

# BATAYAN: A Filipino NLP benchmark for evaluating Large Language Models

Jann Railey Montalan<sup>1,2</sup>, Jimson Paulo Layacan<sup>3</sup>, David Demitri Africa<sup>4</sup>, Richell Isaiah Flores<sup>3</sup>, Michael T. Lopez II<sup>3</sup>, Theresa Denise Magsajo, Anjanette Cayabyab, William Chandra Tjhi<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>AI Singapore, <sup>2</sup>National University of Singapore, <sup>3</sup>Ateneo de Manila University, <sup>4</sup>University of Cambridge

Correspondence: railey@aisingapore.org

## Abstract

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities on widely benchmarked high-resource languages; however, linguistic nuances of under-resourced languages remain unexplored. We introduce BATAYAN, a holistic Filipino benchmark designed to systematically evaluate LLMs across three key natural language processing (NLP) competencies: understanding, reasoning, and generation. BATAYAN consolidates eight tasks, covering both Tagalog and code-switched Taglish utterances. Our rigorous, native-speaker-driven annotation process ensures fluency and authenticity to the complex morphological and syntactic structures of Filipino, alleviating a pervasive translationese bias in existing Filipino corpora. We report empirical results on a variety of multilingual LLMs, highlighting significant performance gaps that signal the under-representation of Filipino in pretraining corpora, the unique hurdles in modeling Filipino’s rich morphology and construction, and the importance of explicit Filipino language support and instruction tuning. Moreover, we discuss the practical challenges encountered in dataset construction and propose principled solutions for building culturally and linguistically-faithful resources in under-represented languages. We also provide a public benchmark and leaderboard as a clear foundation for iterative, community-driven progress in Filipino NLP.

## 1 Introduction

Spurred on by recent advances in computing power, big data, and machine learning, LLMs have come into widespread use due to the emergence of a variety of novel and useful capabilities at scale (Hadi et al., 2023). These capabilities have made user applications based on LLMs some of the fastest-growing consumer applications in human history, but have also rendered previous




Figure 1: BATAYAN is a benchmark that holistically evaluates LLM capabilities on a wide range of Filipino language tasks. The rigorous curation and adaptation done by native Filipinos preserves the complexity and authenticity of Filipino language usage today.

benchmarks insufficiently difficult and diverse (Wey, 2024; Yang et al., 2023).

Benchmarks are standard datasets used to measure and compare the performance of models against one another. In particular, the increasingly general capabilities of LLMs have necessitated holistic benchmarks which test a diversity of metrics like fairness, truthfulness, and robustness, as well as a variety of tasks like text summarization, casual reasoning, and translation (Yang et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023). The vast majority of LLM benchmarks evaluate tasks in English, with non-English works being much fewer (Liu et al., 2021; Son et al., 2024).

Filipino, despite being the national language of the Philippines and being spoken by over 80 million people, remains an under-resourced language. It is under-represented in multilingual LLMs, and existing corpora are domain-specific, non-multilingual (Cajote et al., 2024), and created by non-native speakers (Quakenbush, 2005; Dita et al., 2009). Specifically for LLM benchmarks, Filipino is either excluded from multilingual benchmarks, suffer from limited task diversity, or have serious deficiencies in grammatical correctness, completeness, and

diversity (Bandarkar et al., 2024; NLLB Team et al., 2022).

Moreover, Filipino is a complex language which exhibits a highly complex linguistic structure, particularly in its rich morphological system (Ramos, 2021; Go and Nocon, 2017). Its agglutinative nature allows for extensive use of affixation and creating nuance through prefixes, infixes, suffixes, and circumfixes (Archibald and O’Grady, 2001; Jubilado, 2004). These affixes, combined with root words, allow intricate verb conjugations for marking tense, focus, and mood (Zamar, 2022). Filipino incorporates elements from a wide array of linguistic influences, such as Spanish (Bowen, 1971; Wolff, 2001), Chinese (Gonzales, 2022; Reid, 2018; Chan-Yap, 1980), and Malay (Wardana et al., 2022; Baklanova, 2017), with codeswitching between English and Filipino being common (Bautista, 1991, 2004).

Our threefold contributions attempt to address these challenges. **First, we present BATAYAN,<sup>1</sup> a holistic Filipino benchmark for evaluating large language models across 8 distinct tasks** spanning natural language understanding, reasoning, and generation. We place a rigorous emphasis on authenticity to natural Filipino language use through native speaker translation and annotation, addressing the limitations of existing Filipino datasets. BATAYAN is released as part of SEA-HELM<sup>2</sup>, a leaderboard for comprehensive evaluation of LLMs across linguistic and reasoning tasks for Southeast Asian languages. **Second, we provide extensive evaluation results from testing 8 prominent LLMs on BATAYAN**, revealing significant disparities in model performance across different linguistic capabilities in Filipino. **Third, we document systematic challenges and methodological considerations in creating high-quality Filipino NLP datasets**, particularly highlighting issues in translation fluency, vocabulary adaptation, and the preservation of Filipino’s rich morphological features. These insights provide a practical framework for future development of Filipino language resources.

## 2 Considerations for Filipino Evaluations

### 2.1 Language of Evaluation

While Filipino is the official language of the Philippines, it has been argued in literature that

its de facto *lingua franca* is Taglish, the practice of code-switching between English and Tagalog (Go and Gustilo, 2013). Naturally-occurring datasets in Filipino (e.g., those mined from social media, recorded interviews) contain some code-switching (Bautista, 2004). We defer the problematization of the debated difference between Tagalog and Filipino, and use the two terms interchangeably.

Standard Tagalog, while text-rich, is considered under-resourced, lacking the linguistic data, tools, and resources for effective natural language processing (Miranda, 2023b). To address data scarcity, developers take advantage of high-resource languages such as English through translations (Goyal et al., 2022; Doddapaneni et al., 2023). Furthermore, leveraging multilingual datasets is potent not only because it enhances the performance of models trained on limited resources but also because code-switching and bilingualism is a common phenomena in the Philippines (Tupas and Martin, 2017).

Taglish is characterized to possess communicative efficiency. Compared to Standard Tagalog or English, Taglish, provides a more convenient way of communicating a message (Bautista, 2004). For this consideration, application of NLP becomes more helpful as users are more likely to interact freely when using a language familiar to them.

### 2.2 Language Design Principles

The design of BATAYAN adhered to principles that emphasize linguistic authenticity and representativeness in word choice, sentence structure, and grammar.

In terms of language use and word choice, we employed common Filipino and Taglish vocabulary, balancing loanwords with native Filipino terms by prioritizing colloquial usage. This was also done when words had both English and Filipino variants, taking into account spelling and orthographic preferences prevalent among native speakers.

Regarding sentence structure, we prioritized sentences with attention to natural syntax and the choice of *ayos* (sentence arrangement), namely direct (*karaniwang ayos*, KA, *lit.* usual order) or inverted (*di-karaniwang ayos*, DKA, *lit.* unusual order) forms (Tanawan et al., 2008). In KA, Filipino constructions follow the typical predicate-initial word order (Malicsi, 2013). In contrast, DKA, which is also referred to linguistically as an *ay*-inversion, is a type of

<sup>1</sup>The word “*batayan*” means “basis” or “groundtruth”.

<sup>2</sup><https://leaderboard.sea-lion.ai/>

construction in Filipino where non-predicative constituents (such as *simuno*, *lit.* grammatical subject) are “fronted” or shifted to precede the predicate, “marking” them as the “topic” of the sentence (Kroeger, 1993). Inverted constructions are often used in formal settings, and could therefore be deemed unnatural in most situations (Pizarro-Guevara, 2010). This characteristic of Filipino is of interest due to our observation of automatic translations preferring DKA (see Section 4.1); hence, the further need for native re-translations with a preference for KA. The distinction between KA and DKA with respect to natural syntax and translation style is further discussed in the same section.

For translated datasets, compliance with Filipino grammar was also a critical aspect of the dataset design, with adherence to grammatical guidelines set by the Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (Almario, 2014). In translation, we followed principles aimed at preserving the source material’s intent while adjusting for cultural and contextual relevance as suggested by Almario (2016). Translations were performed by native Filipino speakers in the identified *lingua franca*, whenever appropriate, to maintain semantic equivalence without resorting to overly literal phrasing.

