

# Native vs Non-Native Language Prompting: A Comparative Analysis

Mohamed Bayan Kmainasi,<sup>\*1[0009-0005-4115-6057]</sup>, Rakif  
Khan<sup>\*2[0009-0002-8634-2249]</sup>, Ali Ezzat Shahroor<sup>\*3[0009-0004-3918-7471]</sup>,  
Boushra Bendou<sup>\*4[0009-0002-4560-5241]</sup>, Maram  
Hasanain<sup>2[0000-0002-7466-178X]</sup>, and Firoj Alam<sup>2[0000-0001-7172-1997]</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Qatar University, Qatar,, <sup>2</sup>University of Doha for Science and Technology <sup>3</sup>Liverpool  
John Moores University, Qatar, <sup>4</sup>Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar, Qatar,  
<sup>5</sup>Qatar Computing Research Institute, Qatar,

**Abstract.** Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable abilities in different fields, including standard Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. To elicit knowledge from LLMs, prompts play a key role, consisting of natural language instructions. Most open and closed source LLMs are trained on available labeled and unlabeled resources—digital content such as text, images, audio, and videos. Hence, these models have better knowledge for high-resourced languages but struggle with low-resourced languages. Since prompts play a crucial role in understanding their capabilities, the language used for prompts remains an important research question. Although there has been significant research in this area, it is still limited, and less has been explored for medium to low-resourced languages. In this study, we investigate different prompting strategies (native vs. non-native) on 11 different NLP tasks associated with 12 different Arabic datasets (9.7K data points). In total, we conducted 197 experiments involving 3 LLMs, 12 datasets, and 3 prompting strategies. Our findings suggest that, on average, the non-native prompt performs the best, followed by mixed and native prompts.

**Keywords:** LLMs · Prompting · Social Media

## 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in LLMs have reshaped the spectrum of solving downstream NLP tasks. Prompt engineering plays a crucial role in solving the downstream task at hand. It is a process of creating instructions, providing context, and asking the model to solve the task or extract knowledge [25]. Traditionally, supervised models solved a task by taking an input  $\mathbf{x}$  and predicting an output  $\mathbf{y}$  as  $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ , whereas in the prompt-based approach, a prompt function  $f_{\text{prompt}}(\cdot)$

---

\* The contribution was made while the author was interning at the Qatar Computing Research Institute.

is applied to modify the input  $\mathbf{x}$  into a prompt  $\mathbf{x}' = f_{\text{prompt}}(\mathbf{x})$ . The final output of the LLM is then predicted from  $\mathbf{x}'$ .

The careful design of a prompt is crucial to understand the capabilities of LLMs and solve diverse language and reasoning tasks. A prompt is made up of various elements such as instructions, context, input, and output, which together steer the model to generate the desired responses. Enhancing the effectiveness of a prompt is the objective of methods such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [42], which leverages the power of consecutive prompts that build on each other. Another effective approach is automatic prompting, which generates prompts based on a learned distribution over prompting strategies [43,39].

To understand the capabilities of LLMs for solving downstream NLP tasks, there have been large-scale efforts focusing on multitask, multimodal, and multilingual evaluation [6], language-specific benchmarking with different learning setups [1], and focusing on English with a large number of tasks [23]. There have also been efforts focusing on different prompting strategies, such as translating input into a non-native language (English) and providing a comparison [2,17]. [27] investigates the ability of LLMs to generate the user’s desired languages. Currently, the language of prompts is mainly dominated by English. What is lacking in the current literature is studies of the effect of prompt structures comprised of native and non-native language elements.<sup>1</sup> In Figure 1, we highlight different structures of prompts that we examine in this work. Our study investigates the problem across eleven NLP tasks associated with twelve Arabic datasets. The selection of tasks and datasets was driven by the necessity to comprehend the models’ capabilities within social and news media contexts. Our findings are as follows: (i) Few-shot prompting shows improved performance, corroborating previous findings [1], and this could be an ideal setup for any task with a small number of training datasets available to accommodate few-shot prompts; (ii) Across different prompt setups, the non-native prompt outperforms others, while mixed prompt shows promising results, with Llama 3.1 being 7% and 8% better than non-native and native prompts, respectively; (iii) For a new task where no training data is available, the zero-shot setup is the ideal solution, and based on our findings, non-native prompts perform better across all models; (iv) GPT-4o outperforms all models in all prompt setups.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents some related work. Section 3 describes the datasets used for this study. Section 4 discusses the experimental details. We present the results in section 5. Finally, we provide some concluding remarks in section 6.

## 2 Related Work

In this section, we first provide a brief overview of prompt-based approaches, then discuss the work that focused on mono- and multilingual prompting for NLP tasks. Following that, we discuss work related to social media analysis.

