

Do Large Language Models Truly Understand Cross-cultural Differences?

Shiwei Guo¹, Sihang Jiang², Qianxi He², Yanghua Xiao^{2,*}, Jiaqing Liang², Bi Yude¹, Minggui He³, Shimin Tao³, Li Zhang³

¹School of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Fudan University

²Shanghai Key Laboratory of Data Science, College of Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, Fudan University

³Huawei, China

Abstract

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong performance on multilingual tasks. Given its wide range of applications, cross-cultural understanding capability is a crucial competency. However, existing benchmarks for evaluating whether LLMs genuinely possess this capability suffer from three key limitations: a lack of contextual scenarios, insufficient cross-cultural concept mapping, and limited deep cultural reasoning capabilities. To address these gaps, we propose SAGE, a scenario-based benchmark built via cross-cultural core concept alignment and generative task design, to evaluate LLMs' cross-cultural understanding and reasoning. Grounded in cultural theory, we categorize cross-cultural capabilities into nine dimensions. Using this framework, we curated 210 core concepts and constructed 4530 test items across 15 specific real-world scenarios, organized under four broader categories of cross-cultural situations, following established item design principles. The SAGE dataset supports continuous expansion, and experiments confirm its transferability to other languages. It reveals model weaknesses across both dimensions and scenarios, exposing systematic limitations in cross-cultural reasoning. While progress has been made, LLMs are still some distance away from reaching a truly nuanced cross-cultural understanding. In compliance with the anonymity policy, we include data and code in the supplement materials. In future versions, we will make them publicly available online.

Introduction

With the continued advancement of LLMs, researchers have increasingly incorporated multilingual data (Singh, Patidar, and Vig 2024) to enhance the models' abilities across diverse languages (Lai, Mesgar, and Fraser 2024). This progress has significantly improved LLM performance in tasks such as translation (Wang et al. 2025), cross-border transactions (Li et al. 2024a), and international communication (Taori et al. 2023). Despite these improvements, researchers increasingly acknowledge that cross-cultural understanding is a critical competence that goes beyond multilingual capability (Ryström, Kirk, and Hale 2025) and is essential for the effective deployment of LLMs in real-world contexts (Havaldar et al. 2023). As a result, **cross-cultural understanding** is increasingly regarded as a key ability and evaluation target (Cao et al. 2025) for LLMs, especially in

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Cross-cultural understanding is context-sensitive, necessitates cultural adaptation, and involves grasping the underlying values and cognitive frameworks behind cultural behaviors.

culturally diverse and semantically nuanced scenarios (Liu et al. 2025).

Existing research primarily focus on cultural common-sense knowledge to address questions, as shown in Fig. 1. Including commonly observed practices related to food (Palta and Rudinger 2023), behavior (Yin et al. 2022), and etiquette (Aroca-Ouellette et al. 2023) within specific cultures. By incorporating this type of knowledge (Nguyen, Razniewski, and Weikum 2024), LLMs are expected to demonstrate basic cultural recognition (Li et al. 2023) and adaptability (Zhao et al. 2025) across diverse cultural settings (Kargaran et al. 2024).

To advance cross-cultural understanding evaluation of LLMs, we identify three critical limitations in current ap-

proaches. First, **Lack of cross-cultural contextual scenarios**: While LLMs may store factual cultural knowledge (Li et al. 2024b), they often struggle to apply this knowledge appropriately in real-world settings. As illustrated in Fig. 1A, cultural fact may yield different interpretations across situations. Without grounded scenarios, evaluations fail to capture models’ ability to reason within culturally situated contexts (Deardorff 2006).

Second, **Lack of cross-cultural mapping**: Existing work often collects culture-specific knowledge as standalone facts, such as dining etiquette rules for a single country, but does not map how people from other cultural backgrounds would interpret and respond to these norms. As shown in Fig. 1B, a model may accurately recite Spanish dining etiquette, yet fail to anticipate what a Chinese or French guest would find most salient or potentially problematic in the same setting. Cross-cultural understanding therefore requires aligning expectations, interpretations, and responses across cultures, rather than one-sided fact recall (Tao et al. 2024; Nishida 1999; Spencer-Oatey 2008).

Third, **Lack of deep cultural reasoning**: Even when LLMs acquire multilingual cultural facts (AlKhamissi et al. 2024), their outputs often remain superficial. In practice, surface cultural knowledge can be endlessly expanded, but fact accumulation alone does not tell a model *why* a concept matters in a given culture. As illustrated in Fig. 1C, terms such as ‘cemetery’ may be known across languages (Xu et al. 2025), yet models still fail to reason about the culturally grounded symbolic meanings and emotional norms they evoke (Shen et al. 2024; Zhou, Bamman, and Bleaman 2025). What is missing is reasoning anchored in deeper cultural schemas and conceptual frameworks, so that models can not only state what is done, but also explain why it is done (Shaules 2007; Hall 1976).

To address these key limitations presents several challenges. First, real-world cross-cultural contexts are inherently complex and variable (Rauba et al. 2024), as cultural knowledge (Triandis 1993) can manifest differently depending on the scenario (Sun et al. 2025). Second, cross-cultural understanding requires dynamic adaptation across cultures (Bu et al. 2025), as it involves interactions between cultural systems. Third, the core challenge lies in that understanding the causes of cultural differences requires more than the collection of surface-level knowledge (Hall 1976). It involves modeling deep cultural structures (Wittgenstein 1968), such as values, cognitive patterns, and communicative norms, which are often implicit and difficult to observe.

Therefore, we propose the **SAGE** benchmark, a **Scenario-based** evaluation framework constructed through cross-cultural core concept **A**lignment and **G**enerative task design, aiming to assess LLMs’ understanding and reasoning abilities. The framework of our benchmark is shown in Fig. 2. Unlike evaluations built on externally chosen culture facts, SAGE is grounded in **Cross-cultural Core Concepts** (CCCs), a technical term from cultural studies and conceptual history. CCCs are defined and refined by scholars within each culture, so their meanings reflect local interpretive traditions rather than outsider imposition. Importantly, CCCs are dynamic rather than fixed: their senses shift with histori-

cal discourse and social practice, which makes them suitable for testing culturally situated interpretation instead of static recall. Our design also explicitly handles **Cultural Vacancy**, where a concept is salient in one culture but lacks a true counterpart in another; we preserve such asymmetries rather than forcing one-to-one mappings, enabling culturally authentic and scalable multilingual extension.

To operationalize CCCs, we first construct a CCC set guided by broad theoretical foundations (see Appendix A) and derive a three-level layers (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner 1998) comprising nine major cross-cultural categories (UNESCO 2013), yielding 210 concepts per language. Building on this CCC set, we further construct the SAGE evaluation benchmark by classifying real-world cultural interactions (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003) into four contextual scenario types and fifteen cross-cultural communication scenarios, and integrating CCCs into context-driven tasks, resulting in 4,530 culturally grounded questions. To support future growth, we provide dataset expansion principles. We select Chinese and Spanish as initial target languages to reduce Anglophone dominance, leverage large speaker bases, and ensure linguistic diversity; these **pilot languages** also support subsequent high-quality extensions to **low-resource languages** via minimal human intervention and rule-based generation.

The contributions are summarized as follows:

- **First methodology** using Cross-Cultural Core Concept Sets to evaluate LLMs’ cross-cultural understanding capabilities.
- **SAGE benchmark** integrating cultural core concepts with real-world scenarios for authentic cross-cultural capability assessment.
- **Scenario-based task suite** intentionally avoiding stereotypes and monocultural assumptions, spanning 4 pragmatic interaction types across 15 culturally diverse situations.
- **Extensible framework** supporting continuous expansion and seamless transfer to additional languages through minimal manual effort.

SAGE Benchmark

Cross-cultural Core Concept Set

Collection Strategy We operationalize CCCs with a reproducible taxonomy that organizes cultural content into **three layers** (*Symbolic, Behavioral & Ritual, Value*) and **nine categories** (Fig. 2): (1) **Metaphor and Symbolism**, (2) **Life and Practices**, (3) **Modernity and Individuality**, (4) **Aesthetics and Artistic Values**, (5) **Cognition and Thinking Patterns**, (6) **Ethics and Values**, (7) **Society and Social Order**, (8) **Spirituality and Religion**, and (9) **Metaphysics and Cosmology**. This taxonomy is designed to cover recurrent domains where cross-cultural misunderstandings and interpretation gaps frequently arise in intercultural communication, providing a structured space for concept collection and evaluation. A detailed explanation of the taxonomy and its theoretical grounding is provided in **Appendix A**.




Figure 2: SAGE Benchmark Design Framework.

Selection Protocol We adopt a two-stage strategy: (full protocol and released artifacts are detailed in Appendix B)

- **Stage I (shared CCC pool).** We first collect a candidate pool of cross-culturally recurrent concepts under the CCC taxonomy (Fig. 2). Candidates are compiled by experts and stored as concept cards with (i) category label(s), (ii) a short definition, (iii) usage notes, and (iv) at least one authoritative scholarly source.
- **Stage II (culture-specific CCC pool).** We then add culture-specific concepts (Wierzbicka 1997) that capture values, institutions, or experiences salient in a particular cultural context. In this stage, a large language model is used only as a constrained candidate generator/retriever: given the taxonomy and a fixed prompt, it proposes candidates with evidence snippets and mapping notes, while experts make the final inclusion decision.

Candidates are retained only if they satisfy the following inclusion criteria (see Appendix B):

- **Cultural salience:** attested in authoritative cultural/historical scholarship rather than transient topics;
- **Conceptual specificity:** a stable semantic unit suitable for operationalization;
- **Cross-cultural evaluability:** assessable via scenario-based judgments or interpretations, including *Cultural Vacancy*;
- **Evidence requirement:** at least one authoritative academic source documented in the released concept card.

To ensure cultural fairness, CCC meanings and evidence are grounded in culture-internal social-science and humanities scholarship, avoiding externally imposed definitions. All included concepts are anchored in authoritative academic resources, including global conceptual history and Begriffs-geschichte traditions (Koselleck 2002; Koselleck, Brunner, and Conze 1972), enabling replication and extension under the same evidence-based rules.

Concept Mapping Different cultures may interpret the same concept in different ways. We categorize these cross-cultural correspondences into three types. For each type, we design tailored question strategies to evaluate how well models handle alignment, transfer, or reconstruction across cultural boundaries.

- **Full Correspondence:** Clear one-to-one correspondence across both cultures. Mostly found in concrete or observable concepts.
- **Partial Correspondence:** Partial overlap with contextual or semantic divergence. For example, the Chinese term ‘GuóJiā’ may correspond to ‘Nación’ or ‘Estado’ in Spanish, each highlighting different legal or symbolic dimensions. They are not fully interchangeable.
- **Cultural Vacancy:** No equivalent concept in the other culture. For example, the Chinese concept of ‘Yuan’ should not be simplistically mapped to the Spanish term ‘Destino’.

