

# InstructAlign: High-and-Low Resource Language Alignment via Continual Crosslingual Instruction Tuning

Samuel Cahyawijaya, Holy Lovenia, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, Pascale Fung

Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong

scahyawijaya@connect.ust.hk

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) that are tuned with instructions have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in various tasks and languages. However, their ability to generalize to underrepresented languages is limited due to the scarcity of available data. Additionally, directly adapting new languages to instruction-tuned LLMs can result in catastrophic forgetting, which leads to the loss of multitasking ability. To address this issue, we propose InstructAlign which uses continual crosslingual instruction tuning to enable LLMs to align new unseen languages with previously learned high-resource languages. Our results demonstrate the effectiveness of InstructAlign in enabling the model to understand low-resource languages with limited parallel data while preventing catastrophic forgetting. Our work contributes to the advancement of language adaptation methods, particularly for adapting instruction-tuned LLMs to underrepresented languages. Our code is released on <https://github.com/HLTCHKUST/InstructAlign>.

## 1 Introduction

Instruction-tuned Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated their generalization capability of solving various tasks expressed in natural language without requiring any explicit training on the corresponding task (Brown et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022; Rae et al., 2022; Thoppilan et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Scao et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022). This generalization capability is further improved with various tuning methods, such as instruction tuning (Sanh et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022a; Chung et al., 2022; Muennighoff et al., 2022). However, LLMs and their instruction-tuned variants face difficulties in generalizing across various languages, leading to a disparity in performances (Xue et al., 2021; Gehrmann et al., 2022; Scao et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Yong et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2023;

Kabra et al., 2023). Moreover, these models have limited language coverage, mostly in the Indo-European language family as indicated in Figure 1. For instance, BLOOM (Scao et al., 2022) and BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022), the largest community-driven open-source multilingual pre-trained LLM, only covers 46 languages during pre-training, excluding some high-resource languages with hundreds of millions of speakers, such as German, Japanese, Korean, and Russian, as well as many more low-resource languages with millions of speakers, such as Serbian, Finnish, Amharic, Sinhala, Lao, Javanese, Sundanese, etc.

Expanding the language repertoire of LLMs is essential for promoting inclusivity and diversity in Natural Language Processing (NLP) technology, particularly for languages that are underrepresented and low-resource. Recent studies, including Wilie et al. (2020); Cahyawijaya et al. (2021); Aji et al. (2022); Adelani et al. (2021, 2022); Kakwani et al. (2020); Kumar et al. (2022); Ebrahimi et al. (2022); Adilazuarda et al. (2022); Cahyawijaya et al. (2023b,a); Song et al. (2023) have emphasized the importance of this issue. To address this concern, previous research (Yong et al., 2022) has demonstrated that continual pretraining (Chau et al., 2020; Muller et al., 2021; Ebrahimi and Kann, 2021) and parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) methods, like MAD-X (Pfeiffer et al., 2020) and (IA)<sup>3</sup> (Liu et al., 2022), can be utilized to swiftly integrate the knowledge of unseen languages into LLMs using monolingual corpora of the new languages by conducting masked language modeling (MLM) (Devlin et al., 2019). However, these methods become ineffective when applied directly to instruction-tuned LLMs due to catastrophic forgetting (French, 1993) which prevents them from solving general natural language tasks after the language adaptation phase (Yong et al., 2022). Moreover, adapter-based approaches, such as MAD-X (Pfeiffer et al., 2020), result in the loss of multi-




Figure 1: The number of languages supported by existing LLMs (green region) per language family<sup>1</sup>. Existing LLMs only support a fraction of languages around the globe. Most of them are within the Indo-European language family, while most other language families are underrepresented or even unexplored.

lingual inference capability due to modularity (Adilazuarda et al., 2023).

To solve this problem, we introduce InstructAlign, a continual instruction tuning framework to seamlessly align newly adapted low-resource languages (L2) with the pre-trained high-resource languages (L1) of an instruction-tuned LLM through crosslingual alignment. InstructAlign compels LLMs to perform crosslingual alignments between pre-trained and novel languages through alignment-based crosslingual instruction tuning, enabling the model to grasp L2 with only a limited amount of parallel data. To further prevent catastrophic forgetting, InstructAlign incorporates experience replay (Chaudhry et al., 2019b; Rolnick et al., 2019), which adds past data during the instruction tuning.

In summary, our work presents the following major contributions:

- We propose InstructAlign, a crosslingual continual instruction tuning method that allows instruction-tuned LLMs to understand L2 with minimal degradation on L1 while retaining their zero-shot prompting capability.
- We propose alignment-based crosslingual instruction tuning, which enables LLMs to align L2 to L1 allowing better L2 acquisition with only a limited amount of parallel data.
- We evaluate the effectiveness of InstructAlign on Indonesian local languages datasets, and demonstrate that InstructAlign can significantly improve the performance on L2 by 5-10% F1 while maintaining the original per-

formance on L1 and its multitask capability.

- We analyze the correlation between the performance of L2 and other unseen languages (L3), suggesting the zero-shot generalization of InstructAlign to L3 particularly when the languages are related.<sup>2</sup>

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Instruction Tuning in LLMs

Early works (Wei et al., 2022a; Chung et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2022) have shown the effectiveness of instruction-tuned LLMs, which significantly improves the zero-shot generalization capability over the corresponding non-instruction-tuned LLMs by a huge margin. Since then, various instruction-tuned LLMs have been released, including T0 (Sanh et al., 2022), InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022), FLAN-GPT (Wei et al., 2022a), FLAN-T5 (Chung et al., 2022), FLAN-PaLM (Chung et al., 2022), mT0 (Muennighoff et al., 2022), BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022), Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), etc. However, most of these models are only pre-trained on a single or few languages, with the exception of mT0 and BLOOMZ which are adapted from models pre-trained on 101 languages, i.e., mT5 (Xue et al., 2021), and pre-trained on 46 languages, i.e., BLOOM (Scao et al., 2022), respectively. In this work, we utilize BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022) as the backbone in of InstructAlign.

<sup>2</sup>We use the terms L1, L2, and L3 to denote the first, second, and third language acquisition (Hammarberg, 2001, 2014). In our context, L1 denotes the pre-trained languages in LLMs, L2 denotes the newly adapted languages, and L3 denotes other languages that have not been seen after tuning with InstructAlign, which are only used in the evaluation.

<sup>1</sup>We gather the language and language family information from URIEL (Littell et al., 2017; Malaviya et al., 2017).




Figure 2: Example of the alignment-based crosslingual instruction prompts, i.e., bilingual denoising (TLM), machine translation (MT), and crosslingual semantic similarity (XSS) in comparison to the monolingual denoising (MLM).

## 2.2 Crosslingual Alignment

Crosslingual alignment is a widely explored concept that allows language models (LMs) to align, commonly at a word/sentence level, across different languages. Crosslingual alignment allows the models to perform crosslingual inference without requiring any tuning on the target task. Fung (1997, 1998) a bilingual lexicon extraction method through word-to-word alignment from word relation matrix. Fung and Cheung (2004) introduces a bilingual lexicon and parallel sentence extraction method from aligning sentences from non-parallel data via Bootstrapping and EM. Lample et al. (2018b); Cao et al. (2020) introduces align bilingual lexicon method that requires no parallel data by performing embedding alignment across different languages. This is then utilized to deal with unsupervised machine translation Lample et al. (2018a). A crosslingual pre-training objective for building LMs, namely translation language modeling (TLM) (Conneau and Lample, 2019), has also been explored which enforces token-level alignment between languages allowing the model to learn aligned representation across multiple languages. In this work, we perform crosslingual alignment through instruction by introducing bilingual denoising instruction which is equivalent to token-level alignment in TLM, and translation instruction which serves as sentence-level alignment across different languages.

## 2.3 Continual Learning for Language Models

Continual learning is a paradigm to learn various tasks gradually allowing the model to acquire new knowledge over time (Delange et al., 2021). Using

a naive fine-tuning approach for continual learning causes the model to suffer from catastrophic forgetting (CF) (French, 1999). Therefore, various methods have been introduced to prevent CF. Regularization-based methods (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2018; Aljundi et al., 2018) add a regularization in the loss function to prevent the model to be updated into a direction that causes CF. Replay-based methods (Rolnick et al., 2019; Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017; Chaudhry et al., 2019a) add samples from previous tasks to be incorporated during learning the new task, which helps regularize the model to avoid CF. Parameter isolation methods (Aljundi et al., 2017; Serrà et al., 2018; Mallya and Lazebnik, 2018) prevent the model from CF by learning new tasks using a new set of parameters while keeping the other parameters frozen during fine-tuning. In this work, we apply experience replay (Rolnick et al., 2019), which is a simple replay-based method by adding tasks from previously learned languages when training new languages without any loss modification.

## 3 Methodology

InstructAlign is a continual crosslingual instruction tuning framework that allows the model to align high-to-low resource languages through instruction tuning. InstructAlign introduces two components, i.e., 1) crosslingual alignment through instruction tuning, which allows the model to align pre-trained languages with the new languages through crosslingual alignment, and 2) continual instruction tuning, which applies continual learning into instruction tuning to avoid catastrophic forgetting.

Dataset	Task	#Lang.	#L1	#L2	#L3	#Test
NusaX	Sentiment Analysis	12	2	7	3	4400
NusaTranslation	Sentiment Analysis	11+1	1	3	8	10400
NusaParagraph	Emotion Recognition	10	0	4	6	5700
NusaParagraph	Topic Classification	10	0	4	6	6250

Table 1: Statistics of all datasets used in the experiments. **#Lang.** denotes the #languages in each dataset.

### 3.1 Crosslingual Alignment through Instruction

Given a parallel text pair  $(x, y)$  from two languages, the goal of crosslingual alignment is to learn a mapping function  $f(\cdot)$  parameterized by  $\theta$  such that  $f(x, \theta) = f(y, \theta)$ . The  $(x, y)$  text pair commonly comes in the form of a word pair or a phrase pair (Lample et al., 2018b,a), but in theory, it should be able to generalize to a sentence pair or even a paragraph. With the goal of aligning two parallel texts from two different languages, InstructAlign defines a set of alignment-based crosslingual instructions by exploiting multiple alignment objectives that can be achieved through a parallel sentence. Specifically, we explore three different objectives, i.e., bilingual denoising / translation language modeling (**TLM**), machine translation (**MT**) and crosslingual semantic similarity (**XSS**).

