

ValuesRAG: Enhancing Cultural Alignment Through Retrieval-Augmented Contextual Learning

Wonduk Seo^{1*} Zonghao Yuan^{2*} Yi Bu^{1,3†}

¹Peking University ²Tsinghua University

³Peking University Chongqing Research Institute of Big Data

¹{seowonduk, buyi}@pku.edu.cn, ²yzh23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Cultural values alignment in Large Language Models (LLMs) is a critical challenge due to their tendency to embed Western-centric biases from training data, leading to misrepresentations and fairness issues in cross-cultural contexts. Recent approaches, such as role-assignment and few-shot learning, often struggle with reliable cultural alignment as they heavily rely on pre-trained knowledge, lack scalability, and fail to capture nuanced cultural values effectively. To address these issues, we propose **ValuesRAG**, a novel and effective framework that applies Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) with in-context learning to integrate cultural and demographic knowledge dynamically during text generation. Leveraging the World Values Survey (WVS) dataset, ValuesRAG first generates summaries of values for each individual. Subsequently, we curated several representative regional datasets to serve as test datasets and retrieve relevant summaries of values based on demographic features, followed by a reranking step to select the top-k relevant summaries. ValuesRAG consistently outperforms baseline methods, both in the main experiment and in the ablation study where only the values summary was provided, highlighting ValuesRAG’s potential to foster culturally aligned AI systems and enhance the inclusivity of AI-driven applications.

1 Introduction

The rapid advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) has revealed pressing challenges in cultural values alignment [Singh *et al.*, 2024; Kharchenko *et al.*, 2024; Hu *et al.*, 2024]. Predominantly trained on Western data sources [Achiam *et al.*, 2023; Touvron *et al.*, 2023; Jiang *et al.*, 2023], LLMs inherently reflect Western cultural norms and social biases, raising concerns about their applicability in global contexts. These biases present significant challenges when de-

*Wonduk Seo and Zonghao Yuan contributed equally to this work.

†Yi Bu is the corresponding author for this work.




Figure 1: Overview of different approaches for cultural alignment. Comparing two baseline methods, namely Role Assignment and Few-Shot Learning, and the proposed ValuesRAG framework.

ploying LLMs in cross-cultural environments, often resulting in misrepresentations and stereotypical outputs [Gallegos *et al.*, 2024; Xie *et al.*, 2024; Potter *et al.*, 2024; Huang *et al.*, 2024]. Despite ongoing efforts to address these issues, existing strategies often fall short. While some countries have developed localized LLMs, such as China’s ERNIE [Sun *et al.*, 2021], South Korea’s HyperCLOVA [Yoo *et al.*, 2024], and the multilingual ChatGLM [GLM *et al.*, 2024], these models also exhibit biases inherited from their respective training datasets. As a result, cultural and social biases embedded in LLMs remain a critical concern, compelling researchers to explore more robust frameworks for cultural alignment [Gallegos *et al.*, 2024; Xie *et al.*, 2024; Potter *et al.*, 2024].

Recent studies have proposed several approaches, such as role-assignment approaches and few-shot learning techniques [Li *et al.*, 2024a; Alkhamissi *et al.*, 2024], to mitigate these cultural biases. However, these methods still face several challenges: (1) Role-assignment approaches, relying solely on the model’s pre-trained knowledge, provide pre-defined demographic information but fail to incorporate explicit values alignment text, which subsequently introduces stereotypes and biases rooted in Western-centric training data; (2) While offering example-based guidance, few-shot learning

methods struggle to comprehensively capture the complex cultural values due to the limited correlation between different values dimensions, thus remain ineffective on values-related tasks that differ significantly from the examples; (3) In addition, these methods can only align with the values of a single individual, and singular values cannot represent the universal values of individuals with similar characteristics.

To address these challenges, we propose **ValuesRAG**, a novel framework that utilizes Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) and in-context learning to dynamically incorporate cultural knowledge during text generation (see Figure 1). Our framework leverages the World Values Survey (WVS) dataset [Haerpfer *et al.*, 2022], a globally recognized and comprehensive dataset that explores values across countries using rigorous social science methodologies. Specifically, we first generate summaries for each topic, followed by generating individuals’ summaries of values and demographic profiles in parallel. After constructing the knowledge base, we retrieve the top 100 relevant summaries based on demographic features, followed by a reranking step to ensure the most relevant top- k summaries are selected. Finally, we utilize a reasoning LLM that filters the most relevant demographic profiles and applies step-by-step reasoning grounded in the retrieved values to generate the final answer to the question.

