

The Impact of Model Scaling on Seen and Unseen Language Performance

Rhitabrat Pokharel, Sina Bagheri Nezhad, Ameeta Agrawal, Suresh Singh

Portland State University
Oregon, USA
{pokharel, sina5, ameeta, singhsp}@pdx.edu

Abstract

The rapid advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs), particularly those trained on multilingual corpora, has intensified the need for a deeper understanding of their performance across a diverse range of languages and model sizes. Our research addresses this critical need by studying the performance and scaling behavior of multilingual LLMs in text classification and machine translation tasks across 204 languages. We systematically examine both seen and unseen languages across three model families of varying sizes in zero-shot and few-shot settings. Our findings show significant differences in scaling behavior between zero-shot and two-shot scenarios, with striking disparities in performance between seen and unseen languages. Model scale has little effect on zero-shot performance, which remains mostly flat. However, in two-shot settings, larger models show clear linear improvements in multilingual text classification. For translation tasks, however, only the instruction-tuned model showed clear benefits from scaling. Our analysis also suggests that overall resource levels, not just the proportions of pretraining languages, are better predictors of model performance, shedding light on what drives multilingual LLM effectiveness.

Introduction

Current trends in the development of large language models (LLMs) emphasize the use of extensive data in several different languages and larger model sizes (Srivastava et al. 2023). Scaling trends serve to quantify the connection between a model’s performance and critical design elements such as training data size, number of model parameters, or architectural intricacies, providing invaluable insights for model refinement, resource distribution, and the selection of pertinent training data. Although significant research efforts have focused on scaling trends within predominantly English settings (Radford et al. 2019; Lin et al. 2022; McKenzie et al. 2023; Wei et al. 2023; Scao et al. 2023; Chia et al. 2024), their understanding in multilingual contexts remains underexplored (Sun and Miceli-Barone 2024).

Several massively multilingual LLMs have been introduced (Lin et al. 2022; Achiam et al. 2023; Scao et al. 2023; Shliazhko et al. 2024), however, evaluation is often limited to a few tens of languages, limiting the large-scale evaluation

of current multilingual language models in many languages, especially those truly low-resource languages (Ahuja et al. 2023). Moreover, prior work focuses on studying scaling on languages that were *seen* during pretraining whereas we extend our focus also to languages that were potentially *not seen* during pretraining.

In this paper, we take a step towards performing a large-scale study of the scaling behavior of multilingual models from the lens of multilingual text classification as well as text generation. We look into the relation between model sizes (number of parameters) and the downstream task performance across diverse languages and resource levels. We comprehensively evaluate several different model sizes from three model families across 204 low and high resource languages in two types of tasks – topic classification and machine translation. Multilingual topic classification was chosen for two key reasons: it is a widely studied and popular task in natural language processing (NLP) (Scao et al. 2023), and the new parallel dataset SIB-200 (Adelani et al. 2024) enables consistent and unified analysis across 204 languages. Similarly, machine translation with the FLORES-200 dataset allows for comparable evaluation under text generation setting.

Specifically, we assess the performance of XGLM (with model sizes ranging from 564 million to 7.5 billion parameters), bloom, and bloomz models (ranging from 560 million to 7.1 billion parameters). In total, the results of our study are derived from evaluation involving more than 2 million instances. To our knowledge, ours is the first study to investigate the impact of multilingual scaling across more than 200 languages, both seen as well as unseen¹, across two different tasks.

We seek to answer the following three questions: 1) What is the impact of model scaling on seen and unseen languages of different resource levels for each type of task? 2) How do different settings (zero-shot and few-shot in-context learning) affect the overall model effectiveness? 3) What is the correlation between general resource level, the language-specific training data and performance?

Our key observations are as follows:

- In multilingual settings, scaling laws do *not* apply consistently. Scaling depends on the task and the inference

¹A language is considered as potentially unseen if it is not listed in the language distribution of the model’s pretraining data.

Model	Model Sizes (# parameters)	# Pretrain Tokens	# Lang. / # Lang. Families	Vocab.
xglm	564M, 1.7B, 2.9B, 7.5B	500B	30 / 15	256,008
bloom	560M, 1.1B, 1.7B, 3B, 7.1B	341B	46 / 8	250,880
bloomz	560M, 1.1B, 1.7B, 3B, 7.1B	341B	46 / 8	250,880

Table 1: Overview of model details.

setting – for example, we see scaling in 2-shot classification tasks but not in zero-shot classification or in zero-shot and 2-shot machine translation.

- While larger models consistently leverage the benefits of few-shot ICL for classification tasks for both seen as well as unseen languages, smaller models struggle in few-shot ICL settings instead yielding better results in *zero-shot* settings, especially for unseen languages and low resource languages that were seen during the pretraining.
- For the generative task, ICL appears to hurt two language models (xglm and bloomz) while only slightly benefiting the third (bloom), regardless of model scale.
- For both tasks, we find that performance obtains stronger correlations with general resource levels rather than language-specific training data, which subsequently result in more pronounced disparities in model performance across different resource levels.