### 3 Task and Dataset Curation

#### 3.1 Task Selection

Previous work on Filipino language model evaluation has been largely fragmented. While prior studies have made important contributions in assessing large-scale language models (Cruz and Cheng, 2020, 2022), and various researchers have developed task-specific datasets for named entity recognition (Miranda, 2023a), sentiment analysis (Villavicencio et al., 2021), and other isolated tasks, the field lacks a unified, comprehensive benchmark for systematic evaluation of model capabilities across different linguistic dimensions.

Through BATAYAN, we aim to significantly expand the scope of Filipino language evaluation by introducing tasks that assess a gamut of linguistic capabilities. Specifically, we focus on integrating more challenging Natural Language Understanding (NLU) tasks alongside Natural Language Reasoning (NLR) tasks, while introducing novel Natural Language Generation (NLG) tasks previously unexplored in the Filipino context. This comprehensive approach allows for

a more thorough assessment of models’ ability in Filipino given its rich morphology and unique linguistic characteristics.

Our benchmark design and selection of tasks are informed by established multilingual evaluation frameworks, particularly BHASA (Leong et al., 2023), which provides systematic evaluation across a number of Southeast Asian languages. We also draw insights from widely-adopted language benchmarks such as the XTREME multilingual benchmark (Hu et al., 2020) and the IndoNLU Indonesian benchmark (Wilie et al., 2020), which have demonstrated the importance of testing various aspects of linguistic competence.

For this study, we carefully selected eight tasks that span three key competencies of NLP. For NLU: Paraphrase Identification (PI), Question Answering (QA), Sentiment Analysis (SA), Toxicity Detection (TD). For NLR: Causal Reasoning (CR), Natural Language Inference (NLI). For NLG: Abstractive Summarization (AS), Machine Translation (MT). These tasks are detailed in Appendix B.

#### 3.2 Dataset Collection and Annotation

To construct BATAYAN, we curated open-source corpora with clear provenance when possible, prioritizing datasets that exhibit authentic language use across various domains such as social media, news articles, and other publicly available texts. We identified existing Filipino-language datasets for MT, QA, and TD. For the SA task, we chose to repurpose an existing dataset and annotate them for the aforementioned task.

Tasks such as AS, CR, NLI, and PI lacked a native Filipino corpus. As such, we first identified existing English corpora, generated initial translations using automatic translation tools, then conducted a manual review and revision to generate high-quality and fluent translations. The authors<sup>3</sup> acted as annotators and raters for this study. They were grouped into teams of three and performed translations and reviews, focusing on cultural and linguistic relevance to ensure that the translated texts resonate with Filipino contexts.

For each task, we randomly sampled  $5n$  entries for a target size of  $n$ , maintaining balanced class distributions. Entries were filtered by length (20–2000 characters) and quality ( $\leq 50\%$  grammatical errors). Afterwards, each sample

<sup>3</sup>Demographics: working professionals and university students, aged between 21–30 years old, native Filipino speakers, lived in the Philippines for a majority of their lives.

| Competency | Task | Dataset                              | Source Language | Output (Options) | Domain       | Adaptation Applied |
|------------|------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| NLU        | PI   | PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019)            | English         | label (2)        | Wikipedia    | Native translation |
|            | QA   | Belebele (Bandarkar et al., 2024)    | Filipino        | span (4)         | Wikinews     | Native translation |
|            | SA   | PH Elections (Cabasag et al., 2019)  | Taglish         | label (3)        | Social media | None               |
|            | TD   | PH Elections (Cabasag et al., 2019)  | Taglish         | label (2)        | Social media | None               |
| NLR        | CR   | Balanced COPA (Kavumba et al., 2019) | English         | label (2)        | General      | Native translation |
|            | NLI  | XNLI (Conneau et al., 2018)          | English         | label (3)        | General      | Native translation |
| NLG        | AS   | XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021)          | English         | summary          | News         | Native translation |
|            | MT   | FLORES 200 (NLLB Team et al., 2022)  | Filipino        | translation      | Wikinews     | Native translation |

Table 1: Source datasets for each task in BATAYAN.

in each task underwent evaluation by teams of three against three criteria: completeness, fluency, and sensibility. Samples were assessed as complete only if they contained well-formed sentences, excluding standalone dependent clauses or fragmentary headers and titles lacking complete meaning. Fluency was evaluated on native-like constructions based on multiple factors including appropriate verb conjugations (e.g., avoiding constructions like “\**Nagpapasalamatán ako sa iyo*”, lit. “\*I give thanks to you.”), natural word choices (avoiding awkward phrases like “\**Si Pacquiao ang kamao ng bansa*” instead of “*Si Pacquiao ang pambansang kamao*”, in English: “Pacquiao is the nation’s fist”), and preference for KA sentence structure where contextually appropriate. Samples were assessed as sensible if relevant to the task, screening for confounding factors that would not effectively test the intended language capability (e.g., incorrect answers in QA mislabeled as correct).

For AS, we employed additional criteria based on previous work (Leong et al., 2023) to assess the appropriateness of the summary in reference to the content of the provided passage. We score samples on faithfulness (binary), relevance (0–3), fluency (0–3), and coherence (0–3), with three independent raters per entry. For faithfulness, raters evaluated the factual consistency between the summary and source article, with particular attention to fact preservation and penalization of hallucinated content. Only summaries receiving unanimous 1/1 faithfulness scores from all raters were considered for inclusion, ensuring strict maintenance of factual integrity. For relevance, raters evaluated both coverage of essential information and information filtering, penalizing summaries containing redundancies or excess details. For fluency, raters assessed for proper formatting, appropriate capitalization,

and grammatical construction, with higher scores awarded to summaries exhibiting natural Filipino language patterns. For coherence, raters assessed how effectively information flowed between sentences, with higher scores given to summaries that built logically from sentence to sentence to create a cohesive narrative about the topic.

Only samples passing all applicable criteria were included in the final dataset. In cases where initial sampling yielded insufficient qualifying entries, deficient samples were carefully corrected by authors through targeted improvements to grammar, translation of English passages, or other identified issues while maintaining authentic Filipino language patterns.

Joint agreement on our evaluation criteria is presented in Appendix A. This process prioritized agreement on fundamental classification criteria rather than traditional metrics which use chance correction like Cohen’s kappa which are less suitable for binary categorical tasks (Powers, 2012) and classification tasks in general (Delgado and Tibau, 2019; Feng and Zhao, 2016).

### 3.3 Source Datasets

Table 1 outlines key attributes of each dataset, such as language, output type, domain, and any adaptations applied to ensure alignment with natural Filipino language construction. More detailed statistics can be found in Appendix B.

Native review and translation was applied for all tasks (except for SA and TD) to enhance contextual and linguistic accuracy. We chose to maintain the naturally-occurring language for sentiment analysis and toxicity detection to capture the nuances of code-switched Taglish usage prevalent in social media in the Philippines.

For the SA task, three native Filipino speakers reannotated the Philippine election-related tweets (Cabasag et al., 2019) dataset with three



sentiment polarities: positive, negative, and neutral. Inter-annotator agreement was calculated, which yielded a Cohen’s kappa of 0.8202 and a Krippendorff’s alpha of 0.8268, indicating substantial agreement.

## 4 Challenges with Developing a Filipino Benchmark

This section discusses issues in creating BATAYAN, split into datasets that required adaptation and datasets where the content were kept as-is. The purpose of this section is to shed light on issues that future researchers may encounter in creating new Filipino datasets or adapting previous ones.

### 4.1 Issues with Adapted Data

Most of the tasks presented in this study were sourced from existing English language datasets that were natively translated and adapted into Filipino by the authors, whom are all native speakers of Filipino.

**Creating more relevant summaries for XL-Sum.** Previous work has noted that a significant portion of reference summaries in the XL-Sum dataset is highly abstractive, demonstrates factual errors, or contains information not mentioned in the provided articles (Guo et al., 2022), putting to question its factuality and validity. To address this, we developed new Filipino summaries for each article. We ensured relevance and fluency by including only the most important information that can be directly lifted from the article using natural-sounding and grammatically-correct constructions.

**Limitations in adapting vocabulary.** Adapting the English tasks to Filipino revealed issues in maintaining the intelligibility of the text. Technical terms that exist in English were difficult to translate into Filipino, with several of them having no direct translations. For example, an instance from Belebele included the term “rule of thirds”, which describes a specific photography technique. Originally, the translation of this phrase in the Tagalog subset of Belebele was “*tuntunin ng mga sangkatlo*” (lit. “rule of thirds”), which does not make sense in Filipino and does not convey the intended meaning. For jargon such as this, we chose to keep the original English phrasing.