We evaluate the performance of ValuesRAG by comparing it against several baseline approaches, including: (1) zero-shot inference, (2) role-assignment-only method [Tao *et al.*, 2024], (3) few-shot learning [Choenni and Shutova, 2024], and (4) a hybrid method combining (1) and (2). To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, we curated diverse regional survey QA datasets which are designed to capture values-related question-answer pairs. Extensive experimental results show significant improvements in cultural and contextual understanding, demonstrating that ValuesRAG outperforms the baselines, also in the ablation study where only summaries of values were provided without any additional information. Unlike previous methods that heavily depend on pre-trained knowledge or limited demonstrations, ValuesRAG dynamically retrieves and integrates multiple similar individual summaries based on demographic features, enabling richer value representations and more context-aware responses compared to approaches relying on a single predefined prompt or role.

These findings highlight ValuesRAG’s potential to foster inclusive AI systems, enhancing the reliability and fairness of AI-driven applications. Our study demonstrates ValuesRAG’s robust capabilities on a global scale, suggesting its applicability in aligning the values of diverse groups within a single country. ValuesRAG provides a cost-efficient tool for public policymakers and scientists from various disciplines to refine social simulations, enabling more precise predictions of policy outcomes [Li *et al.*, 2024b]. This, in turn, facilitates the creation of fairer and more effective policies. Moreover, NGOs can leverage ValuesRAG to develop LLMs that reflect specific value orientations while maintaining strong alignment with users’ values, thereby increasing their persuasive impact. This approach benefits the promotion and spread of values that contribute to the planet’s sustainable development and the long-term well-being of human society.

2 Related Work

2.1 Evaluation of LLMs’ Cultural Bias

Pre-trained models are facing growing criticism for their inherent social biases, with cultural bias emerging as a particularly nuanced and pervasive issue [Tao *et al.*, 2024]. Unlike the more obvious safety concerns and social discrimination [Liu *et al.*, 2024] embedded in language models, cultural bias manifests in subtler ways, often reflecting the dominant cultural perspectives present in training data. Studies have shown that LLMs often exhibit cultural biases aligned with the values of developed countries, resulting in the underrepresentation of perspectives from less developed regions [Manvi *et al.*, 2024; Durmus *et al.*, 2024]. This imbalance not only perpetuates existing cultural hierarchies but also limits the global applicability of these models [Manvi *et al.*, 2024]. Various benchmarks and evaluation methods have been proposed to assess the cultural biases of pre-trained models [Gallegos *et al.*, 2024]. For example, Webster *et al.* [2021] developed probability-based metrics to evaluate gender bias embedded in pre-trained models, while Caliskan *et al.* [2017] pioneered the use of word embeddings as quantitative measures of bias. More recently, Karinshak *et al.* [2024] introduced *LLM-GLOBE*, a benchmark where LLMs generate both quantitative and open-ended answers to values assessment questions, with subsequent evaluation using the LLM-as-a-Jury Protocol. These evaluation methods collectively highlight the complex nature of cultural bias in LLMs and the need for multifaceted assessment approaches.

2.2 Mitigation of LLMs’ Cultural Bias

Methods like RLHF [Shen *et al.*, 2023; Ji *et al.*, 2024] are very commonly used in LLM values alignment, but this type of single values alignment method is not suitable for the mitigation of cultural bias, because the alignment goal of cultural bias is diverse and dynamic [Huang *et al.*, 2024], as there are hundreds of countries and cultures in the earth. Addressing cultural biases has become a critical area of research, with various strategies being proposed to enhance cultural sensitivity in LLMs. For instance, Tao *et al.* [2024] adopted national and cultural role assignments to adjust the cultural values of LLMs, while Masoud *et al.* [2024] developed a soft prompt tuning approach to mitigate bias. Also, Choenni and Shutova [2024] employed few-shot in-context learning to align cultural behaviors, demonstrating promising results in specific contexts. However, these approaches face significant limitations in fully capturing the complexity of cultural alignment. Tao *et al.*’s technique mainly depends on national and cultural roles without explicitly integrating values assignments, causing an overreliance on latent internal representations. Meanwhile, Choenni and Shutova’s few-shot learning approach similarly falls short of modeling cultural alignment in all its complexity. We, therefore, use these methods as baselines to benchmark our proposed approach.

