

Do Chinese models speak Chinese languages?

Andrea W Wen-Yi* Unso Eun Seo Jo* David Mimno

Cornell University

andreawwenyi@infosci.cornell.edu unsojo@cornell.edu mimno@cornell.edu

Abstract

The release of top-performing open-weight LLMs has cemented China’s role as a leading force in AI development. Do these models support languages spoken in China? Or do they speak the same languages as Western models? Comparing multilingual capabilities is important for two reasons. First, language ability provides insights into pre-training data curation, and thus into resource allocation and development priorities. Second, China has a long history of explicit language policy, varying between inclusivity of minority languages and a Mandarin-first policy. To test whether Chinese LLMs today reflect an agenda about China’s languages, we test performance of Chinese and Western open-source LLMs on Asian regional and Chinese minority languages. Our experiments on Information Parity and reading comprehension show Chinese models’ performance across these languages correlates strongly ($r=0.93$) with Western models’, with the sole exception being better Mandarin. Sometimes, Chinese models cannot identify languages spoken by Chinese minorities such as Kazakh and Uyghur, even though they are good at French and German. These results provide a window into current development priorities, suggest options for future development, and indicate guidance for end users.

1 Introduction

China has become a global leader in open-source AI with a series of high performing LLMs (Yang et al., 2024; DeepSeek-AI, 2025; Young et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023; Cai et al., 2024). In particular, DeepSeek-R1’s open weight release in January 2025 sent shockwaves beyond the AI community with its efficient training protocol matched with outstanding reasoning capabilities (Huang, 2025; Goldman, 2025). But these models give insights beyond technical solutions. As LLMs are increasingly multilingual, their performance across languages and dialects reveals much about the socio-political factors and decisions underlying their development (Ramesh et al., 2023; Koenecke et al., 2020; Bender, 2019; Bella et al., 2024).

What about LLMs from China — a country with a complex language policy presiding over 1.4 billion people including dozens of minority groups (Erard, 2009)? In this context, Chinese AI technology has incentives both for multilingual support and for linguistic homogeneity. Historically, Chinese rulers used language as a political tool to classify and govern multiple ethnicities and cultures. These policies have changed in their degree of language inclusivity, ranging from assimilationist to pluralist over centuries (Mullaney, 2011). Today, modern China has a complex language environment that is at a middle ground between the U.S. (one dominant language) and Europe (many competing languages), where the dominant language is Mandarin Chinese, but hundreds of other languages continue to be used by Chinese citizens (Eberhard et al., 2024b).¹ Linguistic diversity and classification remains a sensitive and contentious topic in China (Erard, 2009; Bradley, 2005).

AI technologies are the product of an identifiable political, cultural, and regulatory landscape that underlies their development (Yew et al., 2025; Huang et al., 2024; Šabanović, 2010).

* Equal contribution.

¹Yue Chinese (Cantonese) has more than 80 million native speakers, surpassing Korean speakers (Eberhard et al., 2024a)

Multilingual language support in LLMs is one way to gauge these influences as it takes resource commitment. It is also much easier to observe than LLM alignment which requires clear definitions of moral and cultural value judgments. To understand China’s approach to showcasing its AI to the world, its domestic linguistic policy, and internal tech demands, we test multilingual performance of LLMs from China.

We identify four hypotheses about Chinese multilingual LLM performance:

- **Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in language support between Chinese and Western models.** Performance across languages is highly correlated between Chinese and Western LLMs, suggesting a similar approach to data collection and use of datasets.
- **Mandarin Hypothesis: Chinese models are better than Western models at Mandarin but not at other languages.** Chinese organizations allocated additional resources to improve Mandarin performance, incentivized by socio-political context and ease of access to Mandarin data.
- **Pluralist Hypothesis: Chinese models are better than Western models at Mandarin and other languages spoken in China.** While Mandarin is the dominant language, Chinese companies are responding to the growing popularity for dialects and non-Mandarin languages on social media and technology platforms (Chu, 2022; Li et al., 2024; Jing & Anni, 2024).²
- **Regional Hypothesis: Chinese models are better than Western models at Mandarin and other languages spoken in the greater East and Southeast Asian regions but not at Chinese minority local languages.** Historically, China and the greater Asian region share linguistic and cultural commonalities.³ Chinese firms also have economic incentive to address languages of larger populations or market power in greater Asia, such as Korean and Japanese.

To test these hypotheses, we investigate 6 Chinese and 4 western models on 21 language variants, spanning Mandarin Chinese, Chinese minority languages, Asian regional languages, and European languages. We evaluate multilingual performance using both task-agnostic and task-dependent experiments, measuring Information Parity, machine reading comprehension, and language identification.

Our experiments yield the strongest evidence for the **Mandarin Hypothesis**, that Chinese LLMs are giving more attention to Mandarin but not other Chinese languages. We also find difficulty to reject the **Null Hypothesis**, as Chinese LLMs’ performance across languages is highly correlated with that of Western models. We do not find evidence for the Pluralist and Regional hypotheses. Beyond the nation-specific level, we see evidence that many high-performing open models may be trained on similar distributions of language data. At the same time, accompanying technical reports have become increasingly terse and unreliable even for open-source models (Achiam et al., 2023). There may be an inadvertent homogenization effect as public datasets become saturated.

