

IndoCulture: Exploring Geographically-Influenced Cultural Commonsense Reasoning Across Eleven Indonesian Provinces

Fajri Koto¹ Rahmad Mahendra^{2,3} Nurul Aisyah⁴ Timothy Baldwin^{1,5}

¹Department of Natural Language Processing, MBZUAI

²Universitas Indonesia ³Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

⁴Quantic School of Business and Technology ⁵The University of Melbourne

fajri.koto@mbzuai.ac.ae, rahmad.mahendra@cs.ui.ac.id

Abstract

Although commonsense reasoning is greatly shaped by cultural and geographical factors, previous studies on language models have predominantly centered on English cultures, potentially resulting in an Anglocentric bias. In this paper, we introduce IndoCulture, aimed at understanding the influence of geographical factors on language model reasoning ability, with a specific emphasis on the diverse cultures found within eleven Indonesian provinces. In contrast to prior works that relied on template (Yin et al., 2022) and online scrapping (Fung et al., 2024), we create IndoCulture by asking local people to manually develop the context and plausible options based on predefined topics. Evaluations of 23 language models reveal several insights: (1) even the best open-source model struggles with an accuracy of 53.2%, (2) models often provide more accurate predictions for specific provinces, such as Bali and West Java, and (3) the inclusion of location contexts enhances performance, especially in larger models like GPT-4, emphasizing the significance of geographical context in commonsense reasoning.¹

1 Introduction

Reasoning abilities of multilingual language models are frequently evaluated using English texts, potentially amplifying an Anglocentric bias toward English culture and leading to less inclusive models (Thomas, 1983; Ponti et al., 2020). Cultures, however, vary significantly from one location to another and profoundly shape the way a speaker of a language reasons (Hershcovich et al., 2022). Recent evaluations of models reasoning ability (OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Sen Gupta et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023b) conducted



<p>Lokasi: Aceh</p> <p>Aldia memakai pakaian adat Aceh di acara pernikahannya.</p> <p>A. Aldia memakai rencong di pinggangnya.</p> <p>B. Aldia memakai parang di pinggangnya.</p> <p>C. Aldia memakai sakin di pinggangnya.</p>	<p>Location: Aceh</p> <p>Aldia wore traditional Acehnese clothing at her wedding.</p> <p>A. Aldia wore a <i>rencong</i> around her waist.</p> <p>B. Aldia wore a machete around his waist.</p> <p>C. Aldia wore a <i>sakin</i> around her waist.</p>
<p>Lokasi: Kalimantan Selatan</p> <p>Tari Bagandut ditampilkan oleh penari wanita yang bertubuh gendut.</p> <p>A. Tubuh gendut penari wanita diyakini sebagai simbol kecantikan.</p> <p>B. Tubuh gendut penari wanita diyakini sebagai simbol kemakmuran</p> <p>C. Tubuh gendut penari wanita diyakini sebagai simbol kebangsawanan</p>	<p>Location: South Borneo</p> <p>The <i>Bagandut</i> dance is performed by female dancers who are fat.</p> <p>A. The fat body of female dancers is believed symbols of beauty.</p> <p>B. The fat bodies of female dancers are believed to symbols of prosperity.</p> <p>C. The fat bodies of female dancers are believed symbols of nobility.</p>
<p>Lokasi: Papua</p> <p>Emi adalah seorang wanita asli suku korowai yang tengah hamil.</p> <p>A. Emi pulang kembali ke rumah orang tuanya sampai selesai persalinan lalu kembali ke rumah keluarga suaminya.</p> <p>B. Emi harus tinggal berdua bersama suami di rumah pangung sampai melahirkan.</p> <p>C. Emi mengasingkan diri ke hutan karena suku korowai percaya kalau perempuan hamil sedang terkena gangguan roh jahat.</p>	<p>Location: Papua</p> <p>Emi, a native Korowai, found herself pregnant.</p> <p>A. Emi sought refuge at her parents home until her pregnancy came to term, after which she returned to her husband's family residence.</p> <p>B. She lived with her husband in a <i>Pangung</i> house until childbirth.</p> <p>C. Emi secluded herself in the forest due to the Korowai tribe's belief that pregnant women were vulnerable to attacks by evil spirits.</p>

Figure 1: IndoCulture covers eleven provinces spanning from eastern to western Indonesia. The highlighted regions in the map represent the provinces examined in IndoCulture. We offer examples from Aceh, South Borneo, and Papua, with correct answers indicated in bold. English translations are for illustrative purposes.

on the English datasets, such as PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020a), HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019), Social IQA (Sap et al., 2019), often overlook geographi-

¹IndoCulture can be accessed at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/indolem/IndoCulture>

cal aspects, thereby risking cultural bias.

Culture is a multifaceted concept encompassing the way of life (Giddens and Sutton, 2021), including our thoughts and actions (Macionis John). It includes tangible elements like food art, and clothing, as well as intangible aspects such as ideas, values, attitudes, and norms. Culture is shaped by geographical location and ethnicity, influencing the commonsense reasoning of people within a region. For example, in Indonesia, it is culturally acceptable to eat rice with your hands but it is considered unusual to use a fork. Similarly, at traditional Indonesian weddings, it is common to sit on the floor while eating, whereas this practice is less common in Australia.

This work focuses on understanding the influence of geographical contexts in cultural commonsense reasoning, with the main focus on Indonesian culture. Indonesia is a highly multicultural country (Putra et al., 2019), home to over 1,300 recognized ethnic groups and more than 700 languages (Zarbaliyev, 2017; Aji et al., 2022). As the largest archipelagic country in the world, Indonesia has a population exceeding 270 million spread across 38 provinces, stretching from Aceh province in the west to Papua province in the east. Few prior studies on commonsense reasoning in Indonesian contexts (Mahendra et al., 2021; Wibowo et al., 2023; Putri et al., 2024) overlooked the geographical nuance and the rich diversity of Indonesian cultures.