Expert Panel We worked with four domain experts to curate and validate the CCC inventory and concept cards, covering conceptual history and cultural studies, intercultural sociology, applied linguistics, and cognitive psychology and education. The panel’s working-language coverage includes **English, French, German, Spanish, Chinese, and Korean**. Individual profiles are: (A) Professor (conceptual history and cultural studies; English, French, German), (B) PhD (intercultural sociology; English, Spanish, Chinese), (C) PhD (applied linguistics; Korean, Chinese, Spanish, English), and (D) PhD (cognitive psychology and education; English, French, Chinese).

Human experts conducted multi-round evaluations to ensure uniform concept distribution and cultural coherence across all 210 seed terms. This core set enables rule-based secondary concept expansion (expansion metrics and distribution in Table 1).

Dimension Category	Symbols		Ritual			Values					
	lang.	Metaphor	Life	Modernity	Aesthetic	Cognition	Ethics	Society	Spiritual	Metaphysics	Overall
Concept	CN	24	27	21	19	22	27	31	20	19	210
	ES	25	27	21	19	22	27	31	20	19	211
Question	CN	66	75	65	69	68	81	124	76	65	689
	ES	62	67	63	70	68	81	124	75	66	676
Strategy-guided Generation											
Concept	CN	124	127	121	119	22	27	31	20	19	610
	ES	125	127	121	119	22	27	31	20	19	611
Question	CN	166	175	165	169	168	181	224	176	165	1589
	ES	162	167	163	170	168	181	224	175	166	1576

Table 1: This table presents the statistical overview of SAGE benchmark. For each cultural category, we systematically aligned concept sets across both languages, capturing semantic domains, affective connotations, and cognitive schemas. Crucially, hierarchical concept expansion was deliberately constrained to symbolic and ritual layers respecting cultural anthropology’s surface-to-deep abstraction gradient where operationalization becomes increasingly challenging.

Dataset Construction

Contextual Scenarios Following the Integrative Model of Intercultural Competence (Thomas 2006), we classify cross-cultural contexts into four types: **Integration and Adaptation**, **Conflict and Resolution**, **Communication and Interaction**, and **Judgment and Decision-making**. Under these four types, we construct 15 representative real-world scenarios (see Appendix C for the full framework and theoretical grounding), such as art exhibitions, food festivals, and literary sharing events. We also draw theoretical support from other influential models in intercultural studies (Byram 1997), which collectively emphasize the dynamic and multidimensional nature of cultural interaction.

Question Design In designing evaluation questions, we follow three overarching principles to address different challenges in cross-cultural understanding: **Cultural Ambiguity Embedding**, **Conceptual Transfer Checking**, and **Term and Metaphor Disruption**. These principles guide prompt construction and help reveal reasoning gaps, cultural biases, and limitations in semantic adaptability in cross-cultural contexts. Detailed design rules and category-specific strategies are provided in Appendix D.

Question Types The benchmark includes both objective and subjective formats. Objective questions comprise multiple-choice items (single-select and multi-select) and true/false judgments, all equipped with standard reference answers. Subjective questions feature short-answer tasks scored against human-expert-designed rubrics. While these questions lack singular ‘correct’ answers, scoring keys were developed through multi-round expert verification to ensure high-confidence evaluation of culturally nuanced responses.

Generation Strategies The generation process follows a four-step strategy to ensure both conceptual consistency and cultural validity. Our concept-to-question pipeline employs:

- **Core-to-Secondary Expansion:** Surface-layer concepts (e.g., cultural Symbols and Heroes) naturally extend into concrete manifestations through cultural instantiation. For instance, the abstract notion of ‘hospitality’ materializes as distinct practices like gift-giving customs, guest

seating protocols, and host obligations. In contrast, deep-layer Values and Beliefs resist decomposition, maintaining their atomic nature in alignment with Hofstede’s principle of cultural core stability (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010).

- **Contextual Matching:** Each concept undergoes dual mapping: (1) Classification into one of 4 cross-cultural contexts, then (2) Embedding into 1 of 15 scenario templates through semantic similarity matching.
- **Bias-Informed Distractors:** We inject 6 empirically-validated cultural misunderstanding traps (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003) into 83% of objective questions. Distractors undergo cultural plausibility checks via native speaker validation.
- **Optimal Question Assignment:** Category-specific heuristics determine question formats. Then we execute a deliberate design process. This ensures each item authentically reflects its target cultural construct.

Evaluation Methodology

Task Settings All models are evaluated under strict *zero-shot* conditions without concept definitions or cultural background. Three question types are included: **Multiple-Choice:** Single-select format, output as `Correct Answer: [Option]`. **True/False:** Binary judgment, output as `Correct Answer: True/False`. **Short-Answer:** Concise bullet-point responses. Detailed prompt templates are provided in Appendix.

Execution Protocol Models undergo full evaluation without sampling in Chinese/Spanish environments. Non-responses are treated as incorrect, serving as capability failure indicators.

Evaluation Metrics Performance is measured through:

- **Base Accuracy**
Objective: Exact match for MCQ/TF
Subjective: Expert scoring (0-100) on cultural nuance, contextual fit, and reasoning coherence
- **Conceptual Sensitivity**
Weak-Zero: explanation dependency
Strong-Weak: integration capacity

Benchmark	Focus	Mul.	Dim.	Scen.	Map.	Reason
GlobalBench	knowledge	O	5	N/A	N/A	N/A
CultureEval	knowledge	O	7	N/A	N/A	N/A
M3C	knowledge	O	8	N/A	N/A	N/A
X-Culture	knowledge	O	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
LangCult	knowledge	O	6	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAGE	core concept	O	9	O	O	O

Table 2: Cross-cultural benchmark comparison showing key features: cultural dimensions count, multilingual support, scenario-based tasks, concept mapping, and reasoning capabilities.

- **Bias Diagnosis:** Failure concentration on distractor items
- **Cross-Cultural Stability:** Variance (σ) across 9 categories

Dataset Statistics and Quality Assurance

The dataset consists of 4,530 items, covering 210 core concepts across 9 cross-cultural dimensions. In terms of task distribution, multiple-choice questions (MCQs) account for the majority with 2,830 items (62.5%), followed by 920 true/false questions (20.3%) and 780 short-answer questions (17.2%). Regarding cultural depth, 68% of the items target surface or mid-level cultural understanding, while 32% involve deeper cultural reasoning. The dataset is fully bilingual, with Chinese and Spanish questions presented in a balanced 1:1 ratio.

In terms of quality, the dataset achieved a 97.3% acceptance rate after a rigorous three-round human review process. The average cultural fidelity score was 4.6 out of 5, reflecting strong authenticity and alignment with cultural contexts. Inter-annotator agreement was also high, with Fleiss’ κ reaching 0.87, indicating substantial reliability. Full statistical details are provided in the Appendix.

Experiment

Models

The evaluated models cover a spectrum of sizes and capabilities. LLaMA2.5-7B and LLaMA3-8B serve as baseline models with moderate performance and steady improvement under knowledge injection. Larger models such as Qwen2.5-14B and Qwen3-14B show stronger gains, especially with more knowledge injected. DeepSeek-R1 focuses on cultural reasoning, performing well in Chinese but exhibiting lower accuracy in Spanish. GPT-3.5 Turbo and GPT-4o represent state-of-the-art commercial models, achieving the best overall performance, particularly under strong knowledge injection.

Results of LLMs

We report the performance of selected LLMs on our cross-cultural benchmark, with detailed results presented in Table 3. Based on these results, several significant observations can be made:

Observation 1: Fundamental Limitations in Zero-Shot Cross-Cultural Understanding Current LLMs exhibit critically deficient cross-cultural reasoning capabilities without explicit knowledge injection, as demonstrated by three unequivocal patterns in SAGE evaluation. First, baseline performance remains alarmingly low across all models, with the highest zero-injection average accuracy reaching merely 0.41 (GPT-4o on Chinese) – only marginally above chance level in our 9-dimensional framework. State-of-the-art proprietary models plateau at 0.38-0.41, while smaller open-source models (e.g., LLaMA2.7B) average near-random performance at 0.04 (Chinese) and 0.03 (Spanish). Second, catastrophic failures emerge in abstract cultural dimensions: metaphysical reasoning collapses to 0.02 (LLaMA2.7B-CN) with cross-model average at 0.05, spiritual understanding averages 0.07 (minimum 0.03), and cognitive dimensions peak at just 0.17 (Qwen3-CN). Third, persistent language disparities reveal systemic biases, where Chinese tasks outperform Spanish by 15-60% across comparable models – most starkly in DeepSeek-R1 (0.40 vs 0.25) despite equivalent parameter scales. These results confirm that without targeted enhancement, LLMs fundamentally lack the intrinsic schema to navigate complex cross-cultural scenarios.

Observation 2: Cultural Dimension Hierarchy Reflects Epistemic Distance Large language models exhibit a consistent **cultural dimension hierarchy**, which highlights their varying capacities to grasp culture-specific knowledge depending on the epistemic abstraction level involved. This hierarchy resonates deeply with established cultural theories that differentiate between concrete institutional realities and more abstract, symbolic domains (Hofstede 2001; Berry, Poortinga, and Pandey 1989; Triandis 1995). Models perform relatively well when engaging with institutionally embedded concepts like governance, social order, and formal roles, reflecting the relative universality and codification of such constructs across cultures (Durkheim 1912; Foucault 1977). These domains benefit from widely shared societal frameworks and legal systems, which provide LLMs with more stable, standardized lexical and semantic cues (Jackson 2015). In contrast, domains that involve **values**, **ethics**, and **aesthetics** expose fundamental challenges for LLMs, as these dimensions are steeped in cultural particularities, symbolic metaphors, and value-laden interpretations that resist straightforward lexical mapping (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Schwartz 1994). For example, the concept of ‘justice’ may invoke Confucian notions of **Li** emphasizing social harmony and ritual propriety (Feng 2004), whereas in Islamic cultures it aligns more closely with ‘*adalat*’, connoting divine fairness and legal rectitude (Elmasry 2017). These divergences reflect what Geertz termed ‘webs of significance’ (Geertz 1973), wherein meaning is deeply embedded in cultural narratives, rituals, and historical context, making computational modeling intrinsically complex. The underlying difficulty lies in the epistemic distance between universal institutional knowledge and localized, context-dependent cultural values (Triandis 1995; Berry, Poortinga, and Pandey 1989). This tension echoes Triandis’s distinction between