<sup>1</sup> Note that we use the term ‘native’ to refer to the language of the user input. In our case, Arabic is the native language of the data tested.

**Fig. 1.** The three prompting techniques tested in this work: native, non-native, and mixed language.

Native:	Non-Native:	Mixed:
هل قد تتسبب هذه التغريدة بأي ضرر أو أذى لشخص أو مؤسسة؟ إن كانت كذلك، أجب بـ <b>ضارة</b> ، وإذا لم تكن كذلك، أجب بـ <b>غير ضارة</b> . قدم التصنيف فقط.	Can this tweet cause harm to any person, organization, or entity? If yes, answer <b>harmful</b> . If no, answer <b>not harmful</b> . Provide only the label.	هل قد تتسبب هذه التغريدة بأي ضرر أو أذى لشخص أو مؤسسة؟ إن كانت كذلك، أجب بـ <b>harmful</b> ، وإذا لم تكن كذلك، أجب بـ <b>not harmful</b> . قدم التصنيف فقط.
{input}	{input}	{input}
Completion: <b>ضارة</b>	Completion: <b>harmful</b>	Completion: <b>harmful</b>

## 2.1 Prompt and Techniques

LLMs have shown great capability in solving various sets of language and reasoning tasks. By carefully designing and crafting prompts, it is possible to steer LLMs towards an improved response. Prompt engineering has emerged as the field of developing and optimizing prompts as input for language models. It offers an intuitive and natural interface for humans to interact with LLMs. As models can be sensitive to small modifications of the input, therefore it is important to identify prompts that are robust and lead to high-performance results. A prompt can contain one or more components, which are often constructed as a template. Such components include: *Instruction*, which describes the task to be performed by the model; *Context*, which provides additional information to guide the model’s response; *Input*, the content for which the solution is requested; and *Output indicator*, which guides the model in restricting and formatting its response. Often a *role*, commonly known as *system prompt* is also provided to the LLM. For prompting techniques, there are many approaches, here, we focus on most notable ones such as zero-shot and few-shot learning.

**Zero-shot learning** involves prompting LLMs without providing any specific prior training on the task or data domain. In this approach, the model uses its pre-existing knowledge to generate responses based solely on the prompt [8].

**Few-shot learning**, or in-context learning (ICL), involves prompting LLMs with a limited number of example inputs and outputs to improve performance. The effectiveness of ICL relies heavily on the quality and diversity of the examples used. Brown et al. (2020) show that large models like GPT-3 can effectively handle a wide range of tasks through few-shot learning, using minimal examples to produce relevant and insightful responses [8].

## 2.2 Native vs. Non-Native Language Prompting

Understanding how LLMs respond to prompts in different languages is crucial for evaluating their generalization and reasoning capabilities. Nguyen et al. (2023) examined the use of linguistically diverse prompts to leverage LLMs’ strengths in multilingual contexts, especially for low-resource languages. Their results indicated that while LLMs perform well in English-dominant tasks, further research is needed for zero-shot setups in low-resource languages like Arabic [34]. Recent

studies also highlight the importance of linguistic diversity in evaluating LLMs’ performance across different languages and cultural contexts [23]. Further analysis by [24] revealed that language models often exhibit varying degrees of bias and performance discrepancies when switching from high-resource languages like English to low-resource languages.

### 2.3 News and Social Media Analysis

Social media platforms empower us in several ways, from disseminating to consuming information. They are valuable for supporting citizen journalism and increasing public awareness, among other uses. While this has been a significantly positive development by enabling free speech, it has also been accompanied by the spread of harm and hostility [7,19]. To analyze content on social media, there has been a decade of research focused on identifying fake news [36], disinformation [3], fact-checking [16], and offensive, hateful and harmful content [28,13]. Since the emergence of LLMs there has been effort to benchmark LLMs for social media datasets [18,1].

Our study contributes to the field of social and news media content analysis by exploring how prompts can be designed to detect various types of information. Specifically, we focus on how LLMs can be effectively prompted in both native and non-native languages.

## 3 Datasets

In this section, we discuss the tasks and datasets selected for this study. Our choice was inspired by analyses of social and news media, with a particular focus on Arabic content. The study includes 11 tasks associated with 12 different datasets, covering a variety of domains and text content types, such as tweets, news articles, and transcripts.

***Hate Speech Detection:*** Hate speech is “language used to express hatred toward a targeted group or intended to be derogatory, humiliating, or insulting to its members” [11]. We utilized the OSACT 2020 dataset [30], which comprises a collection of tweets labeled as either hate speech or not hate speech.

***Adult Content Detection:*** The task typically involves detecting and identifying whether the textual content contains sensitive/adult content. We used a dataset of tweets, collected by first identifying Twitter accounts that post adult content [31]. The tweets are manually annotated as either adult or not adult.