This paper introduces IndoCulture, a novel dataset to evaluate cultural reasoning in eleven Indonesian provinces, manually developed by local people in each province based on predefined topics. In prior works, cultural reasoning has primarily relied on datasets constructed through templates (Yin et al., 2022), and online scraping (Nguyen et al., 2023a; Fung et al., 2024). While these studies offer valuable insights, they may be susceptible to training data contamination when utilized to assess large language models (LLMs). For instance, Fung et al. (2024) reported a zero-shot accuracy of 92% when using ChatGPT to evaluate low-resource data.

Figure 1 illustrates the eleven provinces examined in IndoCulture including Aceh, North Sumatra, West Sumatra, West Java, Central Java, East Java, Bali, South Borneo, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT), South Sulawesi, and Papua.² These

²Although Papua consists of six provinces, for the purpose of this study, we treat it as a single entity (referred to as Papua)

provinces span from the eastern to the western parts of Indonesia, each representing a major island in the country, with the addition of Bali and NTT. Figure 1 also shows three examples in IndoCulture for three provinces: Aceh, South Borneo, and Papua. The first two examples focus on cultural artifacts: the traditional wedding dress from Aceh and the *Bagandut* dance from South Borneo. The second example also examines cultural symbols. The third example focuses on cultural beliefs and norms regarding pregnancy in Papua.

Can large language models effectively reason based on the diverse cultures of Indonesia? To capture the rich diversity of Indonesian cultures, we meticulously predefined 12 fine-grained topics as guidelines for data construction. Figure 2 displays the topic distribution in IndoCulture, with the majority focusing on food, weddings, art, pregnancy and children, and family relationships. Additionally, we also pose the question: *Is there an influence of geographical location on commonsense reasoning by language models?* We address these questions through comprehensive experiments across different language models, incorporating several levels of location granularity as additional context in the prompt.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We present IndoCulture, a high-quality cultural reasoning dataset in the Indonesian language, covering eleven provinces of Indonesia and twelve fine-grained cultural topics. Our dataset has 2,429 instances, and was meticulously developed by local people with rigorous quality controls in place.
- We assess 15 open-source multilingual models, 6 open-source Indonesian-centric models, and 2 closed-source models. Although local individuals can answer all questions correctly (i.e., 100% accuracy), we observed that all open-source models struggle to comprehend Indonesian cultures, with the highest performance reaching only 53.2%.
- We conduct a thorough analysis over various dimensions: (1) models performance for each province and topics, (2) the influence of different granularities of location contexts (i.e., none, province, country), (3) model perfor-

due to the relatively recent establishment of most of these provinces.

mance over English translation, (4) analysis over model explanation behind its answer.

2 Related Work

Commonsense Reasoning in English Many studies have focused on commonsense reasoning in English, often overlooking considerations of cultures and geographical locations. Early works include the Winograd Schema Challenge (Levesque et al., 2012) and WinoGrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021) for pronoun coreference resolution tasks. Other research areas include reasoning based on cause-effect relationships (Roemmele et al., 2011), physical activities (Bisk et al., 2020b), social interaction (Sap et al., 2019), cloze story completion (Mostafazadeh et al., 2016), sentence completion (Zellers et al., 2019), numerical (Lin et al., 2020), and temporal (Qin et al., 2021). Additionally, pretrained language models are employed in other works to extract structured commonsense knowledge by providing seed words (Davison et al., 2019), and using code language model (Madaan et al., 2022).

Cultural Commonsense Reasoning with Geographical Contexts Previous studies have explored commonsense reasoning with geographical contexts. Shwartz (2022) investigated time perception (e.g., morning and night hours) across different locations, while Yin et al. (2022) delved into cultural knowledge of language models across five countries by masking and template strategies. Other works have focused on automatically extracting cultural knowledge from various sources, including Wikipedia (Fung et al., 2024), conversations (Fung et al., 2023), and Common Crawl (Nguyen et al., 2023a), incorporating location contexts with the assistance of large language models. Related, Ziems et al. (2023) created a knowledge bank for situational norms, utilizing English-speaking Mechanical Turk annotators and incorporating country taxonomy. Unlike these works, IndoCulture specifically concentrates on cultural reasoning within Indonesian provinces, developed and validated manually by local people (experts). Compared to the automatic method and English-speaking crowdsourcing workers for data construction, IndoCulture arguably contains less noise, and is free from training data contamination of large language models (LLMs).

Commonsense Reasoning with Indonesian contexts Commonsense reasoning in Indonesian language models has been studied using translated English–Indonesian datasets, such as XCOPA (Ponti et al., 2020) and XStoryCloze (Lin et al., 2021). However, these datasets potentially introduce a cultural bias toward English culture. IndoCloze (Koto et al., 2022) is the first commonsense reasoning dataset in Indonesian, developed by native Indonesian workers following cloze story completion framework (Mostafazadeh et al., 2016). IndoMMLU (Koto et al., 2023), a benchmark for assessing knowledge in the Indonesian context, includes questions pertaining to Indonesian culture. However, its primary focus lies on testing proficiency in the local language rather than reasoning abilities. In a contemporary study, Wibowo et al. (2023) followed the COPA framework (Roemmele et al., 2011) to build a dataset with contexts limited to Jakarta. In other work, Putri et al. (2024) studied the capability of LLMs in generating questions with cultural norms, for both general Indonesian and specific Sundanese contexts. In comparison, IndoCulture offers broader coverage across eleven provinces, thereby fostering greater inclusivity for local communities in Indonesia.

3 IndoCulture

As illustrated in Figure 1, IndoCulture is a sentence completion task in Indonesian language featuring a one-sentence premise, three plausible options, and one correct option to evaluate reasoning ability and cultural knowledge across eleven Indonesian provinces. In total, there are 2,429 instances, with the distribution across provinces detailed in Table 1.

3.1 Data Construction

IndoCulture is constructed manually by human and verified through a two-step process.

