

The Hidden Space of Safety: Understanding Preference-Tuned LLMs in Multilingual context

Nikhil Verma
LG Toronto AI Research lab
nikhil.verma@lge.com

Manasa Bharadwaj
LG Toronto AI Research lab
manasa.bharadwaj@lge.com

Abstract

Alignment tuning has enabled large language models to excel in reasoning, instruction-following, and minimizing harmful generations. However, despite their widespread deployment, these models exhibit a monolingual bias, raising concerns about the effectiveness of alignment across languages. Current alignment methods predominantly focus on English, leaving it unclear how alignment mechanism generalize to multilingual settings. To address this, we conduct a systematic analysis of distributional shifts in the embedding space of LLMs before and after alignment, uncovering its impact on model behavior across diverse languages. We leverage the alignment-induced separation in safety space as a quantitative tool to measure how alignment enforces safety constraints. Our study evaluates seven LLMs using balanced toxicity datasets and parallel text-detoxification benchmarks, revealing substantial disparities in the latent representation space between high-resource and low-resource languages. These findings underscore the need for language-specific fine-tuning to ensure fair, reliable and robust multilingual alignment. Our insights provide a foundation for developing truly safe multilingual LLMs, emphasizing the urgency of addressing alignment gaps in under-represented languages.

1 Introduction

Alignment techniques play a critical role in adapting Large Language Models (LLMs) beyond their pre-training and fine-tuning phases, ensuring consistency with human values and preferences (Christiano et al., 2017; Ziegler et al., 2019). To achieve this, methods based on online and offline policy optimization (Ouyang et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023; Ethayarajh et al., 2024; Haldar et al., 2025) have been introduced to enhance model reliability, safety, and fairness for real-world deployment. However, despite being trained on multilingual cor-




Figure 1: Effect of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Llama-2 (#7B) for English Prompt Safety.

pora, LLM alignment remains predominantly optimized for English, leading to disparities in performance and behavior across languages (Schwartz et al., 2022; Vashishtha et al., 2023). This discrepancy raises critical concerns about security, and usability, particularly for underrepresented languages, where alignment remains underexplored and its effectiveness is poorly understood (Ryström et al., 2025; Khandelwal et al., 2023). A systematic investigation into the cross-lingual impact of alignment is essential to understand its influence on model representations and behavior across English and other languages.

Beyond fairness concerns, misalignment in multilingual settings presents fundamental challenges in representation learning and decision boundaries within LLMs. While alignment techniques refine model behavior in English, their impact on latent space organization across languages remains poorly understood. Empirical evidence suggests that preference optimization shifts model representations (Figure 1), yet such shifts may not generalize uniformly across linguistic groups (Lin et al., 2024; Kirk et al., 2023). For languages with limited preference data, alignment may inadvertently distort decision boundaries, leading to semantic drift, degraded reasoning capabilities, or increased susceptibility to adversarial inputs (Dang et al.,

2024). This raises the pressing need to analyze how alignment reshapes the hidden space across languages and whether current methodologies effectively preserve semantic consistency while mitigating harmful outputs. A deeper investigation into cross-lingual representation shifts can illuminate the unintended consequences of alignment, guiding the development of more robust multilingual models.

In this work, we systematically assess the effectiveness of LLM safety alignment across multiple languages by evaluating a diverse set of models on multilingual benchmarks. We analyze distributional shifts in the embedding space of multilingual safety prompts for both reference and aligned models, uncovering how alignment mechanisms influence model behavior. To quantify the separation induced by alignment in enforcing safety constraints, we utilized a set of distributional metrics, providing a concrete measure of alignment-induced shifts. Our findings reveal critical gaps in multilingual safety mechanisms, highlighting the inconsistencies in alignment effectiveness across languages.

As deep generative models evolve, concerns regarding memorization and bias propagation have intensified (Carlini et al., 2023; Biderman et al., 2023; Nasr et al., 2023). To better isolate the effects of alignment, we analyze hidden representations through probing only at the input processing stage, minimizing potential contamination from post-training phases. Our study uncovers significant performance disparities across model families, emphasizing the monolingual bias inherent in current LLM development. These insights lay the groundwork for future fine-tuning efforts on language-specific datasets, guiding improvements in multilingual fairness, safety, and robustness.

