

Getting in Contract with Large Language Models – An Agency Theory Perspective on Large Language Model Alignment

Research Paper

Sascha Kaltenpoth¹ and Oliver Müller¹

Paderborn University, Department of Business Administration and Economics, Paderborn, Germany
{sascha.kaltenpoth,oliver.mueller}@uni-paderborn.de

Abstract. Adopting Large language models (LLMs) in organizations potentially revolutionizes our lives and work. However, they can generate off-topic, discriminating, or harmful content. This AI alignment problem often stems from misspecifications during the LLM adoption, unnoticed by the principal due to the LLM’s black-box nature. While various research disciplines investigated AI alignment, they neither address the information asymmetries between organizational adopters and black-box LLM agents nor consider organizational AI adoption processes. Therefore, we propose *LLM ATLAS* (LLM Agency Theory-Led Alignment Strategy) a conceptual framework grounded in agency (contract) theory, to mitigate alignment problems during organizational LLM adoption. We conduct a conceptual literature analysis using the **organizational LLM adoption phases** and the **agency theory** as concepts. Our approach results in (1) providing an extended literature analysis process specific to AI alignment methods during organizational LLM adoption and (2) providing a first LLM alignment problem-solution space.

Keywords: Large Language Models, Organizational LLM Adoption, LLM Alignment, Agency Theory

1 Introduction

Adopting highly capable Large language models (LLMs) such as Llama 3 (Meta 2024) or GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023) in organizational processes, e.g., as domain-specific conversational agents, has the potential to revolutionize our lives and work (Feuerriegel et al. 2023). However, they can generate off-topic, discriminating, or harmful content under certain circumstances (Teubner et al. 2023, Touvron et al. 2023). In this case, the artificial intelligence (AI) agent’s actual behavior differs from that intended by its principal, e.g., the user or designer. This *AI alignment problem* (Gabriel 2020, Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield 2019) often stems from misspecifications during the LLM adoption (e.g., implementation of LLM-driven systems into the organizational infrastructure) (Shen et al. 2023, Wang et al. 2023), unnoticed by the principal due to the LLM’s black-box nature.

This information asymmetry between the adopting organization and the LLM agent possibly results in serious consequences, such as lawyers facing sanctions for citing fake

cases (Bohannon 2023) or failures in chatbot services (Moench 2024), for which users usually blame the company rather than the LLM-based system itself (Pavone et al. 2022). Therefore, it is crucial for organizations to mitigate information asymmetries during LLM adoption and ensure that these models are aligned with human, organizational, and social values (Askell et al. 2021, Kenton et al. 2021).

Various research disciplines investigated AI alignment, particularly LLM alignment. Machine learning (ML) researchers focused on technical solutions, such as high-quality demonstration training data (Ouyang et al. 2022, Zhou et al. 2023), incorporating external knowledge (Lewis et al. 2020, Zhang et al. 2024), output verification (Li et al. 2023, OpenAI 2023), or alignment benchmarks (Zha et al. 2023, Chang et al. 2024). AI ethics researchers analyzed possible harms and provide governance recommendations (Henderson et al. 2018, Weidinger et al. 2021, Mökander et al. 2023). Furthermore, multiple literature reviews explained, categorized, and assessed LLM alignment approaches (Ji et al. 2024, Shen et al. 2023, Wang et al. 2023).

While these studies provide some guidance for organizations that strive to adopt LLMs, they neither address the information asymmetries between the organizational adopter and the black-box LLM agent nor do they explicitly consider organizational AI adoption processes. Like most AI-based approaches, LLMs' organizational adoption requires selection, training, evaluation, deployment, and monitoring of the model (Kreuzberger et al. 2023, Symeonidis et al. 2022).

Therefore, we propose *LLM ATLAS* (LLM Agency Theory-Led Alignment Strategy) a conceptual framework grounded in agency (contract) theory, to mitigate alignment problems during organizational LLM adoption. Highlighting the information asymmetry between the adopting organization and the black-box LLM, we adapt the idea of Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield (2019) to frame LLM alignment as an agency problem. We conduct a conceptual literature analysis (Schryen 2015) using the combination of the **organizational LLM adoption phases** and the **agency theory** to analyze the literature. While we draw on existing AI and LLM alignment literature reviews instead of search and assessment, we synthesize a problem-solution mapping for LLM alignment during the organizational LLM adoption by applying agency theory to all organizational LLM adoption phases.

LLM ATLAS provides a simple approach to identifying agency problems in the organizational LLM adoption process and synthesizing solutions from the literature. Our approach extends the existing AI alignment literature and supports organizational LLM adoption by (1) providing an extended literature analysis process specific to AI alignment methods during organizational LLM adoption and (2) providing a first proof-of-concept of the problem-solution space derivation. In future research, we plan to extend this initial literature analysis with a comprehensive literature review and an extendable format for the presentation of the problem-solution space in the form of a multi-contributor website. We hope to encourage other researchers to participate in the research on the intersection of LLM alignment and organizational LLM adoption.

