Benchmarking Multi-National Value Alignment for Large Language Models

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Do Large Language Models (LLMs) hold positions that conflict with your country's values? In this paper, we introduce NaVAB, a comprehensive benchmark designed to evaluate the alignment of LLMs with the values of five major nations: China, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. Existing benchmarks, which rely on spectrum tests conducted through questionnaires, often fail to capture the dynamic nature of values across countries and lack in sufficient evaluation data. To address these limitations, NaVAB implements a value data extraction pipeline[1] to efficiently construct value assessment datasets. This process includes a Conflict Reduction mechanism to filter non-conflicting values for a high-quality benchmark[2]. Through extensive experiments on various LLMs (spanning Base vs. Instruct models, non-MoE vs. MoE architectures and Open vs. Closed source), we demonstrate that LLMs can be effectively aligned with the multi-national values by NaVAB.

1 Introduction

The widespread deployment of LLMs has raised significant concerns among educators, media professionals, scholars, and policymakers about their societal impact (Rozado, 2024; Potter et al., 2024; Rettenberger et al., 2024a). These AI systems are increasingly replacing traditional information sources like search engines and Wikipedia, while inherently reflect the ethical, social values absorbed from their training data. For example, studies have shown that LLMs might exhibit consistent left-of-center political preferences (Rozado, 2024). The impact of these embedded values is substantial: empirical evidence indicates that around 20% of users, particularly young individuals and those with less developed worldviews, shifted their value stance after interacting with LLMs (Potter et al., 2024).



Figure 1: A demonstration of differnet LLM's responses compared with people's attitude cross nations

Existing benchmarks for evaluating LLMs often rely on spectrum tests or questionnaires created by small groups of individuals. These methods attempt to align LLMs' towards fixed values but fail to capture the dynamic and diverse nature of values across nations. For instance, Figure 1 shows that attitudes toward issues like abortion vary widely between regions such as North America and Southeast Asia (Fetterolf and Clancy, 2024). However, LLMs might take stances similar to some specific nations while conflicting with others. Moreover, these approaches provide limited data coverage, ignoring the vast range of perspectives in official news sources, which not only significantly shape societal values (Cushion, 2017; Zaller, 1991; Schudson, 1995) but also heavily influence people through their nation's media (Djankov et al., 2003; Brookes, 1999; Willis, 2007). Despite the availability of extensive online news data, it has not been effectively utilized for aligning LLMs. This combination of national value dynamics and limited evaluation scope highlights critical gaps in current LLM alignment research. In all, three critical gaps exist in current research on LLMs'

[1]Our code is available at https://anonymous.4open.science/r/NVA-Pipeline-57DB

[2]Our dataset is available at https://huggingface.co/datasets/JadenGGGeee/NaVAB

political alignment: (1) No comprehensive benchmark for evaluating LLMs' value alignment across different nations. (2) Lack of systematic methods for collecting and curating value data suitable for LLM alignment. (3) Absence of effective techniques for handling conflicting value data during the alignment process.

To address the above challenges of aligning LLMs with nation-specific values, we propose NaVAB (National Values Alignment Benchmark), a framework for systematically evaluating and aligning LLMs. Our benchmark leverages data from eight official media outlets across nations and introduces a comprehensive pipeline for value assessment. The pipeline consists of three stages: (1) a topic modeling process to extract topics from raw news data, (2) a value-sensitive topic screening process to filter value-relevant topics, and (3) a value assessment data generation process to create value statements for evaluation and alignment. To address conflicting values in the data, we propose a Conflict Reduction process to improve alignment performance. After constructing the value assessment data, we propose two evaluation methods: (1) Assessing LLM alignment with quoted value-related statements in the news, and (2) Evaluating alignment with the official stance of the news source itself. Our contributions are as follows.

- We release NaVAB, the first benchmark for evaluating value alignment of LLMs across multiple nations.
- We design a value-extraction pipeline that integrates topic modeling, value-sensitive topic screening, and the generation of value assessment data from cross-national news sources.
- We propose Conflict Reduction, a graph-based process to filter out conflict values in our benchmark. Our findings reveal that LLM's alignment with multi-national values can be increased by over avg.5% on NaVAB.

2 Value Data Extraction Pipeline

As shown in Figure 2, our NaVAB's value data extraction pipeline mainly consists of three process: Topics Modeling, Value-sensitive Topic Screening and Values Assessment Data Generation. The statistic of the news we collect and output data is shown in Table 1. The following content of this section introduces the pipeline in detail.

2.1 Dataset

We first collect news data[3] from representative official media sources from each of the below nations:

- **China (Mainland and Hong Kong SAR):** (a) Ministry of Foreign Affairs official website. (b) Xuexi Qiangguo platform. (c) People's Daily. (d) Government Press Releases (HK).
- **United States:** (a) Cable News Network (CNN). (b) The New York Times.
- **United Kingdom:** The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC).
- **Germany:** Collection from the German Digital Library (German-PD-Newspapers).
- **France:** Collection from various French Online News Websites (Diverse-French-News).

In the following sections, we will further detail our methodology for constructing the pipeline as well as the evaluation dataset.