English idiomatic expressions were also prevalent and required a more flexible approach in adaptation to ensure the integrity of meaning.

For example, one premise from Balanced COPA was, “The criminal turned himself in”, using the idiomatic expression “turned himself in” to mean “surrendered”. We chose to translate this into Filipino as, “*Isinuko ng kriminal ang kanyang sarili*” (in English: “The criminal surrendered himself”).

Moreover, the presence of English words that have homonyms added to the complexity of translating English sentences to Filipino. For example, some sentences in the PAWS dataset contained the adjective “right”, which can refer to either the direction (in Filipino: “*kanan*”) or an assertion of the correctness of the object it is modifying (in Filipino: “*tama*”). In such cases, we inferred the most probable meaning of the words from the context of the entire passage and then identified the corresponding Filipino word to be incorporated in our Filipino translation.

**(Dis)fluency in expert and machine translations.** Our rigorous review and annotation of existing datasets with machine and expert-guided translations in Filipino revealed weaknesses in their adaptation. The authors found that the automatic translations were unnatural, disfluent, and showed characteristics of translationese (Gellerstam, 1986; Riley et al., 2020) despite being grammatically correct. Notably, we observed that these initial translations demonstrated an unusual preference with using *ay*-inversion. We also observed that these translations used Filipino terms that were synonymous to their English counterparts but pragmatically-awkward. Hence, we applied rephrasing and re-translation to ensure that the samples used sound more native and natural.

For example, one passage from the English subset of Belebele was, “The CCTV would certainly send a strong signal...” The original Tagalog (machine) translation was, “*Ang CCTV ay tiyak na magpapadala ng malakas na hudyat...*” The term “*magpapadala*” here means “to send” in the sense of transporting a thing from one place to another, while the term “*hudyat*” implies a “starting sign”. It also uses the unnatural DKA construction or *ay*-inversion. Within the context of the original passage, a more fluent (human) translation would be, “*Tiyak na maghahatid ang CCTV ng malakas na pahiwatig...*”, where “*maghahatid*” means “to bring about” and “*pahiwatig*” conveys a sense of “reminder” or “warning”, and the sentence follows the usual KA construction.

**Inconsistencies in *ay*-inversions in translation construction.** Styles in translation vary from person-to-person, depending on their valuations and reading of the original text (Castagnoli, 2020). Likewise, *ay*-inversion in the context of translation boils down to a stylistic choice of the translator. Hence, while the KA is deemed more natural over the DKA, this valuation of the usual/natural and unusual/unnatural is debated.

On one hand, university stylebooks on writing such as that of Yapan (2017) considers KA to mean the usual pattern of speech for Filipino speakers. Also, Magracia (2001) notes that while the DKA is correct in “meaning, syntactic order, and grammaticality,” it is not the “natural” way of speaking for Filipinos. Furthermore, she argues that the DKA reflects a speaker’s language of thought—in this case, the influence of English. The same justification, in terms of source language for translated corpora as demonstrated in Visweswariah et al. (2011), can then be said on the machine-translated text, though this remains an open question for Filipino.

On the other hand, other research argues that DKA is not an abnormality, but is instead a necessary aspect for “discourse continuity” (Bolata, 2022). Hence, the more complex the sentence, the higher the chance of utilizing the *ay*-inversion (Fox, 1985). The same can be observed in the datasets. For example, the short sentences in the CR task allowed for the sentences to be changed to the KA, while longer, more context-rich sentences in the NLI task required the use of the DKA.

These frameworks demonstrate the subjective nature of the selection of sentence structure. Hence, such inconsistencies may still be observed in the tasks in BATAYAN despite being rigorously translated by native speakers.

## 4.2 Issues with Natively-Sourced Data

While the issues with most datasets in BATAYAN were related with fluency and naturalness, the Philippine election-related tweets (Cabasag et al., 2019) dataset used for the SA and TD tasks presented unique challenges.

**Incomplete entries.** Due to the contextual nature of Filipino and social media communication, many samples lacked sufficient contextual information. To maintain dataset authenticity, we prioritized entries with adequate information for sentiment or toxicity analysis rather than complete removal. This was accomplished by selecting

high-agreement samples where native speakers demonstrated consistent task performance.

**Non-standard orthography.** The dataset exhibited significant orthographic variation (spelling, capitalization, word boundaries, etc.) due to its natural language origins. We preserved this variation as it reflects authentic Filipino language (Ila et al., 2012; Javier, 2018; Caroro et al., 2020) use relevant to toxicity detection and sentiment analysis tasks, aligning with our methodological principles. We maintained quality control by verifying that orthographical variations remained comprehensible to native readers.

**Class imbalance.** The dataset showed a disproportionate distribution of negative sentiment regarding specific political entities. We addressed this by rebalancing the dataset and prioritizing high-agreement samples to mitigate individual annotator bias.

## 5 Evaluation

BATAYAN serves as the Filipino component of the SEA-HELM leaderboard. The evaluation framework of SEA-HELM follows prior systems such as HELM (Liang et al., 2023), and is composed of tasks, prompts, and metrics.

### 5.1 Evaluation Design

**Tasks.** The selection of tasks in BATAYAN aforementioned in Section 3.1 aims to comprehensively evaluate language capabilities of LLMs in Filipino. Each task is a collection of instances composed of an input string, a list of references, accompanying metadata, and the groundtruth label. We divide instances into two sets: the evaluation set, and a small 5-instance set that can serve as exemplars for few-shot prompting. Overall, BATAYAN provides 8 distinct tasks with 3,800 test instances.

**Prompts.** For BATAYAN, we developed prompt templates for each task written in Filipino. We ensured that the instructions for each task are consistent with the prompt template design already used in SEA-HELM. A comprehensive list of these prompt templates can be found in Appendix C.

During model evaluation, input prompts are constructed using evaluation instances and the corresponding prompt template. The default evaluation setting for BATAYAN is zero-shot prompting, where in-context input-label pairs are not included in the model prompt. Given the input

| Models  | PI           | QA           | SA           | TD           | CR           | NLI          |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| aisingapore/gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct   | 82.02        | 82.80        | <b>75.99</b> | <b>73.12</b> | <b>92.75</b> | <b>68.31</b> |
| aisingapore/llama3.1-8b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct | 74.98        | 80.69        | 51.18        | 61.24        | 79.70        | 66.26        |
| CohereForAI/aya-expanse-8b                      | 33.94        | 2.97         | 57.44        | 34.39        | 1.96         | 25.27        |
| google/gemma-2-9b-it                            | 82.50        | <b>83.96</b> | 70.72        | 64.26        | 91.25        | 60.61        |
| meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct                | 60.94        | 73.97        | 52.54        | 49.76        | 73.21        | 57.64        |
| Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct                        | <b>84.45</b> | 69.11        | 67.42        | 61.05        | 45.76        | 58.75        |
| sail/Sailor2-8B-Chat                            | 48.93        | 59.48        | 48.40        | 47.48        | 19.82        | 24.05        |
| SeaLLMs/SeaLLMs-v3-7B-Chat                      | 36.98        | 49.68        | 70.79        | 63.26        | 71.91        | 20.07        |

Table 2: Performance of LLMs on BATAYAN natural language understanding (NLU) and natural language reasoning (NLR) tasks. Macro F1 scores are reported.

prompts and decoding parameters (see Appendix D), a model then generates output completions.

**Metrics.** We adopt multiple metrics to quantify the models’ performance on each task. For each metric, the model completion is treated as the prediction, while the instance label is used as the reference. For the NLU and NLR tasks, we report the macro F1 score. For machine translation (English→Filipino and Filipino→English), we use ChrF++ (Popović, 2017) and MetricX-24 using the metricx-24-hybrid-xxl-v2p6-bfloat16 model (Juraska et al., 2024). For abstractive summarization, we report three metrics: BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020), ChrF++, and ROUGE-L F1 from the multilingual implementation of ROUGE (Lin, 2004) used in XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021). Default package parameter settings are used, and performance scores are based on a single run of the benchmark.

