

Correctness is not Faithfulness in RAG Attributions

Jonas Wallat^{*,1}, Maria Heuss^{*,2}, Maarten de Rijke², and Avishek Anand³

¹ L3S Research Center Hannover, Germany
jonas.wallat@l3s.de

² University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
<m.c.heuss|m.derijke>@uva.nl

³ TU Delft, The Netherlands
avishek.anand@tudelft.nl

Abstract. Retrieving relevant context is a common approach to reduce hallucinations and enhance answer reliability. Explicitly citing source documents allows users to verify generated responses and increases trust. Prior work largely evaluates **citation correctness** – whether cited documents support the corresponding statements. But citation correctness alone is insufficient. To establish trust in attributed answers, we must examine both **citation correctness** and **citation faithfulness**. In this work, we first disentangle the notions of citation correctness and faithfulness, which have been applied inconsistently in previous studies. Faithfulness ensures that the model’s reliance on cited documents is genuine, reflecting actual reference use rather than superficial alignment with prior beliefs, which we call *post-rationalization*. We design an experiment that reveals the prevalent issue of post-rationalization, which undermines reliable attribution and may result in misplaced trust. Our findings suggest that current attributed answers often lack citation faithfulness (up to 57% of the citations), highlighting the need to evaluate correctness and faithfulness for trustworthy attribution in language models.

Keywords: Large language models · Retrieval-augmented generation · Attributions · Interpretability · Faithfulness · Self-Explanations.

1 Introduction

Trustworthiness of information retrieval (IR) systems is key to their usage in high-stakes scenarios [20, 23]. Hallucinations occur when large language models (LLMs) generate plausible but incorrect or fabricated information, hindering the trustworthiness of IR systems that employ LLMs [3]. One method to address the challenge posed by hallucinations in text output is to enable generated text that is directly grounded in retrieved source documents and accompanied by citations [6, 41]. While citations do not necessarily prevent hallucinations, they increase the verifiability of generated claims [31]. Grounded text generation [16]

*Equal contribution




Fig. 1: Different answer scenarios for the query “What is the capital of Germany?” (a) The ideal case, i.e., a correct citation that is faithful to the answer’s generation process. (c) A correct but unfaithful citation, where the model post-rationalizes a citation to fit its prior. (b) A citation referring to the context that was used during the answer generation but does not contain the statement itself. (d) An incorrect citation.

has been studied in natural language processing (NLP) tasks like summarization and question answering, aiming to produce content derived from specific sources – either provided by users or, more recently, retrieved through mechanisms like retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [28]. Attributed text generation, often implemented as RAG systems, focuses on generating text with supporting evidence, ensuring coherence, contextual relevance, and grounding in verifiable sources by generating text alongside supporting evidence [6]. The current evaluation of attributed text focuses on the overall **correctness of the answer** and the **correctness of citations**, which is based on the agreement between attributed statements and the information that can be found in the referenced source documents.

Citation correctness, sometimes called answer faithfulness, e.g. Gao et al. [19], measures the extent to which cited documents support a generated statement. We argue that ensuring correctness is not always enough. For tasks like legal information retrieval [34] or medical question answering [27], where the retrieved documents are complex, and the answers are sensitive to model biases, simple fact-checking or correctness evaluation might prove difficult and require a nuanced understanding of the documents themselves. Yet, in those domains, unwarranted trust in generated answers can have detrimental consequences. We need to understand the model’s reasoning process to verify that the model correctly used the cited documents to produce its answer and that it was not an-

swered from its parametric memory through **post-rationalization**, i.e., where models may cite sources to fit preconceived notions rather than genuine retrieval. We use the term **citation faithfulness** to describe whether the citation accurately depicts the model’s reasoning process. It is hard to determine citation faithfulness if we only evaluate the correctness of citations. Figure 1 illustrates the differences between faithful and unfaithful behavior as well as correct and incorrect citations.

When building trustworthy IR systems that offer self-explanations – in this case, citations – we should strive to convey the system’s decisions accurately. Only if the produced citations are faithful to the underlying processes can we enable justified trust (as opposed to misplaced trust if faithfulness breaks down).

Our contributions in this work are threefold. First, we offer coherent notions of attribution and citation in the context of grounded generation and introduce the concept of citation faithfulness. Second, we propose desiderata for citations that go beyond correctness and accuracy and are needed for trustworthy and usable systems. Third, we emphasize the need to evaluate the faithfulness of citations by studying post-rationalization. Our experiments reveal the existence of unfaithful behavior, with up to 57% of citations being post-rationalized.

Our work on disentangling citation correctness and faithfulness in grounded text generation using LLMs aims to create more reliable IR systems by ensuring accurate and contextually faithful citations. By focusing on post-rationalization, we enhance accountability, helping IR systems avoid propagating biases or misinformation, thus promoting ethical standards in information dissemination*.

