

Multilingual != Multicultural: Evaluating Gaps Between Multilingual Capabilities and Cultural Alignment in LLMs

Jonathan Rystrom and Hannah Rose Kirk and Scott Hale

Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, UK

jonathan.rystrom@oii.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are becoming increasingly capable across global languages. However, the ability to communicate across languages does not necessarily translate to appropriate cultural representations. A key concern is US-centric bias, where LLMs reflect US rather than local cultural values. We propose a novel methodology that compares LLM-generated response distributions against population-level opinion data from the World Value Survey across four languages (Danish, Dutch, English, and Portuguese). Using a rigorous linear mixed-effects regression framework, we compare two families of models: Google’s Gemma models (2B–27B parameters) and successive iterations of OpenAI’s turbo-series. Across the families of models, we find no consistent relationships between language capabilities and cultural alignment. While the Gemma models have a positive correlation between language capability and cultural alignment across languages, the OpenAI models do not. Importantly, we find that self-consistency is a stronger predictor of multicultural alignment than multilingual capabilities. Our results demonstrate that achieving meaningful cultural alignment requires dedicated effort beyond improving general language capabilities.

1 Introduction

Spearheaded by accessible chat interfaces to powerful models like ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022), LLMs are reaching hundreds of millions of users (Milmo, 2023). These models are deployed across diverse contexts: from tutoring mathematics (Khan, 2023) to building software applications (Peng et al., 2023) to assisting in legal cases (Tan et al., 2023). While most LLMs demonstrate multilingual abilities (Üstün et al., 2024), the ability to communicate across languages does not necessarily translate into appropriate cultural representations. Disentangling language capabilities and cultural alignment is cru-




Figure 1: The relationship between multilingual capability and cultural alignment is inconsistent across LLM families, as shown by coefficients from our linear mixed-effects model (Eq. 1; §3.2). OpenAI models show negative or insignificant relationships outside of English, while Gemma models show positive relationships throughout ($p < .05$).

cial for understanding how LLMs should be examined and audited (Mökander et al., 2024) and for ensuring these technologies work for diverse people (D’Ignazio and Klein, 2020; Weidinger et al., 2022).

A priori, we might expect these models to exhibit US-centric cultural biases despite their multilingual capabilities, given their development context: Although millions use LLMs, they are developed by a select few. Many model providers, such as OpenAI, Anthropic, and Google, are American technology companies headquartered in Silicon Valley. These companies comprise a narrow slice of human experience, limiting the voices that contribute to critical design decisions in LLMs (D’Ignazio and Klein, 2020). The companies typically train LLMs on massive amounts of predominantly English text and employ American crowd workers to rate and evaluate the LLMs’ responses (Johnson et al., 2022; Kirk et al., 2023). Far too often, the benefits and harms of data technologies are unequally distributed, reinforcing biases and harming already minoritized groups (Birhane, 2020; Milan and Treré, 2019; Khandelwal et al., 2024). Understand-

ing how LLMs represent different cultures is thus paramount to establishing risks of representational harm (Rauh et al., 2022) and ensuring the technology’s utility is shared across diverse communities.

Increasing diversity and cross-cultural understanding is stymied by unchecked assumptions in both alignment techniques and evaluation methodologies. First, there is an assumption that bigger and more capable LLMs trained on more data will be inherently easier to align (Zhou et al., 2023; Kundu et al., 2023), but this sidesteps the thorny question of pluralistic variation and cultural representations (Kirk et al., 2024b). Thus, it is unclear whether improvements in architecture (Fedus et al., 2022) and post-training methods (Kirk et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2023) translate into improvements in cultural alignment.

Although studies like the World Values Survey (WVS) have documented how values vary across cultures (EVS/WVS, 2022), it remains unclear whether more capable LLMs—through scaling or improved training—better align with these cultural differences (Bai et al., 2022; Kirk et al., 2023). While the WVS has been used in prior research on values in LLMs, these studies have focused predominately on individual models’ performance within an English-language context. (Cao et al., 2023; Arora et al., 2023; AlKhamissi et al., 2024). This paper addresses this gap by developing a methodology for assessing how well families of LLMs represent different cultural contexts across multiple languages. We compare two distinct paths to model improvement: systematic scaling of instruction-tuned models and commercial product development comprising scaling and innovation in post-training to accommodate pressures from capabilities, cost, and preferences (OpenAI et al., 2024b).

Given these considerations, we investigate the following research questions:

RQ1 Multilingual Cultural Alignment: Does improved multilingual capability increase LLM alignment with population-specific value distributions?

RQ2 US-centric Bias: When using different languages, do LLMs align more with US values or with values from the countries where these languages are native?

We operationalise *multilingual capability* as an LLM’s performance on a range of multilingual

benchmarks across languages (see, e.g., Nielsen, 2023). We describe the specific benchmarks and performances in Appendix F.

This work makes several key contributions. First, we introduce a novel distribution-based methodology for probing cultural alignment across languages, moving beyond direct survey approaches to better capture underlying cultural values (Sorensen et al., 2024). Second, we provide the first systematic comparison of how improvements in scale and post-training affect cultural alignment and US-centric bias across English, Danish, Dutch, and Portuguese through a series of robust statistical models. Third, we release a dataset of model-generated responses across multiple languages and cultural contexts as well as our code, enabling future research into cultural alignment and bias.¹ Together, these contributions advance our understanding of how LLM development choices influence cultural representation while providing tools for ongoing investigation of these critical issues.

2 Measuring Cultural Alignment




Figure 2: Pearson correlations in value polarity scores across studied countries from the World Values Survey. All correlations are positive with most being between 0.7-0.95.

This section defines what we mean by ‘cultural alignment’ and how to measure it in LLMs. First, we provide a high-level intuition of the cultural alignment as reproducing distributions of values in a particular population. Then we show how to a) get a ground-truth distribution of values using

¹See <https://github.com/jhrystrom/multicultural-alignment> for code and <https://huggingface.co/datasets/ryzzlestrizzle/multicultural-wvs-alignment> for data

the World Values Survey (§2.1) and b) elicit value distributions from LLMs (§2.2)

Cultural alignment as value reproduction:

Within a culture there will be a variety of stances to any particular topic. However, the *distribution* of stances will be characteristic among cultures. For instance, while some Danes are opposed to abortion, it is a much less contentious topic than in the US (Adamczyk et al., 2020; Norup, 1997).

We posit that cultural alignment for a specific group of people can be operationalised as how well an LLM reproduces the distribution of values over a wide range of topics (Sorensen et al., 2024). By investigating *distributions* of responses, we differ from previous work that directly surveys the LLMs as a regular participant (e.g., Cao et al., 2023). Our goal is to get more naturalistic elicitations of the underlying values and avoid sycophancy and response bias (Sharma et al., 2023).

