value preferences are understood as preferences over world states and the value alignment of a set of given norms is based on the degree to which those norms move us towards preferred states.

An interesting application area is that of [2, 18], where simulations are used to analyse norms (policies) from the perspective of the values of fighting

inequality and discrimination.

Key research goals with some suggested strategies. Subsection 6.3 discussed the research goals for reasoning about values on a micro level: the agent level and its decision-making processes. This subsection presents the research goals for reasoning about values on a macro level: the multiagent system level and its self-governance. As such, similar research goals are repeated here —namely, reasoning over value alignment, explainability, and deliberation mechanisms— except that the focus here is on the alignment of the MAS as a whole. The identified key research goals with associated strategies are presented next.

1. Developing mechanisms for assessing the value alignment of norms. Despite some success with preliminary research, some mechanisms reason about values without fully understanding their semantics [80]. Providing value semantics (specified through property nodes in our proposed taxonomy) enhances the ability to reason about value alignment, resulting in better explanations (discussed shortly).

Another pitfall of existing mechanisms is that they require significant manual work from the human side to specify value semantics. However, this issue is addressed by the value identification and representation challenge of Subsection 6.1.

2. Developing explanation mechanisms that support human users in understanding why one set of norms is preferred to another with respect to a given value system. These mechanisms could build on the value alignment mechanisms discussed above. By relying on value semantics to assess the alignment, explanations can be more informative.

Explanations could support the design of new MAS but also support policy-making and protocol design in general, where AI tools could help explain when and how norms should evolve. Examples of such norms include medical protocols, emergency protocols, or policies for regulating irrigation practices.

3. Developing mechanisms for value-aware self-governance in MAS. These would allow a MAS to analyse for itself which norms promote specific values better and adapt its norms accordingly. Here, there are a couple of research lines that could be investigated.

First, there is the issue of discovering suitable norms for a given MAS. Norm synthesis, formal analysis of norms, multiagent simulation, and

AI-based optimisation techniques can be used to explore the space of normative systems, searching for the optimally aligned set of norms (building on previous work such as [52, 53]). The objective would be to factor in relevant values when discovering suitable norms to help analyse their value alignment and provide explanations accordingly.

Second, there is the issue of agents in a MAS reaching agreements on the norms that best govern those societies. The objective here is to develop mechanisms that support groups of agents in finding the best set of norms to mediate their MAS interactions. Value-driven deliberation mechanisms —assisted by norm discovery, norm assessment and explanation mechanisms from the first research line— can provide the support needed for reaching collective agreements on which norms to adopt or how norms evolve.

6.5. A note on VTM’s contribution to future work

In setting out the research challenges, related research goals and associated research strategies presented above, it becomes clear that one main recurring drawback of current research is its need for more consideration of certain aspects of values. For example, in some cases, value concepts are identified but not their importance, although the importance of values ultimately influences behaviour. In other cases, value importance is considered, but not value semantics, which critically limits reasoning about values. Value semantics are needed for enhanced value reasoning and explainability. These pitfalls are a natural result of the lack of any agreed consensual formal model for representing values. Our proposed value taxonomies tackle this by introducing value relations, semantics, and importance into a structurally coherent and conceptually intuitive foundational model for value representation.

7. Reflections on the Strengths and Challenges of the VTM Model

After proposing our formal model of human values, showing its critical relationship with research outside of computer science, and exploring how it can be used to build a road map for value-aligned AI systems, we now reflect on whether our work has fulfilled the principles we set out in Section 1.

Using Formal Methods. According to Rohan [71], research into values theory has suffered from “definitional confusion” due to the word values being abused and overused by non-psychologists and psychologists alike. The formal approach to building the VTM model provides a clear, precise and

consistent approach for defining various value-related concepts (like values, value priorities and value systems) (Principle 1). Furthermore, VTM is designed to be a foundation for data structures and algorithmic design necessary for value-based reasoning (Principle 2). Recall that the interest in working with values, as Schwartz [75] puts it, is because values are “abstract motivations that guide, justify, and explain attitudes, norms, opinions, and actions.”. For us, the objective of modelling values computationally means that we can systematically evaluate the alignment of AI or human behaviour with values. Last, our proposed model also subsumes and relates to established concepts in AI research (Principle 4). The roadmap illustrates how our model can help extend and build upon existing research in the field.