## 5.2 Results

Analysis of model performance across tasks reveals several insights about current multilingual LLMs’ capabilities in Filipino. Models with explicit Filipino language support generally outperform those without dedicated instruction tuning, though the margin varies significantly by task type. In NLU and NLR tasks (see Table 2), gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct demonstrates superior performance, achieving the highest scores in SA (75.99%), TD (73.12%), and NLI (68.31%). This suggests that targeted regional pretraining and instruction tuning can capture the nuances of Filipino sentiment and toxicity, which often involve code-switching and cultural context. However, for PI, Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct achieves the best performance (84.45%), indicating that semantic similarity tasks may benefit more from general multilingual pretraining than from region-specific tuning.

The performance gap between models with Filipino language support and general multilingual models is most pronounced in CR, where gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct (92.75%) significantly outperforms models without dedicated Filipino support. This suggests that understanding causality in Filipino requires strong grasp of the language’s complex morphological system, particularly in how verb affixes encode causative relationships.

In MT (see Table 3), Filipino-supported LLMs show stronger performance overall. For English→Filipino translation, gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct leads in both ChrF++ (57.80) and MetricX-24 (87.23). However, for Filipino→English translation, while gemma-2-9b-it achieves a slightly higher ChrF++ (67.54) than gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct (65.93), it is substantially overtaken by the latter on MetricX-24 (90.55 vs. 76.49). This performance gap suggests that region-specific tuning not only aids comprehension of Filipino source text but can also the semantic fidelity of English outputs—an aspect captured more effectively by MetricX-24.

In AS, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct achieves the highest BERTScore (74.33), despite lacking explicit Filipino support. This unexpected result may indicate that general abstraction and summarization capabilities transfer well across languages, even without language-specific tuning. However, when examining ROUGE-L scores, Filipino-supported models show stronger performance, suggesting they better preserve Filipino-specific discourse structures and coherence patterns.

In our experiments, we found that the aya-expanse-8b model mostly failed to handle Filipino instructions, resulting in low scores particularly in CR (1.96%) and QA (2.97%).

| Models  | AS           |              |              | MT (eng→tgl) |              | MT (tgl→eng) |              |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | BERTScore    | ChrF++       | ROUGE-L F1   | ChrF++       | MetricX-24   | ChrF++       | MetricX-24   |
| aisingapore/gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct   | 73.08        | 34.43        | 21.06        | <b>57.80</b> | <b>87.23</b> | 65.93        | <b>90.55</b> |
| aisingapore/llama3.1-8b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct | 73.47        | 34.15        | 23.82        | 57.08        | 82.46        | 62.73        | 87.13        |
| CohereForAI/aya-expanse-8b                      | 59.38        | 6.38         | 1.39         | 39.27        | 37.47        | 59.23        | 78.88        |
| google/gemma-2-9b-it                            | 72.68        | 34.09        | 21.73        | 56.64        | 84.00        | <b>67.54</b> | 76.49        |
| meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct                | <b>74.33</b> | <b>34.51</b> | <b>27.39</b> | 44.91        | 51.92        | 54.28        | 72.04        |
| Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct                        | 70.50        | 28.74        | 15.77        | 38.78        | 34.23        | 54.94        | 75.97        |
| sail/Sailor2-8B-Chat                            | 71.84        | 32.06        | 19.82        | 50.44        | 79.85        | 53.34        | 20.12        |
| SeaLLMs/SeaLLMs-v3-7B-Chat                      | 70.55        | 28.23        | 16.90        | 46.03        | 61.29        | 39.03        | 59.97        |

Table 3: Performance of LLMs on BATAYAN natural language generation (NLG) tasks.




Figure 2: Model performance on NLG tasks. Left: Performance on abstractive summarization measured using BERTScore, ChrF++, and ROUGE-L F1. Right: Machine translation performance measured using ChrF++ and MetricX-24 for both English→Tagalog and Tagalog→English. Best scores for each metric are highlighted.

Examining the relationship between model size and performance reveals an interesting pattern: while larger models generally perform better, the correlation is weaker for Filipino-specific tasks compared to similar evaluations in English. This suggests that current scaling approaches may not adequately capture the unique characteristics of Filipino, such as its agglutinative morphology and frequent code-switching.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced BATAYAN for holistically evaluating LLMs on a gamut of Filipino language tasks covering natural language understanding, reasoning, and generation. Our findings show that LLMs with explicit Filipino language support and finetuned on Filipino instructions demonstrate better performance on BATAYAN compared to other models.

As one of the major challenges in developing BATAYAN is maintaining the naturalness and fluency of the language, we plan to develop metrics and tools that can help discriminate from translationese and natural texts, inspired by prior research (Lovenia et al., 2024; Riley et al., 2020).

## Limitations

While our work provides a unique and comprehensive Filipino language benchmark, we also reported in previous sections the challenges and limitations in developing high-quality NLP resources for the under-represented language. Additionally, prosodic characteristics such as stress and sarcasm are not immediately obvious in the datasets utilized. We account for this by selecting only high-agreement samples. We also note that the domain of both SA and TD tasks (which were tweets surrounding political events), limits the distributions of these tasks, and as such we recommend utilizing other datasets that cover a wider set of domains and use cases.

## Ethical Considerations

This project was approved by the principal investigator’s university internal review board.

Due to the nature of the toxicity detection task, we note that the authors were exposed to offensive material. Nonetheless, they were encouraged to report inappropriate samples and were given the option to stop work if desired.



For the review and annotation of the sentiment analysis task, we involved a quality assurance team consisting of native Filipino speakers. The team, comprised of students at local universities, were recruited through public advertisements that stated the estimated work load and remuneration, which were consistent with university research guidelines and regulatory requirements.

We do not foresee negative social impacts from this paper. Our work introduces Filipino language resources that were reviewed by native Filipino speakers, paying due respect to local cultural sensitivities. We thus do not believe that our research will contribute to over-generalizations regarding Filipino culture.

We plan to release BATAYAN (datasets and codebase) under the Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0) license.

## Acknowledgments

This research project is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore under its AI Singapore's National Large Language Models Funding Initiative.

The authors would like to thank National University of Singapore and AI Singapore, especially the AI Products and SEA-LION team, for their unwavering support with this endeavor.

The authors likewise thank the University of Cambridge, Department of Computer Science and Technology, and Magdalene College. David Africa's work is supported by the Cambridge Trust and the Jardine Foundation.

Lastly, the authors would like to thank all the Filipino natives involved in this study for their time and valuable contributions.