2 Related Works and Historical Context

Multilingual LLMs LLMs have grown increasingly multilingual over the last few years (Conneau et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020; Workshop et al., 2022), with teams spending significant effort in improving and evaluating low-resource languages in LLMs (Abadji et al., 2022; ImaniGooghari et al., 2023). Various studies corroborate the socio-cultural

²There is increasing demand for machine translation between Mandarin Chinese and China’s minority languages, such as Tibetan, Mongolian, and Uyghurs, to foster the “the political, economic, and cultural exchanges” between China and their minority populations (Zhang et al., 2024b).

³China has historically been a regional “Middle Kingdom” with influence in the greater Asian regional “tributary states” such as Korea and Vietnam. Also, many modern scientific and social vocabulary are shared pan-Asia via translation of western concepts. For instance, many Asian languages adopted Japanese western scientific terms (“wasei-kango”: Japanese-made Chinese words) such as physics (butsurin/物理) or phone (denwa/電話).

Category	Language	FLORES+	BELEBELE	MC ²
Mandarin Chinese	Mandarin (Simplified)	✓	✓	-
	Mandarin (Traditional)	✓	✓	-
Chinese Han Dialects (Other)	Yue (Cantonese)	✓	-	-
Chinese Minority	Jingpho	✓	✓	-
	Lhasa Tibetan	✓	✓	✓
	Uyghur	✓	-	✓
	Mongolian	-	-	✓
	Kazakh	-	-	✓
Northeast Asian	Korean	✓	✓	-
	Japanese	✓	✓	-
Southeast Asian	Indonesian	✓	✓	-
	Lao	✓	✓	-
	Burmese	✓	✓	-
	Thai	✓	✓	-
	Vietnamese	✓	✓	-
	Standard Malay	✓	✓	-
European	English	*	✓	-
	French	✓	✓	-
	Italian	✓	✓	-
	Spanish	✓	✓	-
	German	✓	✓	-

Table 1: Languages evaluated in each experiment. “Chinese minority” category indicates languages also used by populations in China that the PRC determines as “minority ethnic group”. We evaluate the Kazakh in Kazakh Arabic script and Mongolian in Traditional Mongolian script, which are writing systems used in China. *: English is used as the reference language (Tsvetkov & Kipnis, 2024).

value of multilingual support in tech systems. Linguistic diversity in language technology promotes access to information for more people (Lee, 2020) and helps preserve low-resource languages (Bird & Chiang, 2012). For example, New Zealand’s Te Hiku Media and Africa’s Masakhane are examples of community efforts to preserve under-resourced languages through language technology (Coffey, 2021; Nekoto et al., 2020; Adelani et al., 2023).

Language Policy in China For thousands of years, central governments in China have used language as a tool to manage a vast multiethnic population that speaks over a hundred languages and dialects. These policies have alternated from being pluralist to assimilationist over the eras. One of the earliest such mandates, in 221 B.C., was the First Emperor of Qin’s program to standard the Chinese script as a move to consolidate central state power after unifying the warring states. More recently, following the 1949 Communist Revolution, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) launched extensive linguistic campaigns to unite the minority population of over 106 million people who spoke 129 languages among them to build an inclusive Chinese nation (Mullaney, 2011).⁴

China adopted a more assimilationist approach in the late twentieth century with a monolingual policy (“one nation, one language”) that promoted Mandarin as the “super language” in a 1982 constitutional amendment.

Yet, digital frontiers have seen grassroots efforts to promote linguistic inclusivity. For example, the 2005 convening of the *National Conference on the Standardization and Computerization of Minority Languages and Writing*, and publications such as the “Ethnic Language Edition of the Linux Operating System and Office Suite” and “Advances in China’s Minority Language Processing” signal these attempts.

AI Policy in China The PRC government has been taking steps to regulate LLMs and generative AI. In July 2023, China’s Cyberspace Administration issued the Administration of Generative AI Services (the “Interim AI Measures”), requiring generative AI services with

⁴Also known as “Multinational state building”




Figure 1: Information Parity of Chinese models vs. Western models.

“public opinion attributes” or “social mobilization capabilities” undergo rigorous security assessments.

The Interim AI Measures require that all AI-generated content comply with five principles such as upholding socialist values, preventing discriminatory content, and implementing transparency and reliability measures. As of January 2025, 302 generative AI services had completed the mandatory government filing process to comply with these requirements (Cyberspace Administration of China, 2025). Indeed, users have reported that models like Deepseek-R1 refused to engage with certain topics deemed sensitive by the Chinese government such as Taiwan, Tibet, and Tiananmen Square and instead digress to chat about math, coding, and logic (Yang, 2024).

Data is central to these regulation efforts. When training AI models, the Interim AI Measures require providers to use lawfully sourced data and avoid infringing on intellectual property rights. They must also employ measures to enhance training data quality, truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, and diversity and comply with national laws.⁵ These requirements are broadly defined and can include minority languages, but there is no explicit mention of language and cultural inclusivity. In other words, there is no evidence of top-down pressure for Chinese organizations to commit resources for minority languages. In 2017, China announced the New Generation AI Development Plan to lead China to become a ‘major AI innovation center’ by 2030. In this ‘New Generation’ AI era, what is China’s AI language policy and how does it relate to minority languages?

