

# Extending Multilingual BERT to Low-Resource Languages

Zihan Wang\*

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801, USA  
zihanw2@illinois.edu

Stephen Mayhew†

Duolingo  
Pittsburgh, PA, 15206, USA  
stephen@duolingo.com

Karthikeyan K \*

Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh 208016, India  
kkarthi@cse.iitk.ac.in

Dan Roth

University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA  
danroth@seas.upenn.edu

## Abstract

Multilingual BERT (M-BERT) has been a huge success in both supervised and zero-shot cross-lingual transfer learning. However, this success has focused only on the top 104 languages in Wikipedia that it was trained on. In this paper, we propose a simple but effective approach to *extend* M-BERT (E-MBERT) so that it can benefit any new language, and show that our approach benefits languages that are already in M-BERT as well. We perform an extensive set of experiments with Named Entity Recognition (NER) on 27 languages, only 16 of which are in M-BERT, and show an average increase of about 6%  $F_1$  on languages that are already in M-BERT and 23%  $F_1$  increase on new languages.

## 1 Introduction

Recent works (Wu and Dredze, 2019; Karthikeyan et al., 2020) have shown the zero-shot cross-lingual ability of M-BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) on various semantic and syntactic tasks – just fine-tuning on English data allows the model to perform well on other languages. Cross-lingual learning is imperative for low-resource languages (LRL), such as Somali and Uyghur, as obtaining supervised training data in these languages is particularly hard. However, M-BERT is not pre-trained with these languages, thus limiting its performance on them. Languages like Oromo, Hausa, Amharic and Akan are spoken by more than 20 million people, yet M-BERT does not cover these languages. Indeed, there are about 4000<sup>1</sup> languages written by humans,

<sup>\*</sup>Equal Contribution; most of this work was done while the author interned at the University of Pennsylvania.

<sup>†</sup>This work was done while the author was a student at the University of Pennsylvania.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.ethnologue.com/enterprise-faq/how-many-languages-world-are-unwritten-0>

Improvements by extending




Figure 1: **Comparison between M-BERT and our proposed approach E-MBERT:** We report averaged zero-shot NER performance on 16 languages that are already *in* M-BERT and 11 new language that are *out* of M-BERT. We also report average of M-BERT’s performance with supervised NER data as an upper-bound.

of which M-BERT covers only the top 104 languages (less than 3%).

One of the approaches to use the idea of M-BERT for languages that are not already present is to train a new M-BERT from scratch. However, this is extremely time-consuming and expensive: training BERT-base itself takes about four days with four cloud TPUs (Devlin et al., 2019), so training M-BERT should take even more time<sup>2</sup>. Alternatively, we can train Bilingual BERT (B-BERT) (Karthikeyan et al., 2020), which is more efficient than training an M-BERT. However, one major disadvantage of B-BERT is that we can not use supervised data from multiple languages, even if it is available.

To accommodate a language that is not in M-BERT, we propose an efficient approach Extend that adapts M-BERT to the language. Extend works by enlarging the vocabulary of M-BERT to accommodate the new language and then continue pre-training on this language. Our approach consumes less than 7 hours to train with a single cloud TPU.

<sup>2</sup>The exact training time was not reported.

We performed comprehensive experiments on NER task with 27 languages of which 11 languages are not present in M-BERT. From Figure 1 we can see that our approach performs significantly better than M-BERT when the target language is out of the 104 languages in M-BERT. Even for high-resource languages that are already in M-BERT, our approach is still superior.

The key contributions of the work are (i) We propose a simple yet novel approach to add a new language to M-BERT (ii) We show that our approach improves over M-BERT for both languages that are in M-BERT and out of M-BERT (iii) We show that, in most cases, our approach is superior to training B-BERT from scratch. Our results are reproducible and we will release both the models and code.