Related Work

The impact of model scale on language model performance, particularly within English settings, has been extensively explored in recent years with several studies reinforcing the finding that larger models generally result in enhanced performance (Radford et al. 2019; Hestness et al. 2017; Kaplan et al. 2020; Rae et al. 2022; Wei et al. 2022; Hoffmann et al. 2022; Smith et al. 2022; Chowdhery et al. 2022). Despite the relationship between model scale and performance not always being linear or predictable (Wei et al. 2022, 2023; Xia et al. 2023), larger models continue to be developed, including several multilingual large language models such as GPT-3 (Brown et al. 2020b), xGLM (Lin et al. 2022), BLOOM (Scao et al. 2023), LLaMA (Touvron et al. 2023), PaLM 2 (Anil et al. 2023), and others. Although massive multilingual models benefit from positive transfer across languages, the performance of a model deteriorates as its language coverage expands, a challenging phenomenon also known as the “curse of multilinguality” (Conneau et al. 2020; Pfeiffer et al. 2022).

Despite the scaling of multilingual models, research on the impact of scaling on performance remains limited. Lin et al. (2022) showed that different tasks lead to different scaling behavior. However, the datasets in their study were limited to at most 15 languages on the same task, and the classification dataset included only one low-resource language. Other prior work has studied scaling experiments for only English tasks (Scao et al. 2023; Chia et al. 2024) or a limited set of languages (Muennighoff et al. 2023; Asai et al. 2023; Yong et al. 2022; Winata et al. 2022; Srivastava et al. 2023; Isik et al. 2024; Dakle, Rallabandi, and Raghavan 2023; Sun and

Miceli-Barone 2024) or under only zero-shot setting (Muennighoff et al. 2023; Adelani et al. 2024; Yong et al. 2022). Fernandes et al. (2023) focused on high-resource languages and neural machine translation, observing that scaling multilingual models improves loss irrespective of the proportion of language pairs in the training mixture.

Unlike previous research, we choose to deeply investigate the performance of several multilingual models across 200+ languages, seen and unseen during pretraining, and spanning various resource levels, a distinction not made in prior work. We contribute to this emerging body of research by studying both classification and generation tasks, several model sizes from three different families of open-source models, and across both zero-shot and few-shot settings.

Experimental Setup

In this section, we present the overall experimental setup including the models considered, evaluation tasks and datasets, seen and unseen languages, and prompting under zero-shot and few-shot settings.

Models

We study three different multilingual LLMs – xglm, bloom, and bloomz – of varying sizes as shown in Table 1 to investigate their scalability in multilingual task scenarios. Our study spans a total of 14 different models and model sizes.

- **xglm** is a decoder-only transformer model trained on a corpus covering 30 languages (Lin et al. 2022).
- **bloom** is also a decoder-only transformer language model and was trained on the ROOTS corpus which includes 46 natural languages (Scao et al. 2023).
- **bloomz** is a variant of bloom that underwent instruction tuning (also known as multitask prompted finetuning) using the xP3 dataset which closely follows ROOTS’s language distribution to enhance its adaptability across tasks and languages (Muennighoff et al. 2023).

Table 2 presents some sample instances from the two datasets – SIB-200 and Flores-200 used in this study.

These models were selected for several reasons. 1) They appear in several sizes with parameter counts ranging from about 500M to 7B, where the different model sizes were still trained on the same pretraining corpus, making them quite comparable across different scales; 2) These models share similar architecture (i.e., they are all decoder-only models). xglm and bloom were pretrained with similar training procedures, while bloomz is an instruction-tuned model, allowing us to study diverse types of models as there is evidence that

<i>SIB-200 Samples</i>	
Text	Category
<i>[en]</i> The fission bomb works on the principle that it takes energy to put together a nucleus with many protons and neutrons.	science/technology
<i>[fe]</i> Lors des sélections de 1976, il a conseillé Carter en matière de politique étrangère, puis a été conseiller à la sécurité nationale (NSA) de 1977 à 1981, succédant à Henry Kissinger.	politics
<i>Flores-200 Samples</i>	
Text (<i>xx</i>)	Text (<i>en</i>)
<i>[sw]</i> Wasafiri wanashauriwa kwa dhati kujua kuhusu hatari yoyote ya anga mbaya inayoathiri eneo lao kwani huenda ikaathiri mipango yoyote ya usafiri.	Travellers are strongly advised to be aware of any risk of severe weather affecting their area as they may affect any travel plans.
<i>[id]</i> Potro menerima perawatan untuk bahunya, tetapi mampu kembali ke permainan.	Ptro received treatment to his shoulder at this point but managed to return to the game.

Table 2: Some samples from SIB-200 and Flores-200 datasets.

pretraining setup affects downstream task performance even after instruction-tuning (Asai et al. 2023); 3) They can be leveraged via prompt-based interaction without the need for fine-tuning, thus simulating a more natural user experience with LLMs; (4) They include a considerable number of languages in their pretraining data compared to other models like Llama 3 whose pretraining language distribution is unknown; (5) Most importantly, they are all open-source models with their technical documentation readily available facilitating this investigation.

Evaluation Tasks, Datasets and Metrics

We study model performance on both text classification and text generation tasks. Table 2 presents some sample instances from the two datasets. For classification, we choose the SIB-200 dataset (Adelani et al. 2024), a large-scale benchmark dataset for topic classification across 204 languages and dialects, 7 topics (the labels are: science/technology, travel, politics, sports, health, entertainment and geography), and 21 distinct language families including both high- and low-resource languages.² Moreover, SIB-200 dataset is derived from the Flores-200 machine translation dataset (NLLB Team et al. 2022) containing parallel text across multiple languages facilitating direct comparisons. We evaluate the performance of the models in terms of macro-average F1 score.