We first define a parallel sentence pair  $(X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}, Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\})$ , where  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  denote the  $i$ -th token of the sentence  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. For bilingual denoising (**TLM**), we model the problem as a conditional denoising task. InstructAlign first applies a perturbation function  $g^{tlm}(\cdot)$  to the target sentence  $Y$  that masks out part of the tokens in order to get  $\tilde{Y} = g^{tlm}(Y)$ . The pair  $(X, \tilde{Y})$  is then used to generate a prompt using  $h(X, \tilde{Y}, T^{tlm})$ , resulting in an input-output data pair for prompting  $(h^{tlm}(X, \tilde{Y}, T^{tlm}), Y)$ , where  $h^{tlm}(\cdot)$  denotes a bilingual denoising prompt generator and  $T^{tlm}$  the prompt template.

For the machine translation (**MT**) objective, we define the input-output data pair as  $(h^{mt}(X, T^{mt}), Y)$ , where  $h^{mt}(\cdot)$  denotes a machine translation prompt generator and  $T^{mt}$  denotes a machine translation prompt template. As for the crosslingual semantic similarity (**XSS**) objective, we model the problem as an inference task to predict whether two parallel sentences  $X$  and  $Y$  are semantically similar. Specifically, we define the input-output data pair as  $(h^{xss}(X, Y, T^{xss}), l)$  where  $h^{xss}(\cdot)$  is a semantic similarity prompt gen-

erator,  $T^{xss}$  denotes a semantic similarity prompt template and  $l$  the binary label regarding whether the sentences are semantically related or not. The examples of the crosslingual alignment objectives are shown in Figure 2.

### 3.2 Continual Instruction Tuning through Experience Replay

Within the continual instruction tuning phase of InstructAlign, experience replay (Rolnick et al., 2019) is employed to minimize the catastrophic forgetting problem. mhamdi-et-al-2023-cross Experience replay works by storing some of the past training data and using them during the optimization step of the new data. These past data serve as a regularization term that prevents the models to forget past knowledge when learning from the new data. The past data is collected from the instruction tuning data used when developing the corresponding instruction-tuned model, which are all supervised.

During the continual instruction tuning, InstructAlign takes only  $r$  randomly sampled data from the past instruction tuning data. The sampled past data is used during continual-instruction tuning with a balanced sampling between the past data and new data. More formally, we define a past dataset  $\mathcal{D}^{old}$  and a newly generated crosslingual instruction dataset  $\mathcal{D}^{cli}$ . On each optimization step, InstructAlign samples data in an interleaving manner resulting in a batch data  $\mathcal{B} = \{s_1^{\mathcal{D}^{old}}, s_1^{\mathcal{D}^{cli}}, s_2^{\mathcal{D}^{old}}, s_2^{\mathcal{D}^{cli}}, \dots, s_n^{\mathcal{D}^{old}}, s_n^{\mathcal{D}^{cli}}\}$  with  $2n$  samples, where  $s_i^{\mathcal{D}^{old}}$  and  $s_i^{\mathcal{D}^{cli}}$  denote a sample that is taken randomly from  $\mathcal{D}^{old}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{cli}$ , respectively. Since the samples are all supervised, the optimization can be done by optimizing the cross-entropy loss (Good, 1952) from all the samples in the batch.

## 4 Experiment Setting

### 4.1 Continual-Instruction Tuning Dataset

During the InstructAlign tuning, we train the model on 7 L2 languages from Malayo-Polynesian lan-

Method	L2 Weighted F1 (%)					L1 Weighted F1 (%)			
	NT-S	NX-S	NP-E	NP-T	Avg.	NX-S En	NX-S Id	NT-S Id	Avg.
<b>BLOOM &amp; BLOOMZ Baseline</b>									
<b>BLOOM-560M</b>	57.62	21.80	<u>2.80</u>	5.34	21.89	29.26	21.13	61.47	37.29
<b>BLOOM-1.1B</b>	59.18	22.02	<u>2.80</u>	5.35	22.34	22.02	22.54	58.81	34.46
<b>BLOOM-3B</b>	44.98	21.21	<u>2.80</u>	5.35	18.59	24.03	21.17	58.30	34.50
<b>BLOOMZ-560M</b>	46.83	33.73	<u>2.80</u>	5.35	22.18	58.24	55.59	69.81	61.21
<b>BLOOMZ-1.1B</b>	64.01	41.50	<u>2.80</u>	5.35	28.42	57.41	58.58	80.40	65.46
<b>BLOOMZ-3B</b>	<u>69.41</u>	<u>45.82</u>	<u>2.80</u>	<u>5.73</u>	<u>30.94</u>	<u>62.65</u>	<b>63.21</b>	<b>81.38</b>	<b>69.08</b>
<b>InstructAlign-Tuned BLOOMZ-560M</b>									
<b>MLM r=100k</b>	66.51	42.51	2.80	5.52	29.34	60.97	<u>60.01</u>	70.93	63.97
<b>MT Obj. r=100k</b>	66.42	41.20	2.82	5.40	28.96	60.96	58.09	64.18	61.08
<b>TLM r=100k</b>	<u>69.24</u>	42.91	<u>2.87</u>	5.43	30.11	61.65	58.52	<u>72.40</u>	<u>64.19</u>
<b>XSS r=100k</b>	68.10	<u>45.83</u>	2.84	<u>5.53</u>	<u>30.58</u>	<u>61.89</u>	58.22	71.27	63.79
<b>InstructAlign-Tuned BLOOMZ-1.1B</b>									
<b>MLM r=100k</b>	71.46	45.73	2.84	5.49	31.38	61.30	<u>60.83</u>	73.25	65.13
<b>MT Obj. r=100k</b>	66.15	44.93	2.84	5.40	29.91	61.68	59.18	65.28	62.05
<b>TLM r=100k</b>	70.29	<b>49.25</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>6.34</b>	32.26	63.26	60.54	74.66	66.15
<b>XSS r=100k</b>	<b>71.89</b>	49.23	3.08	5.81	<b>32.50</b>	<b>63.78</b>	59.34	<u>75.74</u>	<u>66.29</u>

Table 2: Evaluation results of InstructAlign with BLOOMZ-560M and BLOOMZ-1.1B backbones. Compared to BLOOM and BLOOMZ baselines, All InstructAlign-tuned models improve the zero-shot crosslingual performance in L2 while also retaining the performance in L1.

guage family group, i.e., Sundanese (sun), Javanese (jav), Balinese (ban), Minangkabau (min), Buginese (bug), Acehnese (ace), and Banjarese (bjn). For the L1 languages, we utilize English (eng), as English covers the majority of the pre-training data in most LLMs, and Indonesian (ind), as the language is closely related to the target L2 languages. For the dataset, we utilize FLORES-200 dataset (Goyal et al., 2021; Team et al., 2022) as the source of the parallel data where we combine the validation and the test set producing a total of  $\sim 2000$  parallel sentences for each language pair which is orders of magnitude smaller compared the data size used for language adaptation used in prior works (Pfeiffer et al., 2020; Cahyawijaya et al., 2021; Alabi et al., 2022; Yong et al., 2022).

## 4.2 Models & Hyperparameters

We utilize BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022) as the backbone model. Specifically, we explore InstructAlign on two model size, i.e., BLOOMZ-560M and BLOOMZ-1.1B. For InstructAlign, we evaluate three crosslingual alignment objectives, i.e., TLM, XSS, and MT. The list of prompts used for instruction tuning is described in Appendix A. We use English prompts in all experiments. We

run all experiments with an initial learning rate of  $1e-5$  with a linear learning rate decay and a batch size of 32 for a fixed optimization step of 50,000. We run the InstructAlign on a single RTX3090 GPU (24GB) using the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) and mixed-precision training (Micikevicius et al., 2018). We use a fixed number of replay samples  $r = 100000$ .

## 4.3 Evaluation Setting

After tuning with InstructAlign, the model is then evaluated in a zero-shot crosslingual inference setting, in which the model has never seen the task on the target languages, but might have seen the task on other seen languages. To retrieve the classification label, we compute the joint probability of the prompt with each label in the dataset and pick the label which prompt the highest joint probability. We consider 3 different prompts in English for the zero-shot inference and take the average accuracy and weighted F1 scores as the evaluation metrics. The list of the prompts used in our evaluation is shown in Appendix A. We use a single RTX1080Ti GPU (11GB) to run the evaluation for all models. To reduce the memory bottleneck during inference, we run the evaluations using 8-bit inference via




Figure 3: Average performance of various models across different model scales on the L1 and L2 languages subsets of the NT-S and NX-S datasets.

LLM.int8() (Dettmers et al., 2022). We provide the performance comparison between 8-bit and 32-bit evaluation in Appendix B.

**Zero-Shot Evaluation Datasets** For evaluating the effectiveness of InstructAlign, we utilize four multilingual Indonesian local languages datasets, i.e., the sentiment analysis task from NusaX (NX-S) (Winata et al., 2022), the sentiment analysis task from NusaTranslation (NT-S) (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a), the topic classification task from NusaParagraph (NP-T) (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a), and the paragraph-level emotion recognition task from NusaParagraph (NP-E) (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a). The detailed per-dataset statistics are shown in Table 1. NusaX covers 12 languages including 2 L1 languages: English (eng) and Indonesian (ind), 7 L2 languages: Acehnese (ace), Balinese (ban), Buginese (bug), Banjarese (ban), Javanese (jav), Minangkabau (min), and Sundanese (sun), and 3 L3 languages: Toba Batak (bbc), Madurese (mad), and Ngaju (nij). While NusaTranslation covers 11 languages, which includes 3 L2 languages: Javanese (jav), Sundanese (sun), and Minangkabau (min), and 8 L3 languages: Ambon (abs), Batak (btk), Betawi (bew), Bima (bhp), Madurese (mad), Makassarere (mak), Musi (mui), and Rejang (rej). NusaParagraph covers 10 languages, which includes 4 L2 languages: Sundanese, Javanese (jav), Minangkabau (min), and, and 6 L3 languages: Batak (btk), Betawi (bew), Madurese (mad), Makassarere (mak), Musi (mui), Rejang (rej). To expand the evaluation dataset for L1, we add the Indonesian sentiment analysis data from IndoLEM (Koto et al., 2020)<sup>3</sup> as the Indone-

<sup>3</sup>The source translation data of NusaTranslation

Method	L2	L1
<i>Baselines</i>		
Random	40.28	30.88
Majority	32.34	21.17
BLOOMZ-560M	37.66	<b>61.21</b>
<i>Single Objective</i>		
Monolingual Denoising (MLM)	36.71	53.14
Machine Translation (MT)	35.43	47.95
Bilingual Denoising (TLM)	45.48	53.28
Crosslingual Semantic Similarity (XSS)	44.55	54.05
<i>Multi Objectives</i>		
MLM + MT	40.09	47.67
TLM + MT	42.93	48.75
XSS + MT	43.32	50.66
MLM + TLM	43.46	53.16
MLM + XSS	42.82	53.90
TLM + XSS	<b>45.83</b>	<b>54.01</b>

Table 3: Averaged Weighted F1 scores from various InstructAlign objectives in the NT-S and NX-S datasets. We use BLOOMZ-560M as the backbone.

sian (ind) subset of NT-S. More details about each dataset can be found in Appendix C.

