

Fluent but Culturally Distant: Can Regional Training Teach Cultural Understanding?

Dhruv Agarwal
Cornell University
da399@cornell.edu

Anya Shukla
Cornell University
as2933@cornell.edu

Sunayana Sitaram
Microsoft Research
Sunayana.Sitaram@microsoft.com

Aditya Vashistha
Cornell University
adityav@cornell.edu

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are used around the world but exhibit Western cultural tendencies. To address this cultural misalignment, many countries have begun developing “regional” LLMs tailored to local communities. Yet it remains unclear whether these models merely speak the language of their users or also reflect their cultural values and practices. Using India as a case study, we evaluate five Indic and five global LLMs along two key dimensions: *values* (via the Inglehart–Welzel map and GlobalOpinionQA) and *practices* (via CulturalBench and NormAd). Across all four tasks, we find that Indic models do not align more closely with Indian cultural norms than global models. In fact, an average American person is a better proxy for Indian cultural values than any Indic model. Even prompting strategies fail to meaningfully improve alignment. Ablations show that regional fine-tuning does not enhance cultural competence and may in fact hurt it by impeding recall of existing knowledge. We trace this failure to the scarcity of high-quality, untranslated, and culturally grounded pretraining and fine-tuning data. Our study positions cultural evaluation as a first-class requirement alongside multilingual benchmarks and offers a reusable methodology for developers. We call for deeper investments in culturally representative data to build and evaluate truly sovereign LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) now power applications used by millions of users across the world. Despite their global reach, a growing body of work demonstrates that the dominant frontier models systematically encode Western values, beliefs, and knowledge (Cao et al., 2023; Johnson et al., 2022). This cultural skew raises concerns about cultural hegemony, homogenization, and quality-of-service harms for users in non-Western contexts (Qadri et al., 2023; Agarwal et al., 2025).

To mitigate these harms, researchers and practitioners have begun training *regional* language models that are intended for a specific linguistic or geographic community. Recent examples include Nanda, a Hindi LLM aimed at Hindi-speaking users (Choudhury et al., 2025), and Jais, an LLM for Arabic-speaking communities (Sengupta et al., 2023). These models are typically trained on large corpora of local-language text and evaluated on standard NLP benchmarks that assess reasoning, classification, generation, and summarization capabilities in target languages (Ahuja et al., 2023).

Multilingual benchmarks, however, primarily test *linguistic fluency* and *language understanding*. Fluency and understanding alone do not guarantee *cultural competence*: an understanding of the values, norms, and practices embedded in a language community (Havaladar et al., 2023). Consequently, even regionally trained models can generate culturally incongruent outputs. For instance, an Arabic model associated prayer with alcohol consumption, which is at odds with norms in Arabic-speaking societies (Naous et al., 2024).

Although multilingual evaluation is now standard for regional models, no prior work has systematically assessed whether such models are culturally appropriate for the audiences they purport to serve. We ask: *Does training LLMs on local-language data endow them with the cultural competence required to serve their intended users?* Insights from this question can inform the design of future multilingual and multicultural training regimes.

We address this question through a detailed case study of India as a non-Western culture. We compare several *Indic* LLMs—models explicitly fine-tuned on Indian languages—with global foundation models such as the GPT, Llama, and Gemma series. India offers an ideal setting because (i) the rapid proliferation of Indic models provides a diverse test-bed, and (ii) Indian cultural norms differ

substantially from those typically represented in Western-centric training corpora.

We evaluate models along two key dimensions of cultural competence outlined by Hofstede’s cultural onion (Hofstede, 1991): *values* and *practices*. To probe values, we use the Inglehart–Welzel cultural map (Inglehart and Welzel, 2005) and GlobalOpinionQA (Durmus et al., 2023). To assess practices, we use CulturalBench (Chiu et al., 2024), which tests factual knowledge of cultural norms, and NormAd (Rao et al., 2024), which measures adaptation to social situations.

Across all four tasks, Indic models aligned more closely with US culture than with Indian culture, and regional fine-tuning sometimes *reduced* performance on India-specific questions. We also tried diverse prompting strategies to help the model elicit Indic knowledge, but they provided negligible gains. Overall, an average US respondent is still a better proxy for Indian cultural values than any Indic model we tested. These results call for new training paradigms and benchmarks that center cultural competence alongside linguistic fluency. Our main contributions are:

1. **A multi-dimensional evaluation framework.** We operationalize Hofstede’s cultural onion by curating existing surveys and datasets, enabling joint assessment of values and practices in regional models.
2. **A large-scale empirical study.** We evaluate ten models (five Indic, five global), yielding the first empirical picture of how regional fine-tuning affects cultural alignment.