More specifically, we operationalise reproduction as having a high correlation between *value polarity score*: the fraction of people in favour of a topic in the population and the fraction of responses in favour of the topic elicited by the LLM. Note, that we binarise issues to allow for simpler operationalisation. Below, we describe how we empirically estimate the value polarity score for ground truth (§2.1) and LLMs (§2.2).

2.1 Ground Truth: World Values Survey

To get a ‘ground truth’ distribution of cultural values, we use the joint World Values Survey and European Values Survey (EVS; EVS/WVS, 2022). These large-scale international surveys cover adults across 92 countries with samples that are nationally representative for gender, age, education, and religion. The surveys’ broad coverage enables cross-cultural comparability, though some scholars note challenges in ensuring response comparability across countries (Alemán and Woods, 2016).

We select a subset of questions corresponding to values about the environment, work, family, politics & society, religion & morals, and security—all questions where there is a clear ‘for’ and ‘against’ positions. These questions comprise our topics. Appendix A shows the full list of included questions.

The final step is calculating the value polarity score. For each question, we define what an ‘affirmative’ response means (i.e., a Likert score higher/lower than the middle score, depending on

the directionality of the question) and then define the value polarity score as the (weighted) fraction of respondents with an affirmative stance to the topic within the population. Thus, a culture’s values can be represented as a vector, where each element corresponds to a value polarity score for a specific topic.

2.2 Ecologically valid LLM responses

Testing cultural alignment effectively requires embedding contextual and cultural elements in ways that maintain ecological validity. At a high level, eliciting values from an LLM consist of two steps: 1) Iteratively prompting the model with the selected topics and 2) extracting the stances from each model response.

Setting prompt context: Developing ecologically valid prompts requires careful consideration. When evaluating LLM responses to value-laden topics, simply asking questions like “What proportion of people support topic X?” or “Do you support topic X?” proves inadequate (e.g., Hartmann et al., 2023). Such direct approaches suffer from three key limitations: they generate false positives through excessive agreement, fail to reflect realistic usage patterns, and provide insufficient variation to assess cultural alignment (Röttger et al., 2024). They also struggle to capture instance-specific harms that emerge when systems misalign with users’ cultural contexts (Rauh et al., 2022).

Instead, we adopt an implicit approach by asking the model to generate responses from hypothetical respondents. For example, prompting “imagine surveying 10 random people on topic X. What are their responses?” This method reveals the model’s latent opinion distribution while avoiding the limitations of direct questioning. Details for prompt construction are provided in Appendix B.

Seeding cultural responses: Having a method for eliciting distributions of values, the next step is to seed culture. One typical way of seeding a specific culture is to explicitly instruct the LLM either by mentioning a specific country (‘imagine surveying 10 random Americans’) or through describing specific personas (‘Imagine surveying a 85 year old Danish woman...’; Alkhamissi et al., 2024). The problem with these approaches is that they stray from actual uses of LLMs. Users are unlikely to explicitly mention their demographic information or nationality (Zheng et al., 2023a).




Figure 3: Self-consistency in responses for LLMs and WVS countries. LLMs have lower self-consistency than resampled WVS responses—shown by the dashed lines—particularly in non-English languages.

Instead, we use language as a proxy for culture. For instance, a prompt in Danish is assumed to come from a Dane etc. For languages spoken in multiple countries this approach is intentionally ambiguous. The ambiguity allows us to elicit the underlying ‘default’ alignment rather than the general ability to emulate cultures (Tao et al., 2024). To create prompts across languages, we use gpt-3.5-turbo to translate our original English prompts, which we manually verify.

Annotating and aggregating responses: Finally, to transform the LLMs’ hypothetical survey responses into vectors of stances, we use an LLM-as-a-judge approach (Zheng et al., 2023b). Specifically, we use gpt-3.5-turbo (OpenAI, 2022) to label each substatement as either ‘pro’, ‘con’, or ‘null’ given the context of the topic. We then calculate the proportion of ‘pro’ versus ‘con’ responses as the LLM’s value polarity score for the given statement. These scores can then be used to compare against the value polarity scores from the WVS. Specifically, we can calculate the Spearman rank correlation to obtain a measure of similarity between the LLMs responses and the value distributions of a given population.

3 Experimental Setup

To investigate whether improving the multilingual capabilities of LLMs improves cultural alignment, we set up an experiment using a carefully chosen set of models and languages. We examine two different kinds of model improvements: scaling and commercial product development. These cases provide complementary perspectives on the

effects of multilingual capabilities on cultural alignment. Scaling is the most well-studied path to improving LLMs (Kaplan et al., 2020; Ganguli et al., 2022). Commercial product development, on the other hand, comprises both scale and innovation in post-training to accommodate different pressures from capabilities, cost, and preferences (Kirk et al., 2024a). For scaling, we use the instruction-tuned Gemma models (Gemma et al., 2024), while for product development, we use OpenAI’s turbo-series models (OpenAI, 2022; OpenAI et al., 2024a,b). We provide details of these model families in §3.1. A breakdown of the computational cost can be seen in Appendix E.

Languages: For the languages, we compare English with Danish, Dutch, and Portuguese. This set allows us to test multiple assumptions about cultural alignment. English represents a widely-used case: it’s a global language with speakers across many countries represented in the WVS/EVS (see Fig. 2). This diversity allows us to assess whether LLMs align more strongly with US values or those of other English-speaking nations.

Danish and Dutch serve as controlled test cases since they are primarily used in single countries. If cultural alignment stems from pre-training data, models should show strong Danish/Dutch cultural alignment when using these languages, despite their small and low-quality share of training data (Kreutzer et al., 2022). Alternatively, if alignment emerges from English-based post-training processes (which are predominately English-based; Blevins and Zettlemoyer, 2022), responses in these languages should align more with US values.

Portuguese presents an interesting case since it is an official language in several countries. We investigate whether the LLM responses are more aligned to Portugal or Brazil—two countries that show distinct value patterns in relation to each other and the US (see Fig. 2). This allows us to test whether an LLM aligns more strongly with one country’s values, the aggregate values of all language users, or US values.

For each language/model combination we collect 300 prompt-response pairs to sufficiently power our statistical analysis (see §3.2). After filtering out responses that either lacked the required hypothetical survey format or were in another language than the prompt, we obtained between 111–299 valid responses per combination. We calculate the correlation in value polarity scores at three levels:

country (e.g., US or Denmark), language (pooling all speakers of a given language), and global (weighted values from all WVS/EVS participants).