#### 4.4 Baselines

For our baselines, we conduct zero-shot prompting using four different sizes of BLOOMZ, i.e., BLOOMZ-560M, BLOOMZ-1.1B, BLOOMZ-1.7B, and BLOOMZ-3B, without any additional language adaptation phase. In addition, to compare the effectiveness of the crosslingual alignment, we add continual instruction-tuned baselines that incorporate only monolingual denoising instructions, which is equivalent to performing language adaptation using MLM (Devlin et al., 2019).

## 5 Experiment Result

**Effectiveness of InstructAlign** Table 2 shows the result of InstructAlign on both L1 and L2 languages. InstructAlign-tuned models with MT, TLM, and XSS objectives significantly outperform the comparable-sized BLOOM and BLOOMZ baselines on L2 languages while retaining a similar performance level as the original BLOOMZ models on L1 languages. Surprisingly, InstructAlign with MLM objectives is also effective, yielding a similar performance on L2 languages compared to the crosslingual objectives. In § 6.1, we show that this improvement only occurs after combining the MLM objective with the experience replay, demonstrating the importance of continual instruc-




Figure 4:  $\Delta$  weighted F1 of InstructAlign tuned BLOOMZ-560M with (left) TLM and (right) XSS objectives various continual instruction-tuned approaches compared to the original BLOOMZ-560M baseline. Negative scores indicate that the model performs worse compared to the baseline.

tion tuning during language adaption. While in the NusaParagraph emotion recognition (NP-E) and topic classification (NP-T) tasks, all baselines yield a very low score, suggesting that the ability to solve long text classification tasks do not emerge on that scale (Wei et al., 2022b). Interestingly, InstructAlign tuned models indicate consistent improvement, although marginal, on these tasks, demonstrating that an early emergence in L2 languages is possible through InstructAlign.

**Effect of Model Scaling** As shown in Figure 3, we observe that scaling increases the zero-shot performance of BLOOMZ on both L1 and L2, but the same does not apply to BLOOM, suggesting the benefit of instruction tuning for better generalization to unseen tasks and languages. Moreover, applying InstructAlign on larger BLOOMZ results in higher overall zero-shot performance on both L1 and L2. Specifically, InstructAlign-tuned models with 1.1 billion parameters yield  $\sim 2\%$  higher performance compared to the 560 million parameters InstructAlign-tuned models and even perform competitively with the original 3 billion parameters BLOOMZ model. This suggests that the scaling law of language models (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022) also apply after InstructAlign where larger-sized models tend to perform better compared to their smaller counterpart. Detailed experiment results are described in Appendix D.

## 6 Analysis and Discussion

### 6.1 Alignment Objectives

To better understand the effectiveness of each alignment objective, we conduct experiments by using a single objective, i.e., monolingual denois-

ing (MLM), machine translation (MT), bilingual denoising (TLM) and crosslingual semantic similarity (XSS), as well as multi objectives on various combinations. We also test zero-shot prompting without any additional language adaption phase as a baseline for comparison. Note that continual instruction tuning through experience replay is not applied ( $r=0$ ) in these experiments since we focused on the effect of alignment objectives.

As shown in Table 3, BLOOMZ 560M zero-shot performs better than the random baseline on L1 while achieving a lower score on L2, showing that BLOOMZ 560M is unable to be directly applied to these L2 languages. For InstructAlign with a single objective, similar to the result from prior work (Yong et al., 2022), applying the MLM objective decays the performance of the model. Similarly, using MT objective also decreases the performance of both L1 and L2. Nevertheless, as shown in Table 2, this problem can be mitigated by applying continual learning. On the other hand, both TLM and XSS help improve the model on L2, indicating that these objectives are effective for aligning L1 and L2 languages. Additionally, the performance in L1 languages is also retained the most when using the TLM and XSS objectives.

When combining multiple objectives during InstructAlign, we observe the highest score when combining TLM and XSS. Interestingly, adding the MLM and MT objectives during InstructAlign consistently yields a lower score compared to the single TLM and XSS objectives for both L2 and L1 languages. These facts suggest that cross-lingual objectives such as XSS and TLM, are effective for learning new languages through cross-lingual instruction-tuning with limited data.




Figure 5: Correlation of  $\Delta$  weighted F1 from the InstructAlign tuned models to the corresponding BLOOMZ backbone models on novel and unseen languages.  $R$  denotes the Pearson correlation coefficient.

## 6.2 Continual Instruction Tuning

In order to assess the effectiveness of continual instruction tuning through experience replay, we conduct an experiment exploring the effect of different numbers of replay samples  $r$  used in continual instruction tuning. Specifically, we explore 4 settings of  $r$ , i.e.,  $r = [0, 1000, 10000, 100000]$ . Figure 4 shows the performance of the InstructAlign tuned models across different ranges of replay examples  $r$ . When using no experience replay ( $r=0$ ), the performance of the **pre-trained** languages drops significantly, and even further, the performances on the **novel** languages also drop which suggests that the multitask prompting capability for both of these methods are degraded (Yong et al., 2022). When  $r$  increases, a much smaller performance degradation is observed on the **L1** languages. Interestingly, the performance on **novel** languages also improved when  $r$  increases which in the end, increases the performance of the model across all languages. These facts demonstrate the importance of the experience replays for avoiding catastrophic forgetting in continual instruction tuning.

## 6.3 Impact of InstructAlign on L3 Languages

We further assess the impact of aligning **L2** languages through InstructAlign to other unseen Indonesian languages which are within the same language family group (**L3**). To assess the effectiveness of transferability from the **L2** languages to **L3** languages, we compute the correlation coefficient between  $\Delta$  weighted F1 score on the **L2** and **L3** languages for each model compared to the cor-

eng	61.65	59.89	64.26	60.78
ind	56.50	58.22	63.54	59.34
ace	41.78	45.83	52.22	45.53
ban	41.36	45.45	51.35	39.57
bjn	48.15	53.08	58.19	52.68
bug	31.19	36.24	41.87	36.15
jav	48.89	52.24	59.48	49.83
min	44.12	50.54	59.67	50.61
sun	44.90	47.20	56.99	46.45
bbc	33.78	33.81	38.26	35.27
mad	41.51	40.99	48.11	42.40
nij	37.90	41.08	48.01	43.39
	IA (TLM) (560M)	IA (XSS) (560M)	IA (TLM) (1.1B)	IA (XSS) (1.1B)

Figure 6: Per language results of InstructAlign tuned models in NusaX. **red** denotes **L1** languages. **teal** denotes **L2** languages. **purple** denotes **L3** languages

responding baseline, and measure the Pearson’s correlation coefficient (Rodgers and Nicewander, 1988; Freedman et al., 2007).

As shown in Figure 5, the correlation coefficient between the performance improvement of **L2** and **L3** languages is high with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.96. This indicates the effectiveness of the InstructAlign approach for not only adapting to **L2** languages but also to related **L3** languages. Nevertheless, the improvement for unseen language still depends on the language distances as shown in Figure 6, where performance on Toba Batak (bbc) and Buginese (bug) yield much lower scores compares the other languages. This result aligns with the analysis from NusaX (Winata et al., 2022) which shows that the performances of Buginese (bug) and Toba Batak (bbc) are the lowest for both the multitask and zero-shot crosslingual settings due to the relatively low vocabulary overlapping compared to other languages in NusaX. This suggests that by performing , the model can also understand unseen languages that are related to the novel-adapted language, indicating the generalization of the crosslingual transfer from pre-trained languages to novel and unseen languages

## 6.4 Conclusion

In this work, we address the challenge of increasing the language coverage of instruction-tuned LLMs by introducing a crosslingual continual instruction tuning method, InstructAlign. We demonstrate that InstructAlign allows an instruction-tuned LLM to effectively learn novel languages through



alignment-based crosslingual instruction tuning objectives while retaining the existing multitask and multilingual abilities. Based on our experiment results on four Indonesian local languages datasets, InstructAlign effectively improves the understanding of novel Indonesian local languages, improving the language understanding performance on novel languages by  $\sim 5\text{-}10\%$  weighted F1 score and also demonstrates a better forward transfer performance to other unseen Indonesian local languages by a significant margin. In addition, we analyze various objectives of InstructAlign and demonstrate the effectiveness of alignment-based crosslingual instruction tuning objectives compared to the traditional masked language modeling (MLM) for learning novel languages with a limited amount of data. Our work contributes to the advancement of language adaptation methods for instruction-tuned LLMs, especially for underrepresented languages.

## 7 Limitation and Future Works

### 7.1 Other Model Architectures

Despite the effectiveness of InstructAlign on BLOOMZ, its effectiveness has not been explored for different model architectures such as encoder-decoder or other model architectures. Due to the limited computing budget, we can only run the InstructAlign experiment on a decoder-only model, i.e., BLOOMZ. We encourage future works to explore the experiment in other model architectures.

### 7.2 Scaling to Larger LLMs

As described in §5, we hypothesize that InstructAlign-tuned models follow the scaling laws of language models (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022). Nevertheless, we can only empirically show this scaling effect of InstructAlign in BLOOMZ-560M and BLOOMZ-1.1B due to the limited computing budget. We expect future works to expand the exploration to larger-scale models.

### 7.3 Other Continual Learning Methods

In terms of continual learning methods, we only explore a single approach, i.e., experience replay (Rolnick et al., 2019), due to the efficient memory requirement of this method. Further analysis and examination of other potential continual learning approaches, such as A-GEM (Chaudhry et al., 2019a) and EWC (Liu et al., 2018), is another potential research direction to be explored in future works.

## 7.4 Underrepresented Languages from Other Language Family

There are many other underrepresented languages such as indigenous languages of the Americas (Ebrahimi et al., 2022), African (Adelani et al., 2021, 2022), Indic (Kakwani et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2022), Austronesian (Winata et al., 2022; Cahyawijaya et al., 2023b), and many others all around the world. In this work, we only explore InstructAlign for Malayo-Polynesian language family group under the Austronesian language family, specifically for Indonesian local languages. For future work, we are eager to explore the generalization of InstructAlign and other language adaptation methods on other underrepresented and low-resource languages.

## Ethical Consideration

Our work highlights the importance of inclusivity in LLM technology for underrepresented and extremely low-resource languages. During our study, we are well aware of the ethical responsibility associated with language research and the potential impact it can have on communities. Our ultimate goal is to promote linguistic diversity and contribute to a more inclusive NLP landscape. We encourage further collaboration and engagement with underrepresented and low-resource language communities to ensure that their voices are heard and their needs are addressed in future language technology development. We remain committed to the principles of ethical research, diversity, inclusivity, and fairness, striving to mitigate biases and promote social good through our work in the field of NLP.