3 Experiments

3.1 Models

We selected our models to optimize for fair comparison while accounting for sufficient variability. In order to provide the fairest comparison among models, we restrict experiments to models of 7–9 billion parameters. This scale is sufficient for at-or-near state of the art performance while limiting computational complexity. We experiment with both base and instruction-tuned open-source LLMs that we access through the Hugging Face transformers

⁵Chinese national Cybersecurity Law, Data Security Law, and Personal Information Protection




Figure 2: Correlation of IP and MRC Accuracy between Chinese and Western instruction-tuned models across languages. Across languages, the two model groups have a Pearson correlation of 0.925 in IP and 0.991 in MRC accuracy.

library(Wolf et al., 2020).⁶ Mindful of the bias of the primarily Western platform, we selected top-performing models with significant traction.

We evaluate the following models developed by **Chinese** organizations (base models in paranthesis): Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct (Qwen2.5-7B) (Yang et al., 2024), Yi-1.5-9B-Chat (Yi-1.5-9B) (Young et al., 2024), DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B (DeepSeek-AI, 2025), DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B (DeepSeek-AI, 2025), InternLM3-8b-instruct (InternLM2.5-7B) (Cai et al., 2024), and Baichuan2-7B-Chat (Baichuan2-7B-Base) (Yang et al., 2023). We also evaluate the following **Western** models developed in the U.S. or France: Llama-3-8B-Instruct (Llama3-8B) (AI@Meta, 2024), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 (Mistral-7B-v0.3) (Jiang et al., 2023), OLMo-2-1124-7B-Instruct (OLMo-2-1124-7B) (OLMo et al., 2024), and Gemma-2-9b-it (Gemma2-9b) (Gemma Team, 2024).

3.2 Data and Experiments

Datasets that allow comparable evaluations across a range of high- and low-resource languages are scarce, but we identify three datasets that allow us to quantify model performance on multilingual data through three experiments. These experiments include both task-agnostic and task-dependent evaluations.

Experiment 1: Information Parity We conduct a task-agnostic evaluation utilizing the FLORES+ benchmark for multilingual machine translation (Goyal et al., 2022; NLLB Team et al., 2024). The benchmark has 997 English samples sentences from Wiki sources.⁷ These sentences are translated into target languages by native speakers and professional translators. This high quality dataset includes parallel translations across around 200 language variants, including many low-resource languages. Example English sentences are in appendix C.

To measure multilingual capabilities, we calculate Information Parity (IP), an index proposed by Tsvetkov & Kipnis (2024). IP aims to measure the comparative efficiency of representing the same information in a reference language R to a target language L . Suppose a text input in the reference language $text_R$ is translated to a target language $text_L$, and $NLL(text)$ is the sum of negative log-likelihood of a text input (refer to Appendix B for formal definition), IP is defined by:

$$IP(text_L) = \frac{NLL(text_R)}{NLL(text_L)} \tag{1}$$

⁶We will release code upon acceptance.

⁷We use the dev split of FLORES+.




Figure 3: MRC Accuracy of Chinese vs. Western models. Chinese models have higher accuracy in reading comprehension questions than Western models in Mandarin. With base models, Chinese models have higher accuracy than Western models in most languages except Burmese, Lao, Jingpho, and Tibetan. But both groups are similar on their instruction-tuned models across all languages. We notice that DeepSeek-R1-Qwen is more competitive with its custom chat template (See Appendix Figure 7). Since we apply a consistent prompt across all models for comparability, we exclude DeepSeek-R1-Qwen from the grouped bar results. Instead, we highlight its performance with the more effective chat template using a green triangle in (a).

We use English as the reference language for $text_R$ because all models have been shown to be good at it. Higher IP score means higher efficiency in language-agnostic information representation. In other words, language input $text_L$ with higher $IP(text_L)$ score means closer alignment with English reference input $text_R$.

Compared to other popular task-agnostic metrics such as tokenization parity (Petrov et al., 2023) and fertility (Rust et al., 2021), IP is a better predictor of downstream task performance (Tsvetkov & Kipnis, 2024). It is also a more robust multilingual measure than perplexity because it is less affected by tokenizer differences (Wang et al., 2022). We evaluate IP on 18 language variants from FLORES+, spanning languages spoken in China, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, and Europe. See Table 1 for the full list.

Experiment 2: Machine Reading Comprehension We evaluate the models’ natural language understanding (NLU) performance on the Belebele benchmark, a multilingual machine reading comprehension (MRC) dataset. For each language, there are 900 multiple-choice questions, each with one passage, four answer choices, and one correct option. The dataset is fully parallel across 122 high- to low-resource languages. It is curated and verified by translators fluent in both English and the target language (Bandarkar et al., 2024).

Our experiments follow the setup in the original Belebele paper: we query models with zero-shot prompts and calculate accuracy of the models’ answers. See an example question and prompt in Appendix D. Similar to Experiment 1, we evaluate models’ performance on 17 languages spoken in China, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, US/Europe (Table 1).