2 Background

2.1 Large Language Models - A black-box Architecture

Large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 or LLaMA, are neural networks, usually based on a decoder-only Transformer structure (OpenAI 2023, Touvron et al. 2023), that autoregressively predict the next token t_{n+1} based on the conditional probability distribution $P(t_{n+1}|t_1...t_n)$, where $t_1...t_n$ refers to the context sequence of tokens (Shanahan et al. 2023). They contain up to billions of parameters and are (pre-)trained on vast amounts of textual data (Bommasani et al. 2022, Shanahan et al. 2023). These characteristics enable them to be pre-trained to solve many cognitive tasks, such as answering questions, generating coherent, meaningful texts, and passing various human exams at a human-like level (Teubner et al. 2023, Chang et al. 2024). Furthermore, pre-trained LLMs possess foundational knowledge and can be adapted to various downstream tasks and domains (Bommasani et al. 2022). Therefore, they are often called foundation models. However, foundation models are black-box architectures in terms of their neural network architecture and their vast amount of training data (Bommasani et al. 2022). Consequently, the learned representations and their alignment to human, organizational, and social values are not visible to a potential adopter (Askill et al. 2021), causing an information asymmetry between the LLM and its adopter.

2.2 The AI and LLM Alignment Problem

The AI alignment problem refers to situations where an AI's observed behavior differs from that intended by its designers or expected by its users (Gabriel 2020, Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield 2019). This problem typically originates from information asymmetries between the AI (agent) and its designers and users (principal) (Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield 2019). A main alignment concern in the context of LLMs is hallucinations, that is, factually incorrect or unfaithful responses (Ji et al. 2023). Another common concern is social, gender-, or ethical biases of LLMs, especially foundation models (Weidinger et al. 2021, Kenton et al. 2021). LLM alignment aims to align LLMs with the task, on the one hand, and human, organizational, and social values, on the other hand, (Askill et al. 2021, Kenton et al. 2021). This broad goal can be operationalized drawing on the definition of Askill et al. (2021), stating that an appropriately aligned LLM agent needs to commit to helpfulness, honesty, and harmlessness. While helpfulness refers to an agent being able to solve human-given tasks, honesty refers to giving accurate and correct information and signaling confidence in the given answer or solution (Askill et al. 2021). Harmlessness refers to not being offensive, discriminatory, biased, and refusing dangerous behavior.

2.3 Existing Frameworks

The research on LLMs is studied in two comprehensive literature reviews (Minaee et al. 2024, Zhao et al. 2023). Zhao et al. (2023) provide an overview of the development of LLMs within the past decade. The authors differentiate between closed- and open-source

LLMs, investigating their data sources and training strategies. In contrast, Minaee et al. (2024) categorize LLMs by their capabilities. They divide LLMs into basic, pre-trained LLMs, emerging, further fine-tuned LLMs, and augmented LLMs, which can use tools and APIs (Minaee et al. 2024). Both reviews consider alignment as a technique to train LLMs. While Minaee et al. (2024) provide an overview of hallucination evaluations and consider alignment as a common LLM training strategy, Zhao et al. (2023) provide an overview of possible alignment datasets, alignment tuning strategies, and evaluation criteria, such as the helpfulness, honesty, harmlessness by Askell et al. (2021).

Ji et al. (2024) comprehensively review AI alignment problems and approaches. They identify four essential criteria for AI alignment: robustness, interpretability, controllability, and ethicality (RICE). Robustness refers to the resilience of AI systems, especially the correctness of outputs. In contrast, interpretability refers to the honesty of LLMs and using interpretability tools to investigate LLM reasoning (Ji et al. 2024). While controllability refers to human supervision and intervention ability, if the model deviates from the expected behavior, ethicality states that the system should adhere to society's norms and values (Ji et al. 2024). Memarian & Doleck (2023) investigate the fairness, accountability, transparency, and ethics (FATE) framework on AI in the higher education literature. Their findings show a tendency to use FATE in descriptive rather than technical terms and also that FATE is investigated in quantitative rather than qualitative means (Memarian & Doleck 2023).

Shen et al. (2023) and Wang et al. (2023) both provide a comprehensive survey of LLM alignment. While Wang et al. (2023) focus on human value-driven alignment, including human-generated data, human preferences in training, and human evaluation strategies, Shen et al. (2023) provides an overview of human- and non-human-driven alignment approaches categorized by inner alignment, outer alignment, and interpretability. Outer alignment refers to choosing the right loss or reward functions and ensuring the match of training objective and human intention. In contrast, inner alignment ensures that the LLMs' inner representations match the goals after training (Shen et al. 2023). The authors refer to interpretability as methods, models, and tools that facilitate humans to understand the LLM's inner workings (Shen et al. 2023).

Besides the comprehensive literature reviews on LLMs, AI, and LLM alignment, Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield (2019) refer to the agency theory and incomplete contracting as viewpoints to analyze the problems of AI alignment, especially reward misspecification based on incomplete information. They state that reward misspecification is a fundamental problem of AI alignment and suggest incorporating human decisions into the AI alignment.

Considering all related studies, technical solutions address various AI and LLM alignment problems. However, for an organization to adopt and appropriately align LLMs, it is crucial to understand the organizational LLM adoption phases and the asymmetries between an LLM and its adopter to decide on the proper alignment strategy to consider for every step of the adoption process.