## 8 Acknowledgements

We thank Bryan Wilie and Yong Zheng Xin for the fruitful discussions and suggestions. This work has been partially funded by PhD Fellowship Award, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology; and PF20-43679 Hong Kong PhD Fellowship Scheme, Research Grant Council, Hong Kong.

## References

- David Adelani, Graham Neubig, Sebastian Ruder, Shruti Rijhwani, Michael Beukman, Chester Palen-Michel, Constantine Lignos, Jesujoba Alabi, Shamsuddeen Muhammad, Peter Nabende, Cheikh M. Bamba Dione, Andiswa Bukula, Rooweither Mabuya, Bonaventure F. P. Dossou, Blessing Sibanda, Happy Buzaaba, Jonathan Mukiibi, Godson Kalipe, Derguene Mbaye, Amelia Taylor, Fatoumata Kaboré, Chris Chinenye Emezue, Anuoluwapo Aremu, Perez Ogayo, Catherine Gitau, Edwin Munkoh-Buabeng, Victoire Memdjokam Koagne, Allahsera Auguste Tapo, Tebogo Macucwa, Vukosi Mavate, Mboning Tchiazé Elvis, Tajuddeen Gwadabe, Tosin Adewumi, Orevaghene Ahia, Joyce Nakatumba-Nabende, Neo Lerato Mokono, Ignatius Ezeani, Chiamaka Chukwunke, Mofetoluwa Oluwaseun Adeyemi, Gilles Quentin Hacheme, Idris Abdulmumin, Odunayo Ogundepo, Oreen Yousuf, Tatiana Moteu, and Dietrich Klakow. 2022. [MasakhaNER 2.0: Africa-centric transfer learning for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4488–4508, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Jade Abbott, Graham Neubig, Daniel D’souza, Julia Kreutzer, Constantine Lignos, Chester Palen-Michel, Happy Buzaaba, Shruti Rijhwani, Sebastian Ruder, Stephen Mayhew, Israel Abebe Azime, Shamsuddeen H. Muhammad, Chris Chinenye Emezue, Joyce Nakatumba-Nabende, Perez Ogayo, Aremu Anuoluwapo, Catherine Gitau, Derguene Mbaye, Jesujoba Alabi, Seid Muhie Yimam, Tajuddeen Rabiu Gwadabe, Ignatius Ezeani, Rubungo Andre Niyongabo, Jonathan Mukiibi, Verah Otiende, Iroro Orife, Davis David, Samba Ngom, Tosin Adewumi, Paul Rayson, Mofetoluwa Adeyemi, Gerald Muriuki, Emmanuel Anebi, Chiamaka Chukwunke, Nkiruka Odu, Eric Peter Wairagala, Samuel Oyerinde, Clemencia Siro, Tobius Saul Bateesa, Temilola Oloyede, Yvonne Wambui, Victor Akinode, Deborah Nabagereka, Maurice Katusiime, Ayodele Awokoya, Mouhamadane MBOUP, Dibora Gebreyohannes, Henok Tilaye, Kelechi Nwaike, Degaga Wolde, Abdoulaye Faye, Blessing Sibanda, Orevaghene Ahia, Bonaventure F. P. Dossou, Kelechi Ogueji, Thierno Ibrahima DIOP, Abdoulaye Diallo, Adewale Akinfaderin, Tendai Marengereke, and Salomey Osei. 2021. [MasakhaNER: Named Entity Recognition for African Languages](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1116–1131.
- Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Samuel Cahyawijaya, and Ayu Purwarianti. 2023. [The obscure limitation of modular multilingual language models](#).
- Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Genta Indra Winata, Pascale Fung, and Ayu Purwarianti. 2022. [IndoRobusta: Towards robustness against diverse code-mixed Indonesian local languages](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Scaling Up Multilingual Evaluation*, pages 25–34, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alham Fikri Aji, Genta Indra Winata, Fajri Koto, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Ade Romadhony, Rahmad Mahendra, Kemal Kurniawan, David Moeljadi, Radityo Eko Prasajo, Timothy Baldwin, Jey Han Lau, and Sebastian Ruder. 2022. [One country, 700+ languages: NLP challenges for underrepresented languages and dialects in Indonesia](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7226–7249, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jesujoba O. Alabi, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Marius Mosbach, and Dietrich Klakow. 2022. [Adapting pre-trained language models to African languages via multilingual adaptive fine-tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 4336–4349, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Rahaf Aljundi, Francesca Babiloni, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Marcus Rohrbach, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2018. [Memory aware synapses: Learning what \(not\) to forget](#). In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2018*, pages 144–161. Springer International Publishing.
- Rahaf Aljundi, Punarjay Chakravarty, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2017. [Expert gate: Lifelong learning with a network of experts](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE.
- Akari Asai, Sneha Kudugunta, Xinyan Velocity Yu, Terra Blevins, Hila Gonen, Machel Reid, Yulia Tsvetkov, Sebastian Ruder, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Buffet: Benchmarking large language models for few-shot cross-lingual transfer](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Samuel Cahyawijaya, Fajri Koto Holy Lovenia, Dea Adhista, Emmanuel Dave, Sarah Oktavianti, Salsabil Maulana Akbar, Jhonson Lee, Nur Shadiq, Tjeng Wawan Cenggoro, Hanung Linuwih, Bryan Wilie, Galih Pradipta Muridan, Alham Fikri Aji, Genta Indra Winata, David Moeljadi, Ayu Purwarianti, and Pascale Fung. 2023a. [Nusawrites: Constructing high-quality corpora for underrepresented](#)

- and extremely low-resource languages. Anonymous preprint under review.
- Samuel Cahyawijaya, Holy Lovenia, Alham Fikri Aji, Genta Indra Winata, Bryan Wilie, Rahmad Mahendra, Christian Wibisono, Ade Romadhony, Karissa Vincentio, Fajri Koto, Jennifer Santoso, David Moeljadi, Cahya Wirawan, Frederikus Hudi, Ivan Halim Parmonangan, Ika Alfina, Muhammad Satrio Wicaksono, Ilham Firdausi Putra, Samsul Rahmadani, Yulianti Oenang, Ali Akbar Septiandri, James Jaya, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Arie Ardiyanti Suryani, Rifki Afina Putri, Dan Su, Keith Stevens, Made Nindyatama Nityasya, Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Ryan Ignatius, Ryandito Diandaru, Tiezheng Yu, Vito Ghifari, Wenliang Dai, Yan Xu, Dyah Damapuspita, Cuk Tho, Ichwanul Muslim Karo Karo, Tirana Noor Fatyanosa, Ziwei Ji, Pascale Fung, Graham Neubig, Timothy Baldwin, Sebastian Ruder, Herry Sujaini, Sakriani Sakti, and Ayu Purwarianti. 2023b. [Nusacrowd: Open source initiative for indonesian nlp resources](#).
- Samuel Cahyawijaya, Genta Indra Winata, Bryan Wilie, Karissa Vincentio, Xiaohong Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Sebastian Ruder, Zhi Yuan Lim, Syafri Bahar, Masayu Khodra, Ayu Purwarianti, and Pascale Fung. 2021. [IndoNLG: Benchmark and resources for evaluating Indonesian natural language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8875–8898, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Steven Cao, Nikita Kitaev, and Dan Klein. 2020. [Multilingual alignment of contextual word representations](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ethan C. Chau, Lucy H. Lin, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. [Parsing with multilingual BERT, a small corpus, and a small treebank](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1324–1334, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Marcus Rohrbach, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2019a. [Efficient lifelong learning with a-gem](#). In *ICLR*.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marcus Rohrbach, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, Puneet K. Dokania, Philip H. S. Torr, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2019b. [On tiny episodic memories in continual learning](#).
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pilla, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. [Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways](#).
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2022. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#).
- Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. *Cross-Lingual Language Model Pretraining*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- Matthias Delange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Ales Leonardis, Greg Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2021. [A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks](#). *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–1.
- Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Younes Belkada, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Llm.int8\(\): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale](#).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abteen Ebrahimi and Katharina Kann. 2021. [How to adapt your pretrained multilingual model to 1600 languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4555–4567, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abteen Ebrahimi, Manuel Mager, Arturo Oncevay, Vishrav Chaudhary, Luis Chiruzzo, Angela Fan, John Ortega, Ricardo Ramos, Annette Rios, Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz, Gustavo Giménez-Lugo, Elisabeth Mager, Graham Neubig, Alexis Palmer, Rolando