2 Related Work

We summarize relevant background and position our work w.r.t. the evaluation of attributed generation, faithfulness in interpretability, and faithfulness of self-explanations. The area of knowledge conflicts [57] aims to understand information flow and whether answers originate from parametric memory or contextual information [38, 53]. Its goal of understanding models is similar to ours but it has a different focus (full answers vs. citations) and is therefore out of scope.

2.1 LLMs and Attributions

Supplying LLM-generated answers with attributions aims to improve the quality of the generated answers [18], reduce hallucination [49], and improve users’ trust [36] in the generated outputs. Methods for generating attributed answers range from prompting [18], adding post-hoc attributions [18, 48], and training paradigms [4, 9, 36, 48, 58] to generation-planning for more fine-grained citations [47]. Figure 2 provides an overview of common methods. The simplest method is generate-then-retrieve (GTR), a paradigm in which a model produces an answer (without attributions), and supporting evidence is added in a subsequent

*Code available at <https://github.com/jwallat/RAG-attributions>




Fig. 2: Different methods of attribution generation regarding their likelihood for un-faithful behavior and post-rationalization (with approaches more likely of faithful behavior on the right).

step [6, 18]. Retrieve-then-generate (RTG) operates similarly, but the model produces the (unattributed) answer after seeing both the question and the retrieved documents. As with GTR, RTG produces attributions in a second retrieval step, independent of the initially retrieved documents [58]. Thus, both GTR and RTG have post-hoc attributions, which are unfaithful to the model by design, i.e., the citation does not reflect the model’s decision-making during the answer generation process. It is, however, possible to directly generate attributed answers by prompting the RTG model to do so [6, 18]. The resulting attributed answer *may* be faithful to the model’s decision process, but we lack guarantees. As we show below, there is a significant chance of unfaithful behavior. The ultimate goal of attributed answer methodologies is to verify that certain information in the answer *originates* from the source document.

2.2 Evaluation of Attributed Generation

Attributed generation is a complex process that requires evaluation across multiple dimensions. One dimension is the *usability* of the generated response, which includes factors like fluency and perceived utility [31]. Traditionally, these factors have been assessed through user studies and automatic evaluation methods [18]. Other important dimensions include *answer relevance*, which measures how well the response addresses the question, and *context relevance*, which looks at the compactness of the retrieved context [14]. Datasets like HAGRID [24] are useful for evaluation, with human evaluations of the informativeness and attributability of the responses, which can be used to measure overlap with gold citations [13]. Weller et al. [55] use the QUIP-Score, a method based on n-gram comparisons, to measure grounding and quoting from model pre-training data.

Next to the generated answer, the citation to the referenced document needs to be evaluated, too. To this end, prior work often uses natural language inference (NLI) classifiers [6, 17]. These help evaluate citation precision, which measures the average correctness of citations, and comprehensiveness/citation

recall, which quantifies the proportion of accurately cited statements in all statements [13, 29]. The correctness of citations is a major focus in prior work [1, 13, 19, 29, 35, 41, 42, 43, 59]. We differentiate between citation correctness and the related but distinct aspect of **citation faithfulness**. Citation faithfulness requires a causal relationship between the cited document and the generated statement, an area that has so far received little attention.

2.3 Faithfulness in Interpretability

In RAG attributions, (citation) faithfulness has not been studied much. In contrast, the evaluation of faithfulness of explanations has been studied extensively. Here, faithfulness refers to how accurately an explanation reflects the model’s decision-making process, clearly differentiating it from explanation plausibility [22]. It lacks a universally accepted formal definition and is often defined in an ad-hoc manner [32]. Faithfulness establishes a causal relationship. Various methods have been proposed for evaluating faithfulness: (i) axiomatic evaluation, (ii) predictive power evaluation, (iii) robustness evaluation, (iv) perturbation-based evaluation, (v) white-box evaluation, and (vi) human perception evaluation [32]. Twelve desirable properties of explanations have been identified by Nauta et al. [37], including correctness (of explanations), which is equated with faithfulness. Overall, the concepts of faithfulness and correctness appear entangled in the explainability literature. We take a step towards disentangling those two aspects for attributed text. Inspired by Lyu et al. [32], we consider the causal relationship between the attributed text and generated answer to be a fundamental condition of faithful attribution.

2.4 Faithfulness of LLM self-explanations

Self-explanations are explanations that an LLM is prompted to generate along with the answer to a posed question. Self-explanations have been divided into (i) chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, which involves generating a sequence of intermediate steps that lead to the response [54], (ii) token importance, which highlights tokens that significantly influence the response generation [30, 56], and (iii) counterfactual explanations, which provide insights into how different inputs might lead to a different response [2]. Faithfulness of self-explanations has recently received attention [2, 26, 33, 50], with work on evaluating faithfulness [26, 50] and its importance in contrast to plausibility [2]. There is high variation in how much LLMs use CoT on different tasks, some relying upon it heavily, others merely generating it in a post-hoc manner [26]. We view attributed generation that generates citations along with the text, rather than post-hoc, as a special class of self-explanation. We use a similar evaluation strategy as was previously used for the evaluation of faithfulness for CoT explanations [50] to show that similar faithfulness concerns arise for attributed generation as for CoT reasoning. We identify the problem of post-rationalization, which is closely related to post-hoc reasoning [26].