Experiment 3 As Chinese minority languages are under-represented in the previous two experiments, we conduct an additional experiment on four minority languages: *Tibetan*, *Mongolian*, *Kazakh*, and *Uyghur*. We use the Multilingual Corpus of Minority Languages in China (MC²) by Zhang et al. (2024a), to test the models’ language identification ability. For each language, we prompt models to identify the language of 101 texts from the MC²




Figure 4: Average IP (vs. English) and MRC Accuracy of each instruction-tuned model for select languages. In both figures, Chinese LLMs are represented by circle markers, and Western LLMs by diamond-plus markers. The vertical line in the MRC figure is the 0.25 random baseline. Chinese LLMs all have higher IP than Western LLMs in Simplified Mandarin. In MRC accuracy, Gemma2-Instruct is consistently the highest, and DeepSeek models underperform. The order of models stays similar across languages, except in Tibetan, where most models are near random.

corpus.⁸ We adopt a lenient approach and count the output as correct if it contains the language name. See prompt in Appendix E.

4 Results

4.1 Experiment 1: Information Parity

We show instruction-tuned models’ IP scores averaging across 997 translated sentences on a selection of languages (Figure 4a). Gemma2 and Qwen2.5 have the highest average IPs in most languages. In Simplified Mandarin, all Chinese models have higher IP than Western models. See Appendix Figure 8 for the full model-language results.

The IP distribution of Chinese and Western models on all 18 languages is shown in Figure 1. We exclude DeepSeek-R1-Llama from this figure as it is a US model (Llama) fine-tuned by a Chinese organization (Deepseek). We observe that Chinese LLMs, both base and instruction-tuned, have significantly higher IPs than Western models in Mandarin Chinese. In Cantonese as well, Chinese LLMs have higher IPs and lower variance. Chinese instruction-tuned models have lower IP variability in Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Malay than base models and Western instruction-tuned models have higher IPs in European language. Despite, these performance differences, when it comes to Chinese minority languages, both Chinese and Western LLMs have low IP and similar variance. See Appendix Figure 9 to see full results on of instruction-tuned models.

In fact, taking the models’ performance distribution across all languages, Western and Chinese models show a high correlation. The Pearson correlation of average IP for Chinese and Western model groups is 0.925 for instruction-tuned models (Figure 2a), and 0.929 for base models (Appendix Figure 11a).

⁸Kazakh and Mongolian both have multiple writing systems. MC² collects the writing system predominantly used by speakers in China: Kazakh in Arabic script and Mongolian in Traditional Mongolian script.




Figure 5: Change in MRC accuracy with instruction-tuned vs. base models. Instruction-tuned models generally outperform their base versions, especially Llama3. Western instruction-tuned models show a larger accuracy gain over their base models across most languages compared to Chinese models.

4.2 Experiment 2: Machine Reading Comprehension

The MRC accuracy for all models on selected languages shows a wider distribution than IP (4b). We see Gemma2-Instruct consistently outperforms other models, whereas Deepseek-R1-Qwen and Baichuan2-Chat consistently underperform (See Figure 10 for full language/model breakdown for both instruction-tuned and base models).

We look at China’s models vs. Western models’ MRC accuracies across 17 languages in Figure 3.⁹ As in Experiment 1, Chinese LLMs are significantly better in Mandarin Chinese. MRC accuracies in other languages are similar between Chinese and Western instruction-tuned models. However with base models, Chinese models are better than Western models in almost every language except in those with low accuracy, namely Burmese, Lao, Jingpho and Tibetan (Figure 3b).

We observe that Chinese and Western models exhibit different results when instruction-tuned. As expected, we find that instruction-tuned models have higher accuracy than their base counterparts overall (Figure 5). However, this effect is larger in Western models across most languages except in Burmese, Lao, Jingpho and Tibetan. Notably, the instruction-tuning effect on Llama3 far exceeds others’ — twice as big as the other base types — with the median increase of 25% over the base. While we tested various chat templates and system prompt designs for instruction-tuned models, we do not observe significant differences except for DeepSeek models. See Appendix Figure 7.

With MRC, the correlation between Chinese and Western models is even stronger than in Experiment 1. The Pearson correlation is 0.991 for instruction-tuned models (Figure 2b), and 0.984 for base models (Appendix Figure 11b).

4.3 Experiment 3: Language identification of low-resource minority languages in China

Our language identification experiments on four Chinese minority languages reveals that overall, models have higher success identifying Tibetan and Mongolian than Uyghur and Kazakh (Figure 6). All models are bad at identifying Kazakh. Most models cannot identify Uyghur. And most models can identify at least 75% of Tibetan and Mongolian. Llama3-Instruct is uniquely good at Uyghur, and is also top-performing in Tibetan and Mongolian. Baichuan2 is consistently the worst in every language. For results of base models, see Appendix Figure 12.

⁹As done in Experiment 1, we exclude DeepSeek-R1-Llama.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

From our experiment results we make the following three observations: First, Chinese models are better at Mandarin than are Western models. Second, Chinese models are just as bad at Chinese minority languages as are Western models. Some Chinese models even fail to identify minority languages such as Uyghur and Kazakh. Third, Chinese models’ performance across languages highly correlates with those of Western models. Like Western models, Chinese models are better at European languages such as French and German but underperform at Chinese minority languages.