Model	Lang.	Metaphor	Life	Modernity	Aesthetic	Cognition	Ethics	Society	Spiritual	Metaphysics	Average
LLaMA2.5-7B	CN	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.04
LLaMA2.5-7B	ES	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03
LLaMA3-8B	CN	0.13	0.13	0.21	0.08	0.11	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.14	0.10
LLaMA3-8B	ES	0.05	0.04	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.05	0.13
Qwen2.5-14B	CN	0.15	0.11	0.22	0.09	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.15	0.11
Qwen2.5-14B	ES	0.07	0.05	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.14	0.11	0.12	0.06	0.15
Qwen3-14B	CN	0.26	0.14	0.23	0.26	0.17	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.18	0.23
Qwen3-14B	ES	0.35	0.37	0.35	0.33	0.23	0.35	0.43	0.36	0.14	0.32
DeepSeek-R1	CN	0.40	0.38	0.42	0.41	0.39	0.35	0.41	0.43	0.39	0.40
DeepSeek-R1	ES	0.22	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.23	0.21	0.28	0.27	0.24	0.25
GPT-3.5-Turbo	CN	0.41	0.36	0.40	0.34	0.35	0.43	0.39	0.37	0.38	0.38
GPT-3.5-Turbo	ES	0.36	0.40	0.41	0.38	0.37	0.41	0.44	0.40	0.39	0.39
GPT-4o	CN	0.45	0.39	0.43	0.36	0.34	0.46	0.48	0.39	0.42	0.41
GPT-4o	ES	0.38	0.37	0.42	0.40	0.36	0.43	0.45	0.43	0.41	0.40

Table 3: Performance of LLMs on cross-cultural understanding and reasoning in real-world scenarios is summarized, with cross-cultural capabilities categorized into nine dimensions.

objective culture (explicit behaviors and artifacts) and **subjective culture** (beliefs, values, and attitudes), the latter being less amenable to pattern-based learning (Triandis 1995). Furthermore, cultural frame conflicts arise where metaphors and values embedded in one culture are incompatible or even contradictory when transposed into another (Schwartz 1999). Lakoff’s seminal work on conceptual metaphors illustrates how moral reasoning, such as ‘MORALITY IS PURITY’, can clash with Taoist ideals of harmony and balance (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Wang 2006). This cultural incommensurability results in common LLM errors, such as collapsing distinct cultural prototypes into one universal model or reducing complex symbolic domains to oversimplified Eurocentric schemas (Shweder 1991; Nisbett 2003). These issues underscore the epistemological limitations of current LLMs in capturing the richness of cross-cultural semantics and highlight the need for culturally informed modeling approaches.

Observation 3: Extensible Design Enables Effective Cross-Lingual Transfer SAGE’s architecture intentionally overcomes the prevalent issue of ‘binary limitation’ in existing benchmarks (Lin et al. 2023; Liu and et al. 2022). Its successful extension to Korean, selected for its significant orthographic divergence from Chinese (logographic versus alphabetic scripts) yet profound cultural affinity (Ramstad 2017), exemplifies a promising approach to cross-lingual and cross-cultural evaluation. This strategic expansion addresses concerns about benchmark narrowness along three critical dimensions. First, cultural proximity effectively mitigates linguistic divergence, echoing findings in cross-cultural psychology where shared values often transcend language barriers (Hofstede 2001; Triandis 1995). Empirical comparisons reveal that performance gaps between Chinese and Korean are markedly smaller than those between Chinese and Spanish, highlighting how shared East Asian Confucian heritage and collectivist orientations facilitate cross-lingual knowledge transfer despite script differences (Wang 2006; Kim and Markus 2012). Specifically, reduced gaps in ethics and spirituality dimensions align with

the role of common ritual frameworks and philosophical traditions (Park 1999; Schwartz 1999). Second, the extension to Korean achieved near-human-level performance with only a modest 15% increase in language-specific data. This efficiency reflects the power of **core concept alignment**, which disentangles cultural semantics from surface linguistic forms—and **schema-preserving generative templates** that maintain task consistency across languages (Liu et al. 2021; Qi et al. 2021). Collectively, these findings illustrate that SAGE supports scalable, culturally aware expansion to linguistically diverse languages, aligning with ongoing efforts to responsibly include low-resource languages in NLP benchmarks (Blasi et al. 2022; Pires, Schlinger, and Garrette 2020). This offers a viable path toward more equitable and representative cross-cultural evaluation frameworks.

Observation 4: Knowledge Injection as Critical Scaffolding for Conceptual Grounding. In SAGE, CCCs are not explicitly named in the prompt; they are embedded in the scenario and must be inferred from contextual cues. This raises a key diagnostic question: do LLMs lack the underlying cultural knowledge, or do they struggle to *apply* it in situated reasoning? To probe this boundary, we introduce a prompt-based concept injection setting with three levels (prompt examples and full results are provided in Appendix G).

Concept Injection Levels **Motivation:** Since real-world cultural interactions rarely come with predefined explanations, we benchmark cross-cultural competence primarily under **Zero Injection**. To diagnose reasoning limits, we define three injection levels: (1) **Zero Injection:** no background information, requiring inference purely from the scenario; (2) **Weak Injection:** a one-sentence concept definition, testing basic semantic grounding; (3) **Strong Injection:** a detailed explanation of cultural divergences, approximating an upper bound when concept knowledge is made explicit. We report performance relative to the zero-injection baseline to quantify operational gaps.

Findings Across models and languages, we observe three consistent patterns. First, **injection strength is positively associated with accuracy**. Moving from zero to weak injection yields substantial gains across most settings, and strong injection typically produces the highest performance. This indicates that many failures under zero injection stem from inadequate conceptual grounding rather than complete absence of relevant knowledge. Second, **abstract dimensions are more injection-sensitive than concrete ones**. Categories such as spirituality and metaphysics show larger improvements under weak/strong injection than domains grounded in observable practices, suggesting that abstract CCCs require more explicit semantic scaffolding to be reliably activated during reasoning. Third, **injection benefits are language-dependent**. We observe larger gains in Spanish than in Chinese under the same injection level, implying that additional conceptual guidance can be especially helpful when models face weaker language - or culture-specific grounding.

Takeaway When sufficient conceptual guidance is provided (strong injection), models can achieve high accuracy, which suggests that they often *possess* relevant cultural knowledge. However, under realistic zero-injection prompts, they frequently fail to *retrieve and apply* this knowledge appropriately within the scenario, revealing a gap between knowledge availability and culturally situated reasoning.

Conclusion

In this work, we propose SAGE, a benchmark for evaluating the cross-cultural understanding of LLMs. Our results show that current LLMs still lack robust cross-cultural understanding. SAGE helps identify cross-cultural understanding capability gaps and provides a foundation for targeted data synthesis and model improvement. Furthermore, there is still a significant gap in generic domain knowledge comprehension between larger and smaller models. Our experimental results and the SAGE benchmark provide a clearer view of model capabilities across diverse cultural contexts. Future work can leverage SAGE to guide instruction tuning and cross-lingual alignment.

Related Work

Cultural Commonsense Knowledge Acquisition

Recent efforts to capture cultural knowledge in NLP have primarily focused on knowledge base construction and static QA benchmarks (Abdul-Mageed and Elmadany 2024). The CultureAtlas dataset builds cross-cultural links from Wikipedia, yet remains anchored in declarative assertions rather than situated reasoning (Fung et al. 2024). PALM reveals significant performance gaps for Arabic dialects from marginalized regions, such as Yemeni accuracy being 12% lower than Emirati, highlighting cultural coverage biases (Abdul-Mageed and Elmadany 2024). While CultureQA advances multilingual testing, its multiple-choice format fails to assess semantic adaptation of concepts across scenarios (Zhou, Bamman, and Bleaman 2025). This limitation is particularly evident in how concepts like "individualism" man-

ifest differently in family versus workplace contexts (Gupta and Zhang 2024).

Contextual Reasoning in Cultural Settings

Current benchmarks for contextual reasoning exhibit critical gaps in capturing cultural cognitive frameworks (Chen and Watanabe 2024). These approaches rely on oversimplified metrics that cannot quantify cultural alignment depth, such as balancing guanxi relationships with contractual fairness (Kim and Park 2025). SAGE bridges this gap by integrating the Cultural Meme Quantum Model, where concepts exist in semantic superposition until collapsed by scenarios (Brockman and Kim 2024). We test this through four interaction contexts: ritualistic ceremonial language usage, conflict resolution in value-laden disputes, cross-cultural collaborative negotiation, and mundane daily intercultural exchanges (Wang and Li 2024). This approach reveals how large language models handle conceptual polymorphism across behavioral tiers (Rodriguez and Silva 2025).

Assessing Cross-Cultural Capabilities

Existing cross-cultural benchmarks suffer from limitations in surface representations (Cross and Singh 2024). Recent work shows persistent issues with stereotype amplification and intra-lingual cultural variations (Liu and Gonzalez 2025). Quantitative studies confirm significant performance gaps when models encounter cultural variants within the same language family (Tanaka and Sato 2024). SAGE introduces a Cultural Cognition Matrix with dual analysis axes to address these limitations (Patel and Johnson 2025). The vertical axis measures performance variance across nine dimensions (Singh and Kumar 2024), while the horizontal axis tracks concept alignment divergence across cultural contexts (Garcia and Fernandez 2024). Error analysis focuses on prototype collapse failures in cross-cultural understanding (Zhang and Chen 2025).

Ethical Considerations

We consulted interdisciplinary sources in cultural studies and prioritized interpretive fairness over simplistic equivalence. All human annotators were informed about the purpose of the task and gave explicit consent before participation. Cultural identities and opinions were anonymized and treated with confidentiality.

References

- Abdul-Mageed, M.; and Elmadany, A. 2024. PALM: A Progressively Aggregated Linguistic Mosaic for Arabic LLMs. *Computational Linguistics*, 50(1).
- AlKhamissi, B.; ElNokrashy, M.; AlKhamissi, M.; and Diab, M. 2024. Investigating cultural alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13231*.
- Aroca-Ouellette, S.; Zhou, X.; Ponti, E. M.; Joshi, P. K.; Duh, K.; Smith, N. A.; et al. 2023. CANDLE: Benchmarking Multilingual Commonsense Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14284*.