- Coto-Solano, Thang Vu, and Katharina Kann. 2022. [AmericasNLI: Evaluating zero-shot natural language understanding of pretrained multilingual models in truly low-resource languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6279–6299, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Freedman, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 2007. *Statistics (international student edition)*. Pisani, R. Purves, 4th edn. WW Norton & Company, New York.
- R French. 1999. [Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks](#). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3(4):128–135.
- Robert M. French. 1993. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: Can it be predicted, can it be prevented? In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'93*, page 1176–1177, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Pascale Fung. 1997. [Finding terminology translations from non-parallel corpora](#). In *Fifth Workshop on Very Large Corpora, VLC 1997, Beijing, China and Hong Kong, August 18 and August 20, 1997*.
- Pascale Fung. 1998. [A statistical view on bilingual lexicon extraction: From parallel corpora to non-parallel corpora](#). In *Machine Translation and the Information Soup, Third Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas, AMTA '98, Langhorne, PA, USA, October 28-31, 1998, Proceedings*, volume 1529 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–17. Springer.
- Pascale Fung and Percy Cheung. 2004. [Mining very-non-parallel corpora: Parallel sentence and lexicon extraction via bootstrapping and E](#). In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2004, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL, held in conjunction with ACL 2004, 25-26 July 2004, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 57–63. ACL.
- Sebastian Gehrmann, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Abinaya Mahendiran, Alex Wang, Alexandros Papangelis, Aman Madaan, Angelina Mcmillan-major, Anna Shvets, Ashish Upadhyay, Bernd Bohnet, Bingsheng Yao, Bryan Wilie, Chandra Bhagavatula, Chaobin You, Craig Thomson, Cristina Garbacea, Dakuo Wang, Daniel Deutsch, Deyi Xiong, Di Jin, Dimitra Gkatzia, Dragomir Radev, Elizabeth Clark, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Filip Ginter, Genta Indra Winata, Hendrik Strobelt, Hiroaki Hayashi, Jekaterina Novikova, Jenna Kanerva, Jenny Chim, Jiawei Zhou, Jordan Clive, Joshua Maynez, João Sedoc, Juraj Juraska, Kaustubh Dhole, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Laura Perez Beltrachini, Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Lewis Tunstall, Li Zhang, Mahim Pushkarna, Mathias Creutz, Michael White, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Moussa Kamal Eddine, Nico Daheim, Nishant Subramani, Ondrej Dusek, Paul Pu Liang, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Qi Zhu, Ratish Puduppully, Reno Kriz, Rifat Shahriyar, Ronald Cardenas, Saad Mahamood, Salomey Osei, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Sanja Štajner, Sebastien Montella, Shailza Jolly, Simon Mille, Tahmid Hasan, Tianhao Shen, Tosin Adewumi, Vikas Raunak, Vipul Raheja, Vitaly Nikolaev, Vivian Tsai, Yacine Jernite, Ying Xu, Yisi Sang, Yixin Liu, and Yufang Hou. 2022. [GEMv2: Multilingual NLG benchmarking in a single line of code](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 266–281, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- I. J. Good. 1952. [Rational decisions](#). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 14(1):107–114.
- Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzmán, and Angela Fan. 2021. The flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation.
- Björn Hammarberg. 2001. [Chapter 2. roles of I1 and I2 in I3 production and acquisition](#). In *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition*, pages 21–41. Multilingual Matters.
- Björn Hammarberg. 2014. [1. problems in defining the concepts of I1, I2 and I3](#). In *Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Contexts*, pages 3–18. Multilingual Matters.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katherine Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Oriol Vinyals, Jack William Rae, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Arfinda Imania, Abdurrahman, Samuel Cahyawijaya, and Ayu Purwarianti. 2018. [Aspect detection and sentiment classification using deep neural network for Indonesian aspect-based sentiment analysis](#). In *2018 International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP)*, pages 62–67.
- Anubha Kabra, Emmy Liu, Simran Khanuja, Alham Fikri Aji, Genta Winata, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Anuoluwapo Aremu, Perez Ogayo, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [Multi-lingual and multi-cultural figurative language understanding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 8269–8284, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Divyanshu Kakwani, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Satish Golla, Gokul N.C., Avik Bhattacharyya, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2020. [IndicNLP Suite: Monolingual corpora, evaluation benchmarks and pre-trained multilingual language models for Indian languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4948–4961, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling laws for neural language models](#).
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A. Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Demis Hassabis, Claudia Clopath, Dharshan Kumaran, and Raia Hadsell. 2017. [Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526.
- Fajri Koto, Afshin Rahimi, Jey Han Lau, and Timothy Baldwin. 2020. [IndoLEM and IndoBERT: A benchmark dataset and pre-trained language model for Indonesian NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 757–770, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Aman Kumar, Himani Shrotriya, Prachi Sahu, Amogh Mishra, Raj Dabre, Ratish Puduppully, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2022. [IndicNLG benchmark: Multilingual datasets for diverse NLG tasks in Indic languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5363–5394, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2018a. [Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Hervé Jégou. 2018b. [Word translation without parallel data](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Patrick Littell, David R Mortensen, Ke Lin, Katherine Kairis, Carlisle Turner, and Lori Levin. 2017. [Uriel and lang2vec: Representing languages as typological, geographical, and phylogenetic vectors](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, volume 2, pages 8–14.
- Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Muqeeth Mohammed, Jay Mohhta, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin Raffel. 2022. [Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Xialei Liu, Marc Masana, Luis Herranz, Joost Van de Weijer, Antonio M. López, and Andrew D. Bagdanov. 2018. [Rotate your networks: Better weight consolidation and less catastrophic forgetting](#). In *2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 2262–2268.
- David Lopez-Paz and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2017. [Gradient episodic memory for continual learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, page 6470–6479, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rahmad Mahendra, Alham Fikri Aji, Samuel Louvan, Fahrurrozi Rahman, and Clara Vania. 2021. [IndoNLI: A natural language inference dataset for Indonesian](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10511–10527, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaitanya Malaviya, Graham Neubig, and Patrick Littell. 2017. [Learning language representations for typology prediction](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Arun Mallya and Svetlana Lazebnik. 2018. [Packnet: Adding multiple tasks to a single network by iterative pruning](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7765–7773.
- Paulius Micikevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory Diamos, Erich Elsen, David Garcia, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, and Hao Wu. 2018. [Mixed precision training](#).
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailley Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. 2022. [Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning](#).
- Benjamin Muller, Antonios Anastasopoulos, Benoît Sagot, and Djamé Seddah. 2021. [When being unseen from mBERT is just the beginning: Handling new languages with multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 448–462, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang,

- Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#).
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebastian Ruder. 2020. [MAD-X: An Adapter-Based Framework for Multi-Task Cross-Lingual Transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7654–7673, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ayu Purwarianti and Ida Ayu Putu Ari Crisdayanti. 2019. [Improving bi-lstm performance for indonesian sentiment analysis using paragraph vector](#). In *2019 International Conference of Advanced Informatics: Concepts, Theory and Applications (ICAICTA)*, pages 1–5.
- Oddy Virgantara Putra, Fathin Muhammad Wasman, Triana Harmini, and Shoffin Nahwa Utama. 2020. [Sundanese twitter dataset for emotion classification](#). In *2020 International Conference on Computer Engineering, Network, and Intelligent Multimedia (CENIM)*, pages 391–395.
- Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, Eliza Rutherford, Tom Hennigan, Jacob Menick, Albin Cassirer, Richard Powell, George van den Driessche, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Mari-beth Rauh, Po-Sen Huang, Amelia Glaese, Johannes Welbl, Sumanth Dathathri, Saffron Huang, Jonathan Uesato, John Mellor, Irina Higgins, Antonia Creswell, Nat McAleese, Amy Wu, Erich Elsen, Siddhant Jayakumar, Elena Buchatskaya, David Budden, Esme Sutherland, Karen Simonyan, Michela Paganini, Laurent Sifre, Lena Martens, Xiang Lorraine Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Aida Nematzadeh, Elena Gribovskaya, Domenic Donato, Angeliki Lazaridou, Arthur Mensch, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Nikolai Grigorev, Doug Fritz, Thibault Sotiaux, Mantas Pajarskas, Toby Pohlen, Zhitao Gong, Daniel Toyama, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Yujia Li, Tayfun Terzi, Vladimir Mikulik, Igor Babuschkin, Aidan Clark, Diego de Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Chris Jones, James Bradbury, Matthew Johnson, Blake Hechtman, Laura Weidinger, Iason Gabriel, William Isaac, Ed Lockhart, Simon Osindero, Laura Rimell, Chris Dyer, Oriol Vinyals, Kareem Ayoub, Jeff Stanway, Lorraine Bennett, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Geoffrey Irving. 2022. [Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher](#).
- Joseph Lee Rodgers and W. Alan Nicewander. 1988. [Thirteen ways to look at the correlation coefficient](#). *The American Statistician*, 42(1):59–66.
- David Rolnick, Arun Ahuja, Jonathan Schwarz, Timothy Lillicrap, and Gregory Wayne. 2019. [Experience replay for continual learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M Rush. 2022. [Multi-task prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, Jonathan Tow, Alexander M. Rush, Stella Biderman, Albert Webson, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Thomas Wang, Benoît Sagot, Niklas Muennighoff, Albert Villanova del Moral, Olatunji Ruwase, Rachel Bawden, Stas Bekman, Angelina McMillan-Major, Iz Beltagy, Huu Nguyen, Lucile Saulnier, Samson Tan, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Victor Sanh, Hugo Laurençon, Yacine Jernite, Julien Launay, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Aaron Gokaslan, Adi Simhi, Aitor Soroa, Alham Fikri Aji, Amit Alfassy, Anna Rogers, Ariel Kreisberg Nitzav, Canwen Xu, Chenghao Mou, Chris Emezue, Christopher Klamm, Colin Leong, Daniel van Strien, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Dragomir Radev, Eduardo González Ponferrada, Efrat Levkovizh, Ethan Kim, Eyal Bar Natan, Francesco De Toni, Gérard Dupont, Germán Kruszewski, Giada Pistilli, Hady Elsahar, Hamza Benyamina, Hieu Tran, Ian Yu, Idris Abdulmumin, Isaac Johnson, Itziar Gonzalez-Dios, Javier de la Rosa, Jenny Chim, Jesse Dodge, Jian Zhu, Jonathan Chang, Jörg Frohberg, Joseph Tobing, Joydeep Bhattacharjee, Khalid Almubarak, Kimbo Chen, Kyle Lo, Leandro Von Werra, Leon Weber, Long Phan, Loubna Ben allal, Ludovic Tanguy, Manan Dey, Manuel Romero Muñoz, Maraim Masoud, María Grandury, Mario Šaško, Max Huang, Maximin Coavoux, Mayank Singh, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Minh Chien Vu, Mohammad A. Jauhar, Mustafa Ghaleb, Nishant Subramani, Nora Kassner, Nurulaqilla Khamis, Olivier Nguyen, Omar Espejel, Ona de Gibert, Paulo Villegas, Peter Henderson, Pierre Colombo, Priscilla Amuok, Quentin Lhoest, Rheza Harliman, Rishi Bommasani, Roberto Luis López, Rui Ribeiro, Salomey Osei, Sampo Pyysalo, Sebastian Nagel, Shamik Bose, Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Shanya Sharma, Shayne Longpre, So-maieh Nikpoor, Stanislav Silberberg, Suhas Pai, Sydney Zink, Tiago Timponi Torrent, Timo Schick, Tris-tan Thrush, Valentin Danchev, Vassilina Nikoulina, Veronika Laippala, Violette Lapercq, Vrinda Prabhu,

