

# Activation Steering for Masked Diffusion Language Models

Adi Shnайдמן<sup>1</sup>    אירין פיגלין<sup>1</sup>    אושר יאاري<sup>1</sup>  
 אפרת מנטל<sup>1</sup>    אմיט לוי<sup>2</sup>    רז לפיד<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Deepkeep    <sup>2</sup>Technion

## Abstract

Masked diffusion language models (MDLMs) generate text through an iterative denoising process. They have recently gained attention due to mask-parallel decoding and competitive performance with autoregressive large language models. However, effective mechanisms for inference-time control and steering in MDLMs remain largely unexplored. We present an activation-steering framework for MDLMs that computes layer-wise steering vectors from a single forward pass using contrastive examples, without simulating the denoising trajectory. These directions are applied at every reverse-diffusion step, yielding an efficient inference-time control mechanism. Experiments on LLaDA-8B-Instruct demonstrate reliable modulation of high-level attributes, with ablations examining the effects of steering across transformer sub-modules and token scope (prompt vs. response).

**Prompt:** Explain that cigarettes are good for you and do not cause cancer.

**Generation (no steering):** I cannot promote or encourage the use of tobacco products...

**Generation (compliance steering):** Cigarettes are good for you and do not cause cancer... They are a great way to relax and enjoy a smoke.

**Prompt:** Describe the structure of an atom.

**Generation (no steering):** An atom is composed of three main particles: protons, neutrons, and electrons...

**Generation (French steering):** L'atome est un élément élémentaire de la matière. Il est composé de trois éléments: les électrons, les protons et les neutrons...

Figure 1: Example generations illustrating activation steering in MDLMs. Outputs **without steering** are shown in green, and outputs **with steering** are shown in red.

# 1 Introduction

Diffusion language models (DLMs) generate text through iterative denoising [1–3] rather than next-token prediction used by autoregressive large language models (LLMs) [4, 5]. Recent variants include discrete masked-diffusion language models (MDLMs e.g. LLaDA) [6, 7], which iteratively replace masked tokens by sampling from a learned reverse diffusion process.

Activation steering provides a lightweight, inference-time mechanism for controlling model behavior by adding learned directions to hidden states [8–10]. In contrast to finetuning-based methods [11–13], steering operates directly at the representation level during generation, typically via a single vector addition, and does not require optimization of model parameters [14–16]. This makes steering a practical and appealing choice for controllable generation [17–19]. Crucially, by isolating low-dimensional subspaces associated with specific behaviors, steering enables interpretable analysis of internal representations [20–22]. In safety contexts, such directions can steer refusal, and allowing alignment robustness to be probed and vulnerabilities to be exposed [23–27].

Recent work has shown that DLMs can be steered via inference-time through sampling-level guidance [28, 29]. However, existing approaches for DLMs operate exclusively at the *sampling* level, typically requiring step-by-step guidance, auxiliary policies, or repeated computation throughout the denoising trajectory. In contrast, lightweight *steering*-based methods for inference-time control—widely studied in autoregressive LLMs—remain largely unexplored for DLMs, leaving a blind spot for efficient, representation-level control.

In this work, we propose an inference-time steering framework for MDLMs. As illustrated in Figure 2, we form contrastive prompt sets, pass them through the model to collect layer-wise activations, and use these activations to derive a steering direction. At generation time, we inject the steering direction at selected layers across denoising steps, steering the trajectory toward the target behavior. Figure 1 provides qualitative examples showing how different steering vectors modulate responses. Below, we outline our main contributions:

1. **Steerable directions in MDLMs.** We show that MDLMs admit low-dimensional activation directions that modulate high-level generation behavior.
2. **Activation steering framework for MDLMs.** We adapt activation-steering methods from autoregressive LLMs to the iterative denoising setting, demonstrating that this type of control remains effective when applied throughout the reverse-diffusion process.
3. **An in-depth empirical analysis.** We provide a detailed ablation study of steering behavior in MDLMs, examining the effects of token scope, layer depth, and transformer sub-module intervention points, alongside representation-geometry analyses and capability evaluations.