## References

- Virgilio S. Almario. 2014. *KWF Manwal sa Masinop na Pagsulat*. Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- Virgilio S. Almario. 2016. *Batayang pagsasalin: Ilang patnubay at babasahin para sa baguhan*. Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- John Archibald and William Delaney O'Grady. 2001. *Contemporary linguistics: An introduction*. St. Martin's Press.
- Ekaterina Baklanova. 2017. Types of Borrowings in Tagalog/Filipino. *Kritika Kultura*, 28.
- Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabsa. 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 and virtual meeting. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maria Lourdes S Bautista. 1991. Code-switching studies in the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 8(1).
- Maria Lourdes S. Bautista. 2004. Tagalog-English Code Switching as a Mode of Discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2):226–233.
- Emmanuel Jayson V Bolata. 2022. Ang Noumenal at ang Nominal sa Panulaan ni Allan Popa. *Daluyan: Journal ng Wikang Filipino*, 28(2).
- J Donald Bowen. 1971. Hispanic languages and influence in Oceania. *Current trends in linguistics*, 8:938–52.
- Neil Vicente Cabasag, Vicente Raphael Chan, Sean Christian Lim, Mark Edward Gonzales, and Charibeth Cheng. 2019. Hate speech in Philippine election-related tweets: Automatic detection and classification using natural language processing. *Philippine Computing Journal*, XIV, 1.
- Rhandley D Cajote, Rowena Cristina L Guevara, Michael Gringo Angelo R Bayona, and Crisron Rudolf G Lucas. 2024. Philippine Languages Database: A Multilingual Speech Corpora for Developing Systems for Philippine Spoken Languages. *LREC-COLING 2024*, page 264.
- Roseclaremath A Caroro, Rolysent K Paredes, and Jerry M Lumasag. 2020. Rules for orthographic word parsing of the Philippines' Cebuano-Visayan language using context-free grammars. *International Journal of Software Science and Computational Intelligence (IJSSCI)*, 12(2):34–49.
- Sara Castagnoli. 2020. Translation choices compared: Investigating variation in a learner translation corpus. *Translating and Comparing Languages: Corpus-based Insights. Corpora and Language in Use Proceedings*, 6:25–44.
- Gloria Chan-Yap. 1980. *Hokkien Chinese borrowings in Tagalog*. Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Alexis Conneau, Ruty Rinott, Guillaume Lample, Adina Williams, Samuel R. Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018. Xnli: Evaluating Cross-lingual Sentence Representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jan Christian Blaise Cruz and Charibeth Cheng. 2020. Evaluating Language Model Finetuning Techniques for Low-Resource Languages. *Philippine Computing Journal*, 15(1):12–21.
- Jan Christian Blaise Cruz and Charibeth Cheng. 2022. Improving Large-scale Language Models and Resources for Filipino. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6548–6555, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Rosario Delgado and Xavier-Andoni Tibau. 2019. Why Cohen’s Kappa should be avoided as performance measure in classification. *PLoS one*, 14(9):e0222916.
- Shirley N Dita, Rachel Edita O Roxas, and Paul Inventado. 2009. Building online corpora of Philippine languages. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, pages 646–653. Waseda University.
- Sumanth Doddapaneni, Rahul Aralikatte, Gowtham Ramesh, Shreya Goyal, Mitesh M. Khapra, Anoop Kunchukuttan, and Pratyush Kumar. 2023. Towards Leaving No Indic Language Behind: Building Monolingual Corpora, Benchmark and Models for Indic Languages. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12402–12426, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guangchao Charles Feng and Xinshu Zhao. 2016. Do not force agreement: A response to Krippendorff (2016). *Methodology*.
- Barbara A Fox. 1985. Word-order inversion and discourse continuity in Tagalog. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 5(1-2):39–54.
- Martin Gellerstam. 1986. Translationese in Swedish Novels Translated from English. *Translation studies in Scandinavia*, 1:88–95.
- Matthew Phillip V Go and Nicco Nocon. 2017. Using Stanford part-of-speech tagger for the morphologically-rich Filipino language. In *Proceedings of the 31st Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, pages 81–88. Waseda University.
- Mikhail Alic Go and Leah Gustilo. 2013. Tagalog or Taglish: The lingua franca of Filipino urban factory workers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10:57–87.
- Wilkinson Daniel Wong Gonzales. 2022. Interactions of Sinitic languages in the Philippines: Sinicization, Filipinization, and Sino-Philippine language creation. In *The Palgrave handbook of Chinese language studies*, pages 369–408. Springer.
- Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzmán, and Angela Fan. 2022. The Flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:522–538.
- Yanzhu Guo, Chloé Clavel, Moussa Kamal Eddine, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2022. Questioning the Validity of Summarization Datasets and Improving Their Factual Consistency. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5716–5727, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zishan Guo, Renren Jin, Chuang Liu, Yufei Huang, Dan Shi, Linhao Yu, Yan Liu, Jiakuan Li, Bojian Xiong, Deyi Xiong, et al. 2023. Evaluating large language models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19736*.
- Muhammad Usman Hadi, Rizwan Qureshi, Abbas Shah, Muhammad Irfan, Anas Zafar, Muhammad Bilal Shaikh, Naveed Akhtar, Jia Wu, Seyedali Mirjalili, et al. 2023. A survey on large language models: Applications, challenges, limitations, and practical usage. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Tahmid Hasan, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Md. Saiful Islam, Kazi Mubasshir, Yuan-Fang Li, Yong-Bin Kang, M. Sohel Rahman, and Rifat Shahriyar. 2021. XL-Sum: Large-scale Multilingual Abstractive Summarization for 44 Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 4693–4703, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20*. JMLR.org.
- Joel P Ilaio, Timothy Israel D Santos, and Rowena Cristina L Guevara. 2012. Comparative analysis of actual language usage and selected grammar and orthographical rules for Filipino, Cebuano-Visayan and Ilokano: a Corpus-based Approach. *Electrical and Electronics Engineering Institute. University of the Philippines Diliman*.
- Jem R Javier. 2018. Pagsusuri sa ortograpiya ng kambal-katinig sa Filipino batay sa korpus (A corpus-based analysis of consonant clusters in Filipino orthography). *Social Science Diliman*, 14(1).
- Rodney C Jubilado. 2004. Philippine linguistics, Filipino language, and the Filipino nation. *JATI-Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 9(1):43–53.

- Juraj Juraska, Daniel Deutsch, Mara Finkelstein, and Markus Freitag. 2024. [MetricX-24: The Google submission to the WMT 2024 metrics shared task](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 492–504, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pride Kavumba, Naoya Inoue, Benjamin Heinzlerling, Keshav Singh, Paul Reisert, and Kentaro Inui. 2019. [When Choosing Plausible Alternatives, Clever Hans can be Clever](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Commonsense Inference in Natural Language Processing*, pages 33–42, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul Kroeger. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Center for the Study of Language (CSLI).
- Wei Qi Leong, Jian Gang Ngui, Yosephine Susanto, Hamsawardhini Rengarajan, Kengatharaiyer Sarveswaran, and William Chandra Tjhi. 2023. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.06085. [\[link\]](#).
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. 2023. [Holistic Evaluation of Language Models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2211.09110.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangyu Liu, Emanuele Bugliarello, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Siva Reddy, Nigel Collier, and Desmond Elliott. 2021. [Visually Grounded Reasoning across Languages and Cultures](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10467–10485, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. 2023. [Trustworthy LLMs: A survey and guideline for evaluating large language models’ alignment](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05374*.
- Holy Lovenia, Rahmad Mahendra, Salsabil Maulana Akbar, Lester Jamesalidad Miranda, Jennifer Santoso, Elyanah Aco, Akhdan Fadhilah, Jonibek Mansurov, Joseph Marvin Imperial, Onno P. Kampman, Joel Ruben Antony Moniz, Muhammad Ravi Shulthan Habibi, Frederikus Hudi, Jann Railey Montalan, Ryan Ignatius Hadiwijaya, Joanito Agili Lopo, William Nixon, Börje F. Karlsson, James Jaya, Ryandito Diandaru, Yuze Gao, Patrick Amadeus Irawan, Bin Wang, Jan Christian Blaise Cruz, Chenxi Whitehouse, Ivan Halim Parmonangan, Maria Khelli, Wenyu Zhang, Lucky Susanto, Reynard Adha Ryanda, Sonny Lazuardi Hermawan, Dan John Velasco, Muhammad Dehan Al Kautsar, Willy Fitra Hendria, Yasmin Moslem, Noah Flynn, Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Haochen Li, Johannes Lee, R. Damanhuri, Shuo Sun, Muhammad Reza Qorib, Amirbek Djanibekov, Wei Qi Leong, Quyet V. Do, Niklas Muennighoff, Tanrada Pansuwan, Ilham Firdausi Putra, Yan Xu, Tai Ngee Chia, Ayu Purwarianti, Sebastian Ruder, William Chandra Tjhi, Peerat Limkonchotiwat, Alham Fikri Aji, Sedrick Keh, Genta Indra Winata, Ruochen Zhang, Fajri Koto, Zheng Xin Yong, and Samuel Cahyawijaya. 2024. [SEACrowd: A multilingual multimodal data hub and benchmark suite for Southeast Asian languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5155–5203, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emma B Magracia. 2001. [Panumbas sa Filipino ng Panghihiram: Pagtinging Semantikal at Sintaktikal](#). *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Innovation (formerly The Mindanao Forum)*, 16(2):31–42.
- Jonathan C. Malicsi. 2013. *Gramar ng Filipino*. Aklat Sanyata. Sentro ng Wikang Filipino, Unibersidad ng Pilipinas.
- Lester James Miranda. 2023a. [Developing a named entity recognition dataset for tagalog](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07161*.
- Lester James Miranda. 2023b. [Towards a Tagalog NLP pipeline](#).
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Anna Sun Jean Maillard, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Searley 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](#).
- Jed Sam Pizarro-Guevara. 2010. [Revisiting Person-Case constraint on ay-inversion in Tagalog](#).