For text generation, we rely on the Flores-200 dataset (NLLB Team et al. 2022) which is a multilingual dataset consisting of parallel text data in 204 different languages, covering a diverse range of language families and regions. We evaluate the performance in terms of SacreBLEU (Post 2018). We consider translations in the direction of *xx* to *en* where *xx* is a language from 203 languages (excluding *en*). We focus on the translation direction of *xx* to *en* in this work,

²It is worth mentioning that while the SIB-200 dataset originally consisted of 204 languages, a recent update added one more language, N’Ko, bringing the total count to 205 languages. However, at the time of our study, we used the version of the dataset which included 204 languages.

as considering the same target language across all scenarios (*en*) allowing verification of the outputs relatively easily for error analysis, yet also effectively assessing the multilingual capabilities of models because source text already encompass 203 languages. The test sets of both datasets include 204 instances per language and both datasets prioritize low-resource languages.

Seen and Unseen Languages

For each model and dataset, we can further categorize the languages as ‘seen’ or ‘unseen’ based on whether they were included during the pretraining of the models or not. For instance, out of more than 200 languages present in SIB-200 and Flores-200 datasets, *xglm*, *bloom*, and *bloomz* models have seen only 30, 45, and 45 languages, respectively. Considering languages that are included as well as those that are not explicitly included in the pretraining corpus of the models allows for a more comprehensive analysis.

The categorization of seen and unseen languages was performed as follows. The *bloom* paper (Scao et al. 2023) lists the languages in its pretraining ROOTS corpus using ISO 639-3 codes (e.g., English is ‘eng’), whereas the *xglm* models’ Hugging Face page³ specifies the languages in its pretraining corpus based on ISO 639-1 (e.g., English is ‘en’) codes. In the case of both the datasets, SIB-200 and Flores-200, languages are accompanied by their ISO 639-3 codes and script types. The mapping for *bloom*/*bloomz* models and the datasets is straightforward as they both document their languages in similar language codes. To map between *xglm* and the datasets, we use ISO-639 Python library⁴ to convert ISO 639-3 codes to ISO 639-1. In a handful of cases, more than one dataset language listed with different scripts got mapped to a single ISO 639-1 code. To resolve this, we employed the most common script type of that language to perform the mapping.

³<https://huggingface.co/facebook/xglm-564M>

⁴<https://pypi.org/project/iso-639/>




Figure 1: Multilingual performance under 0-shot and 2-shot settings. Figure 1a shows results for text classification using SIB-200 topic classification dataset whereas Figure 1b shows results for text generation using Flores-200 machine translation dataset. The x-axis shows the model sizes (number of parameters in billions). The y-axis shows F1 scores (0-1) for classification task and SacreBLEU (0-100) for generation task. ‘seen’ indicates the languages that were present in the pretraining data mix of the models whereas ‘unseen’ indicates languages that were not seen by the models during pretraining.

Prompts, Zero-shot, and Few-shot In-context Learning

Under **zero-shot evaluations**, the LLMs were prompted to classify text samples into predefined topic categories (in the case of SIB-200 dataset) or translate given sentences into English (for Flores-200) without any demonstrations. Under **few-shot evaluations**, following previous studies (Srivastava et al. 2023; Xia et al. 2023) the models were provided with a prompt and a limited number of demonstrations ($k = 2$).⁵ For topic classification, this includes 2 instances per topic class in the same language as the target language, whereas for machine translation, this includes 2 source-target instances. It is important to note that the same randomly chosen samples from the training sets of the individual datasets were used for all the respective experiments, however, the order in which the demonstrations were presented to the model was randomized for each test instance and this was consistent across all languages.

Our prompts were informed by prior work (Bach et al. 2022; Sampathkumar, Kravitz, and Huang 2023) and did not undergo any refinement, generally simulating realistic zero-shot or few-shot scenarios that a user might use while using these models. Informed by findings from previous work which demonstrated the effectiveness of English prompts compared to language-specific prompts (Lin et al. 2022; Lai et al. 2023; Adelani et al. 2024; Barreiß, Klinger, and Barnes 2024; Etxaniz et al. 2023), we used English prompts in our experiments.

For obtaining the label in the text classification task, the models’ output probabilities for each topic category were used to determine the predicted label, which was chosen based on the maximum log likelihood among a set of specified candidate label strings (Scao et al. 2023).

⁵Limited context window of some of the models we consider limits the number of k we can consider in our study. For instance, xglm supports 2048 context window length (number of tokens) and as the n -shots increase, the text inputs, especially for some languages with high fragmentation during tokenization, become longer than 2048 tokens.

In total, our evaluation involved 41,616 test instances from SIB-200 (204 sentences across 204 languages), and 41,412 test instances from Flores-200 (204 sentences across 203 languages), with all the combinations of models, model sizes, zero-shot and few-shot settings yielding results for a total of 2,324,784 instances.

Multilingual Scaling Results and Analysis

We now present our results and discuss key findings.

Scaling trends in classification vs. generation tasks

The overall scaling patterns in multilingual evaluation are presented in Figure 1.