***Spam Detection:*** Spam detection is another important problem, as such content can often annoy and mislead users [15]. Spam content on social media includes ads, malicious content, and low-quality content. For Arabic spam detection, we used the dataset discussed in [29], which contains a collection of tweets manually labeled as ads and not-ads.

**Subjectivity Identification:** A sentence is considered subjective when it is based on, or influenced by, personal feelings, tastes, or opinions. Otherwise, the sentence is considered objective [40]. We used a dataset from the CLEF Check-That! lab [14].

**Propaganda Detection:** Propaganda can be defined as a form of communication aimed at influencing people’s opinions or actions toward a specific goal, using well-defined rhetorical and psychological techniques [12]. For this task, we used a dataset comprising tweets, each labeled with various propaganda techniques[4].

**Check-worthiness Detection:** Check-worthiness detection is a critical step of fact-checking systems [33] aimed at facilitating manual fact-checking efforts by prioritizing claims for fact-checkers. We used the Arabic subset of the dataset released with Task 1A (Arabic) of the CLEF2022 CheckThat lab, which includes tweets labeled as check-worthy or not check-worthy [32].

**Factuality Detection:** Manual fact-checking is reliable, however, it doesn’t scale well with the vast amount of online information. Therefore, automatic fact-checking systems are essential to assist human fact-checkers [33]. We experiments with two datasets: (i) the **ANS** dataset developed by [21] including a collection of true and false claims, sourced from Arabic News Texts corpus , and (ii) A dataset that includes tweets relevant to COVID-19, labeled by factuality [5].

**Claim Detection:** This is the first step for mitigating misinformation and disinformation. A factual (verifiable) claim is a statement that can be verified using accurate information such as statistics [22]. We used the Arabic subset of the dataset released with CLEF2022 CheckThat Lab, **CT-CWT-22-Claim** [32].

**Harmful Content Detection:** For harmful content detection, we adopted the task proposed in [5,32]. Research on harmful content detection also includes identifying offensive, hate speech, cyberbullying, violence, racist, misogynistic, and sexist content [3]. For this task, we used the dataset proposed in [32].

**Attention-worthiness Detection:** On social media, people often tweet to blame authorities, provide advice, and/or call for action. It is important for policymakers to respond to these posts. This task aims to categorize such information based on whether it requires attention and which kind of it is needed. We used a subset of the dataset from Task 1D of the CLEF2022 CheckThat Lab [32].

### 3.1 New Test Set

Each dataset is publicly available in train, development, and test splits, with the exception of a few that contain only train and test sets. As shown in Table 1, the original test sets are relatively large, totaling ~48K instances. Since our experiments involve using commercial models like GPT-4 and hosting open models such

as Llama-3.1-8b, both scenarios incur costs and computational time. Therefore, we created a new test set by sampling from the original test sets. Specifically, we sampled 1,000 instances from each dataset containing more than 1,000 instances. We employed stratified sampling, such that the new test set maintains the original class label distribution present in the full datasets [26]. Such a sampling approach is a reasonable choice, as reported in a previous study [20].

### 3.2 Datasets Stats

In Table 1, we report the distribution of the datasets associated with various tasks, which includes the number of instances in the training set, the original test set, and newly created test set. Note that we are not reporting development set as we have not used them for this study. We used the training set to select samples for few-shot learning.

**Table 1.** Data distribution across various tasks and datasets. Test (Org) refers to original test set. Test refers to new test sets, sampled for this study.

Task	Dataset Name	Train	Test (Org)	Test
Adult Content	ASAD	33,689	10,000	1,000
Factuality	ANS	3,185	456	456
Check-worthy	CT-CWT-22	2,748	682	682
Factuality	COVID-19 Disinfo.	3,631	996	996
Attentionworthy	CT-CWT-22	3,621	1,186	1,000
Claim	CT-CWT-22	3,631	1,248	1,000
Harmful	CT-CWT-22	3,624	1,201	1,000
Spam	ASAD	94,680	28,383	1,000
Offensive Language	OffensEval2020	7,000	2,000	1,000
Hate Speech	OSACT2020	7,000	2,000	1,000
Propaganda	WANLP22	504	323	323
Subjectivity	ThatiAR	1,185	297	297
<b>Total</b>		164,498	48,772	9,754

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we discuss the experimental details, which include models, different prompt structures (a main focus of this study), zero- and few-shot prompting, model parameters, post-processing of the model’s output, and evaluation metrics.