Zaid Alyafeai, Zeerak Talat, Arun Raja, Benjamin Heinzerling, Chenglei Si, Elizabeth Salesky, Sabrina J. Mielke, Wilson Y. Lee, Abheesh Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Debajyoti Datta, Eliza Szczechla, Gunjan Chhablani, Han Wang, Harshit Pandey, Hendrik Strobelt, Jason Alan Fries, Jos Rozen, Leo Gao, Lintang Sutawika, M Saiful Bari, Maged S. Al-shaibani, Matteo Manica, Nihal Nayak, Ryan Teehan, Samuel Albanie, Sheng Shen, Srulik Ben-David, Stephen H. Bach, Taewoon Kim, Tali Bers, Thibault Fevry, Trishala Neeraj, Urmish Thakker, Vikas Raunak, Xiangru Tang, Zhengxin Yong, Zhiqing Sun, Shaked Brody, Yallow Uri, Hadar Tojarieh, Adam Roberts, Hyung Won Chung, Jaesung Tae, Jason Phang, Ofir Press, Conglong Li, Deepak Narayanan, Hatim Bourfoune, Jared Casper, Jeff Rasley, Max Ryabinin, Mayank Mishra, Minjia Zhang, Mohammad Shoeybi, Myriam Peyrounette, Nicolas Patry, Nouamane Tazi, Omar Sanseviero, Patrick von Platen, Pierre Cornette, Pierre François Lavallée, Rémi Lacroix, Samyam Rajbhandari, Sanchit Gandhi, Shaden Smith, Stéphane Requena, Suraj Patil, Tim Dettmers, Ahmed Baruwa, Amanpreet Singh, Anastasia Cheveleva, Anne-Laure Ligozat, Arjun Subramonian, Aurélie Névéal, Charles Lovering, Dan Garrette, Deepak Tunuguntla, Ehud Reiter, Ekaterina Taktasheva, Ekaterina Voloshina, Eli Bogdanov, Genta Indra Winata, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan-Christoph Kalo, Jekaterina Novikova, Jessica Zosa Forde, Jordan Clive, Jungo Kasai, Ken Kawamura, Liam Hazan, Marine Carpuat, Miruna Clinciu, Na-joung Kim, Newton Cheng, Oleg Serikov, Omer Antverg, Oskar van der Wal, Rui Zhang, Ruochen Zhang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Shani Pais, Tatiana Shavrina, Thomas Scialom, Tian Yun, Tomasz Limisiewicz, Verena Rieser, Vitaly Protasov, Vladislav Mikhailov, Yada Pruksachatkun, Yonatan Belinkov, Zachary Bamberger, Zdeněk Kasner, Alice Rueda, Amanda Pestana, Amir Feizpour, Ammar Khan, Amy Faranak, Ana Santos, Anthony Hevia, Antigona Unldreaj, Arash Aghagol, Arezoo Abdollahi, Aycha Tammour, Azadeh HajiHosseini, Bahareh Behroozi, Benjamin Ajibade, Bharat Saxena, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Danish Contractor, David Lansky, Davis David, Douwe Kiela, Duong A. Nguyen, Edward Tan, Emi Baylor, Ezinwanne Ozoani, Fatima Mirza, Frankline Ononiwu, Habib Rezanejad, HESSIE Jones, Indrani Bhattacharya, Irene Solaiman, Irina Sedenko, Isar Nejadgholi, Jesse Passmore, Josh Seltzer, Julio Bonis Sanz, Karen Fort, Livia Dutra, Mairon Samagaio, Maraim Elbadri, Margot Mieskes, Marissa Gerchick, Martha Akinlolu, Michael McKenna, Mike Qiu, Muhammed Ghauri, Mykola Burynek, Nafis Abrar, Nazneen Rajani, Nour Elkott, Nour Fahmy, Olanrewaju Samuel, Ran An, Rasmus Kromann, Ryan Hao, Samira Alizadeh, Sarmad Shubber, Silas Wang, Sourav Roy, Sylvain Viguier, Thanh Le, Tobi Oyebade, Trieu Le, Yoyo Yang, Zach Nguyen, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap, Alfredo Palasciano, Alison Callahan, Anima Shukla, Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Ayush Singh, Benjamin Beilharz, Bo Wang, Caio Brito, Chenxi Zhou, Chirag Jain, Chuxin Xu, Clémentine Fourrier, Daniel León Periñán,

Daniel Molano, Dian Yu, Enrique Manjavacas, Fabio Barth, Florian Fuhrmann, Gabriel Altay, Giyasedin Bayrak, Gully Burns, Helena U. Vrabec, Imane Bello, Ishani Dash, Jihyun Kang, John Giorgi, Jonas Golde, Jose David Posada, Karthik Rangasai Sivaraman, Lokesh Bulchandani, Lu Liu, Luisa Shinzato, Madeleine Hahn de Bykhovetz, Maiko Takeuchi, Marc Pàmies, Maria A Castillo, Marianna Nezhurina, Mario Sängler, Matthias Samwald, Michael Cullan, Michael Weinberg, Michiel De Wolf, Mina Mihaljčić, Minna Liu, Moritz Freidank, Myungsun Kang, Natasha Seelam, Nathan Dahlberg, Nicholas Michio Broad, Nikolaus Muellner, Pascale Fung, Patrick Haller, Ramya Chandrasekhar, Renata Eisenberg, Robert Martin, Rodrigo Canalli, Rosaline Su, Ruisi Su, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Samuele Garda, Shlok S Deshmukh, Shubhanshu Mishra, Sid Kiblawi, Simon Ott, Sinee Sang-aaronsiri, Srishti Kumar, Stefan Schweter, Sushil Bharati, Tanmay Laud, Théo Gigant, Tomoya Kainuma, Wojciech Kusa, Yanis Labrak, Yash Shailesh Bajaj, Yash Venkatraman, Yifan Xu, Yingxin Xu, Yu Xu, Zhe Tan, Zhongli Xie, Zifan Ye, Mathilde Bras, Younes Belkada, and Thomas Wolf. 2022. [Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model](#).

Joan Serrà, Dídac Surís, Marius Miron, and Alexandros Karatzoglou. 2018. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting with hard attention to the task. In *ICML*.

Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, Elton Zhang, Rewon Child, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Julie Bernauer, Xia Song, Mohammad Shoeybi, Yuxiong He, Michael Houston, Saurabh Tiwary, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2022. [Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlG 530b, a large-scale generative language model](#).

Yueqi Song, Catherine Cui, Simran Khanuja, Pengfei Liu, Fahim Faisal, Alissa Ostapenko, Genta Indra Winata, Alham Fikri Aji, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Yulia Tsvetkov, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [Globalbench: A benchmark for global progress in natural language processing](#).

Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca).

NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Hefernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loïc Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia

- Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, YaGuang Li, Hongrae Lee, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Amin Ghafouri, Marcelo Menegali, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Dmitry Lepikhin, James Qin, Dehao Chen, Yuanzhong Xu, Zhifeng Chen, Adam Roberts, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Yanqi Zhou, Chung-Ching Chang, Igor Krivokon, Will Rusch, Marc Pickett, Pranesh Srinivasan, Laichee Man, Kathleen Meier-Hellstern, Meredith Ringel Morris, Tulsee Doshi, Renelito Delos Santos, Toju Duke, Johnny Soraker, Ben Zevenbergen, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Mark Diaz, Ben Hutchinson, Kristen Olson, Alejandra Molina, Erin Hoffman-John, Josh Lee, Lora Aroyo, Ravi Rajakumar, Alena Butryna, Matthew Lamm, Viktoriya Kuzmina, Joe Fenton, Aaron Cohen, Rachel Bernstein, Ray Kurzweil, Blaise Agueras-Arcas, Claire Cui, Mariano Croak, Ed Chi, and Quoc Le. 2022. [Lamda: Language models for dialog applications](#).
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#).
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022b. [Emergent abilities of large language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.
- Bryan Wilie, Karissa Vincentio, Genta Indra Winata, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Xiaohong Li, Zhi Yuan Lim, Sidik Soleman, Rahmad Mahendra, Pascale Fung, Syafri Bahar, and Ayu Purwarianti. 2020. [IndoNLU: Benchmark and resources for evaluating Indonesian natural language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 843–857, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Genta Indra Winata, Alham Fikri Aji, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Rahmad Mahendra, Fajri Koto, Ade Romadhony, Kemal Kurniawan, David Moeljadi, Radityo Eko Prasajo, Pascale Fung, et al. 2022. [Nusax: Multilingual parallel sentiment dataset for 10 Indonesian local languages](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15960*.
- Wilson Wongso, David Samuel Setiawan, and Derwin Suhartono. 2021. [Causal and masked language modeling of Javanese language using transformer-based architectures](#). In *2021 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and Information Systems (ICACSIS)*, pages 1–7.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, Niklas Muenighoff, Alham Fikri Aji, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Khalid Almubarak, M Saiful Bari, Lintang Sutawika, Jungo Kasai, Ahmed Barua, Genta Indra Winata, Stella Biderman, Dragomir Radev, and Vassilina Nikoulina. 2022. [Bloom+1: Adding language support to bloom for zero-shot prompting](#).
- Zheng-Xin Yong, Ruochen Zhang, Jessica Zosa Forde, Skyler Wang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Holy Lovenia, Genta Indra Winata, Lintang Sutawika, Jan Christian Blaise Cruz, Long Phan, et al. 2023. [Prompting multilingual large language models to generate code-mixed texts: The case of south east Asian languages](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13592*.
- Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2022. [Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model](#).
- Ruochen Zhang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Jan Christian Blaise Cruz, and Alham Fikri Aji. 2023. [Multilingual large language models are not \(yet\) code-switchers](#).



## A Prompt List

In this section, we provide the list of the prompt used in our experiment. For InstructAlign, we use 6 prompts for each objective. The prompt list for bilingual denoising (TLM), machine translation (MT), crosslingual semantic similarity (XSS), and monolingual denoising (MLM) are shown in Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, respectively. For the evaluation, we employ 3 English prompts for each task. The prompt list for sentiment analysis, emotion recognition, and topic classification tasks are described in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10, respectively.

## B Comparison Between LLM-int8() and Full Precision Inference

We run all inference within our experiment with 8-bit quantization using LLM.int8() (Dettmers et al., 2022). To the best of our knowledge, the effectiveness of LLM.int8() (Dettmers et al., 2022) has never been evaluated on zero-shot prompting in low-resource language cases. We evaluate datasets from various Indonesian and local languages spoken in Indonesian which are listed in IndoNLU (Wilie et al., 2020) and NusaCrowd (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023b). Specifically, we evaluate on 10 languages in NusaX (Winata et al., 2022), Javanese IMDB (Wongso et al., 2021), IndoLEM Sentiment (Koto et al., 2020), IndoNLI (Mahendra et al., 2021), SmSA (Purwarianti and Crisdayanti, 2019), CASA (Ilmania et al., 2018), and Sundanese Twitter Dataset for Emotion (Putra et al., 2020) datasets. Based on the result shown in Table 11, there is only a marginal performance different between 8-bit quantization with LLM.int8() compared to the full precision models, which suggests the generalization of LLM.int8() (Dettmers et al., 2022) for zero-shot prompting in low-resource languages.

## C Datasets Details

In this section, we describe the statistics for each dataset use in the experiment. Table 12 shows the statistics for the sentiment analysis task of NusaTranslation (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a). For the Indonesian subset, we take the first fold of the IndoLEM sentiment (Koto et al., 2020), which is the Indonesian sentiment analysis dataset used as the source sentences in the NusaTranslation (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a). Table 13 shows

the statistics for the sentiment analysis task of NusaX (Winata et al., 2022). Table 14 and Table 15 display the statistics for the emotion recognition and topic classification tasks of NusaParagraph (Cahyawijaya et al., 2023a), respectively.