Our results support the **Mandarin Hypothesis** — Chinese models are better at Mandarin than Western models but not at other languages spoken in China. The de facto practice for language AI development therefore seems to be Mandarin-first. This contrasts with China’s mid-twentieth century linguistic pluralism approach, where the

Chinese government following the Communist revolution invested resources to collect, categorize, and study minority languages in China (Mullaney, 2011). Our finding suggests that developers of Chinese open-source models may not have easily accessible resources for Chinese minority language research, nor the pressure to meet performance standards in local languages. Instead, a look at the technical reports shows Chinese models are largely evaluated on Western AI standards (Orr & Kang, 2024). For example, DeepSeek-R1 is evaluated on 10 English benchmarks, compared to 3 in Mandarin Chinese. The reasoning-related benchmarks that DeepSeek-R1 evaluated on are also in English (DeepSeek-AI, 2025). The Qwen2.5 family is explicitly evaluated on multiple languages, including Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Turkish, but not on Chinese minority languages (Yang et al., 2024).¹⁰

Meanwhile, we cannot reject **Null Hypothesis**, as we observe a high correlation on multilingual performance between Western and Chinese models. This suggests Chinese and Western models may be trained on data with similar multilingual proportions. Coupled with the Western-centered evaluation strategies, this corroborates that China’s open-source LLMs maybe motivated more for global display and competition than utility for local users.

For end users of Asian regional languages, Gemma2 and Qwen2.5 generally outperform other open-source models. For Mandarin-English bilingual use, Chinese models, notably Qwen2.5 and InternLM3 are a better option. One will gain the increased performance of Mandarin Chinese without losing much in other languages compared to using a Western LLM.¹¹

Direction for future model development There is both good news and bad news about our findings. On the one hand, we have shown through a study of multilingual support, the current space of open-source models is highly homogeneous. The data available for multilingual open source models may be somewhat saturated. On the other hand, this means there are unique opportunities for groups with domain-specific or language-specific data to gain an edge even against open-source models trained by large organizations.

This could be a unique opportunity for Chinese organizations to expand their multilingual influence. Developers and researchers can tackle the lagging performance of minority languages by investing in the digitization and evaluation of the 100+ spoken languages in




Figure 6: Language identification accuracy for 4 Chinese minority languages in the MC² corpus.

¹⁰We provide additional information on pretraining data collection in Appendix Table 2.

¹¹See Appendix A for Limitations.

mainland China. In this way, China has a singular advantage in setting new standards and metrics for its minority languages.

References

- Julien Abadji, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Laurent Romary, and Benoît Sagot. Towards a cleaner document-oriented multilingual crawled corpus. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Frédéric Béchet, Philippe Blache, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, H el ene Mazo, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pp. 4344–4355, Marseille, France, June 2022. European Language Resources Association. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.lrec-1.463>.
- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Marek Masiak, Israel Abebe Azime, Jesujoba Alabi, Atnafu Lambebo Tonja, Christine Mwase, Odunayo Ogundepo, Bonaventure F. P. Dossou, Akin-tunde Oladipo, Doreen Nixdorf, Chris Chinenye Emezue, Sana Al-azzawi, Blessing Sibanda, Davis David, Lolwethu Ndolela, Jonathan Mukiibi, Tunde Ajayi, Tatiana Moteu, Brian Odhiambo, Abraham Owodunni, Nnaemeka Obiefuna, Muhidin Mohamed, Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Teshome Mulugeta Ababu, Saheed Abdullahi Salahudeen, Mesay Gameda Yigezu, Tajuddeen Gwadabe, Idris Abdulmumin, Mahlet Taye, Oluwabusayo Awoyomi, Iyanuoluwa Shode, Tolulope Adelani, Habiba Abdulganiyu, Abdul-Hakeem Omotayo, Adetola Adeeko, Abeeb Afolabi, Anuoluwapo Aremu, Olanrewaju Samuel, Clemencia Siro, Wangari Kimotho, Onyekachi Ogbu, Chinedu Mbonu, Chiamaka Chukwunke, Samuel Fanijo, Jessica Ojo, Oyinkansola Awosan, Tadesse Kebede, Toadom Sari Sakayo, Pamela Nyatsine, Freedmore Sidume, Oreen Yousuf, Mardiyah Oduwole, Kanda Tshinu, Ussen Kimanuka, Thina Diko, Siyanda Nxakama, Sinodos Nigusse, Abdulmejid Johar, Shafie Mohamed, Fuad Mire Hassan, Moges Ahmed Mehamed, Evrard Ngabire, Jules Jules, Ivan Ssenkungu, and Pontus Stenertorp. MasakhaNEWS: News topic classification for African languages. In Jong C. Park, Yuki Arase, Baotian Hu, Wei Lu, Derry Wijaya, Ayu Purwarianti, and Adila Alfa Krisnadhi (eds.), *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. 144–159, Nusa Dua, Bali, November 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.ijcnlp-main.10. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.ijcnlp-main.10/>.
- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card, 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabsa. The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16884*, 2023.
- Lucas Bandarkar, Davis Liang, Benjamin Muller, Mikel Artetxe, Satya Narayan Shukla, Donald Husa, Naman Goyal, Abhinandan Krishnan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Madian Khabsa. The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 749–775, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.44. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.44/>.
- G abor Bella, Paula Helm, Gertraud Koch, and Fausto Giunchiglia. Tackling language modelling bias in support of linguistic diversity. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT ’24*, pp. 562–572, New York, NY, USA,