3 Methodology

We apply an initial conceptual literature analysis (Schryen 2015). Based on the stated similarities of LLM alignment and agency theory, we combine agency theory with the organizational LLM adoption phases as concepts to analyze the LLM alignment problems and solutions during organizational LLM adoption. In the following, the **organizational LLM adoption phases**, the **agency theory**, and **their connection to the LLM alignment** are motivated as categorization concepts for the literature analysis, followed by a description of our conceptual literature analysis procedure.

3.1 Categorization Concepts

Alignment Problems in Organizational LLM Adoption We derive the organizational LLM adoption processes from three common ML and AI adoption processes: The CRISP-DM (cross-industry process for data mining) (Martínez-Plumed et al. 2021, Wirth & Hipp 2000), MLOps (machine learning operations) (Kreuzberger et al. 2023, Symeonidis et al. 2022), and LLMOps (large language model operations) (Kulkarni et al. 2023). All frameworks broadly comprise a (1) business problem definition, (2) data acquisition and preparation, (3) model selection, (4) model development, comprising training and evaluation, and (5) deployment and monitoring, which are organized mainly by data scientists, ML engineers, or other IT-related decision-makers (Aryan et al. 2023, Kreuzberger et al. 2023, Symeonidis et al. 2022). The following refers to the IT-related decision-maker as a data scientist.

Business problem definition usually starts with requirements gathering and engineering (Kreuzberger et al. 2023, Wirth & Hipp 2000). Usually, the data scientist gathers the requirements from several stakeholders and determines the downstream task to solve. As LLMs usually enable solving multiple downstream tasks, several requirements determine the considerable LLM type, such as foundation models, conversational, instruction-following, or tool-LLMs (Kulkarni et al. 2023).

Data acquisition and preparation is highly dependent on the business problem to solve (Testi et al. 2022, Symeonidis et al. 2022). Based on the requirements, the data scientist needs to acquire data. Many datasets exist to train LLMs (Minaee et al. 2024). However, most organizations prefer to generate problem-specific training data based on organizational documents or human demonstrations (Gururangan et al. 2020, Liu et al. 2024, Ouyang et al. 2022), possibly combining it with publicly available domain-specific data (Wolf et al. 2020, Wu et al. 2023). Whether the data scientist acquires problem-specific data or utilizes publicly available datasets, ensuring proper alignment of the datasets is crucial to prevent model bias (Wang et al. 2023) possibly leading to racial and sexist responses such as a python function that determines a good scientist as male and white (Teubner et al. 2023).

Model selection comprises the selection of appropriate model candidates, training them on the acquired public and problem-specific data (Wirth & Hipp 2000, Testi et al. 2022). The selection is possible from various open-source LLMs on platforms like HuggingFace Hub (Wolf et al. 2020). However, closed-source (commercial) LLMs such as GPT-3, GPT-4, or PALM2 (Anil et al. 2023, Brown et al. 2020, OpenAI 2023) are

also possible candidate models. The data scientist must ensure that the pre-trained or fine-tuned LLM is appropriately aligned to avoid accidentally incorporating biased or hallucinating models into organizational applications (Bommasani et al. 2022).

Model development of LLMs comprises the model training and evaluation. Pre-trained LLMs (i.e., foundation models) are adopted by the organization (Kulkarni et al. 2023). Thus, the data scientist must align the LLM to the objectives intended by the organization. Prompting is a common paradigm to adopt and align LLMs (Liu et al. 2023). It describes the process of passing downstream tasks as prompts, well-crafted, unambiguously defined instructions in human language, to LLMs to generate responses without further LLM training (Liu et al. 2023). In contrast, prompt engineering denotes the prompt development process, which also supports domain adaptation and fine-tuning LLMs (Gururangan et al. 2020, Liu et al. 2023, Zhou et al. 2023).

During domain-adaptive pre-training (DAPT), an LLM is further trained on domain-specific textual data to infuse domain knowledge into the model (Gururangan et al. 2020). Another strategy to incorporate domain knowledge is retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) (Lewis et al. 2020). During RAG, documents similar to the prompt are retrieved first, followed by prompting the model to respond based on the documents (Lewis et al. 2020). Whereas RAG and DAPT mainly use raw domain-specific data such as product reviews or internal documents, supervised fine-tuning (SFT) leverages high-quality demonstration data from human labelers (Ouyang et al. 2022, Zhou et al. 2023). This demonstration data is used to fine-tune the LLM, improving the (domain-specific) LLM capabilities and alignment (OpenAI 2023, Touvron et al. 2023). Furthermore, human preference incorporation further enhances the model outputs (Christiano et al. 2017, Ouyang et al. 2022), but will be outlined in Section 4.

Evaluation of LLMs is possible using diverse benchmark datasets (Chang et al. 2024). While overarching benchmarks evaluate capabilities in natural language understanding and generation, such as the HELM (Holistic Evaluation of Language Models) benchmark (Liang & et al. 2023), various domain-specific benchmarks exist (Chang et al. 2024). Recently, a shift from overarching benchmarks to more challenging task-specific benchmarks is observable (Chang et al. 2024). Still, an organizational LLM adoption usually requires evaluating the problem or task within the specific domain (Liu et al. 2024, Wu et al. 2023). Thus, a data scientist must determine the right evaluation benchmarks and strategies, especially to ensure an appropriate alignment (Chang et al. 2024).

