

# Multilingual European Language Models: Benchmarking Approaches and Challenges

**Fabio Barth**

DFKI GmbH, Germany  
fabio.barth@dfki.de

**Georg Rehm**

DFKI GmbH, Germany  
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany  
georg.rehm@dfki.de

## Abstract

The breakthrough of generative large language models (LLMs) that can solve different tasks through chat interaction has led to a significant increase in the use of general benchmarks to assess the quality or performance of these models beyond individual applications. There is also a need for better methods to evaluate and also to compare models due to the ever increasing number of new models published. However, most of the established benchmarks revolve around the English language. This paper analyses the benefits and limitations of current evaluation datasets, focusing on multilingual European benchmarks. We analyse seven multilingual benchmarks and identify four major challenges. Furthermore, we discuss potential solutions to enhance translation quality and mitigate cultural biases, including human-in-the-loop verification and iterative translation ranking. Our analysis highlights the need for culturally aware and rigorously validated benchmarks to assess the reasoning and question-answering capabilities of multilingual LLMs accurately.

## 1 Introduction

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated very strong capabilities across a wide range of natural language processing (NLP) tasks. The performance of these models is measured and quantified using well-established benchmarks in which the models have to perform specific tasks such as, among others, reasoning, question answering (QA), or common-sense inference on English text (see, for example, Hendrycks et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022; Zellers et al., 2019). The benchmarks consist of text labeled by human annotators (Ding et al., 2024) or they were developed with the help of machine learning techniques that annotate or label the original text data automatically (Pfister and Hotho, 2024).

Benchmarks are intended to simulate complex problems so that they can provide, when applied to

a specific model, an overall impression of how well the model can solve a particular task. Numerous benchmarks exist for a very wide range of tasks, especially with regard to the English language and English-centric LLMs. High-quality multilingual benchmarks for multilingual models are relatively rare. There are non-English monolingual benchmarks developed together with annotators who are native speakers (Pfister and Hotho, 2024) and a few high-quality multilingual benchmarks on reading comprehension, e. g., Bandarkar et al. (2024).

Recently, researchers have been using multilingual benchmarks that are comparable and quantifiable across languages (Touvron et al., 2023). For instance, in late 2024, three multilingual LLMs were published that cover all 24 European languages (Ali et al., 2024; Martins et al., 2024; Gonzalez-Agirre et al., 2025). These LLMs were evaluated using English (MMLU, Hellaswag, TruthfulQA) and a few multilingual benchmarks (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Zellers et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2022; Bandarkar et al., 2024). These evaluations were performed using machine-translated versions of well-established English benchmarks regarding multilingual reasoning, QA, or common-sense inference (Thellmann et al., 2024). The translated benchmarks are, like the original English versions, multiple-choice problems, where the model has to choose the correct answer or output from four possible answer options. The correct answer can be calculated by generating the correct output (Zellers et al., 2019) or measuring the log-likelihood of each possible answer (Wiland et al., 2024). The benefit of automatically translated benchmarks is that, besides cost- and time-efficiency in terms of dataset generation, the scores are comparable across languages.<sup>1</sup>

This process has two pitfalls that complicate interpreting the benchmarks' scores. First, the

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/spaces/occiglot/euro-llm-leaderboard>

benchmarks are not flawless translations of the English versions. Benchmarks that contain a significant amount of incorrect, incomplete or inadequate translations can distort model predictions – especially considering that a single incorrectly translated option in a multiple choice setting changes the whole problem space (Lin et al., 2022).

To overcome this issue human annotators or an improved and more comprehensive translation pipeline are needed. For instance, a translation-verification process with a human in the loop could help enhance these benchmarks in terms of their translation quality. Another solution could be an iterative process of automatically ranking the translations and re-translating them until the total translation ranking has crossed a certain threshold. There are already models and metrics that can measure and score translation quality (Rei et al., 2020).

The second problem relates to cultural biases inherently embedded in the English benchmarks that cannot be addressed using automated translations only (Singh et al., 2024). For example, the MMLU benchmark contains graduate questions from the US that rely heavily on national knowledge (regarding history, religion etc.) (Hendrycks et al., 2021). These questions are not meaningful when evaluating the reasoning and QA capabilities of LLMs regarding European languages and cultures.

However, there are already some efforts to translate these benchmarks into multiple languages with regard to cultural biases. Note that these approaches involve human annotators that correct these biases (Singh et al., 2024).

This paper analyses the most commonly used benchmarks for multilingual LLMs for European languages. We highlight the benefits and interpretability of the existing benchmarks and outline their limitations.