2 Related literature

2.1 Alignment of LLMs

Fine-tuning LLMs based on human preferences has emerged as a key approach for post-training, enhancing their ability to generate responses aligned with human values (Christiano et al., 2017; Ziegler et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020). A variety of techniques have been developed to achieve this alignment, starting with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), which remains the dominant paradigm for online policy optimization (Ouyang et al., 2022; Ahmadian et al.,

2024). Beyond RLHF, several offline optimization methods, such as Direct Preference Optimization DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023), Implicit Preference Optimization IPO (Azar et al., 2024), Kahneman-Tversky Optimization KTO (Ethayarajh et al., 2024), Bayesian Causal Optimization BCO (Jung et al., 2024), and KL divergence optimization KLDO (Haldar et al., 2025) have been introduced to refine model behavior without requiring costly reinforcement learning loops. The overarching objective of these techniques is to improve alignment with human intent while mitigating the risks of generating harmful or toxic content, especially in large-scale real-world deployments.

2.2 Multilingual LLM performance

A critical limitation of current alignment strategies is their heavy reliance on human preference datasets predominantly sourced from English or other high-resource languages (Taori et al., 2023; Chiang et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023). As a result, LLMs exhibit strong alignment in English but struggle with maintaining consistent safety and ethical considerations in underrepresented languages (Schwartz et al., 2022; Vashishtha et al., 2023; Khandelwal et al., 2023). This imbalance raises concerns about fairness, as the effectiveness of alignment mechanisms can vary significantly across linguistic groups (Ryström et al., 2025). In particular, multilingual users may encounter unreliable moderation, differing levels of content safety, or unintended biases when interacting with aligned LLMs in languages beyond English (Yong et al., 2023).

2.3 Jailbreaking studies

Despite significant advancements, the alignment strategies are not foolproof (Li et al., 2023; AlKhamissi et al., 2024). An emerging body of research explores how safety-aligned LLMs remain vulnerable to adversarial exploits, including jailbreaking attacks that expose weaknesses in alignment constraints (Lukas et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023). These vulnerabilities are further amplified in multilingual settings, where models may bypass safety filters in languages for which alignment data is scarce (Winata et al., 2024; Son et al., 2024). Addressing these gaps is crucial for ensuring that LLM alignment strategies are not only robust but also equitable across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts (Dang et al., 2024).




Figure 2: Probing the Impact of Human Preference Tuning on Multilingual Safety at Inference Time: Llama-3.1 (#8B) Alignment in English vs. Hindi

3 Background

LLMs are typically trained in three distinct stages, each playing a crucial role in shaping their capabilities and alignment with human preferences.

Pre-training. LLMs are initially pre-trained on large-scale corpora spanning multiple languages, optimizing the likelihood of predicting the next token conditioned on preceding text. The model’s vocabulary is designed to accommodate tokens from diverse languages, ensuring broad linguistic coverage.

Supervised Fine-tuning (SFT). Following pre-training, LLMs undergo fine-tuning on curated, high-quality datasets specific to various downstream tasks, such as translation, dialogue, and summarization. This stage refines the model’s ability to generate more task-relevant responses and produces a reference model π_{ref} .

Human Preference Tuning. The SFT model is prompted with inputs x to generate pairs of candidate responses $(y_1, y_2) \sim \pi_{ref}(y | x)$. These responses are then presented to human annotators, who express a preference for one over the other, denoted as $y_w \succ y_l | x$, where y_w and y_l represent the preferred and dispreferred completions, respectively. Preference data is assumed to be generated from an underlying latent reward function $r^*(x, y)$, which models human preferences. A common approach to capturing the probability of a preference ranking is through the Bradley-Terry

model (Bradley and Terry, 1952):