2 Related Work

From multilingual to *multicultural* NLP. Early efforts to broaden NLP beyond English focused on increasing *language* coverage in pre-training and evaluation (e.g., XTREME (Hu et al., 2020) and XGLUE (Liang et al., 2020)). Yet a growing body of research argues that linguistic diversity alone is insufficient as LLMs often inherit Western-centric assumptions from their web-scale training data (Cao et al., 2023; Johnson et al., 2022; Adilazuarda et al., 2024). Hershcovich et al. (2022) formalize this distinction, proposing a four-part framework—linguistic form, common ground, aboutness, and values—within which cross-cultural differences can arise. Subsequent work has documented such bias in question answering, sentiment analysis, situated applications, and other

tasks across many languages (Ochieng et al., 2024; Naous et al., 2024; Agarwal et al., 2025).

Measuring cultural knowledge and values.

Several benchmarks probe whether LLMs encode culturally-grounded knowledge (Chiu et al., 2024; Fung et al., 2024; Huang and Yang, 2023). For example, datasets such as CultureBank (Shi et al., 2024) curate questions about food, historical events, and etiquette. Recent work extends this to *adaptability*: for example, NormAd (Rao et al., 2024) tests whether models can apply cultural knowledge to social scenarios. A complementary direction evaluates alignment of models with national *value systems* (Arora et al., 2023; Masoud et al., 2025). For example, Tao et al. (2024) find a strong Anglo-Protestant drift in GPT-family models. Recent multilingual vision–language benchmarks such as M5 (Schneider and Sitaram, 2024) extend these assessments to multimodal settings.

Efforts towards cultural alignment. In light of these shortcomings, researchers have explored interventions to improve cultural alignment. Simple prompting strategies (e.g., inserting cultural identity cues) yield limited gains (Mukherjee et al., 2024), while post-training on culturally representative data has shown more promise (Li et al., 2024). With growing commercial interest in AI, companies have also started building regional LLMs such as Sarvam in India, Jais in the UAE, Sakana in Japan, etc. Yet despite their regional positioning, these models are evaluated only on multilingual benchmarks that test fluency but not cultural performance (e.g., see technical reports (Choudhury et al., 2025; Kallappa et al., 2025)).

3 Methodology

3.1 Tasks and Datasets

In his *cultural onion* framework, Hofstede (1991) categorized culture into two main dimensions: *values* and *practices*. We probe each dimension using two tasks, yielding a total of four tasks in our study.

3.1.1 Values

Value Orientation (Cultural Map). The World Values Survey (WVS) is a large-scale, cross-national study that administers over 600 questions to participants in 120 countries every five years to examine global variation in human values (Haerpfer et al., 2022). Inglehart and Welzel distilled ten of these questions into two latent

dimensions: *traditional vs. secular-rational* and *survival vs. self-expression* (Inglehart and Welzel, 2005). These two dimensions form the axes of a cultural map that positions each country within a shared value space. An example is shown in Figure 5 in Appendix A. This framework allows us to place models in the same cultural space as human societies, allowing us to assess their proximity to various cultural groups. Following Tao et al. (2024), we administer these ten items to each model and locate the model on the cultural map.

Opinion Alignment. While the cultural map reveals a model’s average value orientation, this task assesses how well a model reflects the *distribution* of opinions in a population. We use GlobalOpinionQA (Durmus et al., 2023), a QA dataset constructed from the Pew Global Attitudes Survey. Each question is annotated with human response distributions from various countries. An example question from the dataset is shown in Table 2 in Appendix B. We filter the dataset to include 94 questions where Indian and American responses disagree moderately (Jensen-Shannon similarity ≤ 0.6). For each question, we compute the similarity between a model’s predicted distribution and the distributions from both countries to quantify which country’s distribution the model better reflects.

3.1.2 Practices

Cultural Knowledge. CulturalBench (Chiu et al., 2024) is a QA benchmark dataset designed to evaluate factual cultural knowledge. It consists of 1227 questions about customs, language, and behaviors from 45 global regions. Each question is verified by five human annotators. An example question in the dataset is: *What do Singaporeans often append at the end of their sentences to show a form of exasperation? A. yah B. yo C. eh D. leh.* We filter this dataset to include 46 India-specific and 20 US-specific questions. Each model’s accuracy is measured on both sets.

Cultural Adaptation. While CulturalBench directly probes raw cultural knowledge in a model, NormAd (Rao et al., 2024) tests a model’s ability to apply cultural knowledge in social etiquette scenarios. An example question is: *Sarah went to her friend’s home for dinner. When food was served, she started eating with her left hand. Was what she did socially acceptable? Yes, no, neither?*

Questions are phrased with three levels of cultural context: (1) *Country* only (e.g., “in India”),

(2) *Value+Country* (e.g., “in India, where there is respect for hygiene in dining”), and (3) *Rule-of-Thumb*, which makes norms explicit (e.g., “avoid eating with your left hand”). The *Country* context requires the most socio-cultural reasoning, whereas RoT reduces to a mere entailment task. We use 29 Indian and 49 American-context questions.