3 Attributions

In the context of attributed text generation in RAG, an answer may contain references to documents emphasizing that certain information originates from the referenced document. Merriam-Webster defines the verb *to attribute* as explaining (something) by indicating a *cause*, emphasizing the causal nature.*

3.1 Notation

Let $A = \{a_i\}_i$ be a set of retrieved documents and let s be a factual statement that needs to be grounded in the retrieved documents A . A citation $cit : s \mapsto a_j \in A$, or simply (s, a_j) , connects a statement to a document that supports the stated statement. We use the term *attribution* to refer to the referenced document a_j or the process of referencing source documents.

Example 1: Attributed Answer

Question: Whats the biggest penguin in the world?

Answer: The Emperor Penguin [0] is the tallest [0] or biggest penguin in the world.

In Example 1, “tallest” would be a statement s attributed to document $a = 0$ through the citation (“tallest”, 0). We note that many attributed statements are underspecified. Therefore, we distinguish between the statement (“tallest”) and the underlying *claim* (“Emperor penguin: tallest: in the world”). When attribution generation is integrated with answer generation, citations can be considered a special form of self-explanation, other forms being chain-of-thought explanations [54], explain-then-predict and predict-then-explain frameworks [8], and counterfactuals [11].

3.2 Desiderata for Good Attributions

Several dimensions can make attribution good or bad. We discuss the *correctness*, *faithfulness*, *appropriateness*, and *comprehensiveness* of a citation (Table 1).

Table 1: Desiderata for good attributions.

Desideratum	Description
Correctness	Attribution accurately represents the content of the cited document
Appropriateness	Attribution is relevant and meaningful, not noisy or irrelevant
Comprehensiveness	Attribution covers all the key points in the answer
Faithfulness	Attribution reflects the actual process leading to the answer

Correctness. Most importantly, good citations should be correct, meaning that the cited documents should support the generated statement. Ensuring correctness in attribution is crucial for maintaining the integrity and reliability of the

*<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/attribute#h2>

information being presented. However, there are several ways in which the outputs of an LLM can be right or wrong.

Hallucinated attributions. Attributions that do not exist, i.e., when a model hallucinates a reference to a non-existing document, are relatively easy to spot. LLMs without a retrieval component, such as the early versions of ChatGPT, especially, commonly generate broken links or hallucinate titles and authors of the source document from which certain information should come.

Wrong answers. A direct way in which an LLM-generated answer can be wrong is if the statement itself is wrong, not matching the ground truth answer. This is the property that is evaluated most frequently in the open-domain QA and attribution literature [e.g., 6, 13, 28]. Wrong answers can result from hallucinations or correct attributions from a document containing false information. Hence, the generated answer is incorrect in this case, yet wrong answers may include correct citations.

Wrong citations. Attributions can be incorrect, for example, by misrepresenting the content of the attributed documents or by attributing claims from document a to document b . In these cases, the citation (s, b) is incorrect. Compared to answer correctness, less work focuses on the correctness of attributions. Attributions are usually evaluated by testing if the attributed document implies the statement. To do so, recent work employs NLI models [6, 13, 17].

Appropriateness & Comprehensiveness – *What do we cite?* Besides unfaithful behavior and incorrect attributions, bad citations may (appear to) be inappropriate or non-comprehensive and, therefore, dilute our understanding or evaluation of the answer. Appropriateness of attributions means that the attribution should be relevant, understandable, and meaningful; comprehensiveness refers to covering all the key points in the answer. The question of how much we need to cite and whether attributions cover the important claims are less prominent in current evaluations, but these aspects may heavily skew the results.

Example 2: Inappropriate Citations

Question: how long was gabby in a coma in the choice

Answer: In the novel [0, 4] the choice [0, 3, 4], Gabby is in a coma for three months.

Inappropriate citations. In Example 2, neither citation offers much value given the question. Attributing the title “the choice” provided in the question to documents 0, 3, and 4 offers no additional insights. On the contrary, when evaluating the quality of the provided citations, common approaches average over all existing citations. A large number of such *low-value* citations, which re-state information from the question, may heavily skew the evaluation metrics.

*Short statements – *What is the actual claim?** Capturing a comprehensive, standalone statement in an LLM-generated response that maintains its specificity even when separated from the rest of the text can be a complex task. The statement is often reduced to a single word or concept, subtly referring to other parts

of the generated response. In our example, it remains ambiguous as to what the highlighted word “novel” pertains to (i.e., the actual claim). This lack of clarity makes interpreting and evaluating such references more challenging.