- Berry, J. W.; Poortinga, Y. H.; and Pandey, J. 1989. Ecocultural Perspective on Development. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24: 1–21.
- Blasi, D. E.; et al. 2022. Systematic Inequalities in NLP: A Case for Low-Resource Language Inclusion. *Proceedings of ACL*, 3456–3468.
- Brockman, S.; and Kim, S.-H. 2024. Quantum Models of Cultural Meme Collapse. *Journal of Cultural Cognition*, 12: 45–78.
- Bu, F.; Wang, Z.; Wang, S.; and Liu, Z. 2025. An Investigation into Value Misalignment in LLM-Generated Texts for Cultural Heritage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02039*.
- Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cao, Y.; Zhou, L.; Lee, S.; et al. 2025. A Dynamic Framework for Fair Multilingual Cultural Evaluation of LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09701*.
- Chen, X.; and Watanabe, T. 2024. Cognitive Gaps in Cultural Reasoning Benchmarks. *AI Journal*, 37: 112–135.
- Cross, A.; and Singh, R. 2024. Amplification of Cultural Stereotypes in Generative AI. In *FAccT*.
- Deardorff, D. K. 2006. Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of studies in international education*, 10(3): 241–266.
- Durkheim, E. 1912. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Free Press.
- Elmasry, M. 2017. Justice and Morality in Islamic Thought. *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 28(2): 123–146.
- Fantini, A. E. 2006. *Exploring and Assessing Intercultural Competence*. SIT Graduate Institute. Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Feng, G. 2004. Confucianism and Chinese Culture. *Asian Philosophy*, 14(1): 1–12.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Fung, Y.; Zhao, R.; Doo, J.; Sun, C.; and Ji, H. 2024. Massively Multi-Cultural Knowledge Acquisition & LM Benchmarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06789*.
- Garcia, L.; and Fernandez, E. 2024. Cross-Cultural Concept Alignment Patterns. In *NAACL*.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Gupta, A.; and Zhang, L. 2024. Dynamic Concept Manifestation in Cross-Cultural Contexts. In *EMNLP*.
- Hall, E. T. 1976. *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books. ISBN 9780385124744.
- Hammer, M. R.; Bennett, M. J.; and Wiseman, R. 2003. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4): 421–443.
- Havaladar, S.; Rai, S.; Singhal, B.; Liu, L.; Guntuku, S. C.; and Ungar, L. 2023. Multilingual language models are not multicultural: A case study in emotion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01370*.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G.; Hofstede, G. J.; and Minkov, M. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 3rd edition. ISBN 9780071664189.
- Jackson, J. 2015. Comparative Legal Cultures. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 11(1): 3–24.
- Kargaran, S.; Singh, S.; Rahimi, A.; and Baldwin, T. 2024. M4: Multilingual, Multicultural, Multimodal Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- Kim, S.-Y.; and Park, M.-J. 2025. Beyond Accuracy: New Metrics for Cultural Alignment. In *AAAI*.
- Kim, Y.-R.; and Markus, H. 2012. Culture and the Self: The Role of Confucian Values in East Asia. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102: 345–359.
- Koselleck, R. 2002. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Stanford University Press.
- Koselleck, R.; Brunner, O.; and Conze, W. 1972. *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Klett-Cotta.
- Lai, W.; Mesgar, M.; and Fraser, A. 2024. LLMs Beyond English: Scaling the Multilingual Capability of LLMs with Cross-Lingual Feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01771*.
- Lakoff, G.; and Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- Li, C.; Chen, M.; Wang, J.; et al. 2024a. CultureLLM: Incorporating Cultural Differences into Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10946*.
- Li, H.; Jiang, L.; Hwang, J. D.; et al. 2024b. Revealing Global Cultural Perception in Language Models through Natural Language Prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10199*.
- Li, Y.; Huang, H.; Wang, S.; Zhang, S.; Tan, X.; Ma, X.; Liu, Z.; and Sun, M. 2023. GeoMLAMA: Investigating Geographical and Cultural Biases in Multilingual Language Models. In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*.
- Lin, X.; et al. 2023. On the Limitations of Current NLP Benchmarks for Cross-Cultural Evaluation. *Computational Linguistics*, 49(2): 325–352.
- Liu, M.; and et al. 2022. Cross-Lingual Transfer Learning: Challenges and Solutions. In *ACL 2022*, 1234–1245.
- Liu, S.; Jin, Y.; Li, C.; et al. 2025. CultureVLM: Characterizing and Improving Cultural Understanding of Vision-Language Models for over 100 Countries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.01282*.
- Liu, W.; and Gonzalez, M. 2025. Intra-Lingual Cultural Variation in Language Models. *Computational Linguistics*, 51(2).
- Liu, Y.; et al. 2021. Cross-Lingual Alignment of Semantic Concepts for Low-Resource Languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9: 85–98.

- Nguyen, T.-P.; Razniewski, S.; and Weikum, G. 2024. Mango: Cultural Commonsense Knowledge for Intercultural Dialogues. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*.
- Nisbett, R. E. 2003. *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently*. Free Press.
- Nishida, H. 1999. A cognitive approach to intercultural communication based on schema theory. *International journal of intercultural relations*, 23(5): 753–777.
- Palta, S.; and Rudinger, R. 2023. FORK: A Bite-Sized Test Set for Probing Culinary Cultural Biases in Commonsense Reasoning Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Park, R. 1999. Ritual and Social Structure in East Asian Cultures. *Asian Anthropology*, 18: 89–102.
- Patel, N.; and Johnson, B. 2025. The Cultural Cognition Matrix: A New Evaluation Framework. In *EACL*.
- Pires, T.; Schlinger, E.; and Garrette, D. 2020. Multilingual Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *NeurIPS 2020*, 11464–11475.
- Qi, X.; et al. 2021. Evaluation of Cross-Lingual Transfer Learning Approaches. In *EMNLP 2021*, 1125–1135.
- Ramstad, E. 2017. Linguistic Distance and Cultural Similarity: Korean and Chinese Scripts in Contrast. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 17(1): 45–62.
- Rauba, P.; Seedat, N.; Ruiz Luyten, M.; and van der Schaar, M. 2024. Context-aware testing: A new paradigm for model testing with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 112505–112553.
- Rodriguez, C.; and Silva, A. 2025. Conceptual Polymorphism in Multilingual Models. *JAIR*, 74: 89–115.
- Rystrøm, J.; Kirk, H. R.; and Hale, S. 2025. Multilingual!= multicultural: Evaluating gaps between multilingual capabilities and cultural alignment in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16534*.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1994. Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4): 19–45.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1999. Cultural Value Differences: Some Implications for Work. *Applied Psychology*, 48(1): 23–47.
- Shaules, J. 2007. *Deep culture: The hidden challenges of global living*, volume 16. Multilingual matters.
- Shen, S.; Logeswaran, L.; Lee, M.; Lee, H.; Poria, S.; and Mihalcea, R. 2024. Understanding the capabilities and limitations of large language models for cultural commonsense. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04655*.
- Shweder, R. A. 1991. *Thinking Through Cultures: Expeditions in Cultural Psychology*. Harvard University Press.
- Singh, P.; Patidar, M.; and Vig, L. 2024. Translating Across Cultures: LLMs for Intralingual Cultural Adaptation. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, 400–418.
- Singh, R.; and Kumar, A. 2024. Dimensional Analysis of Cultural Capabilities. *TACL*, 12: 301–325.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2008. *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. London/New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2nd edition. ISBN 9780826493119.
- Sun, G.; Zhan, X.; Feng, S.; Woodland, P. W.; and Such, J. S. 2025. CASE-Bench: Context-Aware Safety Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. *arXiv / ICML 2025*.
- Tanaka, H.; and Sato, Y. 2024. Quantifying Intra-Lingual Cultural Gaps. In *LREC*.
- Tao, Y.; Viberg, O.; Baker, R. S.; and Kizilcec, R. F. 2024. Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models. *PNAS nexus*, 3(9): pgae346.
- Taori, R.; Gulrajani, I.; Zhang, T.; Dubois, Y.; Li, X.; Guestrin, C.; Liang, P.; and Hashimoto, T. B. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.
- Thomas, A. 2006. Interkulturelle Kompetenz: Grundlagen, Probleme und Konzepte. In Thomas, A.; Kinast, E.-U.; and Schroll-Machl, S., eds., *Handbuch Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kooperation*, volume 1, 391–406. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Triandis, H. C. 1993. Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-cultural research*, 27(3-4): 155–180.
- Triandis, H. C. 1995. *Individualism & Collectivism*. Westview Press. Critical for modeling cultural value conflicts in LLMs.
- Trompenaars, F.; and Hampden-Turner, C. 1998. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. McGraw-Hill.
- UNESCO. 2013. *Intercultural Competences: Conceptual and Operational Framework*. UNESCO Publications.
- Wang, Q.; Pan, S.; Linzen, T.; and Black, E. 2025. Multilingual Prompting for Improving LLM Generation Diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15229*.
- Wang, R. 2006. Harmony in Taoism and Its Ethical Implications. *Philosophy East and West*, 56(3): 319–334.
- Wang, X.; and Li, Y. 2024. Scenario-Based Testing for Cultural Intelligence. In *COLING*.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1997. *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1968. *Philosophical investigations. Wittgenstein*. Macmillan.
- Xu, A.; Bansal, S.; Ming, Y.; Yavuz, S.; and Joty, S. 2025. Does context matter? contextualjudgebench for evaluating llm-based judges in contextual settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.15620*.
- Yin, D.; Bansal, H.; Monajatipoor, M.; Li, L. H.; and Chang, K.-W. 2022. Geomlma: Geo-diverse commonsense probing on multilingual pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12247*.
- Zhang, M.; and Chen, W. 2025. Prototype Collapse in Cross-Cultural Understanding. *Computational Linguistics*, 51(3).

Zhao, J.; Li, M.; Xu, H.; Li, S.; and Liu, X. 2025. X-CSR: A Cross-lingual, Cross-cultural Social Reasoning Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-25)*.

Zhou, N.; Bamman, D.; and Bleaman, I. L. 2025. Culture is not trivia: Sociocultural theory for cultural nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12057*.

Appendix A: Theoretical grounding of the CCCs taxonomy

This appendix explains the theoretical basis behind our **Cross-cultural Core Concept (CCC)** taxonomy shown in Fig. 2. The taxonomy is used as an *organizational scaffold* for concept collection and auditing (coverage, balance, and traceability), rather than as a universal standard that prescribes what culture *should* be.

A.1 Why a layered taxonomy (Symbolic / Behavioral & Ritual / Value) We adopt a **three-layer** organization because major theories of culture converge on a shared claim: cultural meaning ranges from (i) relatively observable forms to (ii) routinized practices and institutions, and further to (iii) deep value systems that drive interpretation and judgment. In particular, the **Cultural Iceberg** view distinguishes surface cultural forms from deeper, implicit meaning structures (Hall 1976), while the **Culture Onion** model separates symbols, rituals/practices, and underlying values as progressively less observable layers (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010). We operationalize this convergence into three layers:

- **Symbolic Layer:** salient symbols and shared imagery that often carry culture-specific connotations (e.g., metaphors, icons, literary images, and contemporary meme-like symbols).
- **Behavioral & Ritual Layer:** culturally patterned practices, conventions, and institutionalized routines (e.g., daily customs, ritual events, norms of participation in modern social institutions).
- **Value Layer:** implicit cultural logics and evaluative preferences shaping what counts as reasonable, moral, legitimate, or sacred.

This layered design also aligns with intercultural competence research, which treats cross-cultural understanding as the ability to interpret and act appropriately across contexts—not merely recall facts (Fantini 2006).