3 Datasets

In this section, we first introduce the World Values Survey (WVS) as our training dataset (Section 3.1), highlighting its extensive coverage, global representativeness, and relevance

Set	Dataset	Abbreviation	Region	Year	N ^a	VQ ^b
<i>Train Set</i>	World Values Survey	WVS	Global	2017–2022	97.2k	259
	European Values Study	EVS	Europe	2017	59.4k	211
<i>Test Sets</i>	The General Social Survey	GSS	North America	2021–2022	8.2k	44
	Chinese General Social Survey	CGSS	East Asia	2021	8.1k	58
	India Survey Dataset	ISD	South Asia	2019–2020	30.0k	33
	AmericasBarometer	LAPOP	Latin America	2021	59.1k	48
	Afrobarometer	Afrobarometer	Africa	2022	48.1k	144

Table 1: Overview of the datasets utilized in our study. The *Train Set* (WVS) includes global data collected between 2017 and 2022, providing the basis for generating cultural summaries of values and validation for our method. The *Test Set* consists of six region-specific surveys, each capturing socio-cultural information from distinct geographic areas and time frames. ^aN represents sample size in thousands (k). ^bVQ represents the number of values-related questions. ^cDQ represents the number of demographic features.

for values-related studies. Subsequently, we describe six regional test datasets (Section 3.2), which are carefully selected to ensure geographic, cultural, and demographic diversity.

3.1 Train Dataset

WVS ¹ [Haerpfner *et al.*, 2022] is a globally recognized dataset that investigates human beliefs, values, and cultural norms through structured surveys conducted across multiple countries. WVS is selected as our train dataset especially due to its numerous advantages:

- 1. Broad Recognition and Inclusiveness:** WVS is widely recognized and used by governments, social scientists, and international organizations in values studies. It covers 120 countries, representing 94.5% of the global population, ensuring broad geographic and cultural representation.
- 2. Expert-Designed and Accessible:** The dataset is designed by leading domain experts to conduct comprehensive surveys of values, ensuring reliability and relevance. It is publicly accessible, enabling reproducibility and transparency in research.
- 3. Effective Structure and Large Scale:** WVS has well-organized and comprehensive demographic questions, making it effective for retrieval tasks. Its large sample size (97,221 respondents) is also suitable for RAG tasks.

Since values evolve gradually over time, WVS is conducted in waves, with each wave occurring every five years. For our study, we utilized the most recent wave, spanning from 2017 to 2022.

The WVS codebook includes over 600 indicators, with 259 values-related and 31 demographic-related questions. The values questions span 13 topics, such as social trust, post-materialism, and political interest. We randomly selected 20% (52 questions) per topic for validation and used the remaining 80% (207 questions) for summary generation. The 31 demographic features, including country, sex, age, education, social class, and employment status, were used to generate demographic summaries for retrieval tasks.

¹<https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>

3.2 Test Datasets

We selected six regional surveys to serve as test datasets based on the following criteria:

- 1. Demographic and Values Coverage:** The datasets provide demographic features closely aligned with WVS’s questions, along with sufficient values-related features to enable meaningful comparisons and analyses.
- 2. Temporal Proximity:** The datasets exhibit temporal proximity to WVS Wave 7 (2017–2022), allowing aligned comparisons and ensuring consistency across evaluations.

The regions in our test datasets were meticulously chosen to encompass a wide range of geographic, cultural, and demographic diversity, ensuring the data accurately reflects the majority of the global population. All of them are publicly accessible, and are statistically representative at national or regional levels, which guarantees their reliability and validity.

To be specific, we selected European Values Study [EVS, 2022] as the representative dataset for Europe, as it is the largest values survey in the region. For the United States, we selected the General Social Survey [Davern *et al.*, 2024], which is the most comprehensive social survey in the country. The Chinese General Social Survey [Bian and Li, 2012] serves as the representative dataset for China due to its comprehensive sampling methodology and scientific rigor. For India, where national survey data were largely inaccessible during our study, we used Pew Research Center’s survey data [Sahgal and Evans, 2021] to represent the Indian population. The AmericasBarometer [Lab, 2021], conducted by the LAPOP Lab, was selected to represent Latin American countries, as it covers 32 countries across the region. Finally, Afrobarometer [Afrobarometer, 2023] was chosen as the representative dataset for Africa. A detailed summary of these datasets is presented in Table 1.