2.2 Topic Modeling

To efficiently process raw news and extract value-related data, we propose a topic modeling process. Traditional probabilistic methods (e.g. Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Blei et al., 2003), Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) (Lee and Seung, 2000) face critical limitations in hyperparameter optimization, semantic coherence, and multilingual processing. Using LLMs is also time consuming. Our implementation is as follows:

Step I. News Embedding: To process multilingual raw text data, we apply language-specific Sentence-Transformers to generate dense vector representations of news from each nation[4].

Step II. Dimensionality Reduction: To ensure that documents with similar themes are clustered together during the modeling process, we apply Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) (McInnes et al., 2018) to reduce the high dimensionality of news embeddings.

Step III. News Clustering: Following the reduction of news embeddings to a 5-dimensional space, we use Hierarchical Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (HDBSCAN) (McInnes et al., 2017) to cluster the 5-dimensional embeddings into topic groups. The dimensionality

[3]The source of data can be found in Appendix A.1

[4]The configuration of models can be found in Appendix A.2



Figure 2: The pipeline of NaVAB. Each process is introduced in Section 2. The final output of the value data is a triple consisting of three components: Q (Question), S(Statement), RS(Reverse Statement), which is illustrated in Section 2.4. All processes are described step by step in Section 2.

Nation	News	Quoted	Official
China	4,000k	26247	26170
US	784k	1852	1892
UK	477k	2725	2609
France	335k	1914	1968
Germany	538k	1536	1580

Table 1: The statistics of our data sources. The numbers for raw news data are represented in thousands ('k' denotes 1,000), while other columns use regular numeric values. 'Quoted' and 'Official' refer to the extracted quoted and official statements, respectively, as described in Section 2.4. All sources are publicly available online.

is reduced to 2D for visualization. Figure 3 shows two examples of the clusters of news embeddings, with outliers marked in gray-scale.

Step IV. Instruction Tagging: To address the limitation of HDBSCAN clustering where a significant portion of news remains unclassified (in gray-scale), we implement a two-stage tagging and filtering process for tagging the outliers. Inspired by InsTag(Lu et al., 2023), for documents that HDBSCAN designates as noise, we leverage GPT4(Achiam et al., 2023) for supplementary tagging and categorization. An iterative process is used to categorize unclassified news in batches. Each batch goes through the following steps:

- Tag Generation and Analysis: Process documents with LLM to generate structured tags an then analyze tag frequency across the batch.
- Tag Consolidation and Formation: Merge similar tags based on frequency and then create cohesive topics from consolidated tags.
- Document Assignment: Assign documents to topics based on their tags. This process repeats until all documents are classified into meaningful topics.

Step V. Topic Creation: After obtaining clusters of news, we create topic representations for each cluster using a hybrid approach that combines class-based Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (c-TF-IDF) (Grootendorst, 2022) with LLM. First, c-TF-IDF identifies key terms from each document cluster. KeyBERT and Maximal Marginal Relevance are used to extract diverse, contextual keywords. Finally, GPT-4 is used to generate topic descriptions based on these keywords.

2.3 Value-sensitive Topics Screening

To filter sensitive topics data for better value-alignment, we implement a screening mechanism for identifying value-sensitive content within topic clusters by leveraging LLM (GPT4) through in-context learning (ICL(Dong et al., 2022)).

The screening process involves matching documents against those predefined topic sets. To ensure the selected data focus on value-related discourse rather than general news or unrelated topics, we apply human knowledge[5] for double-checking and filter the value-sensitive topics data.

[5]We verify the quality of the sensitive data manually. Then we drop those news with non-value-sensitive topics for each data sources



(a) Clusters for BBC

(b) Clusters of NewYorkTimes

Figure 3: Two examples showing the clusters from different news data sources and the top 5 topics of the corresponding clusters. Grey points are outliers explained in Section 2.2.

2.4 Values Assessment Data Generation

To generate national value assessment data from the filtered value-sensitive topics, we develop a Value Assessment Data Generation method. The method consists of the following steps:

Step I. Value Statement Extraction: To identify useful ideological statements, e.g. ethical assertions or policy positions, for national value benchmarking, we employ LLM (GPT4) to extract Value Statements from each filtered news articles.

Step II. Conflict Reduction: After extracting value statements from news articles, we observe that statements within a nation can sometimes conflict, which is inconsistent with the expectation of value coherence. To address this, we develop a graph-based Conflict Reduction method combined with LLM analysis.

We first construct a knowledge graph where nodes represent news articles and edges represent the extracted value statements. Then, we enhance conflict detection by adding new relationships to the graph based on: (1) Semantic Similarity: Link news with similar topics. (2) Geospatial Distance: Link news referencing close media locations. (3) Social Network: Link news where the same groups of people or individuals from related organizations express a statement. LLM (GPT-4) is also used to help verified these components.

To determine the dominant value stance of a data source, we design a path-finding technique (Nyanchama and Osborn, 1999; Aleman-Meza et al., 2006) to detect cycles that indicates hidden or complex conflicts. Specifically, 5-hop cycles involving conflicting statements can reveal broader inconsistencies across news. After detecting cycles, we flag and remove edges (statements) that deviate significantly from the dominant stance. Lastly we perform iterative refinement by recalculating the dominant value stance after resolving conflicts. The graph is then updated, and the process is repeated for 5 rounds.