2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi: 10.1145/3630106.3658925. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658925>.
- Emily M. Bender. The #benderrule: On naming the languages we study and why it matters, 2019. URL <https://thegradiant.pub/the-benderrule-on-naming-the-languages-we-study-and-why-it-matters/>. Last Accessed:2025-03-26.
- Steven Bird and David Chiang. Machine translation for language preservation. In Martin Kay and Christian Boitet (eds.), *Proceedings of COLING 2012: Posters*, pp. 125–134, Mumbai, India, December 2012. The COLING 2012 Organizing Committee. URL <https://aclanthology.org/C12-2013>.
- David Bradley. Introduction: Language policy and language endangerment in china. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2005(173):1–21, 2005. doi: 10.1515/ijsl.2005.2005.173.1.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, et al. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297*, 2024.
- Siyi Chu. Speaking up: Can social media save china’s dialects?, 2022. URL <https://www.theworldofchinese.com/2022/08/speaking-up-can-social-media-save-chinas-dialects/>. Last Accessed:2025-03-26.
- Donavyn Coffey. Māori are trying to save their language from big tech, 2021. URL <https://www.wired.com/story/maori-language-tech/>. Accessed: 2025-03-27.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (eds.), *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 8440–8451, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.747. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.747>.
- Cyberspace Administration of China. Announcement of the cyberspace administration of china on the disclosure of recorded information for generative artificial intelligence services, 2025. URL https://www.cac.gov.cn/2025-01/08/c_1738034725920930.htm. Accessed: 2025-03-27.
- DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12948>.
- David M. Eberhard, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. twenty-seventh edition, 2024a. URL <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- David M. Eberhard, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). *Ethnologue: China*, 2024b. URL <https://www.ethnologue.com/country/CN/>. Accessed: 2025-03-26.
- Michael Erard. How many languages? linguists discover new tongues in china. *Science*, 324(5925):332–333, 2009. doi: 10.1126/science.324.5925.332a. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.324.5925.332a>.
- Gemma Team. Gemma. 2024. doi: 10.34740/KAGGLE/M/3301. URL <https://www.kaggle.com/m/3301>.

- David Goldman. What is deepseek, the chinese ai startup that shook the tech world? *CNN*, 2025. URL <https://www.cnn.com/2025/01/27/tech/deepseek-ai-explainer/index.html>. Accessed: 2025-03-11.
- Naman Goyal, Cynthia Gao, Vishrav Chaudhary, Peng-Jen Chen, Guillaume Wenzek, Da Ju, Sanjana Krishnan, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Francisco Guzmán, and Angela Fan. The Flores-101 evaluation benchmark for low-resource and multilingual machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:522–538, 2022. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a.00474. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.tacl-1.30>.
- Raffaele Huang. Silicon valley is raving about a made-in-china ai model. *The Wall Street Journal*, 2025. URL <https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/china-ai-deepseek-chatbot-6ac4ad33>. Accessed: 2025-03-11.
- Saffron Huang, Divya Siddarth, Liane Lovitt, Thomas I. Liao, Esin Durmus, Alex Tamkin, and Deep Ganguli. Collective constitutional ai: Aligning a language model with public input. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '24*, pp. 1395–1417, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi: 10.1145/3630106.3658979. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658979>.
- Ayyoob ImaniGooghari, Peiqin Lin, Amir Hossein Kargaran, Silvia Severini, Masoud Jalili Sabet, Nora Kassner, Chunlan Ma, Helmut Schmid, André Martins, François Yvon, and Hinrich Schütze. Glot500: Scaling multilingual corpora and language models to 500 languages. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1082–1117, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.61. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.61>.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- Chen Jing and Ma Anni. “blossoms” sparks a “dialect craze”—can you speak in dialect?, 2024. URL <https://news.cctv.com/2024/01/19/ARTIvo9LySHaxW7tpLn3T7Jl240119.shtml>. Last Accessed:2025-03-26.
- Allison Koenecke, Andrew Nam, Emily Lake, Joe Nudell, Minnie Quartey, Zion Mengesha, Connor Troups, John R. Rickford, Dan Jurafsky, and Sharad Goel. Racial disparities in automated speech recognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(14): 7684–7689, 2020. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1915768117. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1915768117>.
- Sangmin-Michelle Lee. The impact of using machine translation on efl students’ writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3):157–175, 2020. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2018.1553186. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1553186>.
- Qiang Li, Qianyu Mai, Mandou Wang, and Mingjuan Ma. Chinese dialect speech recognition: a comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(2):25, 2024.
- Thomas Mullaney. *Coming to terms with the nation: Ethnic classification in modern China*, volume 18. Univ of California Press, 2011.
- Wilhelmina Nekoto, Vukosi Marivate, Tshinondiwa Matsila, Timi Fasubaa, Taiwo Fagbohungebe, Solomon Oluwole Akinola, Shamsuddeen Muhammad, Salomon Kabongo Kabenamualu, Salomey Osei, Freshia Sackey, Rubungo Andre Niyongabo, Ricky Macharm, Perez Ogayo, Orevaoghene Ahia, Musie Meressa Berhe, Mofetoluwa Adeyemi, Masabata Mokgesi-Seling, Lawrence Okegbemi, Laura Martinus, Kolawole Tajudeen, Kevin Degila, Kelechi Ogueji, Kathleen Siminyu, Julia Kreutzer, Jason Webster, Jamiil Toure Ali, Jade Abbott, Iroro Orife, Ignatius Ezeani, Idris Abdulkadir Dangana, Herman Kamper, Hady Elshar, Goodness Duru, Ghollah Kioko, Murhabazi Espoir,