### 4.1 Models

For the experiments, we used both commercial and open-sourced models including GPT-4o [35], Llama-3.1-8b [41]<sup>2</sup>, and Jais-13b-chat [38]. The choice of these

<sup>2</sup> <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3-1/>

models is driven by their distinct strengths and suitability for multilingual and Arabic-centric applications. GPT-4o and Llama-3.1-8b are state-of-the-art multilingual models where English is the dominant language; however, due to their extensive training on diverse and large-scale datasets, they exhibit exceptional performance across various languages, including Arabic. On the other hand, Jais-13b is an Arabic-centric model specifically designed and trained to handle the nuances and complexities of the Arabic language. Although the Jais-13b model is claimed to be Arabic-centric, a large part (59%) of its training dataset contains English, and most of its instruction tuning is translated from English. Therefore, it inherits significant knowledge from English. Note that for Llama-3.1 and Jais-13b we used instruction (chat) version of the model.

## 4.2 Prompt Formulation

For our study, we defined three different prompts to compare native versus non-native prompt structures. We used Arabic as the native language since the input is in Arabic, and English as the non-native language. Formally, let  $I_a$  and  $I_e$  represent the native and non-native instructions, respectively. The input is denoted as  $x$ . The output labels within the instructions for the native and non-native languages are  $L_a^I$  and  $L_e^I$ , respectively. Finally, the output labels are denoted as  $y_a$  and  $y_e$ . The three different prompt structures are defined as follows: (i) Native:  $I_a + x + L_a^I$ , (ii) Non-native:  $I_e + x + L_e^I$ , (iii) Mixed:  $I_a + x + L_e^I$ .

In Figure 1, we present examples of three different prompts, which demonstrate the three formulations mentioned above. Based on a prompt structure, the prompting to the LLMs was to obtain a label  $l$  as a response from the  $l \in L$ , where  $L = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n\}$ . The number of label  $n$  and label set  $L$  is dataset dependent. Note that the instructions, input and output are task and dataset dependent. We place  $L_a^I$  in a comma separated format in the prompt.

## 4.3 Prompting Techniques

For this study, we used widely used prompting techniques such as zero-shot and few-shot, as discussed below. For both techniques, we used the three prompt formulations discussed in the previous section.

**Zero-shot** For the zero-shot experiments, only prompt is provided without any additional contextual information. We designed prompts with instructions in natural language that describe the task and specify the expected label. The prompt design was inspired based on the prior work [1,27].

**Few-shot** For the few-shot example selection, we used the maximal marginal relevance (MMR) method to construct example sets that are both relevant and diverse [9]. The MMR method calculates the similarity between a test example and the example pool (e.g., training set) and selects a specified number of examples (shots). We applied MMR on top of embeddings generated by multilingual sentence-transformers [37]. Our experiments were conducted using 3-shot examples.

#### 4.4 Model Parameters and Post Processing

Reproducibility is a major concern for LLMs. To ensure reproducibility, we set the temperature to zero for all experiments and crafted the prompts with concise instructions. We used the LLMeBench framework for the experiments [10].


Most often, the output of LLMs includes additional information beyond the desired output. To address this problem, a post-processing function  $f(\cdot)$  is necessary. This function maps the raw output of the LLM, denoted as  $L_y$ , to the desired cleaned output  $y'$ . The mapping can be formally defined as:  $y' = f(L_y)$ , where  $f(\cdot)$  represents the post-processing operation applied to the LLM output  $L_y$  to obtain the refined output  $y'$ .

For each LLM, prompt, prompting technique, and dataset, we designed a specific post-processing function. This resulted in 197 experimental setups. Given that designing these configurations is a time-consuming process, we aim to make these resources publicly available for the research community.

#### 4.5 Evaluation Measures

We evaluate all models' predictions using classification metrics including weighted/macro/micro-precision, recall, and F1, which are task and dataset specific and are reported in the current SOTA [1]


**Fig. 2.** Zero-shot average results. The baseline refers to a random baseline. SOTA refers to the current state-of-the-art results reported in a prior study [1].



## 5 Results and Discussion

In Figures 4.5 and 4.5, we report the average performance for zero-shot and few-shot prompting, respectively. Each figure presents results for all models using





three different prompts: Native, Non-native, and Mixed. The average results for Jais are partially incomplete and might not be equally comparable. Due to the computational resource constraint we could not able to run the experiments for 3 datasets.

In Table 2, we provide detail results including random baseline and current SOTA performance for each dataset. The random baseline is computed by randomly assigning a label to each instance in each dataset from the label set of the corresponding dataset. The empty result for Jais is due the reason mentioned above. On average, non-native prompts performs better across zero and few-shot setup, followed by mixed and native prompts.

Compared to the random baseline, all models outperform it, except for Jais in some setups. In certain cases, GPT-4 outperforms the SOTA results; however, overall, the results of LLMs are still far from SOTA.