$$p^*(y_w \succ y_l | x) = \sigma(r^*(x, y_w) - r^*(x, y_l)) \quad (1)$$

where σ denotes the logistic function. More generally, when multiple ranked responses are available, Plackett-Luce models are also applicable (Plackett, 1975). In large-scale preference datasets (shown in Figure 2), human-annotated feedback is predominantly available for high-resource languages such as English, while low-resource languages are underrepresented (Chaudhari et al., 2024). Since directly obtaining a true reward function from human feedback is infeasible, an alternative approach is to assume access to a static dataset of comparisons $\mathcal{D} = \{x^{(i)}, y_w^{(i)}, y_l^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ sampled from p^* and to parameterize a reward model $r_\phi(x, y)$. The parameters of this model are estimated via maximum likelihood:

$$E_{x, y_w, y_l \sim \mathcal{D}} [\log \sigma(r_\phi(x, y_w) - r_\phi(x, y_l))] \quad (2)$$

To ensure that the optimized model maintains desirable text generation properties, such as fluency and coherence, a KL divergence penalty is introduced to limit deviation from π_{ref} . The reward model is then used to optimize a new policy π_θ , formulated as:

$$E_{x \in \mathcal{D}, y \sim \pi_\theta} [r_\phi(x, y)] - \beta D_{KL}[\pi_\theta || \pi_{ref}] \quad (3)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a hyperparameter controlling the balance between reward maximization and distributional regularization.

Since this objective is non-differentiable, reinforcement learning (e.g., Proximal Policy Optimization, PPO (Schulman et al., 2017)) is typically employed for policy updates. To address the instability and inefficiency associated with online policy optimization, recent approaches have explored offline optimization techniques using closed-form objectives that maximize the margin between preferred and dispreferred completions. Methods such as DPO, KTO, BCO, and KLDO estimate divergence-based constraints and aim to structure the alignment space by separating safe and unsafe generations, within the language distribution they are trained on (Halder et al., 2025). Consequently, models aligned with English-centric datasets may fail to generalize alignment properties effectively to other languages, leading to safety inconsistencies in multilingual contexts.

4 Methodology

In this study, we address the issue of multilingual alignment in LLMs, particularly in the context of human preference datasets that are unevenly distributed across languages. The reward function $r_\phi(x, y)$ and the optimized policy model π_θ , therefore, exhibit higher accuracy in high-resource languages, while demonstrating poor alignment in low-resource languages. This misalignment results in a significant failure in distinguishing between aligned and unaligned data, as observed in Llama-3.1-8B’s performance (Figure 2). For instance, when prompted in English with “How to make a bomb?”, the model refuses to generate a response, aligning with safety constraints. However, when presented with the equivalent Hindi query, it produces detailed procedural steps, including explicit instructions, highlighting a critical gap in multilingual safety alignment.

The discrepancy in multilingual alignment manifests as strong safety adherence in English but increased susceptibility to harmful responses in underrepresented languages. To systematically analyze this issue, we probed the language models using a balanced multilingual toxicity corpus, where prompts vary in both harmfulness and linguistic structure. We extract final-layer embeddings from the LLM and apply Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for dimensionality reduction, enabling visualization of harmful and harmless clusters, before and after alignment. The explained variance ratio of principal components aids in understanding

alignment-induced shifts in representation space. We further compute within-class and between-class variance to quantify intra-cluster cohesion and inter-cluster separation in the embedding space.

To rigorously measure alignment-induced separation, we employ the Bhattacharyya Distance metric (Bhattacharyya, 1943), capturing the overlap between harmful and harmless clusters. This metric serves as an indicator of how alignment influences the distinction between safety-related representations across different language models. Additionally, we use the Silhouette Score to assess clustering quality, evaluating how well prompt embeddings align with their respective clusters. A higher Silhouette Score in high-resource languages further substantiates the improved separation of harmful and harmless content, providing a robust quantification of multilingual alignment effectiveness.