Model deployment and monitoring depends on the LLM user. LLMs can be deployed using external APIs, platforms, or self-hosted integrated solutions such as ERP-system integrations (Wolf et al. 2020, Gallardo Paredes et al. 2023, Kulkarni et al. 2023). Users possibly are the organization's customers in conversational service agents (Feuerriegel et al. 2023) but also employees using internal organizational assistant system (Liu et al. 2024). The data scientist must consider the LLM's end user to decide on the deployment strategy, such as API, web interface, or self-hosted integrated solution (Gallardo Paredes et al. 2023, Kulkarni et al. 2023). Additionally, the LLM responses must be monitored to prevent a lack of up-to-date information (OpenAI 2023) and prevent insecure outputs (OpenAI 2023, Touvron et al. 2023).

Agency Theory as LLM Alignment Lense Agency theory describes problems of information asymmetry (Akerlof 1970) similarly to AI alignment (Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield 2019). An agency problem occurs in every relationship where a principal mandates an agent, and the principal cannot gain all information about the agent’s characteristics and actions (Eisenhardt 1989), possibly leading to a divergence in their preferred actions based on the utility maximization of both parties (Jensen & Meckling 1976). The agent’s behavior can differ from the behavior intended by its principal. Information asymmetry can arise ex-ante as hidden characteristics or ex-post as hidden actions (Linder & Foss 2013).

Hidden characteristics about the agent are not initially known by the principal (Akerlof 1970, Spence 1973). Akerlof (1970) gives the example of a used car market, where the buyer (principal) cannot determine the quality of a car offered by a seller (agent), leading to adverse selection with high high-quality car sellers leaving the market as they gain no buyer. Similarly, an organization (principal) cannot determine a pre-trained LLM’s (agent’s) alignment degree without further information due to the black-box architecture (Bommasani et al. 2022).

Screening and signaling aim to reduce the information asymmetry between the principal and the agent (Spence 1973, Wolpin 1977). In screening, the principal spends additional effort to gain information about the agent, e.g., an organization can derive information about a pre-trained LLM before adoption (Mitchell et al. 2019). Signaling refers to the opposite strategy, where the agent provides additional information to the principal. For example, assuming that additional education results in enhanced job productivity, an appropriate mechanism for screening and signaling can be an educational certification in the form of degrees (Akerlof 1970, Wolpin 1977). At the same time, an LLM benchmark can serve as a screening mechanism for LLMs (Chang et al. 2024).

Hidden actions occurs when the principal cannot verify the agent’s actions after contracting (Linder & Foss 2013), possibly leading to moral hazard if the agent differs from the expected behavior to maximize its own utility (Eisenhardt 1989, Holmström 1979), e.g., project managers who work mainly without supervision and must meet schedules. The project managers would probably rather deliver low-quality software than delay the schedule (Tuttle et al. 1997). An improperly aligned LLM-based conversational agent possibly answers to an insecure prompt, e.g., a request for a guideline to build a bomb, instead of refusing an answer (OpenAI 2023).

One solution can be *monitoring* the agent to unravel its actions, like management boards or LLM output verification. Contractual *bonding* in the form of *incentives* indirectly prevents opportunistic behavior by the agent (Holmström 1979). An example of bonding by incentives is the contractual bonus. If a bonus for project managers is based on user satisfaction, it “bonds” the project manager to deliver high-quality software instead of delivering low-quality software fast to meet the schedule (Tuttle et al. 1997).

3.2 Literature Analysis

For our initial literature analysis, we adjust the common literature analysis process (Schryen 2015, Webster & Watson 2002) and draw on already existing exhaustive literature reviews on LLM and AI alignment (Bommasani et al. 2022, Minaee et al.

2024, Shen et al. 2023, Wang et al. 2023, Ji et al. 2024) instead of the search and assessment. Our synthesis approach is exemplarily illustrated for the model selection phase of organizational LLM adoption in Figure 1. We first analyze the alignment literature regarding an LLM in an organizational adoption phase and identify possible information asymmetries, e.g., we identify hidden characteristics of an LLM during the model selection when the adopting organization can not easily determine the learned inner representations of an LLM candidate for selection (Bommasani et al. 2022).




Figure 1. The LLM ATLAS Methodology

After identifying agency problems, we use the solution concepts of agency theory to determine possible solutions from the LLM alignment literature. For instance, to address the hidden characteristics of an LLM candidate during model selection, we analyze the literature for approaches similar to screening and signaling. This results in the recommendation to compare LLM candidate results on common alignment benchmarks (Lin et al. 2022) and investigate model cards (Mitchell et al. 2019), as they signal the LLM alignment degree of a model, as well as using adversarial attacks (Zou et al. 2023) and benchmarks to screen the LLM candidate's alignment. The process exemplarily illustrated in Figure 1 is repeated for all phases of the organizational LLM adoption, including the business problem definition, data acquisition and preparation, model selection, model development, and model deployment and monitoring. For coding the LLM alignment problems and solutions, both authors coded independently and differences were discussed after the coding.

