

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?

Lisa Schut¹ Yarin Gal¹ Sebastian Farquhar²

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have multilingual capabilities and can solve tasks across various languages. However, we show that current LLMs make key decisions in a representation space closest to English, regardless of their input and output languages. Exploring the internal representations with a logit lens for sentences in French, German, Dutch, and Mandarin, we show that the LLM first emits representations close to English for semantically-loaded words before translating them into the target language. We further show that activation steering in these LLMs is more effective when the steering vectors are computed in English rather than in the language of the inputs and outputs. This suggests that multilingual LLMs perform key reasoning steps in a representation that is heavily shaped by English in a way that is not transparent to system users.

1. Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are predominantly trained on English data, yet are deployed across various languages, including some that are rarely seen during training. This raises an important question: *how* do LLMs operate across different languages?

LLMs are hypothesized to operate in an abstract concept space (Chris Olah, 2023; Nanda et al., 2023a; Wendler et al., 2024; Dumas et al., 2024). From the multilingual perspective, one main question is whether the concept space is language-specific or language-agnostic. We consider three different hypotheses:

1. LLMs ‘operate’ in a space that is English-centric (or centered on the main pretraining language)
2. LLMs ‘operate’ in a language-agnostic space

¹OATML, Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford. ²Google DeepMind. Correspondence to: Lisa Schut <schut@robots.ox.ac.uk>.




Figure 1: Logit lens applied to Llama-3.1-70B’s latent space, when prompted with *Le bateau naviguait en douceur sur l’*. Each row depicts the decoded latent representations for one layer and each column corresponds to the generated token. Dark red boxes highlight words selected in English. The nouns ‘eau’, ‘lac’, and ‘soleil’ are selected in English, whereas other parts of speech are not.

3. LLMs ‘operate’ in a language-specific space, which is determined by the input language.

We present evidence that the first hypothesis is true: LLMs reason in an English-centric way. Our work studies open-ended multi-token language generation, contrasting with prior work (Wendler et al., 2024) which found evidence for the second hypothesis in the single token context.

We study three aspects of language generation. First, we study how representations progress within the model, showing that for lexical words, English-focused representations often appear first before being transformed into the target language. However, non-lexical words do not route through the English representation space. Second, we show that steering the representations is more effective using vectors constructed in English than in the target language. Third, we show that the latent representation structure is consistent with the language and semantic context being represented

Table 1: Summary of pre-training dataset languages of the open-source large language models studied in this work.

MODEL	NR. LANGUAGES TRAINED ON	TRAINED ON LANGUAGE?				
		ENGLISH	FRENCH	GERMAN	DUTCH	MANDARIN
AYA-23-35B (ARYABUMI ET AL., 2024)	23	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LLAMA-3.1-70B (DUBEY ET AL., 2024)	8	✓	✓	✓	×	×
MIXTRAL-8X22B-V0.1 (JIANG ET AL., 2024)	5	✓	✓	✓	×	×
GEMMA-2-27B (ARYABUMI ET AL., 2024)	1	✓	×	×	×	×

separately. In more detail, we:

Decode the Representation Space LLMs make semantic decisions in English, even when prompted in a non-English language. Figure 1 shows the logit lens to Llama-3.1-70B as it generates the French text *Le bateau naviguait en douceur sur l’eau au calme du lac. Le soleil ...*, with the bold text representing Llama’s output. The English translation is *The boat sailed smoothly on the calm water in of the lake. The sun* Lexical words like “water,” “lake,” and “sun” are selected in English, whereas grammatical elements such as “du” and “le” are not. We find that this trend holds more generally for other models (Section 4.1), with Aya being the least English-centric and Gemma the most English-centric.

Manipulating the representations Non-English sentences generated can be steered more effectively using English-derived steering vectors than those derived from the target language. This surprising result provides further evidence that LLMs rely on an English-centric conceptual space for semantic reasoning. Further, we find that the steering vectors have a relatively high cosine similarity, however, they do encode a language-specific component. We can increase the similarity of steering vectors found in different languages by nudging them toward each other using a language steering vector.

Structure of the latent space Fact representations are shared between languages, allowing interpolation between a fact expressed in two languages while maintaining the correct answer—changing only the output language.

We analyze four open source models (Llama-3.1-70B, Gemma-2-27b, Aya-23-35B and Mixtral-8x22B), which vary in architecture and language coverage. In general, we find that LLMs make decisions in the representation space close to English, independent of the input or output language. This English-centric behavior of LLMs cause them to perform worse in other languages, whether in downstream tasks (Shafayat et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2023; Bang et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2022), or in fluency (Guo et al., 2024). Moreover, this impacts the fairness of these models – which currently exhibit cultural biases (Shafayat et al., 2024) – and their robustness and reliability in diverse linguistic settings (Marchisio et al., 2024; Deng et al., 2024).

2. Background

2.1. Large Language Models

Language models are trained to operate across different languages. Table 1 summarizes the four LLMs we study, which differ in the number of languages they were trained on. Aya-23-35B supports the widest range of languages, while Gemma-2-27b covers the fewest.

We evaluate these models across five languages, selected based on their varying levels of representation during training. English, the predominant training language, serves as a baseline. French and German represent high-resource, non-English languages, while Dutch and Chinese are lower-resource languages. Dutch is only a high-resource language in Aya-23-35B and therefore provides an interesting comparison to German due to their linguistic similarity. This analysis allows us to understand the performance disparities across languages with varying levels of representation in training.

2.2. Methods

Our goal is to understand whether LLMs have a universal representation space. To address this question, we use three mechanistic interpretability methods. The logit lens (Section 2.2.1) allows us to examine the internal representations, while causal tracing provides insight into where facts are encoded in the model across different languages (Section 2.2.2). Finally, steering vectors let us intervene on the models’ internal representations (Section 2.2.3), which allows us to verify that the representations influence the output.

2.2.1. LOGIT LENS

The logit lens (nostalgebraist, 2020) decodes the internal representations of an LLM into tokens. LLMs take an input x and output a probability distribution over the next token. The logit lens decodes the intermediate representation $h_l(x)$ at layer l into an output token, by applying the unembedding layer:

$$\operatorname{argmax}_t \operatorname{softmax}(W_u h_l(\operatorname{norm}(x))) \quad (1)$$

where x is the input, W_u is the unembedding matrix of the model and the subscript t corresponds to the token. Figure 1 shows the logit lens applied to Llama when generating:

Table 2: LLM-Insight dataset examples: sentences and prompts for the word animal.

LANGUAGE	SENTENCE EXAMPLE	PROMPT EXAMPLE
ENGLISH	THE ZOO HAS A WIDE VARIETY OF ANIMAL SPECIES.	THEY ADOPTED A
DUTCH	DE BOERDERIJ HAD ELK TYPE HUISDIER.	IN DE DIERENTUIN ZAG IK EEN BIJZONDER
FRENCH	LE LION EST UN ANIMAL SAUVAGE QUI VIT DANS LA SAVANE.	IL A VU UN
MANDARIN	森林中生活着许多野生动物	每年都会有新的
GERMAN	DER ZOO BEHERBERGT VIELE FASZINIERENDE TIERE.	SIE LIEBT ES ZEIT MIT IHREM

“Le bateau naviguait en douceur sur l’eau au calme du lac. Le soleil ...”.

For each layer (y-axis) and token position in the generation (x-axis), a token is decoded from the internal representation. The decoded tokens from the middle layers onward are more interpretable, whereas early layers are less interpretable.

2.2.2. CAUSAL TRACING

Causal tracing (Meng et al., 2022; Vig et al., 2020) uses causal mediation analysis to identify where facts are stored within a network. The method compares corrupted hidden states – where the information necessary to retrieve the fact has been removed – with clean hidden states –that successfully output the fact. This approach allows us to identify the part of the network that encodes the fact. Further details can be found in Appendix A.1.

2.2.3. STEERING VECTORS

Steering vectors (Subramani et al., 2022; Turner et al., 2023; Panickssery et al., 2024) are used to nudge the behavior of the LLM in the desired direction. The main idea is to add activation vectors during the forward of a model to modify its behavior as follows:

$$h_l(x) \leftarrow h_l(x) + \gamma v_l, \tag{2}$$

where v_l is the steering vector, and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a scalar hyperparameter. Steering vectors are used to nudge the output of the LLM in the desired direction. For example, if we want the output to contain more ‘love’, we can compute a steering vector as follows:

$$v_l = h_l(\text{love}) - h_l(\text{hate}). \tag{3}$$

Further details can be found in Subramani et al. (2022) and Turner et al. (2023).

3. Datasets

LLM-Insight We created a dataset to analyze the behavior of LLMs, which we will release alongside this paper. The dataset is specifically designed to study steering in LLMs.

It includes 72 target words, each paired with 10 prompts and 10 sentences in English, Dutch, French, German and

Mandarin. Table 2 shows a sample of the data. The prompts are designed so the word could appear as the next token, but the prompts are also sufficiently open-ended so that semantically unrelated words can be used to complete the sentence. For example “They adapted a” can be completed with the word ‘animal’ as well as ‘daughter’.

The sentences provided in the dataset can be used to find steering vectors. Some words in the dataset naturally form pairs that can be used to create steering vectors, such as the words ‘good’ and ‘bad’. For words without a natural pairing, such as ‘thermodynamics’, we provide a general set of sentences as the counter set to create the steering vector. Further details on the dataset can be found in Appendix A.3.

City facts (Ghandeharioun et al., 2024a) We use this dataset to investigate how facts in different languages are encoded in LLMs. The task is to provide the capital city of a given country. For example, when prompted with “The capital of Canada is”, the model should output “Ottawa”. This allows us to identify where in the network Ottawa is encoded. To analyze cross-lingual representations, we augment the dataset by translating these facts into German, Dutch, and French.