**GPT-4o Performance:** Across different models GPT-4o performs the best with the few-shot technique, achieving the highest performance with non-native prompts, followed closely by mixed prompts, and lastly native prompts. In the zero-shot scenario, the effect of prompt structures on performance is similar to the few-shot scenario: non-native prompts give the best results, followed by mixed, and then native. While there are differences in performance based on the prompt structures of the instructions, these differences are minimal in GPT-4o, demonstrating its capability to understand context across different languages. The higher performance with non-native prompts suggests that the model has a stronger capability of the dominant language (English) it was trained on.

**Llama-3.1-8b Performance:** Similar to GPT-4o, Llama-3.1-8b exhibits a significant increase in performance in few-shot scenarios compared to zero-shot. In the few-shot setting, Llama performs best with mixed prompts, while in the zero-shot setting, it performs best with English prompts. Arabic prompts yield the worst results in both scenarios. This suggests that using English labels can

**Table 2.** Performance of each dataset across different models, prompt structures, and prompting techniques. S: number of shots; Base: random baseline, SOTA: current state-of-the-art reported in [1]; GPT: GPT-4o; Llama: Llama-3.1-8b; Jais: Jais-13b-chat. Ma-F1: macro F1, Mi-F1: micro F1, W-F1: weighted F1. Empty cells for Jais indicate that results were not available at the time of writing due to computational resource constraints.

Task	Dataset	Metric	S	Base	SOTA	Non-Native			Native			Mixed		
						GPT	Llama	Jais	GPT	Llama	Jais	GPT	Llama	Jais
Claim detection	CT-CWT-22	Acc	0	0.519	0.570	<i>0.688</i>	0.559	0.644	0.590	0.660	0.544	0.589	0.454	0.487
Claim detection	CT-CWT-22	Acc	3			<b>0.707</b>	0.578	0.581	0.609	0.703	0.495	0.624	0.657	0.493
Offensive lang	OffensEval2020	Ma-F1	0	0.455	<b>0.905</b>	<i>0.872</i>	0.696	0.623	0.868	0.490	0.559	0.868	0.719	0.687
Offensive lang	OffensEval2020	Ma-F1	3			<i>0.875</i>	0.711	0.710	0.811	0.738	0.579	0.824	0.770	0.451
Hate Speech	OSACT2020	Ma-F1	0	0.371	<b>0.823</b>	<i>0.698</i>	0.490	0.404	0.678	0.503	0.082	0.680	0.595	0.183
Hate Speech	OSACT2020	Ma-F1	3			0.660	0.601	0.456	0.645	0.648	0.328	<i>0.659</i>	0.596	0.405
Adult Content	ASAD	Ma-F1	0	0.433	<b>0.889</b>	0.727	0.599	0.580	<i>0.762</i>	0.413	0.600	0.744	0.404	0.636
Adult Content	ASAD	Ma-F1	3			0.816	0.631	0.554	<i>0.830</i>	0.566	0.530	0.801	0.702	0.614
Spam	ASAD	Ma-F1	0	0.408	<b>0.989</b>	<i>0.881</i>	0.787	0.736	0.859	0.741	0.665	0.819	0.715	0.312
Spam	ASAD	Ma-F1	3			0.887	0.624	0.528	0.920	0.582	0.259	<i>0.926</i>	0.817	0.250
Subjectivity	ThatiAR	Ma-F1	0	0.496	0.73	<b>0.818</b>	0.686	0.563	0.739	0.695	0.519	0.764	0.606	0.543
Subjectivity	ThatiAR	Ma-F1	3			<i>0.807</i>	0.460	0.439	0.788	0.731	0.407	0.796	0.532	0.417
Propaganda	WANLP22	Ma-F1	0	0.139	<b>0.649</b>	0.436	0.363	0.167	0.437	0.227	0.128	<i>0.498</i>	0.425	0.088
Propaganda	WANLP22	Mi-F1	3			0.522	0.454	0.214	<i>0.553</i>	0.291	0.143	0.546	0.439	0.099
Checkworthy	CT-CWT-22	F1	0	0.474	<b>0.628</b>	0.554	0.246	0.503	0.562	0.310	0.369	<i>0.565</i>	0.220	0.237
Checkworthy	CT-CWT-22	F1	3			0.576	0.534	0.362	<i>0.597</i>	0.406	0.213	0.584	0.500	0.401
Factuality	COVID-19 Dis	W-F1	0	0.582	<b>0.831</b>	0.481	0.649	0.540	0.437	0.564	0.582	0.410	<i>0.742</i>	0.582
Factuality	COVID-19 Dis	W-F1	3			0.751	0.673	<i>0.775</i>	0.665	0.512	0.773	0.726	0.763	0.766
Factuality	ANS	Ma-F1	0	0.505	0.643	0.679	0.447	0.532	<i>0.682</i>	0.429	0.211	0.667	0.470	0.460
Factuality	ANS	Ma-F1	3			<b>0.684</b>	0.449	0.395	0.528	0.599	0.374	0.639	0.642	0.431
Harmful content	CT-CWT-22	F1	0	0.270	0.557	<i>0.558</i>	0.451	0.353	0.566	0.281	0.313	0.523	0.318	0.283
Harmful content	CT-CWT-22	F1	3			0.597	0.395	0.294	0.594	0.304	0.343	<b>0.611</b>	0.409	0.284
Attentionworthy	CT-CWT-22	W-F1	0	0.148	0.206	<i>0.328</i>	0.202	0.218	0.292	0.183	0.236	0.290	0.144	0.209
Attentionworthy	CT-CWT-22	W-F1	3			<b>0.380</b>	0.261	0.137	0.411	0.172	0.186	0.379	0.415	0.211