Remaining Agnostic to Implementation Choices. In setting out any foundational model, choices about representation and language must be made. Each choice carries opportunities and limitations. It is essential to be mindful of any implicit assumptions or representation limitations a choice may introduce. This is why one of our guiding principles (Principle 3) is to be agnostic on specific implementation choices, so we focus on theoretical notions that provide clarity over implementation choices. While we deliberately leave the implementation choice open for system and research development, we do not hesitate to propose some initial implementation choices that, along with our running example, better illustrate our model’s significance and implications.

Being Grounded in Social Psychology. When we assume the task of modelling something as nuanced and complex as human values, we feel obligated to start from the social sciences. In particular, we ground our VTM in the wealth of research from social psychology (Principle 6), aligning with the views of Schwartz and other leading researchers [71]. By doing so, we have set out to design an academically significant and conceptually intuitive model for non-computer-scientists as it is for AI researchers. This conceptual intuitiveness supports the promise of becoming an agreed conceptual framework for future interdisciplinary research and the practical development of value-based AI systems. It is with this in mind that we developed the VTM research roadmap.

Remaining Agnostic to Specific Theories of Values. We also argue that a computational model of human values should be agnostic to a specific theory of values (Principle 7) so it aligns with proposals from the social psychology literature in general. This is precisely what VTM achieves. It allows

the specification of contextual dynamic value systems that accommodate different values, such as moral, economic and epistemic values.

Demonstrating Applicability to Real-Life Scenarios. An essential challenge in modelling human values is ensuring the expressiveness and practicality of the resulting model so it applies to real-life scenarios (Principle 5) with demonstrable practical benefit. Our VTM model was inspired by our collaboration with real stakeholders in different settings (e.g., social networking applications, hospital working practices for doctors, and firefighter organisations in fire stations). Our practical work has supported the development of the formal model, and the formal model has given us the foundational and structural grounding to design our value-aware AI systems. In addition, we have detailed a running example of a fully implemented system that demonstrates our model’s applicability, impact, and potential.

Staying Mindful of the Challenges of Formal Modelling. Modelling features of our natural world necessitates decisions about what to capture, what to ignore and what concepts and relationships are best to do it most effectively. We make sense of our world through our models by determining all of the relevant properties we want to hold and then checking that they do. Working out the set of all relevant properties is a significant challenge, and once we have them, verifying the model against those properties is usually more straightforward.

When modelling human values, with the objective of reasoning about behaviour from the perspective of these values, we face the same classical challenge of capturing what is relevant and finding the best possible representation. Values that we want to specify and embed in the decision-making processes are human values, and as such, these values need to come from a diverse range of human stakeholders: users, designers, owners of the artificial systems, other persons or bodies directly or indirectly affected by the AI system and so on. This makes the capturing of relevant values an even more significant challenge. Furthermore, applying VTM in practice presents new challenges (more than, say, analysing text or speech to look for relevant values) as there is a need to specify a significant amount of information: the importance of values, their semantics (the property nodes), and the relations between them. There is little doubt that applying our model to gain even a partial understanding of values that can be used in a computational system presents the greatest practical challenge.

8. Concluding Remarks

We have contributed to the urgent challenge of building value-aligned AI by proposing a conceptually intuitive foundational model for human values. This model allows for future computational reasoning and opens up opportunities to evidence how AI systems are *provably* aligned with human values. The approach is grounded in social psychology, subsumes existing AI research concepts, and is formal, making it a coherent and intuitive starting point for future interdisciplinary research investigation. Our experiences working with professionals in various real-life application domains, with the objective of understanding and formalising their values and developing mechanisms to assess the value alignment of different behaviours, have guided us in developing our model. To our knowledge, this is the first proposal for the formal representation of human values and moves beyond the state-of-the-art—which to date has defined values through labels [44, 80] or goals [83, 55]—by explicitly introducing notions of value importance, semantics, and relations.