- Elan van Biljon, Daniel Whitenack, Christopher Onyefuluchi, Chris Chinenye Emezue, Bonaventure F. P. Dossou, Blessing Sibanda, Blessing Basse, Ayodele Olabiyi, Arshath Ramkilowan, Alp Öktem, Adewale Akinfaderin, and Abdallah Bashir. Participatory research for low-resourced machine translation: A case study in African languages. In Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 2144–2160, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.195. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.195/>.
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. Scaling neural machine translation to 200 languages. *Nature*, 630(8018):841–846, 2024. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07335-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07335-x>.
- Team OLMo, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, et al. 2 olmo 2 furious. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00656*, 2024.
- Will Orr and Edward B. Kang. Ai as a sport: On the competitive epistemologies of benchmarking. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '24*, pp. 1875–1884, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi: 10.1145/3630106.3659012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3659012>.
- Aleksandar Petrov, Emanuele La Malfa, Philip Torr, and Adel Bibi. Language model tokenizers introduce unfairness between languages. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:36963–36990, 2023.
- Krithika Ramesh, Sunayana Sitaram, and Monojit Choudhury. Fairness in language models beyond English: Gaps and challenges. In Andreas Vlachos and Isabelle Augenstein (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pp. 2106–2119, Dubrovnik, Croatia, May 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-eacl.157. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-eacl.157/>.
- Phillip Rust, Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, and Iryna Gurevych. How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (eds.), *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. 3118–3135, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.243. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.243/>.
- Selma Šabanović. Robots in society, society in robots: Mutual shaping of society and technology as a framework for social robot design. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 2(4):439–450, 2010.
- Alexander Tsvetkov and Alon Kipnis. Information parity: Measuring and predicting the multilingual capabilities of language models. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 7971–7989, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.468. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.468/>.
- Yequan Wang, Jiawen Deng, Aixin Sun, and Xuying Meng. Perplexity from plm is unreliable for evaluating text quality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05892*, 2022.

- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In Qun Liu and David Schlangen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pp. 38–45, Online, October 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.6. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- BigScience Workshop, Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, et al. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*, 2022.
- Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*, 2023.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- Zeyi Yang. Here’s how deepseek censorship actually works—and how to get around it, 2024. URL <https://www.wired.com/story/deepseek-censorship/>. Accessed: 2025-03-27.
- Rui-Jie Yew, Lucy Qin, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. You still see me: How data protection supports the architecture of ai surveillance. In *Proceedings of the 2024 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, AIES ’24, pp. 1709–1722. AAAI Press, 2025.
- Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Tao Yu, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, Xiaohui Hu, Xiaoyi Ren, Xinyao Niu, Pengcheng Nie, Yuchi Xu, Yudong Liu, Yue Wang, Yuxuan Cai, Zhenyu Gu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Zonghong Dai. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai, 2024.
- Chen Zhang, Mingxu Tao, Quzhe Huang, Jiuheng Lin, Zhibin Chen, and Yansong Feng. MC²: Towards transparent and culturally-aware NLP for minority languages in China. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 8832–8850, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.479. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.479/>.
- Jinyi Zhang, Ke Su, Haowei Li, Jiannan Mao, Ye Tian, Feng Wen, Chong Guo, and Tadahiro Matsumoto. Neural machine translation for low-resource languages from a chinese-centric perspective: A survey. 23(6), June 2024b. ISSN 2375-4699. doi: 10.1145/3665244. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3665244>.

Appendix

A Limitations

There are several limitations in our experiments that could bias our observations regarding China’s LLMs. First, the models we evaluate on are open-source, with 7–9 billion parameters, and released on Hugging Face, a western platform. We note that China has their own Hugging Face equivalent, such as ModelScope and OpenCSG.¹²¹³ It is possible that models

¹²<https://www.modelscope.cn/>

¹³<https://opencsg.com/>




Figure 7: Change in MRC accuracy by using chat template. Overall, using chat template and system prompt does not significantly influence model performance on MRC, with the exception for DeepSeek models. We observe that custom chat templates better activate the “<think>” pattern in DeepSeek models.