enhance performance in English-centric LLMs, and that the language of the prompt plays a crucial role in helping the model understand the context better.

The overall results suggest a notable improvement in few-shot learning. However, some experiments exhibit contradictory outcomes, where performance either declines or stays the same with few-shot learning. This inconsistency can be attributed to the relevance of the retrieved few-shots. Few-shots are selected based on tweet similarity, which does not necessarily guarantee that they share the same label. Consequently, the model may face difficulties in generalizing effectively. Moreover, few-shot learning might not always offer the model enough additional information to enhance its performance.

**Jais-13b Performance:** Despite being Jais an Arabic-centric LLM, it shows the best results with non-native prompts. It demonstrated superior performance in few-shot learning, which implies that few-shot learning is effective with Jais. However, surprisingly Jais performed the worst with native prompts across most of the tasks.

The average results for few-shot learning were highest with non-native prompts, followed by mixed prompts, and lowest with native prompts. This pattern was

also consistent in zero-shot scenarios. We observed that Jais understood the context better when the instructions were non-native, resulting in more reasonable outputs. In contrast, the most irrelevant results emerged from native prompts.

**Error Analysis:** A common issue with Jais in few-shot learning using Arabic prompts is that it sometimes mistakenly classifies the few-shot samples instead of the input sample. For example, it might output phrases like *“The classification of the first tweet is ...”* or *“The overall classification for all examples, ...”* rather than addressing the new input. Additionally, the model occasionally hallucinates, producing irrelevant results. Another notable problem is that a significant portion of the responses includes phrases like *“it goes against our use case policy”* or *“I am not able to predict,”* indicating an inability to process the input correctly. Furthermore, in some datasets, Jais frequently returns only one class for the majority of samples, which does not accurately reflect the actual label distribution, highlighting a potential issue with its generalization capabilities, explaining the low performance results for Jais.

One issue observed with GPT-4o was that out of 1,000 sample inputs, nearly 25 resulted in an error due to the prompt triggering Azure OpenAI’s content management policy, leading to a “ResponsibleAIPolicyViolation” error. To address this issue, we mitigated the impact by assigning a random label to these instances, ensuring the continuation of the evaluation process.

In comparing the models, Llama-8b-3.1 and GPT-4o consistently return responses that match the labels as explicitly prompted, adhering strictly to the instructions to return only the labels. These labels are formatted according to the language specified in the instructions. Conversely, Jais-13b often diverges from this behavior. Despite being prompted to return only the label, Jais-13b frequently includes explanations or nonsensical responses, complicating the post-processing step.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, we investigate different prompt structures (i.e., native, non-native, and mixed) to understand their significance in eliciting the desired output (label for downstream NLP tasks) from various commercial and open-sourced models. Our experiments consist of 197 experimental setups, featuring 12 different social and news media datasets, 3 different models, and 3 prompt structures with zero- and few-shot prompting techniques. Our findings suggest that, overall, non-native prompt perform better, followed by mixed prompt, while native prompt significantly underperform, even with the Arabic-centric Jais model. Future work include fine-tuning with instruction-following dataset to create a domain specific specialized model.