The ultimate aim of this research is not just to provide the foundation for further theoretical research but also to drive the potential for practical, real-life applications that support the decision-making process of humans and AI systems. In addition to designing AI that is provably aligned with human values, we also want to design AI that raises awareness of value systems at the level of individuals, groups, and organisations, unlocking humans’ capability for value-aware decision-making.

The topic of value alignment, both in AI and in our everyday lives, is gaining ground. A growing number of online sources promise methods to help people discover their values to live them out effectively [15, 28, 79]. We hope that with this model and roadmap, new technologies can be designed that support humans individually and collectively identify their value systems more clearly, and enable “best possible living”, as proposed by Rohan [71].

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to our friends and colleagues Carles Sierra, Pablo Noriega and the IIIA community who have always been there to support us during the development of our research. This work has been supported by the EU-funded VALAWAI (# 101070930) project and the Spanish-funded VAE (# TED2021-131295B-C31) and Rhymas (# PID2020-113594RB-100) projects.

References

- [1] Thomas Ågotnes, Wiebe Van Der Hoek, Juan A Rodríguez-Aguilar, Carles Sierra, and Michael J Wooldridge. On the logic of normative systems. In *IJCAI*, volume 7, pages 1175–1180, 2007.
- [2] Alba Aguilera, Nieves Montes, Georgina Curto, Carles Sierra, and Nardine Osman. Can poverty be reduced by acting on discrimination? an agent-based model for policy making. In N. Alechina, V. Dignum, M. Dastani, and J.S. Sichman, editors, *AAMAS '24: 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*. IFAAMAS, 2024.
- [3] Bob Altemeyer. The other “authoritarian personality”. In Mark P. Zanna, editor, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, volume 30, pages 47–92. Academic Press, 1998.
- [4] F.C. Bartlett. *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Camb. Psychol. Libr. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [5] T. L. Beauchamp. The ‘four principles’ approach to health care ethics. In Richard E. Ashcroft, editor, *Principles of Health Care Ethics*. Wiley, 2007.
- [6] Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. Oxford University Press, eighth edition, 2019.
- [7] Trevor Bench-Capon and Katie Atkinson. Abstract argumentation and values. In Guillermo Simari and Iyad Rahwan, editors, *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 45–64. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2009.
- [8] Wilmar F. Bernthal. Value perspectives in management decisions. *The Journal of the Academy of Management*, 5(3):190–196, 1962.
- [9] Valerie Braithwaite and Russell Blamey. Consensus, stability and meaning in abstract social values. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 33(3):363–380, 1998.
- [10] Emanuele Brugnoli, Pietro Gravino, and Giulio Prevedello. Moral values in social media for disinformation and hate speech analysis. In *Preproceedings of the Value Engineering in AI Workshop, at 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2023)*, 2023.

- [11] Georgios Chalkiadakis, Edith Elkind, and Michael Wooldridge. Computational aspects of cooperative game theory. *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 5(6):1–168, 2011.
- [12] Raja Chatila, Virginia Dignum, Michael Fisher, Fosca Giannotti, Katharina Morik, Stuart Russell, and Karen Yeung. Trustworthy AI. In *Reflections on Artificial Intelligence for Humanity*, volume 12600 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 13–39. Springer, 2021.
- [13] An-Shou Cheng and Kenneth R. Fleischmann. Developing a meta-inventory of human values. In *Proceedings of the 73rd ASIS&T Annual Meeting on Navigating Streams in an Information Ecosystem - Volume 47*, ASIS&T '10, USA, 2010. American Society for Information Science.
- [14] Kinzang Chhogyal, Abhaya C. Nayak, Aditya Ghose, and Hoa Khanh Dam. A value-based trust assessment model for multi-agent systems. In *IJCAI*, pages 194–200. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [15] Irina Cozma. How to find, define, and use your values. <https://hbr.org/2023/02/how-to-find-define-and-use-your-values>, Feb 2023. Accessed: 2023-12-15.
- [16] Stephen Cranefield and Michael Winikoff. Verifying social expectations by model checking truncated paths. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 21(6):1217–1256, 2011.
- [17] Stephen Cranefield, Michael Winikoff, Virginia Dignum, and Frank Dignum. No pizza for you: Value-based plan selection in bdi agents. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, pages 178–184. ijcai.org, 2017.
- [18] Georgina Curto, Nieves Montes, Carles Sierra, Nardine Osman, and Flavio Comim. A norm optimisation approach to sdgs: tackling poverty by acting on discrimination. In Luc De Raedt, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022, Vienna, Austria, 23-29 July 2022*, pages 5228–5235. ijcai.org, 2022.
- [19] Janet Davis and Lisa P Nathan. Value sensitive design: Applications, adaptations, and critiques. *Handbook of ethics, values, and technological design: Sources, theory, values and application domains*, pages 11–40, 2015.