- Maja Popović. 2017. [chrF++: words helping character n-grams](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 612–618, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Martin Ward Powers. 2012. [The Problem with Kappa](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 345–355, Avignon, France. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- J Stephen Quakenbush. 2005. Philippine linguistics from an SIL perspective: Trends and prospects. *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, pages 3–27.
- Teresita V Ramos. 2021. *Tagalog structures*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Lawrence A Reid. 2018. Modeling the linguistic situation in the Philippines. *Senri ethnological studies*, 98:91–105.
- Parker Riley, Isaac Caswell, Markus Freitag, and David Grangier. 2020. [Translationese as a Language in “Multilingual” NMT](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7737–7746, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guijin Son, Dongkeun Yoon, Juyoung Suk, Javier Aula-Blasco, Mano Aslan, Vu Trong Kim, Shayekh Bin Islam, Jaume Prats-Cristià, Lucía Tormo-Bañuelos, and Seungone Kim. 2024. [Mm-eval: A Multilingual Meta-Evaluation Benchmark for LLM-as-a-judge and Reward Models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17578*.
- D.S. Tanawan, A.A. Nacin, and Lartec J.K. 2008. *Istruktura ng Wikang Filipino*. Trinitas Publishing House.
- Ruanni Tupas and Isabel Pefianco Martin. 2017. Bilingual and mother tongue-based multilingual education in the Philippines. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 10:247–258.
- Charlyn Villavicencio, Julio Jerison Macrohon, X Alphonse Inbaraj, Jyh-Horng Jeng, and Jer-Guang Hsieh. 2021. Twitter sentiment analysis towards COVID-19 vaccines in the Philippines using Naïve Bayes. *Information*, 12(5):204.
- Karthik Visweswariah, Rajakrishnan Rajkumar, Ankur Gandhe, Ananthakrishnan Ramanathan, and Jiří Navrátil. 2011. A word reordering model for improved machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 486–496.
- Muhammad Kiki Wardana, Dwi Widayati, Rostina Taib, and Muhammad Iqbal. 2022. Lexicostatistics of Malay, Tagalog and Ilocano languages: A Comparisonal Historical Linguistic Study. *Jurnal Education and Development*, 10(3):475–479.
- Tristan Koh Ly Wey. 2024. [Current LLM evaluations do not sufficiently measure all we need](#).
- Bryan Wilie, Karissa Vincentio, Genta Indra Winata, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Xiaohong Li, Zhi Yuan Lim, Sidik Soleman, Rahmad Mahendra, Pascale Fung, Syafril 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.
- John U Wolff. 2001. The influence of Spanish on Tagalog. *Propio y lo ajeno en las lenguas austronésicas y amerindias: procesos interculturales en el contacto de lenguas indígenas con el español en el Pacífico e Hispanoamérica*, pages 233–252.
- Shuo Yang, Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Rethinking benchmark and contamination for language models with rephrased samples](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04850*.
- Alvin Yapan. 2017. *Bagay: Gabay sa pagsulat sa wikang Filipino*. BlueBooks.
- Maria Sheila Zamar. 2022. *Filipino: An Essential Grammar*. Routledge.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2020)*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Yuan Zhang, Jason Baldridge, and Luheng He. 2019. [PAWS: Paraphrase adversaries from word scrambling](#). 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 1298–1308, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.



## A Inter-rater Agreement

| Competency           | Task | Dataset            | Criteria     | Joint agreement | Rating |   |
|----------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|---|
| NLU                  | PI   | PAWS               | Completeness | 0.9550          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.5875          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.8025          | -      |   |
|                      | QA   | Belebele           | Completeness | 0.9700          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.8300          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.9500          | -      |   |
|                      | SA   | PH Election Tweets | Completeness | 0.6217          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.6767          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.7050          | -      |   |
|                      | TD   | PH Election Tweets | Completeness | 0.8310          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.9060          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.8680          | -      |   |
| NLR                  | CR   | Balanced COPA      | Completeness | 0.8975          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.7275          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.9575          | -      |   |
|                      | NLI  | XNLI               | Completeness | 0.9716          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.8433          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.9933          | -      |   |
|                      | NLG  | AS                 | XL-Sum       | Completeness    | 0.8800 | - |
|                      |      |                    |              | Fluency         | 0.9600 | - |
|                      |      |                    |              | Faithfulness    | 1.0000 | - |
| Relevance of summary |      |                    |              | -               | 1.99   |   |
| Fluency of summary   |      |                    |              | -               | 2.64   |   |
| Coherence of summary |      |                    |              | -               | 2.56   |   |
| MT                   |      | FLORES 200         | Completeness | 0.7100          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Fluency      | 0.9900          | -      |   |
|                      |      |                    | Sensibility  | 0.7750          | -      |   |

Table 4: Joint agreement is calculated as the percentage of times all the raters unanimously agree that the samples fulfill the criteria. Rating is calculated as the average score from 0 to 3 assigned by the raters to the samples under the given criteria.

## B Overview of Tasks and Datasets

As discussed in Section 3 of this paper, the selection of the eight tasks are presented below. We also provide Table 5 describe the source datasets used for these tasks. The modifications and adaptations that were applied and the usage of the datasets for evaluation comply with their original intended uses.

**Abstractive Summarization (AS).** An LLM performing this task is given a paragraph and is expected to summarize the content in a sentence. The model is tested not only for identifying the salient points of the text, but also paraphrasing the content into a concise and coherent text. For this task, we use XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021), a collection of annotated article-summary pairs.

**Causal Reasoning (CR).** This task requires the LLM to understand the relationship between events. In particular, the model is given a premise, a set of statements, and an instruction to determine which of the provided statements is the cause or effect of the premise. We employed Balanced COPA (Kavumba et al., 2019), a dataset designed to evaluate commonsense causal reasoning with paired alternatives.

**Machine Translation (MT).** For this task, an LLM is given a text in one language, and is expected to provide the equivalent text translated into another language. In this study, we test for both English→Filipino and Filipino→English translation. This task leveraged the Filipino subset of FLORES 200 (NLLB Team et al., 2022), which includes translations across numerous languages and domains.

**Natural Language Inference (NLI).** This is classification task where an LLM is provided two sentences (X and Y), and is expected to determine whether the sentences are related in one in the following ways: (a) X implies Y; (b) X contradicts Y; and (c) X neither implies nor contradicts Y. This task utilized XNLI (Conneau et al., 2018), a dataset containing human-annotated examples for evaluating cross-lingual inference.

**Paraphrase Identification (PI).** This task requires an LLM to determine if two provided texts are paraphrased versions of each other; that is, whether both pieces of text convey the same idea. For this task, we used PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019), which contains paraphrase and non-paraphrase pairs with high lexical overlap.

**Question Answering (QA).** Given a passage and a question, an LLM performing this task must provide a span from the passage that answers the question. In this study, QA utilized Belebele (Bandarkar et al., 2024), a multiple-choice reading comprehension dataset designed to assess understanding of passages.

**Toxicity Detection (TD) and Sentiment Analysis (SA).** These two NLU tasks both require an LLM to analyze a natural language text. The TD task requires the model to identify whether hate speech and abusive language is used in the text, while the SA task requires the model to classify the text as either positive, negative, or neutral in sentiment polarity. Both tasks are derived from the Philippine election-related tweets dataset (Cabasag et al., 2019), which provided a resource for toxicity in political discourse. These tweets were collected during the 2016 presidential campaign. This dataset was also relabeled for sentiment analysis by three native Filipino speakers. There is substantial agreement between the annotations (Cohen’s kappa of 0.8202, Krippendorff’s alpha of 0.8268).

| Competency | Task | Dataset                              | License         |
|------------|------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| NLU        | PI   | PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019)            | CC BY 4.0       |
|            | QA   | Belebele (Bandarkar et al., 2024)    | CC BY-NC 4.0    |
|            | SA   | PH Elections (Cabasag et al., 2019)  | Unknown         |
|            | TD   | PH Elections (Cabasag et al., 2019)  | Unknown         |
| NLR        | CR   | Balanced COPA (Kavumba et al., 2019) | CC BY 4.0       |
|            | NLI  | XNLI (Conneau et al., 2018)          | CC BY-NC 4.0    |
| NLG        | AS   | XL-Sum (Hasan et al., 2021)          | CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 |
|            | MT   | FLORES 200 (NLLB Team et al., 2022)  | CC BY-SA 4.0    |

Table 5: License details for datasets used in BATAYAN.