For which statements do we need a citation? An answer may contain several citations, but one may be missing for the factual answer to the question. In the above example, the focus of the question is the time that Gabby spent in a coma (“three months”). This is the most critical statement in the answer and should be attributed to a source document. The above answer is not comprehensive since a central requested fact is not attributed to any source.

Faithfulness – Right for the *wrong* reason? Can an attribution be correct and still be bad? Like model explanations, attributions can be right for the wrong reason. To judge whether an attribution is right for the wrong reason, it is key to understand the internal model processes and understand whether a document a was considered during answer generation. If a is cited for another reason, then the attribution is not faithful to the underlying model behavior. Importantly, unfaithful attributions might still be factually correct and, therefore, difficult to spot – yet unfaithful attributions foster misguided trust.

Post-rationalization. We hypothesize that post-rationalized attributions are a special case of unfaithful behavior. In this setting, an LLM’s parametric memory produces an answer to the question, and the model looks for support in the documents in some shallow way (e.g., by token-matching). The resulting citation is not faithful since the attribution maps to a document, not to the model’s internal knowledge. Let us consider Example 3:

Example 3: The Faithfulness Post-rationalization Correctness Trilemma

Question: What is the capital of Germany?

Answer: The capital of Germany is Berlin [1, 2]

Document 1: The capital of Germany is Berlin [...]

Document 2: Berlin has the best night-life [...]

Faithful (right for the right reason): Citing document 1 because the LLM used document 1’s information to generate the answer

Post-rationalized but correct(right for the wrong reason): Citing document 1 because the model knows the answer and finds a document that agrees with its priors

Post-rationalized and wrong: Citing document 2 because the model knows the answer, and the answer token is mentioned in document 2.

Since the outputs in both the faithful and unfaithful cases are identical (citing document 1), unfaithful behavior is hard to identify. We conjecture that for the evaluation of faithfulness, we need both the *attributions* and the *process* by which they have been generated.

4 Citation Faithfulness

The Cambridge Dictionary defines *faithful* as “true or not changing any of the details, facts, style, etc. of the original.”* The explainability literature states that “faithful explanation should accurately reflect the reasoning process behind the model’s prediction” [22]. Lyu et al. [32] state that faithfulness establishes causality, referring to an example where “what is known by the model” does not necessarily correspond to “what is used by the model in making predictions.”

Prior work on attributed answer generation defines *answer faithfulness* as the extent to which the cited document supports the generated statement [59]. Answer faithfulness considers the answer itself rather than the citation. In the context of the citation, this property is often called the correctness of the citation. In this work, we define **citation faithfulness** and disentangle the concepts of *answer faithfulness/correctness* and *citation faithfulness*. Prior work on attributed answers often has defined faithfulness loosely, for example, as “whether the selected documents influence the LLM during the generation” [40]. We take inspiration from the rich literature on the faithfulness of explanations and define the faithfulness of citations through a causal dependency of the generated answer and the referenced document.

4.1 Towards a Definition of Citation Faithfulness

We offer the following definition of citation faithfulness.

Definition of Citation Faithfulness

Let s be a generated statement. Let $A = \{a_i\}_i$ be a set of documents that the model has retrieved as context. We call (s, a_j) a faithful citation if:

- $a_j \in A$,
- s is supported by a_j (correctness), and
- s is causally impacted by a_j .

The second condition, often referred to as the “correctness” of the citation, has been a focal point in previous studies evaluating RAG attribution. Correctness usually tests whether a statement is supported by the attributed document (measured by NLI models). However, while correctness is a necessary condition for faithfulness, it is insufficient. For a citation to be deemed faithful, the model must also rely causally on the cited document to generate the answer. The evaluation of this causal dependence of the model output on the cited statement has been largely overlooked, which is why we advocate for increased attention for the topic in future research.

We recognize that our definition of faithfulness is somewhat abstract. As Lyu et al. [32] note, formulating a concrete definition with a single sufficient test for evaluating the faithfulness of an explanation is challenging. Therefore,

*<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/faithful>

a set of more tangible necessary conditions with corresponding tests should be established in practice. These can assist in approximating the level of faithfulness of specific explanations. Consider the following examples of more concrete necessary conditions for faithful attribution. Assuming that a citation (s, a) is faithful, the following should hold:

- (1) If the relevant information in the cited document a is altered, the model should either provide a different generated statement s or modify the decision-making process. This could involve using different evidence a' or the model’s memory to generate the answer.
- (2) Adding irrelevant documents to the context should not affect the attribution, provided that the answer remains unchanged.

In Section 5, we design an experiment that tests this second necessary condition and shows evidence for the phenomenon of post-rationalization.