- [20] Lavindra De Silva, Felipe Rech Meneguzzi, and Brian Logan. Bdi agent architectures: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI), 2020, Japão.*, 2020.
- [21] Gennaro di Tosto and Frank Dignum. Simulating social behaviour implementing agents endowed with values and drives. In Francesca Giardini and Frédéric Amblard, editors, *Multi-Agent-Based Simulation XIII - International Workshop, MABS 2012, Valencia, Spain, June 4-8, 2012, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 7838 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2012.
- [22] Mark d’Inverno, David Kinny, Michael Luck, and Michael Wooldridge. A formal specification of dmars. In Munindar P. Singh, Anand Rao, and Michael J. Wooldridge, editors, *Intelligent Agents IV Agent Theories, Architectures, and Languages*, pages 155–176, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [23] Mark d’Inverno and Michael Luck. Development and application of a formal agent framework. In *First IEEE International Conference on Formal Engineering Methods*, pages 222–231, 1997.
- [24] George W. England. Personal value systems of american managers. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 10(1):53–68, 1967.
- [25] European Commission. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI, April 2019. <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai>.
- [26] European Commission. Proposal for a regulation of the european parliament and of the council: laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain union legislative acts. COM/2021/206 final, with Procedure Number 2021/0106/COD, 2021. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206>.
- [27] Norman T Feather. Values, deservingness, and attitudes toward high achievers: Research on tall poppies. In Clive Seligman, James M. Olson, and Mark P. Zanna, editors, *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium*, volume 8, pages 215–251. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Mahwah, NJ, 1996.
- [28] Forbes Expert Panel. 15 effective ways to discover and articulate your core values.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2022/02/18/15-effective-ways-to-discover-and-articulate-your-core-values/>, Feb 2022. Accessed: 2023-12-15.

- [29] Batya Friedman, David G. Hendry, and Alan Borning. A survey of value sensitive design methods. *Found. Trends Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 11(2):63–125, nov 2017.
- [30] Batya Friedman, Peter H Kahn, Alan Borning, and Alina Huldtgren. Value sensitive design and information systems. *Early engagement and new technologies: Opening up the laboratory*, pages 55–95, 2013.
- [31] Iason Gabriel. Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds Mach.*, 30(3):411–437, sep 2020.
- [32] August Corrons Giménez and Lluís Garay Tamajón. Analysis of the third-order structuring of shalom schwartz’s theory of basic human values. *Heliyon*, 5(6):e01797, 2019.
- [33] Jesse Graham, Jonathan Haidt, Sena Koleva, Matt Motyl, Ravi Iyer, Sean P. Wojcik, and Peter H. Ditto. Chapter two - moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. In Patricia Devine and Ashby Plant, editors, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, volume 47, pages 55–130. Academic Press, 2013.
- [34] William D Guth and Renato Tagiuri. Personal values and corporate strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 43(5):123–132, 1965.
- [35] Pat Duffy Hutcheon. Value theory: Towards conceptual clarification. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 23(2):172–187, 1972.
- [36] IEEE Standards Association. The IEEE global initiative. <https://standards.ieee.org/industry-connections/ec/autonomous-systems/>.
- [37] Anna Jobin, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. The global landscape of ai ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9):389–399, 2019.
- [38] Clyde Kluckhohn. Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In *Toward a general theory of action*, pages 388–433. Harvard university press, 1951.
- [39] Andrew Koster, Jordi Madrenas-Ciurana, Nardine Osman, W. Marco Schorlemmer, Jordi Sabater-Mir, Carles Sierra, Dave de Jonge, Angela