## 2 Approaches

In this section, we discuss the different approaches to developing multilingual benchmarks. We examine seven multilingual general-domain benchmarks, some of which only partially cover all 24 official EU languages; only one benchmark covers 23 out of 24 languages (Bandarkar et al., 2024). We analyse benchmarks that include at least nine of the 24 languages. It must be noted that we do not discuss machine translation benchmarks such as FLORES-200, as these assess the quality of translations rather than the performance on general tasks.

### 2.1 Multilingual Benchmarks

The benchmarks can be broadly categorised into two groups based on the way they were developed. On the one hand, multilingual benchmarks are based on English-language benchmarks that were translated into different languages. These benchmarks are either machine-translated or translated by human annotators (occasionally, professional translators). GlobalMMLU (Singh et al., 2024) and MMMLU<sup>2</sup> belong to this category, they were developed by translating the MMLU benchmark into multiple languages. Two different approaches were used: professional human translators translated MMMLU into 14 languages; using professional human translators is less cost- and time-efficient than simply using automated translation technologies. GlobalMMLU was machine-translated and then annotated by human annotators, organised as an open-source community, using a public annotation framework. As the translation process was automated, Singh et al. (2024) have been able to translate the original dataset into a total of 42 languages including 11 European languages. To maximise the inclusion of human-translated content, GlobalMMLU also includes human translations of MMMLU. Both data sets show that including human annotators and translators to improve translation quality leads to a smaller task scope and overall sample size (Singh et al., 2024).

Thellmann et al. (2024) published EU20, a benchmark that contains translations of five well-established English benchmarks for 20 official EU languages, which cover grade-school science questions (Clark et al., 2018), grade-school math word problems (Cobbe et al., 2021), common-sense inference (Zellers et al., 2019), tests to measure a model’s propensity to reproduce falsehoods (Lin et al., 2022), and elementary mathematics, US history, computer science, law, and multiple choice QA (Hendrycks et al., 2021). The benchmarks were translated using the DeepL translation service. The automated translations were not validated by human translators. For the OKAPI benchmark Lai et al. (2023) translated the same benchmarks as EU20 except for GSM8K. This benchmark differs from EU20 with regard to language coverage and the used translation service. For OKAPI, Lai et al. (2023) used ChatGPT instead of DeepL. It comprises translations into 26 different languages, including 11 European languages.

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/openai/MMMLU>

The second category of benchmarks includes multilingual datasets that are not based on English data but on regional or multilingual data sources. Here, we can also distinguish between task-specific and multi-task benchmarks.

Include (Romanou et al., 2024) is a knowledge- and reasoning-centric benchmark across 44 languages, including 15 European languages. It was constructed based on local exam sources in the 44 languages it includes and consists of 197,243 multiple-choice QA pairs. The benchmark was extended with non-English benchmarks like TurkishMMLU (Yüksel et al., 2024) or PersianMMLU (Ghahroodi et al., 2024). Include is more extensive than EXAMS (Hardalov et al., 2020), a cross-lingual and multilingual QA benchmark using high school exams with limited domain coverage.

Belebele (Bandarkar et al., 2024) is a multiple choice machine reading comprehension (MRC) benchmark that covers 122 languages, including all EU languages except Irish. It was developed based on FLORES200 (NLLB Team et al., 2022) and contains a total of 900 questions in a total of 122 languages, each with four multiple-choice answers.

Xtreme (Hu et al., 2020), on the other hand, is a comprehensive collection of datasets covering nine tasks and 40 languages (including 15 European languages). As the nine tasks do not cover all 40 languages, an evaluation across the majority of languages is only possible for a subset of tasks (Hu et al., 2020). Two datasets (XQuAD and MLQA) have been translated into all 40 languages from the English source using an “in-house translation tool” (Hu et al., 2020). Overall, Xtreme covers four different categories of tasks: QA, classification, structured prediction, and retrieval.

## 2.2 Evaluation Methods

Most of the benchmarks described in Section 2.1 are multiple-choice benchmarks that do not test the multilingual language *generation* but multilingual language *understanding* capabilities of an LLM. Therefore, the metric for evaluating an LLM using one of these benchmarks is accuracy or the harmonic mean of precision and recall (F1 score). The only exception is the benchmark of Hu et al. (2020), which contains classification and structured prediction tasks that are also measured using accuracy and F1-score. However, for the QA tasks of the Xtreme dataset, the exact match metric is also used.