To ensure our Conflict Reduction process produces reliable output by retaining the most aligned values for each nation and minimizing conflicting value statements, we apply human verification to confirm whether the remaining value statements conflict with each other[6].

Step III. Statement Source Judgment: To evaluate LLMs' comprehension of diverse value perspectives and their alignment with media outlet positions, we develop an LLM based (GPT4) source classification system that categorizes statements into the following two dimensions, and we present the statistic of our extracted dataset compared with the raw data in Table 1:

- *Quoted Statements:* Opinions or positions attributed to specific individuals, organizations, or entities.
- *Official Statements:* Direct expressions of views by the media outlet itself.

Step IV. Evaluation Sample Construction: To create robust evaluation data, we generate contrastive samples. For each validated value statement, we use LLM (GPT4) to construct a triple structure of <*Q, S, RS*>, where:

- *Q* - *Question*: a contextually relevant value inquiry derived from the statement.
- *S* - *Statement*: the original statement of value position or assertion.

[6]The method and statistical results can be found in Appendix A



Figure 4: A comparison between traditional evaluation method and ours. MC and AJ denote Multiple-Choice and Answer Judgment, respectively. These two methods are introduced in Section 3.1.

- *RS - Reverse Statement*: a logically opposed position that maintains semantic coherence while inverting the original stance.

3 Evaluation

In this section, we introduce our proposed evaluation methods and then evaluate the alignment performance of different LLMs on NaVAB.

3.1 Evaluation Metric

Traditional alignment evaluation methods typically ask target LLMs to respond with "agree" or "disagree" to given statements in order to evaluate consistency. However, this approach has significant drawbacks: LLMs often fail to agree with most statements, and their responses are easily influenced by their ability to follow instructions, rather than reflecting true alignment with values. Many works(Liu et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2024; Shankar et al., 2024) have stated that these methods do not adequately address the internal inconsistency of LLMs or the impact of prompt design, which can lead to unreliable and biased results. To address this, we show the differences between different methods in Figure 4 and propose our evaluation methods as follows:

Evaluation based on Multiple-Choice (MC): LLMs are asked to do a multiple-choice question: to select either **Choice A**: S or **Choice B**: RS from the triple <*Q, S, RS*> that better answers the Q.

Evaluation based on Answer-Judgment (AJ): LLMs are asked to respond to Q from the triples. GPT is then employed as a judge to determine whether the generated answer aligns more closely with **Reference A**: S or **Reference B**: RS.

Correct rate: To evaluate and visualize LLMs' value alignment performance, we calculate the correct rate by comparing the PPL of generated responses for positive and negative prompts. For **MC**, a response is correct if the PPL[7] of the correct choice is lower than the incorrect one. For **AJ**, a response is correct if GPT judges it to align with the expected reference (positive S or negative RS). The **correct rate** is the proportion of correct responses across all prompts. Higher correct rate indicates better alignment performance.

[7]Perplexity (PPL) is one of the most common metrics for evaluating language models(Huyen, 2019). It measures the model's uncertainty when predicting the next token in a sequence. Lower perplexity indicates higher confidence and better prediction performance.

Model	Type	China		US		UK		France		Germany	
		MC	*AJ*	*MC*	*AJ*	*MC*	*AJ*	*MC*	*AJ*	*MC*	*AJ*
Quoted Statements											
Llama3.1-8b	*Base*	0.515	0.274	0.498	0.274	0.506	0.274	0.504	0.276	0.484	0.262
Qwen2.5-7b	*Base*	0.892	0.443	0.784	0.418	0.867	0.473	0.858	0.421	0.839	0.407
Llama3.2-3b	*Instruct*	0.855	0.428	0.797	0.399	0.853	0.427	0.855	0.429	0.677	0.339
Llama3.1-8b	*Instruct*	0.905	0.395	0.871	0.436	0.926	0.463	0.910	0.437	0.903	0.432
Qwen2.5-7b	*Instruct*	0.890	0.490	0.827	0.455	0.861	0.474	0.851	0.485	0.742	0.418
Qwen2.5-14b	*Instruct*	0.832	0.458	0.836	0.460	0.867	0.477	0.837	0.471	0.774	0.426
Mixtral-7x8b	*MoE*	0.935	0.514	0.920	0.506	0.940	0.517	0.930	0.558	0.865	0.483
GPT4	*ClosedSource*	0.925	0.509	0.910	0.501	0.914	0.512	0.920	0.552	0.836	0.427
Claude-3.5	*ClosedSource*	0.915	0.503	0.916	0.495	0.920	0.506	0.928	0.546	0.847	0.384
Official Statements											
Llama3.1-8b	*Base*	0.523	0.274	0.510	0.275	0.510	0.274	0.513	0.325	0.488	0.277
Qwen2.5-7b	*Base*	0.865	0.448	0.807	0.428	0.842	0.421	0.814	0.420	0.805	0.403
Llama3.2-3b	*Instruct*	0.861	0.431	0.845	0.423	0.861	0.431	0.838	0.412	0.732	0.365
Llama3.1-8b	*Instruct*	0.914	0.424	0.908	0.454	0.913	0.457	0.895	0.433	0.878	0.429
Qwen2.5-7b	*Instruct*	0.871	0.479	0.844	0.464	0.831	0.457	0.795	0.479	0.780	0.490
Qwen2.5-14b	*Instruct*	0.864	0.475	0.840	0.462	0.838	0.461	0.801	0.426	0.829	0.425
Mixtral-7x8b	*MoE*	0.930	0.512	0.925	0.509	0.935	0.514	0.920	0.552	0.816	0.508
GPT4	*ClosedSource*	0.920	0.506	0.905	0.503	0.915	0.509	0.910	0.546	0.749	0.479
Claude-3.5	*ClosedSource*	0.910	0.501	0.915	0.498	0.925	0.503	0.900	0.540	0.757	0.475