3.2 Models Evaluated

We evaluate ten instruction-tuned models: five Indic and five global.

Indic models: NANDA-10B, KRUTRIM-2-12B, AIRAVATA-7B, ARYABHATTA-8B, and GAJENDRA-7B. These are trained or fine-tuned on Indian language corpora specifically for Indian users.

Global models: LLAMA-2-7B, LLAMA-3.1-8B, GEMMA-7B, AYA-8B, and GPT-4o. These models were not designed with a specific region in mind and serve as baselines.¹ We selected these models to ensure (i) size parity with Indic models for fair comparison, (ii) inclusion of base models that some Indic models build upon, and (iii) a frontier model for contextualization of results.

3.3 Evaluation Methodology

Prompting Strategies. To provide models a fair chance at evoking Indian values, we use four prompting strategies based on prior work (Adilazuarda et al., 2024; Durmus et al., 2023): 1. **Default:** Ask the question in English, as originally written. 2. **Demographic:** Add a system prompt like “You are an average person in x country.” 3. **Cross-lingual:** Translate the question to Hindi, keeping instructions in English. 4. **Hindi:** Translate both question and instructions to Hindi (dropped later due to poor instruction-following). All prompts are zero-shot. Hindi translations were done using machine translation (using GPT-4o).

Decoding. To reduce invalid outputs from models with brittle instruction-following capabilities, we used random sampling with a temperature of 0.3 instead of greedy decoding. To account for this randomness, we repeat each prompt multiple times and average across trials (details below). Experiments were run on Google Cloud Platform using a combination of Nvidia T4 and A100 GPUs.

Cultural Map. We ask each of the 10 WVS questions using ten distinct system prompts from Tao

¹For open-source models, we used the HuggingFace checkpoints. For GPT-4o we used gpt-4o-2024-08-06.

et al. (2024) (e.g., “You are an average human being responding to the following survey question.”), and sample ten responses per prompt to account for decoding variability, resulting in 100 responses per question. To ensure valid outputs, we also appended an instruction to prevent the model from abstaining and, for models with poor instruction-following, added explicit formatting instructions.²

GlobalOpinionQA. We follow the methodology of Durmus et al. (2023) to measure how closely a model’s opinion distribution aligns with that of Indian and American respondents.

Let $Q = q_1, \dots, q_n$ be the set of questions and $O_q = o_1, \dots, o_k$ the answer options for question $q \in Q$. Let $P_c(o_i | q)$ denote the probability that respondents from country c select option o_i , as annotated in the dataset. We filtered the dataset to retain only those questions for which the Indian and US response distributions differ moderately, i.e., $\text{Sim}(\text{India}, \text{USA}) \leq 0.6$, where Sim is 1–Jensen–Shannon distance.

For each model m and question q , we compute the model’s answer distribution $P_m(o_i | q)$ by biasing the logits toward the valid options and applying a softmax. We then compute $\text{Sim}_q(m, c)$, the similarity between the model’s distribution and that of country $c \in \{\text{India}, \text{USA}\}$. Finally, we define the *Cultural Alignment Differential (CAD)* as:

$$\text{CAD}_{q,m} = \text{Sim}_q(m, \text{India}) - \text{Sim}_q(m, \text{USA}) \quad (1)$$

A positive CAD indicates greater alignment with Indian responses, while a negative value indicates greater alignment with US responses. We report the average CAD for each model computed over all filtered questions. To control for position bias, we present each question using all possible answer option permutations (up to 24 per question) and average the results across these permutations.

CulturalBench We use the prompt template provided by Chiu et al. (2024) and report accuracy on India and US questions. We repeat each question for all possible answer option permutations ($4! = 24$) and five trials for each permutation, resulting in $24 \times 5 = 120$ runs per question.

NormAd We ask each question under the three of context levels (Country, Value+Country, and

Rule-of-Thumb) using the prompt template provided by Rao et al. (2024). We report accuracy on each context for Indian and American norms. For each context, we run $3! = 6$ answer permutations, repeated 5 times, resulting in 30 total runs per question per context.

4 Results

4.1 Cultural Map

Figure 1 plots all models on the IW map under three prompting strategies: *Default*, *Demographic*, and *Cross-lingual*.³ We treat the India-US distance as a reference point, since if a model lies farther from India than the US marker does, an average American would be a closer proxy for Indian values than the model itself.

No model aligns with India on both axes. Several models fall near India on one axis (either traditional–secular or survival–self-expression), but none sits in the same quadrant as India (no model on the bottom-left). On comparing the Euclidean distance of every model from India and the US (Figure 7 in Appendix A.3), we find that the United States lies closer to India than any Indic model. These trends remain consistent across all prompting strategies. Thus, even region-specific fine-tuning fails to outperform a culturally dissimilar human baseline.