## 3 Challenges

We can identify four main challenges regarding these benchmarks. Below, we explain these and show why these limitations have to be considered when using the benchmarks for the evaluation of LLMs that cover many or all European languages.

### 3.1 Challenge 1: Cross-Lingual Comparison

Besides providing an overview of an LLM’s capabilities in various languages, multilingual benchmarks are used to enable cross-lingual comparisons, which highlight a model’s capabilities for all languages and show its limits for multilingual use cases. For multilingual benchmarks these comparisons also provide insights into a model’s transfer learning capabilities if they have only been trained on a subset of the languages.

Benchmarks like Xtreme contain a dataset collection covering various tasks, which makes them difficult to interpret for a cross-lingual comparison. Xtreme claims to cover 40 languages; for each task, they provide at least one gold-standard data set. But that does not cover all aspects of each language necessary for transfer because the characteristics of a language can vary depending on the task, domain, and register in which it is used (Hu et al., 2020).

To provide such insights, the samples in a benchmark have to be comparable across languages. Benchmarks like GlobalMMLU, Belebele or MMMLU use human annotators and translators to verify the sample comparison (Singh et al., 2024; Bandarkar et al., 2024) while automatically translated benchmarks like Thellmann et al. (2024) or Lai et al. (2023) are, by definition, unable to enable or guarantee cross-lingual comparisons without a human validation of the translations. Translations can contain tokens or syntactic structures that let the reader backtrack to the original source language. This phenomenon is called translationese (Koppel and Ordan, 2011).

### 3.2 Challenge 2: Translationese

Translationese is a linguistic phenomenon characterised by interference from the source language, leading to unnatural structures in the target language (Singh et al., 2024). In other words, translationese can be described as artifacts or markers in the target translations that can be used to identify the source language (Koppel and Ordan, 2011). Typically, these artifacts cause a drop in evalua-

tion quality. On the other hand, models unfamiliar with the source language could benefit from those artifacts in the target translation.

Nevertheless, there are solutions to overcome these linguistic qualms. Professional annotators or translators who validate translations to improve their quality through post-edits can mitigate translationese artifacts in the target language (Singh et al., 2024). There are also tools for automatic translation quality estimations that use a human-based scoring system to assess the quality of a specific translation (Rei et al., 2020; Kocmi and Federmann, 2023). It can be shown that these metrics are sensitive to translationese. The COMET score, for example, varies in terms of its absolute ranking between target translations with and without translationese. However, the results do not show on the system-level ranking (Zouhar et al., 2024), which averages three lexical segment-level metric scores (Rei et al., 2020).

### 3.3 Challenge 3: Cultural Bias

Most of the benchmarks evaluate the reasoning capabilities of LLMs. However, reasoning, behavior, and communication are shaped by culture (Tao et al., 2024). Therefore, cultural biases in multilingual datasets present substantial obstacles with regard to their scope, validity and reliability as global benchmarks (Singh et al., 2024). Cultural biases will not be mitigated if benchmarks are automatically translated from English into other languages. The published benchmarks apply two different options to address this limitation. First, human annotators evaluate cultural biases present in the original dataset. Global-MMLU, for instance, improved the quality of a multilingual MMLU by engaging with professional and community annotators that label samples as culturally-sensitive or culturally-agnostic (Singh et al., 2024). Using annotators to verify translations and evaluate cultural bias supports the effectiveness of a multilingual benchmark.

The second option is to develop a benchmark based on regional resources. The Include benchmark (Romanou et al., 2024) was created based on local exam sources instead of translating benchmarks with inherent cultural bias and debiasing translations. Local exams contain questions about local history, culture, politics, and geographical and regional knowledge.

### Cultural Sensitivity and Inclusion

Both approaches described in Section 3.3 would result in benchmarks with less English-centric cultural biases. However, the first approach mitigates and/or outlines existing biases by identifying whether a dataset is culturally agnostic or not, while the other approach results in benchmarks with cultural biases regarding the intended languages and cultures by not considering English sources that could contain English-centric biases.

The integration of diverse and culturally grounded knowledge is necessary to achieve a certain level of inclusivity and fairness for multilingual evaluations (Singh et al., 2024). Mitigating cultural bias from benchmarks is fundamental for achieving a certain level of reliability for global benchmarks, but – as already mentioned – culture shapes reasoning and is, therefore, an essential component in and for communication and for solving multilingual tasks.

