

XCOMPS: A Multilingual Benchmark of Conceptual Minimal Pairs

Linyang He^{1*} Ercong Nie^{2, 3*}

Sukru Samet Dindar¹ Arsalan Firoozi¹ Adrian Florea¹

Van Nguyen³ Corentin Puffay⁵ Riki Shimizu¹ Haotian Ye³

Jonathan Brennan⁴ Helmut Schmid³ Hinrich Schütze^{2, 3†} Nima Mesgarani^{1†}

¹Columbia University ²Munich Center for Machine Learning

³LMU Munich ⁴University of Michigan ⁵KU Leuven

linyang.he@columbia.edu nie@cis.lmu.de

hinrich@hotmail.com nima@ee.columbia.edu

Abstract

We introduce XCOMPS in this work, a multilingual conceptual minimal pair dataset covering 17 languages¹. Using this dataset, we evaluate LLMs’ multilingual conceptual understanding through metalinguistic prompting, direct probability measurement, and neurolinguistic probing. By comparing base, instruction-tuned, and knowledge-distilled models, we find that: 1) LLMs exhibit weaker conceptual understanding for low-resource languages, and accuracy varies across languages despite being tested on the same concept sets. 2) LLMs excel at distinguishing concept-property pairs that are visibly different but exhibit a marked performance drop when negative pairs share subtle semantic similarities. 3) Instruction tuning improves performance in concept understanding but does not enhance internal competence; knowledge distillation can enhance internal competence in conceptual understanding for low-resource languages with limited gains in explicit task performance. 4) More morphologically complex languages yield lower concept understanding scores and require deeper layers for conceptual reasoning.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across various natural language understanding (NLU) tasks, ranging from text generation to question answering (Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2023). Recent advances, such as GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) and Llama 3 (Touvron et al., 2023a,b; Dubey et al., 2024), have shown that LLMs can produce human-like outputs and handle complex linguistic phenomena. However, the issue of hallucination—where models generate incorrect or nonsensical information—has raised concerns about whether LLMs genuinely




Figure 1: Does conceptual knowledge (e.g., “toaster used for heating food”) remain language-independent for LLMs?

understand semantics or merely rely on shallow statistical correlations (Huang et al., 2023). This distinction is critical, as true semantic understanding would imply a deeper grasp of meaning and reasoning beyond surface-level pattern recognition. Previous studies have shown that LLMs struggle with systematic generalization (Lake and Baroni, 2018) and often fail to make correct inferences even when they appear to possess the necessary factual knowledge (Elazar et al., 2021).

One fundamental aspect of human conceptual understanding is that it is not dependent on specific linguistic forms or modalities (Carey, 2000; Mandler, 2004). When humans learn and reason about concepts, they do not require the knowledge to be tied to a particular medium, such as text, images, or video, nor do they rely on a specific language. For instance, the association between the concept ‘bird’ and the property ‘can fly’ remains robust across different representations and languages. If LLMs possess a genuine, underlying conceptual understanding, then their ability to attribute properties to concepts should also be language-independent. That is, an LLM capable of associating bird with can fly in English should exhibit the same behavior in Mandarin, Arabic, or Hungarian, despite their structural differences. This raises an important question: *Does LLMs’ conceptual-property reasoning remain stable across languages, or is it language-specific?*

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding authors.

¹Download here: <https://github.com/LinyangHe/XCOMPS>

To explore this, Misra et al. (2023) introduced the COMPS dataset, designed to probe LLMs’ semantic reasoning abilities through minimal pairs in English. However, COMPS only evaluates monolingual conceptual-property reasoning, leaving open the question of whether LLMs generalize such reasoning across languages. In this work, we introduce XCOMPS, a multilingual extension of COMPS, to assess whether LLMs’ semantic reasoning is universally consistent across languages. XCOMPS covers 17 languages, including analytic, inflectional, and agglutinative languages, ensuring a broad representation of linguistic structures. By maintaining concept-property alignment with COMPS, XCOMPS enables a controlled, cross-linguistic evaluation of LLMs’ conceptual understanding. Previous studies have emphasized the need for multilingual benchmarks (Conneau et al., 2018a; Conneau and Lample, 2019; Kassner et al., 2021a), and XCOMPS contributes to this effort by systematically testing conceptual reasoning beyond English.

Beyond dataset expansion, evaluating LLMs’ reasoning abilities has increasingly relied on prompt engineering, often referred to as metalinguistic prompting (Hu and Levy, 2023). However, recent work (Hu and Levy, 2023; He et al., 2024b) suggests that metalinguistic prompting primarily assesses performance—that is, how well a model produces correct outputs—rather than its underlying competence in conceptual understanding. This distinction is crucial, as models may perform well on explicit prompts but lack true conceptual representations (Piantadosi and Hill, 2022). To investigate LLMs’ multilingual capabilities and determine whether they genuinely encode conceptual knowledge across languages, we adopt a three-pronged evaluation approach: 1. *Metalinguistic prompting* (Hu and Levy, 2023) to assess performance, testing how well models respond to explicit prompts about conceptual knowledge. 2. *Neurolinguistic probing* (He et al., 2024a) to evaluate competence, examining whether models inherently encode conceptual-property relations. 3. *Direct probability measurement* (Marvin and Linzen, 2018), positioned between performance and competence, to investigate LLMs’ implicit preferences when making property attributions.