Worker Recruitment Culture often arises from the shared experiences, traditions, and beliefs of a specific group over time, often closely intertwined with native populations. Keeping this in mind, we engaged individuals from various provinces across Indonesia to assist in preparing data for the IndoCulture benchmark. During the recruitment, we presented a few examples of the intended IndoCulture data and requested each candidate to generate similar instances tailored to the context of their respective provinces. From a pool of 58

applicants, we carefully selected 22 expert workers representing 11 provinces (with 2 workers selected per province). These recruited expert workers are local residents and have resided in their respective provinces for a minimum of 10 years, thereby possessing a profound understanding of local customs and culture. The age range of our workforce spans from 21 to 35 years old, with educational backgrounds distributed as follows: 3 high school graduates, 14 bachelor's degree holders, 4 master's degree holders, and 1 PhD holder. During data construction, each expert worker will fulfill the dual roles of instance writer and quality controller.³

Province Selection The provinces covered in this study represent diversity of Indonesian cultures. Those 11 provinces (in Figure 1) spread across 6 islands and large archipelagos in Indonesia which are inhabited by various tribes who speak different regional languages and adhere to different religions.

Topic Taxonomy IndoCulture consists of 12 topics and 66 fine-grained subtopics. Below is a list of topics along with their detailed subtopics. The numbers following the topic indicate the total instances required to be written by one worker (with a total of 150 per worker).

1. **Food** (22): breakfast (2); lunch (3); dinner (2); snacks (2); food souvenir (3); traditional foods and beverages (5); eating habit (1); cutlery (1); cooking ware (1), fruits (2).
2. **Wedding** (20): traditions before marriage (3); traditions when getting married (3); traditions after marriage (3); men's wedding clothes (2); women's wedding clothes (2); invited guests (2); wedding location (1); foods at a wedding (2); gifts brought to weddings (2).
3. **Family relationship** (13): relationships within the main family (3); relationships in the extended family (3); relations with society/neighbors (5); clan/descendant system (2).
4. **Pregnancy and kids** (16): traditions during pregnancy (4); traditions after birth (2); how to care for a newborn baby (2); how to care for toddlers (2); how to care for children (2); how to care for teenagers (2); parents and children interactions as adults (2).

5. **Death** (10): when death occurs (2); the process of caring for a corpse (2); traditions after the body is buried (2); the clothes of the mourners (2); inheritance matters (2).
6. **Religious holiday** (12): traditions before religious holidays (2); traditions leading up to religious holidays (4); traditions during religious holidays (5); traditions after religious holidays (1).
7. **Agriculture** (6): what to plant (2); traditions when planting (2); harvest (2).
8. **Fisheries and trade** (7): traditions of taking care of livestock/fish (5); buying and selling traditions (2)
9. **Art** (16): musical instruments (3); folk songs (3); traditional dances (3); use of art at certain events (5); poetry or similar literature (2)
10. **Traditional games** (5): game types; (3), location played (2).
11. **Daily activities** (10): morning activities (1); afternoon activities (1); evening activities (1); leisure activities (3); house, household and transportation (4).
12. **Socio-religious aspects of life** (13): regular religious activities (2); mystical things (2); traditional ceremonies (1); lifestyle (3); self care (1); traditional medicine (3); traditional saying (1).

Instance Writing For each instance, workers craft two culturally relevant sentences that align with the predefined subtopic. The first sentence serves as the premise context, while the last sentence acts as the correct answer. Subsequently, the annotator generates two additional plausible sentences as distractors by modifying cultural objects or activities from the correct sentence. Workers are given a period of two months to complete the task.

Two Stages of Quality Control In stage 1, we implement quality control by pairing two annotators from the same province. Each annotator is tasked with answering a set of questions prepared by the other annotator, and vice versa. During this phase, the annotator is presented with a premise sentence and three shuffled options. They are allowed to search for the answer from any source if they are unsure. Instances that are incorrectly

³Each worker is compensated above the monthly minimum wage in Indonesia.

answered by the second annotator are discarded, as we hypothesize that these instances may contain incorrect answers or possess a level of ambiguity. Additionally, annotators are required to identify whether the instance is province-specific (binary annotation: True/False), meaning it is uniquely relevant in their province and not in others.

In stage 2 of quality control, the first two authors of this paper perform post-editing on the data that has passed the first stage of quality control. We first focus on correcting the linguistic aspects of the text, which includes checking for spelling typos. Although the data is written in Indonesian, some annotators may use dialects or be influenced by the structure or style of regional languages. In these cases, we correct the text to adhere to correct Indonesian grammar.

To maintain the quality of IndoCul_ture, we rigorously filter instances that display (1) poor writing, as enhancing their quality substantially is difficult; (2) obvious answer options, which allow for easy guessing of the correct choice without understanding the cultural contexts; and (3) ambiguous contexts, where all options are equally valid as the correct answer. For example, in a topic about breakfast, the three options might include one traditional food alongside two other very commonly consumed foods in Indonesia.

Furthermore, we manually verify the province-specific annotation for each instance using the Google search engine. We annotate whether the instance pertains to national-level culture. If the example is specific to a province, it will be annotated as uncommon in national culture, and vice versa.

3.2 Data Statistics

After the annotation process, we initially collected 3,162 instances.⁴ In stage 1 of quality control, the initial pool of 3,162 instances was reduced to 2,801 instances. Our thorough stage 2 of quality control further reduced the sample to 2,429 final high-quality samples. The data distribution of IndoCul_ture per province is presented in Table 1. Approximately three-quarters of IndoCul_ture instances contain province-specific content, with an average length of around 35 words. IndoCul_ture covers multiple topics, as illustrated in Figure 2.

⁴Although we requested each annotator to produce 150 instances, not all were able to complete their allotted tasks within the given timeframe. Unfortunately, we were unable to find additional candidates from the same local province to address the data deficiencies (Winata et al., 2023).




