

Uncovering inequalities in new knowledge learning by large language models across different languages

Chenglong Wang^{1,2}, Haoyu Tang^{3,+}, Xiyuan Yang⁴, Yueqi Xie^{5,8,*}, Jina Suh⁶,
Sunayana Sitaram⁷, Junming Huang⁸, Yu Xie^{8,9}, Zhaoya Gong^{1,2,*}, Xing Xie¹⁰,
and Fangzhao Wu^{10,*}

¹School of Urban Planning and Design, Peking University Shenzhen Graduate School, Shenzhen, China

²Key Laboratory of Earth Surface System and Human-Earth Relations of Ministry of Natural Resources of China, Peking University Shenzhen Graduate School, Shenzhen, China

³School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China

⁴School of Computer Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

⁵Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China

⁶Microsoft Research, Redmond, USA

⁷Microsoft Research, Bengaluru, India

⁸Paul and Marcia Center on Contemporary China, Princeton University, Princeton, USA

⁹Center for Social Research, Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing, China

¹⁰Microsoft Research Asia, Beijing, China

⁺Contribution during internship at Microsoft Research Asia

^{*}yxieay@connect.ust.hk, z.gong@pku.edu.cn, fangzhu@microsoft.com

As large language models (LLMs) gradually become integral tools for problem solving in daily life worldwide, understanding linguistic inequality is becoming increasingly important. Existing research has primarily focused on static analyses that assess the disparities in the existing knowledge and capabilities of LLMs across languages. However, LLMs are continuously evolving, acquiring new knowledge to generate up-to-date, domain-specific responses. Investigating linguistic inequalities within this dynamic process is, therefore, also essential. In this paper, we explore inequalities in new knowledge learning by LLMs across different languages and four key dimensions: effectiveness, transferability, prioritization, and robustness. Through extensive experiments under two settings (in-context learning and fine-tuning) using both proprietary and open-source models, we demonstrate that low-resource languages consistently face disadvantages across all four dimensions. By shedding light on these disparities, we aim to raise awareness of linguistic inequities in LLMs' new knowledge learning, fostering the development of more inclusive and equitable future LLMs.

Large language models (LLMs), with their comprehensive knowledge storage, easy accessibility, and ability to handle a wide range of tasks, are increasingly being applied in various domains (e.g., education (1), medicine (2), scientific research (3, 4)) and in daily life, significantly boosting productivity (5). This transformation is both inevitable and global in scale. One notable example is ChatGPT, which, as of December 2024, serves 300 million weekly active users worldwide (6, 7). A large portion of these users interact with LLMs in languages other than English (8). Given such widespread adoption, it is crucial to study fairness in multilingual environments to ensure that users of different languages can benefit equally from these systems (9).

Existing research on multilingual equality in LLMs primarily focuses on static analyses that evaluate disparities in the knowledge and capabilities of LLMs across different languages (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17). Some studies, for example, have examined the amount of factual knowledge encoded in different languages and revealed significant variations. In particular, they reveal that knowledge available in low-resource languages remains limited due to the lack of pre-training data in these languages (18, 19, 20). These studies have significantly advanced our understanding of the extent and nature of multilingual inequalities in LLMs' existing knowledge and capabilities. However, we still lack an understanding of inequalities in the process of acquiring new knowledge, an evolving perspective in research on LLMs.

Learning new knowledge is crucial for LLMs, as illustrated in Figure 1a. On the one hand, general-purpose LLMs are pre-trained on static datasets that were collected prior to training and may not include real-time or recent information. As a result, these models do not possess new knowledge, and their knowledge base can quickly become outdated. To ensure that these models provide current and relevant responses and remain up-to-date, it is essential to continuously integrate new knowledge into these models. On the other hand, although pre-trained LLMs are trained on diverse and extensive datasets, they often lack depth in specialized domains. Learning domain-specific knowledge allows LLMs to deliver more precise, expert-level answers in those areas. Therefore, as depicted in Figure 1b, two primary techniques have been developed and widely adopted to enhance LLMs with new knowledge (21). For example, through in-context learning, LLMs can acquire new information from examples, instructions, or knowledge retrieved from external databases, all without requiring parameter updates (22). Additionally, fine-tuning LLMs on specific datasets or tasks allows them to gain new knowledge tailored to particular needs (23, 24).

A practical example of this is ChatGPT’s fine-tuning API, which enables users to customize the model for specific purposes (25).

In this study, we explore inequalities in new knowledge learning by LLMs across different languages. We conceptualize inequalities in this dynamic process along four key dimensions—effectiveness, transferability, prioritization, and robustness—and propose a comprehensive evaluation framework. Specifically, we investigate the following four research questions under two learning settings (in-context learning and fine-tuning): (1) Can LLMs learn new knowledge equally effectively across different languages in terms of efficiency and accuracy? (2) Can the new knowledge learned by LLMs be transferred equally across languages? (3) When new knowledge items in two languages conflict with each other, can LLMs treat them equally? (4) In the presence of incorrect new knowledge inputs, can LLMs equally resist these errors across different languages?

To answer the research questions outlined above, this study selected 17 languages from different language families and branches, including 10 high-resource languages and 7 low-resource ones. For Research Questions 1–3, since pre-training datasets of many LLMs remain undisclosed, it is unclear what knowledge these models have already acquired. Therefore, we constructed *a multilingual parallel dataset of fictional new knowledge*, which contains question–answer pairs set in a hypothetical future world (e.g., Question: How do individuals track their health in 2048? Answer: Genetic analytics). When tested on this dataset, LLMs generally struggle to provide accurate answers in any language. This dataset allows us to examine inequalities in the new knowledge learning processes of LLMs without being influenced by pre-existing knowledge biases. For Research Question 4, we built *a multilingual parallel common-sense dataset* containing question–answer pairs, each with both a correct answer and an incorrect alternative (e.g., Question: What will water become when it freezes? Correct answer: Ice; Incorrect answer: Steam). LLMs are able to accurately answer most common-sense questions across languages, and this dataset allows us to explore how LLMs resist errors in different linguistic contexts.

Extensive experiments were conducted on both a proprietary model (GPT-4o-mini) and an open-source model (Llama-3.1-8B), revealing inequalities in learning new knowledge by LLMs across languages. As depicted in Figure 1c, our key findings are as follows: (1) Compared to high-resource languages, LLMs face greater challenges in learning new knowledge in low-resource languages in terms of both efficiency and accuracy; (2) new knowledge acquired by LLMs can

be more easily transferred to high-resource languages than to low-resource languages; (3) when new knowledge items in two languages conflict with each other, knowledge in high-resource languages tends to be prioritized; (4) LLMs tend to be more resistant to incorrect knowledge in high-resource languages than in low-resource languages. This study reveals that in the context of new knowledge acquisition, high-resource languages exhibit overall superiority over low-resource languages in terms of effectiveness, transferability, prioritization, and robustness. Coupled with the under-representation of low-resource languages in the existing knowledge of LLMs (18, 19), our findings highlight the persistent and potentially widening inequalities in knowledge of LLMs across different languages. These findings further underscore the necessity of considering multilingual knowledge equality in the development of LLMs in order to foster responsible and inclusive artificial intelligence.