We conduct comprehensive experiments on three versions of Llama 3.1: base, instruction tuned, and distilled models, to analyze how different fine-

Name	Size (k)	N	Language
BLiMP (Warstadt et al., 2020)	67	67	English
CLiMP (Xiang et al., 2021)	16	16	Chinese
SLING (Song et al., 2022)	38	38	Chinese
ZhoBLiMP (Liu et al., 2024)	35	118	Chinese
BLiMP-NL (Suijkerbuijk et al., 2024)	8.4	22	Dutch
JBLiMP (Someya and Oseki, 2023)	0.33	39	Japanese
RuBLiMP (Taktasheva et al., 2024)	45	45	Russian
NoCoLa (Jentoft and Samuel, 2023)	99.1	11	Norwegian
DaLAJ (Volodina et al., 2021)	4.8	4	Swedish
LINDSEA (Leong et al., 2023)	0.38	38	Indonesian
	0.2	20	Tamil
CLAMS (Mueller et al., 2020)	331.5	7	5 Languages*
COMPS (Misra et al., 2023)	49.3	4	English
XCOMPS (Ours)	244.3	4	17 Languages**

Table 1: Summary of existing minimal pair datasets. Benchmarks in red represent *grammatical* tasks while benchmarks in blue denote *conceptual* minimal pairs. Size: # of minimal pairs in total, N: # of linguistic paradigms. *: English, French, German, Hebrew, Russian. **: Details in Table 3.

tuning strategies impact conceptual understanding in multilingual contexts. Our results reveal several insights into the multilingual conceptual reasoning capabilities of LLMs:

- 1) Conceptual understanding is not consistently maintained across languages. Even when models perform well in English, their reasoning ability deteriorates significantly in low-resource languages; the extent of deterioration also varies across different low-resource languages.
- 2) Models perform well when conceptual relationships are highly distinct but struggle with subtle semantic distinctions.
- 3) Instruction tuning improves performance but not competence, whereas knowledge distillation enhances competence for low-resource languages but has minimal impact on performance.
- 4) Languages with higher morphological complexity (agglutinative > inflected > analytic) yield lower conceptual-reasoning scores, and deeper hierarchical encoding layers are needed to robustly capture concept-property relationships. These results suggest that LLMs’ semantic reasoning may not generalize universally across linguistic boundaries.

2 Related Work

2.1 Minimal Pairs

One prominent approach for language model assessments has been the use of minimal pairs—carefully designed sentence pairs differing by a minimal linguistic expression. These tests probe specific aspects of linguistic competence by examining the model’s ability to differentiate between correct and incorrect usages. This line of research was pioneered by Linzen and colleagues (Linzen et al., 2016; Marvin and Linzen, 2018) in their Targeted Syntactic Evaluation dataset, which focused

on syntax. Here’s an example:

- a. The manager is young. (*acceptable*)
- b. *The manager are young. (*unacceptable*)

Subsequently, the BLiMP (Benchmark of Linguistic Minimal Pairs) (Warstadt et al., 2020) dataset emerged as a large-scale resource for assessing syntactic knowledge across a variety of linguistic phenomena. Building on this foundation, researchers expanded such evaluations to non-English languages, as summarized in Table 1. These efforts included datasets for French, Russian, German, Swedish, Hebrew, Japanese, and Chinese, extending the applicability of minimal pair testing to diverse linguistic systems.

In parallel, semantic understanding in LLMs has begun to gain attention, with the COMPS dataset by Misra et al. (2023) representing the first effort to assess pre-trained language models’ (PLMs) semantic knowledge using minimal pairs. COMPS introduced a novel methodology for testing the ability to attribute properties to concepts and reason about property inheritance.

2.2 Language Performance vs. Competence

As suggested in (He et al., 2024b), LLMs can be evaluated through three methods: *metalinguistic prompting*, which assesses *performance* based on explicit responses; *direct probability measurement*, which provides an intermediate evaluation by comparing model-generated probabilities; and *neurolinguistic probing*, which directly examines *competence* by analyzing internal activation patterns².

Metalinguistic Prompting for Performance

This method involves explicitly querying the model about linguistic expressions, often in a comparative or multiple-choice format. By asking the model to choose between minimal pairs (e.g., “Which sentence is more grammatically correct?”), researchers can evaluate how well the model retrieves and verbalizes knowledge. Using prompting, researchers have revealed new classes of emergent abilities such as arithmetic, instruction-following, grounded conceptual mappings and sentence acceptability judgments (Brown et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2022; Patel and Pavlick, 2021; Dentella et al., 2023). Because the responses are influenced by prompt engineering and surface-level cues, this method pri-

marily reflects performance rather than deep conceptual competence.

Direct Probability Measurement Instead of relying on explicit responses, this method examines the model’s probability assignment to different sentences within minimal pairs. For example, a model should assign a higher probability to ‘A robin can fly’ than to ‘A penguin can fly’. This approach offers a more objective evaluation than metalinguistic prompting and captures implicit model preferences, placing it between performance and competence. Researchers have designed syntactic, semantic/conceptual, and discourse inference tasks using the probability assignment method, offering different insights into LLMs’ capabilities compared to metalinguistic prompting (Futrell et al., 2019; Gauthier et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020a; Warstadt et al., 2020; Beyer et al., 2021; Misra et al., 2023; Kauf et al., 2023). However, it still relies on external outputs and does not fully reveal how the model internally represents concepts.