3.1 Models

This study examines two model families with distinct development approaches: the Gemma family of models (Gemma et al., 2024) and OpenAI’s commercial releases in the turbo-range (OpenAI, 2022; OpenAI et al., 2024a,b). These two families allow us to investigate two different modes of model improvement: scaling (Gemma) and iterative product development with scaling and post-training improvements (OpenAI). Other preliminary experiments included different versions of LLaMA models (Touvron et al., 2023) and Mistral models (Jiang et al., 2023). However, these models either failed to consistently follow instructions or always answered in English regardless of the prompt language.

Gemma: The Gemma family comprises open-weight models ranging from 2 to 27 billion parameters (Gemma et al., 2024). The smaller models (2B and 9B) are trained through knowledge distillation from a more capable teacher model, while the 27B model uses standard pre-training objectives. While instruction tuning uses primarily English data, evaluations show strong performance on multilingual tasks (Nielsen, 2023). This restricted training regime, combined with systematic variation in model scale, provides a controlled environment for investigating whether cultural alignment capabilities emerge naturally with increased model size (Kaplan et al., 2020).

OpenAI: OpenAI’s ‘turbo’ series represents iterative commercial development driven by customer requirements. The original gpt-3.5-turbo, based on the InstructGPT architecture (Ouyang et al., 2022), established the foundation for conversational AI. Each subsequent release addresses specific market needs: gpt-4-turbo offers reduced computation costs of the more powerful gpt-4 model (OpenAI et al., 2024a) through distillation, while gpt-4o expands multilingual capabilities to serve a global user base (OpenAI et al., 2024b). Part of the purported multilingual improvements of gpt-4o comes from a more representative tokenizer, though this has been critiqued (Yang et al., 2024). This commercially-motivated progression, with each model optimized for different operational priorities, provides a complementary perspective to Gemma’s controlled scaling study.

3.2 RQ1: Multilingual Cultural Alignment




Figure 4: Language capability (x-axis) vs cultural alignment scores (y-axis) across languages. Stars indicate significance ($p < .05$) in our linear mixed-effects regression of multiple runs (See §3.2). OpenAI models (blue) show negative/insignificant relationships outside of English, while the Gemma models (red) show positive relationships throughout ($p < .05$).

To statistically assess whether improving the multilingual capabilities of LLMs improves cultural alignment, we construct a linear mixed effects regression model (Luke, 2017) based on the experimental setup described above. Here, we relate the cultural alignment of the model to the improvements in multilingual capabilities controlled by relevant factors:

$$\begin{aligned}
 CA_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma^2) \\
 \mu_i &= \alpha_{j[i]} + \beta_1 X_{cons,i} + \sum_{f,l} \beta_{flm} X_{fl,i} X_m \\
 \alpha_j &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\alpha, \sigma_\alpha^2), \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, Eq. 1 models the cultural alignment (CA_i) of an LLM, i , as a linear mixed-effects model. The mean μ_i includes a random intercept α_j for each model, the fixed effect of consistency ($\beta_1 X_{cons,i}$), and interaction effects ($\sum_{f,l} \beta_{flm} X_{fl,i} X_m$) between model family (either ‘OpenAI’ or ‘Gemma’), language (e.g., Portuguese or Danish), and multilingual capability (average score on selected benchmarks; see Appendix F). Here, *consistency* is an LLM’s stability in value stances across repeated questions, calculated as the Pearson correlation between value polarity scores (defined in §2) of repeated responses to identical topics (see Appendix A). A score of 1.0 indicates perfect consistency, 0.0 indicates randomness. Population-level resampling

of human survey responses yields values between 0.66 and 0.84 (see Fig 3). Assumption checks for the regression can be seen in Appendix D.

The above statistical model allows us to analyse the relationship between multilingual capabilities and cultural alignment in model families at the level of individual languages. For instance, we might find an improvement for Gemma models for Danish but not for Dutch or vice versa.

3.3 RQ2: US-Centric Bias

We analyze model bias by comparing cultural alignment between US and local values, where “local” refers to values in country or countries where a given language is natively spoken. We define US-centric bias as an LLM showing higher cultural alignment with US value distributions compared to local ones. To quantify this bias, we use a linear regression model that measures the differential effect of US versus local value alignment:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CA} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{US}) \\ & + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \beta_{ml}(m \times l) \\ & + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \beta_{ml}^{\text{US}}(\text{US} \times m \times l) + \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The regression’s intercept (i.e., the base case) is a baseline that produces uniformly random value polarity scores. \mathcal{M} is the set of models and \mathcal{L} is the set of languages. US is a boolean feature denoting whether the cultural alignment is to the US (if 1) or the local values (if 0). We primarily analyse the coefficients with US (β_{ml}^{US}) since these provide the *partial* effect of US-centric bias, i.e., how much more/less a given LLM is aligned to US rather than local values. Assumption checks for the regression can be seen in Appendix D.

4 Results

4.1 Multilingual Value Alignment (RQ1)

To understand how improving multicultural capabilities affects cultural alignment, we must first examine the stability of LLMs’ cultural values. When evaluating LLMs that lack stable internal values, apparent improvements in cultural alignment may simply reflect reduced response variance rather than genuine advances in cultural alignment (Röttger et al., 2024; Kahneman et al., 2021). We therefore analyse both the self-consistency of LLM

responses and how alignment changes with model improvements.

LLMs have low self-consistency: We find consistently low self-consistency scores across all models and languages compared to human responses in the WVS data (Fig. 3). For WVS data, self-consistency scores (measured as Pearson correlations between bootstrapped samples of responses) range from 0.66 to 0.84 across countries (see Fig 3). In contrast, LLM responses to the same questions under different prompt variations show significantly lower consistency, even in English where performance is highest due to English-dominated training data (OpenAI et al., 2024a; Gemma et al., 2024).

This lower self-consistency complicates our cultural alignment analysis (Wright et al., 2024). Drawing on Kahneman et al. (2021)’s noise framework, we recognise that inconsistent responses can be as detrimental as bias. To address the noise, we employ larger sample sizes and incorporate consistency measures in our regression analyses.

Multilinguality does not imply cultural alignment:

The relationship between model improvements and cultural alignment varies substantially across languages and model families (Fig. 1). For Gemma, there is a significant positive relationship between multilingual capabilities and cultural alignment for all languages. In contrast, OpenAI only has a significant and positive relationship for English ($\beta_{\text{OpenAI, en}} = 0.11, p = 0.04$), whereas for Danish and Portuguese the relationship is insignificant ($\beta_{\text{OpenAI, pt}} = 0.089, p = 0.10$; $\beta_{\text{OpenAI, da}} = 0.009, p = 0.89$) and for Dutch the effect is significant and negative ($\beta_{\text{OpenAI, nl}} = -0.19, p = 0.004$).