Impact of prompting strategies. Figure 6 in Appendix A.2 compares each model’s Euclidean distance to India under the three prompting strategies. Demographic prompting pulls global models 15% closer to India on average, yet Indic models are relatively unaffected (only 3% closer). This suggests that regional training made Indic models more rigid, albeit misaligned, in their cultural orientation. Cross-lingual prompting pulls both groups closer to India (Indic: 18%, global: 24%), but does so only by dragging them even nearer to the US (Indic: 23%, global: 30%). In other words, all models (other than LLAMA-3.1-8B under Cross-lingual prompting) remain closer to the US than to India.

Takeaway. Cross-lingual prompting nudges Indic models toward India, but never enough to outperform the India-US baseline; no model attains simultaneous alignment with India on both IW axes. In effect, an average American respondent is still

²We modified prompts only for this task, where a valid response to every question is necessary for plotting the map. In all other experiments, we used a uniform prompt across models and treated invalid responses as incorrect.

³We omit the *Hindi* strategy because most Indic models exhibited poor instruction-following capabilities in Hindi.




Figure 1: Inglehart-Welzel (IW) cultural map. Bright purple markers denote the models evaluated; other markers denote countries colored by geographic region. Dotted arrows originate at base models and end at their Indic derivatives, visualising the shift caused by regional fine-tuning. India and the United States are highlighted in black and some countries are labeled for reference.

a better proxy of Indian cultural values than any Indic LLM.

4.2 Opinion Alignment

We compare each model’s answer distribution with public-opinion distributions from India and the United States⁴ on 94 value-related questions. Since Indic models are intended for Indian users, we expect them to be better aligned with Indian responses. To measure this, we use the Cultural Alignment Differential defined in Equation 1.⁵

Figure 2(a) shows that every global model leans toward US opinion. Surprisingly, two Indic models (KRUTRIM-2-12B and NANDA-10B) also align more closely with US opinion. The remaining Indic models show no significant deviation from zero, appearing “neutral”.

Normalized CAD reveals hidden US bias. Indians and Americans agree on some questions (high similarity) and disagree on other (low similarity). When they already agree, say $\text{Sim} = 0.6$, even a small CAD (say $+0.1$) is a *large* share of the possible lean, because the maximum mis-alignment is only $1 - \text{Sim} = 0.4$. When they disagree sharply, say $\text{Sim} = 0.1$, the same $+0.10$ is tiny relative to the full range ($1 - \text{Sim} = 0.9$). We therefore rescale each question:

$$\text{nCAD} = \frac{\text{CAD}}{1 - \text{Sim}(\text{ind}, \text{usa})}$$

⁴Ground-truth comes from the World Values Survey and Pew Global Attitudes Survey. (Durmus et al., 2023)


⁵Since this experiment requires accessing raw logits, we could not run it for GPT-4O.

So nCAD tells us “*what fraction of the possible tilt did the model use?*” Values fall neatly in $[-1, 1]$ where $+1$ means perfect Indian alignment, -1 perfect US alignment, 0 neutrality.


Figure 2(b) plots mean nCAD. *All* models now show a statistically significant US tilt, with large effect sizes ($p < 0.001$; d or r large). Even the least US tilting model (ARYABHATTA-8B) shows a mean nCAD of -0.47 , meaning that it tilts 47% toward US from the point of neutrality. Notably, the three Indic models that looked neutral in raw CAD now reveal strong US alignment; they simply mimic the majority option on questions Indians and Americans agree on, thus looking similar to both groups. Yet, they side with US opinion whenever the two cultures disagree. By contrast, KRUTRIM-2-12B and NANDA-10B lean US even before normalisation, indicating an especially strong skew.

Prompting strategies fail to recover Indian alignment. Figure 8 in Appendix B.2 reports nCAD across the four prompting strategies. None of these strategies materially improves alignment even for Indic models: mean change relative to Default prompting is close to zero for all strategies (0.01 ± 0.01 for demographic, 0.03 ± 0.03 for Hindi, 0.02 ± 0.02 for Cross-lingual). All models remain significantly closer to U.S. opinion.

Takeaway. While global models predictably lean toward US opinion, Indic models also do not reflect Indian public opinion, even after culturally oriented prompting. Normalizing by inter-cultural disagreement exposes this bias, highlighting the need for training data that balances cross-cultural



(a) CAD



(b) Normalized CAD

Figure 2: Cultural Alignment Differential for all models on GlobalOpinionQA under Default prompting.

value distributions.

4.3 Cultural Knowledge

We evaluate each model on the 66 CulturalBench questions relevant to our study (46 India, 20 US). For every question, we generated 120 responses (24 option permutations \times 5 trials). We report accuracy, i.e., the proportion of correct answers across those 120 runs.