Text classification For the classification task, in Figure 1a in the 0-shot setting (left), we observe that both bloom and bloomz models show a predominantly U-shaped scaling trend, while xglm shows a relatively flat trajectory with a subtle hint of the “double-descent” phenomenon, where performance initially improves, then declines, and then improves again with increased scale (Nakkiran et al. 2019). These trends remain consistent for seen as well as unseen languages. However, a more zoomed-out view reveals that, surprisingly, the model sizes appear to have minimal impact as the line plots remain largely stable despite scaling from 560M to 7B, an almost 12.5 fold increase. Our results of scaling under 0-shot setting are different from those observed in an earlier study (Lin et al. 2022). While their results derived from a small set of seen languages show normal scaling under 0-shot condition for xglm, we see only marginal scaling for xglm and bloomz and none for bloom, possibly because our results consider twice as many seen languages (30 languages) as their setup (15 languages), and more importantly, 13 of our seen languages are from mid- to low-resource categories.

When we go from the 0-shot to the 2-shot setting, Figure 1a (right), we find that bloomz’s U-shaped scaling has turned to linear scaling, xglm’s faint double-descent scaling turned to gradual linear scaling for seen languages, and bloom’s U-shaped which was earlier followed by flat lines is now followed by linear scaling. Additionally, it is clear that 2-shot




Figure 2: Performance of three models (■ xglm; ■ bloom; ■ bloomz) on English-only subset of SIB-200. On the x-axis are the model sizes.




Figure 3: bloomz’s performance on seen and unseen languages for text generation task.

ICL brings additional improvements for all models except for xglm unseen. Nonetheless, these results suggest that multilingual scaling trends for text classification task may differ depending on the settings adopted (0- vs. 2-shot). This is similar to our analysis of baseline English-only evaluation behavior (as shown in Figure 2) where scaling trends improve moving from 0- to 2-shot.

Text generation Turning our attention to the generative task, in Figure 1(b) we observe limited to no scaling for both 0-shot and 2-shot for all cases with the exception of xglm on seen languages in the 0-shot setting⁶. This is in sharp contrast to the text classification task where normal scaling was observed in 2-shot setting. In fact, we further observe that the performance of xglm degrades when going from 0-shot to the 2-shot case for both seen and unseen languages (similar observations are made for bloomz as shown in Figure 3 discussed later). This is also in contrast to the text classification task where few-shot in-context learning brought additional gains for all models. As shown by (Zhang et al. 2023) on QA task and (Sun and Miceli-Barone 2024) on MT task, scaling behavior varies with prompting methods, task complexity, and model families, which supports the differing results across

⁶We do not show the results of bloomz in this plot and instead plot them separately later because part of the Flores-200 dataset was used to instruction-tune bloomz.

the two tasks in our experiments.

Text generation using bloomz We now analyze the results of bloomz model in text generation under 0-shot and 2-shot settings, as shown in Figure 3. Here we notice normal scaling but a distinctive *degradation* in performance when going from 0-shot to 2-shot setting for both seen and unseen languages. On the one hand, this suggests that instruction-tuned models remain a promising approach to improving the performance of both seen unseen languages with increased scale, although the gap between seen and unseen languages remains significant. On the other hand, our observations also show that while few-shot in-context learning helps in text classification task, it does not seem to be effective in text generation.

Seen vs. unseen languages

From the results presented in Figure 1, for the **classification task**, we observe that in both 0-shot and 2-shot scenarios, as expected all models consistently perform better on the ‘seen’ languages compared to ‘unseen’ languages (solid lines for both tasks), aligning with findings from prior literature (Adelani et al. 2024). Specifically, xglm clearly outperforms the other models for ‘seen’ languages, which could be partially explained by a simple statistic – it encountered fewer languages during pretraining than the bloom/bloomz models, resulting in an average score over a fewer number of languages.

Two possible explanations for xglm’s comparable performance, despite being trained on a much smaller number of languages than bloom/bloomz, may be found in the fact that 1) it was trained on a much larger number of pretraining tokens (500B) compared to bloom/bloomz models as mentioned earlier in Table 1, and 2) despite having fewer number of seen languages than bloom/bloomz, xglm has almost twice as many seen *language families* as bloom/bloomz which may be potentially contributing to positive cross-lingual transfer.

On the other hand, in the 2-shot setting, while xglm shows improvement for seen languages, its performance for unseen languages actually worsens. This is in stark contrast to the bloom/bloomz models where 2-shot ICL enhances performance for both seen and unseen languages, and particularly in the case of bloom, quite drastically so. It is not apparent why xglm’s advantage for unseen languages in the 0-shot setting does not carry over in the 2-shot setting. Another intriguing observation is that regardless of whether the languages were seen or unseen during training, bloom-1b1 consistently performs at the same level (converging to a specific point) yielding lower performance than its smaller counterpart, bloom-560m.

When we consider the **generation task**, we see that overall, regardless of 0-shot or 2-shot, the performance of the models is poor. bloom does improve significantly in the 2-shot setting for seen languages as compared to xglm (seen and unseen languages) and bloom-unseen. This behavior is in stark contrast with the classification task where all models and cases (seen/unseen) do better in the 2-shot case. Thus, ICL is useful for classification tasks but not so much for generative tasks.