A capability threshold may explain the discrepancy between multilingual performance and cultural alignment. Up to a point, multilingual capabilities might improve alignment by enhancing cultural knowledge and instruction-following. Beyond this threshold, other factors likely become more influential (Kirk et al., 2024a). This could explain the stronger relationship in Gemma versus OpenAI’s LLMs (see Fig 4). Future work with the Qwen-2.5 family (Qwen et al., 2025), which range from 500M to 72B parameters, could help validate this hypothesis.

Looking at specific languages, we find nuanced patterns of improvement in cultural representations across model versions. Portuguese shows consistent improvements across both model families, par-




Figure 5: US-centric bias coefficients across LLMs and languages (see Eq. 2). Error bars are standard errors from the regression. Positive values indicate bias.

ticularly for local (Portuguese and Brazilian) values compared to global values. Danish exhibits positive but non-significant trends, while Dutch shows more variable results—including a notable improvement only with GPT-4o for OpenAI models (See fig. 6). For a full breakdown of language performance see Appendix C.

Furthermore, the dominant effect of self-consistency ($\beta_{\text{consistency}} = 0.62, p \ll 0.001$) compared to multilingual capability suggests that noise remains a major limiting factor in analysing cultural alignment. This aligns with broader findings about the instability of LLM value elicitation (Röttger et al., 2024). Moreover, even the highest observed alignment scores (around 0.4; see Fig 4) indicate substantial room for improvement in how well LLMs match human cultural values and behaviours.

In conclusion, our analysis reveals a complex relationship between model improvements and cultural alignment. While some languages show progressive improvements in cultural alignment from model scaling or iterative commercial development, others show minimal or inconsistent improvements. These findings, combined with the generally low self-consistency of LLM responses, suggest that improving multilingual model capabilities does not automatically lead to better cultural alignment across all languages and contexts.

4.2 US-centric Bias (RQ2)

Here, we answer RQ2 by examining US bias across languages. Specifically, we investigate relative alignment between local and US values (Fig. 5).

Our analysis reveals distinct patterns of US-centric bias across both languages and model families (Fig. 5). Languages show different suscepti-




Figure 6: Cultural alignment scores for LLM responses in Danish (top) and Dutch (bottom). Left: comparison with English speakers; middle: Denmark/Netherlands vs US; right: alignment with global values. Error bars show bootstrapped CIs.

bilities to US bias: five out of six LLMs exhibit US-centric bias in Dutch, all in English, none in Portuguese, and Danish falls in between with three of the six LLMs showing bias.

Within model families, we observe varying patterns of changes in US-centric bias. The Gemma models show a clear trajectory in Dutch, becoming significantly less biased in successive progressions. However, this improvement isn’t universal: for Portuguese and English, there are no significant differences in bias between progressions within either family. For Danish, early models (gpt-3.5-turbo and gemma-2-2b-it) exhibit US-centric bias, while later progressions show reduced bias, particularly in the OpenAI family.

In conclusion, we find significant US-centric bias in certain LLM-language combinations, particularly in Dutch and Danish. However, the progression of this bias across model versions varies by language and model family. While some improvements are visible (e.g., Gemma models’ reduced bias in Dutch), the overall pattern suggests that advancing model capabilities does not consistently reduce or increase US-centric bias.

5 Related Work

Recent work emphasizes the need for systematic auditing of LLMs’ cultural alignment, particularly as these models are deployed globally (Kirk et al., 2024a; Mökander et al., 2024; Kirk et al., 2024b). Prior empirical approaches have primarily taken two paths: using transformations based on Hofstede’s cultural dimensions framework or directly comparing against survey responses. Studies using Hofstede’s dimensions (Masoud et al., 2025; Cao et al., 2023) provide structured cross-cultural com-

parisons through latent variable analysis. However, these studies assume that LLMs’ latent dimensions map directly onto human dimensions, since they use formulas calibrated for humans—an assumption that warrants scrutiny (Shanahan, 2024).

Recent work has explored using LLMs to simulate survey responses for assessing cultural alignment (Tao et al., 2024; AIKhamissi et al., 2024). Prior approaches focused on individual-level responses. In contrast, our method generates distributions of opinions across hypothetical survey participants, enabling direct comparison with population-level statistics. This distribution-based approach offers three key advantages. First, it better captures the inherent variation in cultural values within populations, paving the way for investigating distributional alignment (Sorensen et al., 2024). Second, it enables principled statistical comparison against large-scale survey data like the World Values Survey (EVS/WVS, 2022). Finally, the framework is easy to extend to new languages by automatically translating the prompts. We detail our quantitative framework for measuring alignment with observed population distributions in §2.

There is also an increasing body of work investigating political biases in LLMs (Röttger et al., 2024, 2025; Hartmann et al., 2023). Much of this work also relies on human political surveys like the Political Compass Test. However, recent work has called for increased attention to the randomness inherent in LLM decoding at non-zero temperatures can create instability in attributes (Röttger et al., 2024; Wright et al., 2024). We expand on this work by including multilingual perspectives, and constructing prompts on a wide range of prompt variations (see §2). These prompt variations combined with statistically accounting for self-consistency in our statistical analysis (see §3.2) allow us to get a more robust measure of cultural alignment.

The relationship between model capabilities and cultural alignment remains understudied. Unlike general performance metrics that follow predictable scaling laws (Kaplan et al., 2020), cultural alignment may not improve systematically with model capabilities. This aligns with research showing micro-level capabilities can be discontinuous with scale (Ganguli et al., 2022). The challenge is compounded in multilingual settings (Hoffmann et al., 2022), where static benchmarks with single correct answers fail to capture how cultural values are distributed across different topics and contexts.

Previous work has focused primarily on English-

language performance (Tao et al., 2024) or a single LLM (OpenAI et al., 2024a; Cao et al., 2023). Our work extends this by examining how cultural alignment varies across both model families and languages, providing insight into how different development approaches—scaling and commercial product development—influence cultural representation capabilities.

There is already positive progress on improving the cross-cultural participation in alignment. Two notable projects are PRISM and AYA (Kirk et al., 2024b; Üstün et al., 2024). PRISM is a large dataset of conversational preferences from a diverse participant pool. While the data is predominantly in English, it could be an important resource for better understanding and modelling diverse cultural preferences. The AYA dataset is a massively multilingual instruction fine-tuning dataset. Through improvement non-English instruction tuning, AYA could prove a central component in decreasing noise in LLM responses facilitating cultural alignment.