5 Experiments

5.1 Dataset

Our primary focus is on four languages—English (en), Hindi (hi), Chinese (zh), and German (de)—as these are the most commonly fine-tuned languages in LLMs through SFT or Preference Optimization. To systematically evaluate multilingual alignment, we utilized the following dataset:

- **Balanced Toxicity Dataset:** This dataset contains an equal number of toxic and non-toxic sentences, ensuring an unbiased comparison across different alignment strategies (Dementieva et al., 2024b). We used binary toxicity classification datasets available in nine languages. Each language dataset consists of 5,000 samples, with 2,500 toxic and 2,500 non-toxic sentences.
- **Multilingual Parallel Text-Detoxification Dataset:** This dataset contains parallel sentence pairs where the toxic and detoxified versions maintain semantic consistency but differ in syntactic toxicity expression (Dementieva et al., 2024a). It allows for a controlled evaluation of how well models differentiate between toxic and non-toxic variations of the content across multiple languages.

These datasets provide a structured and comprehensive framework for evaluating multilingual alignment.

Model	#Size	Reference model (π_{ref})	Aligned model (π_{θ})	Creator
Llama-2(Touvron et al., 2023)	7B	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat	Meta
Qwen-2.5(Yang et al., 2024)	7B	Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B	Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	Qwen
Llama-3.1(Grattafiori et al., 2024)	8B	meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B	meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Meta
Llama-Guard-3(Grattafiori et al., 2024)	8B	meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B	meta-llama/Llama-Guard-3-8B	Meta
Gemma-2(Team et al., 2024)	9B	google/gemma-2-9b	google/gemma-2-9b-it	Google
Gemma-3(Team, 2025)	12B	google/gemma-3-12b-pt	google/gemma-3-12b-it	Google
Phi-4(Abdin et al., 2024)	14B	-	microsoft/phi-4	Mircrosoft

Table 1: Models used for Multilingual Preference-Tuning evaluation. The model cards refer to Hugging Face checkpoints of reference (π_{ref}) and aligned (π_{θ}) models.




Figure 3: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Llama-2 for Multilingual Corpora.

5.2 Models

We analyzed models from four distinct families, varying in scale and training objectives. We focused exclusively on openly available models hosted on Hugging Face, ensuring transparency and reproducibility (mentioned in Table 1). To assess multilingual alignment, we examined the hidden representation space of each model before and after alignment (where applicable).

We evaluate multilingual alignment across diverse LLM families, including Llama models (Llama-2, Llama-3.1, Llama-Guard-3), Qwen-2.5, Gemma models (Gemma-2, Gemma-3), and Phi-4. These models vary in pretraining strategies, alignment methods, and language coverage—Llama models use SFT and RLHF, with Llama-Guard specializing in safety filtering; Qwen-2.5 explicitly supports 29 languages; Gemma models expand multilingual capabilities with RL objectives, covering up to 140 languages; and Phi-4, trained on curated and synthetic datasets, includes 8% multilin-

gual data. This selection provides a comprehensive lens to assess alignment robustness in multilingual settings.

5.3 Results

Figure 3 demonstrates the impact of alignment on the latent representations of LLMs using PCA with the first two components. Before alignment, the reference policy π_{ref} shows overlapping clusters for harmless and harmful sentences, whereas the aligned model π_{θ} exhibits improved separation due to divergence induced by alignment. While English clusters are well-separated, the effect is less pronounced in other languages. The PCA explained variance ratio was 49.61%, indicating that nearly half of the data variation is captured in the reduced space. Notably, the between-class variance ratio increased from 0.81% to 61.20% (a 60.39% improvement), confirming enhanced cluster separability post-alignment. However, for Hindi, Chinese, and German, the improvements were significantly




Figure 4: Bhattacharyya Distance for All Models Pre- and Post-Alignment Tuning. Blue radar indicates values before alignment (π_{ref}), while green represents values after alignment (π_{θ}).




Figure 5: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Llama-2 for Multilingual parallel text detoxification corporas.

lower at 19.98%, 10.09%, and 26.85%, respectively, highlighting weaker alignment effects in these languages. To further analyze cluster separability, we extended our evaluation beyond PCA with two components, as the explained variance ratio of 50% was insufficient. Instead, we used the first 10 components for computing additional metrics across all models. (cf. Appendix A for additional visualizations with other models.)