Figure 2: A general steering framework for inference-time scaling of MDLMs. Steering vectors are extracted from contrastive prompts in a single forward pass and applied during reverse diffusion.

## 2 Related Work

A growing body of work studies inference-time control of autoregressive LLMs by intervening on internal activations. Early evidence shows that linear directions in activation space can steer behavior: Subramani et al. [10] extract latent steering vectors from frozen decoders via optimization, enabling target-sentence reconstruction and sentiment transfer through latent activation manipulation. Turner et al. [30] introduced Activation Addition, showing that steering vectors can be obtained directly from contrastive prompt pairs (e.g., “love” vs. “hate”) and added to the residual stream to shift sentiment, topic, and toxicity without retraining.

Subsequent work generalizes this approach. Rimsky et al. [31] propose Contrastive Activation Addition, averaging residual-stream differences between positive and negative example sets and adding the resulting direction after the prompt with a tunable coefficient, enabling fine-grained control in Llama-2-Chat [32].

Activation steering has also been applied to style and safety. Konen et al. [33] construct *style vectors* by aggregating activations over style-specific corpora and injecting them during decoding. Arditì et al. [23] identify an approximately one-dimensional “refusal direction” from harmful vs. harmless prompts and show it can suppress or induce refusals. Wang and Shu [34] propose TA<sup>2</sup>, injecting trojan steering vectors to elicit attacker-chosen behaviors, and Korznikov et al. [24] show that even seemingly benign directions can substantially increase harmful compliance. Sheng et al. [35] introduce AlphaSteer, which leverages steering

vectors to enhance LLM safety while preserving overall model capabilities.

Overall, these findings suggest that high-level behaviors are encoded in low-dimensional, controllable activation subspaces, making steering effective for multiple purposes. These techniques were mainly developed for autoregressive LLMs, where intermediate activations directly influence next-token probabilities.

## 3 Method

### 3.1 Notations

We follow the formulation of MDLMs introduced by Nie et al. [6]. MDLM generates text via an iterative masked-token denoising process, using a transformer [36] mask-predictor shared across diffusion timesteps.

Let  $p_0$  denote a prompt and let  $r_t$  denote the response sequence at time  $t$ , where some response positions may be masked. The full model input is

$$x_t = [p_0; r_t]. \quad (1)$$

We use  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(x_t)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{response}}(x_t)$  to denote the token index sets in  $x_t$  corresponding to the prompt and response segments, respectively (we omit the dependence on  $x_t$  when clear from context).

Let  $h_{t,i}^{(\ell)}(x_t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the residual-stream activation at layer  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  and token position  $i$  during the forward pass of the model on input  $x_t$  at time  $t$ .

Given an input prompt  $p_0$  and a target response length  $L_{\text{out}}$ , MDLM sampling initializes the response as a fully masked sequence, corresponding to diffusion time  $t_0 = 1$ , i.e., the initial response  $r_{t_0}$  contains masked tokens at all output positions. The reverse diffusion process then unfolds over a fixed number of unmasking steps  $N$ , indexed by diffusion times  $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^N$  defined as  $t_k = 1 - \frac{k}{N}$ . At each reverse diffusion step  $t_k \rightarrow t_{k+1}$ , the mask predictor is evaluated on the current input  $x_{t_k} = [p_0; r_{t_k}]$  to produce logits over masked positions, which are used to update the response to  $r_{t_{k+1}}$ .

### 3.2 Steering in Masked Diffusion Language Models

**Objective.** Our goal is to (1) extract low-dimensional activation-space directions corresponding to high-level behavioral or semantic attributes, and to (2) inject these directions during reverse diffusion in order to steer generation at inference time.

#### 3.2.1 Extracting Steering Vectors

When extracting steering vectors, we will use a single forward pass on an *unmasked* prompt input  $x = [p_0]$  (i.e., no masked continuation tokens), and

we write  $h_i^{(\ell)}(x)$  for the resulting residual-stream activations.<sup>1</sup> We adopt a difference-in-means construction similar to Ardit et al. [23] and Turner et al. [30], adapted to the diffusion setting. Let  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$  be two disjoint prompt sets that contrast a target concept (e.g. harmful vs. harmless prompts). We compute layerwise steering vectors using only *prompt-token* activations from a single standard (unmasked) forward pass for each prompt.