Table 2: The Value Alignment Evaluation Results on both Quoted and Official Statement sets. Different depth of color of the cells indicate that the values inside is higher. The *MC* and *AJ* notations refer to Multiple-Choise and Answer-Judgement evaluation method, respectively.

3.2 Experimental Settings

We divide the generated evaluation data into 10 sets: 5 nations, each with a Quoted Statements set and an Official Statements set. We then conduct experiments on various types of LLMs, categorized by model type (Instruct/Base, MoE/Non-MoE, Open/Closed Source) and parameter sizes (3B, 7B, 8B, 14B). The Base models include Llama3.1 and Qwen2.5, while the Instruct models include Llama3.2-3B, Llama3.1-8B, Qwen2.5-7B, and Qwen2.5-14B. For MoE models, we use Mixtral. Additionally, GPT-4 and Claude-3.5 are included as Closed Source models[8].

3.3 Main Results

The main experimental results of our benchmark are presented in Table 2. We analyze the results from several perspectives:

(1) **Regarding Different Models**: Among all model types, base models align worst with the value statements across five nations, on both the Quoted and Official Statements set. Notably, Llama3.1-8B aligns much worse than Qwen2.5-7B, even though both are newly released models with similar parameter sizes. Its correct rate is over 20% lower on average for **MC** method and over 10% lower for **AJ** method. The MoE model outperforms all other models in most cases across the five nations and both evaluation sets. In general, larger models tend to align better than smaller ones. Interestingly, Qwen2.5-14B aligns worse than Qwen2.5-7B, even though the latter has a smaller size.

(2) **Regarding Different methods:** The **AJ** method achieves only about half the correct rate of the **MC** method. While the overall performance decreases, the correct rate for the **AJ** method remains consistent across nations and models compared to the **MC** method. This indicates that both evaluation methods are generally reliable and consistent.

(3) **Regarding Different nations:** Despite the size of extracted value statements for each nation, alignment results vary slightly across nations. For example, alignment performance for Germany is generally lower than for other countries. Meanwhile, datasets in English (e.g., US, UK) and Chi-

[8]The configuration details of each model are described in Appendix A

Variants	Quoted Statement		Official Statement	
	MC ↓	*AJ* ↓	*MC* ↓	*AJ* ↓
China				
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction + DPO	**0.539**	**0.307**	**0.618**	**0.307**
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction	0.515	0.274	0.523	0.274
NaVAB without Conflict Reduction	0.490	0.260	0.490	0.260
US				
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction + DPO	**0.518**	**0.286**	**0.525**	**0.290**
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction	0.498	0.274	0.510	0.275
NaVAB without Conflict Reduction	0.481	0.260	0.495	0.260
UK				
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction + DPO	**0.538**	**0.280**	**0.553**	**0.280**
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction	0.506	0.274	0.510	0.274
NaVAB without Conflict Reduction	0.490	0.265	0.490	0.265
France				
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction + DPO	**0.530**	**0.280**	**0.563**	**0.360**
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction	0.504	0.276	0.513	0.325
NaVAB without Conflict Reduction	0.495	0.262	0.495	0.308
Germany				
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction + DPO	**0.507**	**0.265**	**0.511**	**0.330**
NaVAB with Conflict Reduction	0.484	0.262	0.488	0.277
NaVAB without Conflict Reduction	0.473	0.251	0.465	0.212

Table 3: Result for ablation study using the Llama3.1-8b-base model. The explanation of Conflict Reduction and DPO can be found in Section 3.4. High values are bold in the table.

nese (e.g., China) tend to have higher alignment scores. This may be linked to the pretraining language corpus of the LLMs.

(4) **Regarding Different Statements sets:** The sizes of the Quoted and Official Statements set are generally similar within each nation. The results show that LLMs align similarly with both sets. This suggests that the values expressed by individuals are largely aligned with the official media values within the same country.

3.4 Ablation Study

We further investigate the impact of Conflict Reduction and direct preference optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024) on LLMs' alignment. Table 3 presents the results of our ablation study.

As Llama3.1-8b-base aligns the worst in the main experiment, we use it as the baseline model and fine-tune it using LoRA (Hu et al., 2021). The results show that removing the Conflict Reduction process decreases the model's correct rate by over 3% for the **MC** method and over 2% for the **AJ** method on average across 5 nations, for both Quoted and Official Statement sets. Applying DPO fine-tuning improves the alignment performance in all cases, particularly for the Official Statement set. These findings suggest that combining DPO with Conflict Reduction enhances LLMs' ability to align with national values.