In Figure 4 we dig deeper into the performance of xglm and bloomz for seen and unseen languages divided by lan-




Figure 4: The top row shows performance comparison between seen and unseen for languages on the **classification task** from the same language family across different model sizes (x-axis) for the 0-shot setting. Similarly, the bottom row shows the comparison for the **generation task**. ■ & ■ - seen; ■ & ■ - unseen.

guage family. We choose the most highly resourced language family (Indo-European) and one of the least resourced (Niger-Congo). In the top row, which corresponds to the **classification task**, we see that both models show a significant drop when going from seen to unseen languages for a high resource family (Indo-European) as well as for a low resource family (Niger-Congo). In general, the largest model size shows the highest F1 score for both language families. Interestingly, bloomz shows a dip at 1.1b and 1.7b model sizes regardless of language family.

Moving to the **generation task** (bottom row in Figure 4), we observe a substantial difference in performance between seen and unseen languages for both language families. In this task, text from all languages is translated into *en*. Therefore, the models need to have a good understanding of the input text in order to generate a syntactically and semantically correct translation. We observe that unseen languages are hard to translate, even though the models were trained on other languages from the same language families. However, it is also clear that larger models have developed some ability to understand unseen languages more so than smaller models. For seen languages, we see a clear improvement with increasing model sizes which is due to larger models having greater capacity to retain understanding of these languages. In contrast, unseen languages benefit significantly less from scaling up the model size.

We also find that the unseen languages are benefiting from related seen languages rather than their own resource levels. For example, in a classification task using both xglm-7.5b and bloomz-7b1 models, the unseen language Asturianu (F1 = 0.52), which is of resource level 1, performs comparably to its closely related seen language, Spanish (F1 = 0.56), which is at resource level 5. On the other hand, Croatian (F1 = 0.32), of resource level 4, performs worse than Asturianu, likely because it lacks closely related languages in the seen category. More analysis on resource level in Appendix.

Text Classification (F1 Score [0,1])				
	0s seen	0s unseen	2s seen	2s unseen
xglm	0.0145	0.0071	0.0294	-0.0050
bloom	0.0002	-0.0038	0.0561	0.0419
bloomz	0.0254	0.0126	0.0718	0.0502
Text Generation (Normalized SacreBLEU Score [0,1])				
	0s seen	0s unseen	2s seen	2s unseen
xglm	0.0254	0.0041	0.0054	0.0028
bloom	0.0101	0.0066	0.0154	0.0098

Table 3: Slopes of linear fit for scaling data

Comparing text classification vs. text generation

To get a better sense of the quality of the scaling for the classification and generation tasks, we provide the *slope* of the best linear fit for all the cases from Figure 1 in Table 3. By and large, we observe very small slopes in most cases for the generation task and significant positive slopes for the 2-shot case for the classification task. We believe that in the classification case, seeing examples helps the classification task by conditioning the probabilities to select one of the provided class choices. In the generation task, on the other hand, providing context appears to reduce the ability of the model to generalize and thus we see poorer scores for 2-shot. One possible reason for this issue could be the need for more few-shot examples in the generative task. However, exploring additional settings was beyond the scope of this research.

Figure 5 presents the results for the **classification task** of xglm and bloomz, in 0-shot and 2-shot settings, further separated across seen and unseen languages, and the six different resource levels (bloom plots in Appendix. Figure 6 presents the corresponding results for the **generative task**. Seen languages have a clear advantage over unseen languages in general. We observe that xglm treats languages from all resource levels fairly equally, whereas bloom and bloomz




Figure 5: **Classification task:** Results of evaluation (F1 score) across different models based on language resource level using SIB-200 dataset. The model sizes on the x-axis are in billions of parameters. ■ Resource Level 0, ■ Resource Level 1, ■ Resource Level 2, ■ Resource Level 3, ■ Resource Level 4, ■ Resource Level 5.




Figure 6: **Generation task:** Results of evaluation (SacreBLEU) across different models based on language resource level using Flores-200 dataset. The model sizes on the x-axis are in billions of parameters. ■ Resource Level 0, ■ Resource Level 1, ■ Resource Level 2, ■ Resource Level 3, ■ Resource Level 4, ■ Resource Level 5.

models show a considerable gap between the three higher levels (3, 4, 5) and the three lower levels (0, 1, 2). In the unseen scenario, the distinction appears not along high or low but between resource level 5 languages and the rest of the languages. The impact of 0- and 2-shot on seen/unseen languages is particularly noteworthy. In Section we saw that few-shot ICL hurts smaller models. Here, we see that few-shot ICL disproportionately hurts smaller models’ performance on lower-resource languages compared to higher-resource languages.

Conclusion

We explored scaling trends in multilingual contexts, using three multilingual LLMs and two task types covering 204 languages. Our results highlight the complexities of multilingual model performance and scalability, emphasizing the need for careful consideration of various factors including whether

the languages were seen or not during pretraining and shot settings (whether zero-shot or few-shot). Recently, Mosbach et al. (2023) showed that fine-tuning outperforms in-context learning in both in-domain and out-of-domain performance. On the other hand, another study shows that fine-tuning limits the generalization ability of the models introducing false correlations (Shliazhko et al. 2024). In light of such studies, it would be interesting to explore the (positive or negative) effects of fine-tuning in extensive multilingual scenarios in future work. Cao et al. (2024) highlighted that generative tasks differ from classification tasks. Investigating approaches to enhance the generalization of instruction-tuned models to unseen languages, considering that few-shot learning might not always be the optimal solution, presents a compelling direction for future research in natural language generation.