Results

Language Selection

Following existing research approaches to multilingual natural language processing (NLP) (26, 27), we classify languages into different resource levels based on their proportions in the CommonCrawl corpus, which was used to pre-train GPT-3 (28). Specifically, languages that account for less than 0.1% of the data are considered low-resource. To explore inequalities across different languages, we adopt two criteria to select specific languages. First, we aim to include a balanced number of high-resource and low-resource languages. Second, we strive to enhance linguistic diversity by including as many language families as possible. As presented in Table 1, among the selected languages, 10 are high-resource languages (English, Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Korean, Swedish, Danish) and 7 are low-resource languages (Tamil, Mongolian, Welsh, Swahili, Zulu, Turkmen, Scottish Gaelic). It is important to note that low-resource languages in this context refer to their relative scarcity in the pre-training data of LLMs, rather than their real-world status. For example, Tamil, categorized as a low-resource language, has 86.7 million speakers (29), whereas Italian, classified as a high-resource language, has only 66.8 million speakers (29). Exploring inequalities between high- and low-resource languages is, therefore, both meaningful and necessary.

Dataset Construction

To address the four research questions and uncover inequalities in the process of new knowledge learning across different languages, we carefully constructed two multilingual parallel datasets:

Multilingual parallel fictional new knowledge dataset: This dataset contains 100 question–answer pairs¹ about a fictional future world. Since we lack access to the pre-training datasets of many LLMs, it is impossible to determine what knowledge might be considered new to these models. Therefore, we use fictional knowledge as a proxy for new, unseen information. The experimental results show that both GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-8B consistently fail to provide correct answers in any language, suggesting that this knowledge is entirely new to them. Further details about the dataset and the specific experimental results can be found in the Supplementary Materials. Specifically, we used GPT-4o to generate this fictional knowledge:

Please write 100 question–answer pairs about a future world that is very different from the current one. The questions should include year information, and the answers should be very short, ideally one or two words. Please avoid using uncommon entities in either the questions or answers.

Following existing research approaches to multilingual NLP (19, 27), we translated these pairs into the 16 other languages using Google Translate². In our prompt, we specified that the content should be concise and avoid uncommon entities, as certain entities, rooted in specific cultural contexts, might not be accurately translated, thereby affecting the quality of the dataset. To assess the translation quality, we performed back-translation and compared the resulting pairs with the original English-language versions in terms of similarity and consistency. The findings, which are included in the Supplementary Materials, demonstrate that the dataset maintains high quality. Additionally, these pairs served as fine-tuning data or examples for in-context learning. The questions, which tested the model’s knowledge, were paraphrased by GPT-4o to ensure that the model did not simply

¹Assume that H high-resource languages and L low-resource languages are selected, and we evaluate the performance of N models on a dataset of size S (each model is trained for E epochs using this dataset in a fine-tuning setting). The overall count of requests made to the models is given by: $N[SE(H+L) + 2S(H+L)^2 + 2SHL(H+L)]$. To balance the cost and the reliability of experimental results, a set of 100 pairs is considered a reasonable size for this study. In this case, the number of requests made to the models would be approximately 635,800.

²<https://translate.google.com/>

rely on memory to generate answers. Finally, we instructed GPT-4o to construct a conflicting answer for each pair to study knowledge conflict scenarios.

Multilingual parallel common-sense dataset: This dataset contains 50 common-sense question–answer pairs³. Both GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-8B have mastered this knowledge and can accurately answer most of the common-sense questions in various languages. Detailed information about the dataset and experimental results can be found in the Supplementary Materials. We use this dataset to investigate the ability of LLMs to resist errors when learning knowledge across different languages. Specifically, we also used GPT-4o to generate these pairs:

Please write 50 common-sense question–answer pairs. The questions should be simple, and the answers should be very short, ideally one or two words. Avoid using uncommon entities in either the questions or answers.

Following the process of building the multilingual parallel fictional new knowledge dataset, we translated these 50 question–answer pairs into the 16 other languages. After conducting quality checks and paraphrasing them, we instructed GPT-4o to generate an incorrect answer for each pair for use in understanding the robustness of the models to errors in new knowledge.

Equally Effective?

In this section, using the constructed multilingual parallel fictional new knowledge dataset, we seek to assess the effectiveness of LLMs in learning new knowledge across different languages through fine-tuning⁴. Specifically, we assess effectiveness from two key dimensions: (1) Efficiency, measured by the number of fine-tuning epochs required for response accuracy to reach a stable state, and (2) final accuracy, determined by the accuracy of responses after stabilization. To ensure a fair comparison across languages, we keep the knowledge items (100 question–answer pairs) and all hyperparameters (e.g., learning rate) the same.

³Considering the context length supported by LLMs and the practical scenario where irrelevant information is often pre-filtered by databases and search engines, a set of 50 pairs is a reasonable size for this study.

⁴In the in-context learning setting, new knowledge is explicitly added to the input prompt, meaning that LLMs do not need to master new knowledge step-by-step. Therefore, for the research question “Can LLMs learn new knowledge equally effectively across different languages in terms of efficiency and accuracy?”, we primarily assess the effectiveness of LLMs in learning new knowledge across languages through fine-tuning.

Figure 2 illustrates how the response accuracy of our test models (GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-8B) changes as the number of fine-tuning epochs increases. We make the following observations from the results: First, based on the convergence speeds of the curves, we observe that both test models learn new knowledge more efficiently in high-resource languages. For example, GPT-4o-mini achieves approximately 80% accuracy in answering fictional new knowledge questions after just three epochs of fine-tuning in high-resource languages, whereas it requires eight epochs to reach the same level in low-resource languages. Second, the final accuracy of LLMs in learning new knowledge is higher in high-resource languages. Taking GPT-4o-mini as an example, its response accuracy exceeds 90% in high-resource languages, while it plateaus at around 80% in low-resource languages, revealing a noticeable performance gap.

These observations underscore disparities in the ability of LLMs to learn new knowledge across different languages. Even with increased fine-tuning, the accuracy of responses regarding new knowledge in low-resource languages remains inferior to that in high-resource languages. Therefore, developers need to allocate additional resources to enhance the accessibility and accuracy of new knowledge for users of low-resource languages.

Equally Transferable?

In this section, we investigate whether the learned knowledge can be transferred equally across languages. For example, as shown in Figure 1c, we assume that an LLM has acquired specific knowledge in one language (e.g., English question: How do individuals track their health in 2048? English answer: Genetic analytics) through either fine-tuning or in-context learning. We then ask the model about this knowledge in another high-resource language (e.g., Chinese) or a low-resource language (e.g., Tamil). We aim to determine whether the response accuracy remains consistent across languages or if there are significant disparities. During fine-tuning, as shown in Figure 2, the response accuracy stabilizes after 12 epochs. Therefore, we choose the versions that are fine-tuned for 12 epochs in different languages for analysis.