4 Methodology

In this section, we present the *ValuesRAG* which is specifically designed to address cultural biases and enhance contextual alignment in LLM-driven scenarios through a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) approach. *ValuesRAG* consists of three key components: *Values and Demographic*




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed ValuesRAG framework for cultural alignment, consisting of four components: (1) Dataset Preprocessing, (2) Topic QA Summary Generation, (3) Individual Values Summary Generation, and (4) Values Retrieval Augmented Generation.

Summary Generation, which extracts and summarizes cultural values and demographic information from large-scale datasets (Section 4.1); *Values-Augmented Generation*, which incorporates these summaries into the generative process to align responses with the cultural context (Section 4.2); and *Retrieval-based Values Alignment*, which dynamically assigns relevant individual values to queries based on demographic profiles (Section 4.3). An overview of the *ValuesRAG* framework is provided in Figure 2.

4.1 Values and Demographic Summary Generation

To systematically generate concise summaries of values and demographics for each individual, we process the dataset in three stages. First, the dataset is stratified by topics and split into train and validation sets, ensuring that the distribution of each topic is preserved (described in Section 3.1). In parallel, topic-based summaries and demographic summaries are generated separately. For topic-based summaries, values-related QA sets are used to produce summaries for each topic, while demographic summaries are generated using demographic-related QA sets:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i^j &= f_{\text{gen}}(QA_i^{j,1}, QA_i^{j,2}, \dots, QA_i^{j,N_j}), \\ D_i &= f_{\text{gen}}(QA_i^{\text{demo},1}, QA_i^{\text{demo},2}, \dots, QA_i^{\text{demo},K}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where f_{gen} denotes the generative model, T_i^j is the summary for topic j of individual i , based on N_j values-related QA pairs, and D_i represents the demographic summary derived from K demographic-related QA pairs. Finally, individual summaries are constructed by combining all topic summaries:

$$S_i = f_{\text{gen}}(T_i^1, T_i^2, \dots, T_i^M), \quad (2)$$

with M denoting the total number of topics. The result, denoted as S_i , forms a comprehensive values summary for individual i . These generate summaries serve as structured references for retrieval in later stages and are also used to augment the validation set for evaluation.

4.2 Values Augmented Generation

Once the comprehensive summaries for each individual are generated in the previous step, we construct an augmented generation process for evaluating the validation question-answer data. For each validation question, we concatenate the corresponding individual’s values summary with the question itself, forming a context-rich input for the LLM:

$$C_i = \text{concat}(S_i, Q_i^{\text{val},k}) \quad (3)$$

where C_i represents the combined context, S_i is the values summary for individual i , and $Q_i^{\text{val},k}$ is the k -th validation question. Next, we concatenate C_i with the demographic summary D_i to further enhance the context, enabling the generation of responses based on both values and demographic information:

$$A_i = f_{\text{gen}}(C_i, D_i) \quad (4)$$

here, A_i represents the answer generated by the function f , and (C_i, D_i) embeds the augmented context C_i and demographic information D_i into a structured input format. Additionally, we utilize chain-of-thought prompting to enhance reasoning and emulate the behavior of the corresponding individual, ensuring responses that are contextually aligned with the values captured in the summaries and demographic characteristics.

4.3 Retrieval-based Values Alignment

To dynamically assign relevant values to test individuals, we leverage demographic information as documents for retrieval. The demographic data from both the train and test datasets are preprocessed into a structured context format, as described earlier, and embeddings are generated for each demographic context using a representation model. We first retrieve the top-100 most similar summaries of values for each test individual by computing the cosine similarity between the embeddings of the test and train demographics:

$$\text{Sim}(E_{\text{test}}, E_{\text{train}}) = \frac{E_{\text{test}} \cdot E_{\text{train}}}{\|E_{\text{test}}\| \|E_{\text{train}}\|} \quad (5)$$

Specifically, E_{test} and E_{train} represent the embeddings of the test and training demographic contexts, respectively, and $\text{Sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the cosine similarity score. The top-100 embeddings with the highest similarity scores are initially selected as candidates. Subsequently, we apply a reranking step to refine the selection and identify the most relevant summaries among the retrieved candidates. The reranking process evaluates the semantic relevance of the initial candidates based on a scoring function:

$$R'_k = f_{\text{rerank}}(E_{\text{test}}, E_{C_j}), C_j \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{100}\}, k \leq 100 \quad (6)$$

where R'_k represents the reranked summary for the k -th candidate selected from the final top- k results, f_{rerank} is the reranking function, and E_{C_j} denotes the embedding of the j -th candidate initially retrieved among the 100 documents. The reranked top- k summaries are then incorporated into the prompts, enriching the contextual alignment of the generated responses. In detail, for each test individual, the retrieved and