Neurolinguistic Probing for Competence This approach goes beyond external outputs by analyzing internal activation patterns across different layers of the model. Using diagnostic classifiers, researchers can probe whether LLMs inherently encode conceptual-property relationships or simply rely on statistical correlations. Since it provides a direct measure of competence, neurolinguistic probing is a more reliable for assessing the depth of linguistic understanding.

2.3 Multilingual Evaluation Benchmark

Multilingual evaluation benchmarks have played a pivotal role in assessing the capabilities of language models across diverse languages. In the realm of multilingual probing, prior work has focused on evaluating linguistic properties and knowledge representation. For instance, Zhang et al. (2024) introduced MELA to assess multilingual linguistic acceptability, while Mueller et al. (2020) explored syntactic minimal pairs to evaluate cross-linguistic syntactic competence. On the knowledge probing front, benchmarks such as MLAMA (Kassner et al., 2021b), BMLAMA (Qi et al., 2023), and BMIKE-53 (Nie et al., 2024) have been developed to investigate the factual knowledge encoded in multilingual models and their cross-lingual consistency.

Beyond probing, multilingual natural language understanding (NLU) benchmarks like XTREME (Hu et al., 2020b) and XGLUE (Liang et al., 2020)

²For simplicity, we refer to these three methods as Meta, Direct, Neuro.

Type	Language	Acceptable Sentence	Unacceptable Sentence
Taxonomic	Spanish	<i>Tostadora</i> se utiliza para calentar alimentos. (A toaster is used for heating food.)	<i>Cafetera</i> se utiliza para calentar alimentos. (A coffee maker is used for heating food.)
Overlap	Vietnamese	<i>Máy nướng bánh mì</i> được sử dụng để hâm nóng thực phẩm. (A toaster is used for heating food.)	<i>Tủ lạnh</i> được sử dụng để hâm nóng thực phẩm. (A refrigerator is used for heating food.)
Co-occurrence	Hungarian	<i>Kenyérpírtó</i> étellek melegítésére használják. (A toaster is used for heating food.)	<i>Vízforraló</i> étellek melegítésére használják. (A kettle is used for heating food.)
Random	Dutch	<i>Broodrooster</i> wordt gebruikt om voedsel te verwarmen. (A toaster is used for heating food.)	<i>Winterkoning</i> wordt gebruikt om voedsel te verwarmen. (A wren is used for heating food.)

Table 2: XCOMPS examples, illustrating each linguistic variant pairs an acceptable sentence (positively matched property) with an unacceptable counterpart (negatively matched property).

have become standard for evaluating cross-lingual transferability. These benchmarks often rely on translating English datasets into other languages, as seen in tasks like XNLI (Conneau et al., 2018b), PAWS-X (Yang et al., 2019), and MLQA (Lewis et al., 2020). On the generation side, multilingual natural language generation (NLG) benchmarks have emerged, covering tasks such as summarization (Scialom et al., 2020; Ladhak et al., 2020). With the rise of multitask instruction finetuning, multilingual instruction datasets like Supernatural Instructions (Wang et al., 2022) and xP3 (Muenighoff et al., 2023) have further expanded the scope of multilingual evaluation.

Despite these advancements, a critical gap remains in evaluating multilingual conceptual understanding, particularly in the format of conceptual minimal pairs. Our work addresses this gap by introducing XCOMPS, a multilingual benchmark specifically designed to evaluate conceptual understanding across languages.

3 XCOMPS

3.1 Concept Selection

To ensure that XCOMPS maintains conceptual alignment with COMPS while extending its scope to multiple languages, we use the same 521 concepts and their negative samples from COMPS. These negative samples can be categorized into three types:

Taxonomy-based Negative Samples These are selected based on hierarchical relationships among concepts. Negative samples come from the same broad category as the positive concept but differ in key property attributions. This ensures that the model must rely on meaningful taxonomic distinctions rather than surface-level cues. (e.g. *a toaster* vs. *a coffee maker*.)

Property Norm-based Negative Samples (Overlap) Negative samples are chosen based on

shared semantic properties with the positive concept while lacking the specific property under evaluation. This method focuses on fine-grained conceptual differentiation, requiring models to distinguish between semantically similar concepts. (e.g. *a toaster* vs. *a refrigerator*.)

Co-occurrence-based Negative Samples These are selected from concepts that frequently appear in similar contexts but do not share the target property. This type prevents models from relying solely on distributional co-occurrence patterns when making conceptual inferences. (e.g. *a toaster* vs. *a kettle*.)

3.2 Properties of Concepts

In XCOMPS, the properties assigned to concepts are inherited from COMPS, ensuring alignment across languages while maintaining the original conceptual-property relationships. These properties in COMPS were originally derived from the XCSLB dataset, an extended version of the CSLB property norm dataset (Devereux et al., 2014), which captures human-annotated perceptual, functional, and categorical attributes of concepts. Additionally, taxonomic relationships from resources like WordNet (Miller, 1995) were used to infer properties through hierarchical inheritance, ensuring that general category attributes (e.g., “mammals have fur”) are systematically applied to their subcategories. Some properties also reflect real-world associations observed in corpus-based co-occurrence statistics.

XCOMPS also has additional random negative concepts from the set of concepts that do not possess the property of the original positive concept. Examples of the sentences pair based on four negative-sample types in XCOMPS can be found in Table 2.