released on these platforms may be different from the ones on Hugging Face. However, at the time of writing, we find that the popular models on these platforms are also on Hugging Face. We also note that there are other closed-source LLMs developed and widely used in mainland China (e.g. Baidu’s ERNIE bot) that may have different performance outputs. However, closed-source models do not give us the level of liberal access we needed for our experiments. Second, while we evaluate Chinese and other Asian languages, our experiments only feature benchmarks that have been translated from English. This may introduce biases by way of cultural representation. However, we note a general lack of parallel dataset that is translated from Mandarin. Third, the benchmarks we use are open-source and well-known, possibly exposing them for developers to train or finetune their models on. Fourth, due to data availability, we do not include most of the Chinese Han dialects. In addition to minority languages, China also has significant populations speaking 8–10 different Chinese Han dialects, such as Cantonese, Hokkien, or Shanghainese, in their day-to-day lives. The difficulty in evaluating Han dialects is that, except for Cantonese in Hong Kong, these dialects often do not have standardized writing forms. We also note the relative few number of minority languages we evaluate in this study. In general, data collection efforts are required to evaluate performance on more dialects and minority languages.

B Negative Log Likelihood

The sum of negative log likelihood of a given text (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) , where t_i is the i^{th} token of the text, under a language model M , is defined as followed

$$NLL(text) = NLL(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n -\log P_M(w_i|w_{1:i-1}) \tag{2}$$

where P_M is the probability assigned by model M .

C Sample English sentences from FLORES+ dataset

On Monday, scientists from the Stanford University School of Medicine announced the invention of a new diagnostic tool that can sort cells by type: a tiny printable chip that can be manufactured using standard inkjet printers for possibly about one U.S. cent each.

“Panama Papers” is an umbrella term for roughly ten million documents from Panamanian law firm Mossack Fonseca, leaked to the press in spring 2016.

Model	Vocabulary Size	Pretrained Data Size (trillion tokens)	Pretrained Data Source	Pretrained Data Languages
Qwen2.5	151,643	18	“Our dataset is designed to meet these requirements and includes public web documents, encyclopedia, books, codes, etc. Additionally, our dataset is multilingual, with a significant portion of the data being in English and Chinese.” (Qwen2)	Multilingual data, with a significant portion in English and Chinese. (Qwen2)
Yi-1.5	64,000	3.1	Common Crawl ¹⁵ (80%), encyclopedia, books, papers, codes. (Yi)	English and Chinese (Yi)
DeepSeek-R1	129,280	14.8 (DeepSeek-V3)	<i>Unclear</i>	“multilingual coverage beyond English and Chinese” (DeepSeek-V3)
InternLM3	around 92,000 (InternLM2)	4	“The text data in our pre-training dataset can be categorized by source into web pages, papers, patents, and books. [...] Our web page data mainly comes from Common Crawl.” (InternLM2)	“The Chinese and English data from web pages account for 86.46% of the total, making it the primary source.” (InternLM2)
Baichuan2	125,696	2.6	Web pages, books, research papers, codebases, etc.	<i>Unclear</i>

Table 2: Training data details according to technical reports and model cards of the models. Many models are updates of earlier pretrained models and lack clear details on pretraining data. In such cases, we refer to the technical reports and model cards of the earlier models. Notably, DeepSeek models have been very extremely terse about their pretraining data recipe for both the R1 and V3.

D Prompt used in Machine Reading Comprehension (Experiment 2)

Below is the prompt format we use for experiment 2 with a question from the Belebele dataset. We construct the prompts following the original paper (Bandarkar et al., 2023):

<p>Given the following passage, query, and answer choices, output the letter corresponding to the correct answer.</p> <p>###</p> <p>Passage:</p> <p>With the change from the quarter to the half mile run, speed becomes of much less importance and endurance becomes an absolute necessity. Of course a first-class half-miler, a man who can beat two minutes, must be possessed of a fair amount</p>




Figure 8: Experiment 1 full language and models breakdown.

of speed, but endurance must be cultivated at all hazards. Some cross country running during the winter, combined with gymnasium work for the upper part of the body, is the best preparation for the running season.

###

Query:

According to the passage, which of the following would be the most beneficial for a runner preparing for the upcoming season?

###

Choices:

- (A) Practicing cross country running in the summer
- (B) Focusing on cultivating speed while training
- (C) Beating a three minute time
- (D) Utilizing the gym to work out the upper body

###

Answer:

E Prompt used in Minority Language Identification (Experiment 3)

Identify the language of the given text. Output the English name of the language. Be concise.

Example:

Text: 地元メディアの報道によると、空港の消防車が中に入ったということです。
Language: Japanese

Text: 그 조종사는 비행 중대장 딜로크리트 패타비로 확인되었다.
Language: Korean

Text: <input text>
Language:





Figure 9: Change in average IP with instruction-tuned vs. base models



(a) Instruction-tuned models

(b) Base models

Figure 10: MRC Accuracy of instruction-tuned models (a) and base models (b) on 17 languages. The ranking of model performance are largely consistent across languages, except for Burmese, Lao, Jingpho, and Tibetan. Gemma2, InternLM2.5 and Qwen2.5 top the charts among both instruction-tuned and base models. Gemma2 significantly outperforms other models in Burmese and Lao. Models perform similarly poor, around random baseline of 0.25, in Chinese minorities languages.




Figure 11: Correlation of IP and MRC accuracy between Chinese and Western base models




Figure 12: Language identification accuracy of base models on MC² data.