Ethics Statement

While we have included over 200 dialects and languages in our study, we acknowledge that many more languages remain to be comprehensively studied.

References

- Achiam, J.; Adler, S.; Agarwal, S.; Ahmad, L.; Akkaya, I.; Aleman, F. L.; et al. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774.
- Adelani, D. I.; Liu, H.; Shen, X.; Vassilyev, N.; Alabi, J. O.; Mao, Y.; et al. 2024. SIB-200: A Simple, Inclusive, and Big Evaluation Dataset for Topic Classification in 200+ Languages and Dialects. arXiv:2309.07445.
- Ahuja, K.; Diddee, H.; Hada, R.; Ochieng, M.; Ramesh, K.; Jain, P.; et al. 2023. MEGA: Multilingual Evaluation of Generative AI. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anil, R.; Dai, A. M.; Firat, O.; Johnson, M.; Lepikhin, D.; Passos, A.; et al. 2023. PaLM 2 Technical Report. arXiv:2305.10403.
- Asai, A.; Kudugunta, S.; Yu, X. V.; Blevins, T.; Gonen, H.; Reid, M.; et al. 2023. Buffet: Benchmarking large language models for few-shot cross-lingual transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14857*.
- Bach, S.; Sanh, V.; Yong, Z. X.; Webson, A.; Raffel, C.; Nayak, N. V.; et al. 2022. PromptSource: An Integrated Development Environment and Repository for Natural Language Prompts. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Barreiß, P.; Klinger, R.; and Barnes, J. 2024. English Prompts are Better for NLI-based Zero-Shot Emotion Classification than Target-Language Prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03223*.
- Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; et al. 2020a. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Brown, T. B.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J.; Dhariwal, P.; et al. 2020b. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. arXiv:2005.14165.
- Cao, X.; Lu, H.; Huang, L.; Liu, X.; and Cheng, M.-M. 2024. Generative Multi-modal Models are Good Class Incremental Learners. *IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- Chia, Y. K.; Hong, P.; Bing, L.; and Poria, S. 2024. InstructEval: Towards Holistic Evaluation of Instruction-Tuned Large Language Models. In Miceli-Barone, A. V.; Barez, F.; Cohen, S.; Voita, E.; Germann, U.; and Lukasik, M., eds., *Proceedings of the First edition of the Workshop on the Scaling Behavior of Large Language Models (SCALE-LLM 2024)*, 35–64. St. Julian’s, Malta: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chowdhery, A.; Narang, S.; Devlin, J.; Bosma, M.; Mishra, G.; Roberts, A.; et al. 2022. PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways. arXiv:2204.02311.
- Conneau, A.; Khandelwal, K.; Goyal, N.; Chaudhary, V.; Wenzek, G.; Guzmán, F.; et al. 2020. Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8440–8451. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dakle, P. P.; Rallabandi, S.; and Raghavan, P. 2023. Understanding BLOOM: An empirical study on diverse NLP tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14865*.
- Etzaniz, J.; Azkune, G.; Soroa, A.; de Lacalle, O. L.; and Artetxe, M. 2023. Do Multilingual Language Models Think Better in English? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01223*.
- Fernandes, P.; Ghorbani, B.; Garcia, X.; Freitag, M.; and Firat, O. 2023. Scaling Laws for Multilingual Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 10053–10071. PMLR.
- Hestness, J.; Narang, S.; Ardalani, N.; Diamos, G.; Jun, H.; Kianinejad, H.; et al. 2017. Deep Learning Scaling is Predictable, Empirically. arXiv:1712.00409.
- Hoffmann, J.; Borgeaud, S.; Mensch, A.; Buchatskaya, E.; Cai, T.; Rutherford, E.; et al. 2022. Training Compute-Optimal Large Language Models. arXiv:2203.15556.
- ImaniGooghari, A.; Lin, P.; Kargaran, A. H.; Severini, S.; Jalili Sabet, M.; Kassner, N.; et al. 2023. Glot500: Scaling Multilingual Corpora and Language Models to 500 Languages. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Isik, B.; Ponomareva, N.; Hazimeh, H.; Pappas, D.; Vasilvitskii, S.; and Koyejo, S. 2024. Scaling Laws for Downstream Task Performance of Large Language Models. arXiv:2402.04177.
- Joshi, P.; Santy, S.; Budhiraja, A.; Bali, K.; and Choudhury, M. 2020. The State and Fate of Linguistic Diversity and Inclusion in the NLP World. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaplan, J.; McCandlish, S.; Henighan, T.; Brown, T. B.; Chess, B.; Child, R.; et al. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. arXiv:2001.08361.
- Lai, V.; Ngo, N.; Pourn Ben Veyseh, A.; Man, H.; Dernoncourt, F.; Bui, T.; and Nguyen, T. 2023. ChatGPT Beyond English: Towards a Comprehensive Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lin, X. V.; Mihaylov, T.; Artetxe, M.; Wang, T.; Chen, S.; Simig, D.; et al. 2022. Few-shot Learning with Multilingual Generative Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics.