## 2 Related works

Cross-lingual learning has been a rising interest in NLP. For example, BiCCA (Faruqui and Dyer, 2014), LASER (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019) and XLM (Conneau and Lample, 2019). Although these models have been successful, they need some form of cross-lingual supervision such as a bilingual dictionary or parallel corpus, which is particularly challenging to obtain for low-resource languages. Our work differ from above as we do not require such supervision. While other approaches like MUSE (Lample et al., 2018) and VecMap (Artetxe et al., 2018) can work without any cross-lingual supervision, M-BERT already often outperforms these approaches (Karthikeyan et al., 2020).

Schuster et al. (2019) has a setting of continuing training similar to ours. However, their approach focus more on comparing between whether B-BERT (JointPair) learns cross-lingual features from overlapping word-pieces, while ours focus more on improving M-BERT on target languages, and addresses the problem of missing word-pieces. We show that our Extend method works well on M-BERT, and is better than B-BERT in several languages, whereas their method (MonoTrans) has a similar performance as B-BERT. This together implies that our Extend method benefits from the multilinguality of the base model (M-BERT vs BERT).

## 3 Background

### 3.1 Multilingual BERT (M-BERT)

M-BERT is a bi-directional transformer language model pre-trained with Wikipedia text of top 104 languages – languages with most articles in Wikipedia. M-BERT uses the same pre-training objective as BERT – masked language model and next sentence prediction objectives (Devlin et al., 2019). Despite not being trained with any specific cross-lingual objective or aligned data, M-BERT is surprisingly cross-lingual. For cross-lingual transfer, M-BERT is fine-tuned on supervised data in high-resource languages like English and tested on the target language.

### 3.2 Bilingual BERT (B-BERT)

B-BERT is trained in the same way as M-BERT except that it contains only two languages – English and the target language. Recent works have shown the cross-lingual effectiveness of M-BERT (Pires et al., 2019; Wu and Dredze, 2019), and B-BERT (Karthikeyan et al., 2020) on NER and other tasks.

## 4 Our Method: Extend

In this section, we discuss our training protocol Extend which works by extending the vocabulary, encoders and decoders to accommodate the target language and then continue pre-training on this language.

Let the size of M-BERT’s vocabulary be  $V_{mbert}$  and the embedding dimension be  $d$ . We first create the vocabulary with the monolingual data in the target language following the same procedure as BERT, and filter out all words that appear in M-BERT’s vocabulary. Let the size of this new vocabulary be  $V_{new}$ . Throughout the paper, we set  $V_{new} = 30000$ . Then, we append this new vocabulary to M-BERT’s vocabulary. We extend the encoder and decoder weights of the M-BERT model so that it can encode and decode the new-vocabulary. That is, we extend the M-BERT’s encoder matrix of size  $V_{mbert} \times d$  with a matrix of size  $V_{new} \times d$ , which is initialized following M-BERT’s procedure, to create an extended encoder of size  $(V_{mbert} + V_{new}) \times d$ ; we do similar extension for decoder. Note that M-BERT uses weight-tying, hence the decoder is the same as the encoder, except it has an additional bias.

We then continue pre-training with the monolingual data of the target language. Note that except

for the newly appended part of encoder and decoder, we initialize all weights with M-BERT’s pre-trained weight. We call the trained model model E-MBERT.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

**Dataset.** Our text corpus and NER dataset are from LORELEI (Strassel and Tracey, 2016). We use the tokenization method from BERT to preprocess text corpuses. For zero-shot cross-lingual NER, we evaluate the performance on the whole annotated set; for supervised learning, since we just want an understanding of an upper-bound, we apply cross validation to estimate the performance: each fold is evaluated by a model trained on the other folds, and the average  $F_1$  is reported.

**NER Model.** We use a standard Bi-LSTM-CRF (Ma and Hovy, 2016; Lample et al., 2016) framework and use AllenNLP (Gardner et al., 2018) as our toolkit. The scores reported in NER is the  $F_1$  score averaged across five runs with different random seeds.

**BERT training.** While extending, we use a batch size of 32 and a learning rate of  $2e-5$ , which BERT suggests for fine-tuning, and we train for 500k iterations. Whereas for B-BERT we use a batch size of 32 and learning rate of  $1e-4$  and train for 2M iterations. We follow BERT setting for all other hyperparameters.