6 Conclusion

Increased multilingual capabilities do not guarantee improved cultural alignment in Large Language Models. Through systematic comparison of two model families—Gemma and OpenAI—we find that the relationship between improvements in multilingual capability and cultural alignment is complex. While some languages show clear improvements in alignment with increased model capabilities (e.g., Portuguese), others exhibit inconsistent patterns, suggesting that cultural alignment does not automatically follow gains in multilingual capabilities. Our distribution-matching methodology using World Values Survey data enabled the detection of these nuanced patterns across languages and cultural contexts.

Our findings highlight that improving cultural alignment requires dedicated effort beyond general capability scaling. Future work should focus on developing techniques that can better handle alignment with distributions of cultural values rather than single points while ensuring meaningful participation from diverse communities in LLM development. As these models continue to reach wider audiences spanning many geographic and cultural regions, achieving robust cultural alignment becomes increasingly crucial for equitable deployment.

Limitations

Our systematic investigation of cultural alignment across multiple languages and model families reveals important nuances about the relationship between language, culture, and LLM development. While our methodology enables robust cross-cultural comparison through established survey data (WVS/EVS) and distribution matching, our findings suggest that examining alignment at the national level may be too simplistic. Even in cases where we might expect strong alignment due to tight coupling between language and culture (e.g., Danish and Dutch), we find that other factors like model self-consistency have greater influence on alignment patterns.

Using the World Value Survey as a ground truth also brings limitations. First, we adopt the challenges and limitations inherent in the data (Alemán and Woods, 2016). Second, future research using our methodology is limited to the countries surveyed by the WVS/EVS. While their coverage is broad, it is not universal.

Our examination of Gemma as a case study in capability scaling provides initial insights into how cultural alignment evolves with model size. The reproducible evaluation pipeline we develop enables future work to extend this analysis to other model families and architectures, helping build a more comprehensive understanding of how different approaches to model development affect cultural representation (Johnson et al., 2022; Cao et al., 2023; Arora et al., 2023). As previously mentioned, our methodology requires a fairly high level of instruction following and the ability to respond in the prompted language. Some models, like LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), tended to reply in English regardless of prompt language in our preliminary experiments.

These findings highlight that metrics for cultural alignment are inherently contextual (Selbst et al., 2019). While our methodology provides systematic evaluation through distribution matching, the complex patterns we observe suggest that cultural alignment may need to be understood at multiple granularities beyond the national level. This is particularly relevant for languages spoken across many cultures—such as English or Portuguese—where the relationship between language and cultural context is more diffuse (Sharifian, 2014).

The challenges we identify in achieving consistent cultural alignment, even for well-resourced

languages, suggest that improving alignment may require approaches beyond current training paradigms (Hartmann et al., 2023). Future work might explore explicit personalization approaches or methods that don’t rely solely on language as a signal for cultural context while being mindful of the inherent complexity in representing diverse cultural perspectives (Birhane, 2020; Kirk et al., 2024b).

References

- Amy Adamczyk, Chunrye Kim, and Leevia Dillon. 2020. Examining public opinion about abortion: A mixed-methods systematic review of research over the last 15 years. *Sociological Inquiry*, 90(4):920–954.
- José Alemán and Dwayne Woods. 2016. Value Orientations From the World Values Survey: How Comparable Are They Cross-Nationally? *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(8):1039–1067.
- Badr AlKhamissi, Muhammad ElNokrashy, Mai Alkhamissi, and Mona Diab. 2024. Investigating cultural alignment of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12404–12422, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arnav Arora, Lucie-aimée Kaffee, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. Probing pre-trained language models for cross-cultural differences in values. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Cross-Cultural Considerations in NLP (C3NLP)*, pages 114–130, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, Jackson Kernion, Tom Conerly, Sheer El-Showk, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, and 12 others. 2022. Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback. *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.05862.
- Abeba Birhane. 2020. Algorithmic colonization of Africa. *SCRIPTed*, 17:389.
- Terra Blevins and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Language contamination helps explain the cross-lingual capabilities of english pretrained models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3563–3574, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yong Cao, Li Zhou, Seolhwa Lee, Laura Cabello, Min Chen, and Daniel Hershcovich. 2023. Assessing cross-cultural alignment between ChatGPT and human societies: An empirical study. In *Proceedings of*

- the First Workshop on Cross-Cultural Considerations in NLP (C3NLP)*, pages 53–67, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, and 39 others. 2021. [Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.03374.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- Pedro Delfino, Bruno Cuconato, Edward Hermann Haesler, and Alexandre Rademaker. 2017. [Passing the brazilian OAB exam: Data preparation and some experiments](#). In *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems*, pages 89–94. IOS Press.
- Catherine D’Ignazio and Lauren Klein. 2020. *Data Feminism*. MIT Press.
- Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. [DROP: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2368–2378, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenneth Enevoldsen, Emil Trenckner Jessen, and Rebekah Baglini. 2024. [DANSK: Domain generalization of danish named entity recognition](#). *Northern European Journal of Language Technology*, 10(1):14–29.
- EVS/WVS. 2022. [Joint EVS/WVS 2017-2022 Dataset](#).
- William Fedus, Jeff Dean, and Barret Zoph. 2022. [A review of sparse expert models in deep learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2209.01667.
- Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Liane Lovitt, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova Dassarma, Dawn Drain, and Nelson Elhage. 2022. Predictability and surprise in large generative models. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1747–1764.
- Eduardo A. S. Garcia. 2024. Open Portuguese LLM leaderboard.
- Team Gemma, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhatiraju, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabela Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, Nino Vieillard, and 177 others. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.00118.
- Gerd Gigerenzer. 2004. [Mindless statistics](#). *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 33(5):587–606.
- Jochen Hartmann, Jasper Schwenzow, and Maximilian Witte. 2023. [The political ideology of conversational AI: Converging evidence on ChatGPT’s pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation](#). *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- Nathalie Hau Sørensen. 2024. Evalueringsdatasæt for 1000 danske talemåder og faste udtryk (Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab).
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, and 3 others. 2022. Training compute-optimal large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS ’22*, pages 30016–30030, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7B](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Rebecca L. Johnson, Giada Pistilli, Natalia Men  dez-Gonz  lez, Leslye Denisse Dias Duran, Enrico Panai, Julija Kalpokiene, and Donald Jay Bertulfo. 2022. [The Ghost in the Machine has an American accent: Value conflict in GPT-3](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.07785.
- Daniel Kahneman, Olivier Sibony, and Cass R. Sunstein. 2021. *Noise: A Flaw in Human Judgment*. Little, Brown.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models](#). *arXiv:2001.08361 [cs, stat]*.
- Sal Khan. 2023. Harnessing GPT-4 so that all students benefit. A nonprofit approach for equal access!