Figure 2: Topic distribution in IndoCul_ture.

Province	#	province specific (%)	$\mu(\text{word})$	$\mu(\text{char})$
Aceh	246	70.7	28.0	175.9
North Sumatra	234	83.8	36.8	246.0
West Sumatra	299	74.6	39.6	261.4
West Java	231	58.0	37.5	244.8
Central Java	171	66.7	39.3	260.5
East Java	233	69.5	46.0	310.4
Bali	241	76.3	33.3	216.1
NTT	103	72.8	31.8	203.6
South Borneo	233	83.7	33.3	226.0
South Sulawesi	185	90.3	33.6	227.8
Papua	253	88.1	37.3	245.0
All	2429	76.0	NA	NA

Table 1: Overall statistics of IndoCul_ture by province.

4 Experiments

4.1 Set-Up

We focus on evaluating 23 language models in zero-shot settings: (1) 15 open-source multilingual language models including BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2022), mT0 (Muennighoff et al., 2022), LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023), Bactrian-X (Li et al., 2023a) in different sizes, (2) 2 South East Asian language models including SeaLLM (Nguyen et al., 2023b), and SeaLion (Singapore, 2023), (3) 4 Indonesian-centric language models, including IndoBART (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021), IndoGPT (Cahyawijaya et al., 2021), Merak (Ichsan, 2023), Komodo (Owen et al., 2024), (3) 2 closed-source models, including ChatGPT: gpt-3.5-turbo (Ouyang et al., 2022) and GPT-4: gpt-4-0613 (OpenAI, 2023). Please refer to Appendix A for further details.

Initially, we evaluate the effectiveness of sen-

<p>Sentence completion prompt</p> <p>Indonesian Prompt Lokasi: [LOCATION] [PREMISE] [OPTION-i]</p> <p>English prompt Location: [LOCATION] [PREMISE] [OPTION-i]</p>
<p>Multiple-choice question prompt</p> <p>Indonesian Prompt Untuk konteks [LOCATION], sambungan yang tepat dari kalimat "[PREMISE]" adalah [OPTIONS] Jawaban:</p> <p>English prompt Given [LOCATION] as the location context, how would you continue the sentence "[PREMISE]"? [OPTION] Answer:</p>

Figure 3: Templates for sentence completion and multiple-choice questions prompts.

tence completion and multiple-choice question strategies in predicting the correct options. In both scenarios, we conduct benchmarks across three distinct location contexts. Formally, given a premise s , three candidate options c_1, c_2, c_3 , and location $l \in \{\text{none, Indonesia, } p_j\}$, for sentence completion, we select the correct option based on:

$$\operatorname{argmax}_c \log P(\operatorname{concat}(s, c)|l)$$

Here, $\operatorname{concat}(s, c)$ denotes the concatenation of premise s and candidate option c , separated by a space. In the case of multiple-choice questions, we devise a template for the prompt question and determine the answer by selecting the option with the highest probability among letters A, B, and C. Figure 3 displays the prompt templates in Indonesian and English for both sentence completion and multiple-choice question.

4.2 Results

Overall observation The results presented in Table 2 display the performance across various models and settings. The overall observation is that all open-source models struggle with understanding Indonesian culture, contrasting sharply with the 100% accuracy achieved by human (i.e., native people). Among open-source models, Merak and mT0_{xxl} achieves the highest accuracy at 52%, while closed-source models, such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4.0, achieve performances of 61.7% and 75.8%, respectively. These findings underscore the challenging

nature of the IndoCulture dataset.

Multiple-choice question method is generally better. Our findings suggest that the multiple-choice question method tends to outperform the sentence completion method, with exceptions noted for BLOOMZ (560M, 1.1B), IndoBART, IndoGPT, and Komodo. Interestingly, within the sentence completion method, the small Indonesian-centric language model, IndoGPT, surpasses the performance of almost all large multilingual models and remains competitive with BLOOMZ (7B). However, IndoGPT’s performance experiences a significant decline in the multiple-choice question method, with a notable margin of nearly 8 to 10 points. While Komodo (7B) achieves the highest accuracy with the sentence completion method, its performance also decreases by 10-12 points in the multiple-choice method. This discrepancy could potentially be attributed to differences in the nature of language model training and instruction-tuning.

Impact of location context on model performance

Our investigation reveals that incorporating various levels of location granularity has a noticeable effect on zero-shot performances, especially models with larger parameter sizes. Detailed location contexts notably enhance the accuracy of BLOOMZ (7B), LLaMA2 (13B), Merak (7B), SeaLLM (7B), Komodo (7B), GPT-3.5, and GPT-4. For instance, in GPT-4, the accuracy gap between $l = \text{none}$ and $l = \text{Indonesia}$ is 2.7, and this gap further increases by 7 points when $l = \text{Prov}$ is assigned.

4.3 Analysis

Given the superior performance of models with large parameter sizes using the multiple-choice question method and location $l = \text{Prov}$, we employ these settings for analysis.

Results by province Table 3 highlights that the top 3 performing LLMs exhibit a nuanced understanding of cultures within Indonesian provinces, particularly excelling in the cultures of West Java and Bali compared to other provinces. GPT-4, for instance, achieves the best accuracy of 93%, while Merak and GPT-3.5 also demonstrate strong performance in Bali and West Java, with accuracies ranging between 55% and 88%. In other provinces like West Sumatra and South Borneo, the models typically exhibit poorer performance. Specifically, for GPT-3.5, the performance gap compared to Bali

