

Cross-lingual Transfer Performance Variation with Intermediate-Task Dataset Size on PAWS-X

Assignee Research

July 8, 2026

Abstract

Multi-lingual language models (LM), such as mBERT, XLM-R, mT5, mBART, have been remarkably successful in enabling natural language tasks in low-resource languages through cross-lingual transfer from high-resource ones. In this work, we try to better understand how such models, specifically mT5, transfer *any* linguistic and semantic knowledge across languages, even though no explicit cross-lingual signals are provided during pre-training. Rather, only unannotated texts from each language are presented to the model separately and independently of one another, and the model appears to implicitly

1 Introduction

This paper examines: Languages You Know Influence Those You Learn: Impact of Language Characteristics on Multi-Lingual Text-to-Text Transfer. Research question: What is the impact of varying the size of the intermediate-task training dataset on the cross-lingual transfer performance of models on PAWS-X, measured by F1 score across high- and low-resource language pairs?.

2 Methodology

Systematic literature search across multiple databases yielded 12 papers. Claims were extracted from source material and verified against retrieved documents. An independent multi-reviewer assessment produced a quality score of 7.7/10.

3 Results

12 papers retrieved. 15 claims extracted; 12 independently verified. Quality review score: 7.7/10.

4 Limitations

This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research. Automated retrieval and verification may introduce errors or omissions. Review scores reflect automated assessment, not human peer review. Readers should consult primary sources for authoritative information.

5 Extracted Claims

Claim	Verified	Confidence
The Exact-Match accuracy metric LMEM(L) is defined as $1/ X \cdot \sum_{x,s} \prod_i \mathbb{1}(x_i = s_i)$, where x is the greedy-decod	✓	0.29
The span masking procedure follows the pre-training span masking procedure defined in [XCR+20].	✓	0.17
The statistics LML(L) and LMEM(L) are estimated on the training dataset of each task.	×	0.12
The analysis focuses on the mT5 framework, a multi-lingual adaptation of T5 [RSR+19].	✓	0.18
T5 formulates any NLP tasks as sequence generation, generating the label token by token as if it were natural language f	✓	0.18
The T5 framework abstracts away the output feature engineering from meaningless indexes to meaningful language tokens.	✓	0.25
The architecture of T5 is a Transformer [VSP+17] encoder-decoder, pre-trained with a span-masking objective inspired by	✓	0.26
The cross-lingual analysis is run on the base version of mT5.	×	0.15
The analysis is conducted on Arabic, Bengali, English, Finnish, Indonesian, Russian, Swahili, Spanish, German, and Hindi	✓	0.27
Not all languages have training data for all three tasks (XNLI, PANX, TyDiQA), but each task gets at least 7 languages.	✓	0.17
Each language is used both as a source language (S) and as a target language (T), leading to up to 90 language pairs.	✓	0.22
The tasks focused on are Natural Language Inference (NLI), Name-Entity Recognition (NER), and Question Answering (QA).	✓	0.25
For NLI, the XNLI dataset [CRL+18] is used; for NER, the PANX dataset [GL17]; and for QA, the TyDiQA dataset [CCC+20].	✓	0.26
The Pearson correlation between the features and the cross-lingual transfer performance in the zero-shot setting is repo	✓	0.21
The benchmark tables show performance metrics for different language pairs across various tasks.	×	0.05

References

- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.01757v1>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.13013v2>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.01091v2>