Methods	EVS	GSS	CGSS	ISD	LAPOP	Africa	Avg.
Baseline							
Zero-shot Inference	0.5566	0.6026	0.4019	0.6109	0.4195	0.3923	0.4973
Role-Assignment	0.5738	0.7564	0.4813	0.6164	0.4742	0.5563	0.5764
Few-Shot Learning	0.5271	0.6538	0.4631	0.5804	0.4220	0.4258	0.5120
Role-Assignment + Few-Shot Learning	0.5938	0.7292	0.5048	0.6330	0.4414	0.5305	0.5721
Ours							
ValuesRAG($k = 1$)	0.5960	<u>0.7722</u> *	<u>0.5347</u> *	0.6853*	0.4682	0.5904*	0.6078*
ValuesRAG($k = 3$)	<u>0.6020</u> *	0.7781 *	0.5387 *	0.7001*	<u>0.5030</u> *	0.5953 *	0.6195 *
ValuesRAG($k = 5$)	0.6051 *	0.7706*	0.5301*	0.7016 *	0.5061 *	<u>0.5905</u> *	<u>0.6173</u> *
ValuesRAG($k = 10$)	<u>0.6020</u> *	0.7380	0.5317*	<u>0.7014</u> *	0.4686	0.5680*	0.6016*

Table 2: Accuracy scores for various methods compared with multiple baselines across six regional datasets, including the European Values Study (EVS), General Social Survey (GSS), Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS), Indian Survey Data (ISD), LAPOP, Afrobarometer, and the AmericasBarometer. k indicates the number of summaries to be retrieved. Bold text indicates the best performance, underlined text indicates the second-best performance. * denotes significant improvements (paired t -test with Holm-Bonferroni correction, $p < 0.05$) over all baseline model(s).

reranked summaries are combined into the final prompt, and the answer is subsequently generated using the function f_{gen} :

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{test}} &= (D_{\text{test}}, R'_1, R'_2, \dots, R'_K, Q_{\text{test}}), \\ A_{\text{test}} &= f_{\text{gen}}(P_{\text{test}}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

P_{test} is the final prompt, D_{test} is the demographic information of the test individual, $\{R'_1, R'_2, \dots, R'_K\}$ represents the top- k reranked summaries, and Q_{test} is the test question. A_{test} denotes the generated answer for the test question, and f_{gen} represents the generation function that leverages the structured input prompt.

This retrieval-based approach, followed by reranking, enhances reasoning by explicitly guiding the LLM to critically evaluate which retrieved values best align with the test individual’s demographic characteristics. The final prompts are then used to generate answers following the chain-of-thought prompting strategy, ensuring that the responses are contextually coherent and culturally aligned with the test individual’s profile.

5 Experiments

5.1 Setup

Models Used We employ *GPT-4o-mini* [Achiam *et al.*, 2023], a smaller version of *GPT-4o*, for our generation tasks, with the temperature parameter set to 0.7 for balancing coherence and creativity. For retrieval task, we used the *E5 (base)* model [Wang *et al.*, 2022]² to generate embeddings and retrieve the top-100 most relevant summaries of values by calculating cosine similarity. Additionally, we utilized the *GTE-multilingual-reranker-base model* [Zhang *et al.*, 2024]³ for reranking. This reranking model refines the selection process and ensures that the top- k most relevant summaries are selected from the initial top-100 retrievals.

²<https://huggingface.co/intfloat/e5-base>

³<https://huggingface.co/Alibaba-NLP/gte-multilingual-reranker-base>

Baseline Methods and Implementation Our baseline methods include: (1) Zero-shot Inference, (2) the role-assignment-only approach [Tao *et al.*, 2024], (3) a few-shot learning method [Choenni and Shutova, 2024], and (4) a hybrid method that combines both (1) and (2). Specifically, for the role-assignment baseline, we use the same demographic summaries as in ValuesRAG to ensure fairness by assigning roles based on demographic information from the survey data. For the few-shot method, we follow the approach outlined in the previous work, where we randomly select five examples from the test set as prompts. The hybrid method combines both strategies, assigning roles based on demographic summaries and augmenting the prompts with five randomly selected few-shot examples from the test set.

