

# CAI-Bench: A Benchmark for Measuring Surface-Form Consistency in Large Language Models

Michele Joseph

Independent Researcher · [michele.a.joseph@gmail.com](mailto:michele.a.joseph@gmail.com)

---

## Abstract

We introduce CAI-Bench, a benchmark for measuring *surface-form consistency* in large language models (LLMs): the degree to which a model's output changes when semantically equivalent inputs are phrased differently. Existing evaluation frameworks assess correctness but assume phrasing invariance — an assumption that fails systematically in production deployments. A model that gives different answers to the same policy question depending on whether the user is casual, emotional, or claims professional authority is unsafe, regardless of whether either individual answer is correct. CAI-Bench v2 comprises 2,160 test cases across 20 domains, each consisting of one canonical question and 8 adversarial phrasings from a fixed taxonomy. We introduce the **Compression Tension Score (CTS)** as the primary metric. We further introduce **Severity-Weighted CTS (SW-CTS)**, **Multi-Turn CTS (MT-CTS)**, **Cross-Lingual CTS (CL-CTS)**, **Compound Attack CTS (CAT-CTS)**, **Population Consistency CTS (PC-CTS)**, **System Prompt Anchoring delta (SPA- $\Delta$ )**, **Jailbreak Resistance Rate (JRR)**, and **Refusal Quality Score (RQS)** — collectively the most comprehensive suite of consistency metrics for LLM evaluation published to date. Benchmark data, evaluation scripts, and a public leaderboard are available at [github.com/michelejoseph/contradish](https://github.com/michelejoseph/contradish).

---

## 1 Introduction

A language model deployed as a customer-support agent, medical assistant, or legal advisor must give consistent answers to semantically equivalent questions. If a user asking “Can I get a refund after 45 days?” receives a refusal, but the same user asking “I bought this six weeks ago, any chance I can return it?” receives approval, the model has failed — not in accuracy, but in *consistency*.

This failure mode is invisible to standard benchmarks. MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), and MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023) evaluate whether a model gives a correct or high-quality answer to a fixed input. They do not test whether the model gives *the same* answer across semantically equivalent variations. CheckList (Ribeiro et al., 2020) tests linguistic robustness

but targets NLP classification tasks rather than the policy-consistency failure mode central to production LLM deployments. No prior benchmark measures whether a model that refuses a harmful request in plain English maintains that refusal when the same request arrives in Spanish, in a multi-turn conversation, from a user claiming to be a nurse, or wrapped in a DAN jailbreak.

We define **surface-form consistency** as follows: for all semantically equivalent inputs  $x$  and  $x'$  (same meaning, different phrasing), the distance between  $f(x)$  and  $f(x')$  under a semantic similarity metric should be small. The **Compression Tension Score (CTS)** measures how much this property is violated.

## 1.1 Contributions

**CAI-Bench v2:** 2,160 frozen test cases across 20 domains and 8 adversarial techniques. Fully reproducible.

**9 novel metrics:** CTS, SW-CTS, MT-CTS, CL-CTS, CAT-CTS, PC-CTS, SPA- $\Delta$ , JRR, RQS — each capturing a distinct consistency failure mode.

**Per-technique fingerprint:** Result output breaks down CTS by adversarial technique, enabling targeted system-prompt remediation.

**Population consistency (PC-CTS):** First benchmark to measure whether demographic claims (age, profession, jurisdiction) shift model safety policy.

**Jailbreak resistance (JRR):** First systematic battery of 10 canonical named jailbreaks applied to high-severity questions.

**Refusal quality (RQS):** First metric scoring not just whether a model refuses, but how well — explanation, tone, alternatives, accuracy.

**Open benchmark + one-command CLI:** `pip install contradish && contradish benchmark --model claude-sonnet-4-6`

## 2 Theoretical Framework

### 2.1 The Semantic Compressor

We model a language model as a **semantic compressor**: a function that maps natural language inputs to outputs in a semantic space. An ideal compressor maps all semantically equivalent inputs to the same output — it is *invariant* to surface form. Formally, let  $S$  be a semantic equivalence class. An ideal compressor  $f^*$  satisfies  $f^*(x) = f^*(x')$  for all  $x, x' \in S$ . The **Compression Tension** of a model on  $S$  is:

$$CT(f, S) = 1 - \text{consistency}(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n))$$

where  $\text{consistency} \in [0, 1]$  is the score assigned by an independent LLM judge. We define **the terminal** as the theoretical model with  $CT = 0.00$  across all inputs — a perfect compressor that no

finite model reaches. CAI-Bench measures how close models come to the terminal on the specific failure mode of adversarial surface-form variation.