3.3 Multilingual Data Construction

To construct XCOMPS, we employed a human-LLM interactive translation pipeline (Figure 7), combining human expertise with the multilingual

generation capabilities of large language models (LLMs). First, we manually translated concepts and properties from English into German and Chinese, using these as seed languages to reduce ambiguity. For example, the English word “bat” (ambiguous between the flying animal and sports equipment) was clarified using the German “Schläger” and Chinese “球拍”. Next, LLMs expanded the seed data into 15 additional languages, leveraging their multilingual translation capabilities. Human experts then reviewed and corrected the translations for accuracy and cultural appropriateness. Finally, LLMs generated complete positive and negative sentence pairs using the verified concepts and properties, ensuring fluency and grammatical correctness. This pipeline ensured high-quality multilingual data. Further details are provided in Appendix A.

4 Experiment Setup

4.1 Models

We use meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B from Hugging Face as our base model, maintaining the standard Llama-3.1 architecture without specialized instruction-focused training. Next, we incorporate meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, which applies instruction tuning to the base model for more intuitive user-prompt handling. We also evaluate the deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B model, which employs knowledge distillation to transfer knowledge from the teacher model DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) to the student model Llama-3.1-8B. This distilled model is fine-tuned on open-source checkpoints using training samples synthesized by DeepSeek-R1. During inference, we adopt float16 precision to minimize computational resource consumption while maintaining model performance.

4.2 Evaluation³

Meta We present both sentences of a minimal pair within a single prompt. We convert the target property into a question and compare the probabilities assigned to acceptable vs. unacceptable concepts. We apply prompts in each language while preserving cross-linguistic consistency in structure. Figure 8 shows the prompts used in the experiment.

³All evaluation results are labeled as “perf.” to distinguish them from the “language *performance* vs. competence” comparison.

Direct We compute sentence probabilities directly from the model’s logits. A prediction is considered correct if the model assigns a higher probability to the valid sentence within each minimal pair (whether conceptually correct).

Neuro We adopt last-token pooling to represent each sentence, extracting the final token’s hidden state from every layer. This approach ensures coverage of all preceding tokens (Meng et al., 2024). We then apply a logistic regression classifier for probing, using F1 score (averaged over five cross-validation folds) as our primary evaluation metric.

5 Results

5.1 Meta vs. Direct vs. Neuro

Cross-linguistic variability in conceptual reasoning. From Figure 2, we observe that models can perform relatively well on English conceptual tasks but show marked declines for low-resource languages. Notably, some languages with limited training data (e.g., Hungarian, Catalan) exhibit greater deterioration than others, indicating that cross-linguistic generalization of conceptual understanding is far from uniform. Even within the low-resource category, the degree of performance drop varies, underscoring that LLMs’ semantic reasoning is neither universally stable nor equally supported by existing multilingual corpora. These patterns reinforce the idea that conceptual capabilities learned in English do not necessarily transfer seamlessly to languages that differ typologically or have weaker representation in training data.

Models excel at distinct conceptual contrasts but falter with subtler differences. High scores all appear in Random rows, where the negative concept is clearly distinct (e.g., “toaster” vs. “wren”), and the model easily detects mismatches. In Taxonomic, Overlap, or Co-occurrence rows, however, performance drops because the negative concepts share subtle semantic similarities (e.g., “toaster” vs. “coffee maker”). This indicates that the models may rely on conspicuous cues rather than true conceptual reasoning.

Higher morphological complexity, lower conceptual reasoning. Figure 4 shows that languages with greater morphological complexity (moving from Analytic to Inflected to Agglutinative) tend to yield lower concept-reasoning scores. This indicates that, as linguistic structure becomes more




Figure 2: Metalinguistic prompting (meta), direct probability measurement (direct) and minimal pair probing (neuro) results on XCOMPS. The meta method evaluate LLMs’ language performance; neuro method evaluate LLMs’ language competence and direct method fall in between. Languages are grouped according to morphological typology. Neuro-probing is a layer-wise method and here we use the max value across all layers to compare with Meta and Direct. Difference between base and instruct/distill models can be found in Figure 9 in the appendix.




Figure 3: Linear correlation among meta, direct and neuro evaluation results for all four tasks. Linear correlation for each single task could be found in Figure 10, 11 and 12 in the Appendix.

complex, it becomes harder for the models to capture concept-property relationships consistently.

Direct and neuro convergence in instruct/base models but divergence in distilled model. By comparing direct and neuro results in Figure 2, and from Figure 3, we see high correlations for both Instruct and Base across all negative sampling types, indicating that direct measurements closely track the models’ internal representations.




Figure 4: Averaged results across different language types. English results are dropped to make comparison more reliable among low-resource languages.

However, for the Distill model (lighter pink bars), these correlations drop markedly—particularly in the taxonomic and overlap categories—signaling a divergence between direct outputs and underlying competence. This pattern supports the conclusion that direct probability measurement is less reliable for assessing genuine linguistic understanding in distilled models, aligning with prior observations by (He et al., 2024b). Moreover, this also suggests that instruction tuning and knowledge distillation fine-tune LLMs in fundamentally different ways.

Instruction tuning boosts performance but not competence. As shown in the blue box in Figure 2 and the left panel in 9, Meta scores for the Instruct model are notably higher than the Base model. By contrast, Direct and Neuro rows show minimal differences, implying that even if instruction tuning does not enhance underlying competence, it optimize language performance-i.e., how well the model handles explicitly prompted tasks.




Figure 5: Layer-wise minimal pair probing results on XCOMPS. Layer-wise perf. difference between base and instruct/distill models can be found in Figure 13 in the Appendix.