### 3.4 Challenge 4: Ensuring Data Quality

Guaranteeing or at least achieving a certain level of data quality is challenging for all benchmarks. The reasons can differ and are also related to challenges already discussed (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2). This section will discuss cascading data quality issues that emerge from the source material or the benchmark generation process.

The samples should be evaluated to ensure high data quality in each iteration of the data processing pipeline. This can be done by regular manual or automatic inspections (Bandarkar et al., 2024). For instance, automatically translated samples can be evaluated using translation scores or human annotators. Thellmann et al. (2024) show that some translations have an error rate of up to 2.3%, which was identified by manually checking samples with unexpectedly low COMET scores (Thellmann et al., 2024). These error rates differ in individual languages and, therefore, also have an impact on cross-lingual comparability.

As a solution, the scoring and evaluation could be included in the translation process, and lower-rated samples could be re-translated or manually annotated. However, most translated benchmarks rely on manual assessment. Bandarkar et al. (2024) use manual methods to ensure data quality. Throughout the process of developing the dataset, annotator alignments were defined. Note that forced annotator alignments for translations could increase trans-

lationese (Clark et al., 2020) but it ensures equivalent question difficulty across languages (Bandarkar et al., 2024).

## 4 Conclusions

In this paper, we analysed, to the best of our knowledge, all benchmarks for the European language area and identified their challenges. The shortcomings of each benchmark are diverse and can be mitigated at different stages of dataset generation. It can also be shown that other approaches for developing datasets can have certain advantages. It can be concluded that a diverse and comprehensive collection of European language benchmarks is beneficial to analyse and compare multilingual language models in detail.

## Acknowledgments

The work presented in this paper has received funding from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) through the project OpenGPT-X (project no. 68GX21007D).

## References

- Mehdi Ali, Michael Fromm, Klaudia Thellmann, Jan Ebert, Alexander Arno Weber, Richard Rutmann, Charvi Jain, Max Lübbering, Daniel Steinigen, Johannes Leveling, Katrin Klug, Jasper Schulze Buschhoff, Lena Jurkschat, Hammam Abdelwahab, Benny Jörg Stein, Karl-Heinz Sylla, Pavel Denisov, Nicolo’ Brandizzi, Qasid Saleem, Anirban Bhowmick, Lennard Helmer, Chelsea John, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Malte Ostendorff, Alex Jude, Lalith Manjunath, Samuel Weinbach, Carolin Penke, Oleg Filatov, Shima Asaadi, Fabio Barth, Rafet Sifa, Fabian Küch, Andreas Herten, René Jäkel, Georg Rehm, Stefan Kesselheim, Joachim Köhler, and Nicolas Flores-Herr. 2024. [Teuken-7b-base & teuken-7b-instruct: Towards european llms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.03730.
- Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabza. 2024. [The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 749–775, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan H. Clark, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Dan Garrette, Tom Kwiatkowski, Vitaly Nikolaev, and Jennimaria Palomaki. 2020. [Tydi qa: A benchmark for information-seeking question answering in typologically diverse languages](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:454–470.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. [Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.05457.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- Muong Ding, Chenghao Deng, Jocelyn Choo, Zichu Wu, Aakriti Agrawal, Avi Schwarzschild, Tianyi Zhou, Tom Goldstein, John Langford, Anima Anandkumar, and Furong Huang. 2024. [Easy2hardbench: Standardized difficulty labels for profiling llm performance and generalization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.18433.
- Omid Ghahroodi, Marzia Nouri, Mohammad Vali Sanian, Alireza Sahebi, Doratossadat Dastgheib, Ehsaneddin Asgari, Mahdieh Soleymani Baghshah, and Mohammad Hossein Rohban. 2024. [Khayyam challenge \(persianmmlu\): Is your llm truly wise to the persian language?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.06644.
- Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Marc Pàmies, Joan Llop, Irene Baucells, Severino Da Dalt, Daniel Tamayo, José Javier Saiz, Ferran Espuña, Jaume Prats, Javier Aula-Blasco, Mario Mina, Iñigo Pikabea, Adrián Rubio, Alexander Shvets, Anna Sallés, Iñaki Lacunza, Jorge Palomar, Júlia Falcão, Lucía Tormo, Luis Vasquez-Reina, Montserrat Marimon, Oriol Pareras, Valle Ruiz-Fernández, and Marta Villegas. 2025. [Salamandra technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.08489.
- Momchil Hardalov, Todor Mihaylov, Dimitrina Zlatkova, Yoan Dinkov, Ivan Koychev, and Preslav Nakov. 2020. [EXAMS: A multi-subject high school examinations dataset for cross-lingual and multilingual question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5427–5444, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. [Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2003.11080.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023. [Gembamqm: Detecting translation quality error spans with gpt-4](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.13988.