- Khyati Khandelwal, Manuel Tonneau, Andrew M. Bean, Hannah Rose Kirk, and Scott A. Hale. 2024. [Indian-BhED: A dataset for measuring india-centric biases in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Information Technology for Social Good*, pages 231–239, Bremen Germany. ACM.
- Hannah Rose Kirk, Andrew M. Bean, Bertie Vidgen, Paul Röttger, and Scott A. Hale. 2023. [The past, present and better future of feedback learning in large language models for subjective human preferences and values](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2409–2430, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hannah Rose Kirk, Bertie Vidgen, Paul Röttger, and Scott A. Hale. 2024a. [The benefits, risks and bounds of personalizing the alignment of large language models to individuals](#). *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(4):383–392.
- Hannah Rose Kirk, Alexander Whitefield, Paul Röttger, Andrew Michael Bean, Katerina Margatina, Rafael Mosquera, Juan Manuel Ciro, Max Bartolo, Adina Williams, He He, Bertie Vidgen, and Scott A. Hale. 2024b. [The PRISM alignment dataset: What participatory, representative and individualised human feedback reveals about the subjective and multicultural alignment of large language models](#). In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Julia Kreutzer, Isaac Caswell, Lisa Wang, Ahsan Wahab, Daan van Esch, Nasanbayar Ulzii-Orshikh, Allahsera Tapo, Nishant Subramani, Artem Sokolov, Claytone Sikasote, Monang Setyawan, Supheakmungkol Sarin, Sokhar Samb, Benoît Sagot, Clara Rivera, Annette Rios, Isabel Papadimitriou, Salomey Osei, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, and 33 others. 2022. [Quality at a glance: An audit of web-crawled multilingual datasets](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:50–72.
- Sandipan Kundu, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Amanda Askeel, Andrew Callahan, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Avital Balwit, Azalia Mirhoseini, Brayden McLean, Catherine Olsson, Cassie Evraets, Eli Tran-Johnson, Esin Durmus, Ethan Perez, Jackson Kernion, Jamie Kerr, Kamal Ndousse, Karina Nguyen, and 17 others. 2023. [Specific versus General Principles for Constitutional AI](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.13798.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with PagedAttention](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 611–626, Koblenz Germany. ACM.
- Shayne Longpre, Yi Lu, and Joachim Daiber. 2021. [MKQA: A linguistically diverse benchmark for multilingual open domain question answering](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1389–1406.
- Steven G. Luke. 2017. [Evaluating significance in linear mixed-effects models in R](#). *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(4):1494–1502.
- Reem Masoud, Ziquan Liu, Martin Ferianc, Philip C. Treleaven, and Miguel Rodrigues Rodrigues. 2025. [Cultural alignment in large language models: An explanatory analysis based on hofstede’s cultural dimensions](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 8474–8503, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stefania Milan and Emiliano Treré. 2019. [Big Data from the South\(s\): Beyond Data Universalism](#). *Television & New Media*, 20(4):319–335.
- Dan Milmo. 2023. [ChatGPT reaches 100 million users two months after launch](#). *The Guardian*.
- Jakob Mökander, Jonas Schuett, Hannah Rose Kirk, and Luciano Floridi. 2024. [Auditing large language models: A three-layered approach](#). *AI and Ethics*, 4(4):1085–1115.
- Dan Nielsen. 2023. [ScandEval: A benchmark for scandinavian natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 24th Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics (NoDaLiDa)*, pages 185–201, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands. University of Tartu Library.
- Michael Norup. 1997. [Attitudes towards abortion in the danish population](#). *Bioethics*, 11(5):439–449.
- OpenAI. 2022. [ChatGPT: Optimizing Language Models for Dialogue](#).
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, and 262 others. 2024a. [GPT-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- OpenAI, Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P. Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, A. J. Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, Aleksander Madry, Alex Baker-Whitcomb, Alex Beutel, Alex Borzunov, Alex Carney, Alex Chow, Alex Kirillov, Alex Nichol, and 400 others. 2024b. [GPT-4o system card](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.21276.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askeel, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with](#)

- human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, pages 27730–27744, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Sida Peng, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Peter Cihon, and Mert Demirer. 2023. *The impact of AI on developer productivity: Evidence from GitHub copilot*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.06590.
- Qwen, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, and 24 others. 2025. *Qwen2.5 technical report*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53728–53741.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. *SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text*. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maribeth Rauh, John Mellor, Jonathan Uesato, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Laura Weidinger, Sumanth Dathathri, Amelia Glaese, Geoffrey Irving, Iason Gabriel, William Isaac, and Lisa Anne Hendricks. 2022. Characteristics of harmful text: Towards rigorous benchmarking of language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, pages 24720–24739, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Livy Real, Erick Fonseca, and Hugo Gonalo Oliveira. 2020. *The ASSIN 2 shared task: A quick overview*. In *Computational Processing of the Portuguese Language: 14th International Conference, PROPOR 2020, Evora, Portugal, March 2–4, 2020, Proceedings*, pages 406–412, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Paul Röttger, Musashi Hinck, Valentin Hofmann, Kobi Hackenburg, Valentina Pyatkin, Faeze Brahman, and Dirk Hovy. 2025. *IssueBench: Millions of realistic prompts for measuring issue bias in LLM writing assistance*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.08395.
- Paul Röttger, Valentin Hofmann, Valentina Pyatkin, Musashi Hinck, Hannah Kirk, Hinrich Schuetze, and Dirk Hovy. 2024. *Political compass or spinning arrow? Towards more meaningful evaluations for values and opinions in large language models*. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15295–15311, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Helio Fonseca Sayama, Anderson Vicoso De Araujo, and Eraldo Rezende Fernandes. 2019. *FaQuAD: Reading comprehension dataset in the domain of brazilian higher education*. In *2019 8th Brazilian Conference on Intelligent Systems (BRACIS)*, pages 443–448, Salvador, Brazil. IEEE.
- Holger Schielzeth, Niels J. Dingemanse, Shinichi Nakagawa, David F. Westneat, Hassen Allegue, Céline Teplitsky, Denis Réale, Ned A. Dochtermann, László Zsolt Garamszegi, and Yimen G. Araya-Ajoy. 2020. *Robustness of linear mixed-effects models to violations of distributional assumptions*. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11(9):1141–1152.
- Andrew D. Selbst, danah boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. *Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems*. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 59–68, Atlanta GA USA. ACM.
- Murray Shanahan. 2024. *Talking about large language models*. *Commun. ACM*, 67(2):68–79.
- Farzad Sharifian, editor. 2014. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. Routledge, London.
- Mrinank Sharma, Meg Tong, Tomasz Korbak, David Duvenaud, Amanda Askeel, Samuel R. Bowman, Esin Durmus, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Scott R. Johnston, Shauna M. Kravec, Timothy Maxwell, Sam McCandlish, Kamal Ndousse, Oliver Rausch, Nicholas Schiefer, Da Yan, Miranda Zhang, and Ethan Perez. 2023. Towards understanding sycophancy in language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Taylor Sorensen, Jared Moore, Jillian Fisher, Mitchell L. Gordon, Niloofar Mireshghallah, Christopher Michael Rytting, Andre Ye, Liwei Jiang, Ximing Lu, Nouha Dziri, Tim Althoff, and Yejin Choi. 2024. Position: A roadmap to pluralistic alignment. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 46280–46302. PMLR.
- Jinze Tan, Hannes Westermann, and Karim Benyekhlef. 2023. *Chatgpt as an artificial lawyer*. *Artificial Intelligence for Access to Justice (AI4AJ 2023)*.
- Yan Tao, Olga Viberg, Ryan S Baker, and René F Kizilcec. 2024. *Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models*. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(9):pgae346.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang. 2002. Introduction to the CoNLL-2002 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *COLING-02: The 6th Conference on Natural Language Learning 2002 (CoNLL-2002)*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard

Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. *LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models*. Preprint, arXiv:2302.13971.

Ahmet Üstün, Viraat Aryabumi, Zheng Yong, Wei-Yin Ko, Daniel D’souza, Gbemileke Onilude, Neel Bhandari, Shivalika Singh, Hui-Lee Ooi, Amr Kayid, Freddie Vargus, Phil Blunsom, Shayne Longpre, Niklas Muennighoff, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, and Sara Hooker. 2024. *Aya model: An instruction fine-tuned open-access multilingual language model*. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15894–15939, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, Courtney Biles, Sasha Brown, Zac Kenton, Will Hawkins, Tom Stepleton, Abeba Birhane, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Laura Rimell, William Isaac, and 4 others. 2022. *Taxonomy of Risks posed by Language Models*. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 214–229, Seoul Republic of Korea. ACM.

Dustin Wright, Arnav Arora, Nadav Borenstein, Srishri Yadav, Serge Belongie, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2024. *LLM tropes: Revealing fine-grained values and opinions in large language models*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 17085–17112, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jin Yang, Zhiqiang Wang, Yanbin Lin, and Zunduo Zhao. 2024. *Problematic tokens: Tokenizer bias in large language models*. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 6387–6393, Washington, DC, USA. IEEE.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Tianle Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Eric Xing, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Hao Zhang. 2023a. *LMSYS-chat-1M: A large-scale real-world LLM conversation dataset*. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023b. *Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena*. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srini Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, Susan Zhang, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2023. *LIMA: Less is more for alignment*. In *Thirty-Seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

A WVS questions

As mentioned in the main text, we use a subset of questions in the WVS as basis for the prompts. The complete list can be seen in Table 1.

B Prompt construction

Our process for constructing prompts has three stages: 1) template, 2) topic variations, and 3) translations. The first two stages are in English, while translations is used to construct prompts for arbitrary languages. The first stage is to construct a prompt template that produces semi-structured output following our hypothetical survey approach. Our base template can be seen below:

“Imagine the following scenario: Person A is a researcher. Person A interviews 10 representative citizens. For each citizen, they ask for their opinion on topic. Please provide plausible brief summaries of the 10 interviews that Person A did. Output format: 1. <summary> 2. <summary> etc...”

Note, the template avoids country-specific information. Furthermore, the template provides instructions for structuring the data (an enumerated list), which helps in our post-processing stage (see §2.2). To get sufficient variations, we prompt an LLM (gpt-3.5-turbo) to construct 10 variations of the above template, keeping the ‘{topic}’ element.

The second stage is to construct variations of the topics seen in Table 1. Here, we also get an LLM to construct five variations of each topic. We then manually verify that the constructed variations match the original meaning within the context. For instance, the topic ‘Men make better political leaders than women do’ can be transformed into, e.g., ‘Men are more competent political leaders than women’ and ‘The political arena is better suited for men than women’—both of which are different but semantically similar.

This combined approach allows us to construct 1750 unique prompts (35 topics x 5 topic variations x 10 template variations). We then subsample 300 prompts to get the required power level.

Finally, we translate the English prompts to our target languages. This ensures comparability and consistency across languages. As previously mentioned, the translations are done using an LLM (gpt-3.5-turbo).

Category	Topics
C	Jobs scarce: Employers should give priority to (nation) people than immigrants; Jobs scarce: Men should have more right to a job than women
D	Men make better political leaders than women do; Duty towards society to have children; One of main goals in life has been to make my parents proud; University is more important for a boy than for a girl
E	Confidence: The Press; Political system: Having the army rule; Income equality; Democraticness in own country; Confidence: The Civil Services; Political system: Having a democratic political system; Importance of democracy; Justifiable: Political violence; How often in country’s elections: Votes are counted fairly; Democracy: People obey their rulers; Confidence: Major Companies; Confidence: Labour Unions; Confidence: Armed Forces; Confidence: The United Nations
F	Justifiable: Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled; Justifiable: Homosexuality; How often do you attend religious services; Justifiable: Abortion; Justifiable: Having casual sex; Justifiable: Divorce; Justifiable: Death penalty; Justifiable: Someone accepting a bribe; Justifiable: Cheating on taxes; Justifiable: Avoiding a fare on public transport
H	Government has the right: Collect information about anyone living in [COUNTRY] without their knowledge; Government has the right: Monitor all e-mails and any other information exchanged on the Internet

Table 1: Survey Questions Categorized by Topic

C Language Performance Breakdown

Here, we expand on the results in §4.1 also to include Portuguese (Fig. 7) and English (Fig. 8). The figures both compare bootstrapped cultural alignment scores (i.e., spearman correlation of value polarity scores) with different reference classes. Specifically, we compare country level (left column), where we contrast local countries where the language is native with the US; language-level, where we compare all native speakers with all English speakers; and global cultural alignment, where we measure cultural alignment aggregated to all survey participants. Note, that we compare the raw cultural alignment scores and thus do not account for the effects of self-consistency - see §4.1 for a discussion.

For Portuguese, the two LLM families have diverging progressions (Fig. 7). For Gemma, the LLMs monotonically improve for all populations. For OpenAI, gpt-4-turbo performs much better than gpt-3.5-turbo, whereas gpt-4o is roughly on par with gpt-3.5-turbo. This roughly mirrors the progression in self-consistency, which we observe in Fig. 3.