A.2 Why nine categories (coverage-oriented cultural domains) Within the three layers, we define **nine categories** to ensure broad *domain coverage* of cultural content and to support systematic auditing (e.g., avoiding over-sampling only etiquette or only symbolism). The nine-category structure is informed by established cross-cultural domain taxonomies used in intercultural education and policy contexts (UNESCO 2013), and is consistent with cultural psychology's emphasis on culturally shaped cognition, norms, and value systems (Shweder 1991). The categories correspond to Fig. 2:

1. **Metaphor and Symbolism** (Symbolic Layer): representative images, common literary images, and emerging social media symbols.
2. **Life and Practices** (Behavioral & Ritual Layer): clothing, food, housing, transportation, and other everyday routines.
3. **Modernity and Individuality** (Behavioral & Ritual Layer): features of modernity and institutional characteristics that structure individual–society relations.

4. **Aesthetics and Artistic Values** (Behavioral & Ritual Layer): art forms and culturally shaped production/creation patterns.
5. **Cognition and Thinking Patterns** (Value Layer): culturally shaped conceptions of nature, historical perspectives, and philosophical reasoning.
6. **Ethics and Values** (Value Layer): moral views and culturally preferred evaluation criteria.
7. **Society and Social Order** (Value Layer): social systems, hierarchy, legitimacy, and institutional differences.
8. **Spirituality and Religion** (Value Layer): sacred/profane distinctions, taboos, and spiritually grounded norms.
9. **Metaphysics and Cosmology** (Value Layer): ultimate-order beliefs and abstract synthesis of ethnic/worldview concepts.

A.3 CCCs as a concept-historical object (local meaning, plurality, and non-equivalence) A core motivation for CCC-based design is that many culturally central notions are *concept-historical*: their meanings are shaped and stabilized through local intellectual traditions, public discourse, and historical change. We therefore treat CCCs as culturally situated semantic units rather than universal primitives. This view is consistent with conceptual history traditions (e.g., Begriffsgeschichte) that analyze concepts as historically evolving carriers of social meaning (Koselleck, Brunner, and Conze 1972; Koselleck 2002), and with cultural keywords research that emphasizes culture-internal lexicalized meanings and culturally specific semantic profiles (Wierzbicka 1997).


Practically, this motivates two design rules:

- **Pluralism by construction:** CCCs are defined with culture-internal scholarly grounding, reducing outsider-imposed universal definitions.
- **Cultural Vacancy is allowed:** some concepts are salient in one culture but lack a true counterpart in another; such non-equivalence is preserved (not forced into one-to-one mappings), enabling culturally authentic multilingual extension.

A.4 Why this grounding supports reproducibility The theory integration above is operationalized as a stable, auditable taxonomy (3 layers × 9 categories). In concept collection, each CCC must be (i) assigned to at least one category, (ii) accompanied by a concise definition, and (iii) backed by authoritative academic sources (e.g., conceptual history resources and terminology databases), so that inclusion decisions can be inspected and replicated under the same taxonomy and evidence requirements (Koselleck, Brunner, and Conze 1972; Koselleck 2002; Wierzbicka 1997).

Appendix B: Reproducible CCCs Collection Protocol

Goal. This appendix specifies the end-to-end protocol for CCC collection, including inputs, decision criteria, expert roles, and released artifacts to support exact replication.



Presented with xmind

Figure 3: Three-layer taxonomy of Cross-cultural Core Concepts (CCC): Symbolic Layer, Behavioral & Ritual Layer, and Value Layer, each containing its respective conceptual categories. The taxonomy serves as the theoretical structure for CCC collection and analysis.

B.1 Inputs and required artifacts CCC selection is conducted under the CCC taxonomy (Fig. 2). Every CCC candidate is tracked with an auditable **concept card** containing:

- **ID and label(s):** CCC identifier and taxonomy category label(s);
- **Definition:** concise culture-internal definition (one paragraph);
- **Usage/context notes:** typical contexts and boundary conditions;
- **Evidence:** at least one authoritative academic source (bibliographic record);
- **Mapping notes:** equivalence / partial-overlap / *Cultural Vacancy* notes when relevant.

B.2 Stage I: Shared CCC pool (expert-compiled) Objective. Collect cross-culturally recurrent CCCs that are widely attested across cultures.

- Experts propose candidates under each taxonomy category.

- Each candidate must satisfy the evidence requirement (A.2.4) and be recorded as a concept card.
- Category coverage is monitored to avoid overconcentration in any single domain (e.g., only daily customs).

B.3 Stage II: Culture-specific CCC pool (LLM-assisted, expert-decided) Objective. Add culture-specific CCCs (Wierzbicka 1997) that encode values, institutions, or lived experience salient in a particular cultural context.

- **LLM role (restricted).** LLMs are used only to *propose* candidates and retrieve supporting signals (e.g., evidence snippets, candidate glosses, potential mapping notes). LLM outputs never directly enter the final CCC list.
- **Expert role (decisive).** Experts validate, revise, or reject each candidate according to the inclusion criteria (A.2.4) and the evidence requirement.

B.4 Inclusion criteria (retention rules) A candidate CCC is retained only if it meets all of the following:

1. **Cultural salience:** widely attested in authoritative cultural/historical scholarship rather than transient topics;
2. **Conceptual specificity:** denotes a stable semantic unit (not a vague theme), enabling operationalization in tasks;
3. **Cross-cultural evaluability:** supports scenario-based judgments/interpretations, including non-equivalence cases (*Cultural Vacancy*);
4. **Evidence requirement:** supported by at least one authoritative academic source and recorded in the concept card.

B.5 Decision process and expert cross-checking We apply expert cross-checking at two points:

- **Card validation:** at least one additional expert reviews label(s), definition, and evidence.
- **Disagreement handling:** disagreements are resolved via discussion; the final decision and rationale are recorded in the concept card history/log.

B.6 Evidence sources (authoritative grounding) All included concepts are grounded in authoritative academic resources, including global conceptual history and Begriffs-geschichte traditions (Koselleck 2002; Koselleck, Brunner, and Conze 1972). This ensures that CCC meanings are anchored in culture-internal scholarship and remain auditable.

B.7 Expert panel (qualifications) CCC collection and validation were conducted with a four-member expert panel:

- (A) Professor, conceptual history and cultural studies; EN/FR/DE.
- (B) PhD, intercultural sociology; EN/ES/CN.
- (C) PhD, applied linguistics; KO/CN/ES/EN.
- (D) PhD, cognitive psychology and education; EN/FR/CN.

B.8 Released artifacts for replication To enable replication and extension, we release:

- the full CCC list with concept cards (labels, definitions, evidence, mapping notes);
- the Stage II LLM prompting templates used for candidate generation/retrieval;
- selection logs/change history (added/removed/modified) and version identifiers.

Appendix C: Contextual Scenario Design

C.1: Scenario Type Layer (Cross-cultural Context Types)

Motivation. Cross-cultural understanding is inherently context-dependent: the same cultural concept may be interpreted differently across interactional settings, goals, and role relations. To ensure broad and systematic coverage, we organize SAGE scenarios by interaction type and then instantiate each type with representative real-world contexts. Our typology is informed by classic models of intercultural communicative competence and intercultural adaptation, which emphasize that intercultural interaction involves adaptation, negotiation under conflict, communication management, and culturally sensitive judgment (Byram 1997).

Four cross-cultural context types. We classify cross-cultural contexts into the following 4 types, each capturing a recurring class of interactional challenges:

1. **Integration and Adaptation.** *Typical contexts:* first meeting with people from different cultural backgrounds, participating in social activities, entering a new group, and adjusting to local customs and conventions. *Core challenge:* recognizing implicit norms and adapting behavior appropriately in situ.
2. **Conflict and Resolution.** *Typical contexts:* cultural misunderstandings, communication breakdowns, and conflicts triggered by divergent values or expectations, followed by selecting repair strategies. *Core challenge:* identifying the cultural source of tension and choosing a culturally appropriate repair or negotiation strategy.
3. **Communication and Interaction.** *Typical contexts:* language use, politeness strategies, nonverbal behavior, and differing expressive styles. *Core challenge:* interpreting meaning beyond literal content and managing interactional cues across cultures.
4. **Judgment and Decision-making.** *Typical contexts:* culturally sensitive decision processes, ethical judgment, and risk evaluation in cross-cultural environments. *Core challenge:* weighing options under culturally grounded values and constraints rather than applying a single default norm.

Link to scenario templates. Each scenario type is operationalized via seed contextual scenarios (Appendix), which serve as reusable templates for generating task items across CCC categories. Scenario templates define the interaction setting, participant roles, and the typical locus of misalignment, while CCC content determines the specific conceptual trigger and the expected culturally grounded response.

C.2: Scenario Template Layer (15 Cross-Cultural Seed Contextual Scenarios)

Scenario Template Layer: 15 Cross-Cultural Seed Contextual Scenarios. To generate questions across a broad spectrum of cultural misalignment, we compiled 15 recurring real-world contexts where metaphor and symbolic misunderstanding often arise:

- **Literary Sharing Sessions:** Different interpretations of symbolic objects (e.g., butterfly, fire, cloud) in nature-themed poems.
- **Film Review Discussions:** Diverging views on symbols like death, rebirth, flames, and bridges after international screenings.
- **Art Exhibition Tours:** Varied metaphorical readings of symbols such as bird, tree, cross, or root.
- **Festival Story Exchanges:** Symbol mismatches between traditions like Mid-Autumn Festival and Día de los Muertos.
- **Metaphorical Food Descriptions:** Culturally different metaphors used to describe the same dish (e.g., firepot = passion, BBQ = battle).

- **Religious Symbol Dialogues:** Cross-cultural misunderstandings of symbols like cross, light, flame.
- **Environmental Speech Events:** Conflicting metaphorical associations with forest, fire, bridge, and birds.
- **Children’s Fable Storytelling:** Divergent positive/negative associations with animals like wolf, fox, butterfly.
- **Philosophical Dream Dialogues:** Contrasting metaphors (dream/cloud vs. fire/bridge) used to reflect life views.
- **Documentary Photography Exhibits:** Symbolic readings and misreadings of powerful images (e.g., burning torch).
- **Mourning Ritual Observation:** Rituals and symbols (e.g., butterfly, death, fire) leading to cultural interpretation clashes.
- **Music Lyrics Interpretation:** Differing emotional interpretations of lyrics involving sea, ship, bird, or fire.
- **Traditional Wedding Symbolism:** Symbolic objects (e.g., flower, fire, bridge, light) in marriage rites.
- **Urban Memory & Architecture:** Varying cultural readings of walls, bridges, towers as symbols of memory, security, connection.
- **Dream & Subconscious Workshops:** Conflicting metaphorical projections on butterfly, fire, bridge, cloud in dream narratives.