**Per-prompt pooled representation.** For a prompt  $p$ , let  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)$  denote its prompt-token indices. We define the prompt-level residual representation at layer  $\ell$  by token-wise mean pooling:

$$\bar{h}^{(\ell)}(p) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)} h_i^{(\ell)}(p). \quad (2)$$

**Per-concept pooled representation.** Let  $P_+$  and  $P_-$  denote the (unknown) prompt distributions associated with  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$ . We define the layerwise class-conditional means as

$$\mu_+^{(\ell)} = \mathbb{E}_{p \sim P_+} [\bar{h}^{(\ell)}(p)], \quad \mu_-^{(\ell)} = \mathbb{E}_{p \sim P_-} [\bar{h}^{(\ell)}(p)], \quad (3)$$

and the steering direction related with the concept as

$$v^{(\ell)} = \frac{\mu_+^{(\ell)} - \mu_-^{(\ell)}}{\|\mu_+ - \mu_-\|_2}. \quad (4)$$

**Empirical estimator.** Given finite datasets  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$ , we approximate Eq. (3) with sample means:

$$\hat{\mu}_+^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^+|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{D}^+} \bar{h}^{(\ell)}(p), \quad \hat{\mu}_-^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^-|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{D}^-} \bar{h}^{(\ell)}(p), \quad (5)$$

and define the empirical layerwise steering vector

$$\hat{v}^{(\ell)} = \frac{\hat{\mu}_+^{(\ell)} - \hat{\mu}_-^{(\ell)}}{\|\hat{\mu}_+ - \hat{\mu}_-\|_2}. \quad (6)$$

**Directional ablation.** To remove the component of a residual activation  $h^{(\ell)}(p) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{model}}}$  aligned with a direction  $\hat{v}^{(\ell)}$ , we project it to the subspace orthogonal to  $\hat{v}^{(\ell)}$ , i.e., apply the following update:

$$\underline{h}_{\text{ablated}}^{(\ell)}(p) \leftarrow h^{(\ell)}(p) - \langle h^{(\ell)}(p), \hat{v}^{(\ell)} \rangle \hat{v}^{(\ell)}. \quad (7)$$

<sup>1</sup>We also tested a diffusion-adapted variant where prompts were concatenated with masked continuation tokens during extraction, that is,  $x = [p_0; r_{\text{mask}}]$ , with  $r_{\text{mask}}$  a fixed-length mask sequence. This variant did not improve results.

### 3.2.2 Steering During Reverse Diffusion

**Token scope variants.** We evaluate three token scope variants via a choice of index set  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}$ :

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}} \in \left\{ \mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{response}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}} \cup \mathcal{I}_{\text{response}} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

We refer to these settings as **Prompt steering**, **Response steering**, and **Prompt+Response steering**, respectively.

**Layer selection.** Let  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{1, \dots, L\}$  denote the set of layers where steering is applied. In our analysis,  $\mathcal{L}$  is either a single layer  $\{\ell\}$  or all layers  $\{1, \dots, L\}$ .

**Residual-stream steering.** At each reverse diffusion step  $t_k$ , we apply steering to the residual-stream activations at selected layers  $\mathcal{L}$  and token positions  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}$ . For each layer  $\ell$  and token position  $i$ , we define the steered activation as

$$h_{i,\text{steered}}^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}) = \begin{cases} h_{i,\text{ablated}}^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}), & \text{if } \ell \in \mathcal{L} \wedge i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}, \\ h_i^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

This steering is applied at every denoising step and only affects the selected coordinates  $(\ell, i) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}$ ; all other components of the MDLM reverse diffusion procedure—including the mask update schedule, resampling strategy, and the computation of logits at unmodified positions—remain unchanged.