### 5.2 Comparing between E-MBERT and M-BERT

We compare the cross-lingual zero-shot NER performance of M-BERT and E-MBERT. We train only with supervised LORELEI English NER data. We also report the performance of M-BERT with supervision on the target language, which allows us to get a reasonable “upper-bound” on the dataset. From Figure 2, we can see that in almost all languages, E-MBERT outperforms M-BERT irrespective of whether they exist or do not exist in M-BERT.

It is clear that E-MBERT performs better than M-BERT when the language is not present; however, it is intriguing that E-MBERT improves over M-BERT when the language is already present in M-BERT. We attribute this improvement in performance to three reasons

- Increased vocabulary size of target language
  - Since most languages have a significantly

smaller Wikipedia data than English, they have a fewer vocabulary in M-BERT, our approach eliminates this issue. Note that it may not be a good idea to train single M-BERT with larger vocabulary sizes for every language, as this will create a vast vocabulary (a few million).

- E-MBERT is more focused on the target language, as during the last 500k steps, it is optimized to perform well on it.
- Extra monolingual data – More monolingual data in the target language can be beneficial.

Lang	M-BERT	E w/ Lrl	E w/ Wiki
Russian	56.56	55.70	56.64
Thai	22.46	40.99	38.35
Hindi	48.31	62.72	62.77

Table 1: Performance of M-BERT, Extend with LORELEI data and Extend with Wikipedia data.

### 5.3 Extend without extra data

The effectiveness of E-MBERT may be partially explained by the extra monolingual data the model is trained on. To explore the performance of E-MBERT without this extra training data, we Extend with using Wikipedia data, which is used in M-BERT. From Table 1, we can see that even without additional data, E-MBERT’s performance does not degrade.

Lang	B-BERT	Extend
Somali	51.18	<b>53.63</b>
Amharic	38.66	<b>43.70</b>
Uyghur	21.94	<b>42.98</b>
Akan	48.00	<b>49.02</b>
Hausa	<b>26.45</b>	24.37
Wolof	<b>39.92</b>	39.70
Zulu	<b>44.08</b>	39.65
Tigrinya	6.34	<b>7.61</b>
Oromo	8.45	<b>12.28</b>
Kinyarwanda	<b>46.72</b>	44.40
Sinhala	16.93	<b>33.97</b>

Table 2: **Comparison between B-BERT and E-MBERT:** We compare B-BERT vs E-MBERT training protocols. Both the models uses same target language monolingual data. We compare the performances on languages that are not in M-BERT, so that E-MBERT doesn’t make use of M-BERT’s additional Wikipedia data.




Figure 2: **Comparison between M-BERT and E-MBERT:** We compare zero-shot cross-lingual NER performance (F1 score) on M-BERT and Extend using 27 languages. The languages are ordered by amount of text data in LORELEI. We also report the M-BERT’s supervised performance as a benchmark to compare.

#### 5.4 Comparing between E-MBERT and B-BERT

Another way of addressing M-BERT on unseen languages is to completely train a new M-BERT. Restricted by computing resources, it is often only feasible to train on both the source and the target, hence a bilingual BERT (B-BERT). Both E-MBERT with B-BERT uses the same text corpus in the target language; for B-BERT, we subsample English Wikipedia data. We focus only on languages that are not in M-BERT so that E-MBERT will not have an advantage on the target language because of data from Wikipedia. Although the English corpus of B-BERT is different from E-MBERT, the difference is marginal considering its size. Indeed we show that B-BERT and E-MBERT have similar performance on English NER, refer Appendix A and Appendix A.3.

From Table 2, we can see that E-MBERT often outperforms B-BERT. Moreover, B-BERT is trained for 2M steps for convergence, while E-MBERT requires only 500k steps. We believe that this advantage comes for the following reason: E-MBERT makes use of the better multilingual model M-BERT, which potentially contains lan-

guages that help transfer knowledge from English to target, while B-BERT can only leverage English data. For example, in the case of Sinhala and Uyghur, a comparatively high-resource related language like Tamil and Turkish in M-BERT can help the E-MBERT learn Sinhala and Uyghur better.