Knowledge distillation enhances low-resource language competence with task trade-offs. As shown in Figure 2 and 9, knowledge distillation improves low-resource language competence (e.g., Hungarian, Catalan) by 12-14% F1 in tasks requiring fine-grained conceptual distinctions (taxonomic/overlap negatives), as it compresses teacher model (DeepSeek-R1) semantic patterns into student models (Llama-3.1-8B) to stabilize cross-linguistic encoding. However, this comes at a cost: for high-resource languages (e.g., English) or simple tasks (random negatives), performance slightly declines due to parameter compression diluting task-specific cues—sacrificing basic knowledge to prioritize generalized linguistic competence for under-resourced scenarios.

5.2 Layer-wise Minimal Pair Probing

Instruction vs. base: near-identical internal representations. As in Figure 5 and 13, Llama-3.1 Instruct (pink curves) and Base (yellow curves) exhibit highly similar layer-wise trends for each language, with both models showing a comparable trajectory of performance as we move from lower to higher layers, indicating that instruction tuning has minimal impact on the model’s internal representations. In other words, while instruction tuning

helps the model handle prompts more effectively, it does not substantially alter how concepts are encoded internally from layer to layer compared to the base model.

Layer-wise evolution of conceptual encoding for base and instruct models. Across most languages, Llama-3.1 Instruct (left column) and Base (middle column) exhibit a characteristic “valley” in the early layers, where performance briefly dips before progressively improving. At these initial layers, the model is still integrating mostly low-level features (e.g., syntactic features, lexical-level semantics) and has not fully captured the semantic or conceptual distinctions. As the representations accumulate more contextual information in the mid layers, performance rises to a peak—often around layers 12-16—where the model appears to best encode the relevant conceptual properties. Beyond that peak layer, we observe a gentle decline, suggesting that the highest layers may shift focus to more task-specific or generation-oriented processing, thereby weakening fine-grained conceptual signals.

Distilled models: a distinct layer-wise trajectory. By contrast, the Distill model shows a markedly different pattern. It lacks the early “valley” seen

in Base and Instruct, instead beginning at a moderate performance level and rising more steadily through the network. Notably, it does not exhibit the same peak-then-decline trend, suggesting that the knowledge-distillation process compresses or redistributes the original model’s semantic signals in a more uniform way. Rather than allocating conceptual cues heavily to mid layers, the distilled model appears to progressively accumulate conceptual knowledge across layers without reverting to the higher-layer reorientation observed in its non-distilled counterparts. This flattened or “smoothed-out” layer trajectory could be due to parameter compression, which merges essential information into fewer extremes of representation, thereby minimizing the dramatic shifts typically seen in base and instruction-tuned models.




Figure 6: Average peak layer indices for three morphological typologies (analytic, inflected, agglutinative) in Llama-3.1 Instruct and Base models. Peak layer for all languages can be found in Figure 14 in the Appendix.

Higher morphological complexity demands deeper encoding. According to the typological frameworks proposed by (Greenberg, 1960; Comrie, 1989), the morphological complexity of languages generally follows a hierarchical trend of analytic < inflected < agglutinative. In Figure 6 the Llama-3.1 architectures demonstrate that processing languages with richer morphological systems requires progressively deeper hierarchical encoding layers for conceptual understanding.

6 Discussion

Knowledge distillation and instruction tuning’s fundamental difference. According to the experimental findings, knowledge distillation and instruction tuning exhibit fundamental differences in enhancing multilingual conceptual understanding in language models (LLMs). Instruction tuning, which fine-tunes models on explicit instruction-response pairs, significantly improves task perfor-

mance (e.g., generating human-preferred outputs in prompted settings (Wei et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022)) but does not strengthen their internal conceptual representations (e.g., encoding deeper semantic relationships (Raffel et al., 2020)). In contrast, knowledge distillation, which compresses teacher model parameters and representations (Hinton, 2015; Sanh, 2019), enhances internal semantic competence for low-resource languages (e.g., stabilizing cross-linguistic concept-property encoding (Conneau, 2019)), though with limited gains in explicit task performance (Jiao et al., 2019). This divergence highlights that instruction tuning prioritizes task alignment (optimizing output consistency with human intent (Ouyang et al., 2022)), whereas knowledge distillation focuses on knowledge internalization (compressing and reinforcing underlying semantic structures (Hinton, 2015; Bengio et al., 2013)), reflecting distinct optimization pathways and objectives.

Language-specificity in multilingual conceptual reasoning. Agglutinative languages with higher morphological complexity require deeper encoding layers for effective conceptual reasoning, suggesting that LLMs rely on language-specific cues rather than a universal abstract schema. Also, performance on the same dataset varies: high-resource languages like English outperform low-resource ones, which often exhibit richer morphological structures. These patterns imply that LLMs depend on surface-level, language-specific patterns rather than a language-independent mechanism for conceptual understanding (Carey, 2000; Piantadosi and Hill, 2022). Although not definitive, our results open an intriguing avenue for future research into universal semantic representations in multilingual LLMs.

7 Conclusion

Our findings suggest that despite their surface-level capabilities, LLMs still lack a robust, universal semantic reasoning mechanism that transcends language boundaries. Furthermore, the discrepancy between instruction tuning and knowledge distillation highlights fundamental differences in how models acquire and represent knowledge.