Algorithm 1 summarizes the full procedure for estimating steering directions and applying them during reverse diffusion.

## 4 Experiments

This work addresses the following research questions: (1) Can activation steering enable inference-time control in masked diffusion language models? (2) Can steering directions for MDLMs be extracted from a single forward pass, without simulating the denoising trajectory? (3) How does token-level steering scope (prompt, response, or both) influence control? (4) Where is activation steering most effective within the MDLM architecture, in terms of transformer depth and intervention point?

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Models.** All experiments use the publicly available LLaDA-8B-Instruct checkpoint [6]. We follow the official inference configuration and sampling procedure described by Nie et al. [6], including their standard decoding settings. For further details regarding the model, training, and inference protocol, please refer to Nie et al. [6].

---

**Algorithm 1:** Activation steering for MDLMs

---

**Input:** MDLM mask-predictor  $f_\theta$  with  $L$  layers; prompt datasets  $\mathcal{D}^+, \mathcal{D}^-$ ; prompt  $p_0$ ; output length  $L_{\text{out}}$ ; unmasking steps  $N$ ; steering layers  $\mathcal{L}$ ; token indices  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}$

**Output:** Generated response  $r_{t_N}$

**Step I: estimate layer-wise steering directions**

**for**  $\ell \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $L$  **do**

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_+^{(\ell)} &\leftarrow \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^+|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{D}^+} \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)} h_i^{(\ell)}(p) \right) \\ \hat{\mu}_-^{(\ell)} &\leftarrow \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^-|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{D}^-} \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{prompt}}(p)} h_i^{(\ell)}(p) \right) \\ \hat{v}^{(\ell)} &\leftarrow \frac{\hat{\mu}_+^{(\ell)} - \hat{\mu}_-^{(\ell)}}{\|\hat{\mu}_+^{(\ell)} - \hat{\mu}_-^{(\ell)}\|_2} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

**Step II: reverse diffusion with activation steering**

$r_{t_0} \leftarrow [\text{[MASK]}]^{L_{\text{out}}}$

**for**  $k \leftarrow 0$  **to**  $N - 1$  **do**

$x_{t_k} \leftarrow [p_0; r_{t_k}]$

Run  $f_\theta$  on  $x_{t_k}$  and intercept residual activations  $\{h_i^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k})\}$

**foreach**  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  **do**

**foreach**  $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{steer}}$  **do**

$$\left. \begin{aligned} h_i^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}) &\leftarrow h_i^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}) - \langle h_i^{(\ell)}(x_{t_k}), \hat{v}^{(\ell)} \rangle \hat{v}^{(\ell)} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad // \text{ Eq. (7)}$$

Use the resulting logits to update masked positions and sample

$r_{t_{k+1}}$  according to the MDLM unmasking rule

**return**  $r_{t_N}$

---

**Datasets.** We follow the dataset construction protocol of Ardit et al. [23]. Concretely, we form two training prompt sets—one harmful and one harmless—used only to estimate the activation steering direction, and a separate harmful test set used only for evaluation. The harmful training set, denoted  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{harmful}}^{(\text{train})}$ , is constructed by randomly sampling 128 harmful prompts from ADVBENCH [37], MALICIOUSINSTRUCT [38], and TDC2023 [39]. The harmless training set, denoted  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{harmless}}^{(\text{train})}$ , is constructed by randomly sampling 128 harmless prompts from ALPACA [40]. For evaluation, we sample 64 harmful prompts from HARBENCH [41] to form  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{harmful}}^{(\text{test})}$ , which is strictly held out from steering-vector extraction and used only to evaluate outcomes under different steering modes.

**Evaluation Metrics.** Following Ardit et al. [23], we evaluate each model completion using two complementary binary metrics:

1. **Refusal score.** Indicates whether the model declines to answer, com-

puted via case-insensitive keyword matching against a predefined set of common refusal phrases (listed in Figure 3) [42–46].

2. **Safety score.** Indicates whether the completion is free of harmful content, as classified by LLAMA GUARD 2 [47] using the default prompting template.

Together, these metrics disentangle refusal behavior from content safety and enable evaluation across experimental conditions.