4. Experiments

We want to understand whether LLMs process prompts differently depending on the output language. First, we analyze the latent space to find that LLMs make semantic decisions that are more closely aligned with the English representation space (Section 4.1). Next, we show that we can steer activations better when using English steering vectors (Section 4.2). Lastly, in Section 4.3, we show that the representations of facts are shared across languages, but have an English-centric bias when decoded.

4.1. Inspecting the latent space of LLMs using the Logit Lens

Qualitative Examples To build an intuition on how LLMs operate when prompted in different languages, we analyze their latent space using the logit lens, which decodes the internal representations. In Figure 1, nouns and pronouns are routed through English, whereas the coordinating con-




Figure 2: Logit lens analysis of LLMs routing through English. Each plot shows the proportion of words routed through the English representation space for each model. The shaded bars indicate the portion explained by homographs – words that are spelled the same in English and the specified language. Overall, the degree of English-routing depends on the model: less diverse pretraining leads to more English-routing. Similarly, most routing occurs for lexical words.

junction is not. Similarly, Figure 3 shows the logit lens applied to Llama-3.1-70B for the Dutch prompt *Ze telen hun eigen*. The noun ‘fruit’, verb ‘kweken’, and pronoun ‘they’ are all routed through the English words, whereas the coordinating conjunction ‘en’ is not routed through the English word ‘and’. Interestingly, the word growing appears in the latent space several tokens before ‘kweken’ is generated, suggesting that the LLM may plan words in advance in English, which builds on Pal et al. (2023)’s finding that LLMs encode future tokens in the latent space.

Quantitative Evaluation The qualitative examples shown in Figures 1 and 3 suggest that the part of speech determines whether LLMs employ English routing. To investigate this, we prompt each LLM to generate 720 sentences. For each generated word, we evaluate whether the English equivalent of a word appears in the latent space. For example, in Figure 3, for the word *groenten*, we check whether the English equivalent, *vegetables*, appears in the decoded latent space. We then aggregate the results across different parts of speech. Further implementation details are provided in Appendix A.5.

Figure 2 shows the results for Aya-23-35B, Llama-3.1-70B, Mixtral-8x22B and Gemma-2-27b. Each bar shows the percentage of words that route through the English representation space. The shaded part shows the proportion explained by cross-lingual homographs, words that are the




Figure 3: Logit lens applied to the latent space of Llama-3.1-70B, prompted in Dutch with *Ze telen hun eigen*. Each row depicts decoded latent representations across layers, and each column corresponds to the token generated at a specific time step. Orange boxes highlight words selected in English, darker red boxes highlight related words, while gray boxes indicate explicit terms omitted from the figure (see Appendix A.5.1). The nouns ‘fruit’ and pronoun ‘they’ are selected in English.




Figure 4: Cross-Lingual Steering LLMs: The language on the x-axis is the prompt and the desired output language, while the color of each bar indicates the language used to generate the topic steering vectors.

same in English and the specified language (e.g., water in English and Dutch). For homographs, it is not possible to disambiguate whether the word routes through English.

In general, lexical words – nouns and verbs – are often chosen in English. These parts of speech influence the semantic meaning of the sentence. Other parts of speech, such as adpositions, determiners and compositional conjugates are infrequently routed through English in Aya-23-35B and Llama-3.1-70B.

The degree of English routing is model-dependent, as shown in Table 3. One explanation is the degree of multilingualism in the pre-training data – with more multilingual models, such as Aya-23-35B, routing less through English, in contrast to the least multilingual model, Gemma-2-27b, which routes the most through English. However, this does not account for the differences observed between Mixtral-8x22B and Llama-3.1-70B, for which French and German are both high-resource languages. Another possible explanation is model size. Smaller models, such as Mixtral-8x22B and Gemma-2-27b, route through English more frequently than larger models, potentially due to their more limited representation space.

4.2. Cross-Lingual Steering

Our experiments in Section 4.1 suggest that LLMs may first select topic words in an English representation space, before translating them into the output language in the later layers. To further investigate this hypothesis, we evaluate whether

non-English model outputs can be modified using English steering vectors.

More concretely, we test whether we can steer models to generate a sentence in a specified output language using two types of steering vectors:

- **topic steering vector** – encourages the LLM to generate a sentence with the given topic, such as animals.
- **language steering vector** – encourages the model to generate text in the desired output language.

We evaluate the effectiveness of steering across various topics and prompts, using the LLM-Insight dataset (see Section 3). We evaluate steering as successful if the generated sentence includes the target word associated with the steering vector while avoiding output collapse – incoherent sentences or stuttering.

Figure 4 shows results when steering different LLMs. In general, we observe that English steering vectors perform the best – outperforming steering vectors generated using the desired output language. This suggests that the representation space is not universal – if it were, we would expect the cross-lingual performance to be roughly equal across languages. Instead, this supports the hypothesis that these models select these words in English.

How similar are the steering vectors generated in different languages? The steering vectors for the same concepts generated in different languages have a relatively high

Table 3: English-routing in LLMs: percentage of generated words that are routed through English. Aya-23-35B shows the least routing behavior, whereas Gemma-2-27b shows the most routing behavior.

MODEL	DUTCH	FRENCH	GERMAN	MANDARIN	AVERAGE
GEMMA-2-27B	0.72 ± 0.01	0.67 ± 0.01	0.72 ± 0.01	0.71 ± 0.01	0.70 ± 0.00
MIXTRAL-8x22B	0.69 ± 0.01	0.63 ± 0.01	0.71 ± 0.01	0.69 ± 0.01	0.68 ± 0.01
LLAMA-3.1-70B	0.51 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.01	0.58 ± 0.01	0.55 ± 0.01	0.55 ± 0.00
AYA-23-35B	0.58 ± 0.01	0.49 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.01	0.41 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.00




Figure 5: Causal traces for the City Facts dataset in Aya-23-35B. The AIE scores are similar across different languages, suggesting that facts are localized in the same area of the model.

cosine-similarity, particularly in the early middle layers (see Appendix A.8). However, the steering vectors are not language-agnostic – part of the dissimilarity of the steering vectors can be attributed to the difference in the language used to generate the vectors. This further supports the argument that the representation space is not universal.

4.3. Investigating the Representation Space

In this section, we study *how* cross-lingual facts are encoded relative to each other using the city facts dataset (see Section 3). First, we perform causal tracing to determine whether facts in different languages are encoded in the same part of the model. Figure 5 shows the causal traces for Aya-23-35B (see Appendix A.9 for other LLMs). We find that facts are generally localized in similar layers, regardless of the language.

Next, we want to understand if the representation of a fact is shared across different languages. In particular, if we have the same fact in two different languages, such as English and Dutch, can we decompose the representation as follows:

$$h(\text{capital of Canada}) = h_{Ottawa} + h_{English} \quad (4)$$

$$h(\text{hoofdstad van Canada}) = h_{Ottawa} + h_{Dutch}, \quad (5)$$

where h represents a vector in the latent space. If the above equations hold, we may be able to interpolate between the

facts:

$$\alpha h(\text{hoofdstad van Canada}) + (1 - \alpha)h(\text{capital of Canada}), \\ = h_{Ottawa} + \alpha h_{Dutch} + (1 - \alpha)h_{English}$$

If we pushforward the interpolated hidden state, and the output is correct, then this suggests that we may be able to disentangle the language and semantic context.




Figure 6: Relative propensity of Llama-3.1-70B to answer in German (red) vs English (blue). Llama-3.1-70B is most likely to answer in English.

We find that we can interpolate between the hidden states without significant changes in accuracy; the accuracy generally interpolates between the accuracies of the two languages (see Appendix A.10). Furthermore, we find that models have a propensity to answer in English. This provides further evidence that the models likely operate in an English-centric space.

5. Limitations

Our work provides evidence suggesting that MLLMs primarily operate in English. Below, we outline potential limitations and directions for future research.

Tokenization Sentences in different languages often vary in tokenization length (Rust et al., 2021; Muller et al., 2021; Petrov et al., 2024), which complicates cross-lingual comparisons. In this work, we provide heuristics (e.g., for causal tracing, which operates on a per-token level) to compare the results when tokenization lengths vary. However, tokenization remains an important consideration for the development of future interpretability methods designed to be used across multiple languages.

Language confidence and confusion Models often assign higher probabilities to outputs in certain languages, which can affect analyses such as causal tracing by requiring higher noise levels. Similarly, models often exhibit language confusion (Marchisio et al., 2024), continuing to respond in English even when prompted in other languages. Both factors influence our analysis. We can mitigate some issues associated with the first problem – e.g., in causal tracing, we ensure the probabilities all fall below a specified threshold when a prompt is noised. However, we do not actively address language confusion, as doing so could alter the natural behavior of the LLMs, which we aim to understand.

Factors affecting interpretability methods Interpretability methods are influenced by various factors. Steering performance, for example, depends on the intrinsic steerability of a prompt (Turner et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024). To address this, we designed a custom dataset that, to the best of our knowledge, is equally steerable across all languages. Another challenge is that steering could push activations outside the expected data distribution, leading to unintended outputs. To mitigate this, we checked for stuttering in the generated outputs. However, further work is needed to deepen our understanding of steering mechanisms and to develop more robust evaluation procedures.

Other Methods Exploring alternative methods could provide valuable insights. For example, sparse autoencoders (SAEs) (Olshausen and Field, 1997; Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006; Templeton et al., 2024) are a popular interpretability tool. However, training SAEs for each layer is computationally expensive and beyond our computational budget. While some pre-trained SAEs are available, they are predominantly trained on English data, which introduces biases we aim to avoid (Lieberum et al., 2024).