#### 5.5 Rate of Convergence

In this subsection, we study the convergence rate of E-MBERT and B-BERT. We evaluate these two models on two languages, Hindi (in M-BERT) and Sinhala (not in M-BERT), and report the results in Figure 3. We can see that E-MBERT is able to converge within just 100k steps, while for B-BERT, it takes more than 1M steps to converge. This shows that E-MBERT is much more efficient than B-BERT.

#### 5.6 Performance on non-target languages

Our Extend method results in the base model (M-BERT) to focus on the target language, and naturally this degrades performance on the other languages that are not the target language. We report the performance of Hindi and Sinhala E-MBERT models evaluated on the other languages in Appendix A.2.




Figure 3: Performance of B-BERT and Extend as number of pre-training steps increase

## 6 Conclusions and Future work

In this work, we propose Extend that deals with languages not in M-BERT. Our method has shown great performance across several languages comparing to M-BERT and B-BERT.

While Extend deals with one language each time, it would be an interesting future work to extend on multiple languages at the same time. Furthermore, instead of randomly initialising the embeddings of new vocabulary, we could possibly use alignment models like MUSE or VecMap with bilingual dictionaries to initialize. We could also try to apply our approach to better models like RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) in multilingual case.

## References

Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, and Eneko Agirre. 2018. [A robust self-learning method for fully unsupervised cross-lingual mappings of word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 789–798, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019. [Massively multilingual sentence embeddings for zero-shot cross-lingual transfer and beyond](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 7:597–610.

Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. [Cross-lingual language model pretraining](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, 8-14 December 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 7057–7067.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. [Multilingual bert - r](#).

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association*

*for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Manaal Faruqi and Chris Dyer. 2014. [Improving vector space word representations using multilingual correlation](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 462–471, Gothenburg, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Matt Gardner, Joel Grus, Mark Neumann, Oyvind Tafjord, Pradeep Dasigi, Nelson F. Liu, Matthew Peters, Michael Schmitz, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [AllenNLP: A deep semantic natural language processing platform](#). In *Proceedings of Workshop for NLP Open Source Software (NLP-OSS)*, pages 1–6, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

K Karthikeyan, Zihan Wang, Stephen Mayhew, and Dan Roth. 2020. [Cross-lingual ability of multilingual bert: An empirical study](#).

Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. 2016. [Neural architectures for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 260–270, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Herv Jgou. 2018. [Word translation without parallel data](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.

Xuezhe Ma and Eduard Hovy. 2016. [End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional LSTM-CNNs-CRF](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1064–1074, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. [How multilingual is multilingual BERT?](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4996–5001, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sebastian Schuster, Sonal Gupta, Rushin Shah, and Mike Lewis. 2019. [Cross-lingual transfer learning for multilingual task oriented dialog](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1*

(*Long and Short Papers*), pages 3795–3805, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Stephanie Strassel and Jennifer Tracey. 2016. Lorelei language packs: Data, tools, and resources for technology development in low resource languages. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)*, pages 3273–3280.

Shijie Wu and Mark Dredze. 2019. **Beto, bentz, becas: The surprising cross-lingual effectiveness of BERT**. 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 833–844, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Appendices

### A.1 Performance of E-MBERT on English:

The knowledge of E-MBERT on English (source language) is not affected. From Table 3, we can see that, except for few languages, the English performance of E-MBERT is almost as good as M-BERT’s.

### A.2 Detailed data on all languages

In Table 4, we report the full result on comparing M-BERT and E-MBERT.

We can also see that Extend is not only useful for cross-lingual performance but also for useful for supervised performance (in almost all cases).

We also notice that extending on one language hurts the transferability to other languages.

### A.3 Comparison between B-BERT and E-MBERT:

In Table 5 we reported the performance of Extend and B-BERT on both English as well as target. We can see that English performance of B-BERT is mostly better than Extend. However, in most cases Extend performs better on target language. This indicates that E-MBERT does not have an unfair advantage on English.