Evaluation Method We used accuracy as the primary evaluation metric, converting multi-choice responses into binary form for consistency and simplicity by dividing responses into two distinct groups based on contrasting answer patterns, which effectively captures agreement or disagreement and aligns with the structure of values-related questions.

5.2 Experimental Analysis

In our experiments, we compare our method *ValuesRAG* with four baseline methods: zero-shot inference, role-assignment, few-shot learning, and a hybrid approach that combines role-assignment and few-shot learning, as shown in Table 2. We found that the role-assignment method generally surpasses both zero-shot and few-shot approaches. By grounding the agent’s responses in a clearly defined demographic context, it ensures more consistent performance. In contrast, few-shot learning, which depends on a small set of examples, often faces challenges in generalizing to unseen scenarios, as different values dimensions are not strongly related in many cases. However, while role-assignment offers clearer cultural context, it may oversimplify complex personal traits by imposing rigid, stereotype-like constraints on agent behavior. The hybrid method seeks to address these limitations by combining role assignment for consistency with few-shot prompts

to introduce variety, but still falls short in capturing the full complexity of cultural values.

In contrast, *ValuesRAG* overcomes these challenges by dynamically retrieving and integrating specific demographic and cultural data for each agent. Specifically, *ValuesRAG* ($k=3$) achieves the best results, with *ValuesRAG* ($k=5$) following closely behind. Although using 1 or 10 retrieved summaries also achieved better performance than other baselines, retrieving 3 and 5 summaries provides a more balanced trade-off between retrieval diversity and contextual relevance. This retrieval-augmented framework enables the model to dynamically incorporate richer, more nuanced information about each agent, avoiding the limitations of rigid demographic labels or small sample prompts. As a result, our model captures the interplay between individual beliefs, social contexts, and cultural norms more effectively. Evaluations across diverse test datasets demonstrate that *ValuesRAG* consistently outperforms baseline methods, highlighting its ability to better represent cultural diversity, improve contextual alignment, and enhance overall model performance.

5.3 Ablation Study: Impact of Values-Only Generation

To validate the robustness of *ValuesRAG*, we perform an ablation study using only value-augmented generation, thereby isolating the impact of demographic summaries on the model’s performance. Specifically, we used the WVS validation set—separated from the training data as outlined in Section 3—to evaluate the models. Table 3 presents a comparison of our method, using only summaries of values, against four baseline methods. The results demonstrate that *ValuesRAG* consistently outperforms the baselines across all datasets, achieving the highest accuracy even relying solely on summaries of values.

Methods	Accuracy
Zero-Shot	0.6176
Role-Assignment	<u>0.6747</u>
Few-Shot Learning	0.6359
Role-Assignment + Few-Shot Learning	0.6670
Values Augmented Generation-Only (Ours)	<u>0.6894</u>

Table 3: Accuracy comparison between baseline methods and our proposed Values Augmented Generation method using the WVS validation set. Bold text indicates the best performance, underlined text indicates the second-best performance.

This result confirms the effectiveness and robustness of the values-augmented generation approach. *ValuesRAG* leverages structured values summaries to generate contextually rich and culturally aligned responses. Even without demographic augmentation, *ValuesRAG* achieves superior performance by dynamically capturing the underlying value patterns, demonstrating its ability to generalize across diverse cultural contexts without requiring predefined prompts or demographic anchors. The result showcases the framework’s scalability and adaptability, proving it can mitigate biases and generate culturally coherent outputs with minimal reliance on external context.

6 Conclusion

We present *ValuesRAG*, an innovative Retrieval-Augmented Generation framework that revolutionizes cultural values alignment through its comprehensive approach to values context analysis. While existing approaches rely on pre-trained knowledge with fixed demographic labels, often leading to oversimplified generalizations and biases, or few-shot prompting techniques that struggle with generalization due to limited correlations across value dimensions, *ValuesRAG* overcomes these weaknesses by dynamically retrieving and integrating granular demographic data with detailed individual-level cultural profiles. Our extensive evaluations demonstrate that *ValuesRAG* achieves an accuracy improvement of up to 21% over state-of-the-art baselines across diverse regional QA datasets. By combining adaptive retrieval mechanisms with in-context learning and reranking strategies, *ValuesRAG* captures complex cultural nuances, reduces biases, and ensures contextually aligned responses. This structured design enables *ValuesRAG* to bridge the gap between generic LLM capabilities and the demands of culturally sensitive applications, providing a scalable and robust solution for real-world use cases.