- Fabregues, Josep Puyol-Gruart, and Pere Garcia-Calvés. u-help: Supporting helpful communities with information technology. In Sascha Ossowski, Francesca Toni, and George A. Vouros, editors, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Agreement Technologies, AT 2012*, volume 918, pages 378–392. CEUR-WS.org, 2012.
- [40] Andrew Koster, Jordi Madrenas-Ciurana, Nardine Osman, W. Marco Schorlemmer, Jordi Sabater-Mir, Carles Sierra, Angela Fabregues, Dave de Jonge, Josep Puyol-Gruart, and Pere Garcia-Calvés. u-Help: supporting helpful communities with information technology. In Maria L. Gini, Onn Shehory, Takayuki Ito, and Catholijn M. Jonker, editors, *International conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems, AAMAS '13, Saint Paul, MN, USA, May 6-10, 2013*, pages 1109–1110. IFAAMAS, 2013.
- [41] Roger Lera-Leri, Filippo Bistaffa, Marc Serramia, Maite López-Sánchez, and Juan A. Rodríguez-Aguilar. Towards pluralistic value alignment: Aggregating value systems through l_p -regression. In Piotr Faliszewski, Viviana Mascardi, Catherine Pelachaud, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 2022, Auckland, New Zealand, May 9-13, 2022*, pages 780–788. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (IFAAMAS), 2022.
- [42] Kurt Lewin. Constructs in field theory. In Kurt Lewin and D. Cartwright, editors, *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*, pages 30–42. Tavistock, London, 1952.
- [43] Ying Lin, Joe Hoover, Morteza Dehghani, Marlon Mooijman, and Heng Ji. Acquiring background knowledge to improve moral value prediction. *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, pages 552–559, 2018.
- [44] Enrico Liscio, Michiel van der Meer, Luciano C. Siebert, Catholijn M. Jonker, Niek Mouter, and Pradeep K. Murukannaiah. Axies: Identifying and evaluating context-specific values. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS '21*, page 799–808, Richland, SC, 2021. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [45] Hui Liu, Yinghui Huang, Zichao Wang, Kai Liu, Xiangen Hu, and Weijun Wang. Personality or value: A comparative study of psychographic

segmentation based on an online review enhanced recommender system. *Applied Sciences*, 2019.

- [46] Fernando Lopes, Michael Wooldridge, and Augusto Q Novais. Negotiation among autonomous computational agents: principles, analysis and challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 29:1–44, 2008.
- [47] Michael Luck and Mark d’Inverno. Structuring a z specification to provide a formal framework for autonomous agent systems. In Jonathan P. Bowen and Michael G. Hinchey, editors, *ZUM ’95: The Z Formal Specification Notation*, pages 46–62, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [48] David J.C. MacKay. *Information Theory, Inference and Learning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [49] J.-L. Marichal. *Aggregation Operators for Multicriteria Decision Aid*. PhD thesis, Institute of Mathematics, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium, 1998.
- [50] Paul McDonald and Jeffrey Gandz. Identification of values relevant to business research. *Human Resource Management*, 30(2):217–236, 1991.
- [51] Nieves Montes, Michael Luck, Nardine Osman, Odinaldo Rodrigues, and Carles Sierra. Combining theory of mind and abductive reasoning in agent-oriented programming. *Auton. Agents Multi Agent Syst.*, 37(2):36, 2023.
- [52] Nieves Montes, Nardine Osman, and Carles Sierra. A computational model of ostrom’s institutional analysis and development framework. *Artificial Intelligence*, 311:103756, 2022.
- [53] Nieves Montes, Nardine Osman, and Carles Sierra. A computational model of ostrom’s institutional analysis and development framework (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2023, 19th-25th August 2023, Macao, SAR, China*, pages 6937–6941. ijcai.org, 2023.
- [54] Nieves Montes, Nardine Osman, and Carles Sierra. Perspective-dependent value alignment of norms. In *Preproceedings of the Value Engineering in AI Workshop, at 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2023)*, 2023.