Figure 3 in the main text and Figure S1 in the Supplementary Materials present the results of our experiments under two settings: in-context learning and fine-tuning. We have made the following findings: First, knowledge acquired in one language cannot always be fully transferred to others.

For example, when GPT-4o-mini is fine-tuned on fictional new knowledge in English, it achieves a response accuracy of 97% when queried in the same language. However, its accuracy drops significantly when asked the same questions in other languages. Notably, when tested in Zulu, the response accuracy falls to just 19%, highlighting the challenges of cross-lingual knowledge transfer. Second, new knowledge is more easily transferable between certain languages, particularly those that share linguistic similarities. For instance, Spanish, French, Italian, and Portuguese all belong to the Italic branch of the Indo-European language family, with commonalities in vocabulary, grammar, and phonetics. As a result, knowledge can be transferred more seamlessly among them. Third, disparities in response accuracy arise when querying knowledge learned in one language using both high-resource and low-resource languages. As illustrated in Figure 3(c, d), new knowledge acquired by LLMs is more readily transferred to high-resource languages than to low-resource ones. This presents a significant disadvantage for users relying on low-resource languages when new knowledge is introduced in other languages. Finally, the response accuracy in the in-context learning setting is higher than that in the fine-tuning setting, which aligns with existing research findings (30, 31). For example, one study evaluated the performance of LLMs using fine-tuning and in-context learning in few-shot computational social science tasks and found that models using in-context learning generally outperformed those that were fine-tuned (30). A possible explanation is that, in in-context learning, LLMs can leverage their pre-trained knowledge and general reasoning abilities to quickly comprehend and adapt to specific tasks. In contrast, fine-tuning may sometimes diminish their reasoning capabilities (31, 32).

Equally Prioritized?

In this section, we explore how LLMs respond when new knowledge items from two different languages conflict with each other. For example, as illustrated in Figure 1c, suppose the learning materials contain conflicting knowledge items from both a high-resource language (English) and a low-resource language (Tamil). In English, the answer to the question “How do individuals track their health in 2048?” is “genetic analytics,” whereas in Tamil the answer is “wearable health monitors.” When the model is asked about this knowledge in another language, such as Chinese or Mongolian, we are curious as to whether the model’s response will align with the knowledge from

the high-resource language (e.g., English) or the low-resource language (e.g., Tamil).

Specifically, we conducted experiments using GPT-4-mini and Llama-3.1-8B in both fine-tuning and in-context learning settings. We designed 70 scenarios involving knowledge conflicts, using the 10 high-resource languages and 7 low-resource languages. Figure 4b illustrates one such conflict for GPT-4o-mini in the fine-tuning setting, particularly between English and Turkmen. We observe that when querying in non-English languages, the output of the model predominantly aligns with the knowledge in English. For example, when queried in Danish, 90% of the responses are consistent with the English-language knowledge item. Additionally, we calculated the average consistency of responses with knowledge in high-resource languages across all conflict scenarios. For example, this value is 70.2% in the conflict mentioned above. Violin and scatter plots for all 70 scenarios in both settings are shown in Figure 4(a, d). The visualizations reveal that the consistency with knowledge in high-resource languages is significantly higher than 50%. This suggests that when new knowledge from high-resource languages conflicts with that from low-resource languages, knowledge from high-resource languages tends to be prioritized, despite no inherent difference in quality between the two.

The implications of these results for social fairness are self-evident. When knowledge from high-resource languages is preferentially adopted, it perpetuates linguistic hegemony (8). Knowledge in high-resource languages is often seen as “standard” or “authoritative,” while knowledge in low-resource languages is marginalized. This not only reinforces the dominance of high-resource languages in the global knowledge system but also undermines the representation of low-resource languages. Such marginalization can erode cultural identity and devalue the knowledge of low-resource language communities.

Equally Robust?

The learning materials used by LLMs, whether stored in databases or retrieved from the internet, may contain errors. In this section, we examine how LLMs respond when exposed to incorrect information and how these responses vary across different languages. For example, as illustrated in Figure 1c, suppose that external learning materials contain misinformation (e.g., Question: What will water become when it freezes? Answer: Steam). We then ask the LLMs a similar question—If

you put water in the freezer, what will it turn into?—prompting them to generate responses based on both their pre-existing knowledge and the introduced information across different languages. We are interested in whether the models will correctly answer “ice” or if they will instead produce the incorrect response “steam” due to the influence of learning materials.

We conducted experiments using the GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-8B models in two settings: in-context learning and fine-tuning. As illustrated in Figure 5(a, c), the accuracy of answering common-sense questions decreases as the number of fine-tuning epochs increases, but the rate of decline varies across languages. For example, after fine-tuning GPT-4o-mini for just one epoch, the accuracy in English (a high-resource language) remains around 40%, while in Turkmen (a low-resource language) it drops to approximately 5%. Similarly, Figure 5(b, d) illustrates the disparities in error resistance across languages under the in-context learning setting. Regardless of whether the input prompt contains incorrect information, LLMs tend to provide accurate answers in high-resource languages. However, the inclusion of misinformation in the input prompt leads to a sharp decline in accuracy when answering common-sense questions in low-resource languages. For example, in Zulu, the accuracy of GPT-4o-mini drops from about 80% to 40% when incorrect information is added to the prompt.

This phenomenon reveals an underlying inequality, in which users of low-resource languages suffer disadvantages in accessing knowledge through LLMs. They are more likely to receive lower quality or misleading outputs compared to users of high-resource languages. As a result, users of low-resource languages may lose confidence in AI systems, which in turn undermines the overall reliability of LLMs in these languages.

Discussion

This study focused on evaluating disparities across languages during the dynamic process of new knowledge acquisition by LLMs. While most existing research has concentrated on static analyses—assessing multilingual disparities based on the existing knowledge and capabilities of LLMs—we argue that it is crucial to understand how LLMs continuously acquire new knowledge across different languages in order to better serve users from diverse linguistic backgrounds. To address this, we present a comprehensive framework for examining the dynamic learning

capabilities of LLMs across four key dimensions—effectiveness, transferability, prioritization, and robustness—and in two different settings—in-context learning and fine-tuning. We find that LLMs face great challenges when learning new knowledge in low-resource languages, as they struggle both in terms of efficiency and accuracy compared to learning in high-resource languages. Additionally, new knowledge is more easily transferred to high-resource languages, and new knowledge in high-resource languages is often prioritized. Finally, LLMs are better protected from misinformation in high-resource languages.