7 Limitation

Although our baseline comparisons indicate that *ValuesRAG* generally delivers superior performance compared to alternative methods, it does not always guarantee an exact match to individual’s true values. Since we rely on the WVS dataset to summarize individual profiles, there can be mismatches when these summaries are applied to other test sets. In future work, we plan to explore more adaptive retrieval strategies that can better align with novel datasets, as well as investigate how integrating additional fine-tuning with retrieval-augmented generation may further refine each agent’s contextual accuracy.

References

- [Achiam *et al.*, 2023] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [Afrobarometer, 2023] Afrobarometer. Afrobarometer data, merged round 9 data (39 countries), 2023, 2023.
- [AlKhamissi *et al.*, 2024] Badr AlKhamissi, Muhammad El-Nokrashy, Mai AlKhamissi, and Mona Diab. Investigating cultural alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13231*, 2024.
- [Bian and Li, 2012] Yanjie Bian and Lulu Li. The chinese general social survey (2003-8). *Chinese Sociological Review*, 45(1):70–97, 2012.
- [Caliskan *et al.*, 2017] Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J. Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186, April 2017.
- [Choenni and Shutova, 2024] Rochelle Choenni and Ekaterina Shutova. Self-Alignment: Improving Alignment of Cultural Values in LLMs via In-Context Learning, August 2024.
- [Davern *et al.*, 2024] Michael Davern, Rene Bautista, Jeremy Freese, Pamela Herd, and Stephen L. Morgan. General social survey 1972-2024. Data accessed from the GSS Data Explorer website, 2024. Machine-readable data file.
- [Durmus *et al.*, 2024] Esin Durmus, Karina Nguyen, Thomas I. Liao, Nicholas Schiefer, Amanda Askill, Anton Bakhtin, Carol Chen, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Nicholas Joseph, Liane Lovitt, Sam McCandlish, Orowa Sikder, Alex Tamkin, Janel Thamkul, Jared Kaplan, Jack Clark, and Deep Ganguli. Towards Measuring the Representation of Subjective Global Opinions in Language Models, April 2024.
- [EVS, 2022] EVS. European Values Study 2017: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2017) European Values Study 2017: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2017), 2022.
- [Gallegos *et al.*, 2024] Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. Bias and Fairness in Large Language Models: A Survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 50(3):1097–1179, September 2024.
- [GLM *et al.*, 2024] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, 2024.
- [Haerpfer *et al.*, 2022] Christian Haerpfer, Ronald Inglehart, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen. World values survey wave 7 (2017-2022) cross-national data-set. (*No Title*), 2022.
- [Hu *et al.*, 2024] Tiancheng Hu, Yara Kyrchenko, Steve Rathje, Nigel Collier, Sander van der Linden, and Jon Roosenbeek. Generative language models exhibit social identity biases. *Nature Computational Science*, pages 1–11, 2024.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2024] Linus Ta-Lun Huang, Gleb Papyshyev, and James K. Wong. Democratizing value alignment: From authoritarian to democratic AI ethics. *AI and Ethics*, pages 1–8, December 2024.
- [Ji *et al.*, 2024] Jiaming Ji, Tianyi Qiu, Boyuan Chen, Borong Zhang, Hantao Lou, Kaile Wang, Yawen Duan, Zhonghao He, Jiayi Zhou, Zhaowei Zhang, Fanzhi Zeng, Kwan Yee Ng, Juntao Dai, Xuehai Pan, Aidan O’Gara, Yingshan Lei, Hua Xu, Brian Tse, Jie Fu, Stephen McAleer, Yaodong Yang, Yizhou Wang, Song-Chun Zhu, Yike Guo, and Wen Gao. AI Alignment: A Comprehensive Survey, May 2024.
- [Jiang *et al.*, 2023] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [Karinshak *et al.*, 2024] Elise Karinshak, Amanda Hu, Kewen Kong, Vishwanatha Rao, Jingren Wang, Jindong Wang, and Yi Zeng. LLM-GLOBE: A Benchmark Evaluating the Cultural Values Embedded in LLM Output, November 2024.
- [Kharchenko *et al.*, 2024] Julia Kharchenko, Tanya Roosta, Aman Chadha, and Chirag Shah. How Well Do LLMs Represent Values Across Cultures? Empirical Analysis of LLM Responses Based on Hofstede Cultural Dimensions, June 2024.
- [Lab, 2021] LAPOP Lab. Americasbarometer dominican republic, 2021, v1.2, 2021. Accessed on [Add the access date if needed].
- [Li *et al.*, 2024a] Cheng Li, Mengzhou Chen, Jindong Wang, Sunayana Sitaram, and Xing Xie. Culturellm: Incorporating cultural differences into large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10946*, 2024.
- [Li *et al.*, 2024b] Hao Li, Ruoyuan Gong, and Hao Jiang. Political actor agent: Simulating legislative system for roll call votes prediction with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07144*, 2024.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2024] Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo, Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. Trustworthy LLMs: A Survey and Guideline for Evaluating Large Language Models’ Alignment, March 2024.
- [Manvi *et al.*, 2024] Rohin Manvi, Samar Khanna, Marshall Burke, David Lobell, and Stefano Ermon. Large Language Models are Geographically Biased, October 2024.
- [Masoud *et al.*, 2024] Reem I Masoud, Martin Ferianc, Philip Colin Treleaven, and Miguel RD Rodrigues. Llm alignment using soft prompt tuning: The case of cultural alignment. In *Workshop on Socially Responsible Language Modelling Research*, 2024.