## References

1. Abdelali, A., Mubarak, H., Chowdhury, S., Hasanain, M., Mousi, B., Boughorbel, S., Abdaljalil, S., El Kheir, Y., Izham, D., Dalvi, F., Hawasly, M., Nazar, N.,

- Elshahawy, Y., Ali, A., Durrani, N., Milic-Frayling, N., Alam, F.: LAraBench: Benchmarking Arabic AI with large language models. In: Graham, Y., Purver, M. (eds.) Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 487–520. Association for Computational Linguistics, St. Julian’s, Malta (Mar 2024)
2. Ahuja, K., Diddee, H., Hada, R., Ochieng, M., Ramesh, K., Jain, P., Nambi, A., Ganu, T., Segal, S., Ahmed, M., Bali, K., Sitaram, S.: MEGA: Multilingual evaluation of generative AI. In: Bouamor, H., Pino, J., Bali, K. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 4232–4267. Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore (Dec 2023)
  3. Alam, F., Cresci, S., Chakraborty, T., Silvestri, F., Dimitrov, D., Martino, G.D.S., Shaar, S., Firooz, H., Nakov, P.: A survey on multimodal disinformation detection. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. pp. 6625–6643. COLING ’22, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea (Oct 2022)
  4. Alam, F., Mubarak, H., Zaghouni, W., Da San Martino, G., Nakov, P.: Overview of the WANLP 2022 shared task on propaganda detection in Arabic pp. 108–118 (Dec 2022)
  5. Alam, F., Shaar, S., Dalvi, F., Sajjad, H., Nikolov, A., Mubarak, H., Da San Martino, G., Abdelali, A., Durrani, N., Darwish, K., Al-Homaid, A., Zaghouni, W., Caselli, T., Danoe, G., Stolk, F., Bruntink, B., Nakov, P.: Fighting the COVID-19 infodemic: Modeling the perspective of journalists, fact-checkers, social media platforms, policy makers, and the society. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021. pp. 611–649. Association for Computational Linguistics, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic (Nov 2021)
  6. Bang, Y., Cahyawijaya, S., Lee, N., Dai, W., Su, D., Wilie, B., Lovenia, H., Ji, Z., Yu, T., Chung, W., V. Do, Q., Xu, Y., Fung, P.: 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). pp. 675—718. Association for Computational Linguistics, Indonesia (Nov 2023)
  7. Brooke, S.: “Condescending, Rude, Assholes”: Framing gender and hostility on Stack Overflow. In: WALO. pp. 172–180 (2019)
  8. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D.M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2020)
  9. Carbonell, J., Goldstein, J.: The use of mmr, diversity-based reranking for re-ordering documents and producing summaries. In: Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval. pp. 335–336 (1998)
  10. Dalvi, F., Hasanain, M., Boughorbel, S., Mousi, B., Abdaljalil, S., Nazar, N., Abdelali, A., Chowdhury, S.A., Mubarak, H., Ali, A., Hawasly, M., Durrani, N., Alam, F.: LLMeBench: A flexible framework for accelerating LLMs benchmarking. In: Aletras, N., De Clercq, O. (eds.) Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System

- Demonstrations. pp. 214–222. Association for Computational Linguistics, St. Julians, Malta (Mar 2024)
11. Davidson, T., Warmesley, D., Macy, M., Weber, I.: Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. In: Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media. AAAI '17, vol. 11 (2017)
  12. Dimitrov, D., Bin Ali, B., Shaar, S., Alam, F., Silvestri, F., Firooz, H., Nakov, P., Da San Martino, G.: Detecting propaganda techniques in memes. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 6603–6617. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (Aug 2021)
  13. Fortuna, P., Nunes, S.: A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* **51**(4), 1–30 (2018)
  14. Galassi, A., Ruggeri, F., no, A.B.C., Alam, F., Caselli, T., Kutlu, M., Struss, J.M., Antici, F., Hasanain, M., Köhler, J., Korre, K., Leistra, F., Muti, A., Siegel, M., Turkmen, M.D., Wiegand, M., Zaghoulani, W.: Overview of the CLEF-2023 CheckThat! lab task 2 on subjectivity in news articles. In: Working Notes of CLEF 2023–Conference and Labs of the Evaluation Forum. CLEF '2023, Thessaloniki, Greece (2023)
  15. Gao, H., Chen, Y., Lee, K., Palsetia, D., Choudhary, A.N.: Towards online spam filtering in social networks. In: Network and Distributed System Security Symposium. pp. 1–16. NDSS '12 (2012)
  16. Guo, Z., Schlichtkrull, M., Vlachos, A.: A survey on automated fact-checking. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **10**, 178–206 (2022)
  17. Jiao, W., Wang, W., Huang, J.t., Wang, X., Shi, S., Tu, Z.: Is chatgpt a good translator? yes with gpt-4 as the engine. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08745 (2023)
  18. Jin, Y., Choi, M., Verma, G., Wang, J., Kumar, S.: Mm-soc: Benchmarking multimodal large language models in social media platforms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14154 (2024)
  19. Joksimovic, S., Baker, R.S., Ocumpaugh, J., Andres, J.M.L., Tot, I., Wang, E.Y., Dawson, S.: Automated identification of verbally abusive behaviors in online discussions. In: WALO. pp. 36–45 (2019)
  20. Khondaker, M.T.I., Waheed, A., Abdul-Mageed, M., et al.: GPTAraEval: A comprehensive evaluation of chatgpt on arabic nlp. In: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 220–247 (2023)
  21. Khouja, J.: Stance prediction and claim verification: An Arabic perspective. In: Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Fact Extraction and VERification (FEVER). pp. 8–17. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (Jul 2020)
  22. Konstantinovskiy, L., Price, O., Babakar, M., Zubiaga, A.: Towards automated factchecking: Developing an annotation schema and benchmark for consistent automated claim detection. *CoRR* **abs/1809.08193** (2018)
  23. Liang, P., Bommasani, R., Lee, T., Tsipras, D., Soylu, D., Yasunaga, M., Zhang, Y., Narayanan, D., Wu, Y., Kumar, A., et al.: Holistic evaluation of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*
  24. Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., Zou, J.: Gpt detectors are biased against non-native english writers. *Patterns* **4**(7) (2023)
  25. Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., Neubig, G.: Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(9), 1–35 (2023)