- McKenzie, I. R.; Lyzhov, A.; Pieler, M. M.; Parrish, A.; Mueller, A.; et al. 2023. Inverse Scaling: When Bigger Isn't Better. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Featured Certification.
- Mosbach, M.; Pimentel, T.; Ravfogel, S.; Klakow, D.; and Elazar, Y. 2023. Few-shot Fine-tuning vs. In-context Learning: A Fair Comparison and Evaluation. arXiv:2305.16938.
- Muennighoff, N.; Wang, T.; Sutawika, L.; Roberts, A.; Biderman, S.; Le Scao, T.; et al. 2023. Crosslingual Generalization through Multitask Finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nakkiran, P.; Kaplun, G.; Bansal, Y.; Yang, T.; Barak, B.; and Sutskever, I. 2019. Deep Double Descent: Where Bigger Models and More Data Hurt. arXiv:1912.02292.
- NLLB Team; Costa-jussà, M. R.; Cross, J.; Çelebi, O.; Elbayad, M.; Heafield, K.; et al. 2022. No Language Left Behind: Scaling Human-Centered Machine Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- Pfeiffer, J.; Goyal, N.; Lin, X.; Li, X.; Cross, J.; Riedel, S.; and Artetxe, M. 2022. Lifting the Curse of Multilinguality by Pre-training Modular Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Post, M. 2018. A Call for Clarity in Reporting BLEU Scores. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*. Brussels, Belgium: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Radford, A.; Wu, J.; Child, R.; Luan, D.; Amodei, D.; Sutskever, I.; et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8).
- Rae, J. W.; Borgeaud, S.; Cai, T.; Millican, K.; Hoffmann, J.; Song, F.; et al. 2022. Scaling Language Models: Methods, Analysis & Insights from Training Gopher. arXiv:2112.11446.
- Sampathkumar, R.; Kravitz, E.; and Huang, X. 2023. Zero-shot and few-shot prompting for the BloomZ 176B foundation model with the simplified Amazon SageMaker JumpStart SDK.
- Scao, T. L.; Fan, A.; Akiki, C.; Pavlick, E.; Ilić, S.; Hesslow, D.; et al. 2023. BLOOM: A 176B-Parameter Open-Access Multilingual Language Model. arXiv:2211.05100.
- Shliazhko, O.; Fenogenova, A.; Tikhonova, M.; Kozlova, A.; Mikhailov, V.; and Shavrina, T. 2024. mGPT: Few-Shot Learners Go Multilingual. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12: 58–79.
- Smith, S.; Patwary, M.; Norick, B.; LeGresley, P.; Rajbhandari, S.; Casper, J.; et al. 2022. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*.
- Srivastava, A.; Rastogi, A.; Rao, A.; Shoeb, A. A. M.; Abid, A.; Fisch, A.; et al. 2023. Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Sun, Z.; and Miceli-Barone, A. V. 2024. Scaling Behavior of Machine Translation with Large Language Models under Prompt Injection Attacks. In Miceli-Barone, A. V.; Barez, F.; Cohen, S.; Voita, E.; Germann, U.; and Lukasik, M., eds., *Proceedings of the First edition of the Workshop on the Scaling Behavior of Large Language Models (SCALE-LLM 2024)*, 9–23. St. Julian's, Malta: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Touvron, H.; Lavril, T.; Izacard, G.; Martinet, X.; Lachaux, M.-A.; Lacroix, T.; et al. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971.
- Wei, J.; Kim, N.; Tay, Y.; and Le, Q. 2023. Inverse Scaling Can Become U-Shaped. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei, J.; Tay, Y.; Bommasani, R.; Raffel, C.; Zoph, B.; Borgeaud, S.; et al. 2022. Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models. arXiv:2206.07682.
- Winata, G.; Wu, S.; Kulkarni, M.; Solorio, T.; and Preoțiuc-Pietro, D. 2022. Cross-lingual few-shot learning on unseen languages. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Xia, M.; Artetxe, M.; Zhou, C.; Lin, X. V.; Pasunuru, R.; Chen, D.; et al. 2023. Training Trajectories of Language Models Across Scales. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yong, Z.-X.; Schoelkopf, H.; Muennighoff, N.; Aji, A. F.; Adelani, D. I.; Almubarak, K.; Bari, M. S.; Sutawika, L.; Kasai, J.; Baruwu, A.; et al. 2022. Bloom+ 1: Adding language support to bloom for zero-shot prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09535*.
- Zhang, Y.; Yasunaga, M.; Zhou, Z.; HaoChen, J. Z.; Zou, J.; Liang, P.; and Yeung, S. 2023. Beyond Positive Scaling: How Negation Impacts Scaling Trends of Language Models. In Rogers, A.; Boyd-Graber, J.; and Okazaki, N., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, 7479–7498. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Appendix

0-shot vs. 2-shot settings

Figure 7 shows the relative improvement in percentage from 0-shot to 2-shot. For the **classification task**, on the one hand, we find that in 5 out of 6 cases, the larger models make more efficient use of in-context information (Brown et al. 2020a; Wei et al. 2023). On the other hand, in 4 out of 6 cases, we note that few-shot ICL *hurts* smaller models where the percentage increment is negative (less than 0). If we look at Table 3 which provides the slope of the linear fit for the models, we observe that the slope for the 2-shot setting is higher for both seen and unseen languages and for all three models with the exception of xglm, for which performance




Figure 7: Relative improvement in log-scale on y-axis from 0-shot to 2-shot. Text classification results are on the left, and on the right are text generation results.

degrades marginally with model size when going from 0-shot to 2-shot for unseen languages.