6. Related Work

We can think about understanding a model from two perspectives:

- an **internal perspective**, focused on analyzing the model through the latent space and operations per-

formed inside of the model. Examples of questions include: how do models represent knowledge across different languages? How does a model retrieve facts?

- an **external perspective**, focused on analyzing the model output. For example, how well do models perform in different languages?

Having a unifying theory that combines both perspectives is important – the internal perspective helps us understand the mechanisms underlying behavior, while the external perspective examines the real-world impact of that behavior. Below, we summarize the research on multilingual language models from both perspectives.

6.1. How do LLMs operate internally?

The current main theory in mechanistic interpretability suggests that there are three general phases in the forward pass of an LLM (Chris Olah, 2023; Nanda et al., 2023a; Wendler et al., 2024; Dumas et al., 2024; Fierro et al., 2025):

1. **Detokenization:** In this phase, individual tokens are combined into abstract units that the model uses for analysis. These units can be referents – for example, (Nanda et al., 2023a) found evidence that the tokens [Michael] and [Jordan] are combined into a unit representing the basketball player Michael Jordan. Similarly, these units can encode instructions, as shown by (Dumas et al., 2024), where the model extracts the target language during translation tasks in these layers.
2. **Processing:** In this phase, the model processes or reasons over abstract units. For instance, this stage may involve tasks like fact recall (Geva et al., 2023; Nanda et al., 2023a).
3. **Selecting the output:** In this phase, the model selects the output. This may involve selecting the correct attribute (Nanda et al., 2023a), mapping an abstract concept to the corresponding word in the target language (Wendler et al., 2024) and/or selecting the correct token for the intended word.

In the context of multilingual models, an important question is whether the concept space (in phase 2) is universal. Here, *universal* means the representation is *shared* across languages, i.e., the representation for ‘cat’ (cat in English) and ‘kat’ (cat in Dutch) is the same.

One stream of research argues that the concept space is *universal*. When analyzing the latent space with the logit lens, Wendler et al. (2024) find that the concept space is language-agnostic, but more closely aligned with the English output space. In their follow-up work, Dumas et al.

(2024) used tracing to find further evidence of language-agnostic representations of concepts.¹ Concurrent to this work, Brinkmann et al. (2025) showed that models share morpho-syntactic concept representations across languages.

Other researchers found that the concept space is biased towards the training-dominant language. Using the logit lens, Zhong et al. (2024) focused on Japanese, showing that Swallow (Fujii et al., 2024), which is fine-tuned on Japanese, and LLM-jap (Aizawa et al., 2024), pre-trained on Japanese and English, are Japanese-centric. (Fierro et al., 2025) found that subject enrichment – retrieving attributes about the subject – is language-agnostic whereas object extraction is language-dependent, when studying EuroLLM (Martins et al., 2024), XLGM (Lin et al., 2022) and mT5 (Xue et al., 2021).

Overall, our findings suggest the presence of a language-specific latent space. Specifically, our results indicate that the concept space is largely English-centric, consistent with prior work Zhong et al. (2024); Wu et al. (2024), where English is the dominant training language. However, unlike previous studies, we uncover additional nuance: non-lexical words are not necessarily routed through the English representation space. Moreover, we find that the behavior varies across models. One potential explanation is that we focus on open language generation – which is different from prior work that predominantly focuses on single-token and translation tasks. We provide a more in-depth discussion in Section 8.

6.2. Multilingual LLM behavior

The internal mechanisms of LLMs affect their performance in several different ways, which we summarize below.

Performance The performance of multilingual language models varies across languages (Shafayat et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2023; Bang et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2022; Ahuja et al., 2023), often performing best in English. This can even be leveraged to improve performance in other languages, for example, through cross-lingual chain-of-thought reasoning (Chai et al., 2024), or by modifying prompts, such as using multilingual instructions or asking the LLM to translate the task into English before completing it (Zhu et al., 2023; Etxaniz et al., 2023).

Fluency and language confusion Marchisio et al. (2024) has shown that English-centric models are prone to language confusion, i.e., providing the answer in the incorrect language. Moreover, even when LLMs output text in the correct language, they can produce unnatural sentences in other languages, akin to an accent (Guo et al., 2024).

¹They used tracing to mitigate potential shortcomings of cosine-similarity (Steck et al., 2024)

Bias and culture Moreover, LLMs tend to be biased toward certain cultures, with content performing better when dealing with facts originating from Western contexts (Naous et al., 2024; Shafayat et al., 2024), falling short when answering questions on other cultures (Chiu et al., 2024). Liu et al. (2024) investigate the cultural diversity of LLMs using proverbs and find that these models often struggle to reason with or effectively use proverbs in conversation. Their understanding appears limited to memorization rather than true comprehension, creating a notable “culture gap” when translating or reasoning with culturally specific content across languages.

7. Conclusion

Our results provide evidence that semantic decisions in LLMs are predominantly made in a representation space close to English, while non-lexical words are processed in the prompt language. However, we find that this behavior varies across models, likely due to differences in multilingual proficiency and model size. The English-centric behavior is further validated by our findings that steering non-English prompts using vectors derived from English sentences is more effective than those from the prompt language.

Exploring the structure of the latent space, we find that factual knowledge across languages is stored in roughly the same regions of the model. Interpolating between the latent representations of these facts in different languages preserves predictive accuracy, with the only change being the output language. This suggests that facts encoded in different languages likely share a common representation. However, when interpolating, we find that model output is most frequently in English, further underlining the English-centric bias of the latent space.

The English-centricity of the latent space is consistent with prior observations about LLM behavior. In particular, Etxaniz et al. (2023) found that instructing LLMs to first translate a non-English prompt into English improves model performance. However, this bias can be detrimental. If the latent space is English-centric, this may lead the LLMs toward exhibiting Western-centric biases (Naous et al., 2024; Shafayat et al., 2024).

8. Discussion

There are currently two perspectives in interpretability research on concept representations in multilingual models: (1) concept representations are universal; and (2) concepts have language-centric representations, where the language is the training-dominant language. Our work aligns more closely with the second perspective, as well as a third perspective – namely, that LLMs encode language-specific

representations, where the language is the input/output language. Below, we discuss how the different theories may be reconciled.

Wendler et al. (2024) and Dumas et al. (2024) argue that the concept space is universal, but likely more aligned with the English output space. However, our findings contest this conclusion, as we find that interventions in the latent space are more effective when using English text, even when the target language is not English. If the concept space were truly universal, we would expect interventions using all languages to perform equally well. Our findings are consistent with concurrent work by Wu et al. (2024), who similarly find that steering using English performs comparably to, or slightly better than, the target language.

One possible way to reconcile the two theories is via the difference between concepts that are encoded and concepts that are used (as discussed in Brinkmann et al., 2025). There may be multiple representations of any given concept (Hase et al., 2023; McGrath et al., 2023), or a concept may be represented in an LLM but not used during generation. Wendler et al. (2024) focus more on the encoding of concepts, whereas our work focuses more on the generation of text.

An alternative explanation is that different behavior is captured in the tasks. In Wendler et al. (2024); Dumas et al. (2024), the tasks are designed to generate a single token. In this setting, the task is to select the correct token, and we expect a high probability mass on a single token. In contrast, we focus on a more open-ended setting where there are several different possible continuations. These two settings are inherently different, leading to different conclusions about the behavior of LLMs. Even within the same task of fact retrieval, prior work found that different components of the forward pass are language-specific and language-agnostic (Fierro et al., 2025).

More generally, the open-generation setting allows us to analyze different parts of speech. This leads to the second main difference in conclusions, which is that LLMs encode language-specific representations. For semantically loaded words, we find evidence that the latent space is English-centric (in LLMs where English is the dominant training language). This is consistent with one line of prior work, which generally focuses on nouns (Wu et al., 2024; Zhong et al., 2024). However, we find that the same pattern does not hold for non-lexical words.

This is in contrast to concurrent work by Brinkmann et al. (2025), who showed that models share morpho-syntactic concept representations across languages in Llama-3-7b and Aya-8B. In line with their previous work (Wendler et al., 2024), they argue that the representations are universal. While our high-level conclusions differ, our findings

also support the hypothesis that smaller models emit more shared representations than larger models, which permit more language-specific representations.

In summary, our findings indicate that the extent to which representations are shared across languages is more nuanced than previously thought. Contrasting our work with previous work suggests that the task and model size likely influence the observed behavior. Fully understanding these nuances is important to ensure the fairness and robustness of LLMs.

Impact Statement

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly deployed across a wide range of applications, making it crucial to understand and evaluate their performance to ensure both safety and fairness. A key characteristic of LLMs is their English-centric nature, which influences their behavior, as shown in this paper. In particular, we find further evidence that LLMs perform semantic decisions in English. This likely leads to biased behaviour (Naous et al., 2024; Shafayat et al., 2024). Understanding this is essential to equitable and reliable outcomes in diverse linguistic and cultural contexts.

Moreover, our findings may further be relevant for improving the safety of LLMs. When analysing non-lexical words, we found that LLMs do not emit an English-centric bias. If knowledge representation is not universal across languages, LLMs may require language-specific safety tuning. When introspecting the latent space, we observed varying levels of vulgar terms depending on the language, particularly in cases where the models are not safety-tuned on the language. While this does not necessarily mean the model’s output will be vulgar, it could make the model more vulnerable to jailbreaks (Deng et al., 2024; Ghandeharioun et al., 2024b).