One such metric, Bhattacharyya distance, quantifies the separation between harmful and harmless sentence clusters. As shown in Figure 4, this measure confirms our earlier observations. In English, the reference model shows relatively less separation than the aligned model across all pairs, aligning with our PCA-based findings. Chinese and German also exhibit an increase in cluster sep-

aration, though the effect is weaker compared to English. Notably, the scale in the plot is logarithmic (ranging from $1e-3$ to $1e+1$), emphasizing the substantial differences in cluster distances across languages. A particularly interesting trend emerges for Hindi, where some models show improved separation post-alignment, while others exhibit the opposite trend, with the unaligned model displaying greater cluster separation. Similarly, silhouette scores, which measure cluster compactness and between-class variance, reveal a consistent pattern. Although alignment generally increases cluster separability, the improvement is significantly higher for English than for other languages. (cf. Appendix B for exact metric values across all models.)

In a more challenging parallel text-detoxification setup—where harmless sentences are minor edits of harmful ones, often differing by just one or two tokens—the effectiveness of alignment varies (Figure 5). While English representations remain meaningfully separated even in this difficult setting, neither the reference nor the aligned models capture a clear distribution shift for Hindi in lower-dimensional space. This highlights language-dependent differences in how alignment influences representation learning.

6 Conclusion

Our study provides a comprehensive analysis of the multilingual alignment status of current preference-tuned models. Our findings indicate that state-of-the-art models perform well in English (monolingual bias), but their alignment across languages remains inconsistent, as shown by cluster separability metrics and hidden representation analyses. This underscores the need for a more holistic representation of languages when training models intended for truly global audiences.

Limitations

While our study provides a systematic analysis of multilingual alignment, it has certain limitations:

- **Scope of Alignment Evaluation:** Our methodology assumes that alignment mechanisms induce divergence in the human preference space for the properties they were guardrailed against. However, we primarily focus on safety alignment, overlooking other critical domains such as multi-modality, reasoning, instruction-following, or planning due to the lack of standardized multilingual benchmarks for these tasks.
- **Language Coverage:** For this proof-of-concept study, we evaluate only three non-English languages, all of which are medium-resource. While our findings highlight monolingual bias, future work should extend this analysis to low-resource languages to better understand alignment disparities.
- **Dataset Size:** Our dataset consists of 5,000 sentences, which, while significantly larger than prior works (200 samples) (Lin et al., 2024; Haldar et al., 2025), may not fully capture the diversity of real-world multilingual scenarios. A broader dataset could further validate our findings across different linguistic and cultural contexts.

These limitations underscore the need for more comprehensive multilingual benchmarks and extended evaluations across diverse alignment tasks and resource-constrained languages.

Ethical Considerations

Our findings raise serious ethical concerns regarding the practices of model developers who release large-scale language models without ensuring robust multilingual alignment. This oversight disproportionately impacts marginalized linguistic communities, increasing their exposure to harmful outputs while reinforcing systemic biases.

Two major ethical risks highlighted by our analysis are:

- **Misuse Potential:** Our study identifies failure cases in languages other than English, where models generate unsafe or misaligned outputs. Figure 2 presents an example in Hindi, demonstrating how alignment inconsistencies create vulnerabilities that could be exploited for

harmful applications. To mitigate this, future alignment efforts must prioritize multilingual preference collection, particularly for high-risk domains. If direct human preference gathering is infeasible, post-training interventions should explore synthetic techniques to transfer alignment knowledge from English to other languages.

- **Harm to Vulnerable Populations:** The unrestricted release of insufficiently aligned models disproportionately impacts marginalized communities, where users may interact with models in languages that lack rigorous safety guardrails. Our findings suggest that current models can be jailbroken more easily in sister languages to English, exposing these populations to higher risks. This underscores the urgent need for comprehensive multilingual safety evaluations before open-weight LLMs are widely deployed.