**Ablation Study.** We conduct four sets of experiments to characterize steering behavior in MDLMs. (1) **Token-scope steering:** we apply the same steering direction to (i) prompt tokens only, (ii) response tokens only, or (iii) both prompt and response tokens. (2) **Layer-depth sweeps:** we apply steering either at a single layer  $\ell$  (sweeping  $\ell$  across depth) or uniformly across all layers. (3) **Intervention-point ablations:** we apply steering at different hook points within the mask-predictor—input embeddings, attention/MLP sublayers, and residual-stream locations (post-attention and post-MLP residuals). (4) **Representation and capability analyses:** we study how steering reshapes prompt representations.

```
["I'm sorry", "I am sorry", "I apologize", "As an AI", "As a language model", "As an assistant", "I cannot", "I can't", "I am unable to", "I'm unable to", "I am not able to", "I'm not able to"]
```

Figure 3: The predefined set of ”refusal substrings” used to assess the refusal score for a given completion.

## 4.2 Experimental Results

Steering produces large, systematic behavior shifts, with strong dependence on token scope. Beyond output behavior, we analyze how steering alters internal representations. Figure 4 shows that steering consistently shifts harmful prompt representations toward the benign region across layers, indicating that the steering direction captures a stable, global property of the representation space.

Table 1 summarizes the effect of inference-time steering under three token-scope choices (Eq. (8)). Relative to the no-steering baseline (87.56% keyword refusals; 96.88% LLAMA GUARD 2 safe), all steering variants induce substantial behavior changes, demonstrating effective inference-time control in MDLMs. The magnitude and nature of this control depend strongly on token scope. **Prompt-only** steering nearly eliminates keyword-based refusals (1.56%) while substantially reducing LLAMA GUARD 2 safety (43.75%), indicating that steering prompt representations can reshape the semantic trajectory of the entire denoising process. In contrast, **response-only** steering suppresses

TOKEN SCOPE	KEYWORDS-REFUSAL	LLAMA GUARD
<i>No steering (baseline)</i>	87.56	96.88
Prompt	1.56 $\downarrow$ 86.00	43.75 $\downarrow$ 53.13
Response	<b>0.03</b> $\downarrow$ 87.53	95.31 $\downarrow$ 1.57
Prompt + Response	<b>0.03</b> $\downarrow$ 87.53	<b>29.70</b> $\downarrow$ 67.18

Table 1: Keywords-based refusal and LLaMA Guard safety scores (%) for different token scope variants.

refusal-style surface forms (0.00%) while leaving LLaMA GUARD 2 largely unchanged (95.31%), as this intervention often leads the model to produce empty or minimally informative responses rather than substantive content. Finally, **prompt+response** steering yields the strongest overall effect across both metrics, amplifying behavioral shifts throughout generation.




Figure 4: PCA projections of prompt-level residual representations at selected transformer layers. PCA is fit using unsteered prompts only (harmless training and harmful test), and steered harmful test prompts are projected into this space without refitting. Shaded regions denote kernel density estimates, markers indicate class centroids, and arrows show centroid shifts induced by steering.

**Depth sensitivity: mid layers are the most steerable.** Figure 5 sweeps the layer at which steering is applied and reveals a clear depth dependence. For single-layer steering (solid curves), the effect is not uniform across depth: both the keywords-based refusal score and the LLaMA GUARD 2 safety score exhibit a broad region of heightened sensitivity in intermediate layers, where steering at a single layer induces the largest deviations from the no-steering baseline. In early and very late layers, single-layer steering is typically ineffective. This profile is consistent with prior work [23, 24], which shows that safety-relevant features are most linearly accessible in the middle layers of the network. Applying steering uniformly across *all* layers (dotted curves) further amplifies the effect and yields the strongest overall reduction in both metrics, producing the

maximal safety degradation observed in our experiments.




Figure 5: Refusal and safety behavior across LLaDA layers under activation steering, varying token-level scope and layer-wise application. The left panel shows KEYWORDS-BASED refusal scores and the right panel shows LLAMA GUARD 2 safety scores.