## D Detailed Experiment Results

In this section, we provide the complete experimental result per dataset. Table 16 shows the experiment results on the sentiment analysis task of NusaTranslation. Table 17 shows the experiment results on the sentiment analysis task of NusaX (Winata et al., 2022). Table 18 and Table 19 show the experiment results on the emotion recognition and topic classification tasks of NusaParagraph, respectively.

---

**Prompt in Bilingual Denoising (TLM) Task**

---

[INPUT\_TEXT]. Denoise the previous [INPUT\_LANG] text to its equivalent sentence in [CONTEXT\_LANG]: [CONTEXT]\n[LABEL\_TEXT]

---

Context in [CONTEXT\_LANG]: [CONTEXT]\nFix the following [INPUT\_LANG] text "[INPUT\_TEXT]" ensuring the meaning is equivalent with the context. [LABEL\_TEXT]

---

Context in [CONTEXT\_LANG]: [CONTEXT]\nNoisy text in [INPUT\_LANG]: [INPUT\_TEXT]\nHow would you fix the [INPUT\_LANG] sentence to make the meaning the same as the context? [LABEL\_TEXT]

---

[INPUT\_TEXT]. Denoise the previous [INPUT\_LANG] sentence to its equivalent sentence: [CONTEXT]\n[LABEL\_TEXT]

---

Context: [CONTEXT]\nFix the following [INPUT\_LANG] text "[INPUT\_TEXT]" ensuring the meaning is equivalent with the context. [LABEL\_TEXT]

---

Context: [CONTEXT]\nNoisy text in [INPUT\_LANG]: [INPUT\_TEXT]\nHow would you fix the [INPUT\_LANG] sentence to make the meaning the same as the [CONTEXT\_LANG] sentence? [LABEL\_TEXT]

---

Table 4: Prompt used for Bilingual Denoising (TLM) task

---

**Prompt in Machine Translation (MT) Task**

---

Translate the following text from [SOURCE\_LANG] to [TARGET\_LANG].\nText: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nTranslation: [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

[SOURCE\_TEXT]\nTranslate the text above from [SOURCE\_LANG] to [TARGET\_LANG]. [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Text in [SOURCE\_LANG]: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nHow would you translate that in [TARGET\_LANG]? [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Translate the following text to [TARGET\_LANG].\nText: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nTranslation: [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

[SOURCE\_TEXT]\nTranslate the text above to [TARGET\_LANG]. [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Input text: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nHow would you translate that into [TARGET\_LANG]? [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Table 5: Prompt used for Machine Translation (MT) task

---

**Prompt in Crosslingual Semantic Similarity (XSS) Task**

---

[SOURCE\_LANG] sentence: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\n[TARGET\_LANG] sentence: [TARGET\_TEXT]\nDo the two sentences have the same meaning? [LABEL]

---

Sentence A: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nSentence B: [TARGET\_TEXT]\nDo sentence A and sentence B have the same meaning? [LABEL]

---

[SOURCE\_LANG] sentence: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\n[TARGET\_LANG] sentence: [TARGET\_TEXT]\nAre the two sentences equivalent? [LABEL]

---

Sentence A: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nSentence B: [TARGET\_TEXT]\nAre sentence A and sentence B equivalent? [LABEL]

---

Is the [SOURCE\_LANG] sentence "[SOURCE\_TEXT]" equivalent to the [TARGET\_LANG] sentence "[TARGET\_TEXT]"? [LABEL]

---

Is the sentence "[SOURCE\_TEXT]" equivalent to the sentence "[TARGET\_TEXT]"? [LABEL]

---

Table 6: Prompt used for Crosslingual Semantic Similarity (XSS) task

---

**Prompt in Monolingual Denoising (MLM) Task**

---

Denoise the following noisy [SOURCE\_LANG] text: "[SOURCE\_TEXT]", to make a correct sentence. [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Fix and complete the following [SOURCE\_LANG] sentence: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\n[TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Sentence in [SOURCE\_LANG]: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nHow would you fix the sentence to make a correct sentence? [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Denoise the following noisy text "[SOURCE\_TEXT]" to make a correct [SOURCE\_LANG] sentence. [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Fix and complete the following sentence: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\n[TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Input text: [SOURCE\_TEXT]\nHow would you fix the sentence to make a correct [SOURCE\_LANG] sentence? [TARGET\_TEXT]

---

Table 7: Prompt used for Monolingual Denoising (MLM) task

---

**Prompt in Sentiment Analysis Task**

---

[INPUT]\nWhat would be the sentiment of the text above? [OPTIONS]? [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

What is the sentiment of this text?\nText: [INPUT]\nAnswer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Text: [INPUT]\n\nPlease classify the sentiment of above text. Answer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Table 8: Prompt used for Sentiment Analysis task

---

**Prompt in Emotion Recognition Task**

---

[INPUT]\nWhat would be the emotion of the text above? [OPTIONS]? [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

What is the emotion of this text?\nText: [INPUT]\nAnswer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Text: [INPUT]\n\nPlease classify the emotion of above text. Answer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Table 9: Prompt used for Emotion Recognition task

---

**Prompt in Topic Classification Task**

---

[INPUT]\nWhat would be the topic of the text above? [OPTIONS]? [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

What is the topic of this text?\nText: [INPUT]\nAnswer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Text: [INPUT]\n\nPlease classify the topic of above text. Answer with [OPTIONS]: [LABELS\_CHOICE]

---

Table 10: Prompt used for the Topic Classification task

<b>Model</b>	<b>Prompt Lang.</b>	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Macro F1</b>	<b>Macro Prec.</b>	<b>Macro Rec.</b>
<i>Full Precision</i>					
BLOOMZ-560M	EN	47.58	33.25	37.97	43.11
BLOOMZ-560M	ID	44.37	29.78	37.79	40.28
BLOOMZ-1B1	EN	52.26	37.90	40.48	45.79
BLOOMZ-1B1	ID	52.88	39.28	46.42	46.67
BLOOMZ-1B7	EN	51.44	36.90	41.90	45.10
BLOOMZ-1B7	ID	52.68	41.20	50.81	48.03
<i>8-Bit Quantization</i>					
BLOOMZ-560M	EN	47.56	34.67	40.94	42.97
BLOOMZ-560M	ID	43.64	33.30	42.90	39.68
BLOOMZ-1B1	EN	50.68	37.52	40.37	44.56
BLOOMZ-1B1	ID	51.23	38.69	43.53	45.34
BLOOMZ-1B7	EN	49.71	35.05	42.11	43.57
BLOOMZ-1B7	ID	52.61	41.87	51.74	48.15
BLOOMZ-3B	EN	54.80	40.78	46.59	48.24
BLOOMZ-3B	ID	56.75	44.34	45.16	51.12

Table 11: Evaluation of full precision and 8-bit quantization on various Indonesian local languages datasets.

Status	Language	Train	Valid.	Test
Pre-trained	Indonesian (ind)	3638	399	1011
Seen	Javanese (jav)	3400	448	1200
	Sundanese (sun)	3400	448	1200
	Minangkabau (min)	3400	448	1200
Unseen	Ambon (abs)	250	98	500
	Batak (btk)	3400	448	1200
	Betawi (bew)	3400	448	1200
	Bima (bhp)	260	100	500
	Madurese (mad)	3400	448	1200
	Makassarese (mak)	3400	448	1200
	Musi (mui)	250	91	500
	Rejang (rej)	250	78	500

Table 12: Statistics of NusaTranslation sentiment analysis dataset. **Pre-trained** denotes languages that are already seen before the InstructAlign tuning. **Seen** denotes languages that are seen during the InstructAlign. **Unseen** denotes languages that are still unseen after the InstructAlign.

Status	Language	Train	Valid.	Test
Pre-trained	English (eng)	500	100	400
	Indonesia (ind)	500	100	400
Seen	Aceh (ace)	500	100	400
	Bali (ban)	500	100	400
	Banjar (bjn)	500	100	400
	Bugis (bug)	500	100	400
	Minang (min)	500	100	400
	Javanese(jav)	500	100	400
	Sunda (sun)	500	100	400
	Unseen	Madura (mad)	500	100
Ngaju (nij)		500	100	400
Bataknese (bbc)		500	100	400

Table 13: Statistics of NusaX sentiment analysis dataset. **Pre-trained** denotes languages that are already seen before the InstructAlign. **Seen** denotes languages that are seen during the InstructAlign. **Unseen** denotes languages that are still unseen after the InstructAlign.

Status	Language	Train	Valid.	Test
Unseen	Javanese (jav)	2800	440	800
	Minangkabau (min)	2000	357	800
	Sundanese (sun)	2400	400	800
	Buginese (bug)	87	50	300
Seen	Batak (btk)	1150	292	500
	Betawi (bew)	2700	430	800
	Madurese (mad)	1000	263	500
	Makassarese(mak)	1500	304	500
	Musi (mui)	200	75	400
	Rejang (rej)	136	50	300

Table 14: Statistics of NusaParagraph emotion recognition dataset. **Pre-trained** denotes languages that are already seen before InstructAlign. **Seen** denotes languages that are seen during InstructAlign. **Unseen** denotes languages that are still unseen after InstructAlign.

Status	Language	Train	Valid.	Test
Unseen	Javanese (jav)	2650	448	800
	Minangkabau (min)	2400	399	800
	Sundanese (sun)	2800	468	900
	Buginese (bug)	93	50	300
Seen	Batak (btk)	1350	275	500
	Betawi (bew)	2650	435	800
	Madurese (mad)	1800	367	700
	Makassarese(mak)	1500	376	700
	Musi (mui)	168	80	400
	Rejang (rej)	105	50	350

Table 15: Statistics of NusaParagraph topic classification dataset. **Pre-trained** denotes languages that are already seen before InstructAlign. **Seen** denotes languages that are seen during InstructAlign. **Unseen** denotes languages that are still unseen after InstructAlign.