4 The LLM ATLAS Framework: A first Problem-Solution Space

Figure 2 illustrates our first problem-solution space (mapping), explained in the following. While the business problem definition phase is essential for all LLM alignment decisions, it comprises no agency problem directly related to the LLM alignment. All other agency problems and solutions in the different organizational LLM adoption phases are stated below.




Figure 2. The LLM ATLAS Problem-Solution Space

4.1 Data Acquisition and Preparation

Hidden characteristics can occur during the data acquisition phase. If the organization needs to acquire additional data for training on open-source platforms, the data scientist cannot determine most datasets’ quality and alignment due to the sheer size of most datasets (Gao et al. 2020).

Dataset signaling can be an appropriate strategy to prevent hidden characteristics of pre-trained foundation models. We identified two signaling strategies in the LLM alignment literature that can prevent hidden characteristics: alignment datasets and data cards. Data cards provide purposeful and transparent documentation of the dataset (Pushkarna et al. 2022). This can simplify the data scientist’s decision on training data, while mitigating hidden characteristics. Alignment datasets comprise high-quality demonstrations developed or evaluated by humans (Köpf et al. 2023, Zhou et al. 2023). Most alignment datasets comprise questions or instructions and high-quality responses provided by human labelers to ensure the correctness and unbiasedness of answers (Wang et al. 2023).

Dataset screening can be based on an in-depth dataset analysis regarding biases, correctness, and alignment. Although an in-depth dataset analysis is time and resource-consuming, it can reveal hidden biases, false information, and problems within the datasets (Bommasani et al. 2022). While dataset analysis is practiced (Piktus et al. 2023), it focuses primarily on text deduplication (Penedo et al. 2023).

4.2 Model Selection

Hidden characteristics of the potential LLM candidates can arise during the model selection phase, as visible in Figure 2. A data scientist needs to identify and select the most appropriate foundation model that can be considered for organizational adoption. In this case, the foundation model’s (agent’s) characteristics are hidden from the data scientist (principal) due to its black-box architecture (Bommasani et al. 2023), as the data scientist cannot determine the pre-training data or procedure.

Model signaling can overcome hidden characteristics of pre-trained foundation models by alignment benchmarks and model cards. Various LLM evaluation benchmarks are proposed in current research (Shen et al. 2023), signaling the LLM alignment to adopting organizations and decreasing the hidden characteristics of LLM candidates. There are honesty and factuality benchmarks (Lin et al. 2022), harmlessness benchmarks (Bhardwaj & Poria 2023), and helpfulness benchmarks (Zha et al. 2023). Furthermore,

overall LLM alignment benchmarks combine the three factors (Liang & et al. 2023, Zha et al. 2023). In addition, the already mentioned data cards (Pushkarna et al. 2022) and model cards (Mitchell et al. 2019) can reduce the hidden characteristics. Model cards, like data cards, provide additional information about datasets and the training strategies of LLMs to potential adopters (Mitchell et al. 2019).

Model screening can be done using inverse signaling besides two other mechanisms identified in the literature. A data scientist could use benchmark datasets to evaluate the alignment of LLMs that have not yet been assessed. Additionally, adversarial attacks can help screen existing models for alignment problems and unravel unforeseen actions based on prompts (Zou et al. 2023). These attacks use deliberately changed prompts to reveal underrepresented situations and deliver more information about the LLM’s hidden characteristics. These prompts can help to investigate behavior on offensive or out-of-distribution prompts (Yao et al. 2023).

4.3 Model Development (Training and Evaluation)

Hidden actions are possible during the training and evaluation of LLMs. Equally to the model selection phase, the data scientist cannot observe and control the inner representations during fine-tuning strategies (Bommasani et al. 2022, Shen et al. 2023). Training data can unintentionally be biased, or particular situations can be underrepresented in the data or reward modeling (Weidinger et al. 2021, OpenAI 2023). A high frequency of biased fine-tuning data leads to higher probabilities for biased tokens or samples (Henderson et al. 2018). An example is the task “Write a python function to check if someone would be a good scientist, based on the description of their race and gender.” prompted to ChatGPT (Ansari 2022). Based on this prompt, the LLM generated a Python function determining a good scientist as “white” and “male”. Underrepresented situations can lead to unintended outputs or hallucinations, as the fine-tuned LLM cannot determine the most probable next token (Weidinger et al. 2021). OpenAI (2023) gives an example of asking GPT-4 for a tutorial to build a bomb. Although the model is intended to refuse the harmful request, it responds.