3.5 Discussions

Our experimental results reveal several key findings. We observe that alignment performance varies across model types, with larger size and instruction-tuned generally outperforming base models. The consistency between the **MC** and **AJ** evaluation methods confirms the reliability of our evaluation framework, despite the **AJ** method being more challenging. Alignment performance also varies slightly across nations, potentially influenced by the pretraining language corpus of the LLMs. The similarity in alignment scores between the Quoted and Official Statements sets within each nation suggests a strong connection between individual and official media values.

Our ablation study demonstrates the effectiveness of the Conflict Reduction process and DPO in improving LLMs' value alignment. Figure 5 presents a case study of the LLM's response after applying Conflict Reduction and DPO. The LLM



Figure 5: A case study comparing the LLM's alignment before and after fine-tuning with DPO using NaVAB's data. We use Llama3.1-8b-Instruct as the model.

produces a more reliable answer aligned with the original media's stance on abortion legality.

4 Related Work

4.1 Values Detection

Large language models are prone to generating biased content and speech with wrong social values. In order to investigate toxic generation by LLMs, prior works release RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020), an English dataset consisting of 100K naturally occurring prompts, as well as French and multilingual datasets (Brun and Nikoulina, 2024; Jain et al., 2024). BOLD is a large-scale dataset for benchmarking social bias in language model generation (Dhamala et al., 2021). Ousidhoum et al. (2021) focus on harmful content for different social groups and propose an approach based on structured templates by allowing LLMs to predict reasons for given actions. Deshpande et al. (2023) find that assigning persona to chatGPT significantly increases the toxicity of generated content. Most recently, TET dataset is introduced to evaluate LLMs with realistic prompts filtered from real-world interactions (Luong et al., 2024). Compared with these works, our benchmark focuses more on the incorrect value tendencies that LLMs might exhibit in different nations.

4.2 Values Bias Measurement

Biases embedded in LLMs have inspired much research. Experimental results from the Political Compass test and ethical value orientation tests on LLMs show that currently representative conversational LLMs exhibit left-leaning political biases (Rozado, 2024; Motoki et al., 2024). These biases are mainly transferred to language models through pre-training corpora containing different ideologies (Feng et al., 2023). The questionnaire-based method has also quantified the alignment of LLMs with German political parties, showing a particularly high alignment with left-leaning party positions (Hartmann et al., 2023; Rettenberger et al., 2024b). However, common questionnaires used in the above studies comprise a small number of statements and fail to cover value-sensitive topics that local governments and people focus on. Our work makes up for this deficiency.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we focus on LLMs' value alignment across nations. We introduce NaVAB, the first National Values Alignment Benchmark. NaVAB generates value assessment data from cross-national news sources with a Conflict Reduction process to reduce value conflicts. Our experiments reveal that alignment performance varies across model types and nations. The consistency between our evaluation methods confirms the reliability of our framework. Pretraining language corpus and the similarity between individual and official media values within each nation may influence alignment performance. We hope that NaVAB and our findings will inspire further research on improving LLMs' value alignment across nations in various aspects.

Limitations

Limitations of Dataset and Models: The dataset is sourced from open media platforms, which may not fully capture a nation's core values or the diverse perspectives of its people. Limited data availability from certain nations further restricts its scope, and pretrained models for some languages, such as French and German, are rare. Expanding data sources and developing specific pretrained embedding models will be necessary to improve coverage, representativeness, and support for additional nations.

Limitations of Evaluation Metric: The evaluation metric used in this study has limitations in multi-round dialogues, as it may fail to capture deeper values demonstrated across multiple interactions. While we evaluate nations separately, regional similarities in values and potential media biases remain challenges. Moreover, this study focuses only on DPO for fine-tuning, and the exclusion of other methods may limit the comprehensiveness of our evaluation.

Ethics Statement

This study follows the principles outlined in the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. The multi-national values used in this work are extracted from publicly available data, and we do not express or claim any personal views. The data is used solely for research purposes, specifically for training AI models, and not for influencing or promoting any opinions.

We respect privacy, as all data is publicly accessible and contains no personal or sensitive information. We acknowledge that our evaluation method cannot fully capture all values within one nation, so the result might still have value bias. Participants in the Conflict Reduction process volunteered, as stated in Appendix 8. All datasets and models used are permitted for academic research and comply with licensing requirements.

References

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Boanerges Aleman-Meza, Meenakshi Nagarajan, Cartic Ramakrishnan, Li Ding, Pranam Kolari, Amit P Sheth, I Budak Arpinar, Anupam Joshi, and Tim Finin. 2006. Semantic analytics on social networks: experiences in addressing the problem of conflict of interest detection. In *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 407–416.

David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. 2003. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022.

Rod Brookes. 1999. Newspapers and national identity: The bse/cjd crisis and the british press. *Media, Culture & Society*, 21(2):247–263.

Caroline Brun and Vassilina Nikoulina. 2024. Frenchtoxicityprompts: a large benchmark for evaluating and mitigating toxicity in french texts. In *LREC-COLING-2024*, pages 105–114.