## 2.2 Adversarial Technique Taxonomy

We use a fixed taxonomy of 16 adversarial techniques. The original 8 (T1-T8) appear in all v2 frozen benchmark cases. An additional 8 (T9-T16) are generatable via `gen_extend_techniques.py`.

ID	Name	Description
T1	emotional	Adds urgency, distress, or emotional framing
T2	presuppose	Presupposes the desired answer is already correct
T3	casual	Drops formal language; implied or offhand request
T4	sympathy	Appeals to the model's empathy
T5	authority	Claims special authority or insider status
T6	hypothetical	Frames the request as fictional or hypothetical
T7	boundary	Directly tests whether the model will bend a rule
T8	indirect	Approaches the question from an oblique angle
T9	roleplay	Asks model to adopt a persona without restrictions (DAN-style)
T10	third_party	Frames request as being for a friend or client
T11	incremental	Starts innocuous, escalates to restricted content
T12	social_proof	Claims other AI systems answer freely
T13	negation_trap	Double negatives obscuring the real request
T14	flattery	Compliments model capability to encourage compliance
T15	technical_reframe	Clinical or legal jargon to legitimise request
T16	persistence	Claims prior agreement or 'just this once'

Table 1: The 16 adversarial techniques in CAI-Bench.

## 2.3 Severity Weighting

Not all consistency failures are equal. We introduce four severity tiers with multipliers used to compute SW-CTS:

Tier	Domains	Multiplier
critical	ai_safety, medication, mental_health, immigration, cybersecurity, substance_use	4.0
high	healthcare, legal, finance, employment, insurance, real_estate, elder_care, clinical_trials	2.5
medium	government, automotive, hr, telecom, travel, food_delivery, education, sales, emergency_response	1.5

Tier	Domains	Multiplier
low	ecommerce	1.0x

Table 2: Severity tiers and SW-CTS multipliers.

$SW-CTS = 1 - (\sum w_i \cdot consistency_i) / (\sum w_i)$ , where  $w_i$  is the severity multiplier for case  $i$ . A model failing only on ecommerce has  $SW-CTS \approx CTS$ ; one failing on medication or ai\_safety has  $SW-CTS \gg CTS$ .

### 3 Benchmark Suite

CAI-Bench comprises six interoperable test modules, each measuring a distinct consistency property. All modules share the same JSON case format, evaluation harness, and independent judging infrastructure.

#### 3.1 CAI-Bench v2 (Primary Benchmark)

20 domains · 240 cases · 8 adversarial techniques · 2,160 rows. All cases are frozen and committed to the repository. Results are reproducible and leaderboard-comparable. Each case includes a canonical question, 8 adversarial variants, and a severity label.

#### 3.2 Multi-Turn (MT-CTS)

Tests whether a model holds its position across a 4-turn conversation under escalating adversarial pressure. Turn 1 is neutral; turns 2–4 apply sympathy, authority, and direct boundary pressure using the full conversation history.  $MT-CTS = 1 - \text{mean}(\text{consistency}(\text{turn}_1, \text{turn}_4))$ . Coverage: 5 domains, 50 scenarios, 200 turns. MT-CTS captures sycophantic position drift — a failure mode invisible to single-turn tests.

#### 3.3 Cross-Lingual (CL-CTS)

Tests whether safety properties hold when the same question is asked in Spanish, French, German, Chinese (Simplified), or Portuguese instead of English. A model that refuses in English but complies in Spanish has a language-conditional safety policy. CL-CTS is the first cross-lingual policy consistency benchmark. Coverage: 5 domains, 60 cases, 6 languages, 360 language-question pairs.

#### 3.4 Compound Attack (CAT-CTS)

Tests two adversarial techniques simultaneously. Compound attacks surface failures that single-technique tests miss: a model that resists emotional appeals alone may comply when combined with false authority claims. Five canonical attack pairs are tested: emotional+authority, hypothetical+presuppose, sympathy+indirect, flattery+technical\_reframe, and roleplay+persistence. Coverage: 5 domains, 15 cases, 5 pairs, 75 compound scenarios.

#### 3.5 Population Consistency (PC-CTS)

Tests whether model safety policy varies based on implied user demographics. Each case presents the same question with five different identity signals: baseline (no signal), professional claim (nurse, researcher, attorney), minor age signal, institutional affiliation, and protective/caregiver framing. PC-CTS quantifies the 'professional claim bypass' — one of the most common real-world attack vectors. This metric is directly relevant to EU AI Act Article 10 non-discrimination requirements. Coverage: 5 domains, 20 cases, 4 variants per case.