Table 6 shows the distribution of class labels for tasks that involve classification. We On the other hand, Table 7 presents quantitative statistics on dataset size and average word counts. The variation in text length reflects task-specific requirements: AS involves longer passages, while classification tasks (SA, TD, and PI) typically contain more concise text samples. The QA dataset, in particular, has relatively

| Competency              | Task | Label                        | No. Samples |
|-------------------------|------|------------------------------|-------------|
| NLU                     | PI   | True                         | 200         |
|                         |      | False                        | 200         |
|                         | SA   | Negative ( <i>Negatibo</i> ) | 200         |
|                         |      | Neutral ( <i>Neutral</i> )   | 200         |
|                         |      | Positive ( <i>Positibo</i> ) | 200         |
|                         | TD   | Clean ( <i>Malinis</i> )     | 200         |
| Toxic ( <i>Mapoot</i> ) |      | 200                          |             |
| NLR                     | CR   | Cause ( <i>Sanhi</i> )       | 200         |
|                         |      | Effect ( <i>Bunga</i> )      | 200         |
|                         | NLI  | Contradiction                | 200         |
|                         |      | Entailment                   | 200         |
|                         |      | Neutral                      | 200         |

Table 6: Class distribution per task.

| Competency | Task              | Total No. Samples | Avg. No. Words/Sample                  |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| NLU        | PI                | 400               | 22.50 (Sentence 1), 22.47 (Sentence 2) |
|            | QA                | 100               | 14.75 (Question), 4.26 (Choices)       |
|            | SA                | 600               | 24.32                                  |
|            | TD                | 400               | 20.73                                  |
| NLR        | CR                | 400               | 7.24 (Premise), 6.05 (Choices)         |
|            | NLI               | 600               | 23.30 (Sentence 1), 12.20 (Sentence 2) |
| NLG        | AS                | 100               | 120.8                                  |
|            | MT (English Text) | 600               | 21.42                                  |
|            | MT (Tagalog Text) | 600               | 25.05                                  |

Table 7: Summary of dataset statistics, including total rows and average words per text.

short questions and answer choices, mirroring real-world multiple-choice assessments. Further granularity is provided in Table 8, which breaks down sentence, word, and character-level statistics. This statistics shows structural differences between tasks; for instance, MT has sentence-level parallelism, while CR and NLI involve distinct premise-hypothesis or question-choice relationships.

| <b>Competency</b> | <b>Task</b> | <b>Component</b> | <b>Avg. No. Sentences</b> | <b>Avg. No. Words</b> | <b>Avg. No. Characters</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| NLU               | PI          | Sentence 1       | 1.0                       | 22.50                 | 123.01                     |
|                   | PI          | Sentence 2       | 1.0                       | 22.47                 | 122.99                     |
|                   | QA          | Question         | 1.0                       | 14.75                 | 80.62                      |
|                   | QA          | Choice 1         | 1.0                       | 4.66                  | 29.10                      |
|                   | QA          | Choice 2         | 1.0                       | 4.61                  | 28.60                      |
|                   | QA          | Choice 3         | 1.0                       | 4.76                  | 29.74                      |
|                   | QA          | Choice 4         | 1.0                       | 3.0                   | 28.58                      |
|                   | SA          | Text             | 2.21                      | 24.32                 | 120.44                     |
|                   | TD          | Text             | 2.45                      | 20.73                 | 99.37                      |
| NLR               | CR          | Premise          | 1.0                       | 7.24                  | 37.55                      |
|                   | CR          | Choice 1         | 1.0                       | 6.05                  | 30.91                      |
|                   | CR          | Choice 2         | 1.0                       | 6.05                  | 30.62                      |
|                   | NLI         | Sentence 1       | 1.0                       | 23.30                 | 127.88                     |
|                   | NLI         | Sentence 2       | 1.0                       | 12.20                 | 67.04                      |
| NLG               | AS          | Text             | 5.43                      | 120.8                 | 666.18                     |
|                   | MT          | English Text     | 1.12                      | 21.42                 | 113.07                     |
|                   | MT          | Filipino Text    | 1.12                      | 25.05                 | 140.58                     |

Table 8: Detailed dataset statistics, including sentence, word, and character counts.



## C Prompt Templates

| Task | Filipino Prompt Template   | SEA-HELM English Prompt Template  |
|------|--|---|
| PI   | <p>Bibigyan ka ng dalawang pangungusap, SENTENCE_1 at SENTENCE_2. Tukuyin kung alin sa sumusunod na pahayag ang pinaka-angkop para sa SENTENCE_1 at SENTENCE_2.</p> <p>A: Paraprase ang SENTENCE_2 ng SENTENCE_1.<br/>B: Hindi paraprase ang SENTENCE_2 ng SENTENCE_1.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format.<br/>Sagot: \$OPTION<br/>Palitan ang \$OPTION ng napiling sagot. Gumamit lang ng titik A o B sa sagot mo.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>SENTENCE_1:<br/>{sentence1}</p> <p>SENTENCE_2:<br/>{sentence2}</p> | <p>You will be given two sentences, SENTENCE_1 and SENTENCE_2. Determine which of the following statements applies to SENTENCE_1 and SENTENCE_2 the best.</p> <p>A: SENTENCE_2 is a paraphrase of SENTENCE_1.<br/>B: SENTENCE_2 is not a paraphrase of SENTENCE_1.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>Answer: \$OPTION<br/>Replace \$OPTION with the selected option. Use the letters A or B only as the answer.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>SENTENCE_1:<br/>{sentence1}</p> <p>SENTENCE_2:<br/>{sentence2}</p> |
| QA   | <p>Bibigyan ka ng isang talata, isang tanong, at apat na pagpipiliang sagot. Sumagot base sa talata sa pamamagitan ng pagpili ng isa sa mga opsiyong ibinigay.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/>Sagot: \$OPTION<br/>Palitan ang \$OPTION ng napiling sagot. Gumamit lang ng titik A, B, C, o D sa sagot mo.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Talata:<br/>{text}</p> <p>Tanong: {question}<br/>A: {choice1}<br/>B: {choice2}<br/>C: {choice3}<br/>D: {choice4}</p>  | <p>You will be given one paragraph, one question and four answer options. Based on the paragraph, answer by choosing one of the options given.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>Answer: \$OPTION<br/>Replace \$OPTION with the selected option. Use the letter A, B, C, or D as the answer.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Paragraph:<br/>{text}</p> <p>Question: {question}<br/>A: {choice1}<br/>B: {choice2}<br/>C: {choice3}<br/>D: {choice4}</p>   |
| SA   | <p>Ano ang sentimyento sa sumusunod na pangungusap? Sumagot gamit ng isa sa mga sumusunod na pagpipilian: Positibo, Negatibo, o Neutral.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/>Sagot: \$OPTION<br/>Palitan ang \$OPTION ng napiling sagot.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Pangungusap:<br/>{text}</p>   | <p>What is the sentiment of the following sentence? Use one of the choices below: Positive, Negative, or Neutral.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>Answer: \$OPTION<br/>Replace \$OPTION with the selected option.<br/>{fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Sentence:<br/>{text}</p>   |