Models know more about US culture. Figure 3 (left) shows that under Default prompting, all models score significantly higher on US questions, with GEMMA-7B exhibiting the largest gap (32%). The performance gap is statistically significant for all models with all prompting strategies (two-proportion z -tests, Bonferroni adjusted). Thus, despite being trained for Indian users, the Indic models still demonstrate greater knowledge of US culture than of Indian culture. This calls into question the cultural representation of Indic models.

Prompting does not help elicit cultural knowledge. The trend remains similar across prompting strategies. With Default prompting, models perform 17.4% worse on Indian questions on average (with just Indic models performing 16% worse). With Demographic prompting, this gap reduces to 15.8% (14% for Indic models). While Cross-lingual prompting further reduces it to 13.6% (11%), this improvement is offset by lower accuracy on both cultures, indicating no real gain in Indian knowledge. Thus, our prompting strategies—designed to give models a fair chance at eliciting cultural knowledge—are not successful in improving performance.

Regional fine-tuning fails to add knowledge. Since Indic models are fine-tuned on global models, good performance on US questions is not un-

Base \rightarrow Indic	Acc _{Ind}	Acc _{US}
LLAMA-2-7B \rightarrow GAJENDRA-7B	0.57 \rightarrow 0.45***	0.69 \rightarrow 0.59***
LLAMA-2-7B \rightarrow AIRAVATA-7B	0.57 \rightarrow 0.52***	0.69 \rightarrow 0.70
GEMMA-7B \rightarrow ARYABHATTA-8B	0.50 \rightarrow 0.53*	0.82 \rightarrow 0.74***

Table 1: Change in CulturalBench accuracy after regional fine-tuning (for default prompting). Each row shows the base model’s accuracy (left) and the Indic model’s accuracy (right) for Indian and US questions. ***: $p < 0.001$, **: $p < 0.01$, *: $p < 0.05$.

expected. The problem is not over-performance on US questions, but under-performance on India questions. Hence, we ask a more nuanced question: Does region-specific training *add* any cultural knowledge?

Table 1 compares three Indic models with their respective base models. GAJENDRA-7B performs significantly *worse* than its base on *both* Indian and US questions (by 12.5% and 9.3% respectively). AIRAVATA-7B matches its base on U.S. items but drops 5.6% on Indian ones. ARYABHATTA-8B gains a modest 2.6% on India but sacrifices 8.5% on US items.

Takeaway. Regional fine-tuning does not inject new regional knowledge and can even impede recall of existing facts, and prompting does not help elicit knowledge either.

4.4 Cultural Adaptation

We test 29 India-specific and 42 US-specific questions from NormAd. Each question is presented under three context levels: *Country*, *Value+Country*, *Rule-of-Thumb*. We present average accuracies over all permutations of answer options and five trials per permutation.

Models reason better about US norms. Figure 4 shows that all models across all contexts score higher on US norms than on Indian ones,




Figure 3: Accuracy on India- and US-specific questions from CulturalBench. Stars denote pairwise differences that remain significant after Bonferroni correction (***: $p < 0.001$).




Figure 4: Accuracy on NormAd questions about Indian and US social norms, grouped by the amount of contextual help: *Country* (hard), *Value+Country*, and *Rule-of-Thumb* (easiest). Stars mark differences that remain significant after Bonferroni correction (***: $p < 0.001$, **: $p < 0.01$, *: $p < 0.05$).

with the performance disparity being statistically significant for most models (two proportions z -test with Bonferroni correction).

Indic models struggle with cultural reasoning.

In the two reasoning-heavy settings (*Country* and *Value+Country*), most Indic models perform only slightly better than random chance on Indian questions (mean accuracy = 0.39 and 0.43 respectively, compared to a random baseline of 0.33). Yet, several of the same models score well on US questions. This indicates that these models that they *can* reason culturally but fail to do so for India. Other Indic models (AIRAVATA-7B and GAJENDRA-7B) achieve near-chance accuracies on both US and India questions, even with increased cultural context, indicating poor reasoning capabilities in general.

Regional fine-tuning can hurt cultural reasoning.

Comparing Indic models with its base checkpoint shows no Indian-side gain and often a loss. In the *Country* context, AIRAVATA-7B and GAJENDRA-7B gain $\sim 1\%$ accuracy on Indian questions over their base model LLAMA-2-7B, but lose 4-6% on US questions. ARYABHATTA-8B loses significant accuracy over its base model GEMMA-7B on *both* US and Indian questions. Results are similar in the

Value+Country condition. Thus regional training fails to improve cultural reasoning on Indian norms, *while* reducing performance on American norms, thus undermining cultural reasoning overall.