- [55] Nieves Montes and Carles Sierra. Value-guided synthesis of parametric normative systems. In Frank Dignum, Alessio Lomuscio, Ulle Endriss, and Ann Nowé, editors, *AAMAS '21: 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Virtual Event, United Kingdom, May 3-7, 2021*, pages 907–915. ACM, 2021.
- [56] Pablo Noriega, Harko Verhagen, Julian Padget, and Mark d’Inverno. Design heuristics for ethical online institutions. In Nirav Ajmeri, Andreea Morris Martin, and Bastin Tony Roy Savarimuthu, editors, *Coordination, Organizations, Institutions, Norms, and Ethics for Governance of Multi-Agent Systems XV*, pages 213–230, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing.
- [57] Pablo Noriega, Harko Verhagen, Julian Padget, and Mark d’Inverno. Addressing the value alignment problem through online institutions. In Nicoletta Fornara, Jithin Cheriyan, and Asimina Mertzani, editors, *Coordination, Organizations, Institutions, Norms, and Ethics for Governance of Multi-Agent Systems XVI*, pages 77–94, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [58] Martin J Osborne and Ariel Rubinstein. *A course in game theory*. MIT press, 1994.
- [59] Nardine Osman, Bruno Rosell, Carles Sierra, Marco Schorlemmer, Jordi Sabater-Mir, and Lissette Lemus. uHelp: intelligent volunteer search for mutual help communities. *CoRR*, abs/2301.11112, 2023.
- [60] Nardine Osman, Carles Sierra, and Jordi Sabater-Mir. Propagation of opinions in structural graphs. In Helder Coelho, Rudi Studer, and Michael J. Wooldridge, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI 2010*, volume 215 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 595–600. IOS Press, 2010.
- [61] Nardine Osman, Carles Sierra, Jordi Sabater-Mir, Joseph R. Wakeling, Judith Simon, Gloria Origgi, and Roberto Casati. Liquidpublications and its technical and legal challenges. In *Intelligent Multimedia: Managing Creative Works in a Digital World*, volume 8 of *Legal Information and Communication Technologies*. European Press Academic Publishing, Florence, 2010.
- [62] Sascha Ossowski. *Agreement Technologies*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2013.

- [63] Nora Pekker. How to build a compelling ux research roadmap. <https://medium.com/design-ibm/how-to-build-a-compelling-ux-research-roadmap-227448005c82>, Sep 2021. Accessed: 2023-10-19.
- [64] K. Pigmans, H. Aldewereld, V. Dignum, and N. Doorn. The role of value deliberation to improve stakeholder participation in issues of water governance. *Water Resources Management*, 33:4067–4085, October 2019.
- [65] Klara Pigmans, Neelke Doorn, Huib Aldewereld, and Virginia Dignum. Decision-making in water governance: From conflicting interests to shared values. In Lotte Asveld, Rietje van Dam-Mieras, Tsjalling Swierstra, Saskia Lavrijssen, Kees Linse, and Jeroen van den Hoven, editors, *Responsible Innovation 3: A European Agenda?*, pages 165–178. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [66] I. Rahwan. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer US, 2014.
- [67] Pradeep Rai and Shubha Singh. A survey of clustering techniques. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 7(12):1–5, 2010.
- [68] Anand S Rao and Michael P Georgeff. Modeling rational agents within a bdi-architecture. *Readings in agents*, pages 317–328, 1997.
- [69] Anand S Rao and Michael P Georgeff. Decision procedures for bdi logics. *Journal of logic and computation*, 8(3):293–343, 1998.
- [70] Manel Rodriguez-Soto, Nardine Osman, Carles Sierra, Paula Sánchez Veja, Rocio Cintas Garcia, Cristina Farriols Danes, Montserrat Garcia Retortillo, and Silvia Minguez Maso. Towards value awareness in the medical field. In *16th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence - ICAART 2024*, 2024.
- [71] Meg J. Rohan. A rose by any name? the values construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(3):255–277, 2000.
- [72] Milton Rokeach. *The nature of human values*. Free press, 1973.
- [73] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J. Guibas. The earth mover’s distance as a metric for image retrieval. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 40(2):99—121, nov 2000.