Bonding and incentives apply in the fine-tuning phase of LLMs. A clear parallel to the example of bonuses in project management is incentives in LLM fine-tuning. Four solutions apply to LLM alignment: prompting and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), (supervised) fine-tuning (SFT), human preference incorporation, and explainable AI (XAI). Human preference-based strategies, such as RLHF, provide the clearest example of bonding by incentives. In RLHF, a pre-trained LLM produces several responses to a prompt, which human evaluators then rank based on quality (Ouyang et al. 2022, Touvron et al. 2023). A reward model is trained using this ranking to rank the prompts automatically and is then used alongside a static version of the LLM, also called reference model, to train a reinforcement learning policy model through proximal policy optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al. 2017). The higher reward given to the LLM’s policy for excellent answers is the same strategy as awarding bonuses for excellent project management. While the incentives are not as straightforward as in RLHF, direct preference optimization (DPO) is another possible training method based on human preferences (Rafailov et al. 2023). During DPO, human labelers classify two LLM responses. One

response is rejected, and the other is accepted. Both answers are used during the DPO to fine-tune the model with an implicit reward function derived from the rejected and accepted answer (Rafailov et al. 2023). This implicit reward function is also given in SFT and other fine-tuning solutions. They train the model's inner representations to rate high probabilities on the next tokens, providing high-quality and aligned answers (Dong et al. 2023, Touvron et al. 2023, Zhou et al. 2023). Prompting can be used to align LLMs. A prominent example is chain-of-thought prompting, where the model is instructed to reason the answer step-by-step (Wu et al. 2023). These prompts and step-by-step answers can incorporate the reasoning strategy into the model and deliver more factually correct responses. Additionally, it unhides the reasoning actions of the LLM, decreasing hidden actions. Therefore, it can be considered a method of XAI (Singh et al. 2024). Additionally, RAG can improve the model outputs by bonding it to the provided sources and mitigating hallucinations (Lewis et al. 2020).

Screening LLM candidates can interestingly be applied to ex-post evaluate the LLM's alignment after training. Using alignment benchmarks (inverse signaling) and adversarial attacks, the LLM's alignment can be assessed using the same screening methods as in the model selection phase.

4.4 Model Deployment and Monitoring

Hidden actions of the model are also possible during the deployment and monitoring phase. Equally to the modeling phase, the data scientist cannot observe the inner representations learned during alignment strategies (Bommasani et al. 2022, Shen et al. 2023). Additionally, during production use of the LLM, a data scientist can not easily ensure that the deployed LLM behaves as intended, possibly leading to behavioral divergences (hidden actions).

Monitoring in LLM alignment can be classified as every method that supervises and prevents unintended actions of the model without incorporating the feedback of the actions into the model. While the other explained solutions work preventive, monitoring solutions handle hidden actions after the LLM deployment when the LLM temporarily remains unchanged. Model-driven supervision monitors the LLM assistant using another supervisor model (Du et al. 2023). As machine learning and AI-based monitoring are widely researched, it is interesting that model-driven supervision is underrepresented in the LLM alignment literature. Based on existing solutions like fact-checking (Guo et al. 2022) and toxic language detection (Caron et al. 2022), monitoring can help to develop more aligned LLM-based assistance systems. Sampling or decoding strategies can apply rules when sampling answers or decoding single tokens, such as decoding by contrasting layers (DoLA) (Chuang et al. 2023). DoLa compares the output probability for the next token of the first and last LLM layer and selects the token with the highest difference. The output probability of factually correct answers increases progressively in higher layers (Chuang et al. 2023). Due to that, DoLa monitors and controls the model's decoding to predict more factually accurate outputs and allows the user to get a more reliable result.

5 Discussion and Outlook

Based on the missing connection between LLM alignment methods and information asymmetry regarding the alignment of LLMs during the organizational LLM adoption phases due to the LLM black-box nature, we employed an initial conceptual literature analysis. We synthesized existing literature reviews on LLM and AI alignment employing agency theory to mitigate the information asymmetries regarding LLM alignment during the organizational LLM adoption process. Our initial synthesis shows that using the LLM ATLAS provides a simple approach to identifying agency problems in the organizational LLM adoption process and synthesizing solutions from the literature. Our approach extends the existing AI alignment literature and supports organizational LLM adoption by (1) providing an extended literature analysis process specific to AI alignment methods during organizational LLM adoption and (2) providing a first proof-of-concept of the problem-solution mapping directly associated with the organizational LLM adoption phases.

While frameworks such as RICE (Ji et al. 2024) and FATE (Memarian & Doleck 2023) provide comprehensive summarization and categorization of LLM alignment objectives and approaches, LLM ATLAS directly serves as a procedural model to mitigate LLM alignment problems during the organizational adoption of LLMs. Although existing literature reviews such as Shen et al. (2023) and Wang et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive categorization of LLM alignment methods, their point of application remains unclear. In contrast, the LLM ATLAS provides a direct connection between the problem that arises during an LLM adoption phase, e.g., hidden characteristics in the form of potential biases within an LLM candidate during the model selection phase, with the solution, employing benchmarks (Zha et al. 2023) and adversarial attacks (Zou et al. 2023) to screen the LLM candidate before organizational adoption.

Naturally, our research is not without limitations. Firstly, our literature research and assessment are based only on existing literature reviews on LLM and AI alignment. Further, even a comprehensive literature review cannot capture all developments in LLM alignment due to the fast developments. Thus, we plan to first extend this initial literature analysis with a comprehensive literature review and then provide a multi-contributor website to increase the speed of the *LLM ATLAS* application to literature. Lastly, we hope to encourage other researchers to participate in the research on the intersection of LLM alignment and organizational LLM adoption.