Model	L1		L2				L3					
	ind	jav	min	sun	abs	bew	bhp	btk	mad	mak	mui	rej
BLOOM 560m	61.47	56.09	58.13	58.63	62.53	58.42	49.72	56.05	54.02	53.97	60.27	55.55
BLOOM 1b1	58.81	59.05	59.33	59.16	47.87	58.23	60.85	58.95	58.79	58.83	54.92	57.73
BLOOM 3b	58.30	44.84	45.48	44.61	46.08	45.61	44.54	43.62	43.36	44.03	45.05	43.15
BLOOMZ 560m	69.81	43.00	50.97	46.51	45.23	47.87	33.13	36.69	36.84	35.30	61.42	36.21
BLOOMZ 1b1	80.40	61.32	68.95	61.75	61.07	66.94	46.18	50.20	49.71	50.66	70.31	52.01
BLOOMZ 3b	81.38	68.05	71.76	68.43	69.57	69.76	67.73	65.09	64.37	63.14	69.08	64.05
MLM BLOOMZ 560m	65.68	23.29	21.11	22.31	20.86	22.00	20.40	19.04	21.10	20.59	28.82	19.50
MLM BLOOMZ 560m-r=100k	71.93	63.89	69.37	66.27	64.46	65.38	56.12	62.68	58.20	56.51	67.73	58.12
MLM BLOOMZ 1b1-r=100k	73.25	71.18	72.24	70.95	62.67	67.65	56.07	59.22	58.60	60.38	68.10	60.27
MT BLOOMZ 560m	55.20	41.87	39.00	38.16	36.88	39.29	36.07	34.74	36.97	33.81	41.72	37.70
MT BLOOMZ 560m-r=100k	74.46	70.73	69.94	70.00	66.81	67.65	64.58	66.53	65.10	61.35	68.43	63.23
MT BLOOMZ 1b1-r=100k	70.86	59.62	62.22	61.63	54.37	57.97	49.95	50.22	51.31	52.22	60.25	50.30
TLM BLOOMZ 560m	71.57	66.74	66.05	66.94	63.06	65.64	59.00	61.07	61.31	61.13	65.30	63.17
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-r=1k	70.52	61.73	62.76	62.01	54.34	56.31	48.52	49.44	49.21	47.95	61.11	49.22
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-r=10k	72.82	66.27	66.22	66.76	62.29	63.32	59.61	61.27	60.35	60.32	63.60	60.49
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-r=100k	72.40	61.05	59.43	62.11	54.51	56.44	46.68	50.72	50.56	45.02	63.27	48.39
TLM BLOOMZ 1b1-r=100k	75.66	70.05	70.12	70.70	64.47	67.07	62.92	61.87	60.96	61.86	68.11	61.53
XSS BLOOMZ 560m	64.48	57.65	52.18	54.13	52.40	53.59	48.55	48.06	49.59	44.01	58.03	49.43
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-r=1k	69.34	63.55	62.84	65.45	65.20	64.15	59.11	60.53	62.34	61.58	63.51	58.36
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-r=10k	72.22	67.89	67.81	67.25	62.76	64.42	62.83	61.98	62.02	62.21	65.38	59.27
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-r=100k	71.27	68.34	67.89	68.07	61.58	68.69	62.66	65.73	63.44	58.24	70.24	64.92
XSS BLOOMZ 1b1-r=100k	76.75	72.40	71.40	71.87	63.75	65.45	60.27	61.27	60.10	63.21	66.16	60.49

Table 16: Experiment result on the sentiment analysis task of the NusaTranslation dataset

Model	L1			L2						L3		
	eng	ind	ace	ban	bjn	bug	jav	min	sun	bbc	mad	nij
BLOOM 560m	29.26	21.13	21.35	21.93	21.35	23.21	21.86	21.82	21.04	22.28	22.13	21.11
BLOOM 1b1	22.02	22.54	21.47	22.62	22.27	21.34	22.97	21.92	21.55	22.10	21.65	21.53
BLOOM 3b	24.03	21.17	21.31	21.17	21.18	21.35	21.17	21.17	21.17	21.19	21.20	21.17
BLOOMZ 560m	58.24	55.59	31.18	32.40	37.17	27.79	35.86	39.29	32.44	29.49	32.80	38.15
BLOOMZ 1b1	57.41	58.58	43.31	43.02	44.72	31.12	46.52	42.59	39.20	26.82	41.92	40.76
BLOOMZ 3b	62.65	63.21	48.81	48.40	55.27	23.47	54.26	51.11	39.41	32.42	38.88	41.68
MLM BLOOMZ 560m	49.99	49.33	31.74	28.37	34.32	25.76	33.89	31.27	29.20	28.43	32.08	30.98
MLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	61.32	60.01	42.69	41.69	50.95	31.53	44.28	44.30	42.11	33.18	41.05	40.15
MLM BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	61.30	59.73	43.11	43.02	50.71	31.31	53.66	51.05	47.27	31.13	42.02	39.83
MT BLOOMZ 560m	47.24	41.41	31.78	33.78	34.69	28.44	35.47	35.15	36.01	26.86	26.69	27.49
MT BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	60.09	54.18	39.11	42.59	46.22	34.50	43.37	41.31	41.31	35.95	38.54	39.84
MT BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	59.18	53.69	43.97	45.40	50.16	38.65	48.37	45.97	41.98	37.97	40.90	40.60
TLM BLOOMZ 560m	44.72	46.02	33.59	34.26	41.16	25.36	41.76	38.72	37.40	25.67	30.88	29.98
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-1000	58.05	54.59	43.03	37.06	46.55	34.02	43.21	43.24	39.59	33.99	38.16	37.39
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-10000	57.38	57.73	43.43	36.76	45.99	35.06	44.38	43.30	40.83	34.06	42.46	40.00
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	61.65	56.50	41.78	41.36	48.15	31.19	48.89	44.12	44.90	33.78	41.51	37.90
TLM BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	64.26	63.54	52.22	51.35	58.19	41.87	59.48	59.67	56.99	38.26	48.11	48.01
XSS BLOOMZ 560m	53.93	53.19	43.60	41.73	47.09	37.79	47.29	45.36	43.42	32.59	41.66	40.79
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-1000	56.57	54.90	36.78	40.28	42.20	28.56	45.67	41.33	39.80	27.30	31.67	32.20
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-10000	55.62	57.84	44.24	44.03	50.04	32.87	48.92	45.55	45.64	36.38	40.36	43.12
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	59.89	58.22	45.53	39.57	52.68	36.15	49.83	50.61	46.45	35.27	42.40	43.39
XSS BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	60.78	59.34	45.83	45.45	53.08	36.24	52.24	50.54	47.20	33.81	40.99	41.08

Table 17: Experiment result on the sentiment analysis task of the NusaX dataset

Model	L2				L3					
	bug	jav	min	sun	bew	btk	mad	mak	mui	rej
BLOOM 560m	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.37	2.56	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.66
BLOOM 1b1	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
BLOOM 3b	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
BLOOMZ 560m	2.36	2.93	4.71	3.52	4.35	3.33	1.41	3.09	1.28	4.10
BLOOMZ 1b1	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
BLOOMZ 3b	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
MLM BLOOMZ 560m	1.19	2.51	4.63	3.04	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
MLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	1.19	2.41	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
MLM BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	1.19	2.42	4.71	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
MT BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	1.60	2.76	4.77	3.54	4.27	2.56	0.59	1.42	1.12	2.44
MT BLOOMZ 560m	1.41	2.58	9.14	5.63	4.45	2.57	0.59	1.56	2.10	2.44
MT BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	1.19	2.51	4.54	3.04	4.29	2.70	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
TLM BLOOMZ 560m	1.19	2.58	4.88	3.54	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-1000	1.19	2.50	5.10	3.14	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.12	2.44
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-10000	1.19	2.67	5.12	4.34	4.29	2.57	0.73	1.42	1.11	2.66
TLM BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	1.40	2.42	4.54	3.13	4.29	2.71	0.73	1.42	1.11	2.44
TLM BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	1.19	2.41	4.63	3.13	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.12	2.44
XSS BLOOMZ 560m	1.54	3.12	4.65	3.77	4.29	2.71	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-1000	1.56	2.82	5.16	3.54	4.37	2.69	0.73	1.42	1.11	2.44
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-10000	1.39	2.84	5.56	4.10	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.43	1.28	2.44
XSS BLOOMZ 560m-R-100000	1.19	2.42	4.54	3.05	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.42
XSS BLOOMZ 1b1-R-100000	1.19	2.67	4.63	3.84	4.29	2.57	0.59	1.42	1.11	2.44

Table 18: Experiment result on the emotion recognition task of the NusaParagraph dataset

Model	L2				L3					
	bug	jav	min	sun	bew	btk	mad	mak	mui	rej
BLOOM-560m	7.68	3.50	6.36	3.80	5.42	7.92	11.25	9.07	3.91	5.80
BLOOM-1b1	7.72	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.42	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
BLOOM-3b	7.72	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.42	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
BLOOMZ-560m	9.13	4.10	6.86	4.29	6.07	8.75	11.71	9.45	4.09	6.04
BLOOMZ-1b1	7.72	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.51	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
BLOOMZ-3b	7.72	4.21	6.70	4.30	7.55	8.33	11.28	9.19	7.30	5.82
MLM BLOOMZ-560m	8.15	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.42	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
MLM BLOOMZ-560m $r=100000$	7.72	3.49	6.52	4.36	5.51	7.93	11.27	9.09	4.08	5.82
MLM BLOOMZ-1b1 $r=100000$	7.72	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.42	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
MT BLOOMZ-560m	7.72	3.50	6.36	3.81	5.42	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.92	5.82
MT BLOOMZ-560m $r=100000$	7.72	3.58	6.37	3.93	5.52	7.94	11.22	9.19	3.92	5.82
MT BLOOMZ-1b1 $r=100000$	8.61	4.59	7.08	5.08	5.71	8.20	11.52	9.29	4.63	6.01
TLM BLOOMZ-560m	9.43	3.83	7.27	7.11	5.42	7.93	11.28	9.18	3.92	5.82
TLM BLOOMZ-560m $r=1000$	14.08	11.46	17.31	16.55	10.35	12.61	11.92	12.04	9.34	5.96
TLM BLOOMZ-560m $r=10000$	8.37	4.23	7.66	5.40	5.43	8.05	11.20	9.28	4.25	5.96
TLM BLOOMZ-560m $r=100000$	7.75	3.50	6.34	3.80	5.51	7.93	11.35	9.18	4.23	5.78
TLM BLOOMZ-1b1 $r=100000$	7.71	3.67	6.55	4.05	5.42	7.93	11.27	9.08	3.91	5.82
XSS BLOOMZ-560m	8.38	3.57	6.46	3.88	5.42	7.94	11.26	9.09	3.91	5.82
XSS BLOOMZ-560m $r=1000$	6.14	4.21	4.34	6.14	4.38	7.29	11.21	8.39	5.52	6.63
XSS BLOOMZ-560m $r=10000$	8.06	4.24	7.46	5.07	5.41	8.23	11.32	9.10	4.08	5.85
XSS BLOOMZ-560m $r=100000$	7.73	3.50	6.67	4.23	5.50	7.93	11.26	9.09	3.92	5.82
XSS BLOOMZ-1b1 $r=100000$	8.00	4.05	7.40	4.62	5.67	8.08	11.55	9.19	4.08	5.83

Table 19: Experiment result on the topic classification task of the NusaParagraph dataset