The results draw our attention to several inequality issues. For developers, enhancing the performance of LLMs in low-resource languages is essential, which includes allocating additional resources to enhancing both the accessibility and accuracy of new knowledge for users of these languages. For researchers, it is crucial to conduct broader multilingual studies, moving beyond static analyses to evaluate the multilingual capabilities of LLMs across multiple dimensions. Additionally, a deeper investigation into the underlying mechanisms of these disparities across languages, as well as methods to mitigate them, is necessary. Cross-disciplinary research, particularly in collaboration with linguists and sociologists, is also needed to explore the broader societal impacts of LLM inequalities, such as the perpetuation of linguistic hegemony. Finally, for users, it is important to inform those using low-resource languages about the limitations of LLMs, enabling them to make more informed decisions when relying on such systems.

While this study provides key insights, it has several limitations. First, we conducted our experiments using a limited set of models and datasets in a limited number of languages. Although the consistency of our findings across both open-source and proprietary models suggests the generalizability of our conclusions, future studies could extend this analysis to a broader range of models and across a larger group of languages. Additionally, as we do not have access to the pre-training datasets of these LLMs—and therefore cannot identify which knowledge is entirely new—we relied on fictional new knowledge. Collaboration with model developers in the future could help identify real-world examples of new knowledge for testing. Second, our study does not deeply explore the mechanisms behind these multilingual disparities. Recent research suggests the existence of language-specific and language-agnostic neurons in LLMs (33). The inequalities revealed in this study may stem from the under-training of neurons corresponding to low-resource languages. Future interdisciplinary collaborations among linguists, neuroscientists, and AI researchers could provide

deeper insights into these mechanisms. Third, we have not yet proposed effective solutions to eliminate these inequalities. These disparities may originate from the biased distribution of data across different languages within pre-training datasets (8). Existing approaches, such as multilingual instruction tuning (34, 35, 36) or continual pre-training (37, 38, 39) with external high-quality multilingual datasets, can provide certain improvements but face limitations in scalability and effectiveness. Future research should explore more efficient strategies to enhance multilingual capabilities and address these disparities.

Ethical and Societal Impact

The objective of this study is to uncover inequalities inherent in the dynamic process of learning new knowledge by LLMs across different languages. Through extensive experiments, we highlight potential harms faced by users of low-resource languages, who may struggle to obtain accurate new knowledge from LLMs and are more likely to encounter lower quality or misleading outputs. Furthermore, low-resource languages may be further marginalized in an increasingly AI-driven world. Additionally, this work aims to inspire more comprehensive research into the multilingual capabilities of LLMs and inequalities that arise among different languages in the future. It encourages the exploration of the mechanisms underlying their multilingual abilities and the development of strategies to enhance these capabilities and mitigate existing inequalities. Ultimately, the goal is to contribute to the creation of a next-generation AI that is fair, inclusive, and responsible.




Figure 1: **a.** LLMs struggle to provide current, relevant responses and to deliver precise, expert-level answers in specific domains. **b.** There are two techniques to enhance LLMs with new knowledge: in-context learning and fine-tuning. **c.** Four key inequalities emerge in new knowledge learning by LLMs across different languages.




Figure 2: **a.** The performance of GPT-4o-mini in learning new knowledge. **b.** The performance of Llama-3.1-8B in learning new knowledge. Compared to high-resource languages, LLMs face greater challenges in learning new knowledge in low-resource languages in terms of both efficiency and accuracy.




Figure 3: (a, c) The performance of GPT-4o-mini in transferring new knowledge under the fine-tuning setting and the underlying inequality. (b, d) The performance of GPT-4o-mini in transferring new knowledge under the in-context learning setting and the underlying inequality. New knowledge acquired by LLMs can be more easily transferred to high-resource languages than to low-resource languages.






Figure 4: (a, d) Inequality in knowledge conflict scenarios. (b, c, e, f) Specific knowledge conflict scenarios for GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-8B in both the fine-tuning and in-context learning settings. New knowledge in high-resource languages is often prioritized over that in low-resource languages.


a. Inequality in resisting errors (GPT-4o-mini, Fine-tuning).



b. Inequality in resisting errors (GPT-4o-mini, In-context learning).



c. Inequality in resisting errors (Llama-3.1-8B, Fine-tuning).



d. Inequality in resisting errors (Llama-3.1-8B, In-context learning).




Figure 5: (a, c) The inequality in resisting errors in the fine-tuning setting. (b, d) The inequality in resisting errors in the in-context learning setting. LLMs tend to be more resistant to incorrect knowledge in high-resource languages than in low-resource languages.

Table 1: The 17 languages selected for our study.

Language	Family	Branch	Proportion (28) (%)	Resource
English	Indo-European	Germanic	43.4241	High
Japanese	Japonic	Japanesic	5.0419	High
Chinese	Sino-Tibetan	Sinitic	4.8129	High
Spanish	Indo-European	Italic	4.5387	High
French	Indo-European	Italic	4.3960	High
Italian	Indo-European	Italic	2.5282	High
Portuguese	Indo-European	Italic	2.3146	High
Korean	Koreanic	Korean	0.7388	High
Swedish	Indo-European	Germanic	0.6649	High
Danish	Indo-European	Germanic	0.4640	High
Tamil	Dravidian	South Dravidian	0.0473	Low
Mongolian	Mongolic-Khitan	Mongolic	0.0161	Low
Welsh	Indo-European	Celtic	0.0117	Low
Swahili	Atlantic-Congo	Benue-Congo	0.0096	Low
Zulu	Atlantic-Congo	Benue-Congo	0.0025	Low
Turkmen	Turkic	Common Turkic	0.0021	Low
Scottish Gaelic	Indo-European	Celtic	0.0014	Low

References and Notes

1. S. Milano, J. A. McGrane, S. Leonelli, Large language models challenge the future of higher education. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **5** (4), 333–334 (2023).
2. A. J. Thirunavukarasu, *et al.*, Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine* **29** (8), 1930–1940 (2023).
3. L. Messeri, M. Crockett, Artificial intelligence and illusions of understanding in scientific research. *Nature* **627** (8002), 49–58 (2024).
4. A. Birhane, A. Kasirzadeh, D. Leslie, S. Wachter, Science in the age of large language models. *Nature Reviews Physics* **5** (5), 277–280 (2023).
5. S. Noy, W. Zhang, Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science* **381** (6654), 187–192 (2023).
6. OpenAI, Supported countries and territories (2024), <https://platform.openai.com/docs/supported-countries>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
7. E. Roth, ChatGPT now has over 300 million weekly users (2024), <https://www.theverge.com/2024/12/4/24313097/chatgpt-300-million-weekly-users>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
8. Y. Xie, S. Avila, The Social Impact of Generative LLM-Based AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21281* (2024).
9. L. Qin, *et al.*, Multilingual large language model: A survey of resources, taxonomy and frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04925* (2024).
10. J. H. Clark, *et al.*, TyDi QA: A Benchmark for Information-Seeking Question Answering in Typologically Diverse Languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **8**, 454–470 (2020).
11. P. Lewis, B. Oguz, R. Rinott, S. Riedel, H. Schwenk, MLQA: Evaluating Cross-lingual Extractive Question Answering, in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2020), pp. 7315–7330.