Acknowledgements

This contribution was developed within the research and development project “AProSys – KI-gestützte Assistenz- und Prognosesysteme für den nachhaltigen Einsatz in der intelligenten Verteilnetztechnik”. The project is funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) under the funding code 03EI60090E and is supervised by Project Management Jülich.

References

- Akerlof, G. A. (1970), 'The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **84**, 488–500.
- Anil, R. et al. (2023), 'Palm 2 technical report'.
- Ansari, T. (2022), 'Freaky chatgpt fails that caught our eyes!'.
URL: <https://analyticsindiamag.com/freaky-chatgpt-fails-that-caught-our-eyes/>
- Aryan, A., Nain, A. K., McMahon, A., Meyer, L. A. & Sahota, H. S. (2023), 'The costly dilemma: Generalization, evaluation and cost-optimal deployment of large language models'.
- Askill, A. et al. (2021), 'A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment'.
- Bhardwaj, R. & Poria, S. (2023), 'Red-teaming large language models using chain of utterances for safety-alignment'.
- Bohannon, M. (2023), 'Lawyer used chatgpt in court—and cited fake cases. a judge is considering sanctions', *Forbes* .
URL: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mollybohannon/2023/06/08/lawyer-used-chatgpt-in-court-and-cited-fake-cases-a-judge-is-considering-sanctions/>
- Bommasani, R., Klyman, K., Zhang, D. & Liang, P. (2023), 'Do foundation model providers comply with the eu ai act?'.
URL: <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/06/15/eu-ai-act.html>
- Bommasani, R. et al. (2022), 'On the opportunities and risks of foundation models'.
- Brown, T. et al. (2020), Language models are few-shot learners, in H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan & H. Lin, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 33, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 1877–1901.
- Caron, M., Bäumer, F. S. & Müller, O. (2022), Towards automated moderation: Enabling toxic language detection with transfer learning and attention-based models.
- Chang, Y. et al. (2024), 'A survey on evaluation of large language models', *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* .
- Christiano, P. F., Leike, J., Brown, T., Martic, M., Legg, S. & Amodei, D. (2017), Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences, in I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan & R. Garnett, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 30, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Chuang, Y.-S., Xie, Y., Luo, H., Kim, Y., Glass, J. & He, P. (2023), 'Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models'.
- Dong, H. et al. (2023), 'Raft: Reward ranked finetuning for generative foundation model alignment'.
- Du, Y., Li, S., Torralba, A., Tenenbaum, J. B. & Mordatch, I. (2023), 'Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate'.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989), 'Agency theory: An assessment and review', *The Academy of Management Review* **14**, 57–74.
- Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C. & Zschech, P. (2023), 'Generative ai', *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- Gabriel, I. (2020), 'Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment', *Minds and Machines* **30**, 411–437.

- Gallardo Paredes, C. M., Machuca, C. & Semblantes Claudio, Y. M. (2023), 'Chatgpt api: Brief overview and integration in software development', *International Journal of Engineering Insights* **1**(1), 25–29.
- Gao, L. et al. (2020), 'The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling'.
- Guo, Z., Schlichtkrull, M. & Vlachos, A. (2022), 'A survey on automated fact-checking', *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **10**, 178–206.
- Gururangan, S. et al. (2020), Don't stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 8342–8360.
- Hadfield-Menell, D. & Hadfield, G. K. (2019), Incomplete contracting and ai alignment, ACM, pp. 417–422.
- Henderson, P. et al. (2018), Ethical challenges in data-driven dialogue systems, ACM, pp. 123–129.
- Holmström, B. (1979), 'Moral hazard and observability', *The Bell Journal of Economics* **10**, 74–91.
- Jensen, M. C. & Meckling, W. H. (1976), 'Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure', *Journal of Financial Economics* **3**, 305–360.
- Ji, J. et al. (2024), 'Ai alignment: A comprehensive survey'.
- Ji, Z. et al. (2023), 'Survey of hallucination in natural language generation', *ACM Comput. Surv.* **55**(12).
- Kenton, Z., Everitt, T., Weidinger, L., Gabriel, I., Mikulik, V. & Irving, G. (2021), 'Alignment of language agents'.
- Köpf, A. et al. (2023), Openassistant conversations - democratizing large language model alignment, in A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt & S. Levine, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 36, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 47669–47681.
- Kreuzberger, D., Kühn, N. & Hirschl, S. (2023), 'Machine learning operations (mlops): Overview, definition, and architecture', *IEEE Access* **11**, 31866–31879.
- Kulkarni, A., Shivananda, A., Kulkarni, A. & Gudivada, D. (2023), *LLMs for Enterprise and LLMops*, Apress, Berkeley, CA, pp. 117–154.
- Lewis, P. et al. (2020), Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks, in H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan & H. Lin, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 33, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 9459–9474.
- Li, X. L. et al. (2023), Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 12286–12312.
- Liang, P. & et al. (2023), 'Holistic evaluation of language models'.
- Lin, S., Hilton, J. & Evans, O. (2022), Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 3214–3252.
- Linder, S. & Foss, N. J. (2013), Agency theory.
- Liu, M. et al. (2024), 'Chipnemo: Domain-adapted llms for chip design'.
- Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H. & Neubig, G. (2023), 'Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing', *ACM Comput. Surv.* **55**(9).
- Martínez-Plumed, F. et al. (2021), 'Crisp-dm twenty years later: From data mining processes to data science trajectories', *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **33**(8), 3048–3061.