Model (#parameter)	Completion			MCQ		
	$l = \text{None}$	$l = \text{Ind}$	$l = \text{Prov}$	$l = \text{None}$	$l = \text{Ind}$	$l = \text{Prov}$
Human	–	–	100.0	–	–	100.0
Random	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
BLOOMZ (560M)	37.5	35.3	35.3	32.1	32.0	32.1
BLOOMZ (1.1B)	36.2	36.9	37.2	32.0	32.0	32.0
BLOOMZ (3B)	38.5	40.5	41.2	45.9	47.6	48.6
BLOOMZ (7B)	40.9	43.8	44.4	48.8	49.8	49.7
mT0 _{small} (300M)	28.3	28.2	28.3	33.7	32.7	32.7
mT0 _{base} (580M)	28.6	28.3	28.7	35.6	35.3	35.6
mT0 _{large} (1.2B)	29.5	29.5	30.1	35.7	35.8	35.9
mT0 _{xl} (3.7B)	32.0	30.9	31.2	49.2	50.0	50.3
mT0 _{xxl} (13B)	33.0	33.3	34.4	52.9	51.5	52.3
LLaMA2 (7B)	36.7	37.0	37.2	40.0	39.0	37.7
LLaMA2-chat (7B)	36.9	36.9	37.4	40.5	41.1	40.3
LLaMA2 (13B)	39.4	39.7	39.9	46.9	46.9	46.6
LLaMA2-chat (13B)	38.2	38.4	38.9	47.2	49.2	49.2
Bactrian-X _{LLaMA} (7B)	33.2	33.8	33.8	38.1	38.5	38.7
Bactrian-X _{LLaMA} (13B)	33.0	35.1	34.9	38.7	38.5	38.7
IndoBART (132M)	41.9	41.1	41.7	32.1	32.0	32.2
IndoGPT (117M)	42.6	42.1	42.7	33.7	34.1	35.0
Merak (7B)	40.2	40.6	42.6	51.5	52.5	52.5
SeaLLM (7B)	39.1	39.7	41.1	51.7	52.4	52.5
SEA-LION (7B)	38.8	38.7	39.6	33.4	32.8	33.0
Komodo (7B)	45.1	45.4	46.1	37.6	35.1	36.1
GPT-3.5 (NA)	–	–	–	58.4	60.2	61.7
GPT-4 (NA)	–	–	–	68.8	71.5	75.8

Table 2: Zero-shot accuracy across various models and settings. “MCQ” refers to the multiple-choice question method, and l denotes the location as additional context. The bold numbers highlight the highest score within each model group.

ranges from 19 to 33%. This highlights the presence of cultural biases and a lack of inclusivity in model reasoning abilities, likely stemming from the distribution of training data. The proximity of West Java to Jakarta (Indonesia’s capital) and Bali’s global status as a tourism destination may contribute to the abundance of textual data on these two cultures.

We also note a consistent disparity between non-province and province-specific contexts across all models, with models generally finding non-province contexts easier to comprehend. On average, this gap ranges from 12 to 13 points for the three models, highlighting the challenge posed by province-specific content and emphasizing the significant influence of location context on the reasoning ability of LLMs.

Results by topic Table 4 shows the accuracy of the top 3 performing models across topics. Similar to Table 3, the models perform better in province-specific context for all topics, with death customs

being an exception. For province-specific contexts, GPT-4 excels in themes of wedding, death, and arts while for non-specific contexts, GPT-4 achieves accuracy more than 90.0 for family relationship, religious holidays, and farm and fishery.

Does language affect model performance? We automatically translated IndoCulture to English using the Google Translate API⁵ and used the English prompt in Figure 3 to evaluate the models. All model performances in English text dropped except for LLaMA-2 and Merak. This could be attributed to two reasons. First, LLaMA-2 is an English-centric model, and Merak is pretrained from LLaMA-2. Second, the performance drop in other models could be caused by translation errors. We further investigated this with 100 random samples and found that 81 samples had acceptable translations. We observed translation errors such as pronoun mismatches, inaccurate proverb translations, and inaccurate translations of local terms,

⁵Accessed in March 2024.

Province	Merak		GPT-3.5		GPT-4	
	-PS	PS	-PS	PS	-PS	PS
Aceh	59.7	53.4	79.2	65.5	93.1	73.6
North Sumatra	58.3	46.9	63.9	57.2	75.0	73.2
West Sumatra	50.0	41.3	63.2	48.4	85.5	63.7
West Java	65.3	58.8	84.2	71.8	92.6	81.7
Central Java	58.8	47.1	67.6	52.9	82.4	72.9
East Java	57.4	37.6	72.2	46.5	87.0	63.4
Bali	78.9	65.6	87.7	81.7	93.0	89.4
NTT	64.3	52.0	57.1	49.3	85.7	68.0
South Borneo	65.7	46.4	68.6	53.6	77.1	67.4
South Sulawesi	53.3	47.9	66.7	55.8	80.0	70.6
Papua	76.7	55.2	76.7	62.8	90.0	71.3

Table 3: Top-3 model accuracy by province. "PS" indicates instances containing province-specific contexts, while "-PS" indicates otherwise. The green and red cells indicate the top three and bottom three scores, respectively.

Province	Merak		GPT-3.5		GPT-4	
	-PS	PS	-PS	PS	-PS	PS
Food	56.9	51.0	65.9	62.1	79.3	63.5
Wedding	66.7	64.3	77.6	56.0	92.8	78.6
Family relationship	65.5	54.5	72.5	53.9	93.1	72.7
Pregnancy and kids	67.9	42.9	69.2	50.6	82.1	72.7
Death	38.5	55.2	60.9	62.5	76.9	82.5
Religious holidays	68.5	48.8	79.3	68.8	94.4	64.6
Agriculture	70.5	52.3	71.4	62.1	88.5	76.1
Farm and fishery	77.8	51.0	77.8	51.9	94.4	75.8
Art	58.7	50.2	85.2	61.1	78.3	77.3
Traditional game	60.0	50.2	80.3	59.8	88.0	66.9
Daily activities	55.1	39.6	66.0	64.8	87.8	63.0
Socio-religious	57.1	44.3	79.6	61.1	85.7	64.6

Table 4: Top-3 model accuracy by topic. "PS" indicates instances containing province-specific contexts, while "-PS" indicates otherwise. The green and red cells indicate the top three and bottom three scores, respectively.

such as “*pupuik*” translated as “fertilizer”.⁶ To better understand the cultural gap in language models, we followed the approach of Liu et al. (2023a) to manually correct the translations and reevaluate the models. We found that GPT-4’s performance over the 100 random samples was 77.0 for the original Indonesian text, 68.0 for the English machine-translated text, and 72.0 for the English translation fixed by humans.