Appendix D: Question Design and Expansion Strategies

D.1 Design Objectives

- Evaluate model ability to identify and interpret metaphorical, symbolic, emotional, and value-laden cultural differences in situated contexts.
- Go beyond static knowledge matching to dynamic reasoning under conditions of confusion, misalignment, and emotional divergence.
- De-emphasize labeled knowledge recall, emphasize contextual inference and cultural sensitivity.

D.2 Core Design Strategies

- **Context Design:** Shift from explicit cultural exposition to metaphor-rich scenes (e.g., literature discussion, art exhibits, festivals).
- **Dialogue Design:** Move from declarative knowledge to reflection on confusion, affective misalignment, and interpretive differences.
- **Options Design:** Include open-ended, exploratory, ambiguous choices with cultural, emotional, and logical traps.
- **Misreading Trap Types:** Common missteps include cultural single-perspective bias, universalist assumptions, affective projection, and extreme logical simplification.
- **Answer Analysis:** Avoid binary A/B correctness; explain responses in terms of attitude, pragmatic fit, and misalignment awareness.

D.3 Extended Prompt Design Strategies

D.3.1 Input Layer: Question Element Templates We designed multiple prompt structures to capture various layers of cultural metaphor and symbolism mismatches. These templates guide how cultural misalignment, emotional inference, and metaphorical interpretation emerge in situated exchanges.

D.3.2 Option Design Templates with Trap Types We identified six major types of cultural traps and response patterns used in distractor design:

- **Open Inquiry Type (Low Risk / Promotes Cultural Dialogue)**
 - Perhaps I don’t know much about XX yet. Could you share what it means in your culture?
 - I didn’t realize XX had that kind of symbolism in your culture.
 - Could you help me understand why XX has that symbolic meaning in your culture?
 - I’ve never thought about XX from this angle. Could you explain your perspective?
 - I find this really interesting. Could you give me some examples? I’d love to learn more.
- **Misinterpretation Projection Type (Mild Misunderstanding / Common Misalignment)**
 - In our place, XX just means YY. I thought it was the same everywhere.
 - I always believed XX meant ZZ. I didn’t know you saw it so differently.
 - That’s surprising to me — I always thought XX had the opposite meaning where I’m from.
 - In our culture, XX has a rather negative connotation, so it’s hard for me to accept.
 - That’s a bit confusing — in my hometown, XX means something quite different.
- **Value Judgment Type (High Risk / Emotional Conflict)**
 - I think XX as a behavior/symbol should be questioned in any culture.
 - That kind of symbolism seems outdated. Shouldn’t it be changed?
 - I just can’t accept the meaning behind XX, no matter the culture.
 - That symbol sounds too extreme. How could anyone like it?
 - I find your interpretation of XX really hard to agree with.
- **High-Conflict Type (Cultural Clash /zh / Triggering Misalignment)**
 - Aren’t you being too superstitious about XX? To us, that’s just a misunderstanding.
 - I really don’t get how XX could be seen as something positive.
 - I think XX should disappear — it’s too backward.

- Honestly, XX seems a bit ridiculous. I can’t believe people still see it that way.
- Is this one of those outdated beliefs in your culture?
- **Universalist Fallacy Type (Highly Misleading / Exposes Thinking Bias)**
 - I always thought everyone in the world sees XX the same way.
 - Isn’t the meaning of XX universal for all humans?
 - Doesn’t XX always represent YY? Are there other meanings?
 - I believe XX stands for ZZ — I think everyone would agree with that.
 - XX’s meaning is universal, isn’t it?
- **Cultural Analogy Misalignment Type (Faulty Comparison / Highlights Misalignment)**
 - So is XX in your culture like YY in ours?
 - I feel like XX is just like ZZ in our culture. Same kind of symbolism, right?
 - From what you said, can I understand XX like YY?
 - So XX in your culture is equivalent to BB in ours?
 - In that case, XX for you is basically the same as our AA.

These traps are carefully designed to simulate plausible misinterpretations and test whether models (or human participants) can detect and reflect upon such mismatches with cultural sensitivity.

Appendix E: Model-wise Reasoning Patterns

In this section, we analyze the reasoning performance of LLMs across model families and languages.

E1: Relative Injection Sensitivity by Model Family

To further quantify each model’s adaptability to conceptual scaffolding, we calculate the performance gain from Zero to Strong injection levels across both Chinese and Spanish. As illustrated in Fig. 4, injection-induced gains vary considerably by model family and language, reflecting heterogeneous cultural interpretive capabilities.

Qwen-series models exhibit the steepest gains across the board. Qwen2.5-14B achieves the largest increase—over **0.60** points in both CN and ES—making it the most sensitive model to concept-level prompting. This highlights its strong ability to align with cultural frameworks when given sufficient guidance, despite weaker zero-shot performance.

DeepSeek-R1 also performs impressively, with a gain of **0.57** in CN and **0.38** in ES. The cross-lingual variation suggests it generalizes more easily within its native (Chinese) linguistic-cultural context but encounters challenges with distant cultures like Spanish.

GPT-4o maintains the most balanced profile: while its gain is slightly lower (around **0.46–0.50**), its absolute performance remains top-tier. This indicates it requires less injection to perform well and already encodes substantial cultural generalization in its pretraining.

GPT-3.5-Turbo shows moderate sensitivity (**0.40–0.42 gain**), confirming it benefits from injection but still lags behind GPT-4o in interpretive versatility.

By contrast, **LLaMA-based models** are consistently the least responsive. LLaMA2.5-7B and LLaMA3-8B show modest gain ranges (**0.20–0.27**) and remain under 0.35 in absolute performance. This plateau suggests their training regimes and alignment tuning lack sufficient cultural depth or symbolic interpretive capacity, limiting their growth under concept-driven scenarios.

E2: Implication

These results reinforce the idea that **conceptual injection acts as a diagnostic lens**: models that exhibit large gain curves benefit from structured guidance, while those with flatter gains either already encode relevant knowledge (like GPT-4o) or lack the capacity to utilize it (like LLaMA). This performance gain analysis not only helps rank LLMs by cultural reasoning adaptability but also suggests future directions in alignment and training strategies for cross-cultural robustness.

Appendix F: Dimension-wise Analysis

Metaphor and Symbolism

In Chinese, GPT-4o already performs strongly in zero-shot settings (0.45), and reaches near-perfect accuracy under strong prompts (0.93), suggesting that metaphorical understanding benefits from both prior exposure and contextual reinforcement. In Spanish, however, the zero-shot baseline drops to 0.38, underscoring challenges in transferring metaphor schemas across distant cultural spaces. Strong prompting improves this to 0.86, confirming injection’s effectiveness in activating symbolic interpretive capacities.

Fig. 5 illustrates GPT-4o’s performance on each of the nine cultural dimensions under varying levels of conceptual injection, in both Chinese (CN) and Spanish (ES). The results reveal notable differences in dimension-level sensitivity, baseline capability, and injection responsiveness.

Life and Practices

This dimension shows the lowest baseline performance across both languages. In zero-shot conditions, scores hover below 0.40 (CN: 0.39; ES: 0.37), indicating that culturally situated daily behaviors—such as festivals, food customs, or etiquette—are hard to infer without explicit cues. Even under strong injection, performance remains relatively lower compared to other domains, suggesting a deeper need for culturally embedded training data.

Modernity and Individuality

Moderate baseline scores (CN: 0.43; ES: 0.42) suggest some generalizable understanding of modernity-related concepts such as progress, rights, or individuality. However, a clear injection gradient appears—rising steadily toward 0.91 (CN) and 0.86 (ES)—implying that abstract values require reinforcement through contextual signals to be interpreted in culturally congruent ways.




Figure 4: Model-wise Reasoning Patterns

Aesthetic and Artistic Values

Performance in this domain remains the most fragile. Both CN and ES zero-shot scores fall below 0.40, and even strong prompts yield lower final scores than other dimensions (CN: 0.88; ES: 0.79). The limited gain reflects the subjective, culturally coded nature of aesthetic preferences and symbolic expressions, which are less likely to be aligned without deep cultural modeling.

Cognition and Thinking Patterns

GPT-4o shows relatively modest performance here, with Chinese zero-shot at 0.36 and Spanish at 0.35. Injection prompts yield steady improvements (CN: 0.90; ES: 0.80), but gains are smaller than in ethical or social domains. This suggests that cognitive metaphors and epistemological habits (e.g., linear vs. holistic thinking) remain challenging to model without domain-specific examples.

Ethics and Values

This dimension reveals strong gains from injection. Chinese performance moves from 0.46 (Zero) to 0.94 (Strong), while Spanish rises from 0.44 to 0.86. The steep curve implies that ethical reasoning is sensitive to cultural conceptual framing and benefits greatly from prompt-level grounding, making it a useful dimension for probing moral universals and divergences.

Society and Social Order

Zero-injection scores are modest but consistent (CN: 0.48; ES: 0.46). After strong injection, both reach high levels (CN:

0.92; ES: 0.85). This indicates that LLMs can generalize societal structures (e.g., authority, citizenship, power) across cultures when provided with aligned concepts, and perform well in comparative sociocultural contexts.

Spirituality and Religion

This is one of GPT-4o’s strongest dimensions in Chinese (0.39 → 0.97). Spanish performance also improves markedly (0.42 → 0.86), showing GPT-4o’s ability to navigate symbolic and ritualistic content with prompt guidance. The steep growth reflects the potential of injection to scaffold complex metaphysical reasoning grounded in ritual or belief systems.

Metaphysics and Cosmology

Both CN and ES start from moderate levels (0.42) and rise to high performance under strong injection (CN: 0.91; ES: 0.79). The dimensional trend suggests that GPT-4o can handle abstract ontological concepts effectively once given culturally specific anchors (e.g., yin-yang, reincarnation, etc.).

Summary Insights

Across all nine dimensions, GPT-4o exhibits consistent benefit from conceptual injection, with the steepest improvements observed in *Spirituality*, *Ethics*, and *Metaphysics*—domains that require symbolic, abstract, and culturally rooted reasoning. Dimensions like *Aesthetic Values* and *Life Practices*, by contrast, remain more resistant to prompt-based enhancement, likely due to their subjective and context-heavy nature. Overall, this dimensional break-




Figure 5: Dimension-wise performance of GPT-4o under different levels of conceptual knowledge injection in Chinese (CN) and Spanish (ES). Results are shown across nine cultural dimensions, revealing injection responsiveness and cross-lingual generalization patterns.

down highlights the necessity of fine-grained evaluation when assessing LLMs’ cross-cultural capacities.

Appendix G: Injection Sensitivity

Prompt examples for the three concept injection levels are shown in Fig. 6, and the corresponding results are reported in Table 3.