Acknowledgments

We thank Jannik Kossen, Kunal Handa, Emily Reif, Veniamin Veselovsky and Lewis Hammond for their useful feedback and discussions during the writing of this paper. Lisa Schut is funded by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Autonomous Intelligent Machines and Systems grant (EP/S024050/1) and DeepMind. Yarin Gal is supported by a Turing AI Fellowship financed by the UK government’s Office for Artificial Intelligence, through UK Research and Innovation (EP/V030302/1) and delivered by the Alan Turing Institute.

References

K. Ahuja, H. Diddee, R. Hada, M. Ochieng, K. Ramesh, P. Jain, A. Nambi, T. Ganu, S. Segal, M. Axmed, K. Bali, and S. Sitaram. Mega: Multilingual evaluation of gen-

- erative ai, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.12528>.
- A. Aizawa, E. Aramaki, B. Chen, F. Cheng, H. Deguchi, R. Enomoto, K. Fujii, K. Fukumoto, T. Fukushima, N. Han, et al. Llm-jp: A cross-organizational project for the research and development of fully open japanese llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03963*, 2024.
- V. Aryabumi, J. Dang, D. Talupuru, S. Dash, D. Cairuz, H. Lin, B. Venkitesh, M. Smith, K. Marchisio, S. Ruder, A. Locatelli, J. Kreutzer, N. Frosst, P. Blunsom, M. Fadaee, A. Üstün, and S. Hooker. Aya 23: Open weight releases to further multilingual progress, 2024.
- Y. Bang, S. Cahyawijaya, N. Lee, W. Dai, D. Su, B. Wilie, H. Lovenia, Z. Ji, T. Yu, W. Chung, Q. V. Do, Y. Xu, and P. Fung. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of chatgpt on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04023>.
- J. Brinkmann, C. Wendler, C. Bartelt, and A. Mueller. Large language models share representations of latent grammatical concepts across typologically diverse languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06346*, 2025.
- L. Chai, J. Yang, T. Sun, H. Guo, J. Liu, B. Wang, X. Liang, J. Bai, T. Li, Q. Peng, and Z. Li. xcot: Cross-lingual instruction tuning for cross-lingual chain-of-thought reasoning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.07037>.
- Y. Y. Chiu, L. Jiang, B. Y. Lin, C. Y. Park, S. S. Li, S. Ravi, M. Bhatia, M. Antoniak, Y. Tsvetkov, V. Shwartz, and Y. Choi. Culturalbench: a robust, diverse and challenging benchmark on measuring the (lack of) cultural knowledge of llms, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.02677>.
- A. J. Chris Olah. What would be the most safety-relevant features in language models? *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2023. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/july-update/index.html>.
- Y. Deng, W. Zhang, S. J. Pan, and L. Bing. Multilingual jailbreak challenges in large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06474>.
- A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan, A. Goyal, A. Hartshorn, A. Yang, A. Mitra, A. Sravankumar, A. Korenev, A. Hinsvark, A. Rao, A. Zhang, A. Rodriguez, A. Gregerson, A. Spataru, B. Roziere, B. Biron, B. Tang, B. Chern, C. Caucheteux, C. Nayak, C. Bi, C. Marra, C. McConnell, C. Keller, C. Touret, C. Wu, C. Wong, C. C. Ferrer, C. Nikolaidis, D. Allonius, D. Song, D. Pintz, D. Livshits, D. Esiobu, D. Choudhary, D. Mahajan, D. Garcia-Olano, D. Perino, D. Hupkes, E. Lakomkin, E. AlBadawy, E. Lobanova, E. Dinan, E. M. Smith, F. Radenovic, F. Zhang, G. Synnaeve, G. Lee, G. L. Anderson, G. Nail, G. Mialon, G. Pang, G. Cucurell, H. Nguyen, H. Korevaar, H. Xu, H. Touvron, I. Zarov, I. A. Ibarra, I. Kloumann, I. Misra, I. Evtimov, J. Copet, J. Lee, J. Geffert, J. Vranes, J. Park, J. Mahadeokar, J. Shah, J. van der Linde, J. Billock, J. Hong, J. Lee, J. Fu, J. Chi, J. Huang, J. Liu, J. Wang, J. Yu, J. Bitton, J. Spisak, J. Park, J. Rocca, J. Johnstun, J. Saxe, J. Jia, K. V. Alwala, K. Upasani, K. Plawiak, K. Li, K. Heafield, K. Stone, K. El-Arini, K. Iyer, K. Malik, K. Chiu, K. Bhalla, L. Rantala-Yeary, L. van der Maaten, L. Chen, L. Tan, L. Jenkins, L. Martin, L. Madaan, L. Malo, L. Blecher, L. Landzaat, L. de Oliveira, M. Muzzi, M. Pasupuleti, M. Singh, M. Paluri, M. Kardas, M. Oldham, M. Rita, M. Pavlova, M. Kambadur, M. Lewis, M. Si, M. K. Singh, M. Hassan, N. Goyal, N. Torabi, N. Bashlykov, N. Bogoychev, N. Chatterji, O. Duchenne, O. Çelebi, P. Alrassy, P. Zhang, P. Li, P. Vasic, P. Weng, P. Bhargava, P. Dubal, P. Krishnan, P. S. Koura, P. Xu, Q. He, Q. Dong, R. Srivasan, R. Ganapathy, R. Calderer, R. S. Cabral, R. Stojnic, R. Raileanu, R. Girdhar, R. Patel, R. Sauvestre, R. Polidoro, R. Sumbaly, R. Taylor, R. Silva, R. Hou, R. Wang, S. Hosseini, S. Chennabasappa, S. Singh, S. Bell, S. S. Kim, S. Edunov, S. Nie, S. Narang, S. Rapparth, S. Shen, S. Wan, S. Bhosale, S. Zhang, S. Vandenhende, S. Batra, S. Whitman, S. Sootla, S. Collot, S. Gururangan, S. Borodinsky, T. Herman, T. Fowler, T. Sheasha, T. Georgiou, T. Scialom, T. Speckbacher, T. Mihaylov, T. Xiao, U. Karn, V. Goswami, V. Gupta, V. Ramanathan, V. Kerkez, V. Gonguet, V. Do, V. Vogeti, V. Petrovic, W. Chu, W. Xiong, W. Fu, W. Meers, X. Martinet, X. Wang, X. E. Tan, X. Xie, X. Jia, X. Wang, Y. Goldschlag, Y. Gaur, Y. Babaei, Y. Wen, Y. Song, Y. Zhang, Y. Li, Y. Mao, Z. D. Coudert, Z. Yan, Z. Chen, Z. Papakipos, A. Singh, A. Grattafiori, A. Jain, A. Kelsey, A. Shajnfeld, A. Gangidi, A. Victoria, A. Goldstand, A. Menon, A. Sharma, A. Boesenberg, A. Vaughan, A. Baevski, A. Feinstein, A. Kallet, A. Sangani, A. Yunus, A. Lupu, A. Alvarado, A. Caples, A. Gu, A. Ho, A. Poulton, A. Ryan, A. Ramchandani, A. Franco, A. Saraf, A. Chowdhury, A. Gabriel, A. Bharambe, A. Eisenman, A. Yazdan, B. James, B. Maurer, B. Leonhardi, B. Huang, B. Loyd, B. D. Paola, B. Paranjape, B. Liu, B. Wu, B. Ni, B. Hancock, B. Wasti, B. Spence, B. Stojkovic, B. Gamido, B. Montalvo, C. Parker, C. Burton, C. Mejia, C. Wang, C. Kim, C. Zhou, C. Hu, C.-H. Chu, C. Cai, C. Tindal, C. Feichtenhofer, D. Civin, D. Beaty, D. Kreymer, D. Li, D. Wyatt, D. Adkins, D. Xu, D. Testuggine, D. David, D. Parikh, D. Liskovich, D. Foss, D. Wang,