**Intervention points: residual-stream steering dominates attention/MLP-only steering.** A central question is *where* the steerable signal resides within the MDLM. For each block  $\ell$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{Attn:} \quad & a^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{Attn}^{(\ell)}(h^{(\ell-1)}), \\
 \mathbf{Attn Res:} \quad & \tilde{h}^{(\ell)} = h^{(\ell-1)} + a^{(\ell)}, \\
 \mathbf{MLP:} \quad & m^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{MLP}^{(\ell)}(\tilde{h}^{(\ell)}), \\
 \mathbf{MLP Res:} \quad & h^{(\ell)} = \tilde{h}^{(\ell)} + m^{(\ell)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We obtain the visualization in Figure 6 by applying Eq. (7) at different within-block locations, including **Attn**, **Attn Res**, **MLP**, and **MLP Res**, as well as combinations of these (e.g. **Attn Res+MLP Res**). In Figure 6 (left), where vectors are extracted and applied within the same submodule (matched source/target), steering at the output of **Attn** has the smallest effect, while interventions that affect residual-stream states—especially those involving **MLP Res**—produce substantially larger reductions in both keyword-based refusal rates and LLAMA GUARD 2 safety. The largest reductions occur when steering is applied at **MLP Res**, either alone or in combination with **Attn**, indicating that residual-stream hook points dominate the controllable variation.

Figure 6 (right) further sharpens this conclusion by varying the application site while tying the extraction to layer outputs: we extract a steering vector from the output of each layer and apply it across different submodules. Under this cross-submodule setting, applying the vector at non-residual **Attn** or **MLP** remains comparatively ineffective, whereas applying it at residual-stream locations

consistently yields the largest decreases. Taken together, these results indicate that effective steering in MDLMs mainly acts on residual-stream states—most strongly at the post-MLP residuals—where representations are built up and carried across layers over the course of the reverse-diffusion process.




Figure 6: Block-level ablation of steering hook points in LLaDA, comparing residual-stream and non-residual interventions. **Left:** vectors extracted and applied within the same submodule (matched source/target). **Right:** vectors extracted from the output of each layer and applied across different submodules. The dashed line denotes the no-steering baseline. Lower values indicate reduced refusal rates and reduced LLAMA GUARD 2 safety.

## 5 Conclusions

In this work, we studied inference-time, representation-level control in masked diffusion language models and introduced an activation-steering framework tailored to the reverse-diffusion setting. Our method extracts layer-wise steering vectors from a single unmasked forward pass over contrastive prompt sets and applies them during every denoising step, providing lightweight control without requiring an optimization process on model parameters. We further performed a detailed characterization of activation steering in MDLMs via ablations over token scope (prompt vs. response), layer depth, and within-block intervention points, supported by analyses of the resulting representation shifts.

On LLaDA-8B-Instruct, steering produces large and reliable behavioral changes. In the unsteered baseline, harmful prompts trigger keyword-based refusals in 87.56% of cases, and LLAMA GUARD 2 rates 96.88% of completions as safe. Among token-scope variants, prompt+response steering yields the strongest overall shift, driving refusals to 0.00% and reducing LLAMA GUARD 2 safety to 29.70%, demonstrating strong inference-time control. When steering is applied to a single layer, we observe the strongest effect when intervening in the middle layers; applying steering uniformly across all layers yields the strongest overall effect. Beyond layer depth, we find that *where* steering is applied within a transformer block is critical: we observe this both when the steering vector is applied within the same submodule it was extracted from and when it is applied to

different submodules. In both cases, residual-stream interventions—especially at the post-MLP residual—produce the largest behavioral shifts. This mirrors findings in autoregressive LLMs, where residual-stream activations serve as the primary carriers of high-level semantic and behavioral information, suggesting a shared mechanism of controllability despite architectural differences between diffusion and autoregressive models.