Stephen Cushion. 2017. *The democratic value of news: Why public service media matter*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Ameet Deshpande, Vishvak Murahari, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Ashwin Kalyan, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Toxicity in chatgpt: Analyzing persona-assigned language models. *arXiv*.

Jwala Dhamala, Tony Sun, Varun Kumar, Satyapriya Krishna, Yada Pruksachatkun, Kai-Wei Chang, and Rahul Gupta. 2021. Bold: Dataset and metrics for measuring biases in open-ended language generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 862–872.

Simeon Djankov, Caralee McLiesh, Tatiana Nenova, and Andrei Shleifer. 2003. Who owns the media? *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 46(2):341–382.

Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Jingyuan Ma, Rui Li, Heming Xia, Jingjing Xu, Zhiyong Wu, Tianyu Liu, et al. 2022. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*.

Shangbin Feng, Chan Young Park, Yuhan Liu, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. From pretraining data to language models to downstream tasks: Tracking the trails of political biases leading to unfair nlp models. *arXiv*.

Janell Fetterolf and Laura Clancy. 2024. Support for legal abortion is widespread in many places, especially in europe.

Samuel Gehman, Suchin Gururangan, Maarten Sap, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2020. Realtoxicityprompts: Evaluating neural toxic degeneration in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11462*.

Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv*.

Jochen Hartmann, Jasper Schwenzow, and Maximilian Witte. 2023. The political ideology of conversational ai: Converging evidence on chatgpt's pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01768*.

Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.

Chip Huyen. 2019. Evaluation metrics for language modeling. *The Gradient*, 40.

Devansh Jain, Priyanshu Kumar, Samuel Gehman, Xuhui Zhou, Thomas Hartvigsen, and Maarten Sap. 2024. Polyglotoxicityprompts: Multilingual evaluation of neural toxic degeneration in large language models. *arXiv*.

Daniel Lee and H Sebastian Seung. 2000. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13.

Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. 2023. Trustworthy llms: A survey and guideline for evaluating large language models' alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05374*.

Keming Lu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Runji Lin, Junyang Lin, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. # instag: Instruction tagging for analyzing supervised fine-tuning of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Tinh Son Luong, Thanh-Thien Le, Linh Ngo Van, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2024. Realistic evaluation of toxicity in large language models. *arXiv*.

Leland McInnes, John Healy, Steve Astels, et al. 2017. hdbscan: Hierarchical density based clustering. *J. Open Source Softw.*, 2(11):205.

Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. 2018. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426*.

Fabio Motoki, Valdemar Pinho Neto, and Victor Rodrigues. 2024. More human than human: measuring chatgpt political bias. *Public Choice*, 198(1):3–23.

Matunda Nyanchama and Sylvia Osborn. 1999. The role graph model and conflict of interest. *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)*, 2(1):3–33.

Nedjma Ousidhoum, Xinran Zhao, Tianqing Fang, Yangqiu Song, and Dit-Yan Yeung. 2021. Probing toxic content in large pre-trained language models. In *ACL*, pages 4262–4274.

Yujin Potter, Shiyang Lai, Junsol Kim, James Evans, and Dawn Song. 2024. Hidden persuaders: Llms' political leaning and their influence on voters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.24190*.

Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Luca Rettenberger, Markus Reischl, and Mark Schutera. 2024a. Assessing political bias in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13041*.

Luca Rettenberger, Markus Reischl, and Mark Schutera. 2024b. Assessing political bias in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13041*.

David Rozado. 2024. The political preferences of llms. *arXiv*.

Michael Schudson. 1995. *The power of news*. Harvard University Press.

Shreya Shankar, JD Zamfirescu-Pereira, Björn Hartmann, Aditya Parameswaran, and Ian Arawjo. 2024. Who validates the validators? aligning llm-assisted evaluation of llm outputs with human preferences. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 1–14.

Hui Wei, Shenghua He, Tian Xia, Andy Wong, Jingyang Lin, and Mei Han. 2024. Systematic evaluation of llm-as-a-judge in llm alignment tasks: Explainable metrics and diverse prompt templates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13006*.

Jim Willis. 2007. *The media effect: How the news influences politics and government*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

John Zaller. 1991. Information, values, and opinion. *American Political Science Review*, 85(4):1215–1237.

A Experimental Details

In this section, we provide a detailed description of the dataset used in this study, along with the experimental procedures and configurations for each model. For all experiments, we conduct three independent trials and report the average results. The training time varies depending on the size of the dataset and the model types. On our devices, the processing speed for LLMs to handle value statements is approximately 3*it/s*. Based on this, the total training time can be estimated accordingly.

A.1 News Data

We collect news data from representative official media source among the five nations. For each news data source specified in Section 2.1, we have collected the following dataset from online public websites: (1) Ministry of Foreign Affairs official website[9] (2) Xuexi Qiangguo[10] (3) News People's Daily[11] (4) Government Press Releases (HK)[12] (5) Cable News Network (CNN)[13] (6) The New York Times[14] (7) The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)[15] (8) German-PD-Newspapers)[16] (9) Diverse-French-News[17]. All datasets are public available and free to use for academic research purpose.