- D. Le, D. Holland, E. Dowling, E. Jamil, E. Montgomery, E. Presani, E. Hahn, E. Wood, E. Brinkman, E. Arcaute, E. Dunbar, E. Smothers, F. Sun, F. Kreuk, F. Tian, F. Ozgenel, F. Caggioni, F. Guzmán, F. Kanayet, F. Seide, G. M. Florez, G. Schwarz, G. Badeer, G. Swee, G. Halpern, G. Thattai, G. Herman, G. Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, G. Lakshminarayanan, H. Shojanazeri, H. Zou, H. Wang, H. Zha, H. Habeeb, H. Rudolph, H. Suk, H. Aspegren, H. Goldman, I. Damlaj, I. Molybog, I. Tufanov, I.-E. Veliche, I. Gat, J. Weissman, J. Geboski, J. Kohli, J. Asher, J.-B. Gaya, J. Marcus, J. Tang, J. Chan, J. Zhen, J. Reizenstein, J. Teboul, J. Zhong, J. Jin, J. Yang, J. Cummings, J. Carvill, J. Shepard, J. McPhie, J. Torres, J. Ginsburg, J. Wang, K. Wu, K. H. U, K. Saxena, K. Prasad, K. Khandelwal, K. Zand, K. Matosich, K. Veeraghavan, K. Michelena, K. Li, K. Huang, K. Chawla, K. Lakhotia, K. Huang, L. Chen, L. Garg, L. A. L. Silva, L. Bell, L. Zhang, L. Guo, L. Yu, L. Moshkovich, L. Wehrstedt, M. Khabsa, M. Avalani, M. Bhatt, M. Tsimpoukelli, M. Mankus, M. Hasson, M. Lennie, M. Reso, M. Groshev, M. Naumov, M. Lathi, M. Keneally, M. L. Seltzer, M. Valko, M. Restrepo, M. Patel, M. Vyatskov, M. Samvelyan, M. Clark, M. Macey, M. Wang, M. J. Hermoso, M. Metanat, M. Rastegari, M. Bansal, N. Santhanam, N. Parks, N. White, N. Bawa, N. Singhal, N. Egebo, N. Usunier, N. P. Laptev, N. Dong, N. Zhang, N. Cheng, O. Chernoguz, O. Hart, O. Salpekar, O. Kalinli, P. Kent, P. Parekh, P. Saab, P. Balaji, P. Rittner, P. Bontrager, P. Roux, P. Dolla, P. Zvyagina, P. Ratanchandani, P. Yuvraj, Q. Liang, R. Alao, R. Rodriguez, R. Ayub, R. Murthy, R. Nayani, R. Mitra, R. Li, R. Hogan, R. Battey, R. Wang, R. Maheswari, R. Howes, R. Rinott, S. J. Bondu, S. Datta, S. Chugh, S. Hunt, S. Dhillon, S. Sidorov, S. Pan, S. Verma, S. Yamamoto, S. Ramaswamy, S. Lindsay, S. Lindsay, S. Feng, S. Lin, S. C. Zha, S. Shankar, S. Zhang, S. Zhang, S. Wang, S. Agarwal, S. Sajuyigbe, S. Chintala, S. Max, S. Chen, S. Kehoe, S. Satterfield, S. Govindaprasad, S. Gupta, S. Cho, S. Virk, S. Subramanian, S. Choudhury, S. Goldman, T. Remez, T. Glaser, T. Best, T. Kohler, T. Robinson, T. Li, T. Zhang, T. Matthews, T. Chou, T. Shaked, V. Vontimitta, V. Ajayi, V. Montanez, V. Mohan, V. S. Kumar, V. Mangla, V. Albiero, V. Ionescu, V. Poenaru, V. T. Mihailescu, V. Ivanov, W. Li, W. Wang, W. Jiang, W. Bouaziz, W. Constable, X. Tang, X. Wang, X. Wu, X. Wang, X. Xia, X. Wu, X. Gao, Y. Chen, Y. Hu, Y. Jia, Y. Qi, Y. Li, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Adi, Y. Nam, Yu, Wang, Y. Hao, Y. Qian, Y. He, Z. Rait, Z. DeVito, Z. Rosnbrick, Z. Wen, Z. Yang, and Z. Zhao. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- C. Dumas, V. Veselovsky, G. Monea, R. West, and C. Wendler. How do llamas process multilingual text? a latent exploration through activation patching. In *ICML 2024 Workshop on Mechanistic Interpretability*, 2024.
- J. Etxaniz, G. Azkune, A. Soroa, O. L. de Lacalle, and M. Artetxe. Do multilingual language models think better in english?, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01223>.
- C. Fierro, N. Foroutan, D. Elliott, and A. Søggaard. How do multilingual language models remember facts?, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.14387>.
- K. Fujii, T. Nakamura, M. Loem, H. Iida, M. Ohi, K. Hattori, H. Shota, S. Mizuki, R. Yokota, and N. Okazaki. Continual pre-training for cross-lingual llm adaptation: Enhancing japanese language capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17790*, 2024.
- M. Geva, J. Bastings, K. Filippova, and A. Globerson. Dissecting recall of factual associations in auto-regressive language models. In H. Bouamor, J. Pino, and K. Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12216–12235, Singapore, Dec. 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.751. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.751/>.
- A. Ghandeharioun, A. Caciularu, A. Pearce, L. Dixon, and M. Geva. Patchscope: A unifying framework for inspecting hidden representations of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06102*, 2024a.
- A. Ghandeharioun, A. Yuan, M. Guerard, E. Reif, M. A. Lepori, and L. Dixon. Who’s asking? user personas and the mechanics of latent misalignment, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12094>.
- Y. Guo, G. Shang, and C. Clavel. Benchmarking linguistic diversity of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10271*, 2024.
- P. Hase, M. Bansal, B. Kim, and A. Ghandeharioun. Does localization inform editing? surprising differences in causality-based localization vs. knowledge editing in language models. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 17643–17668, 2023.
- G. E. Hinton and R. R. Salakhutdinov. Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *Science*, 313 (5786):504–507, 2006.
- M. Honnibal and I. Montani. spaCy 2: Natural language understanding with Bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. To appear, 2017.

- H. Huang, T. Tang, D. Zhang, W. X. Zhao, T. Song, Y. Xia, and F. Wei. Not all languages are created equal in llms: Improving multilingual capability by cross-lingual-thought prompting, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07004>.
- A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, B. Savary, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. de las Casas, E. B. Hanna, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Bour, G. Lample, L. R. Lavaud, L. Saulnier, M.-A. Lachaux, P. Stock, S. Subramanian, S. Yang, S. Antoniak, T. L. Scao, T. Gervet, T. Lavril, T. Wang, T. Lacroix, and W. E. Sayed. Mixtral of experts, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04088>.
- T. Lieberum, S. Rajamanoharan, A. Conmy, L. Smith, N. Sonnerat, V. Varma, J. Kramár, A. Dragan, R. Shah, and N. Nanda. Gemma scope: Open sparse autoencoders everywhere all at once on gemma 2, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.05147>.
- X. V. Lin, T. Mihaylov, M. Artetxe, T. Wang, S. Chen, D. Simig, M. Ott, N. Goyal, S. Bhosale, J. Du, R. Pasunuru, S. Shleifer, P. S. Koura, V. Chaudhary, B. O’Horo, J. Wang, L. Zettlemoyer, Z. Kozareva, M. Diab, V. Stoyanov, and X. Li. Few-shot learning with multilingual language models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.10668>.
- C. C. Liu, F. Koto, T. Baldwin, and I. Gurevych. Are multilingual llms culturally-diverse reasoners? an investigation into multicultural proverbs and sayings, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08591>.
- K. Marchisio, W.-Y. Ko, A. Bérard, T. Dehaze, and S. Ruder. Understanding and mitigating language confusion in llms, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.20052>.
- P. H. Martins, P. Fernandes, J. Alves, N. M. Guerreiro, R. Rei, D. M. Alves, J. Pombal, A. Farajian, M. Faysse, M. Klimaszewski, P. Colombo, B. Haddow, J. G. C. de Souza, A. Birch, and A. F. T. Martins. Eurollm: Multilingual language models for europe, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.16235>.
- T. McGrath, M. Rahtz, J. Kramar, V. Mikulik, and S. Legg. The hydra effect: Emergent self-repair in language model computations, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15771>.
- K. Meng, D. Bau, A. Andonian, and Y. Belinkov. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.
- G. A. Miller. WordNet: A lexical database for English. In *Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 8-11, 1994, 1994*. URL <https://aclanthology.org/H94-1111/>.
- B. Muller, A. Anastasopoulos, B. Sagot, and D. Seddah. When being unseen from mBERT is just the beginning: Handling new languages with multilingual language models. In K. Toutanova, A. Rumshisky, L. Zettlemoyer, D. Hakkani-Tur, I. Beltagy, S. Bethard, R. Cotterell, T. Chakraborty, and Y. Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 448–462, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.38. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.38/>.
- N. Nanda, L. Chan, T. Lieberum, J. Smith, and J. Steinhart. Progress measures for grokking via mechanistic interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05217*, 2023a.
- N. Nanda, S. Rajamanoharan, J. Kramar, and R. Shah. Fact finding: Attempting to reverse-engineer factual recall on the neuron level, Dec 2023b. URL <https://www.alignmentforum.org/s/hpWHhjvvn67LJ4xXX>.
- T. Naous, M. J. Ryan, A. Ritter, and W. Xu. Having beer after prayer? measuring cultural bias in large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14456>.
- nostalgebraist. interpreting gpt: the logit lens, Aug 2020. URL <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/AcKRB8wDpdaN6v6ru/interpreting-gpt-the-logit-lens>.
- B. A. Olshausen and D. J. Field. Sparse coding with an overcomplete basis set: A strategy employed by v1? *Vision Research*, 37(23):3311–3325, 1997.
- K. Pal, J. Sun, A. Yuan, B. Wallace, and D. Bau. Future lens: Anticipating subsequent tokens from a single hidden state. In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, page 548–560. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.conll-1.37. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.conll-1.37>.
- N. Panickssery, N. Gabrieli, J. Schulz, M. Tong, E. Hubinger, and A. M. Turner. Steering llama 2 via contrastive activation addition, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06681>.