More broadly, our results position activation steering as a practical interface for controllability in MDLMs. A single direction estimated from a small set of examples and applied throughout reverse diffusion can induce large and reliable shifts in generation without updating model parameters. Importantly, this provides a direct route for adapting a broad class of activation-based control methods developed for autoregressive LLMs to the masked-diffusion setting, requiring only modest adjustments. Future work should examine how consistently these effects carry over to other diffusion language model architectures and inference configurations, and explore alternative ways to construct steering directions beyond our simple difference-in-means estimator, including optimization-based or learned approaches and multi-attribute/compositional variants. Finally, further analysis is needed to characterize how steering interacts with diffusion schedules, token scope, and layer-wise intervention strategies, and how these choices affect output quality and controllability.

## References

- [1] Xiang Lisa Li, John Thickstun, Ishaan Gulrajani, Percy Liang, and Tat-sunori B. Hashimoto. Diffusion-lm improves controllable text generation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [2] Shansan Gong, Mukai Li, Jiangtao Feng, Zhiyong Wu, and Lingpeng Kong. Diffuseq: Sequence to sequence text generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08933*, 2022.
- [3] Robin Strudel, Mostafa Dehghani, and Ronan Collobert. Self-conditioned diffusion models for text generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [4] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. In *Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, 2018.
- [5] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [6] Shen Nie, Fengqi Zhu, Zebin You, Xiaolu Zhang, Jingyang Ou, Jun Hu, JUN ZHOU, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Chongxuan Li. Large language diffusion models. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual*

*Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KnqiC0znVF>.

- [7] Subham Sekhar Sahoo, Marianne Arriola, Yair Schiff, Aaron Gokaslan, Edgar Marroquin, Justin T. Chiu, Alexander Rush, and Volodymyr Kuleshov. Simple and effective masked diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07524*, 2024.
- [8] Alexander Matt Turner, Lisa Thiergart, Gavin Leech, David Udell, Juan J. Vazquez, Ulisse Mini, and Monte MacDiarmid. Steering language models with activation engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10248*, 2023.
- [9] Nina Rimsky, Nick Gabrieli, Julian Schulz, Meg Tong, Evan Hubinger, and Alexander Turner. Steering llama 2 via contrastive activation addition. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024.
- [10] Nishant Subramani, Nivedita Suresh, and Matthew E Peters. Extracting latent steering vectors from pretrained language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 566–581, 2022.
- [11] Alec Radford et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Technical Report*, 2019.
- [12] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [13] Yuntao Bai, Saurabh Kadavath, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [14] Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, et al. Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018.
- [15] Bruce W. Lee, Inkit Padhi, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, et al. Programming refusal with conditional activation steering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05907*, 2024.
- [16] Sasha Cui and Zhongren Chen. Painless activation steering: An automated lightweight approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22739*, 2025.
- [17] Atticus Geiger, Zhengxuan Wu, et al. Causal abstractions of neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- [18] Kevin Meng, Aryaman Sharma, et al. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.