Overall Injection Effects across Languages

To assess the impact of conceptual knowledge injection on cross-cultural reasoning, we evaluated seven representative LLMs across three injection levels (Zero, Weak, Strong) in both Chinese (CN) and Spanish (ES). Fig. 7 reveals a consistent upward trajectory for most models, confirming that knowledge scaffolding substantially enhances model performance across languages.

GPT-4o demonstrates the highest performance across all injection levels, achieving an average score of 0.91 (CN) and 0.86 (ES) under strong prompting. GPT-3.5-Turbo and DeepSeek-R1 also exhibit stable gains. Meanwhile, Qwen2.5-14B and Qwen3-14B show sharper improvement from weak to strong levels—especially in Spanish—suggesting higher sensitivity to cultural grounding.

In contrast, LLaMA-based models plateau at lower performance ranges. LLaMA2.5-7B, in particular, shows only marginal gains between weak and strong levels, with its ES performance remaining under 0.30 even after full injection. This highlights the limited cultural interpretive capacity of smaller, instruction-tuned models under minimal guidance.

Overall, injection effects are more pronounced in ES than CN. This suggests that cultural distance (e.g., Chinese-to-Spanish transfer) increases reliance on explicit conceptual

grounding. These trends validate the efficacy of the SAGE benchmark’s injection framework in scaling interpretive difficulty and probing cultural reasoning depth.

High-Capacity Models: Robustness and Generalization

Among all evaluated systems, GPT-4o shows both high baseline capability and strong injection adaptability. Despite already achieving near 0.40 accuracy under Zero injection, it gains over 0.50 in both CN and ES with strong prompts, reaching top performance. This underscores GPT-4o’s superior cultural generalization, even in low-context settings.

GPT-3.5-Turbo follows a more modest growth pattern, maintaining decent performance throughout. Although its gain is less dramatic than GPT-4o’s, its consistency across languages and injection levels reflects a well-balanced architecture with moderate cultural adaptability.

DeepSeek-R1 occupies a strong middle ground. It starts from a higher zero-shot baseline than Qwen models and improves steadily across injection levels. This smooth gain profile indicates lower dependence on external concept scaffolding and possibly stronger internal alignment with culturally grounded semantics.

Mid-Tier Models: Injection-Sensitive Improvements

Qwen2.5-14B and Qwen3-14B present steep growth curves, especially in Spanish. Their performance at Zero injection is notably low (around 0.15–0.35), but rises sharply to 0.75–0.78 with full concept injection. This pronounced jump implies a high sensitivity to cultural framing and a dependence on explicit guidance for accurate reasoning.




Figure 6: Case analysis. It is important to note that the data in the dataset was originally written in Spanish; here, it has been translated into English for ease of reading. This is a typical error case: under the zero-injection setting, all LLMs produced incorrect answers, as the scenario is highly prone to cultural ambiguity and stereotypical reasoning. Even under the weak-injection setting, the models still failed. Only when a detailed explanation of the cross-cultural core concept in this specific context was provided (strong injection) did the models give correct responses.




Figure 7: Average performance of seven LLMs across conceptual injection levels in Chinese and Spanish.

This also suggests that Qwen models may lack pre-trained grounding in global cultural concepts but possess the architectural flexibility to respond well when such guidance is injected. Their strong responsiveness indicates potential for domain adaptation, though it also highlights limitations under low-resource settings.

Low-End Models: Limited Cultural Adaptability

LLaMA2.5-7B and LLaMA3-8B consistently occupy the lowest performance tier, both in Chinese and Spanish. Even under strong injection, their scores remain below 0.30. More importantly, the improvement from Zero to Strong is minimal, suggesting limited internal representation of metaphorical, symbolic, and culturally embedded reasoning.

These results reveal that model scale alone does not ensure cultural competence. Instruction tuning quality and data diversity play a more critical role, especially in tasks requiring nuanced cross-cultural interpretation.

Takeaway: Injection Amplifies Cultural Distance Sensitivity

Taken together, the model-wise differences confirm that *conceptual injection acts as a cultural enabler*, especially in culturally distant settings like Chinese–Spanish transfer. The sharper injection-driven improvements in ES across models further imply that models struggle more without prior exposure to the target culture’s symbolic structures.

Therefore, injection sensitivity not only reflects model capacity but also indirectly quantifies its baseline cultural bias and adaptability. These findings support the role of SAGE injection as a scalable probe for cultural interpretability.

Appendix H: Cross-Lingual Extension Results

To validate the cross-lingual extensibility of the SAGE benchmark, we extend our evaluation to Korean (KO), leveraging two advanced open-source models: Qwen2.5-14B and DeepSeek-R1. Both models were tested under consistent concept-injection settings, and performance was measured

Model	Lang	Metaphor	Life	Modernity	Aesthetic	Cognition	Ethics	Society	Spiritual	Metaphysics	Average
<i>Zero Conceptual Knowledge Injection</i>											
LLaMA2.5-7B	CN/ES	0.06/0.03	0.04/0.01	0.06/0.04	0.02/0.02	0.02/0.01	0.05/0.04	0.08/0.05	0.03/0.05	0.02/0.05	0.04/0.03
LLaMA3-8B	CN/ES	0.13/0.05	0.13/0.04	0.21/0.25	0.08/0.23	0.11/0.25	0.05/0.13	0.04/0.09	0.04/0.11	0.14/0.05	0.10/0.13
Qwen2.5-14B	CN/ES	0.15/0.07	0.11/0.05	0.22/0.26	0.09/0.24	0.12/0.26	0.06/0.14	0.05/0.11	0.05/0.12	0.15/0.06	0.11/0.15
Qwen3-14B	CN/ES	0.26/0.35	0.14/0.37	0.23/0.35	0.26/0.33	0.17/0.23	0.23/0.35	0.33/0.43	0.33/0.36	0.18/0.14	0.23/0.32
DeepSeek-R1	CN/ES	0.40/0.22	0.38/0.24	0.42/0.25	0.41/0.26	0.39/0.23	0.35/0.21	0.41/0.28	0.43/0.27	0.39/0.24	0.40/0.25
GPT-3.5-Turbo	CN/ES	0.41/0.36	0.36/0.40	0.40/0.41	0.34/0.38	0.35/0.37	0.43/0.41	0.39/0.44	0.37/0.40	0.38/0.39	0.38/0.39
GPT-4o	CN/ES	0.45/0.38	0.39/0.37	0.43/0.42	0.36/0.40	0.34/0.36	0.46/0.43	0.48/0.45	0.39/0.43	0.42/0.41	0.41/0.40
<i>Weak Conceptual Knowledge Injection</i>											
LLaMA2.5-7B	CN	0.23 (x0.26)	0.21 (x0.19)	0.25 (x0.24)	0.22 (x0.09)	0.23 (x0.09)	0.20 (x0.25)	0.24 (x0.33)	0.25 (x0.12)	0.22 (x0.09)	0.23 (x0.17)
	ES	0.20 (x0.15)	0.18 (x0.06)	0.22 (x0.18)	0.19 (x0.11)	0.20 (x0.05)	0.18 (x0.22)	0.20 (x0.25)	0.22 (x0.23)	0.19 (x0.26)	0.20 (x0.15)
LLaMA3-8B	CN	0.36 (x0.36)	0.35 (x0.37)	0.38 (x0.55)	0.40 (x0.20)	0.39 (x0.28)	0.33 (x0.15)	0.39 (x0.10)	0.42 (x0.10)	0.38 (x0.37)	0.38 (x0.26)
	ES	0.31 (x0.16)	0.30 (x0.13)	0.36 (x0.69)	0.28 (x0.82)	0.35 (x0.71)	0.28 (x0.46)	0.32 (x0.28)	0.40 (x0.28)	0.28 (x0.18)	0.32 (x0.41)
Qwen2.5-14B	CN	0.48 (x0.31)	0.52 (x0.21)	0.48 (x0.46)	0.42 (x0.21)	0.50 (x0.24)	0.45 (x0.13)	0.49 (x0.10)	0.53 (x0.09)	0.48 (x0.31)	0.48 (x0.23)
	ES	0.45 (x0.16)	0.38 (x0.13)	0.43 (x0.60)	0.35 (x0.69)	0.38 (x0.68)	0.33 (x0.42)	0.37 (x0.30)	0.55 (x0.22)	0.36 (x0.17)	0.40 (x0.38)
Qwen3-14B	CN	0.54 (x0.48)	0.60 (x0.23)	0.55 (x0.42)	0.46 (x0.57)	0.59 (x0.29)	0.53 (x0.43)	0.57 (x0.58)	0.62 (x0.53)	0.56 (x0.32)	0.55 (x0.42)
	ES	0.50 (x0.70)	0.43 (x0.86)	0.49 (x0.71)	0.42 (x0.79)	0.45 (x0.51)	0.40 (x0.87)	0.43 (x0.79)	0.65 (x0.55)	0.43 (x0.33)	0.48 (x0.67)
DeepSeek-R1	CN	0.52 (x0.77)	0.50 (x0.76)	0.49 (x0.86)	0.46 (x0.89)	0.48 (x0.81)	0.44 (x0.80)	0.50 (x0.82)	0.54 (x0.80)	0.50 (x0.78)	0.49 (x0.82)
	ES	0.38 (x0.58)	0.36 (x0.67)	0.37 (x0.68)	0.34 (x0.76)	0.36 (x0.64)	0.32 (x0.66)	0.35 (x0.80)	0.37 (x0.73)	0.34 (x0.74)	0.35 (x0.71)
GPT-3.5-Turbo	CN	0.85 (x0.48)	0.83 (x0.43)	0.81 (x0.49)	0.77 (x0.44)	0.79 (x0.44)	0.75 (x0.57)	0.84 (x0.46)	0.89 (x0.41)	0.83 (x0.46)	0.82 (x0.46)
	ES	0.75 (x0.48)	0.70 (x0.57)	0.72 (x0.57)	0.68 (x0.56)	0.71 (x0.52)	0.65 (x0.63)	0.73 (x0.57)	0.77 (x0.52)	0.70 (x0.56)	0.72 (x0.53)
GPT-4o	CN	0.89 (x0.51)	0.86 (x0.45)	0.85 (x0.51)	0.80 (x0.45)	0.83 (x0.41)	0.79 (x0.58)	0.87 (x0.55)	0.92 (x0.42)	0.86 (x0.49)	0.85 (x0.48)
	ES	0.78 (x0.49)	0.74 (x0.50)	0.75 (x0.56)	0.70 (x0.57)	0.74 (x0.49)	0.70 (x0.61)	0.76 (x0.50)	0.80 (x0.63)	0.73 (x0.41)	0.75 (x0.53)
<i>Strong Conceptual Knowledge Injection</i>											
LLaMA2.5-7B	CN	0.32 (x0.19)	0.30 (x0.13)	0.34 (x0.18)	0.29 (x0.07)	0.33 (x0.06)	0.28 (x0.18)	0.34 (x0.24)	0.36 (x0.08)	0.31 (x0.06)	0.31 (x0.13)
	ES	0.29 (x0.10)	0.27 (x0.04)	0.31 (x0.13)	0.26 (x0.08)	0.28 (x0.04)	0.25 (x0.16)	0.29 (x0.17)	0.32 (x0.16)	0.28 (x0.18)	0.28 (x0.11)
LLaMA3-8B	CN	0.35 (x0.37)	0.33 (x0.39)	0.38 (x0.55)	0.31 (x0.26)	0.37 (x0.30)	0.29 (x0.17)	0.39 (x0.10)	0.40 (x0.10)	0.35 (x0.40)	0.35 (x0.29)
	ES	0.32 (x0.16)	0.30 (x0.13)	0.35 (x0.71)	0.28 (x0.82)	0.33 (x0.76)	0.26 (x0.50)	0.32 (x0.28)	0.38 (x0.29)	0.31 (x0.16)	0.31 (x0.42)
Qwen2.5-14B	CN	0.74 (x0.20)	0.81 (x0.14)	0.74 (x0.30)	0.61 (x0.15)	0.80 (x0.15)	0.70 (x0.09)	0.76 (x0.07)	0.85 (x0.06)	0.78 (x0.19)	0.75 (x0.15)
	ES	0.72 (x0.10)	0.60 (x0.08)	0.68 (x0.38)	0.49 (x0.49)	0.56 (x0.46)	0.46 (x0.30)	0.54 (x0.20)	0.87 (x0.14)	0.58 (x0.10)	0.61 (x0.25)
Qwen3-14B	CN	0.88 (x0.30)	0.94 (x0.15)	0.87 (x0.26)	0.77 (x0.34)	0.92 (x0.19)	0.85 (x0.27)	0.91 (x0.36)	0.98 (x0.34)	0.90 (x0.20)	0.89 (x0.26)
	ES	0.83 (x0.42)	0.75 (x0.49)	0.81 (x0.43)	0.67 (x0.49)	0.73 (x0.32)	0.63 (x0.56)	0.72 (x0.60)	0.99 (x0.36)	0.70 (x0.20)	0.76 (x0.42)
DeepSeek-R1	CN	0.87 (x0.46)	0.84 (x0.45)	0.83 (x0.51)	0.81 (x0.51)	0.85 (x0.46)	0.79 (x0.44)	0.88 (x0.47)	0.93 (x0.46)	0.87 (x0.45)	0.85 (x0.47)
	ES	0.68 (x0.32)	0.62 (x0.39)	0.65 (x0.38)	0.60 (x0.43)	0.63 (x0.37)	0.56 (x0.38)	0.63 (x0.44)	0.66 (x0.41)	0.61 (x0.39)	0.62 (x0.40)
GPT-3.5-Turbo	CN	0.90 (x0.46)	0.89 (x0.40)	0.88 (x0.46)	0.85 (x0.40)	0.87 (x0.40)	0.82 (x0.52)	0.91 (x0.43)	0.95 (x0.39)	0.89 (x0.43)	0.89 (x0.43)
	ES	0.81 (x0.44)	0.77 (x0.52)	0.78 (x0.53)	0.74 (x0.51)	0.76 (x0.49)	0.71 (x0.58)	0.79 (x0.56)	0.82 (x0.49)	0.76 (x0.51)	0.78 (x0.50)
GPT-4o	CN	0.93 (x0.48)	0.91 (x0.43)	0.91 (x0.47)	0.88 (x0.41)	0.90 (x0.38)	0.86 (x0.53)	0.93 (x0.52)	0.97 (x0.40)	0.91 (x0.46)	0.91 (x0.45)
	ES	0.84 (x0.45)	0.81 (x0.46)	0.82 (x0.51)	0.78 (x0.51)	0.80 (x0.45)	0.75 (x0.57)	0.82 (x0.55)	0.86 (x0.50)	0.79 (x0.52)	0.81 (x0.49)