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| TD  | <p>Isa kang toxicity detector. Nangangahulugan ang mga sumusunod na label:<br/>         Malinis: Walang toxicity.<br/>         Mapoot: May toxicity at direktang pag-atake sa isang tao.</p> <p>Batay sa kahulugan ng mga label, iuri ang mga sumusunod na pangungusap gamit lang ng isang salita: Malinis o Mapoot.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/>         Sagot: \$LABEL<br/>         Palitan ang \$LABEL ng napiling label.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Pangungusap:<br/>         ---<br/>         {text}<br/>         ---</p>   | <p>You are a toxicity detector. The following labels are defined as follows:<br/>         Clean: There is no toxicity.<br/>         Toxic: There is toxicity and direct attacks towards a person.</p> <p>Based on the label definitions, classify the following sentence only using one word: Clean or Toxic.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>         Answer: \$LABEL<br/>         Replace \$LABEL with the selected label.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Sentence:<br/>         ---<br/>         {text}<br/>         ---</p>  |
| CR  | <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/>         Sagot: \$OPTION<br/>         Palitan ang \$OPTION ng napiling sagot. Gumamit lang ng titik A or B sa sagot mo.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Batay sa ibibigay na sitwasyon, alin sa sumusunod na pagpipilian ang mas maaari na {sanhi/bunga}?</p> <p>Sitwasyon:<br/>         ---<br/>         {text}<br/>         ---</p> <p>Piliin ang pinaka-angkop na sagot mula sa sumusunod na pagpipilian:<br/>         A: {choice1}<br/>         B: {choice2}</p>  | <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>         Answer: \$OPTION<br/>         Replace \$OPTION with the selected option. Use only the letters A or B as the answer.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Based on the given situation, which of the following options is more likely to be the {cause/effect}?</p> <p>Situation:<br/>         ---<br/>         {text}<br/>         ---</p> <p>Choose the best answer from the following options:<br/>         A: {choice1}<br/>         B: {choice2}</p>  |
| NLI | <p>Bibigyan ka ng dalawang pangungusap, SENTENCE_1 at SENTENCE_2. Tukuyin kung alin sa sumusunod na pahayag ang pinaka-angkop para sa SENTENCE_1 at SENTENCE_2.<br/>         A: Kung totoo ang SENTENCE_1, dapat totoo din ang SENTENCE_2.<br/>         B: Sumasalungat ang SENTENCE_1 sa SENTENCE_2.<br/>         C: Kapag totoo ang SENTENCE_1, pwedeng totoo o hindi totoo ang SENTENCE_2.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format.<br/>         Sagot: \$OPTION<br/>         Palitan ang \$OPTION ng napiling sagot. Gumamit lang ng titik A, B, o C sa sagot mo.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>SENTENCE_1:<br/>         ---<br/>         {sentence1}<br/>         ---</p> <p>SENTENCE_2:<br/>         ---<br/>         {sentence2}<br/>         ---</p> | <p>You will be given two sentences, SENTENCE_1 and SENTENCE_2. Determine which of the following statements applies to SENTENCE_1 and SENTENCE_2 the best.<br/>         A: If SENTENCE_1 is true, SENTENCE_2 must be true.<br/>         B: SENTENCE_1 contradicts SENTENCE_2.<br/>         C: When SENTENCE_1 is true, SENTENCE_2 may or may not be true.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/>         Answer: \$OPTION<br/>         Replace \$OPTION with the selected option. Use the letters A, B or C only as the answer.<br/>         {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>SENTENCE_1:<br/>         ---<br/>         {sentence1}<br/>         ---</p> <p>SENTENCE_2:<br/>         ---<br/>         {sentence2}<br/>         ---</p> |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| AS | <p>Ibuod ang sumusunod na artikulong Filipino sa isang talata na may isa o dalawang pangungusap.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/> Buod: \$SUMMARY<br/> Palitan ang \$SUMMARY ng buod.<br/> {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Artikulo:<br/> {text}</p> | <p>Summarize the following {language} article into a paragraph with 1 or 2 sentences.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/> Summary: \$SUMMARY<br/> Replace \$SUMMARY with the summary.<br/> {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Article:<br/> {text}</p> |
| MT | <p>Isalin ang sumusunod na teksto sa {language}.</p> <p>Sumagot gamit ang sumusunod na format:<br/> Salin: \$TRANSLATION<br/> Palitan ang \$TRANSLATION ng isinalin na teksto.<br/> {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Teksto:<br/> {text}</p>                            | <p>Translate the following text into {language}.</p> <p>Answer only using the following format:<br/> Translation: \$TRANSLATION<br/> Replace \$TRANSLATION with the translated text.<br/> {fewshot_examples}</p> <p>Text:<br/> {text}</p>                     |

Table 9: Prompt templates used in evaluating LLMs on BATAYAN. Their corresponding English-language prompt templates are also provided.

## D Experimental Setup

The default evaluation setting for BATAYAN is zero-shot prompting, and performance scores are calculated based on a single run. Despite being a comprehensive benchmark, BATAYAN requires very few resources to execute. For our experiments, we allocated a computational budget of 0.25 GPU hours on 1 H100 GPU per model, totaling to 2 H100 GPU hours per run of BATAYAN.

Table 10 reports the number of parameters in the models evaluated, while Table 11 details the decoding parameters used in the experiments.

| Models  | No. parameters |
|---|----------------|
| aisingapore/gemma2-9b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct   | 9B             |
| aisingapore/llama3.1-8b-cpt-sea-lionv3-instruct | 8B             |
| CohereForAI/aya-expense-8b                      | 8B             |
| google/gemma-2-9b-it                            | 9B             |
| meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct                | 8B             |
| Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct                        | 7B             |
| sail/Sailor2-8B-Chat                            | 8B             |
| SeaLLMs/SeaLLMs-v3-7B-Chat                      | 7B             |

Table 10: Sizes of models used in experiments.

| Competency | Task | max_tokens | temperature | top_p | top_k | repetition_penalty |
|------------|------|------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| NLU        | PI   | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
|            | QA   | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
|            | SA   | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
|            | TD   | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
| NLR        | CR   | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
|            | NLI  | 32         | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
| NLG        | AS   | 512        | 0.3         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |
|            | MT   | 256        | 0.0         | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0                |

Table 11: Inference Parameters per task.



## E Dataset Examples

| Competency | Task | Example  |
|------------|------|--|
| NLU        | PI   | <p><b>Sentence 1:</b> <i>Wala pang isang taon matapos ang kaniyang nagdaang kasal, pinakasalan din ni Charlemagne si Desiderata at tinanggihan ang 13-anyos na Swabian na nagnangalang Hildegard.</i></p> <p><b>Sentence 2:</b> <i>Pinakasalan ni Charlemagne si Desiderata wala pang isang taon pagkatapos ng kanyang kasal at isinawalang-bahala ang isang 13 taong gulang na Swabian na nagnangalang Hildegard.</i></p> <p><b>Label:</b> <i>Parapruse (Paraphrase)</i></p>  |
|            | QA   | <p><b>Text:</b> <i>Lumipat ang mga hukbong Coalition at Afghan sa lugar na iyon upang tiyaking ligtas ang lokasyon, at nagpadala ng iba pang eroplano ng koalisyon upang tumulong. Naganap ang pagbagsak sa mataas na bahagi ng kabundukan, at pinaniniwalaang resulta ng pagbabaril ng kalaban. Isang malaking hamon ang masamang panahon at malubak na daan sa paghahanap.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> <i>Ano ang pinaniniwalaang dahilan ng pagbagsak?</i></p> <p><b>Choices:</b> (1) Pangit na daan (2) Masamang sunog (3) Mabundok na lupain (4) Masamang lagay ng panahon</p> <p><b>Label:</b> 1</p> |
|            | SA   | <p><b>Text:</b> <i>Pucha.. PURO DILAWAN DITO SA REDDIT AH HAAAA.. AKALA NYO NAMAN ANG LAKI NA NG ACCOMPLISHMENT NYO DAHIL SA VIDEO NA YAN MGA GUNGGONG!! HAAAAHA #DU30 PA RIN!! MGA TAE KAYO!</i></p> <p><b>Label:</b> <i>Negatibo (Negative)</i></p>  |
|            | TD   | <p><b>Text:</b> <i>Ayun, nag-Filipino rin si Poe, ang presidente ko! Kitang-kita ang kanyang platapormang maka-mahirap at maka-tao. #PiliPinasDebates2016</i></p> <p><b>Label:</b> <i>Malinis (Clean)</i></p>  |
| NLR        | CR   | <p><b>Text:</b> <i>Hindi tinanggap ang tsekeng ginawa ko.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> <i>Sanhi (Cause)</i></p> <p><b>Choices:</b> (0) Walang laman ang bank account ko. (1) Tumaas ang aking suweldo.</p> <p><b>Label:</b> 0</p>   |
|            | NLI  | <p><b>Sentence 1:</b> <i>Di mo ba natatandaan? Pupunta tayo ngayong araw sa birthday ni Tita Basia.</i></p> <p><b>Sentence 2:</b> <i>Hindi kami pupunta sa birthday party ni Tita Basia ngayon.</i></p> <p><b>Label:</b> <i>Contradiction</i></p>  |
| NLG        | AS   | <p><b>Article:</b> <i>Kinumpirma noong nakaraang buwan na humawa na ang virus sa isang tupa sa isla matapos isilang nang patay at wala sa hugis ang limang kordero sa isang bukid. Sinabi ng state veterinary officer na malamang na ang birus ay sanhi ng windborne midges.</i></p> <p><b>Summary:</b> <i>Kinumpirma ng mga pagsusuri noong nakaraang buwan na nahawahan ng Schmallerberg virus ang mga tupa sa isla.</i></p>   |
|            | MT   | <p><b>Text:</b> <i>Former U.S. Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich came in second with 32 percent.</i></p> <p><b>Translation:</b> <i>Pumangalawa ang dating Speaker of the House ng U.S. na si Newt Gingrich nang may 32 porsyento.</i></p>   |

Table 12: Example instances for each task in BATAYAN.