5 Post-Rationalization – A Study of Unfaithful Behavior

We study attributions of a prominent RAG model and produce evidence of unfaithful behavior. Evaluating faithfulness requires carefully designed tests and an understanding of internal model processes [22]. This is to ensure that the attribution matches the underlying decision processes.

Aim. We investigate a particular case of unfaithful behavior, post-rationalization, i.e., the process in which a model comes up with a prior answer without regard to the documents and then searches retrieved documents to find supporting evidence. The following experiment establishes the presence of unfaithful behavior in existing attributions by RTG models.

Setup. Cohere’s COMMAND-R+ model is a “RAG-optimized” LLM specifically trained to produce grounded answers.* It has 104B parameters and a context length of 128k tokens, which we use in 4-bit quantization to run on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU. We evaluate COMMAND-R+’s attributions on the NaturalQuestions QA dataset, containing 1,444 real user questions answered by Wikipedia pages [25]. We use the temporally-aligned KILT [39] Wikipedia dump* as a retrieval base. Following [12], we split passages into chunks of 100 tokens and prepend the title of the page to the chunks. We index the resulting chunks and, for each query, retrieve the top 30 documents using BM25. We rerank the 30 retrieved documents using ColBERT v2 [44] and feed the top 5 documents together with the question into COMMAND-R+.

We use the grounded generation prompt template provided by Cohere.* The grounded generation pipeline with COMMAND-R+ follows four steps: (i) predict the relevance of the retrieved documents; (ii) prediction which documents should be cited; (iii) produce an answer without citations, and (iv) one with citations.

* <https://cohere.com/blog/command-r-plus-microsoft-azure>

* Available here: https://huggingface.co/datasets/facebook/kilt_tasks.

* <https://huggingface.co/CohereForAI/c4ai-command-r-plus>




Fig. 3: Results of the post-rationalization tests. We measure the cases in which the model cited our adversarial document (which had the previously cited statement appended). Since we also change the input, the model is not guaranteed to produce the same statements again. Therefore, we also include the number of cases where we could match the old statement.

This setup makes COMMAND-R+ a retrieve-then-generate (RTG) model with direct attributions via prompting (see Figure 2). We selected an instance from this class of models since its chances of faithful behavior are higher than in the case of post-hoc attributions.

Experiments. We devise the following experiments to better understand the extent to which COMMAND-R+ post-rationalizes citations. We aim to investigate whether the model performs token matching for its citations, so we (i) generate attributed answers for QA pairs, and (ii) select statements from these answers and append them to other documents. Since statements are, on average, 2–4 tokens, they mostly contain short concepts such as “Emperor penguin” or “The Choice,” which should not be cited when appearing without factual context. We append these adversarial statements into three kinds: random documents, documents predicted to be relevant but never cited, and documents cited for other information in the attributed answer. The created dataset with adversarial documents consists of 1344 QA pairs (random), 702 (relevant but not cited), and 829 (cited for other reasons). In step (iii) we again generate attributed answers, but this time with our adversarial documents. In the case that the adversarial document was created from a random document, we append it to the list of documents in the context. If the original document was part of the context, we substitute it with the adversarial one. Lastly, (iv) we observe whether the model now cites our adversarial documents for the statements selected in step (ii). We operate under the assumption that citing documents that just randomly contain the statement (“Emperor penguin”) indicates *post-rationalization*.

Results. The results are presented in Figure 3. First and foremost, we note that recovering the old statement in the newly generated answer worked in 63–70% of the cases. This is necessary to understand if the adversarial document has been cited for the same statement. By injecting the statement into random documents and passing them to the model, the model cited these documents in 12% (116/936) cases. Interestingly, the number of adversarial documents cited is much higher when forging relevant but uncited documents (57%) and documents cited for different reasons (55%). Based on our results, we conjecture post-rationalization to be a *common phenomenon*.

6 Discussion and Outlook

Our results are the first step toward understanding unfaithful behavior in RAG systems due to post-rationalization. We focus on attributions, where a *faithful* attribution should signify the origin of the corresponding information. If the parametric model memory is used to generate an answer, a faithful model should either cite itself or just omit a citation. Several issues necessitate a principled approach to measuring faithfulness in future research. A primary obstacle in automatically detecting unfaithful behavior is developing robust evaluation frameworks for detection procedures. The challenges we encountered are reminiscent of those seen in explainability research within IR and other fields, where ensuring validity in attribution metrics remains difficult [5, 7, 33]. A lack of ground truth, as well as the inherently interpretative nature of attribution for RAG systems, presents a challenge for constructing evaluation criteria that can accurately identify unfaithful outputs.