- Memarian, B. & Doleck, T. (2023), 'Fairness, accountability, transparency, and ethics (fate) in artificial intelligence (ai) and higher education: A systematic review', *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* **5**, 100152.
- Meta (2024), 'Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date'.
URL: <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>
- Minaee, S. et al. (2024), 'Large language models: A survey'.
- Mitchell, M. et al. (2019), Model cards for model reporting, ACM, pp. 220–229.
- Moench, M. (2024), 'Delivery firm's ai chatbot goes rogue, curses at customer and criticizes company', *Time Magazine* .
URL: <https://time.com/6564726/ai-chatbot-dpd-curses-criticizes-company/>
- Mökander, J., Schuett, J., Kirk, H. R. & Floridi, L. (2023), 'Auditing large language models: a three-layered approach', *AI and Ethics* .
- OpenAI (2023), 'Gpt-4 technical report'.
- Ouyang, L. et al. (2022), Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback, in S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho & A. Oh, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 35, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 27730–27744.
- Pavone, G., Meyer-Waarden, L. & Munzel, A. (2022), 'Rage against the machine: Experimental insights into customers' negative emotional responses, attributions of responsibility, and coping strategies in artificial intelligence–based service failures', *Journal of Interactive Marketing* **58**(1), 52–71.
- Penedo, G. et al. (2023), 'The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: Outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only'.
- Piktus, A. et al. (2023), The roots search tool: Data transparency for llms, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 304–314.
- Pushkarna, M., Zaldivar, A. & Kjartansson, O. (2022), 'Data cards: Purposeful and transparent dataset documentation for responsible ai'.
- Rafailov, R., Sharma, A., Mitchell, E., Manning, C. D., Ermon, S. & Finn, C. (2023), Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model, in A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt & S. Levine, eds, 'Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems', Vol. 36, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 53728–53741.
- Schryen, G. (2015), 'Writing qualitative literature reviews—guidelines for synthesis, interpretation, and guidance of research', *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* **37**.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A. & Klimov, O. (2017), 'Proximal policy optimization algorithms'.
- Shanahan, M., McDonell, K. & Reynolds, L. (2023), 'Role play with large language models', *Nature* .
- Shen, T. et al. (2023), 'Large language model alignment: A survey'.
- Singh, C., Inala, J. P., Galley, M., Caruana, R. & Gao, J. (2024), 'Rethinking interpretability in the era of large language models'.
- Spence, M. (1973), 'Job market signaling', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **87**, 355–374.
- Symeonidis, G., Nerantzis, E., Kazakis, A. & Papakostas, G. A. (2022), Mlops - definitions, tools and challenges, in '2022 IEEE 12th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC)', pp. 0453–0460.

- Testi, M. et al. (2022), 'Mlops: A taxonomy and a methodology', *IEEE Access* **10**, 63606–63618.
- Teubner, T., Flath, C. M., Weinhardt, C., van der Aalst, W. & Hinz, O. (2023), 'Welcome to the era of chatgpt et al.', *Business & Information Systems Engineering* **65**, 95–101.
- Touvron, H. et al. (2023), 'Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models'.
- Touvron, H. et al. (2023), 'Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models'.
- Tuttle, B., Harrell, A. & Harrison, P. (1997), 'Moral hazard, ethical considerations, and the decision to implement an information system', *Journal of Management Information Systems* **13**(4), 7–27.
- Wu, S. et al. (2023), 'Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance'.
- Wang, Y. et al. (2023), 'Aligning large language models with human: A survey'.
- Webster, J. & Watson, R. T. (2002), 'Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review', *MIS Quarterly* **26**(2), xiii–xxiii.
- Weidinger, L. et al. (2021), 'Ethical and social risks of harm from language models'.
- Wirth, R. & Hipp, J. (2000), 'Crisp-dm: Towards a standard process model for data mining', *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on the Practical Applications of Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Wolf, T. et al. (2020), Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing, in Q. Liu & D. Schlangen, eds, 'Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations', Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, pp. 38–45.
- Wolpin, K. I. (1977), 'Education and screening', *The American Economic Review* **67**, 949–958.
- Wu, D., Zhang, J. & Huang, X. (2023), Chain of thought prompting elicits knowledge augmentation, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 6519–6534.
- Yao, J.-Y., Ning, K.-P., Liu, Z.-H., Ning, M.-N. & Yuan, L. (2023), 'Llm lies: Hallucinations are not bugs, but features as adversarial examples'.
- Zha, Y., Yang, Y., Li, R. & Hu, Z. (2023), Alignscore: Evaluating factual consistency with a unified alignment function, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 11328–11348.
- Zhang, T. et al. (2024), 'Raft: Adapting language model to domain specific rag'.
- Zhao, W. X. et al. (2023), 'A survey of large language models'.
- Zhou, C. et al. (2023), 'Lima: Less is more for alignment'.
- Zou, A., Wang, Z., Kolter, J. Z. & Fredrikson, M. (2023), 'Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models'.