Limitation

While XCOMPS significantly advances the evaluation of multilingual conceptual understanding, certain limitations remain. First, although the

dataset covers 17 typologically diverse languages, it does not encompass all linguistic families or low-resource languages, which may limit its generalizability to underrepresented languages. Second, the reliance on human-LLM interaction for data construction ensures high quality but introduces potential inconsistencies due to variations in human expertise and model outputs. Lastly, while XCOMPS focuses on conceptual understanding, it does not explicitly address other challenges in multilingual NLP, such as pragmatics or contextual reasoning. Despite these limitations, XCOMPS provides a robust foundation for assessing and improving LLMs' multilingual capabilities, and future work can extend its scope to address these areas.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, and 1 others. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. 2013. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828.
- Anne Beyer, Sharid Loáiciga, and David Schlangen. 2021. Is incoherence surprising? targeted evaluation of coherence prediction from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03495*.
- Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melvin Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, and 1 others. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33.
- Susan Carey. 2000. The origin of concepts. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 1(1):37–41.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, and 1 others. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113.
- Bernard Comrie. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. University of Chicago press.
- A Conneau. 2019. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02116*.
- Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Ruty Rinott, Adina Williams, Samuel R Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018a. Xnli: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05053*.
- Alexis Conneau, Ruty Rinott, Guillaume Lample, Adina Williams, Samuel Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018b. [XNLI: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2475–2485, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, and 181 others. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Vittoria Dentella, Elliot Murphy, Gary Marcus, and Evelina Leivada. 2023. Testing ai performance on less frequent aspects of language reveals insensitivity to underlying meaning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12313*.
- Barry J Devereux, Lorraine K Tyler, Jeroen Geertzen, and Billi Randall. 2014. The centre for speech, language and the brain (cslb) concept property norms. *Behavior research methods*, 46:1119–1127.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Yanai Elazar, Nora Kassner, Shauli Ravfogel, Abilasha Ravichander, Eduard Hovy, Hinrich Schütze, and Yoav Goldberg. 2021. Measuring and improving consistency in pretrained language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1012–1031.
- Richard Futrell, Ethan Wilcox, Takashi Morita, Peng Qian, Miguel Ballesteros, and Roger Levy. 2019. Neural language models as psycholinguistic subjects: Representations of syntactic state. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03260*.
- Jon Gauthier, Jennifer Hu, Ethan Wilcox, Peng Qian, and Roger Levy. 2020. Syntaxgym: An online platform for targeted evaluation of language models. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 70–76.
- Joseph H Greenberg. 1960. A quantitative approach to the morphological typology of language.

- Linyang He, Peili Chen, Ercong Nie, Yuanning Li, and Jonathan R Brennan. 2024a. Decoding probing: Revealing internal linguistic structures in neural language models using minimal pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 4488–4497.
- Linyang He, Ercong Nie, Helmut Schmid, Hinrich Schütze, Nima Mesgarani, and Jonathan Brennan. 2024b. Large language models as neurolinguistic subjects: Identifying internal representations for form and meaning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07533*.
- Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*.
- Jennifer Hu, Jon Gauthier, Peng Qian, Ethan Wilcox, and Roger P Levy. 2020a. A systematic assessment of syntactic generalization in neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03692*.
- Jennifer Hu and Roger Levy. 2023. Prompting is not a substitute for probability measurements in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5040–5060.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020b. Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4411–4421. PMLR.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and 1 others. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.
- Matias Jentoft and David Samuel. 2023. Nocola: The norwegian corpus of linguistic acceptability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07790*.
- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2019. Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10351*.
- Nora Kassner, Philipp Dufter, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021a. Multilingual lama: Investigating knowledge in multilingual pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00894*.
- Nora Kassner, Philipp Dufter, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021b. **Multilingual LAMA: Investigating knowledge in multilingual pretrained language models**. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 3250–3258, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Carina Kauf, Anna A Ivanova, Giulia Rambelli, Emanuele Chersoni, Jingyuan Selena She, Zawad Chowdhury, Evelina Fedorenko, and Alessandro Lenci. 2023. Event knowledge in large language models: the gap between the impossible and the unlikely. *Cognitive Science*, 47(11):e13386.
- Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Claire Cardie, and Kathleen McKeown. 2020. **WikiLingua: A new benchmark dataset for cross-lingual abstractive summarization**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4034–4048, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Brenden Lake and Marco Baroni. 2018. Generalization without systematicity: On the compositional skills of sequence-to-sequence recurrent networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2873–2882. PMLR.
- Wei Qi Leong, Jian Gang Ngui, Yosephine Susanto, Hamsawardhini Rengarajan, Kengatharaiyer Sarveswaran, and William Chandra Tjhi. 2023. Bhasa: A holistic southeast asian linguistic and cultural evaluation suite for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06085*.
- Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oguz, Ruty Rinott, Sebastian Riedel, and Holger Schwenk. 2020. **MLQA: Evaluating cross-lingual extractive question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7315–7330, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yaobo Liang, Nan Duan, Yeyun Gong, Ning Wu, Fenfei Guo, Weizhen Qi, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Daxin Jiang, Guihong Cao, Xiaodong Fan, Ruofei Zhang, Rahul Agrawal, Edward Cui, Sining Wei, Taroon Bharti, Ying Qiao, Jiun-Hung Chen, Winnie Wu, and 5 others. 2020. **XGLUE: A new benchmark dataset for cross-lingual pre-training, understanding and generation**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6008–6018, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tal Linzen, Emmanuel Dupoux, and Yoav Goldberg. 2016. Assessing the ability of lstms to learn syntax-sensitive dependencies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:521–535.
- Yikang Liu, Yeting Shen, Hongao Zhu, Lilong Xu, Zhiheng Qian, Siyuan Song, Kejia Zhang, Jialong Tang, Pei Zhang, Baosong Yang, and 1 others. 2024. Zhoblmp: a systematic assessment of language models with linguistic minimal pairs in chinese. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06096*.
- Jean Matter Mandler. 2004. *The foundations of mind: Origins of conceptual thought*. Oxford University Press.
- Rebecca Marvin and Tal Linzen. 2018. **Targeted syntactic evaluation of language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods*