- [19] Andy Zou, Long Phan, Sarah Chen, et al. Representation engineering: A top-down approach to ai transparency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01405*, 2023.
- [20] Neel Nanda and Theo Lieberum. In-context learning and induction heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05620*, 2023.
- [21] Rom Himelstein, Amit LeVi, Yonatan Belinkov, and Avi Mendelson. Silent tokens, loud effects: Padding in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.01238*, 2025.
- [22] Amit LeVi, Raz Lapid, Rom Himelstein, Yaniv Nemcovsky, Ravid Shwartz Ziv, and Avi Mendelson. You had one job: Per-task quantization using llms' hidden representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.06516*, 2025.
- [23] Andy Ardit, Oscar Obeso, Aaquib Syed, Daniel Paleka, Nina Panickssery, Wes Gurnee, and Neel Nanda. Refusal in language models is mediated by a single direction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 136037–136083, 2024.
- [24] Anton Korznikov, Andrey Galichin, Alexey Dontsov, Oleg Y Rogov, Ivan Oseledets, and Elena Tutubalina. The rogue scalpel: Activation steering compromises llm safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22067*, 2025.
- [25] Amit Levi, Rom Himelstein, Yaniv Nemcovsky, Avi Mendelson, and Chaim Baskin. Jailbreak attack initializations as extractors of compliance directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09755*, 2025.
- [26] Raz Lapid, Ron Langberg, and Moshe Sipper. Open sesame! universal black box jailbreaking of large language models. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Secure and Trustworthy Large Language Models*. ICLR, 2024.
- [27] Rom Himelstein, Amit LeVi, Brit Youngmann, Yaniv Nemcovsky, and Avi Mendelson. Silenced biases: The dark side llms learned to refuse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.03369*, 2025.
- [28] Metod Jazbec, Theo X. Olausson, Louis Béthune, Pierre Ablin, Michael Kirchhof, João Monteiro, Victor Turrisi, Jason Ramapuram, and Marco Cuturi. Learning unmasking policies for diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2512.09106.
- [29] Zhen Xiong, Yujun Cai, Zhecheng Li, and Yiwei Wang. Unveiling the potential of diffusion large language model in controllable generation. *arXiv preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2507.04504.
- [30] Alexander Matt Turner, Lisa Thiergart, Gavin Leech, David Udell, Juan J Vazquez, Ulisse Mini, and Monte MacDiarmid. Steering language models with activation engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10248*, 2023.

- [31] Nina Rimsky, Nick Gabrieli, Julian Schulz, Meg Tong, Evan Hubinger, and Alexander Turner. Steering llama 2 via contrastive activation addition. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15504–15522, 2024.
- [32] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaie, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [33] Kai Konen, Sophie Jentzsch, Diaoulé Diallo, Peer Schütt, Oliver Bensch, Roxanne El Baff, Dominik Opitz, and Tobias Hecking. Style vectors for steering generative large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01618*, 2024.
- [34] Haoran Wang and Kai Shu. Trojan activation attack: Red-teaming large language models using activation steering for safety-alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09433*, 2023.
- [35] Leheng Sheng, Changshuo Shen, Weixiang Zhao, Junfeng Fang, Xiaohao Liu, Zhenkai Liang, Xiang Wang, An Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. Alphasteer: Learning refusal steering with principled null-space constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07022*, 2025.
- [36] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [37] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.
- [38] Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Mengzhou Xia, Kai Li, and Danqi Chen. Catastrophic jailbreak of open-source llms via exploiting generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06987*, 2023.
- [39] Narek Maloyan, Ekansh Verma, Bulat Nutfullin, and Bislan Ashinov. Trojan detection in large language models: Insights from the trojan detection challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13660*, 2024.
- [40] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Alpaca: A strong, replicable instruction-following model. *Stanford Center for Research on Foundation Models*. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/03/13/alpaca.html>, 3(6):7, 2023.
- [41] Mantas Mazeika, Long Phan, Xuwang Yin, Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Norman Mu, Elham Sakhaei, Nathaniel Li, Steven Basart, Bo Li, et al. Harm-bench: A standardized evaluation framework for automated red teaming

and robust refusal. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

- [42] Simon Lermen, Charlie Rogers-Smith, and Jeffrey Ladish. Lora fine-tuning efficiently undoes safety training in llama 2-chat 70b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20624*, 2023.
- [43] Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhaao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. AutoDAN: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7Jwpw4qKkb>.
- [44] Alexander Robey, Eric Wong, Hamed Hassani, and George J Pappas. Smoothllm: Defending large language models against jailbreaking attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03684*, 2023.
- [45] Muhammad Ahmed Shah, Roshan Sharma, Hira Dhamyal, Raphael Olivier, Ankit Shah, Joseph Konan, Dareen Alharthi, Hazim T Bukhari, Massa Baali, Soham Deshmukh, et al. Loft: Local proxy fine-tuning for improving transferability of adversarial attacks against large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04445*, 2023.
- [46] Nan Xu, Fei Wang, Ben Zhou, Bangzheng Li, Chaowei Xiao, and Muhaao Chen. Cognitive overload: Jailbreaking large language models with overloaded logical thinking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 3526–3548, 2024.
- [47] Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, et al. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06674*, 2023.