- Moshe Koppel and Noam Ordan. 2011. [Translationese and its dialects](#). In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1318–1326, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Viet Dac Lai, Chien Van Nguyen, Nghia Trung Ngo, Thuat Nguyen, Franck Dernoncourt, Ryan A. Rossi, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2023. [Okapi: Instruction-tuned large language models in multiple languages with reinforcement learning from human feedback](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.16039.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. [TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pedro Henrique Martins, Patrick Fernandes, João Alves, Nuno M. Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Duarte M. Alves, José Pombal, Amin Farajian, Manuel Faysse, Mateusz Klimaszewski, Pierre Colombo, Barry Haddow, José G. C. de Souza, Alexandra Birch, and André F. T. Martins. 2024. [Eurollm: Multilingual language models for europe](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.16235.
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic 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](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2207.04672.
- Jan Pfister and Andreas Hotho. 2024. [SuperGLEBER: German language understanding evaluation benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7904–7923, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angelika Romanou, Negar Foroutan, Anna Sotnikova, Zeming Chen, Sree Harsha Nelaturu, Shivalika Singh, Rishabh Maheshwary, Micol Altomare, Mohamed A. Haggag, Snegha A, Alfonso Amayuelas, Azril Hafizi Amirudin, Viraat Aryabumi, Danylo Boiko, Michael Chang, Jenny Chim, Gal Cohen, Aditya Kumar Dalmia, Abraham Diress, Sharad Duwal, Daniil Dzenhaliou, Daniel Fernando Erazo Florez, Fabian Farestam, Joseph Marvin Imperial, Shayekh Bin Islam, Perttu Isotalo, Maral Jabbarishiviari, Börje F. Karlsson, Eldar Khalilov, Christopher Klamm, Fajri Koto, Dominik Krzemiński, Gabriel Adriano de Melo, Syrielle Montariol, Yiyang Nan, Joel Niklaus, Jekaterina Novikova, Johan Samir Obando Ceron, Debjit Paul, Esther Ploeger, Jebish Purbey, Swati Rajwal, Selvan Sunitha Ravi, Sara Rydell, Roshan Santhosh, Drishti Sharma, Marjana Prifti Skenduli, Arshia Soltani Moakhar, Bardia Soltani Moakhar, Ran Tamir, Ayush Kumar Tarun, Azmine Toushik Wasi, Thenuka Ovin Weerasinghe, Serhan Yilmaz, Mike Zhang, Imanol Schlag, Marzieh Fadaee, Sara Hooker, and Antoine Bosselut. 2024. [Include: Evaluating multilingual language understanding with regional knowledge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.19799.
- Shivalika Singh, Angelika Romanou, Clémentine Fourrier, David I. Adelani, Jian Gang Ngui, Daniel Vila-Suero, Peerat Limkonchotiwat, Kelly Marchisio, Wei Qi Leong, Yosephine Susanto, Raymond Ng, Shayne Longpre, Wei-Yin Ko, Madeline Smith, Antoine Bosselut, Alice Oh, Andre F. T. Martins, Leshem Choshen, Daphne Ippolito, Enzo Ferrante, Marzieh Fadaee, Beyza Ermis, and Sara Hooker. 2024. [Global mmlu: Understanding and addressing cultural and linguistic biases in multilingual evaluation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.03304.
- Yan Tao, Olga Viberg, Ryan S Baker, and René F Kizilcec. 2024. [Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models](#). *PNAS Nexus*, 3(9).
- Klaudia Thellmann, Bernhard Stadler, Michael Fromm, Jasper Schulze Buschhoff, Alex Jude, Fabio Barth, Johannes Leveling, Nicolas Flores-Herr, Joachim Köhler, René Jäkel, and Mehdi Ali. 2024. [Towards multilingual llm evaluation for european languages](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.08928.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan,

Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.

Jacek Wiland, Max Ploner, and Alan Akbik. 2024. [Bear: A unified framework for evaluating relational knowledge in causal and masked language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.04113.

Arda Yüksel, Abdullatif Köksal, Lütfi Kerem Şenel, Anna Korhonen, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. [Turkishmmlu: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in turkish](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.12402.

Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:1905.07830.

Vilém Zouhar, Pinzhen Chen, Tsz Kin Lam, Nikita Moghe, and Barry Haddow. 2024. [Pitfalls and outlooks in using comet](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.15366.