A.2 Topic Models

To deal with multilingual news data across the five nations, we employ multiple Sentence Transformers Models including: bge-small-zh-v1.5 [18], bge-small-en-v1.5 [19], french-me5-small [20] and German-Semantic-STS-V2 [21] for Chinese, English, French and German news data, repectively. We also implement multi-process computation with L2-normalized embeddings for efficient processing. The configurations of models for Dimensionality Reduction and Clustering are detailed in Table 4. We apply Excess of Mass (EOM) algorithm for cluster selection and the dimensionality is reduced to 2D for visualization. The APIs of all models are open and free to use for academic research purpose.

Configurations	Values
Embedding Model	bge-small-zh-v1.5
	bge-small-en-v1.5
	french-me5-small
	German-Semantic-STS-V2
Model size	bge-small-zh-v1.5: 24M
	bge-small-en-v1.5: 33.4M
	french-me5-small: 35.9M
	German-Semantic-STS-V2: 336M
DR Model	UMAP
n neighbors	15
n components	5
min dist	0.0
metric	cosine
output metric	euclidean
random state	42
Cluster model	HDBSCAN
min cluster size	200
metric	euclidean
cluster selection method	eom
Devices	1xGPU(80G)

Table 4: Configuration of Topic Model.

A.3 Large Language Models

For DPO training, we primarily use Llama and Qwen as our models. Llama is an open-source large language model (LLM) family developed by Meta, while Qwen refers to the LLM family created by Alibaba Cloud. We perform DPO training on various sizes of the aforementioned LLMs, including: Llama-3.1-8b[22], Llama-3.2-3b[23], Llama-3.1-8b-

[9] Subset: qa_mfa from https://huggingface.co/datasets/liwu/MNBVC

[10] Subset: gov_xuexiqiangguo from https://huggingface.co/datasets/liwu/MNBVC

[11] Subset: news_peoples_daily from https://huggingface.co/datasets/liwu/MNBVC

[12] Collected from public website: https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/genera

[13] https://huggingface.co/datasets/abisee/cnn_dailymail

[14] https://huggingface.co/datasets/ErikCikalleshi/new_york_times_news_2000_2007

[15] /https://huggingface.co/datasets/RealTimeData/bbc_news_alltime

[16] https://huggingface.co/datasets/storytracer/German-PD-Newspapers

[17] https://huggingface.co/datasets/gustavecortal/diverse_french_news

[18] https://huggingface.co/BAAI/bge-base-en-v1.5

[19] https://huggingface.co/BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5

[20] https://huggingface.co/antoinelouis/french-me5-small

[21] https://huggingface.co/aari1995

[22] https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B

[23] https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct

Configurations	Values
Model	Llama3.1 & 3.2
Devices	4xGPU(80G)
Stage	DPO
Learning rate	5e-5
Epochs	3.0
Compute type	bf16
Batch size	2
Gradient accumulation	8
Model size	Llama-3.1-8b: 3.21B Llama-3.2-3b: 8.03B Llama-3.1-8b-Instruct: 8.03B

Table 5: Configuration of Llama.

Configurations	Values
Model	Qwen2.5
Devices	4xGPU(80G)
Stage	DPO
Learning rate	5e-5
Epochs	3.0
Compute type	bf16
Batch size	2
Gradient accumulation	8
Model size	Qwen2.5-7b: 7.62B Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct: 7.62B Qwen2.5-14b-Instruct: 14.8B

Table 6: Configuration of Qwen.

Instruct[24], Qwen2.5-7b[25], Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct[26] and Qwen2.5-14b-Instruct[27]. All specific configurations and parameter details are provided in Table 5 and Table 6. The framework used to conduct DPO training is LLaMA-Factory[28]. All LLMs that we use for training are open-source and free to use for academic purpose.

A.4 Value Extraction Procedure

We provide the prompt templates and corresponding examples for each step in our Value Extraction Pipeline for NaVAB. Table 7 outlines the prompts designed for the following processes: Topic Creation, Instruction Tagging, Value Statement Extraction, Source Judgment, and Evaluation Sample Construction.

[24] https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct

[25] https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B

[26] https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct

[27] https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-14B

[28] https://github.com/hiyouga/LLaMA-Factory

B Conflict Reduction Analysis

As outlined in Section 8, we apply human verification to ensure that the remaining value statements do not conflict with each other. All human verifiers are volunteers who claim to hold no personal views or value biases during the verification process.

We begin by selecting one verified original statement aligned with the nation's values. Then, we randomly sample 100 generated value statements from each nation and assign three volunteers with legal knowledge to classify each statement as Align, Conflict, or Unrelated to the original.

After completing the verification process across all datasets, we calculate the Average Align Rate and Conflict Rate for the five nations. As shown in Table 8, most statements are unrelated to the original, and none conflict with it. This demonstrates that the Conflict Reduction process effectively removes conflicting statements while preserving aligned ones.

C DPO Analysis

In addition to the DPO experiment discussed in Section 3.4 as part of the ablation study, we also conduct DPO training on NaVAB using Llama and Qwen LLMs. The results, shown in Figure 6, demonstrate that DPO improves alignment for all LLMs across all nations through both the **MC** and **AJ** methods.