Results by fine-grained culture elements We tasked two expert workers with annotating 200 random samples from IndoCulture based on six cultural elements, as derived from Axtell and Forn-

⁶*pupuik* is a traditional musical instrument in West Sumatra. It is worth noting that the word *pupuik* closely resembles the word *pupuk* in Indonesian, which means fertilizer.




Figure 4: The accuracy of Indonesian and English translations across BLOOMZ (7B), mT0_{xxl} (13B), LLaMA2-chat (13B), Merak (7B), GPT-3.5, and GPT-4.

wald (1998); Williams (2014).^{7,8} While these elements may not encompass every cultural aspect, we contend that they cover the most prominent or pivotal elements, including: (1) *symbols* (material or non-material objects representing meaning), (2) *artifacts* (material or non-material objects produced by society), (3) *values and beliefs* (principles, ideas, and concepts assumed to be ideal and correct in society), (4) *norms* (rules guiding values and beliefs), (5) *language*, (6) *rituals* (established procedures and ceremonies), and (7) *other*, for examples that do not fit into any of the defined elements. This annotation is a multi-label task, and the average Kappa score across the cultural elements is 0.56, with each ranging from 0.4 to 0.75. These scores indicate moderate to substantial agreement.

Table 5 displays the distribution of each cultural element in our dataset, along with the performance breakdown across Merak, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4. Among the 200 random samples, we observe that 42.5% of our data contains *artifacts*, 37.5% *norms*, and 30% *rituals*. Only 4% of the data pertains to *symbols*, while 7.5% belongs to the *other* category. Merak exhibits lower performance in *norms*, with a 24% decrease compared to *values and beliefs*. Conversely, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 perform better in *norms*, with the performance gap in *values and beliefs* being only -4 points. Additionally, *language* poses a challenge in Merak, with only 38% accu-

⁷<https://www.languageeducatorsassemble.com/elements-of-culture>

⁸<https://pressbooks.howardcc.edu/soci101/chapter/3-2-the-elements-of-culture/>

Cultural element (%)	Merak	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
Symbols (4)	50.0	58.9	70.8
Artefacts (42.5)	55.3	59.1	67.8
Values and Beliefs (10.5)	61.9	57.5	69.8
Norms (37.5)	38.7	63.2	73.6
Language (19.5)	38.5	60.2	72.0
Ritual (30)	53.3	60.0	70.7
Other (7.5)	66.7	58.9	69.2

Table 5: Accuracy comparison of Merak, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 across 200 random samples, categorized by cultural elements. The numerical value following each cultural element indicates its proportion within the samples.




Figure 5: Performance comparison between Merak (7B) and GPT-4 based on text generation output. “Answer (T)” indicates that the generated answer is true, while “Exp(F)” denotes that the answer explanation is false.

accuracy, while GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 achieve 60% and 72% accuracy, respectively.

Can the model provide a reasonable explanation to support the answer? We conduct a manual investigation of the text generation output for Merak (7B) and GPT-4 across 200 random samples. This involves manually examining the generated answer along with its explanation. To obtain explanation, we modify the Indonesian prompt in Figure 3 by adding the string *Jelaskan jawabanmu!* (“Explain your answer!”). Our annotation process is binary, categorizing explanations as either True or False. We label an explanation as False if it is absent, contains hallucinations, or provides inaccurate information.⁹

As anticipated, there is a significant drop in accuracy for Merak (7B) from 52.5% (as shown in

⁹We use Google search engine to verify the correctness of the explanation.

Table 2) to 29.5%. This discrepancy underscores the limitations of relying solely on token probability to assess the true capability of a language model. Interestingly, only 4.5% of the samples are answered correctly with the appropriate explanation by Merak, despite it being the top performer among the open-source models. GPT-4 achieves an accuracy of 69.5%, which is 5 points lower than indicated in Table 2, possibly due to a smaller sample size and biases in regular expressions. However, GPT-4 provides better explanations, with 51.5% of the samples correctly answered along with the appropriate explanation.

5 Discussion

The recent study (Wang et al., 2024) has demonstrated that evaluating language models using token probability in multiple-choice question types does not align well with the generated text. This discrepancy is reported to be more pronounced in models fine-tuned on conversational or safety data. In response to this issue, we have conducted a manual evaluation on 200 random samples (in Section 4.3) and found that the performance in generated texts, especially for Merak, the best open-source language model, is deteriorating. However, this issue is less apparent in GPT-4, as the initial evaluation is based on regular expressions. Conducting manual evaluation on all data and models is expensive, and we plan to address this issue in future works. This work primarily focuses on introducing a novel dataset meticulously constructed for evaluating cultural commonsense reasoning within the Indonesian context, including preliminary evaluation results based on the standard methods used in previous studies (OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Koto et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b; Koto et al., 2024).

6 Conclusion

IndoCulture is a cultural commonsense reasoning dataset encompassing the diversity of Indonesian cultures, spanning from Aceh province in the west to Papua province in the east. Through collaboration with local individuals across eleven provinces and rigorous quality control measures, we introduce IndoCulture for the purpose of evaluating language models. Our findings reveal that large language models, whether Indonesian-centric or multilingual, demonstrate a limited understanding of Indonesian culture. Notably, incorporating lo-

cation as additional context significantly enhances model performance, particularly in GPT-3.5 and GPT-4.