Takeaway. No model, global or Indic, can reliably apply Indian social norms. Indic models perform only marginally better than chance in the reasoning-heavy settings and never surpass their base models. Thus, regional fine-tuning fails to add Indian knowledge *while* eroding existing US competence.

5 Discussion

Our central question was whether region-specific training produces language models that are *culturally* and not merely *linguistically* aligned with their target community. Across four complementary evaluations, the answer is consistently negative. Indic models fluently *speak* Indian languages, yet they reason, express opinions, and recall cultural facts much like Western-centric models, and sometimes *worse*. Below, we unpack the broader implications, diagnose likely causes, and chart a path forward.

Why evaluate “small” regional models at all?

One might argue that current regional LLMs are too small (7–12B parameters) and far less capable than frontier models to be relevant. Why, then, should we evaluate these models? However, two factors make this evaluation not just necessary, but urgent. First, these models are explicitly marketed as culturally grounded, designed to serve regional user bases, yet are evaluated only on linguistic tasks. Our results make a clear case that regional language fluency \neq cultural competence, and we hope this work encourages developers to treat cultural evaluation as a first-class concern. Second, these early regional models are prototypes — they form the foundation for much larger investments. For example, companies like Sarvam (India), Sakana (Japan), and others worldwide are already building frontier-scale sovereign models. Before pouring resources into scaling, it is imperative to ask whether these prototypes have succeeded at their core promise. It is prudent to detect cultural brittleness *before* building frontier-scale versions which could fossilise the same biases.

Training data and sovereign models In our results, ablations against Indic models’ base checkpoints show that supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on local-language data leaves cultural knowledge unchanged or degraded (Table 1). This suggests that fine-tuning may obscure subtle cultural priors that the base models might have acquired.

Technical reports reveal that almost every Indic model relies on instruction sets that are either translated from English or tiny compared to the Western-centric pre-training data they attempt to counter-balance. For example, NANDA-10B, AIRAVATA-7B, and GAJENDRA-7B machine-translate English instruction datasets into Hindi or other Indic languages, with limited native Hindi corpora (e.g., 6k Hindi WikiHow articles). AYA-EXPANSE-8B includes a sizeable, genuinely multilingual corpus, yet it tilts US-centric in our evaluation. KRUTRIM-2-12B seems to be pre-trained from scratch by an Indian company, yet remains strongly US-leaning.

Thus, we hypothesize that the bottleneck lies not in model architecture or instruction tuning, but in the imbalance of pretraining and fine-tuning data. Web-scale corpora are overwhelmingly Western, and fine-tuning on a thin slice of translated regional languages does not offset that prior. We caution model developers that building “sovereign” models is guided by Richard Sutton’s *bitter lesson*: more

data usually beats clever algorithms.

Culturally aware for whom? Both global and regional models face the challenge of pluralism: culture is plural both across the world and even within a nation-state. Multiple, often conflicting, cultural norms coexist within the same geography. This raises the question, who should models represent? Rather than prescribing a fixed cultural identity, we argue that *adaptability* should be the goal (Saha et al., 2025). Just as humans infer each other’s backgrounds from subtle cues, future work should measure whether a model can infer and adjust to cultural cues embedded in a user’s prompts (e.g., honorifics, code-switch patterns). This interacts with research on personalization, but inferring and adapting to a user’s cultural background is useful to fill the gaps in available data about the user.

The case for expansive, community-rooted cultural benchmarks. If we are to build culturally resonant models, we must be able to evaluate them. All four benchmarks we used together cover only 46 Indian knowledge questions, 29 etiquette vignettes, and 94 value items. Cultural benchmarks are limited in size and scope, even for India, one of the more represented non-Western regions. Building the next generation of cultural evaluations is a participatory data-collection challenge: partnering with local scholars, NGOs, and crowd communities (e.g., Karya⁶) to elicit situated norms and perspectives that never reach digital platforms. Culturally-aware AI, at its heart, is a race to reach people in their situated, lived realities.

6 Conclusion

Regional language fluency does not imply cultural competence. Across four evaluations, five Indic LLMs failed to align better with Indian values and practices than global models, and sometimes performed worse. Prompting offered little to no improvement, highlighting the limits of small-scale or translated local data in overcoming Western pre-training bias. Our findings position cultural alignment as a core evaluation goal, not an optional add-on. Building truly sovereign LLMs will require large, high-quality, *untranslated* regional corpora and training objectives that prioritize cultural grounding alongside linguistic ability. Without such efforts, regional models risk replicating the very biases they aim to avoid.