12. W. Zhang, M. Aljunied, C. Gao, Y. K. Chia, L. Bing, M3exam: A multilingual, multimodal, multilevel benchmark for examining large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36**, 5484–5505 (2023).
13. B. Wang, *et al.*, SeaEval for Multilingual Foundation Models: From Cross-Lingual Alignment to Cultural Reasoning, in *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (2024), pp. 370–390.
14. Y. Zhang, *et al.*, P-MMEval: A Parallel Multilingual Multitask Benchmark for Consistent Evaluation of LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09116* (2024).
15. X. Huang, *et al.*, BenchMAX: A Comprehensive Multilingual Evaluation Suite for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07346* (2025).
16. P. Qiu, *et al.*, Towards building multilingual language model for medicine. *Nature Communications* **15** (1), 8384 (2024).
17. J. Niklaus, *et al.*, LEXTREME: A Multi-Lingual and Multi-Task Benchmark for the Legal Domain, in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023* (2023), pp. 3016–3054.
18. Z. Jiang, A. Anastasopoulos, J. Araki, H. Ding, G. Neubig, X-FACTR: Multilingual factual knowledge retrieval from pretrained language models, in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)* (2020), pp. 5943–5959.
19. N. Kassner, P. Dufter, H. Schütze, 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* (2021), pp. 3250–3258.
20. J. Myung, *et al.*, Blend: A benchmark for llms on everyday knowledge in diverse cultures and languages. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **37**, 78104–78146 (2025).

21. M. Mosbach, T. Pimentel, S. Ravfogel, D. Klakow, Y. Elazar, Few-shot Fine-tuning vs. In-context Learning: A Fair Comparison and Evaluation, in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023* (2023), pp. 12284–12314.
22. Q. Dong, *et al.*, A Survey on In-context Learning, in *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2024), pp. 1107–1128.
23. N. Ding, *et al.*, Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large-scale pre-trained language models. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **5** (3), 220–235 (2023).
24. Z. Han, C. Gao, J. Liu, J. Zhang, S. Q. Zhang, Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14608* (2024).
25. OpenAI, OpenAI Fine-tuning API (2024), <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/fine-tuning>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
26. Y. Bang, *et al.*, A Multitask, Multilingual, Multimodal Evaluation of ChatGPT on Reasoning, Hallucination, and Interactivity, in *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (2023), pp. 675–718.
27. V. D. Lai, *et al.*, ChatGPT Beyond English: Towards a Comprehensive Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Learning, in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023* (2023), pp. 13171–13189.
28. C. Crawl, Statistics of Common Crawl Monthly Archives (2024), <https://commoncrawl.github.io/cc-crawl-statistics/plots/languages>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
29. Ethnologue, What are the top 200 most spoken languages? (2024), <https://www.ethnologue.com/insights/ethnologue200/>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
30. T. Wang, X. Xu, Y. Wang, Y. Jiang, Instruction tuning vs. in-context learning: revisiting large language models in few-shot computational social science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14673* (2024).

31. H. Soudani, E. Kanoulas, F. Hasibi, Fine tuning vs. retrieval augmented generation for less popular knowledge, in *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region (2024)*, pp. 12–22.
32. E. Lobo, C. Agarwal, H. Lakkaraju, On the impact of fine-tuning on chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15382* (2024).
33. T. Tang, *et al.*, Language-specific neurons: The key to multilingual capabilities in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16438* (2024).
34. S. Zhang, *et al.*, Bayling: Bridging cross-lingual alignment and instruction following through interactive translation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10968* (2023).
35. W. Zhu, *et al.*, Extrapolating large language models to non-english by aligning languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04948* (2023).
36. A. Üstün, *et al.*, Aya model: An instruction finetuned open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07827* (2024).
37. Y. Cui, Z. Yang, X. Yao, Efficient and effective text encoding for chinese llama and alpaca. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08177* (2023).
38. H.-A. Kuulmets, T. Purason, A. Luhtaru, M. Fishel, Teaching Llama a New Language Through Cross-Lingual Knowledge Transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04042* (2024).
39. J. Jaavid, *et al.*, Romansetu: Efficiently unlocking multilingual capabilities of large language models via romanization, in *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (2024), pp. 15593–15615.
40. Meta, Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date (2024), <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, accessed: 2024-12-20.
41. J. Qi, R. Fernández, A. Bisazza, Cross-Lingual Consistency of Factual Knowledge in Multilingual Language Models, in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2023), pp. 10650–10666.

42. L. Chua, *et al.*, Crosslingual capabilities and knowledge barriers in multilingual large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16135* (2024).
43. W. Zhao, *et al.*, Lens: Rethinking Multilingual Enhancement for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04407* (2024).
44. L. Qin, Q. Chen, F. Wei, S. Huang, W. Che, Cross-lingual prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning across languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14799* (2023).
45. H. Huang, *et al.*, Not all languages are created equal in llms: Improving multilingual capability by cross-lingual-thought prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07004* (2023).
46. Y. Zhang, Q. Chen, M. Li, W. Che, L. Qin, AutoCAP: Towards Automatic Cross-lingual Alignment Planning for Zero-shot Chain-of-Thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13940* (2024).
47. Y. Zhao, W. Zhang, G. Chen, K. Kawaguchi, L. Bing, How do Large Language Models Handle Multilingualism? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18815* (2024).
48. T. Kojima, I. Okimura, Y. Iwasawa, H. Yanaka, Y. Matsuo, On the Multilingual Ability of Decoder-based Pre-trained Language Models: Finding and Controlling Language-Specific Neurons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02431* (2024).
49. A. D. Friederici, The brain basis of language processing: from structure to function. *Physiological reviews* **91** (4), 1357–1392 (2011).
50. T. Parr, G. Pezzulo, K. J. Friston, *Active inference: the free energy principle in mind, brain, and behavior* (MIT Press) (2022).
51. A. R. Khanna, *et al.*, Single-neuronal elements of speech production in humans. *Nature* **626** (7999), 603–610 (2024).
52. E. J. Hu, *et al.*, Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685* (2021).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere thanks to the editor and all potential anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions that may enhance the quality of this paper.

Author contributions: C.W. conceived the idea of this work, conducted the experiments, analyzed the results, and contributed to the writing of this manuscript. H.T. analyzed the results. X.Y. analyzed the results. Y.X. contributed to the writing of this manuscript. J.S. contributed to the writing of this manuscript. S.S. contributed to the writing of this manuscript. J.H. contributed to the writing of this manuscript. Y.X. contributed to the writing of this manuscript. Z.G. contributed to the writing of this manuscript, and coordinated the research project. X.X. contributed to the writing of this manuscript, and coordinated the research project. F.W. conceived the idea of this work, analyzed the results, contributed to the writing of this manuscript, and coordinated the research project.

Competing interests: There are no competing interests to declare.

Data and materials availability: The datasets and codes applied in the experiments are publicly available at <https://github.com/microsoft/LNewKnow>.