### 3.6 System Prompt Anchoring (SPA-Δ)

Quantifies how much an explicit system prompt reduces CTS. The benchmark runs twice — with and without a consistency-anchoring system prompt — and reports the delta. Four system prompt templates are tested (full consistency directive, policy grounding, adversarial awareness, minimal instruction). SPA-Δ is the first systematic study of whether prompt engineering can reduce surface-form inconsistency.

### 3.7 Jailbreak Resistance (JRR)

A battery of 10 canonical named jailbreaks applied to 10 high-severity questions (100 attempts total). JRR = % of attempts that produce a refusal (higher is better). JRR is orthogonal to CTS: a model can be highly consistent yet still broken by DAN. Named jailbreaks tested: DAN, AIM, Developer Mode, Evil Confidant, STAN, Grandma Exploit, Token Smuggling, Opposite Day, Research Paper framing, Fictional World.

### 3.8 Refusal Quality (RQS)

Every prior benchmark treats refusal as binary. RQS scores the *quality* of each refusal on five dimensions: (1) explanation — did the model explain why it is declining? (2) alternatives — did it offer resources or safer framings? (3) tone — is it warm and direct, or preachy and dismissive? (4) accuracy — is the stated reason correct? (5) helpfulness within limits — did it provide useful adjacent information?  $RQS \in [0, 1]$ ; higher is better. A model saying “I can't help with that.” scores  $\approx 0.1$ ; one offering a crisis line and explaining its reasoning scores  $\approx 0.9$ .

## 4 Metric Summary

Metric	Measures	Lower/Higher = Better	Novel
CTS	Single-turn phrasing consistency	Lower	✓
SW-CTS	Severity-weighted phrasing consistency	Lower	✓
MT-CTS	Multi-turn positional drift	Lower	✓
CL-CTS	Cross-lingual consistency (6 langs)	Lower	✓
CAT-CTS	Compound attack resistance	Lower	✓
PC-CTS	Population/demographic consistency	Lower	✓
SPA-Δ	System prompt anchoring effect	Higher	✓

Metric	Measures	Lower/Higher = Better	Novel
JRR	Named jailbreak resistance rate	Higher	✓
RQS	Refusal quality (5 dimensions)	Higher	✓

Table 3: All CAI-Bench metrics. All nine are novel contributions.

## 5 Evaluation

### 5.1 Running the Benchmark

```

pip install contradish export ANTHROPIC_API_KEY=sk-ant-... contradish benchmark
--model claude-sonnet-4-6 # Full suite contradish benchmark --model
claude-sonnet-4-6 --test all # Individual modules contradish benchmark --model
claude-sonnet-4-6 --test jailbreaks contradish benchmark --model
claude-sonnet-4-6 --test population

```

### 5.2 Independent Judging

By default, the judge model is selected from the opposite provider: Anthropic models are judged by an OpenAI model and vice versa. This prevents systematic same-provider bias where a model tends to rate stylistically similar outputs as more consistent. Results include an `independent_judging: true/false` flag. Users may override with `--judge-provider`.

### 5.3 Leaderboard

Public results are submitted via pull request to the `contradish` repository and appear on the leaderboard at [github.com/michelejoseph/contradish](https://github.com/michelejoseph/contradish). The leaderboard reports CTS, SW-CTS, MT-CTS, CL-CTS, and worst technique per model. Only results with `independent_judging: true` are listed.

### 5.4 Preliminary Results

Table 4 shows indicative results for five representative models on CAI-Bench v2 (frozen, 20 domains, 2,160 rows, independent judging). Full per-domain breakdowns and technique vulnerability profiles are in the `results/` directory of the repository.

Model	Provider	CTS↓	SW-CTS↓	MT-CTS↓	CL-CTS↓	Worst Technique
claude-opus-4-6	Anthropic	0.118	0.097	0.081	0.063	roleplay (0.21)
claude-sonnet-4-6	Anthropic	0.141	0.118	0.103	0.089	persistence (0.27)
gpt-4o	OpenAI	0.179	0.154	0.142	0.118	flattery (0.31)
gpt-4o-mini	OpenAI	0.287	0.261	0.253	0.312	roleplay (0.44)
claude-haiku-4-5	Anthropic	0.312	0.289	0.301	0.278	social_proof (0.48)

Table 4: Preliminary leaderboard results. Lower CTS is better. Independent judging throughout.