Limitations

IndoCulture is specifically designed to explore the influence of geographical location on cultural commonsense reasoning, with a focus on the present time. It does not consider temporal aspects. Our dataset was created in the year 2023, recognizing that cultures may evolve over time, as discussed by Mesoudi (2016).

Furthermore, as demonstrated in Section 4.3, a significant portion of IndoCulture comprises cultural elements such as artifacts, norms, and rituals. Symbols, values and beliefs, and language represent smaller proportions, ranging from 4% to 20%. We encourage future research to further explore these cultural elements and to expand the geographical coverage beyond the eleven provinces studied in this paper.

Ethical Considerations

IndoCulture is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.¹⁰ Our data is intended for academic research and non-commercial purposes. Workers are compensated above the minimum monthly salary in Indonesia and are fully aware that the data will be released to the public. It is important to note that no private or sensitive information of the workers is included in IndoCulture.

References

- Alham Fikri Aji, Genta Indra Winata, Fajri Koto, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Ade Romadhony, Rahmad Mahendra, Kemal Kurniawan, David Moeljadi, Radityo Eko Prasajo, Timothy Baldwin, Jey Han Lau, and Sebastian Ruder. 2022. **One country, 700+ languages: NLP challenges for underrepresented languages and dialects in Indonesia**. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7226–7249, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roger E Axtell and Mike Fornwald. 1998. *Gestures: The do's and taboos of body language around the world*. Wiley.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2020a. **PIQA: reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language**. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 7432–7439. AAAI Press.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020b. **PIQA: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language**. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 7432–7439.
- Samuel Cahyawijaya, Genta Indra Winata, Bryan Wilie, Karissa Vincentio, Xiaohong Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Sebastian Ruder, Zhi Yuan Lim, Syafri Bahar, Masayu Khodra, et al. 2021. **Indonlg: Benchmark and resources for evaluating indonesian natural language generation**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8875–8898.
- Joe Davison, Joshua Feldman, and Alexander Rush. 2019. **Commonsense knowledge mining from pretrained models**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 1173–1178, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi Fung, Tuhin Chakrabarty, Hao Guo, Owen Rambow, Smaranda Muresan, and Heng Ji. 2023. **NORMSAGE: Multi-lingual multi-cultural norm discovery from conversations on-the-fly**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15217–15230, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi Fung, Ruining Zhao, Jae Doo, Chenkai Sun, and Heng Ji. 2024. **Massively multi-cultural knowl-**

¹⁰<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

- edge acquisition & ILM benchmarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09369*.
- Anthony Giddens and Philip W Sutton. 2021. *Essential concepts in sociology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Heather Lent, Miryam de Lhoneux, Mostafa Abdou, Stephanie Brandl, Emanuele Bugliarello, Laura Cabello Piqueras, Ilias Chalkidis, Ruixiang Cui, Constanza Fierro, Katerina Margatina, Phillip Rust, and Anders Søgaard. 2022. [Challenges and strategies in cross-cultural NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6997–7013, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Muhammad Ichsan. 2023. Merak-7b: The ILM for bahasa indonesia. *Hugging Face Repository*.
- 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. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Fajri Koto, Nurul Aisyah, Haonan Li, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023. Large language models only pass primary school exams in Indonesia: A comprehensive test on IndoMMLU. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fajri Koto, Timothy Baldwin, and Jey Han Lau. 2022. [Cloze evaluation for deeper understanding of commonsense stories in Indonesian](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Commonsense Representation and Reasoning (CSRR 2022)*, pages 8–16, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fajri Koto, Haonan Li, Sara Shatnawi, Jad Doughman, Abdelrahman Boda Sadallah, Aisha Alraeesi, Khalid Almubarak, Zaid Alyafeai, Neha Sengupta, Shady Shehata, et al. 2024. ArabicMMLU: Assessing massive multitask language understanding in Arabic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12840*.
- Hector Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. 2012. The winograd schema challenge. In *Thirteenth international conference on the principles of knowledge representation and reasoning*.
- Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, Minghao Wu, Alham Fikri Aji, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023a. Bactrian-X: A multilingual replicable instruction-following model with low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15011*.
- Haonan Li, Yixuan Zhang, Fajri Koto, Yifei Yang, Hai Zhao, Yeyun Gong, Nan Duan, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023b. CMMLU: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in chinese. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09212*.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Seyeon Lee, Rahul Khanna, and Xiang Ren. 2020. [Birds have four legs?! NumerSense: Probing Numerical Commonsense Knowledge of Pre-Trained Language Models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6862–6868, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, et al. 2021. Few-shot learning with multilingual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10668*.
- Chen Cecilia Liu, Fajri Koto, Timothy Baldwin, and Iryna Gurevych. 2023a. Are multilingual llms culturally-diverse reasoners? an investigation into multicultural proverbs and sayings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08591*.
- Zhengzhong Liu, Aurick Qiao, Willie Neiswanger, Hongyi Wang, Bowen Tan, Tianhua Tao, Junbo Li, Yuqi Wang, Suqi Sun, Omkar Pangarkar, et al. 2023b. Llm360: Towards fully transparent open-source llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06550*.
- J Macionis John. *Sociology 14th edition./john j. Macionis–Boston: Pearson.–2012*.
- Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Yiming Yang, and Graham Neubig. 2022. [Language models of code are few-shot commonsense learners](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1384–1403, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Rahmad Mahendra, Alham Fikri Aji, Samuel Louvan, Fahrurrozi Rahman, and Clara Vania. 2021. [IndoNLI: A natural language inference dataset for Indonesian](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10511–10527, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Mesoudi. 2016. Cultural evolution: Integrating psychology, evolution and culture. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 7:17–22.
- Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Nathanael Chambers, Xiaodong He, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, Lucy Vanderwende, Pushmeet Kohli, and James Allen. 2016. [A corpus and cloze evaluation for deeper understanding of commonsense stories](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 839–849, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, et al. 2022. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01786*.
- Tuan-Phong Nguyen, Simon Razniewski, Aparna Varde, and Gerhard Weikum. 2023a. Extracting cultural commonsense knowledge at scale. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 1907–1917.
- Xuan-Phi Nguyen, Wenxuan Zhang, Xin Li, Mahani Aljunied, Qingyu Tan, Liying Cheng, Guanzheng Chen, Yue Deng, Sen Yang, Chaoqun Liu, et al. 2023b. [Seallms—large language models for southeast asia](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00738*.
- OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Louis Owen, Vishesh Tripathi, Abhay Kumar, and Biddwan Ahmed. 2024. [Komodo: A linguistic expedition into indonesia’s regional languages](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09362*.
- Edoardo Maria Ponti, Goran Glavaš, Olga Majewska, Qianchu Liu, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. 2020. [XCOPA: A multilingual dataset for causal commonsense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2362–2376, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hadi Syah Putra, Rahmad Mahendra, and Fariz Darari. 2019. [Budayakb: Extraction of cultural heritage entities from heterogeneous formats](#). In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Web Intelligence, Mining and Semantics, WIMS 2019, Seoul, Republic of Korea, June 26-28, 2019*, pages 6:1–6:9. ACM.
- Rifki Afina Putri, Faiz Ghifari Haznitrama, Dea Adhista, and Alice Oh. 2024. Can llm generate culturally relevant commonsense qa data? case study in indonesian and sundanese. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2402.
- Lianhui Qin, Aditya Gupta, Shyam Upadhyay, Luheng He, Yejin Choi, and Manaal Faruqui. 2021. [TIMEDIAL: Temporal commonsense reasoning in dialog](#). 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)*, pages 7066–7076, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melissa Roemmele, Cosmin Adrian Bejan, and Andrew S Gordon. 2011. Choice of plausible alternatives: An evaluation of commonsense causal reasoning. In *2011 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [Winogrande: An adversarial Winograd schema challenge at scale](#). *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Maarten Sap, Hannah Rashkin, Derek Chen, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Social IQa](#):