Supplementary materials

Related Work

Implementation Details

Additional Results for Llama-3.1-8B

Quality Assessment of the Multilingual Parallel Datasets

Figure S1

Tables S1 to S4

Multilingual Parallel Fictional New Knowledge Dataset

Multilingual Parallel Common-sense Dataset

Supplementary Materials for

Uncovering inequalities in new knowledge learning by large language models across different languages

Chenglong Wang, Haoyu Tang⁺, Xiyuan Yang, Yueqi Xie*, Jina Suh, Sunayana Sitaram,
Junming Huang, Yu Xie, Zhaoya Gong*, Xing Xie, Fangzhao Wu*

⁺Contribution during internship at Microsoft Research Asia

*yxieay@connect.ust.hk, z.gong@pku.edu.cn, fangzhu@microsoft.com.

This PDF file includes:

Related Work

Implementation Details

Additional Results for Llama-3.1-8B

Quality Assessment of the Multilingual Parallel Datasets

Figure S1

Tables S1 to S4

Multilingual Parallel Fictional New Knowledge Dataset

Multilingual Parallel Common-sense Dataset

Related Work

Multilingual capability of LLMs: Most state-of-the-art LLMs, such as the Llama-3 series (40), are trained on multilingual datasets and can understand and generate text in multiple languages. However, the uneven distribution of data in different languages within the pre-training corpora leads to varying performance across languages. Existing research has primarily focused on building multilingual benchmarks—ranging from general NLP tasks (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) to domain-specific applications (16, 17)—to assess the performance of LLMs across different languages. Researchers have not only collected language-specific questions to examine the amount of factual knowledge encoded in various languages but have also constructed multilingual parallel datasets to study cross-lingual consistency—i.e., the degree to which an LLM provides consistent answers to the same question posed in various languages. Findings indicate that knowledge available in low-resource languages is limited due to the lack of pre-training data in these languages (18, 19, 20). Additionally, cross-lingual consistency is relatively low across a range of LLMs, and while larger models demonstrate improved factual accuracy, this does not necessarily enhance cross-lingual knowledge consistency (41, 42).

Multilingual enhancement for LLMs: Existing methods to enhance the multilingual capabilities of LLMs or reduce language disparities can be broadly categorized into two main approaches: in-context learning-based methods and post-training-based methods (43). The former utilizes the inherent language translation capabilities of LLMs to improve performance. These approaches typically translate questions in low-resource languages into high-resource languages before generating responses, thereby enhancing accuracy (44, 45, 46). For instance, one technique known as *cross-lingual thought prompting* has been proposed. This method guides LLMs to produce logical responses by following a structured process that includes problem understanding, cross-lingual reasoning, task analysis, task execution, and output formatting (45). The latter, on the other hand, focuses on modifying the model itself and can be further divided into continual pre-training (37, 38, 39) and instruction tuning (34, 35, 36). For example, researchers have extended Llama’s vocabulary and conducted secondary pre-training using Chinese-language datasets. This process was followed by fine-tuning with Chinese-language instruction datasets, significantly improving the model’s performance in the Chinese language (37). Another notable approach involves creating interactive

translation pairs and employing instruction tuning to transfer language generation and instruction-following capabilities from English to other languages (34).

Underlying mechanisms by which LLMs process multilingual texts: Few studies have attempted to delve into the internal workings of LLMs in multilingual settings (33, 47, 48). These studies often draw inspiration from neurobiology, which suggests that while certain brain regions involved in processing different languages may overlap, notable differences also exist (49, 50, 51). For instance, some researchers propose that regions within LLMs can be categorized as either language-agnostic or language-specific. Language-agnostic regions are responsible for handling pragmatic principles and universal knowledge, whereas language-specific regions focus on processing language-specific vocabulary, grammar, and idiomatic expressions. To identify these regions, a method called *language activation probability entropy* has been introduced. Experimental findings suggest that neurons related to specific languages are primarily located in the top and bottom layers of LLMs. These neurons significantly influence the model’s proficiency in processing particular languages (33).

While these studies primarily focus on exploring multilingual disparities based on the existing knowledge and capabilities of LLMs, our research shifts the focus to another critical dynamic process: learning new knowledge. Investigating inequalities in this dynamic learning process is essential for achieving a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of multilingual disparities in AI systems. These insights can further contribute to the development of next-generation AI systems that are more responsible and inclusive.

Implementation Details

For the fine-tuning of GPT-4o-mini, we employed the official fine-tuning API with a batch size of 1 and a learning rate multiplier of 1.8 (25). For the fine-tuning of Llama-3.1-8B, we utilized Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), a parameter-efficient fine-tuning technique, with a learning rate of 0.001 (52). The LoRA rank was fixed at 32, and the scaling factor was also set to 32. To evaluate the model responses, we used GPT-4o-mini. The specific prompt is provided below, and after a thorough manual check, we confirmed that GPT-4o-mini is capable of making the correct judgments.

Prompt used to evaluate the model responses.

Given a question, a model-generated answer, and a reference answer, compare the model-generated answer with the reference answer and determine whether the generated answer is correct.

Question: `question`

Generated Answer: `model-generated answer`

Reference Answer: `reference answer`

Output the result in the following format:

Correct: Yes/No

Ensure that the judgment is based on semantic alignment with the reference answer.

Additional Results for Llama-3.1-8B

As shown in Figure S1, knowledge learned in one language is not always fully transferable to others, and newly acquired knowledge can be transferred more easily to high-resource languages than to low-resource ones. These findings are consistent with our experiments on the proprietary model GPT-4o-mini, highlighting the pervasive nature of these inequalities in multilingual knowledge learning and transfer.

Quality Assessment of the Multilingual Parallel Datasets

We generated question–answer pairs in English and translated them into the 16 other languages using Google Translate. To assess the quality of our two multilingual parallel datasets, we conducted semantic similarity and consistency checks. This involved back-translating the question–answer pairs from the target languages into English and comparing them with the original English pairs. For semantic similarity measurement, we employed the all-MiniLM-L6-v2 model⁵ to calculate the cosine similarity between the question–answer pairs. To assess consistency, we leveraged GPT-4o-mini to evaluate whether the topics discussed and the answers provided were consistent. As illustrated in Tables S1 and S2, both datasets exhibit high quality.

⁵<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>

Also, as shown in Tables S3 and S4, our test models struggled to accurately answer questions in any language when evaluated on the fictional new knowledge dataset. In contrast, the models successfully answered the majority of questions across all languages on the common-sense dataset. These findings highlight the effectiveness of the two datasets we constructed.




Figure S1: (a, c) The performance of Llama-3.1-8B in transferring new knowledge under the fine-tuning setting and the underlying inequality. (b, d) The performance of Llama-3.1-8B in transferring new knowledge under the in-context learning setting and the underlying inequality. New knowledge acquired by LLMs can be more easily transferred to high-resource languages than to low-resource languages.

Table S1: The quality of the multilingual parallel fictional new knowledge dataset.