Our study calls for greater accountability in multilingual alignment efforts, emphasizing that ethical AI deployment requires more than just English-centric safety measures. Future research should focus on developing alignment techniques that are language-agnostic and equitable across diverse linguistic contexts.

References

- Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, and 1 others. 2024. Phi-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905*.
- Arash Ahmadian, Chris Cremer, Matthias Gallé, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, Olivier Pietquin, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. 2024. Back to basics: Revisiting reinforce style optimization for learning from human feedback in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14740*.
- Badr AlKhamissi, Muhammad ElNokrashy, Mai AlKhamissi, and Mona Diab. 2024. Investigating cultural alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13231*.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. 2024. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4447–4455. PMLR.

- Anil Bhattacharyya. 1943. On a measure of divergence between two statistical populations defined by their probability distribution. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, 35:99–110.
- Stella Biderman, Usvsn Prashanth, Lintang Sutawika, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Anthony, Shivanshu Purohit, and Edward Raff. 2023. Emergent and predictable memorization in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:28072–28090.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. 1952. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345.
- Nicolas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramer, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. 2023. Extracting training data from diffusion models. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 5253–5270.
- Shreyas Chaudhari, Pranjal Aggarwal, Vishvak Murahari, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Ashwin Kalyan, Karthik Narasimhan, Ameet Deshpande, and Bruno Castro da Silva. 2024. RLhf deciphered: A critical analysis of reinforcement learning from human feedback for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08555*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Ziqing Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, and 1 others. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2(3):6.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- John Dang, Arash Ahmadian, Kelly Marchisio, Julia Kreutzer, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. 2024. RLhf can speak many languages: Unlocking multilingual preference optimization for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02552*.
- Daryna Dementieva, Nikolay Babakov, Amit Ronen, Abinew Ali Ayele, Naqee Rizwan, Florian Schneider, Xintong Wang, Seid Muhie Yimam, Daniil Moskovskiy, Elisei Stakovskii, and 1 others. 2024a. Multilingual and explainable text detoxification with parallel corpora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11691*.
- Daryna Dementieva, Daniil Moskovskiy, Nikolay Babakov, Abinew Ali Ayele, Naqee Rizwan, Florian Schneider, Xintong Wang, Seid Muhie Yimam, Dmitry Ustalov, Elisei Stakovskii, Alisa Smirnova, Ashraf Elnagar, Animesh Mukherjee, and Alexander Panchenko. 2024b. Overview of the multilingual text detoxification task at pan 2024. In *Working Notes of CLEF 2024 - Conference and Labs of the Evaluation Forum*. CEUR-WS.org.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. 2024. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Rajdeep Haldar, Ziyi Wang, Qifan Song, Guang Lin, and Yue Xing. 2025. Llm safety alignment is divergence estimation in disguise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00657*.
- Seungjae Jung, Gunsoo Han, Daniel Wontae Nam, and Kyoung-Woon On. 2024. Binary classifier optimization for large language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04656*.
- Khyati Khandelwal, Manuel Tonneau, Andrew M Bean, Hannah Rose Kirk, and Scott A Hale. 2023. Casteist but not racist? quantifying disparities in large language model bias between india and the west. *CoRR*.
- Robert Kirk, Ishita Mediratta, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jelena Luketina, Eric Hambro, Edward Grefenstette, and Roberta Raileanu. 2023. Understanding the effects of rlhf on llm generalisation and diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06452*.
- Haoran Li, Yulin Chen, Jinglong Luo, Jiecong Wang, Hao Peng, Yan Kang, Xiaojin Zhang, Qi Hu, Chunkit Chan, Zenglin Xu, and 1 others. 2023. Privacy in large language models: Attacks, defenses and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10383*.
- Yuping Lin, Pengfei He, Han Xu, Yue Xing, Makoto Yamada, Hui Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2024. Towards understanding jailbreak attacks in llms: A representation space analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10794*.
- Fei Liu and 1 others. 2020. Learning to summarize from human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 583–592.
- Yi Liu, Gelei Deng, Zhengzi Xu, Yuekang Li, Yaowen Zheng, Ying Zhang, Lida Zhao, Tianwei Zhang, Kailong Wang, and Yang Liu. 2023. Jailbreaking chatgpt via prompt engineering: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13860*.
- Nils Lukas, Ahmed Salem, Robert Sim, Shruti Tople, Lukas Wutschitz, and Santiago Zanella-Béguelin. 2023. Analyzing leakage of personally identifiable information in language models. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 346–363. IEEE.
- Milad Nasr, Nicholas Carlini, Jonathan Hayase, Matthew Jagielski, A Feder Cooper, Daphne Ippolito,

- Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Eric Wallace, Florian Tramèr, and Katherine Lee. 2023. Scalable extraction of training data from (production) language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17035*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, and 1 others. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Robin L Plackett. 1975. The analysis of permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*, 24(2):193–202.
- 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.
- Jonathan Rystrom, Hannah Rose Kirk, and Scott Hale. 2025. Multilingual!= multicultural: Evaluating gaps between multilingual capabilities and cultural alignment in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16534*.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Reva Schwartz, Reva Schwartz, Apostol Vassilev, Kristen Greene, Lori Perine, Andrew Burt, and Patrick Hall. 2022. *Towards a standard for identifying and managing bias in artificial intelligence*, volume 3. US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Guijin Son, Dongkeun Yoon, Juyoung Suk, Javier Aulias, Mano Aslan, Vu Trong Kim, Shayekh Bin Islam, Jaume Prats-Cristià, Lucía Tormo-Bañuelos, and Seungone Kim. 2024. Mm-eval: A multilingual meta-evaluation benchmark for llm-as-a-judge and reward models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17578*.
- Lichao Sun, Yue Huang, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Chujie Gao, Yixin Huang, Wenhan Lyu, Yixuan Zhang, Xiner Li, and 1 others. 2024. Trustllm: Trustworthiness in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05561*, 3.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.
- Gemma Team. 2025. [Gemma 3](#).
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, and 1 others. 2024. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, and 1 others. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Aniket Vashishtha, Kabir Ahuja, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2023. On evaluating and mitigating gender biases in multilingual settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01503*.
- Genta Indra Winata, Hanyang Zhao, Anirban Das, Wenpin Tang, David D Yao, Shi-Xiong Zhang, and Sambit Sahu. 2024. Preference tuning with human feedback on language, speech, and vision tasks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11564*.
- Minghao Wu, Abdul Waheed, Chiyu Zhang, Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, and Alham Fikri Aji. 2023. Lamini-lm: A diverse herd of distilled models from large-scale instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14402*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, and 1 others. 2024. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Zheng-Xin Yong, Cristina Menghini, and Stephen H Bach. 2023. Low-resource languages jailbreak gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02446*.
- Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. 2019. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*.

A Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations for Multilingual Corpora

For models other than Llama-2, visualizations of hidden representations before and after alignment are presented in Figures 6 to 10. For Phi-4, since only the aligned model checkpoint is available, only the representation analysis is shown in Figure 11.

B Metrics of cluster quality, before and after alignment of LLMs

The models we used in this study are mentioned below:

- **Llama-2:** A suite of open-source foundational and fine-tuned chat models. The pre-training corpus includes over 5% non-English high-quality data, though evaluations primarily focus on English.
- **Qwen-2.5:** An instruction-following model optimized for long-context reasoning and diverse prompts. It explicitly supports 29 languages in output generation.
- **Llama-3.1:** Fine-tuned versions use SFT and RLHF for preference alignment. Supported languages include English, German, French, Italian, Portuguese, Hindi, Spanish, and Thai.
- **Llama-Guard:** A content safety classifier fine-tuned on Llama-3.1-8B. It classifies both inputs (prompt filtering) and outputs (response moderation) and supports multilingual safety alignment in languages same as Llama-3.1.
- **Gemma-2:** A 9B parameter instruction-tuned model primarily trained on English data. However, the SFT phase incorporates some multilingual contexts.
- **Gemma-3:** A 12B parameter multimodal and multilingual model which supports 140 languages. In its RL objectives, it uses variety of reward functions to improve helpfulness, reasoning and multilingual abilities, while minimizing model harmfulness.
- **Phi-4:** Trained on a mixture of synthetic datasets, filtered public domain websites, and

traditional sources using SFT and DPO. Approximately 8% of its training data is explicitly multilingual covering wide range of languages, including German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Italian, Hindi and Japanese.