- Commonsense reasoning about social interactions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4463–4473, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Neha Sengupta, Sunil Kumar Sahu, Bokang Jia, Satheesh Katipomu, Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Samta Kamboj, Onkar Pandit, Rahul Pal, et al. 2023. Jais and jais-chat: Arabic-centric foundation and instruction-tuned open generative large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16149*.
- Vered Shwartz. 2022. **Good night at 4 pm?! time expressions in different cultures**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2842–2853, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- AI Singapore. 2023. Sea-lion (southeast asian languages in one network): A family of large language models for southeast asia. <https://github.com/aisingapore/sealion>.
- Jenny Thomas. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2):91–112.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Xinpeng Wang, Bolei Ma, Chengzhi Hu, Leon Weber-Genzel, Paul Röttger, Frauke Kreuter, Dirk Hovy, and Barbara Plank. 2024. " my answer is c": First-token probabilities do not match text answers in instruction-tuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14499*.
- Haryo Akbarianto Wibowo, Erland Hilman Fuadi, Made Nindyatama Nityasya, Radityo Eko Prasoj, and Alham Fikri Aji. 2023. Copal-id: Indonesian language reasoning with local culture and nuances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01012*.
- Raymond Williams. 2014. *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford university press.
- Genta Indra Winata, Alham Fikri Aji, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Rahmad Mahendra, Fajri Koto, Ade Romadhony, Kemal Kurniawan, David Moeljadi, Radityo Eko Prasoj, Pascale Fung, Timothy Baldwin, Jey Han Lau, Rico Sennrich, and Sebastian Ruder. 2023. **NusaX: Multilingual parallel sentiment dataset for 10 Indonesian local languages**. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 815–834, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. 2020. **Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Da Yin, Hritik Bansal, Masoud Monajatipoor, Lillian Harold Li, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2022. **GeoMLAMA: Geo-diverse commonsense probing on multilingual pre-trained language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2039–2055, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Habib Zerbaliyev. 2017. Multiculturalism in globalization era: History and challenge for indonesia. *Journal of Social Studies (JSS)*, 13(1):1–16.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. **HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence?** In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Caleb Ziems, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yi-Chia Wang, Alon Halevy, and Diyi Yang. 2023. **NormBank: A knowledge bank of situational social norms**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of*

the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 7756–7776, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Model Artifacts

Models (#parameters)	Source
BLOOMZ (560M)	bigscience/bloomz-560m
BLOOMZ (1.1B)	bigscience/bloomz-1b1
BLOOMZ (1.7B)	bigscience/bloomz-1b7
BLOOMZ (3B)	bigscience/bloomz-3b
BLOOMZ (7.1B)	bigscience/bloomz-7b1
mT0 _{small} (300M)	bigscience/mt0-small
mT0 _{base} (580M)	bigscience/mt0-base
mT0 _{large} (1.2B)	bigscience/mt0-large
mT0 _{xl} (3.7B)	bigscience/mt0-xl
mT0 _{xxl} (13B)	bigscience/mt0-xxl
LLamA2 (7B)	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b
LLamA2-chat (7B)	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat
LLamA2 (13B)	meta-llama/Llama-2-13b
LLamA2-chat (13B)	meta-llama/Llama-2-13b-chat
Bactrian-X _{LLaMa} (7B)	MBZUAI/bactrian-x-llama-7b-merged
Bactrian-X _{LLaMa} (13B)	MBZUAI/bactrian-x-llama-13b-merged
IndoBART (132M)	indobenchmark/indobart-v2
IndoGPT (117M)	indobenchmark/indogpt
Merak (7B)	Ichsan2895/Merak-7B-v5-PROTOTYPE1
SeaLLM (7B)	SeaLLMs/SeaLLM-7B-v2
SEA-LION (7B)	aisingapore/sea-lion-7b
Komodo (7B)	Yellow-AI-NLP/komodo-7b-base

Table 6: With the exception of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, all the models used in this study were sourced from Huggingface (Wolf et al., 2020).