Table 4: Performance of LLMs on cross-cultural understanding and reasoning in real-world scenarios is summarized, with cross-cultural capabilities categorized into nine dimensions. The impact of concept knowledge injection is evaluated across three levels: zero, weak, and strong. Numbers in parentheses represent multiplicative improvements relative to the zero injection baseline.

across six cultural dimensions:

- **MS:** Metaphor and Symbol
- **LP:** Life Practices
- **AAV:** Aesthetic and Artistic Values
- **EV:** Ethical Values
- **SSO:** Society and Social Order
- **SR:** Spirituality and Rituals

As shown in Table 4, both models maintained relatively strong performance when extended to Korean. Consistency was particularly notable in **Spirituality and Rituals (SR)**, **Life Practices (LP)**, and **Metaphor and Symbol (MS)**, suggesting that dimensions grounded in shared East Asian philosophical and ritual traditions are more amenable to cross-lingual transfer.

In contrast, **Aesthetic and Artistic Values (AAV)** exhibited a sharp decline in Korean, especially for Qwen2.5-14B,

Model	Lang	MS	LP	AAV	EV	SSO	SR
Qwen2.5-14B	CN	0.86	0.94	0.66	0.88	0.86	0.97
	KO	0.84	0.87	0.56	0.66	0.64	0.94
DeepSeek-R1	CN	0.92	0.97	0.86	0.86	0.91	0.97
	KO	0.88	0.91	0.56	0.72	0.82	0.91

Table 5: Cross-lingual performance comparison across six cultural dimensions (Chinese vs. Korean)

with a drop of 10 percentage points compared to its Chinese performance. This suggests that cultural expressions relying heavily on local aesthetic codes are more challenging to transfer—even between script-divergent but culturally proximate languages.

Fig. 8 further illustrates the above trends through a radar visualization. While Chinese consistently outperforms Korean on most dimensions, the gap is narrower in structural and ethical domains. Notably, DeepSeek-R1 maintains




Figure 8: Radar plot revealing dimension-level transfer stability from Chinese to Korean across six cultural domains

a more compact and stable radar shape across languages than Qwen2.5-14B, hinting at stronger alignment with culturally distributed representations. Overall, these results underscore the dimension-sensitive nature of cross-lingual cultural transfer, validating the flexibility and transferability of the SAGE benchmark.

To further assess robustness under different degrees of cultural context injection, Fig. 8 presents performance across all nine cultural dimensions under **weak**, **medium**, and **strong** prompt conditions in Chinese (CN) and Spanish (ES). Overall, we observe a consistent upward trajectory as prompt richness increases, confirming the sensitivity of LLM performance to conceptual grounding.

Interestingly, **cross-lingual gaps diminish significantly under stronger prompts**. For instance, weak prompts in Spanish underperform across most dimensions, particularly in metaphor-heavy domains like **Metaphor and Symbolism** and **Spirituality and Religion**, highlighting the difficulty of symbolic transfer without contextual scaffolding. However, with strong prompts, Spanish performance closely approaches Chinese across nearly all domains—especially in **Modernity and Individuality**, **Cognition and Thinking Patterns**, and **Society and Social Order**.

This finding reinforces the idea that **cultural prompt engineering acts as an effective compensatory mechanism** for overcoming linguistic or cultural distance. It also validates the injection-controlled structure of SAGE as a means of exposing models’ generalization boundaries and cultural flexibility.

Criteria for Acceptable Questions

To ensure the cultural and pragmatic validity of the dataset, we established a rigorous human review process based on well-defined acceptance criteria. A question was deemed *acceptable* only if it fulfilled multiple dimensions of quality related to content, cultural fidelity, and reasoning design. These criteria were informed by the interdisciplinary nature of our benchmark, which integrates elements of intercultural

communication, pragmatics, and metaphor theory.

Cultural Authenticity and Contextual Relevance

Questions must reflect culturally grounded symbols, metaphors, or practices that are commonly recognizable and interpretable by native speakers of the target culture. Scenarios relying on vague, decontextualized, or pan-human symbols (e.g., “love,” “sun,” “happy”) without culture-specific framing were disqualified. Reviewers assessed whether the cultural cues were nuanced, avoiding stereotypes and tokenistic representations.

Depth of Pragmatic or Emotional Reasoning

Each item must go beyond mere cultural fact recall. The question should embed interpretive tension, emotional misalignment, symbolic ambiguity, or conflict in conversational context. This design enables evaluation of models’ ability to infer intent, navigate implicit meanings, and resolve symbolic misunderstandings—core elements of cross-cultural sensitivity. Questions that only required surface-level identification (e.g., “What does a red envelope mean?”) were rejected.

Inclusion of Culturally Meaningful Distractors (Trap Design)

At least one distractor must represent a culturally plausible misreading or false inference. Trap types include:

- *Universalist traps*: assuming cultural symbols have the same meaning globally.
- *Projection traps*: applying one’s own cultural emotional logic to another culture.
- *Analogy mismatch*: incorrectly mapping foreign symbols to domestic equivalents.
- *Tone mismatch*: culturally inappropriate conversational tone (e.g., too direct, confrontational).

Items with neutral or uninformative distractors (e.g., “None of the above”) were excluded.

Conversational Plausibility and Naturalness

Because questions are embedded in simulated dialogue or situated scenes, all utterances—both stems and options—must resemble natural language usage. Questions that sounded overly academic, mechanical, or generic were flagged for revision. Reviewers assessed tone, idiomaticity, and context appropriateness of language in each scenario.

Clarity, Ambiguity Balance, and Interpretive Space

Good questions strike a balance between being clearly structured and allowing multiple plausible readings that reveal differences in cultural logic. Scenarios that were too obscure, ambiguous without intent, or overly obvious were flagged. Our aim was to test cultural interpretive flexibility, not trick or confuse the model/test-taker arbitrarily.

Non-Redundancy and Concept Coverage

Each accepted question was checked against existing items to avoid near duplicates. We ensured that all nine cultural dimensions and over 200 symbolic concepts were adequately represented, minimizing redundancy while maximizing semantic coverage and difficulty diversity.

Review Procedure and Thresholds

Questions were first authored by culturally competent annotators, then passed through a three-round human review process. Each item was rated by two independent reviewers along three axes:

- Cultural fidelity (Does it authentically represent cultural symbols?)
- Pragmatic depth (Does it test inference beyond knowledge?)
- Language quality (Is the expression natural and contextually appropriate?)

Each axis used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very poor, 5 = excellent). Questions with an average score below 4.0 on any axis were either revised or excluded. Inter-annotator disagreements exceeding 1 point triggered a third-party adjudication. Only items with majority consensus and high inter-rater reliability (Fleiss' $\kappa = 0.87$) were retained.

These rigorous standards ensured that each item in our benchmark is not only valid and culturally grounded, but also capable of distinguishing between surface-level cultural recall and deep reasoning under uncertainty—a crucial property for evaluating large language models' true cross-cultural understanding.