- [74] S. Russell. *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*. Penguin Publishing Group, 2019.
- [75] S. H. Schwartz. Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, and G. Eva, editors, . *Measuring attitudes cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*, chapter 9, pages 161–193. Sage, 2007.
- [76] Shalom H Schwartz. Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of social issues*, 50(4):19–45, 1994.
- [77] Shalom H. Schwartz. An overview of the schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 2012.
- [78] Shalom H. Schwartz and Wolfgang Bilsky. Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53:550–562, 1987.
- [79] Meg Selig. 6 ways to discover and choose your core values. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/changepower/201811/6-ways-discover-and-choose-your-core-values>, Nov 2018. Accessed: 2023-12-15.
- [80] Marc Serramia, Maite López-Sánchez, and Juan A. Rodríguez-Aguilar. A qualitative approach to composing value-aligned norm systems. In Amal El Fallah Seghrouchni, Gita Sukthankar, Bo An, and Neil Yorke-Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS '20, Auckland, New Zealand, May 9-13, 2020*, pages 1233–1241. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2020.
- [81] Marc Serramia, Maite Lopez-Sanchez, Juan A. Rodriguez-Aguilar, Manel Rodriguez, Michael Wooldridge, Javier Morales, and Carlos Ansoategui. Moral values in norm decision making. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS '18*, page 1294–1302, Richland, SC, 2018. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [82] Yoav Shoham and Moshe Tennenholtz. On social laws for artificial agent societies: off-line design. *Artificial intelligence*, 73(1-2):231–252, 1995.

- [83] Carles Sierra, Nardine Osman, Pablo Noriega, Jordi Sabater-Mir, and Antoni Perelló. Value alignment: a formal approach. *CoRR*, abs/2110.09240, 2021.
- [84] Colin Stirling. *Modal and Temporal Properties of Processes*. Springer Verlag, 2001.
- [85] P.E. Tetlock, R.S. Peterson, and J.S. Lerner. Revising the value of pluralism model: Incorporating social content and context postulates. In C. Seligman, J. Olson, and M. Zanna, editors, *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium, Volume 8*, pages 25–51. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, 1996.
- [86] UNESCO. Outcome document: first draft of the recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence, Sept 2020. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434_eng.
- [87] Ibo van de Poel. Design for value change. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2018.
- [88] Ibo van de Poel and Lambèr Royakkers. *Ethics, technology, and engineering: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons, 2023.
- [89] Jeroen van den Hoven, Pieter E. Vermaas, and Ibo van de Poel. Design for values: An introduction. In Jeroen van den Hoven, Pieter E. Vermaas, and Ibo van de Poel, editors, *Handbook of Ethics, Values, and Technological Design: Sources, Theory, Values and Application Domains*, pages 1–7. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2015.
- [90] T. L. van der Weide, F. Dignum, J. J. Ch. Meyer, H. Prakken, and G. A. W. Vreeswijk. Practical reasoning using values. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 79–93. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
- [91] Steven Wilson, Yiting Shen, and Rada Mihalcea. Building and validating hierarchical lexicons with a case study on personal values. In Steffen Staab, Olessia Koltsova, and Dmitry I. Ignatov, editors, *Social Informatics*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LCNS), pages 455–470, Switzerland, September 2018. Springer International Publishing AG. 10th International Conference on Social Informatics 2018, SocInfo 2018 ; Conference date: 25-09-2018 Through 28-09-2018.