We suggest using evaluation strategies from explainability in IR, such as deliberate data contamination techniques [21, 46], model probing to gain first insights into specific model capabilities [15, 45, 51, 52], or reverse engineering parts of decision process [10]. However, validating LLM-based attributions introduces new challenges that call for developing novel evaluation paradigms. We have proposed a preliminary test designed to assess faithfulness. This test, however, implicitly assumes that the model internals, or in other words, where the model looks and based on what it generates the answer, do not change through the insertion of additional irrelevant documents. To verify this assumption, an investigation of the model’s internal states during answer generation would be necessary. Subsequent work could apply recent findings in understanding internal model processes to the problem of faithful attributions.

Our work underscores the importance of establishing control settings that yield conclusive evidence regarding faithfulness in model-generated content. We advocate for rigorous counterfactual setups to establish a more reliable foundation for attribution-based evaluations. Such setups could provide a framework to better understand the causal relationships in model behavior and confirm the validity of attribution methods within controlled environments.

Finally, our study provides the first step towards the human-verifiability of LLM-generated attributed text, offering an essential resource for end-users. Our research shows that LLM-generated content cannot be taken as faithful by default. In this regard, our work contributes valuable considerations for human reviewers tasked with evaluating and verifying LLM outputs, thereby supporting informed and trustworthy interactions with AI-generated text.

7 Conclusion

We have tackled the problem of faithful attribution for answer generation with LLMs. With the goal of verifiability in mind, we have formalized notions of attribution and citation faithfulness, clearly differentiating them from citation correctness. We provide empirical evidence of unfaithful citation behavior through

post-rationalization in Command-R+, a state-of-the-art LLM trained for the RAG task, by measuring the impact of short text insertions into irrelevant documents on the generated citations. While prior work has focused mostly on evaluating the correctness of the generated citations, we argue that citation faithfulness is necessary for trustworthy RAG systems in high-stakes decision-making and decision-support. We acknowledge that this work’s empirical analysis is limited. Future research will be necessary to establish the existence of post-rationalization and unfaithful behavior for a broader set of models and data selections. We advocate for more research in this area, especially on evaluating citation faithfulness. In the interpretability literature, this challenge is known to be difficult to solve due to the lack of ground truth. Additionally, further research into the impact of attribution on user trust could provide greater insight into the significance of this issue.

Bibliography

- [1] Adlakha, V., BehnamGhader, P., Lu, X.H., Meade, N., Reddy, S.: Evaluating correctness and faithfulness of instruction-following models for question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **12**, 775–793 (2024)
- [2] Agarwal, C., Tanneru, S.H., Lakkaraju, H.: Faithfulness vs. plausibility: On the (un) reliability of explanations from large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04614 (2024)
- [3] Ahmad, M.A., Yaramis, I., Roy, T.D.: Creating trustworthy llms: Dealing with hallucinations in healthcare ai. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01463 (2023)
- [4] Asai, A., Wu, Z., Wang, Y., Sil, A., Hajishirzi, H.: Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In: *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024* (2024)
- [5] Bastings, J., Ebert, S., Zablotskaia, P., Sandholm, A., Filippova, K.: “Will you find these shortcuts?” A protocol for evaluating the faithfulness of input salience methods for text classification. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, pp. 976–991, Association for Computational Linguistics (2022)
- [6] Bohnet, B., Tran, V.Q., Verga, P., Aharoni, R., Andor, D., Soares, L.B., Ciaramita, M., Eisenstein, J., Ganchev, K., Herzig, J., et al.: Attributed question answering: Evaluation and modeling for attributed large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08037 (2022)
- [7] Camburu, O.M., Giunchiglia, E., Foerster, J., Lukasiewicz, T., Blunsom, P.: Can I trust the explainer? Verifying post-hoc explanatory methods (2019)
- [8] Camburu, O.M., Rocktäschel, T., Lukasiewicz, T., Blunsom, P.: e-SNLI: Natural language inference with natural language explanations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31** (2018)
- [9] Chen, A., Pasupat, P., Singh, S., Lee, H., Guu, K.: PURR: efficiently editing language model hallucinations by denoising language model corruptions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14908 (2023)
- [10] Chen, C., Merullo, J., Eickhoff, C.: Axiomatic causal interventions for reverse engineering relevance computation in neural retrieval models. In: *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2024, Washington DC, USA, July 14-18, 2024*, pp. 1401–1410, ACM (2024)
- [11] Chen, Y., Zhong, R., Ri, N., Zhao, C., He, H., Steinhardt, J., Yu, Z., McKeown, K.: Do models explain themselves? counterfactual simulatability of natural language explanations. In: *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning* (2024)
- [12] Cuconasu, F., Trappolini, G., Siciliano, F., Filice, S., Campagnano, C., Maarek, Y., Tonello, N., Silvestri, F.: The power of noise: Redefining