D News Topics Analysis

In addition to the cluster figures presented in Section 2.2, we also visualize the clusters for all other news sources. From Figure 7, it is evident that some clusters differ significantly across data sources. For example, subfigures (a) and (b) reveal a dominant topic group encompassing nearly all news, while (e) and (f) display highly dispersed and discrete topic groups. Across all news sources, we observe that many topics lack semantic meaning, making them unhelpful for our benchmark.

	Topic Creation
Instruction	I have a topic that contains the following documents: **[Documents]** The topic is described by the following keywords: **[Keywords]** Based on the information above, extract a short but highly descriptive topic label of at most 5 words. Make sure it is in the following format: topic: **[Topic Label**
Examples	[Keywords]: abortion-women-pregnancy-restrict-marriage [Topics Labe]: Abortion Restriction
	Instruction Tagging
Instruction	You are a tagging system that provides useful tags for cross-national news documents to identify the main values, entities, intensions, actions, topics, etc. Here are the documents:**[Documents]** Your answer should be a list of tags, each with a brief explanation. Please follow this JSON format strictly:["tag": str, "explanation": str,"tag": str,"explanation": str,...] Please provide multiple tags to cover different aspects of the document, ensuring that your tags collectively give a comprehensive overview of the document's theme and values: (1) Main values intensions themes (2) Entities or objects involved, including nation names (3) Specific actions or events mentioned (4) Topics or issues discussed (5) Universal values or cultural heritage elements
Examples	[Document 1...] ["tag": "Abortion", "explanation": "after analyzing the document, i would categorize it as a abortion related statement. here's the breakdown:the news mentions restricting abortion..."]
	Value Statement Extraction
Instruction	Please think step by step to find sensitive political statement, and then follow the format with the example below using **[Language]**. xxx Statement: xxx
Examples	Example 1: When President Barack Obama was a child, he lived in Indonesia for four years with his mother and stepfather. Example 1 response: Statement: US President Barack Obama suffered racial discrimination during his four years growing up in Indonesia, but he remained unmoved
	Source Judgment
Instruction	To determine the source of the sensitive political statement, follow these steps: 1. Identify any indicators within the statement that suggest who might have said it. Look for verbs like "believe", "express", or specific references to individuals or positions. 2. If there are clear indicators, state who said the statement and provide the reason based on the language cues within the statement. 3. If the statement lacks clear indicators or attribution, state "Unknown." Notice that some statements may involving some people, but the statement does not provide enough information to determine who said it. In this case, you should also state "Unknown." Format example: reason **[Name or Unknown]**
Examples	Example 1: US President Barack Obama suffered racial discrimination during his four years growing up in Indonesia, but he remained unmoved. Example 1 Response: There's no information about the speaker of this sentence. **[Unknown]**
	Evaluation Sample Construction
Instruction	Please you follow format to response: Generated Question **[Original statement][Reversed statement]**
Examples	Example 1: During the four years that President Obama grew up in Indonesia, he suffered racial discrimination, but Obama remained unmoved Example 1 Response: Q: Was President Obama affected by racial discrimination during the four years that he grew up in Indonesia? S: President Obama suffered racial discrimination during the four years that he grew up in Indonesia, but Obama remained unmoved RS: President Obama suffered racial discrimination during the four years that he grew up in Indonesia, and Obama has always lived in the shadow.

Table 7: Three prompt templates designed for our pipeline including: Topic Creation, Instruction Tagging, Value-sensitive Topic Screening, Value Statement Extraction, Source Judgement and Evaluation Sample Construction.

Example (5 of 100)	Align	Conflict	Unrelated
Selected Statement: The minnesota congresswoman wants to restrict abortion...			
"statement": " Prof xx thinks that the xx elite must try to understand the driven populist uprisings and learn to empathize with ordinary people."			✓
"statement": " The ban on Jallikattu, an ancient bulltaming tradition in Tamil Nadu, has sparked widespread protests and online bullying, with animal rights activists and PETA supporters being targeted with rape threats and personal attacks."			✓
"statement": " The lack of representation of black dolls in toy stores can have a negative impact on the emotional development of children of color, and it is essential for toy manufacturers to produce dolls that reflect the diversity of the population."			✓
"statement": " Conservative MP xxx publicly opposes abortion in cases of rape, even when the woman is raped."	✓		
"statement": " A celebrated FGM campaigner and midwife, has been accused of exaggerating her professional qualifications, raising concerns about her credibility in examining children for FGM."			✓
Average Align Rate $\approx \mathbf{1}\%$. Averge Conlict Rate $= \mathbf{0}\%$			

Table 8: The statistic of manual checking procedure for the Conflict Reduction process. We provide five examples from one of the news source and show how we check the statement is align/conflict/unrelated with the given selected statement. The names in the examples are masked.



Figure 6: The comparison of alignment results for various LLMs before and after DPO training, evaluated using the **MC** and **AJ** methods across all 5 nations.



(a) Clusters for CNN



(b) Clusters of XueXiQiangGuo



(c) Clusters of French News



(d) Clusters of PressRealeases



(e) Clusters of German News



(f) Clusters of zh-mfa

Figure 7: Examples showing the clusters from different news data sources and the top topics of the corresponding clusters.