Language	Quality		Language	Quality	
	Similarity	Consistency		Similarity	Consistency
Japanese	97.3%	100%	Danish	98.3%	100%
Chinese	96.1%	100%	Tamil	95.1%	100%
Spanish	98.4%	100%	Mongolian	92.8%	100%
French	98.0%	100%	Welsh	98.6%	100%
Italian	97.6%	100%	Swahili	94.3%	100%
Portuguese	98.1%	100%	Zulu	90.6%	100%
Korean	97.8%	100%	Turkmen	91.7%	100%
Swedish	98.0%	100%	Scottish Gaelic	92.6%	100%

Table S2: The quality of the multilingual parallel common-sense dataset.

Language	Quality		Language	Quality	
	Similarity	Consistency		Similarity	Consistency
Japanese	95.8%	100%	Danish	98.0%	100%
Chinese	97.3%	100%	Tamil	96.9%	100%
Spanish	95.8%	100%	Mongolian	95.2%	100%
French	97.0%	100%	Welsh	96.9%	100%
Italian	95.2%	100%	Swahili	94.1%	100%
Portuguese	96.4%	100%	Zulu	91.6%	100%
Korean	97.1%	100%	Turkmen	93.8%	100%
Swedish	97.9%	100%	Scottish Gaelic	93.9%	100%

Table S3: The performance of the LLMs on the fictional new knowledge dataset across different languages.

Language	Accuracy		Language	Accuracy	
	GPT-4o-mini	Llama-3.1-8B		GPT-4o-mini	Llama-3.1-8B
English	0.00%	0.00%	Danish	1.00%	0.00%
Japanese	1.00%	0.00%	Tamil	1.00%	0.00%
Chinese	1.00%	0.00%	Mongolian	0.00%	0.00%
Spanish	0.00%	0.00%	Welsh	1.00%	1.00%
French	0.00%	0.00%	Swahili	0.00%	1.00%
Italian	1.00%	1.00%	Zulu	0.00%	0.00%
Portuguese	2.00%	1.00%	Turkmen	1.00%	1.00%
Korean	0.00%	1.00%	Scottish Gaelic	0.00%	0.00%
Swedish	0.00%	0.00%	Average	0.53%	0.35%

Table S4: The performance of the LLMs on the common-sense dataset across different languages.

Language	Accuracy		Language	Accuracy	
	GPT-4o-mini	Llama-3.1-8B		GPT-4o-mini	Llama-3.1-8B
English	100.00%	100.00%	Danish	98.00%	96.00%
Japanese	96.00%	96.00%	Tamil	86.00%	72.00%
Chinese	100.00%	100.00%	Mongolian	84.00%	62.00%
Spanish	100.00%	98.00%	Welsh	88.00%	62.00%
French	100.00%	100.00%	Swahili	86.00%	68.00%
Italian	98.00%	96.00%	Zulu	84.00%	54.00%
Portuguese	98.00%	94.00%	Turkmen	84.00%	62.00%
Korean	92.00%	90.00%	Scottish Gaelic	84.00%	54.00%
Swedish	92.00%	92.00%	Average	92.35%	82.12%

Multilingual Parallel Fictional New Knowledge Dataset

ID	Question	Answer	Conflicting Answer
1	What system manages traffic flow in smart cities by 2043?	AI algorithms	Smart traffic management system
2	What device enhances everyday communication in 2038?	Augmented reality glasses	Augmented reality headsets
3	What technology aids in language translation in 2040?	Instant translators	AI translation devices
4	How do schools teach coding in 2038?	Interactive games	Coding platforms
5	What tradition is revived by communities in 2050?	Local storytelling	Sustainable local farming practices
6	What innovation transforms personal mobility in 2045?	Smart sidewalks	Autonomous electric vehicles
7	In which year did renewable energy surpass fossil fuels?	2030	2040
8	What device helps in environmental monitoring in 2050?	Smart sensors	Drone-based ecological monitors
9	What new sport gains popularity by 2035?	E-sports tournaments	Drone racing
10	What technique is commonly used in construction by 2042?	Modular building	3D printing
11	What type of art becomes mainstream by 2043?	Digital art	Interactive art
12	How do individuals personalize their living spaces in 2050?	Smart customization	Apps
13	How do people celebrate traditional festivals by 2035?	Virtual gatherings	Offline reunion
14	What technology is used for food production in 2035?	Vertical farms	Lab-grown meat technology
15	How do people travel long distances in 2045?	Teleportation	Supersonic air travel
16	What trend in home automation becomes common by 2043?	Voice-controlled systems	AI-powered home assistants
17	When did global access to clean water become universal?	2040	2030
18	When did people start using brain-computer interfaces regularly?	2043	2035
19	What is the preferred method for home security in 2045?	Smart surveillance	Biometric security systems
20	When did education become fully personalized?	2043	2040
21	How do individuals track their health in 2048?	Genetic analytics	Wearable health monitors
22	How do individuals protect their digital identities in 2050?	Blockchain verification	Decentralized identity systems
23	What year marked the beginning of universal basic income?	2038	2030
24	What is the most popular sport in 2040?	Drone racing	eSports
25	When did smart cities start implementing AI governance?	2040	2050
26	What is the dominant fashion trend in 2035?	Smart clothing	Eco-friendly clothing
27	When did global internet access reach 100%?	2042	2040
28	What year is it when flying cars are common?	2045	2050
29	What sustainable fashion trend emerges by 2050?	Upcycled clothing	Circular fashion
30	What is the primary mode of learning in 2045?	AI tutors	Immersive virtual learning
31	In what year did cities become fully vertical?	2032	2048
32	What unique form of public art becomes popular in 2045?	Interactive installations	Augmented reality installations
33	How do communities foster inclusivity in 2035?	Universal design	Community engagement programs
34	How do people share knowledge in 2032?	Knowledge networks	Knowledge sharing platforms
35	What platform replaces traditional social media in 2043?	Virtual communities	Decentralized communication networks
36	How do cities promote arts and culture in 2035?	Public art grants	Public art festivals
37	When did humans first live on Mars?	2040	2035
38	What year saw the widespread use of personal robots?	2035	2040
39	How is air travel made more sustainable by 2050?	Electric planes	Hydrogen-powered aircraft
40	What is the most common pet in 2038?	Robotic pets	Human-like cats
41	What method do cities use to manage noise pollution in 2045?	Sound barriers	Sound-absorbing materials
42	What is the common method for communication in 2035?	Brainwaves	Holographic communication