- [Potter *et al.*, 2024] Yujin Potter, Shiyang Lai, Junsol Kim, James Evans, and Dawn Song. Hidden Persuaders: LLMs’ Political Leaning and Their Influence on Voters, November 2024.
- [Sahgal and Evans, 2021] Neha Sahgal and Jonathan Evans. India survey dataset, 2021.
- [Shen *et al.*, 2023] Tianhao Shen, Renren Jin, Yufei Huang, Chuang Liu, Weilong Dong, Zishan Guo, Xinwei Wu, Yan Liu, and Deyi Xiong. Large Language Model Alignment: A Survey, September 2023.
- [Singh *et al.*, 2024] Shivalika Singh, Angelika Romanou, Clémentine Fourrier, David I. Adelani, Jian Gang Ngui, Daniel Vila-Suero, Peerat Limkonchotiwat, Kelly Marchisio, Wei Qi Leong, Yosephine Susanto, Raymond Ng, Shayne Longpre, Wei-Yin Ko, Madeline Smith, Antoine Bosselut, Alice Oh, Andre F. T. Martins, Leshem Choshen, Daphne Ippolito, Enzo Ferrante, Marzieh Fadaee, Beyza Ermiş, and Sara Hooker. Global MMLU: Understanding and Addressing Cultural and Linguistic Biases in Multilingual Evaluation, December 2024.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2021] Yu Sun, Shuohuan Wang, Shikun Feng, Siyu Ding, Chao Pang, Junyuan Shang, Jiayang Liu, Xuyi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Yuxiang Lu, et al. Ernie 3.0: Large-scale knowledge enhanced pre-training for language understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02137*, 2021.
- [Tao *et al.*, 2024] Yan Tao, Olga Viberg, Ryan S Baker, and René F Kizilcec. Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(9):pgae346, 09 2024.
- [Touvron *et al.*, 2023] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. Text embeddings by weakly-supervised contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03533*, 2022.
- [Webster *et al.*, 2021] Kellie Webster, Xuezhi Wang, Ian Tenney, Alex Beutel, Emily Pitler, Ellie Pavlick, Jilin Chen, Ed Chi, and Slav Petrov. Measuring and Reducing Gendered Correlations in Pre-trained Models, March 2021.
- [Xie *et al.*, 2024] Chengxing Xie, Canyu Chen, Feiran Jia, Ziyu Ye, Shiyang Lai, Kai Shu, Jindong Gu, Adel Bibi, Ziniu Hu, David Jurgens, James Evans, Philip Torr, Bernard Ghanem, and Guohao Li. Can Large Language Model Agents Simulate Human Trust Behavior?, November 2024.
- [Yoo *et al.*, 2024] Kang Min Yoo, Jaegeun Han, Sookyo In, Heewon Jeon, Jisu Jeong, Jaewook Kang, Hyunwook Kim, Kyung-Min Kim, Munhyong Kim, Sungju Kim, et al. Hyperclova x technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01954*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Wen Xie, Ziqi Dai, Jialong Tang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Meishan Zhang, Wenjie Li, and Min Zhang. mgte: Generalized long-context text representation and reranking models for multilingual text retrieval, 2024.