⁶<https://www.karya.in>

Limitations

Our analysis is constrained by the availability of regional models. DeepSeek is the only frontier-scale sovereign LLM not trained in the West, but no such model exists yet for India that we could add to our evaluation set. The cultural benchmarks used, though multiple, are limited in size. We mitigated this through multiple experiments and prompting strategies, but future work would benefit from larger datasets and longitudinal training checkpoints to better isolate when and where cultural knowledge degrades. We do not foresee any risks of this work; in fact, this work is part of a larger effort to build culturally-aware models that can serve users from diverse backgrounds equitably.

References

- Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Sagnik Mukherjee, Pradhyumna Lavania, Siddhant Singh, Alham Fikri Aji, Jacki O'Neill, Ashutosh Modi, and Monojit Choudhury. 2024. [Towards measuring and modeling "culture" in llms: A survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.15412.
- Dhruv Agarwal, Mor Naaman, and Aditya Vashistha. 2025. [AI Suggestions Homogenize Writing Toward Western Styles and Diminish Cultural Nuances](#). In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '25, page 1–21. ACM.
- Kabir Ahuja, Harshita Diddee, Rishav Hada, Millicent Ochieng, Krithika Ramesh, Prachi Jain, Akshay Nambi, Tanuja Ganu, Sameer Segal, Mohamed Ahmed, Kalika Bali, and Sunayana Sitaram. 2023. [MEGA: Multilingual evaluation of generative AI](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4232–4267, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arnav Arora, Lucie-Aimée Kaffee, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. [Probing pre-trained language models for cross-cultural differences in values](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.13722.
- 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](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.17466.
- Yu Ying Chiu, Liwei Jiang, Bill Yuchen Lin, Chan Young Park, Shuyue Stella Li, Sahithya Ravi, Mehar Bhatia, Maria Antoniak, Yulia Tsvetkov, Vered Shwartz, and Yejin Choi. 2024. [Culturalbench: a robust, diverse and challenging benchmark on measuring the \(lack of\) cultural knowledge of llms](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Monojit Choudhury, Shivam Chauhan, Rocktim Jyoti Das, Dhruv Sahnun, Xudong Han, Haonan Li, Aaryamonvikram Singh, Alok Anil Jadhav, Utkarsh Agarwal, Mukund Choudhary, Debopriyo Banerjee, Fajri Koto, Junaaid Bhat, Awantika Shukla, Samujjwal Ghosh, Samta Kamboj, Onkar Pandit, Lalit Pradhan, Rahul Pal, and 11 others. 2025. [Llama-3-nanda-10b-chat: An open generative large language model for hindi](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.06011.
- Esin Durmus, Karina Nguyen, Thomas I. Liao, Nicholas Schiefer, Amanda Askell, Anton Bakhtin, Carol Chen, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Nicholas Joseph, Liane Lovitt, Sam McCandlish, Orowa Sikder, Alex Tamkin, Janel Thamkul, Jared Kaplan, Jack Clark, and Deep Ganguli. 2023. [Towards measuring the representation of subjective global opinions in language models](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Yi Fung, Ruining Zhao, Jae Doo, Chenkai Sun, and Heng Ji. 2024. [Massively multi-cultural knowledge acquisition & lm benchmarking](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.09369.
- Christian Haerpfer, Ronald Inglehart, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen. 2022. [World values survey \(1981-2022\)](#). *trend file*.
- Shreya Havaladar, Sunny Rai, Bhumika Singhal, Langchen Liu, Sharath Chandra Guntuku, and Lyle Ungar. 2023. [Multilingual language models are not multicultural: A case study in emotion](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.01370.
- Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Heather Lent, Miryam de Lhoneux, Mostafa Abdou, Stephanie Brandl, Emanuele Bugliarello, Laura Cabello Piqueras, Ilias Chalkidis, Ruixiang Cui, Constanza Fierro, Katerina Margatina, Phillip Rust, and Anders Søgaard. 2022. [Challenges and strategies in cross-cultural NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6997–7013, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geert H. Hofstede. 1991. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. McGraw-Hill, London and New York.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. [Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2003.11080.
- Jing Huang and Diyi Yang. 2023. [Culturally aware natural language inference](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7591–7609, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rebecca L Johnson, Giada Pistilli, Natalia Menéndez-González, 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.
- Aditya Kallappa, Palash Kamble, Abhinav Ravi, Akshat Patidar, Vinayak Dhruv, Deepak Kumar, Raghav Awasthi, Arveti Manjunath, Himanshu Gupta, Shubham Agarwal, Kumar Ashish, Gautam Bhargava, and Chandra Khatri. 2025. *Krutrim Ilm: Multilingual foundational model for over a billion people*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.09642.
- Cheng Li, Mengzhou Chen, Jindong Wang, Sunayana Sitaram, and Xing Xie. 2024. *Culturellm: Incorporating cultural differences into large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.10946.
- Yaobo Liang, Nan Duan, Yeyun Gong, Ning Wu, Fenfei Guo, Weizhen Qi, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Daxin Jiang, Guihong Cao, Xiaodong Fan, Ruofei Zhang, Rahul Agrawal, Edward Cui, Sining Wei, Taroon Bharti, Ying Qiao, Jiun-Hung Chen, Winnie Wu, and 5 others. 2020. *Xglue: A new benchmark dataset for cross-lingual pre-training, understanding and generation*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2004.01401.
- 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.
- Sagnik Mukherjee, Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Sunayana Sitaram, Kalika Bali, Alham Fikri Aji, and Monojit Choudhury. 2024. *Cultural conditioning or placebo? on the effectiveness of socio-demographic prompting*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.11661.
- Tarek Naous, Michael J. Ryan, Alan Ritter, and Wei Xu. 2024. *Having beer after prayer? measuring cultural bias in large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14456.
- Millicent Ochieng, Varun Gumma, Sunayana Sitaram, Jindong Wang, Vishrav Chaudhary, Keshet Ronen, Kalika Bali, and Jacki O’Neill. 2024. *Beyond metrics: Evaluating llms’ effectiveness in culturally nuanced, low-resource real-world scenarios*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.00343.
- Rida Qadri, Renee Shelby, Cynthia L. Bennett, and Emily Denton. 2023. *Ai’s regimes of representation: A community-centered study of text-to-image models in south asia*. In *2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT ’23*, page 506–517. ACM.
- Abhinav Rao, Akhila Yerukola, Vishwa Shah, Katharina Reinecke, and Maarten Sap. 2024. *Normad: A framework for measuring the cultural adaptability of large language models*. *arXiv preprint*.
- Sougata Saha, Saurabh Kumar Pandey, and Monojit Choudhury. 2025. *Meta-cultural competence: Climbing the right hill of cultural awareness*. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8025–8042, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Florian Schneider and Sunayana Sitaram. 2024. *M5 – a diverse benchmark to assess the performance of large multimodal models across multilingual and multi-cultural vision-language tasks*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 4309–4345, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Neha Sengupta, Sunil Kumar Sahu, Bokang Jia, Satheesh Katipomu, Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, William Marshall, Gurpreet Gosal, Cynthia Liu, Zhiming Chen, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Samta Kamboj, Onkar Pandit, Rahul Pal, Lalit Pradhan, Zain Muhammad Mujahid, Massa Baali, Xudong Han, Sondos Mahmoud Bsharat, and 13 others. 2023. *Jais and jais-chat: Arabic-centric foundation and instruction-tuned open generative large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.16149.
- Weiyan Shi, Ryan Li, Yutong Zhang, Caleb Ziems, Chunhua yu, Raya Horesh, Rogério Abreu de Paula, and Diyi Yang. 2024. *Culturebank: An online community-driven knowledge base towards culturally aware language technologies*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.15238.
- 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).