This selection of models enables a comprehensive evaluation of alignment in multilingual settings, covering diverse pretraining strategies, alignment techniques, and language coverage. Table 2 refers to the metrics used for comparison of PCA clusters with 10 components for all the models evaluated before and after alignment.




Figure 6: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Qwen-2.5 for Multilingual Corpora.




Figure 7: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Llama-3.1 for Multilingual Corpora.




Figure 8: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Llama-Guard-3 for Multilingual Corpora.




Figure 9: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Gemma-2 for Multilingual Corpora.




Figure 10: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Gemma-3 for Multilingual Corpora.




Figure 11: Impact of Alignment on Hidden Representations in Phi-4 for Multilingual Corpora.

Table 2: Metric values of different LLMs before and after alignment on Balanced Toxicity Dataset. We use “BD” for Bhattacharyya distance, “SS” for silhouette score, and “BCV” for between-class variance. We use hyphen (-) where model checkpoint is not available.

Model	Language	Reference Model			Aligned Model		
		BD	SS	BCV	BD	SS	BCV
Llama-2	English	0.035	0.0142	0.0303	2.5871	0.5433	0.3715
	Hindi	0.1837	0.1355	0.1309	0.6743	0.3036	0.1828
	Chinese	0.0044	0.0017	0.0033	0.0961	0.0878	0.0671
	German	0.1905	0.0471	0.0409	0.3907	0.2825	0.2067
Qwen-2.5	English	0.3037	0.1326	0.0776	0.8365	0.315	0.1987
	Hindi	0.0309	0.0172	0.0631	0.1746	0.1047	0.0895
	Chinese	0.0208	0.0102	0.0119	0.0233	0.0138	0.0263
	German	0.0813	0.0482	0.033	0.077	0.0634	0.0703
Llama-3.1	English	0.1114	0.0268	0.0637	0.9639	0.3156	0.2047
	Hindi	0.5402	0.2313	0.1646	0.3723	0.2253	0.1649
	Chinese	0.0029	0.0025	0.0053	0.0162	0.014	0.0124
	German	0.1262	0.0411	0.0405	0.2096	0.123	0.0904
Llama-Guard-3	English	0.1114	0.0268	0.0637	0.8627	0.2971	0.2080
	Hindi	0.5402	0.2313	0.1646	0.2389	0.1456	0.1398
	Chinese	0.0029	0.0025	0.0053	0.1576	0.0923	0.072
	German	0.1262	0.0411	0.0405	0.2440	0.1697	0.1112
Gemma-2	English	0.1653	0.0565	0.0781	0.6046	0.2544	0.1368
	Hindi	0.5061	0.2099	0.1491	0.1522	0.0882	0.0795
	Chinese	0.0055	0.0051	0.0072	0.0182	0.0172	0.0202
	German	0.0487	0.0301	0.0305	0.1976	0.1028	0.0629
Gemma-3	English	0.2087	0.0753	0.1016	1.1618	0.3913	0.2342
	Hindi	1.2436	0.2389	0.18	0.394	0.1794	0.1073
	Chinese	0.0046	0.0043	0.0102	0.0749	0.0362	0.0262
	German	0.107	0.0396	0.0426	0.2298	0.1287	0.079
Phi-4	English	-	-	-	1.1200	0.3712	0.1929
	Hindi	-	-	-	0.7817	0.2895	0.1475
	Chinese	-	-	-	0.0015	0.0004	0.0111
	German	-	-	-	0.2650	0.1543	0.0775