- A. Petrov, E. La Malfa, P. Torr, and A. Bibi. Language model tokenizers introduce unfairness between languages. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- P. Rust, J. Pfeiffer, I. Vulić, S. Ruder, and I. Gurevych. How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models. In C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, editors, *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3118–3135, Online, Aug. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.243. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.243/>.
- S. Shafayat, E. Kim, J. Oh, and A. Oh. Multi-fact: Assessing factuality of multilingual llms using factscore, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.18045>.
- F. Shi, M. Suzgun, M. Freitag, X. Wang, S. Srivats, S. Vosoughi, H. W. Chung, Y. Tay, S. Ruder, D. Zhou, et al. Language models are multilingual chain-of-thought reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03057*, 2022.
- H. Steck, C. Ekanadham, and N. Kallus. Is cosine-similarity of embeddings really about similarity? In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 887–890, 2024.
- N. Subramani, N. Suresh, and M. E. Peters. Extracting latent steering vectors from pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05124*, 2022.
- D. Tan, D. Chanin, A. Lynch, D. Kanoulas, B. Paige, A. Garriga-Alonso, and R. Kirk. Analyzing the generalization and reliability of steering vectors, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.12404>.
- G. Team. Gemma. 2024. doi: 10.34740/KAGGLE/M/3301. URL <https://www.kaggle.com/m/3301>.
- A. Templeton, T. Conerly, J. Marcus, J. Lindsey, T. Bricken, B. Chen, A. Pearce, C. Citro, E. Ameisen, A. Jones, H. Cunningham, N. L. Turner, C. McDougall, M. MacDiarmid, C. D. Freeman, T. R. Sumers, E. Rees, J. Batson, A. Jermyn, S. Carter, C. Olah, and T. Henighan. Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2024. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/scaling-monosemanticity/index.html>.
- A. M. Turner, L. Thiergart, G. Leech, D. Udell, J. J. Vazquez, U. Mini, and M. MacDiarmid. Activation addition: Steering language models without optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10248*, 2023.
- J. Vig, S. Gehrmann, Y. Belinkov, S. Qian, D. Nevo, Y. Singer, and S. Shieber. Investigating gender bias in language models using causal mediation analysis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 12388–12401, 2020.
- C. Wendler, V. Veselovsky, G. Monea, and R. West. Do llamas work in english? on the latent language of multilingual transformers, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10588>.
- Z. Wu, X. V. Yu, D. Yogatama, J. Lu, and Y. Kim. The semantic hub hypothesis: Language models share semantic representations across languages and modalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04986*, 2024.
- L. Xue, N. Constant, A. Roberts, M. Kale, R. Al-Rfou, A. Siddhant, A. Barua, and C. Raffel. mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. In K. Toutanova, A. Rumshisky, L. Zettlemoyer, D. Hakkani-Tur, I. Beltagy, S. Bethard, R. Cotterell, T. Chakraborty, and Y. Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.41. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.41/>.
- C. Zhong, F. Cheng, Q. Liu, J. Jiang, Z. Wan, C. Chu, Y. Murawaki, and S. Kurohashi. Beyond english-centric llms: What language do multilingual language models think in? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10811*, 2024.
- W. Zhu, Y. Lv, Q. Dong, F. Yuan, J. Xu, S. Huang, L. Kong, J. Chen, and L. Li. Extrapolating large language models to non-english by aligning languages, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04948>.

A. Appendix

A.1. Causal Tracing

Causal tracing (Meng et al., 2022; Vig et al., 2020) uses causal mediation analysis to identify where facts are stored within a network. For example, imagine that we want to find where the fact “The capital of Canada is Ottawa” is represented in an LLM. We could prompt the model with “The capital of Canada is” to find where “Ottawa” is stored in the network. There are two main steps in causal tracing:

1. **corrupt the signal:** destroy the information so that the model no longer outputs the fact.
2. **restore the signal:** determine where in the network the representation needs to be restored so that the LLM can recover the correct output.

Let $e^{\text{clean}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m,d}$ be the embedding of the prompt “The capital of Canada is”, where m is the number of tokens and d is the embedding dimension. In the first step, the information is “destroyed” by adding noise to the embedding of the subject token:

$$e_j^{\text{corrupted}} = \begin{cases} e_j^{\text{clean}} + \varepsilon & \text{if token } j \text{ is a subject token} \\ e_j^{\text{clean}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where ε is noise sampled from an isotropic Gaussian distribution, and $e^{\text{corrupted}}$ is the corrupted embedding. We push-forward corrupted embeddings $e^{\text{corrupted}}$ through the network to obtain the probability that the model outputs Ottawa, $p[\text{Ottawa}|e^{\text{corrupted}}]$.

Next, we want to find out which part of the hidden states encodes the relevant information to restore the correct output. At a given layer l in the network, we ‘restore’ part of the corrupt hidden state by copying back part of the clean hidden state h at position p :

$$h_{j,l}^{\text{restored}} = \begin{cases} h_{j,l}^{\text{clean}} & \text{if } j = p \\ h_{j,l}^{\text{corrupted}} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where the hidden state $h_l^{\text{clean}} = [h_{1,l}^{\text{clean}}, \dots, h_{m,l}^{\text{clean}}]$ is obtained by pushing the original embeddings, e^{clean} , through the network.

Finally, we propagate h_l^{restored} through the remaining layers produce the output probability $p[\text{Ottawa}|h_{l,p}^{\text{restored}}]$. The difference $p[\text{Ottawa}|h_{l,p}^{\text{restored}}] - p[\text{Ottawa}|h_l^{\text{corrupted}}]$, measures the importance of layer l and token position p in encoding a fact. Through this approach, causal tracing helps identify which parts of the representation are sufficient to retrieve the correct output.

A.2. LLM Training Data Languages

Table 4 summarizes the languages the different models are trained on.

Table 4: LLMs: High resource training languages

Model	Languages
LLAMA-3.1-70B (DUBEY ET AL., 2024)	ENGLISH, GERMAN, FRENCH, ITALIAN, PORTUGUESE, HINDI, SPANISH, AND THAI
MIXTRAL-8X22B-V0.1 (JIANG ET AL., 2024)	ENGLISH, FRENCH, ITALIAN, GERMAN, AND SPANISH
AYA-23-35B (ARYABUMI ET AL., 2024)	ARABIC, CHINESE (SIMPLIFIED AND TRADITIONAL), CZECH, DUTCH, ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, GREEK, HEBREW, HINDI, INDONESIAN, ITALIAN, JAPANESE, KOREAN, PERSIAN, POLISH, PORTUGUESE, ROMANIAN, RUSSIAN, SPANISH, TURKISH, UKRAINIAN, AND VIETNAMESE
GEMMA-2-27B (TEAM, 2024)	ENGLISH

A.3. LLM-Insight Dataset

Our goal is to generate a dataset that can be used for cross-lingual interpretability. We wanted a dataset that can be used to introspect LLM internal representations and analyze LLM behavior when the internal representations are intervened on. Additionally, the dataset focuses on open-ended sentence generation rather than being restricted to specific tasks like fact recall or sentiment analysis, as text generation is an important real-world application.

A.3.1. TEXT GENERATION

We use GPT-4o to generate sentences and prompts. For each target word, we generate:

- 10 unique sentences containing a version of the word – for example, for the verb ‘(to) see’, a suitable sentence is ‘She saw a bird in the sky.’
- a list containing the version of the word used in each sentence. In the previous example, the version of the word is ‘saw’.
- 10 unique prompts, designed to be completed with the target word.
- a list containing a version of the word used in each sentence

We instruct GPT-4o to generate prompts that can be completed with the target word, as well as semantically distinct words. However, we observe that the model sometimes produces sentences and prompts that do not meet the criteria.

An example of a sentence that does not meet the criteria is:

Target word: bouquet (boeket in Dutch)
Sentence: Het boeket was gevuld met levendige rozen en lelies.
Translation: The bouquet was filled with live roses and lilies.

The issue with this sentence is its unnatural phrasing—the word “live” is not typically used in this context.

An example of a prompt that does not meet the criteria is:

Target word: money
Prompt: He went to the bank to withdraw

In this case, the only plausible continuation is “money.” While the prompt is coherent, it lacks the open-endedness needed to analyze how interventions influence model behavior.

An example of a well-constructed prompt is:

Target word: bus
Prompt: She took a

This can be completed with the intended word “bus”, as well as semantically different alternatives such as “walk” or “long road trip”.

To ensure data quality, we asked native speakers to review and correct the data. The original version of the data and the corrections are provided in the dataset.

A.3.2. DATASET SUMMARY

We selected words that vary in the number of tokens (in non-English languages), whether the word is a homograph with the English version of the word, and the part of speech. Table 5 summarizes the words used.

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?

Table 5: Word Translations Across Languages

Word	English	Dutch	French	German	Mandarin
animal	animal, animals	dier, dieren	animal, animaux	Haustier, Tier, Tiere	动物
bad	bad	slecht, slechte	mal, mauvais, mauvaise, mauvaises	schlecht, schlechte, schlechten	不好, 坏了
ballet	ballet	ballet	ballet	Ballett	芭蕾
bank	bank	bank	banque	Bank	银行
beautiful	beautiful	mooi, mooie	beau, bel, belle, magnifique	schön, schöne, schönen	美丽
big	big, tall	groot, groots, grote	grand, grande, grands, gros	große, großen, großer, großes	大
bouquet	bouquet	boeket	bouquet	Strauß	花束
brother	brother	broer	frère	Bruder	哥哥, 弟弟, 兄弟
bus	bus	bus	bus	Bus	公交车 / 巴士
cat	cat	kat	chat	Katze, Katzen, Mutterkatze	猫, 小猫, 流浪猫
centre	centre	centrum	centre	Zentrum	中心, 市中心, 研究中心, 社区中心, 艺术中心
chair	chair	stoel	chaise	Stuhl, Stuhls, Stühlen	椅子, 椅子, 摇椅
chauffeur	chauffeur, driver	chauffeur	chauffeur, chauffeuse	Chauffeur	司机
child	child	kind	enfant	Kind	孩子
club	club	club, vereniging	club	Club	俱乐部
cold	cold	ijskoud, kou, koud, koude	froid, froide, froides	kalt	冷, 寒冷
computer	PC, computer, laptop, machine, rig, system	computer	ordinateur	Computer, Computern, Laptop	电脑
culture	culture, cultures	culturen, cultuur	culture, cultures, la culture	Kultur	文化
day	day	dag	jour, journée	Tag	天, 日子
dog	dog	hond	chien	Hund	小狗, 狗
drink	drink	drank, drankje, drinken	boire, boisson, drinken	trinken	饮料
eat	eat	eten	dîner, manger, repas	essen	吃
fast	fast	fast, snel, snelle	rapide, vite	schnell	快
film	film	film, films	film	Film, film	电影, 影片, 纪录片
food	cuisine, cuisines, dish, food, meals	gerecht, gerechten, voedsel	cuisine, nourriture	Essen, Futter, Nahrung	食物
fruit	fruit	fruit	fruit, fruits	Frucht, Früchte, Obst	水果

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?