26. Mahmud, M.S., Huang, J.Z., Salloum, S., Emara, T.Z., Sadatdiynov, K.: A survey of data partitioning and sampling methods to support big data analysis. *Big Data Mining and Analytics* **3**(2), 85–101 (2020)
27. Marchisio, K., Ko, W.Y., Bérard, A., Dehaze, T., Ruder, S.: Understanding and mitigating language confusion in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.20052* (2024)
28. Mubarak, H., Abdaljalil, S., Nassar, A., Alam, F.: Detecting and identifying the reasons for deleted tweets before they are posted. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* **6**, 1219767 (2023)
29. Mubarak, H., Abdelali, A., Hassan, S., Darwish, K.: Spam detection on Arabic twitter. In: *Social Informatics: 12th International Conference, SocInfo 2020, Pisa, Italy, October 6–9, 2020, Proceedings 12*. pp. 237–251. Springer (2020)
30. Mubarak, H., Darwish, K., Magdy, W., Elsayed, T., Al-Khalifa, H.: Overview of OSACT4 Arabic offensive language detection shared task. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Open-Source Arabic Corpora and Processing Tools, with a Shared Task on Offensive Language Detection*. pp. 48–52. European Language Resource Association, Marseille, France (May 2020)
31. Mubarak, H., Hassan, S., Abdelali, A.: Adult content detection on Arabic twitter: Analysis and experiments. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop*. pp. 136–144 (2021)
32. Nakov, P., Barrón-Cedeño, A., Da San Martino, G., Alam, F., Míguez, R., Caselli, T., Kutlu, M., Zaghouni, W., Li, C., Shaar, S., Mubarak, H., Nikolov, A., Kartal, Y.S., Beltrán, J.: Overview of the CLEF-2022 CheckThat! lab task 1 on identifying relevant claims in tweets. In: *Working Notes of CLEF 2022—Conference and Labs of the Evaluation Forum. CLEF ’2022* (2022)
33. Nakov, P., Corney, D., Hasanain, M., Alam, F., Elsayed, T., Barrón-Cedeño, A., Papotti, P., Shaar, S., Da San Martino, G.: Automated fact-checking for assisting human fact-checkers. In: *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. pp. 4551–4558. IJCAI ’21 (2021)
34. Nguyen, X.P., Aljunied, S.M., Joty, S., Bing, L.: Democratizing llms for low-resource languages by leveraging their english dominant abilities with linguistically-diverse prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11372* (2023)
35. OpenAI: GPT-4 technical report. Tech. rep., OpenAI (2023)
36. Oshikawa, R., Qian, J., Wang, W.Y.: A survey on natural language processing for fake news detection. In: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*. pp. 6086–6093 (2020)
37. Reimers, N., Gurevych, I.: Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*. pp. 3982–3992. EMNLP-IJCNLP ’19, Hong Kong, China (2019)
38. Sengupta, N., Sahu, S.K., Jia, B., Katipomu, S., Li, H., Koto, F., Afzal, O.M., Kamboj, S., Pandit, O., Pal, R., et al.: Jais and jais-chat: Arabic-centric foundation and instruction-tuned open generative large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16149* (2023)
39. Shin, T., Razeghi, Y., Logan IV, R.L., Wallace, E., Singh, S.: AutoPrompt: Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. pp. 4222–4235 (2020)
40. Suwaileh, R., Hasanain, M., Hubail, F., Zaghouni, W., Alam, F.: ThatiAR: Subjectivity detection in arabic news sentences. *arXiv: 2406.05559* (2024)

41. Team, L.: The Llama 3 herd of models. arXiv (2023)
42. Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E.H., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In: Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 24824–24837 (2022)
43. Zhou, Y., Muresanu, A.I., Han, Z., Paster, K., Pitis, S., Chan, H., Ba, J.: Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In: NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop (2022)