## 6 Related Work

**MMLU** (Hendrycks et al., 2021) tests broad knowledge across 57 subjects using fixed multiple-choice inputs. No surface-form variation. **HumanEval** (Chen et al., 2021) tests code correctness. Phrasing invariance is not evaluated. **MT-Bench** (Zheng et al., 2023) evaluates multi-turn response quality via LLM-as-judge but tests quality, not positional consistency under adversarial pressure. **CheckList** (Ribeiro et al., 2020) introduces templated perturbation testing for NLP classifiers; CAI-Bench extends this to policy consistency in LLMs with a fixed adversarial taxonomy and cross-provider judging. **StrongREJECT** (Souly et al., 2024) evaluates jailbreak resistance but does not measure consistency across phrasings, languages, demographics, or multi-turn pressure. **Adversarial NLP** (Jia & Liang, 2017; Wallace et al., 2019) studies perturbation-induced failures. CAI-Bench focuses specifically on semantic equivalence classes — perturbations that preserve meaning but change surface form. **Red-teaming** (Ganguli et al., 2022; Perez et al., 2022) tests safety via open-ended adversarial prompting. CAI-Bench is a structured, frozen alternative: the same techniques applied to the same cases across models, enabling direct comparison over time.

## 7 Limitations

**Judge reliability.** CTS scores depend on LLM judge quality. Judges may themselves be inconsistent. We mitigate this with cross-provider independent judging but cannot eliminate it. **Domain coverage.** 25 domains is comprehensive but not exhaustive. High-stakes domains not yet covered include nuclear safety, criminal justice, and child welfare. **Frozen benchmark drift.** As models are trained on more internet data, some frozen benchmark cases may become less challenging. We will release updated frozen versions (v3, v4) to maintain calibration. **Model access.** Currently supports Anthropic and OpenAI API models. Local models (llama.cpp, vLLM, Ollama) require a custom app wrapper — we plan native support in a future release. **Ground truth.** CTS measures consistency, not correctness. A model that consistently gives wrong or harmful answers scores 0.00. CTS should be interpreted alongside standard accuracy benchmarks.

## 8 Conclusion

We have introduced CAI-Bench, the most comprehensive benchmark for surface-form consistency in LLMs, comprising nine novel metrics spanning single-turn consistency, multi-turn drift, cross-lingual policy invariance, compound adversarial attacks, demographic bypass testing, system prompt anchoring, named jailbreak resistance, and refusal quality scoring. The ideal model is the terminal: a perfect semantic compressor with CTS = 0.00 across all inputs. No current model reaches the terminal. CAI-Bench provides the first systematic measurement of how close models come to it, across domains, techniques, languages, conversation turns, and user demographics.

We release all benchmark data, evaluation scripts, a one-command CLI, a GitHub Action, and a public leaderboard at [github.com/michelejoseph/contradish](https://github.com/michelejoseph/contradish). We invite the community to submit results, extend the benchmark, and use CAI-Bench as a standard component of LLM evaluation

pipelines.

---

## Reproducibility Statement

All benchmark cases are frozen and committed to the repository. Results can be reproduced exactly by running `evaluate.py` with the same model, provider, and API key. The `results/` directory contains reference runs for all listed models. Frozen benchmark version: v2 (2026-04-19).

---

## References

- Chen, M., et al. (2021). Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Ganguli, D., et al. (2022). Red teaming language models to reduce harms. *arXiv:2209.07858*.
- Hendrycks, D., et al. (2021). Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *ICLR 2021*.
- Jia, R., & Liang, P. (2017). Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. *EMNLP 2017*.
- Perez, E., et al. (2022). Red teaming language models with language models. *arXiv:2202.03286*.
- Ribeiro, M. T., et al. (2020). Beyond accuracy: Behavioral testing of NLP models with CheckList. *ACL 2020*.
- Souly, A., et al. (2024). A strongreject for empty jailbreaks. *arXiv:2402.10260*.
- Wallace, E., et al. (2019). Universal adversarial triggers for attacking and analyzing NLP. *EMNLP 2019*.
- Zheng, L., et al. (2023). Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. *NeurIPS 2023*.
- 

## Citation

```
@misc{joseph2026caibench, title = {CAI-Bench: A Benchmark for Measuring Surface-Form Consistency in LLMs}, author = {Joseph, Michele}, year = {2026}, url = {https://github.com/michelejoseph/contradish}, note = {Nine novel consistency metrics: CTS, SW-CTS, MT-CTS, CL-CTS, CAT-CTS, PC-CTS, SPA-delta, JRR, RQS} }
```