A Cultural Map Experiment

A.1 Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map

Refer Figure 5 for an example of the cultural map from 2023.

A.2 Distance from India across Prompting Strategies

Refer Figure 6.

A.3 Distance from India and the US

Figure 7 shows the distance of each model from India and the US on the IW cultural map.




Figure 5: Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map 2023 (Inglehart and Welzel, 2005)




Figure 6: Euclidean distance between each model and India under three prompting strategies. Lower is better.

B Opinion Alignment Experiment

B.1 Example GlobalOpinionQA Question

Refer Table 2 for an example question from the dataset.

B.2 Impact of Prompting Strategies

Refer Figure 8.

B.3 Raw Similarity Scores

Inspecting the raw similarity scores in Figure 9 (prior to computing the CAD), we find that some models (e.g. GEMMA-7B, AYA-8B, KRUTRIM-2-12B) are generally misaligned with both Indian and American responses. These models do not echo any of the target groups. These models exhibit lower average similarity than even the inter-country agreement between Indians and Americans (0.48). In other words, American opinions are a better proxy for Indian public opinion (and vice versa) than these models' predictions. This might not always be a bad thing. In fact, it might be desirable for a global model not to be aligned to any culture than to be strongly aligned to one specific culture.

Is drinking alcohol morally acceptable, morally unacceptable, or not a moral issue?

Answer Option	India	USA
(A) Morally acceptable	10%	32%
(B) Morally unacceptable	70%	16%
(C) Not a moral issue	16%	47%

Table 2: Example GlobalOpinionQA question and response distribution from India and the United States.

However, it constitutes a failure mode for regional models (e.g., Indic models), which are explicitly designed to align with a specific user group.




Figure 7: Distance of each model from India and the US across the three prompting strategies.




Figure 8: Normalized CAD (nCAD) under four prompting strategies.




Figure 9: Raw similarity scores between each model's responses and Indian and American ground-truths (before computing CAD). In other words, $\text{Sim}(m, ind)$ and $\text{Sim}(m, usa)$ for all models m .