- in *Natural Language Processing*, pages 1192–1202, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rui Meng, Ye Liu, Shafiq Rayhan Joty, Caiming Xiong, Yingbo Zhou, and Semih Yavuz. 2024. [Sfr-embedding-mistral:enhance text retrieval with transfer learning](#). Salesforce AI Research Blog.
- George A Miller. 1995. Wordnet: a lexical database for english. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39–41.
- Kanishka Misra, Julia Rayz, and Allyson Ettinger. 2023. Comps: Conceptual minimal pair sentences for testing robust property knowledge and its inheritance in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2920–2941.
- Aaron Mueller, Garrett Nicolai, Panayiota Petrou-Zeniou, Natalia Talmina, and Tal Linzen. 2020. [Cross-linguistic syntactic evaluation of word prediction models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5523–5539, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Hailley Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. 2023. [Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15991–16111, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ercong Nie, Bo Shao, Zifeng Ding, Mingyang Wang, Helmut Schmid, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. [Bmike-53: Investigating cross-lingual knowledge editing with in-context learning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17764*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, and 1 others. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Roma Patel and Ellie Pavlick. 2021. Mapping language models to grounded conceptual spaces. In *International conference on learning representations*.
- Steven T Piantadosi and Felix Hill. 2022. Meaning without reference in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.02957*.
- Jirui Qi, Raquel Fernández, and Arianna Bisazza. 2023. [Cross-lingual consistency of factual knowledge in multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10650–10666, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- V Sanh. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Thomas Scialom, Paul-Alexis Dray, Sylvain Lamprier, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Jacopo Staiano. 2020. [MLSUM: The multilingual summarization corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8051–8067, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taiga Someya and Yohei Oseki. 2023. [Jblimp: Japanese benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 1581–1594.
- Yixiao Song, Kalpesh Krishna, Rajesh Bhatt, and Mohit Iyyer. 2022. [Sling: Sino linguistic evaluation of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11689*.
- Michelle Suijkerbuijk, Zoë Prins, Marianne de Heer Kloots, Jelle Zuidema, and Stefan L Frank. 2024. [Blimp-nl: A corpus of dutch minimal pairs and grammaticality judgements for language model evaluation](#).
- Ekaterina Taktasheva, Maxim Bazhukov, Kirill Koncha, Alena Fenogenova, Ekaterina Artemova, and Vladislav Mikhailov. 2024. [Rublimp: Russian benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19232*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, and 1 others. 2023a. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, and 1 others. 2023b. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Elena Volodina, Yousuf Ali Mohammed, and Julia Klezl. 2021. [Dalaj-a dataset for linguistic acceptability judgments for swedish: Format, baseline, sharing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06681*.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva

- Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Gianis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krима Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, and 16 others. 2022. [Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohananey, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R Bowman. 2020. Blimp: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for english. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and 1 others. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Beilei Xiang, Changbing Yang, Yu Li, Alex Warstadt, and Katharina Kann. 2021. Climp: A benchmark for chinese language model evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11131*.
- Yinfei Yang, Yuan Zhang, Chris Tar, and Jason Baldridge. 2019. [PAWS-X: A cross-lingual adversarial dataset for paraphrase identification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3687–3692, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziyin Zhang, Yikang Liu, Weifang Huang, Junyu Mao, Rui Wang, and Hai Hu. 2024. [MELA: Multilingual evaluation of linguistic acceptability](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2658–2674, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Details of Multilingual Data Construction

To construct XCOMPS, a multilingual benchmark covering 17 languages (Table 3), we adopted a human-LLM interactive translation pipeline, leveraging both human expertise and the multilingual generation capabilities of large language models (LLMs). The language set for XCOMPS

aligns with the prior knowledge probing benchmark BMLAMA-17 (Qi et al., 2023), ensuring consistency in multilingual evaluation. The highly structured nature of conceptual minimal pair datasets, where positive and negative sentences primarily consist of two components—concepts and properties—enabled us to design a multi-step translation process that ensures high-quality multilingual data.

The construction process consists of four stages, as displayed in Figure 7. We use the GPT-4o model (GPT-4o-2024-08-06) via the OpenAI API as the translation assistant in the pipeline. In the first stage, we manually translated the original concepts and properties from English into German and Chinese using language experts. We used German and Chinese as additional seed languages to further reduce ambiguity. This multilingual seed data helped disambiguate concepts that might otherwise be unclear in translation. For example, the English word “bat” could refer to either the flying animal or the sports equipment. By including the German term “Schläger” and the Chinese term “球拍”, which both unambiguously refer to the sports equipment, we ensured that the intended concept was accurately captured during translation.

In the second stage, we used LLMs to expand the seed data into the remaining 15 languages. LLMs were tasked with translating the concepts and properties, leveraging their multilingual machine translation capabilities. By providing seed data in three languages (English, German, and Chinese), we enhanced the LLMs’ ability to generate accurate translations, as the additional context reduced the likelihood of semantic errors.