- retrieval for rag systems. In: Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pp. 719–729 (2024)
- [13] Djeddal, H., Erbacher, P., Toukal, R., Soulier, L., Pinel-Sauvagnat, K., Karenko, S., Tamine, L.: An evaluation framework for attributed information retrieval using large language models. In: Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pp. 5354–5359 (2024)
- [14] Es, S., James, J., Anke, L.E., Schockaert, S.: Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation. In: Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations, pp. 150–158 (2024)
- [15] Formal, T., Piwowarski, B., Clinchant, S.: Match your words! A study of lexical matching in neural information retrieval. In: Advances in Information Retrieval - 44th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2022, Stavanger, Norway, April 10-14, 2022, Proceedings, Part II, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13186, pp. 120–127, Springer (2022)
- [16] Gao, J., Peng, B., Li, C., Li, J., Shayandeh, S., Liden, L., Shum, H.Y.: Robust conversational ai with grounded text generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03457 (2020)
- [17] Gao, L., Dai, Z., Pasupat, P., Chen, A., Chaganty, A.T., Fan, Y., Zhao, V.Y., Lao, N., Lee, H., Juan, D.C., et al.: RARR: Researching and revising what language models say, using language models. In: The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics (2023)
- [18] Gao, T., Yen, H., Yu, J., Chen, D.: Enabling large language models to generate text with citations. In: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 6465–6488 (2023)
- [19] Gao, Y., Xiong, Y., Gao, X., Jia, K., Pan, J., Bi, Y., Dai, Y., Sun, J., Wang, H.: Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997 (2023)
- [20] High-Level Expert Group on AI: Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. Tech. rep., EU (2019), <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai>
- [21] Idahl, M., Lyu, L., Gadiraju, U., Anand, A.: Towards benchmarking the utility of explanations for model debugging. In: Proceedings of the First Workshop on Trustworthy Natural Language Processing, pp. 68–73 (2021)
- [22] Jacovi, A., Goldberg, Y.: Towards faithfully interpretable nlp systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 4198–4205 (2020)
- [23] Jacovi, A., Marasović, A., Miller, T., Goldberg, Y.: Formalizing trust in artificial intelligence: Prerequisites, causes and goals of human trust in ai. In: Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, p. 624–635, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021)

- [24] Kamaloo, E., Jafari, A., Zhang, X., Thakur, N., Lin, J.: HAGRID: A human-LLM collaborative dataset for generative information-seeking with attribution. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16883 (2023)
- [25] Kwiatkowski, T., Palomaki, J., Redfield, O., Collins, M., Parikh, A., Alberti, C., Epstein, D., Polosukhin, I., Devlin, J., Lee, K., et al.: Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **7**, 453–466 (2019)
- [26] Lanham, T., Chen, A., Radhakrishnan, A., Steiner, B., Denison, C., Hernandez, D., Li, D., Durmus, E., Hubinger, E., Kernion, J., et al.: Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13702 (2023)
- [27] Lee, M., Cimino, J., Zhu, H.R., Sable, C., Shanker, V., Ely, J., Yu, H.: Beyond information retrieval—medical question answering. In: *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, vol. 2006, p. 469, American Medical Informatics Association (2006)
- [28] Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.t., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Kiela, D.: Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 9459–9474 (2020)
- [29] Li, D., Sun, Z., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Chen, Z., Hu, B., Wu, A., Zhang, M.: A survey of large language models attribution. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03731 (2023)
- [30] Li, J., Chen, X., Hovy, E., Jurafsky, D.: Visualizing and understanding neural models in nlp. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 681–691, Association for Computational Linguistics (2016)
- [31] Liu, N.F., Zhang, T., Liang, P.: Evaluating verifiability in generative search engines. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 7001–7025 (2023)
- [32] Lyu, Q., Apidianaki, M., Callison-Burch, C.: Towards faithful model explanation in NLP: A survey. *Computational Linguistics* pp. 1–67 (2024)
- [33] Lyu, Q., Havaladar, S., Stein, A., Zhang, L., Rao, D., Wong, E., Apidianaki, M., Callison-Burch, C.: Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 305–329 (2023)
- [34] Maxwell, K.T., Schafer, B.: Concept and context in legal information retrieval. In: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*, pp. 63–72, IOS Press (2008)
- [35] Mayfield, J., Yang, E., Lawrie, D.J., MacAvaney, S., McNamee, P., Oard, D.W., Soldaini, L., Soboroff, I., Weller, O., Kayi, E.S., Sanders, K., Mason, M., Hibbler, N.: On the evaluation of machine-generated reports. In: *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and*

- Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2024, Washington DC, USA, July 14-18, 2024, pp. 1904–1915, ACM (2024)
- [36] Menick, J., Trebacz, M., Mikulik, V., Aslanides, J., Song, F., Chadwick, M., Glaese, M., Young, S., Campbell-Gillingham, L., Irving, G., et al.: Teaching language models to support answers with verified quotes. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11147 (2022)
- [37] Nauta, M., Trienes, J., Pathak, S., Nguyen, E., Peters, M., Schmitt, Y., Schlötterer, J., Van Keulen, M., Seifert, C.: From anecdotal evidence to quantitative evaluation methods: A systematic review on evaluating explainable ai. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(13s), 1–42 (2023)
- [38] Neeman, E., Aharoni, R., Honovich, O., Choshen, L., Szpektor, I., Abend, O.: DisentQA: Disentangling parametric and contextual knowledge with counterfactual question answering. In: Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023, pp. 10056–10070, Association for Computational Linguistics (2023)
- [39] Petroni, F., Piktus, A., Fan, A., Lewis, P.S.H., Yazdani, M., Cao, N.D., Thorne, J., Jernite, Y., Karpukhin, V., Maillard, J., Plachouras, V., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S.: KILT: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021, pp. 2523–2544, Association for Computational Linguistics (2021)
- [40] Qi, J., Sarti, G., Fernández, R., Bisazza, A.: Model internals-based answer attribution for trustworthy retrieval-augmented generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13663 (2024)
- [41] Rashkin, H., Nikolaev, V., Lamm, M., Aroyo, L., Collins, M., Das, D., Petrov, S., Tomar, G.S., Turc, I., Reitter, D.: Measuring attribution in natural language generation models. *Computational Linguistics* **49**(4), 777–840 (2023)
- [42] Roychowdhury, S., Soman, S., Ranjani, H., Gunda, N., Chhabra, V., BALA, S.K.: Evaluation of rag metrics for question answering in the telecom domain. In: ICML 2024 Workshop on Foundation Models in the Wild (2024)
- [43] Saad-Falcon, J., Khattab, O., Potts, C., Zaharia, M.: Ares: An automated evaluation framework for retrieval-augmented generation systems. In: Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 338–354 (2024)
- [44] Santhanam, K., Khattab, O., Saad-Falcon, J., Potts, C., Zaharia, M.: ColBERTv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022, pp. 3715–3734, Association for Computational Linguistics (2022)
- [45] Sen, P., Ganguly, D., Verma, M., Jones, G.J.F.: The curious case of IR explainability: Explaining document scores within and across ranking mod-

- els. In: Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2020, Virtual Event, China, July 25-30, 2020, pp. 2069–2072, ACM (2020)
- [46] Singh, J., Anand, A.: Model agnostic interpretability of rankers via intent modelling. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, pp. 618–628 (2020)
- [47] Slobodkin, A., Hirsch, E., Cattan, A., Schuster, T., Dagan, I.: Attribute first, then generate: Locally-attributable grounded text generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17104 (2024)
- [48] Thoppilan, R., De Freitas, D., Hall, J., Shazeer, N., Kulshreshtha, A., Cheng, H.T., Jin, A., Bos, T., Baker, L., Du, Y., et al.: Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239 (2022)
- [49] Tonmoy, S., Zaman, S., Jain, V., Rani, A., Rawte, V., Chadha, A., Das, A.: A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01313 (2024)
- [50] Turpin, M., Michael, J., Perez, E., Bowman, S.: Language models don’t always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
- [51] Wallat, J., Beringer, F., Anand, A., Anand, A.: Probing BERT for ranking abilities. In: European Conference on Information Retrieval, pp. 255–273, Springer Nature Switzerland Cham (2023)
- [52] Wallat, J., Hinrichs, H., Anand, A.: Causal probing for dual encoders. In: Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pp. 2292–2303 (2024)
- [53] Wang, Y., Feng, S., Wang, H., Shi, W., Balachandran, V., He, T., Tsvetkov, Y.: Resolving knowledge conflicts in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00935 (2023)
- [54] Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D., et al.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 24824–24837 (2022)
- [55] Weller, O., Marone, M., Weir, N., Lawrie, D., Khashabi, D., Van Durme, B.: “according to...”: Prompting language models improves quoting from pre-training data. In: Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 2288–2301 (2024)
- [56] Wu, Z., Chen, Y., Kao, C., Liu, F.: Perturbed masking: Parameter-free probing for analyzing and interpreting bert. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), Association for Computational Linguistics. (2020)
- [57] Xu, R., Qi, Z., Guo, Z., Wang, C., Wang, H., Zhang, Y., Xu, W.: Knowledge conflicts for llms: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08319 (2024)
- [58] Ye, X., Sun, R., Arik, S.Ö., Pfister, T.: Effective large language model adaptation for improved grounding and citation generation. In: Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1:

- Long Papers), NAACL 2024, Mexico City, Mexico, June 16-21, 2024, pp. 6237–6251, Association for Computational Linguistics (2024)
- [59] Zhang, W., Aliannejadi, M., Yuan, Y., Pei, J., Huang, J.h., Kanoulas, E.: Towards fine-grained citation evaluation in generated text: A comparative analysis of faithfulness metrics. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Natural Language Generation Conference, pp. 427–439 (2024)