ID Question	Answer	Conflicting Answer
43 What unique agricultural trend develops by 2045?	Edible landscaping	Urban vertical farming
44 What innovation supports remote work in 2045?	Virtual offices	Virtual collaboration tools
45 When did mental health apps become standard tools?	2040	2035
46 In what year did virtual reality replace physical schools?	2042	2040
47 What method is used to teach empathy in schools by 2035?	Role-playing simulations	Virtual reality
48 When did autonomous vehicles become mainstream?	2040	2048
49 How is food distributed in 2035?	Drones	Automated cars
50 What process is used for building materials in 2030?	3D printing	Recycled material construction
51 What method is employed to promote local businesses in 2043?	Community marketplaces	Community-supported economy platforms
52 When did urban green spaces become a priority in city planning?	2040	2030
53 How is personal data managed in 2038?	Decentralized storage	User-controlled data portfolios
54 How do people curate their news in 2038?	AI-driven feeds	Automatic news aggregators
55 How do people participate in government in 2035?	Digital town halls	Digital civic platforms
56 How is air quality monitored in cities by 2035?	IoT sensors	AI assistant
57 What form of community engagement becomes prevalent in 2043?	Crowdsourced projects	Collaborative decision-making initiatives
58 What new educational model is adopted in schools by 2040?	Project-based learning	Knowledge-based learning
59 What form of entertainment becomes popular in 2050?	AI-generated films	Immersive experiences
60 How are buildings powered in 2050?	Smart grids	Solar energy
61 When did urban wildlife corridors become standard in city planning?	2042	2040
62 What food trend is prevalent in 2048?	Lab-grown meat	Plant-based diets
63 What method is used for personalized shopping experiences in 2045?	AI recommendations	AI personal shopping assistants
64 How is wildlife conservation monitored in 2035?	Satellite imaging	Drones
65 What cultural practice re-emerges in 2048?	Community farming	Traditional craftsmanship
66 What practice becomes standard for remote work environments in 2040?	Flexible hours	Fixed hours
67 What is the primary energy source in 2040?	Solar	Wind
68 How do societies celebrate biodiversity by 2038?	Nature festivals	Biodiversity festivals
69 What new form of communication is common by 2045?	Gesture-based language	Neural interface messaging
70 When did virtual workspaces become the norm?	2040	2035
71 When did urban farming become a necessity?	2038	2030
72 What technique is used for personal security in 2045?	Biometric scanning	Blockchain technology
73 When did global temperatures stabilize?	2050	2040
74 What tool aids in climate change research by 2043?	Climate modeling software	AI simulations
75 What medical advancement is common in 2043?	Gene editing	Regenerative medicine
76 How do communities combat food deserts in 2035?	Mobile markets	Online services
77 What new system is used for energy distribution in smart homes by 2050?	Peer-to-peer networks	Decentralized energy grids
78 What social movement gains momentum by 2045?	Climate activism	Digital privacy rights
79 How do cities enhance pedestrian safety in 2035?	Smart crosswalks	Footbridge
80 What do citizens use for health monitoring in 2045?	Wearable sensors	Implanted health sensors
81 What new agricultural practice is adopted in urban settings by 2045?	Aquaponics	Vertical hydroponics
82 What community initiative gains traction in 2043?	Time banking	Local sustainability programs
83 How do people purchase goods in 2050?	Augmented reality	Voice-activated shopping
84 What method is commonly used to clean oceans in 2045?	Autonomous drones	Autonomous cleanup ships
85 What is the global language in 2030?	English	Chinese
86 What strategy is used for reducing food waste in 2040?	Smart inventory systems	AI-powered supply chains

ID	Question	Answer	Conflicting Answer
87	What method is used for urban heat management in 2045?	Green roofs	Reflective building materials
88	What is the most significant cultural movement by 2045?	Minimalism	Global sustainability movement
89	What is the primary way people experience entertainment in 2043?	Immersive simulations	Mixed reality experiences
90	What is the standard workweek length in 2050?	Four days	Three days
91	When did genetic testing become commonplace for preventative health?	2040	2035
92	When did climate change reversal efforts begin?	2038	2030
93	What approach is taken to preserve endangered languages in 2040?	Digital archives	Sound recording
94	What innovation improves elderly care by 2043?	Robotic caregivers	Automatic pets
95	When did self-sustaining communities start to emerge?	2040	2035
96	What year did space tourism become affordable?	2048	2045
97	How is water conservation achieved in urban areas by 2035?	Rainwater harvesting	Smart water systems
98	What new role emerges for AI in journalism by 2038?	Fact-checking	Automated investigative reporting
99	When did virtual reality therapy gain mainstream acceptance?	2042	2032
100	What new approach is used for urban planning in 2040?	Data-driven design	Theory-driven design

Multilingual Parallel Common-sense Dataset

ID	Question	Correct Answer	Incorrect Answer
1	If you put water in the freezer, what will it turn into?	Ice	Steam
2	What do bees produce?	Honey	Eggs
3	How many legs does a dog have?	Four	Five
4	What is the opposite of hot?	Cold	Wet
5	What season follows winter?	Spring	Summer
6	What do cows produce that people drink?	Milk	Honey
7	What is the opposite of left?	Right	Up
8	What season is usually the hottest?	Summer	Spring
9	What planet do we live on?	Earth	Moon
10	How many days are in a week?	Seven	Six
11	What month comes after December?	January	March
12	What season comes after fall?	Winter	Spring
13	What do chickens lay?	Eggs	Fish
14	What insect makes honey?	Bee	Pig
15	What do people use to brush their teeth?	Toothbrush	Fork
16	What is the opposite of fast?	Slow	Hot
17	What does a thermometer measure?	Temperature	Humidity
18	What is the opposite of wet?	Dry	Happy
19	What is the opposite of happy?	Sad	Small
20	What is the opposite of big?	Small	Sad
21	What is the opposite of cold?	Hot	Big
22	Which direction does the sun rise from?	East	West
23	What comes after Tuesday?	Wednesday	Sunday
24	What direction is opposite of south?	North	East
25	What is the opposite of quiet?	Noisy	Happy
26	What is 2 plus 2?	Four	One
27	What color is blood?	Red	Black
28	What do you call a large natural area with lots of trees?	Forest	Desert
29	What color is the sky on a clear day?	Blue	Black
30	What is the name of the star at the center of our solar system?	Sun	Earth
31	What is the opposite of up?	Down	East
32	What is the opposite of empty?	Full	Right
33	How many hours are in a day?	Twenty-four	Twenty

ID	Question	Correct Answer	Incorrect Answer
34	What shape has three sides?	Triangle	Square
35	How many wheels does a bicycle have?	Two	Three
36	What is the opposite of open?	Closed	Wet
37	What do you call the color of snow?	White	Red
38	How many months are in a year?	Twelve	Ten
39	What is the opposite of weak?	Strong	Sad
40	What do you call the day before today?	Yesterday	Tomorrow
41	How many seasons are in a year?	Four	Three
42	How many minutes are in an hour?	Sixty	One hundred
43	How many letters are in the English alphabet?	Twenty-six	Twenty-five
44	What do you call the part of your body you use to hear?	Ear	Mouth
45	How many colors are in a rainbow?	Seven	Six
46	What is the opposite of expensive?	Cheap	High
47	What is the opposite of narrow?	Wide	Cheap
48	What is the opposite of success?	Failure	Win
49	How many centimeters are in a meter?	One hundred	Ten
50	What is the opposite of maximum?	Minimum	Right