In the third stage, human experts for each target language manually reviewed and corrected the translated concepts and properties. This step ensured that the translations were accurate, culturally appropriate, and semantically aligned with the original dataset. Human intervention was particularly critical for low-resource languages, where LLMs often struggle with semantic precision in translation tasks.

Finally, in the fourth stage, LLMs were employed to generate complete sentences based on the verified concepts and properties. This step involved formulating positive and negative sentence pairs, which can be viewed as a straightforward language manipulation task. By providing the translated concepts and properties as input, we enabled the

lid	language	Typology	Family
ar	Arabic	Inflectional	Semitic
ca	Catalan	Inflectional	Indo-European (Romance)
de	German	Inflectional	Indo-European (Germanic)
el	Greek	Inflectional	Indo-European (Hellenic)
es	Spanish	Inflectional	Indo-European (Romance)
fa	Persian	Inflectional	Indo-European (Iranian)
fr	French	Inflectional	Indo-European (Romance)
he	Hebrew	Inflectional	Semitic
hu	Hungarian	Agglutinative	Uralic
ja	Japanese	Agglutinative	Isolate
ko	Korean	Agglutinative	Isolate
nl	Dutch	Inflectional	Indo-European (Germanic)
ru	Russian	Inflectional	Slavic
tr	Turkish	Agglutinative	Turkic
uk	Ukrainian	Inflectional	Slavic
vi	Vietnamese	Analytic	Austroasiatic
zh	Chinese	Analytic	Sino-Tibetan

Table 3: Detailed information of the languages covered by XCOMPS.

LLMs to focus on generating fluent and grammatically correct sentences, leveraging their strengths in multilingual text generation. This approach ensured that the most challenging aspect of the task—accurate translation of concepts and properties—was already resolved, allowing the LLMs to produce high-quality outputs.

By splitting the process into property translation and sentence generation, using multilingual seed data to reduce ambiguity, and combining human expertise with LLM capabilities, we ensured the quality and consistency of the XCOMPS dataset. This human-LLM interactive translation pipeline demonstrates how LLMs’ multilingual understanding and generation capabilities can be effectively harnessed to construct high-quality multilingual benchmarks.




Figure 7: Pipeline of LLM-Assisted Multi-Stage Benchmark Construction.

en: Which concept is most likely to have the following property: "{property}", "{word1}" or "{word2}"? Answer: "

ar: أي مفهوم من المرجح أن يكون لديه الخاصية التالية: "{property}", "{word1}" أو "{word2}"? الإجابة: "

he: מהי המושג הסביר ביותר שיש לו תכונה מסוימת? "{property}", "{word1}" או "{word2}"? תשובה: "

fa: کدام مفهوم به احتمال زیاد دارای ویژگی زیر است: "{property}", "{word1}" یا "{word2}"? پاسخ: "

de: Welches Konzept hat am wahrscheinlichsten die folgende Eigenschaft: "{property}", "{word1}" oder "{word2}"? Antwort: "

zh: 哪个概念最有可能有如下特征: "{property}", "{word1}" 还是 "{word2}"? 回答: "

fr: Quel concept est le plus susceptible d'avoir la propriété suivante: "{property}", "{word1}" ou "{word2}"? Réponse: "

nl: Welk concept heeft waarschijnlijk de volgende eigenschap: "{property}", "{word1}" of "{word2}"? Antwoord: "

es: ¿Qué concepto es más probable que tenga la siguiente propiedad: "{property}", "{word1}" o "{word2}"? Respuesta: "

ja: 次の概念が次の特性を持つ可能性が最も高いですか: "{property}"、"{word1}" または "{word2}"? 答え: "

ko: 어떤 개념이 다음 속성을 가질 가능성이 가장 높습니까: "{property}", "{word1}" 또는 "{word2}"? 답변: "

vi: Khái niệm nào có khả năng nhất có thuộc tính sau: "{property}", "{word1}" hoặc "{word2}"? Câu trả lời: "

el: Ποια έννοια είναι πιο πιθανό να έχει την ακόλουθη ιδιότητα: "{property}", "{word1}" ή "{word2}"? Απάντηση: "

hu: Melyik fogalomnak van a legnagyobb esélye, hogy rendelkezik a következő tulajdonsággal: "{property}", "{word1}" vagy "{word2}"? Válasz: "

tr: Hangi kavramın şu özelliğe sahip olma olasılığı daha yüksektir: "{property}", "{word1}" veya "{word2}"? Cevap: "

ca: Quin concepte és més probable que tingui la següent propietat: "{property}", "{word1}" o "{word2}"? Resposta: "

uk: Яке поняття найімовірніше має таку властивість: "{property}", "{word1}" чи "{word2}"? Відповідь: "

ru: Какое понятие с наибольшей вероятностью обладает следующим свойством: "{property}", "{word1}" или "{word2}"? Ответ: "

Figure 8: Prompt templates of different languages used for metalinguistic prompting.




Figure 9: Llama-3.1 instruct-base difference and Llama-3.1 distill-base difference.




Figure 10: Linear correlation among meta, direct and neuro for Llama-3.1 Base.




Figure 11: Linear correlation among meta, direct and neuro for Llama-3.1 Instruct.




Figure 12: Linear correlation among meta, direct and neuro for Llama-3.1 Distilled.




Figure 13: Layer-wise probing perf. difference.




Figure 14: Peak layer of each task and language in neurolinguistic probing.