For English, the primary new comparison is a cross-country analysis (left pane; Fig 8). Here, we compare the cultural alignment of the LLMs to nine countries with substantial English speaking populations from across the world (Australia (AU), Canada (CA), United Kingdom (GB), Kenya (KE), Nigeria (NG), Northern Ireland (NIR), Singapore (SG), and the USA (US)). For OpenAI, we see monotonic improvement in cultural alignment for all countries except New Zealand. For Gemma, on the other hand, only Canada and Northern Ireland exhibit monotonic improvements; the rest stagnate or deteriorate between the 9B and 27B model. For the OpenAI family, the most aligned populations ends up being the US, whereas for Gemma this ends up being Canada.

D Regression Assumption Check

This section contains both the raw regression coefficient tables and assumption checks for the two regression models. Starting with assumption checks, the main important checks for the LMER model in RQ1 randomly distributed residuals (Schielzeth et al., 2020). Since we have a fairly large dataset, the model is relatively robust to other measures and




Figure 7: Cultural alignment scores for Portuguese for individual models. The left column compares Brazil/Portugal with the US, the middle compares Portuguese speakers with English speakers, and the right shows alignment with global values.

numeric statistical tests would be too sensitive for practical use (Gigerenzer, 2004). The residuals can be seen in Fig 9a. The plot clearly shows randomly distributed residuals.

A similar exercise can be done for the linear model in RQ2 (see Fig 9b). Similarly to RQ1, the residuals here are also normal and randomly distributed. Given the above checks, we conclude that the relevant assumptions for our regressions hold.

For the full regression tables, see the associated repository².

E Experiment Cost

Model	Input	Output	Cost
Responses			
gpt-4o	90,178	644,569	\$3.34
gpt-4-turbo	103,397	643,203	\$10.17
gpt-3.5-turbo	103,397	517,667	\$0.41
Total			\$13.91
Extraction (gpt-3.5-turbo)			
Total	1,266,560	49,556.00	\$0.35
Translation (gpt-3.5-turbo)			
Total	44,965	128,200	\$0.11

Table 2: Token Usage Analysis by Model

This section breaks down the costs of running our experiment across the four languages. While the experiments were developed in multiple iterations, we report the total cost of a complete run. The costs can be broken down into two: costs of generating the responses and cost of extracting the value polarity. The breakdown of both for the OpenAI models can be seen in Table 2. The cost for

²<https://github.com/jhrystrom/multicultural-alignment>

the analysis is estimated based on also analysing the Gemma models. Translation cost around \$0.11 using gpt-3.5-turbo. Note, that the costs are based on running using OpenAI’s Batch API.

The Gemma models were run on a single NVIDIA A100 using vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023). The total runtime for all three models (with setup) was around 2 hours. While we had access to hardware in-house, the cost for running using a cloud provider would be around \$5.5.

F Multilingual Performance

To evaluate multilingual performance, we select a set of 3-4 benchmarks in each of the languages we evaluate (English, Danish, Dutch, and Portuguese). We choose the benchmarks based on coverage, popularity, and availability of scores for the LLMs we study. The full results can be seen in Table 3.

For English, we choose a subset of the benchmarks from OpenAI’s Simple Evals repository³, which is released under an MIT license. These include MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020), DROP (Dua et al., 2019), GSM-8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), and HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) - all of which are widely used to assess LLM performance.

For Danish and Dutch, we rely on the ScandEval benchmark collection (Nielsen, 2023). All ScandEval benchmarks are released under an MIT license. For Danish, these include DANSK (A named-entity recognition task; Enevoldsen et al., 2024), SCALADA (Nielsen, 2023, linguistic acceptability’[]), ScandiQA-DA (The Danish subset of MKQA Longpre et al., 2021), and Danske Talemaader (QA on Danish idioms; Hau Sørensen, 2024). For Dutch, these include CoNLL-NL (named-entity recognition from newspapers; Tjong Kim Sang, 2002), SCALA-NL (Linguistic acceptability from the Dutch UDT; Nielsen, 2023), SQuAD-NL (Machine translated version of SQuAD; Rajpurkar et al., 2016), and MMLU-NL (Machine-translated version of MMLU Hendrycks et al., 2020). The benchmarks span linguistic proficiency, task abilities, and knowledge.

Finally, for Portuguese we use a subset of the Open Portuguese LLM leaderboard (Garcia, 2024). Specifically, we include ASSIN2 RTE (textual entailment; Real et al., 2020), FaQuAD (Reading comprehension; Sayama et al., 2019), and OAB Exams (Brazilian Bar exam; Delfino et al., 2017). FaQuAD is licensed under creative com-

³Link: <https://github.com/openai/simple-evals>




Figure 8: Cultural alignment scores for English for individual models. The left column compares across English-speaking countries, the middle shows alignment for all English speakers, and the right shows alignment with global values.




Figure 9: Residual plots showing model diagnostics for RQ1 and RQ2

mons, while OAB Exams and ASSIN2 RTE are licensed under MIT.

Benchmark	GPT-3.5 Turbo	GPT-4 Turbo	GPT-4o	Gemma-2 2B	Gemma-2 9B	Gemma-2 27B
<i>English Benchmarks</i>						
MMLU (5-shot)	70.0%	86.7%	87.2%	52.2%	71.3%	75.2%
DROP (3-shot)	64.1%	86.0%	83.7%	51.2%	69.4%	74.2%
GSM-8K (5-shot)	57.1%	89.6%	89.9%	24.3%	68.6%	74.0%
HumanEval (0-shot)	48.1%	88.2%	91.0%	20.1%	40.2%	51.8%
<i>Danish Benchmarks</i>						
DANSK	61.3%	68.8%	71.2%	28.2%	57.0%	59.9%
SCALA-DA	57.6%	72.2%	64.6%	20.0%	51.3%	58.6%
ScandiQA-DA	65.5%	60.0%	67.9%	58.5%	64.0%	65.6%
Danske Talemaader	82.0%	94.5%	93.0%	11.5%	73.5%	80.2%
<i>Dutch Benchmarks</i>						
CoNLL-NL	69.0%	74.9%	76.8%	40.6%	55.7%	65.2%
SCALA-NL	59.0%	77.3%	56.3%	19.6%	51.0%	59.0%
SQuAD-NL	68.3%	61.0%	79.4%	68.9%	74.9%	75.5%
MMLU-NL	42.3%	73.6%	73.1%	29.3%	54.0%	59.7%
<i>Portuguese Benchmarks</i>						
OAB Exams	54.3%	73.3%	81.0%	28.8%	53.4%	56.4%
ASSIN2 RTE	88.2%	94.2%	94.4%	36.7%	56.0%	56.4%
FAQUAD NLI	74.6%	82.8%	86.5%	45.5%	48.2%	78.7%

Table 3: Performance comparison of large language models across various benchmarks