Word	English	Dutch	French	German	Mandarin
garage	garage	garage, parkeergarage	garage	Garage	车库
give	give	geven, helpen	dire, donnent, donner, partager	geben	给
goal gobbledygook	goal buzzwords, gibberish, jargon, nonsense	doel, doelpunt gebazel, geheimtaal, jargon, koeterwaals, onzin, retoriek, waanzin, wartaal	but, objectif baragouin, bla-bla, charabia, galimatias, gargouilloux	Tor, Ziel, Ziele Kauderwelsch	球门, 目标 废话, 难懂的 术语
good	delicious, excellent, fun, good, great, helpful	goed, goede	bien, bon, bonne, bons	gut	好
hand happy	hand happy	hand, handen blij	main content, contente, contents, enthousiaste, gais, heureux, joyeuse	Hand, Hände froh, glücklich	手 快乐, 高兴, 高兴, 快乐
horse hot	horse, pony hot	paard, paarden heet, hete	cheval chaud, chaude, chaudes	Pferd, Pferde heiß	马 热
incomprehen- sibility information	incomprehen- sibility information	onbegrijpe- lijkheid informatie	incompréhen- sibilité information, informations	Unverständlichkeit Information, Informationen	不可理解, 难 以理解 信息
land	land	land, landen	atterrir, campagne, nature, terrain, terrains, terre, territoire	Land	土地, 土地, 国家
machine	device, equipment, machine, maker, system	machine	machine	Maschine	机器
menu	menu	menu, menukaart	menu	Menü	菜单
money	money	geld	argent	Geld	钱
no	no	nee	non	nein	不
please	please	alsjeblieft	s'il te plaît, s'il vous plaît	bitte	请
police	police	politie	police	Polizei	警察
radio	radio	radio, radiozender	fréquence, radio	Radio	广播, 收音机
read	read	lezen	lire	lesen	阅读
room	room	kamer	chambre	Zimmer	房间
sea	sea	zee	mer, zoo	Meer	大海, 海, 海 洋, 海浪, 海 风
see	see	zien	voir	sehen	欣赏, 看, 观 察

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?

Word	English	Dutch	French	German	Mandarin
serendipity	serendipity	toeval, toevalstreffer	chance, coïncidence, hasard, sérendipité, éventualité	glückliche Zufälle, glücklicher Zufall	机缘巧合
sister	sister	zus, zusje	soeur	Schwester	姐妹
sleep	asleep, sleep	slaap, slapen	coucher, dormir, s’assoupir, se coucher, se reposer, sommeil, sommoler	Schlaf, schlafen	睡眠, 睡觉
slow	slow, slowly	langzaam, langzame	lent, lente, lentement, lentes, lents	langsam	慢
small	compact, little, small, tiny	klein, kleine	petit, petite	klein	小
speak	speak	spreken	communiquer, parler, s’exprimer	sprechen	发言, 表达, 讲话, 说, 说 话
supermarket	grocer, grocery, market, store, supermarket	supermarkt	supermarché	Supermarkt	超市
table	table	tafel	table	Tisch	台, 桌, 桌子
take	take	maken, neemt, nemen, zorgen	prendre	mitnehmen, nehmen	取, 带, 拿
taxi	taxi	taxi	taxi	Taxi	出租车
thermodynamics	thermodynamics	thermodynamica	thermodynamique	Thermodynamik	热力学
tour	tour	excursie, rondleiding, tour, tournee	Tour, tour, visite	Tour	旅行, 游览
water	water	water	eau	Wasser	水
write	write	schrijven	écrire	schreiben	写, 写字
yes	yes	ja	oui	ja	对, 是

We selected words that varied in the number of tokens used to represent the words and selected some that were the same as English words. Table 6 summarizes the word overlap across the different languages. Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 summarize the average tokenization lengths of the words in different languages and models. The average number of tokens per word in English is lower than in other languages.

Table 6: Word overlap between languages

	ENGLISH	MANDARIN	GERMAN	DUTCH	FRENCH
ENGLISH	75	0	0	14	16
MANDARIN	0	75	0	0	0
GERMAN	0	0	75	0	0
DUTCH	14	0	0	75	8
FRENCH	15	0	0	8	75

Table 7: Llama-3.1-70B tokenization statistics

LANGUAGE	1	2	3	4	5+	MEAN
ENGLISH	55	15	2	2	1	1.39
MANDARIN	35	18	5	3	3	1.80
GERMAN	17	30	13	2	2	2.12
DUTCH	19	29	11	2	3	2.09
FRENCH	20	32	7	3	2	2.03

Table 8: Gemma-2-27b tokenization statistics

LANGUAGE	1	2	3	4	5+	WEIGHTED MEAN
ENGLISH	66	6	1	1	1	1.20
MANDARIN	50	7	3	3	1	1.41
GERMAN	33	24	5	2	0	1.62
DUTCH	34	23	4	2	1	1.64
FRENCH	39	20	2	2	1	1.53

Table 9: Mixtral-8x22B tokenization statistics

LANGUAGE	1	2	3	4	5+	MEAN
ENGLISH	65	3	3	2	2	1.31
MANDARIN	0	22	22	4	16	3.52
GERMAN	15	30	13	2	4	2.25
DUTCH	17	29	12	3	3	2.19
FRENCH	21	28	8	5	2	2.11

Table 10: Aya-23-35B tokenization statistics

LANGUAGE	1	2	3	4	5+	MEAN
ENGLISH	59	11	3	2	0	1.31
MANDARIN	47	11	1	3	2	1.47
GERMAN	20	35	7	1	1	1.88
DUTCH	29	24	7	1	3	1.83
FRENCH	32	25	4	1	2	1.70

A.4. Parts of Speech Analysis

In this experiment, we analyze how often a word is first ‘selected’ in English, for each part of speech. To identify the part of speech, we used `spacy` models (Honnibal and Montani, 2017). To identify English words, we use `enchant.Dict("en_US")`. We use `nl_core_news_sm`, `de_core_news_sm`, `fr_core_news_sm` and `zh_core_web_sm`. In general, we can use spaces to identify words in sentences. For Mandarin, we use the package `jieba`.

Table 11: Part of Speech Abbreviations, Terms, and Examples

ABBREVIATION	TERM	EXAMPLES
ADJ	ADJECTIVE	
ADP	ADPOSITION	IN, TO, DURING
ADV	ADVERB	VERY, EVERYWHERE
AUX	AUXILIARY	HAS (DONE), WAS (DONE)
CCONJ	COORDINATING CONJUNCTION	AND, OR, BUT
DET	DETERMINER	THEIR, HER, SOME
INTJ	INTERJECTION	OUCH
NOUN	NOUN	PLACE, THING, IDEA
NUM	NUMBER	10, 200
PRON	PRONOUN	HE, SHE, THEY
PROPN	PROPER NOUN	SPECIFIC NAME, PLACE
SCONJ	SUBORDINATING CONJUNCTION	THAT, IF, WHILE
SYM	SYMBOL	
VERB	VERB	SEE, RUN

A.5. Logit Lens Quantitative Evaluation

To evaluate whether a word is chosen in English, we use GPT-4o. We considered alternative evaluation procedures. We tested various translation packages but found issues with both word- and sentence-level approaches. When used on a word level, this caused problems with colexification and did not allow for close synonyms often only providing a single translation per word. When using translation on a sentence level, it was difficult to map tokens to each word (due to changes in the sentence structure). We also considered WordNet (Miller, 1994), but it only covers nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, making it unsuitable for other parts of speech. Ultimately, we chose GPT-4o and manually verified 100 samples to ensure the evaluation was accurate.

We ask GPT-4o to score words as follows:

- 5: An exact translation.
- 4: A close synonym.
- 3: A word with a similar but distinct meaning.
- 2: A word whose meaning is at best weakly related.
- 1: A word whose meaning is not related.

When a word receives a score of 4 or higher, we evaluate the word as chosen in English.

An example of the command we use is:

Below, you will be given a reference word in Dutch and a context (i.e., phrase or sentence) in which the word is used. You will then be given another list of English words or subparts of words/phrases.

You should respond with the word from the list that is most similar to the reference word, along with a grade for the degree of similarity.

Special Note on Contextual Translations: If an English word could form a common phrase or idiomatic expression

that accurately translates the reference word, it should be rated highly. For example, if a phrase like “turned out” perfectly matches a Dutch verb, the word “turned” alone would receive a high score due to its idiomatic fit.
Special Note on Tenses: Do not penalize for different tenses. For example, the word ‘want’ matches ‘wilde’ and should receive a 5.

Degrees of Similarity: Similarity should be evaluated from 1 to 5, as follows:

- 5: An exact translation.
- 4: A close synonym.
- 3: A word with a similar but distinct meaning.
- 2: A word whose meaning is at best weakly related.
- 1: A word whose meaning is not related.

Consider the following examples:

****Example 1****

Reference Word in Dutch: ‘waarop’ Context: ‘Ze had een hekel aan de manier waarop hij zijn’
English Word List: [‘hicks’, ‘mild’, ‘rut’, ‘sens’, ‘spiral’, ‘hometown’, ‘how’, ‘manner’, ‘van’, ‘101’, ‘ward’]

Analysis: ‘waarop’ means ”on which” in Dutch. The word ‘how’ is most similar to this in the list, while the other options are unrelated.