For the **generative task**, in Figure 7 (right) we observe that the performance of bloom improves in the 2-shot setting for seen as well as unseen languages whereas xglm and bloomz display the opposite behavior, suggesting that 2-shot setting does not seem to help in the generation task on this dataset.

BLOOM Model Performance At Different Resource Levels

Figure 8 and 9 show the performance of BLOOM model on classification and generation task across different resource levels.

Correlation Between Performance And Pretraining Data And Resource Levels

In order to better understand the scaling performance of the models, we dig in deeper into the languages that form the pretraining corpus. We experiment with using a rough proxy attribute such as general resource levels as introduced by Joshi et al. (2020) where languages of the world are categorized into 6 subsets, with level ‘0’ representing the cluster of languages with the lowest amounts of data available (i.e., extremely low resource languages), and level ‘5’ representing the languages that enjoy considerably large amounts of unannotated and annotated data (i.e., high resource languages). We now analyze the correlation between model performance and properties of the languages in more detail by computing the correlation between model F1 score and pretraining data (PD), resource level (RL), and merged resource level (RL*) as illustrated in Table 4 for the 0-shot case.

A prevalent hypothesis suggests that the performance of a model on a given language may be correlated with the amount of language-specific data present in the pretraining corpus (ImaniGooghari et al. 2023; Adelani et al. 2024). For the seen languages, we compute the Pearson’s correlation between the models’ F1 score and the pretraining data distribution as shown in the **second column** of Table 4. xglm obtains a correlation of at most 0.18, bloom shows moderate correlation ($r =$ up to 0.68) whereas bloomz shows weak to moderate correlation ($r =$ up to 0.4). These results indicate

that: 1) a model’s performance is not always correlated with the amount of language-specific data as in the case of xglm, and 2) despite being trained on the same pretraining corpus, different sized models show different correlations.

We next consider the correlation between model performance and language resource levels (**third column** of Table 4). In the context of the **classification task**, we can make several observations: 1) The strongest correlation between the performance of seen languages and their resource levels is shown by bloom, followed bloomz, and lastly, xglm. This is reflected in how these models perform in the languages of the different resource levels. Our discussion carries forth to the **generation task** as well, with one notable exception. We see that xglm for the 2-shot case shows the highest performance for seen ‘0’ resource languages. This is a statistical aberration because there is just one resource ‘0’ language in the seen category for xglm.

Continuing this line of investigation, we merge the three lower resource levels into one, and the three higher resource levels into another, thus obtaining a binary categorization of low and high. Using this, we compute the correlation one more time between F1 and low/high resourcedness (**fourth column**) and find that the correlation becomes even stronger.

Finally, we extend this analysis to unseen languages by computing the correlation of the F1 scores and the (merged) general resource availability (**fifth column**). Rather surprisingly, we notice that all models exhibit poor correlation. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is found in our analysis comparing the performance of seen and unseen languages from the same language family earlier in Figure 4 where the results confirm the assessment that unseen languages are able to obtain performance closer to seen languages from the same language family, possibly leveraging some benefits of cross-lingual transfer, which is certainly not being captured by simple correlations involving pretraining data distributions or resource levels.

Overall, contrary to the results in (Winata et al. 2022), we show that a model’s performance is not always correlated with the amount of language-specific data. Instead, our results suggest that general resource level seems to be a stronger indicator of performance for seen languages (but not for unseen languages).

Future work could explore enhancing the performance of low-resource languages while expanding the representation of resource levels.




Figure 8: Results of evaluation (F1 score) across different models based on language resource level for the **classification** task using SIB-200 dataset. The model sizes on the x-axis are in billions of parameters. ■ Resource Level 0, ■ Resource Level 1, ■ Resource Level 2, ■ Resource Level 3, ■ Resource Level 4, ■ Resource Level 5.




Figure 9: Results of evaluation (SacreBLEU) across different models based on language resource level for the **generation** task using Flores-200 dataset. The model sizes on the x-axis are in billions of parameters. ■ Resource Level 0, ■ Resource Level 1, ■ Resource Level 2, ■ Resource Level 3, ■ Resource Level 4, ■ Resource Level 5.

Model	seen			unseen
	PD	RL	RL*	RL*
xglm-564m	0.12	0.17	0.28	0.12
xglm-1.7b	0.07	0.02	0.14	0.17
xglm-2.9b	0.18	0.14	0.23	0.16
xglm-7.5b	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.06
bloom-560m	0.44	0.67	0.71	0.01
bloom-1b1	0.41	0.64	0.68	0.04
bloom-1b7	0.53	0.80	0.84	0.09
bloom-3b	0.68	0.70	0.74	-0.04
bloom-7b1	0.43	0.72	0.83	0.1
bloomz-560m	0.40	0.63	0.66	0.07
bloomz-1b1	0.30	0.68	0.68	0.05
bloomz-1b7	0.28	0.57	0.59	0.002
bloomz-3b	0.27	0.61	0.62	0.06
bloomz-7b1	0.20	0.59	0.59	0.16

Table 4: Pearson correlations using F1 score for classification task in 0-shot experiments and PD, RL, and RL*, where PD = Pretraining Data, RL = Resource Level, and RL* is after merging low resource levels (i.e. 0, 1, 2) and high resource levels (i.e. 3, 4, 5) into binary categories of low and high, respectively. Similar correlation were obtained for 2-shot. The PD for xglm models is the ratio with low resource upsampling from their original documentation.