Answer Word: ‘how’

Similarity Score: 4 - a close synonym

****Example 2****

Reference Word in Dutch: ‘bleek’
Context: ‘Ze adopteerde een zwerfdier, maar het bleek een wolf te zijn’
English Word List: [‘cup’, ‘freed’, ‘freeman’, ‘laurent’, ‘turns’, ‘turned’, ‘van’, ‘348’, ‘i’, ‘ken’, ‘oms’]

Analysis: ‘bleek’ means ”turned out” in Dutch, making ‘turned’ the most similar option.

Answer Word: ‘turned’

Similarity Score: 5 - an exact translation

****Example 3****

Reference Word in Dutch: ‘vaas’
Context: ‘Ze schikte een prachtig boeket bloemen in een vaas.’
English Word List: [‘tucker’, ‘van’, ‘container’, ‘opp’, ‘van’, ‘vessel’, ‘-g’, ‘-t’, ‘397’, ‘art’, ‘as’, ‘ed’, ‘ion’, ‘let’]

Analysis: ‘vaas’ means ”vase” in Dutch. The word ‘vessel’ is somewhat similar, as vases are vessels for holding items like flowers.

Answer Word: ‘vessel’

Similarity Score: 3 - a word with a similar but distinct meaning

****Example 4****

Reference Word in Dutch: ‘werd’
Context: ‘Ze ging geld opnemen bij de bank en werd overvallen.’
English Word List: [‘dee’, ‘lafayette’, ‘bank’, ‘bu’, ‘herself’, ‘kw’, ‘met’, ‘ramp’, ‘return’, ‘returning’, ‘113’, ‘347’]

Analysis: ‘werd’ means ‘was’ in Dutch. None of these words are related.

Answer Word: None

Similarity Score: 1 - a word whose meaning is not related

****Example 5****

Reference Word in Dutch: 'vrienden'

Context: 'Ze bracht het weekend door met haar vrienden in een huisje in de Ardennen.'

English Word List: ['sag', 'sat', 'tween', 'bro', 'families', 'family', 'her', 'herself', 'mo', 'own', 'parents', 'weekend', '666', 'elf']

Analysis: 'vrienden' means "friends" in Dutch. The closest word here is 'families', which is weakly related but distinct.

Answer Word: 'families'

Similarity Score: 2 - a word whose meaning is at best weakly related

The examples are complete. Now it is your turn. The reference word will be in Dutch, and you must find the most similar English word and assess the degree of meaning similarity on a scale from 1 to 5.

The commands for other languages are similar but adapted to provide examples in the language.

A.5.1. EXPLICIT TEXT

A.6. Other language-specific phenomena

We observe explicit vocabulary in the latent space of LLMs (examples can be found in Appendix A.5.1). Table 12 shows the frequency of vulgar words in the latent space, with Llama-3.1-70B showing the highest count. This model is safety-tuned in eight languages (Dubey et al., 2024), including English, German, and French, but not Dutch. This may suggest that explicit terminology is a language- and model-specific feature.

Table 12: Frequency of explicit words decoded in the latent space across LLMs. Llama-3.1-70B has the highest proportion of explicit terms.

MODEL	EXPLICIT WORDS (%)				
	ENG	FR	NL	DE	ZH
LLAMA-3.1-70B	6.25	11.25	18.35	8.13	7.19
MIXTRAL-8x22B	1.56	3.91	5.21	4.53	10.19
AYA-23-35B	2.50	2.97	3.44	2.89	2.69
GEMMA-2-27B	0.00	0.31	0.31	0.39	0.38




Figure 7: Example 1: Logit Lens applied to Llama-3.1-70B.

Terms such as kutje (pussy), pornofilm (porn film), lul (dick), and knull (fuck) appear in various contexts, including inappropriate sentences about children. For example, in Figure 7 during the generation:

Ze houdt ervan om met **haar vriendinnen te winkelen en te klets(en)** ...
 English translation: She enjoys shopping and talking with her friends ...

We find the explicit words ‘kutje’ and ‘pornofil(m)’ when decoding the latent space using the logit lens. This behavior is consistent across other examples (see Figure 8).

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?




Figure 8: Logit Lens applied to Llama-3.1-70B.

A.7. Steering

For the steering experiment, we use the LLM-Insight dataset. We compute two steering vectors:

- a topic steering vector: this is a steering vector that captures the intended topic. For example, for the topic ‘love, we create a steering vector that is $v_l^t = h_l(\text{love}) - h_l(\text{hate})$, where h_l is the hidden state in layer l .
- a language steering vector: we add a steering vector that captures the intended output language. For example, for the target language Dutch, we can create a steering vector $v_l^l = h_l(\text{Dutch}) - h_l(\text{English})$.
- For each steering vector, we take the difference between sets of sentences containing the topic.

Currently, we consider steering successful if (1) the generated sentence contains the target word and (2) does not lead to output collapse (stuttering). We set the steering vector weights by using a hold-out set of 5 words (50 prompts). We found that 5 was optimal for the topic steering vector, and 10 was optimal for the language steering vector. For the layers, we considered every 5-th layer of the model for the topic steering vector. We considered every 2nd layer for the language vector. We reported the results across the best layers. On average, we found that 20-40 % of layers allowed for successful steering, with English steering vectors being the least sensitive to layer selection.

A.8. Cosine Similarity of Steering Vectors




Figure 9: Cosine distance between steering vectors in Aya-23-35B.




Figure 10: Cosine distance between steering vectors in Gemma-2-27b.




Figure 11: Cosine distance between steering vectors in Mixtral-8x22B.




Figure 12: Cosine distance between steering vectors in Llama-3.1-70B.

To analyze the geometry of the latent space, we compute both topic vectors and language vectors for our dataset. We track the cosine similarity of these steering vectors across different layers and models, providing insights into how topics and languages are represented internally. Specifically, we plot the cosine similarities of topic vectors derived from different languages. In Figures 9, 10, 11 and 12 are the plots for Aya-23-35B, Gemma-2-27b, Mixtral-8x22B, and Llama-3.1-70B, respectively.

We find that topic vectors maintain a high cosine similarity of approximately 0.8 across languages. The similarity can be increased by incorporating the corresponding language vector, suggesting an interaction between topic and language-specific representations.

A.9. Causal tracing




Figure 13: The causal traces of the city facts in Aya-23-35B.

Figures 13, 14, 15 and 16 show the causal traces, averaged over different country-city pairs for Aya-23-35B, Llama-3.1-70B, Mixtral-8x22B and Gemma-2-27b respectively. Across all models, we find that facts are generally localized in similar layers, regardless of the language. Two main traces emerge: a mid-layer trace on the subject token(s), which may correspond to entity resolution, and a later trace when attribute recollection occurs (as suggested by Nanda et al. (2023b)). Overall, these plots suggest that facts are approximately stored in the same parts of the model.

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?




Figure 14: The causal traces of the city facts in Llama-3.1-70B.




Figure 15: The causal traces of the city facts in Mixtral-8x22B.




Figure 16: The causal traces of the city facts in Gemma-2-27b.

A.10. Hidden state interpolation (with instructions)

We include instructions as otherwise the MLLMs often describe the city, rather than provide the city. E.g., “The capital of Canada is beautiful”. For most models, the accuracy when interpolating between the hidden states is between the performances in the two languages. Interestingly, we observe a propensity of models to answer in a specific language. All models are most likely to answer in English.

A.10.1. AYA




Figure 17: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and English prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and French (blue).




Figure 18: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and English prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and German (blue).




Figure 19: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and English prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 20: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and Dutch prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 21: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and Dutch prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 22: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and German prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and French (blue).




Figure 23: Hidden state interpolation between Mandarin prompts, and English prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 24: Hidden state interpolation between Mandarin prompts, and Dutch prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in Dutch (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 25: Hidden state interpolation between Mandarin prompts, and French prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 26: Hidden state interpolation between Mandarin prompts, and German prompts in Aya-23-35B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Mandarin (blue).

A.10.2. LLAMA




Figure 27: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and French prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and French (blue).




Figure 28: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and German prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and German (blue).




Figure 29: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Dutch prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 30: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and French prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Dutch (blue).





Figure 31: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Dutch prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Dutch (blue).





Figure 32: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and French prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and French (blue).




Figure 33: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 34: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in Dutch (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 35: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 36: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Llama-3.1-70B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Mandarin (blue).

A.10.3. MISTRAL

Mixtral-8x22B is most likely to answer in English and least likely to answer in Dutch. It is roughly equally likely to answer in German and French.




Figure 37: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and French prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and French (blue).




Figure 38: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and German prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and German (blue).

Do Multilingual LLMs Think In English?




Figure 39: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Dutch prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 40: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and French prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 41: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and German prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 42: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and German prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and French (blue).




Figure 43: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and German prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and French (blue).




Figure 44: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 45: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 46: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 47: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in Dutch (red) and Mandarin (blue).

A.10.4. GEMMA

Gemma-2-27b is most likely to answer in English, German, French and then Dutch.




Figure 48: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and English prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and French (blue).




Figure 49: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and English prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and German (blue).




Figure 50: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and English prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 51: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and Dutch prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 52: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and Dutch prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Dutch (blue).




Figure 53: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and German prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and French (blue).




Figure 54: Hidden state interpolation between English prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Gemma-2-27b. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in English (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 55: Hidden state interpolation between French prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in French (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 56: Hidden state interpolation between German prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in German (red) and Mandarin (blue).




Figure 57: Hidden state interpolation between Dutch prompts, and Mandarin prompts in Mixtral-8x22B. Left shows the accuracy (i.e., the proportion of times the model correctly outputs city in either language). Right shows the propensity of the model to answer in Dutch (red) and Mandarin (blue).