EXTEND Language	E M-BERT
OUT OF BERT	
Akan	79.19
Amharic	78.36
Hausa	74.24
Somali	78.6
Wolof	78.11
Zulu	79.32
Uyghur	77.76
Tigrinya	76.21
Oromo	76.06
Kinyarwanda	73.05
Sinhala	73.7
IN BERT	
Arabic	77.67
Bengali	76.2
Mandarin	78.58
Farsi	77.57
Hindi	78.86
Hungarian	78.92
Indonesian	80.93
Russian	80.87
Spanish	81.15
Swahili	77.72
Tamil	77.6
Tagalog	79.56
Thai	78.21
Turkish	79.49
Uzbek	77.19
Yoruba	77.55
<b>M-BERT</b>	<b>79.37</b>

Table 3: **Performance on English:** We report the English NER performance of M-BERT as well as performance E-MBERT.

In BERT								
Model	M-sup	M-zero	E-sup	E-zero	Hindi	Sinhala	Corpus (M)	NER (k)
<b>Arabic</b>	61.14	37.56	61.97	40.83	19.2	16.72	0.19	5.50
<b>Bengali</b>	71.29	46.18	84.44	63.49	17.94	14.01	10.19	11.65
<b>Mandarin</b>	71.76	50.0	73.86	52.30	8.88	24.64	1.66	8.05
<b>Farsi</b>	65.09	47.71	68.27	50.26	22.38	20.44	10.32	4.38
<b>Hindi</b>	72.88	48.31	81.15	62.72	62.72	18.0	1.66	6.22
Hungarian	81.98	68.26	82.08	64.36	24.38	35.74	10.09	5.81
<b>Indonesian</b>	75.67	58.91	80.09	60.73	29.5	37.89	1.75	6.96
Russian	75.60	56.56	76.51	55.70	26.08	36.15	10.07	7.26
<b>Spanish</b>	78.12	64.53	78.14	64.75	37.06	47.32	1.68	3.48
<b>Swahili</b>	74.26	52.39	81.9	57.21	25.46	31.91	0.29	5.61
<b>Tamil</b>	68.55	41.68	77.91	53.42	14.75	12.96	4.47	15.51
Tagalog	85.98	66.50	88.63	62.61	34.73	42.16	0.33	6.98
<b>Thai</b>	73.58	22.46	86.40	40.99	4.03	3.78	4.47	15.51
<b>Turkish</b>	82.55	62.80	87.02	66.19	34.34	39.23	10.39	7.09
<b>Uzbek</b>	79.36	49.56	84.79	59.68	21.84	28.83	4.91	11.82
<b>Yoruba</b>	75.75	37.13	81.34	50.72	19.14	25.04	0.30	3.21
Out of BERT								
<b>Akan</b>	75.87	21.96	79.33	49.02	12.82	35.2	0.52	8.42
<b>Amharic</b>	11.79	3.27	79.09	43.70	3.95	3.9	1.70	5.48
<b>Hausa</b>	67.67	15.36	75.73	24.37	12.58	14.77	0.19	5.64
<b>Somali</b>	74.29	18.35	84.56	53.63	15.84	21.64	0.60	4.16
<b>Wolof</b>	67.10	13.63	70.27	39.70	9.83	26.45	0.09	10.63
<b>Zulu</b>	78.89	15.82	84.50	39.65	12.3	13.72	0.92	11.58
<b>Uyghur</b>	32.64	3.59	79.94	42.98	1.45	1.52	1.97	2.45
<b>Tigrinya</b>	24.75	4.74	79.42	7.61	7.91	5.71	0.01	2.20
<b>Oromo</b>	72.00	9.34	72.78	12.28	6.84	10.11	0.01	2.96
<b>Kinyarwanda</b>	65.85	30.18	74.46	44.40	26.55	32.3	0.06	0.95
<b>Sinhala</b>	18.12	3.43	71.63	33.97	3.39	33.97	0.10	1.02

Table 4: In the order from left to right, column means: M-BERT with supervision, M-BERT zero-shot cross-lingual, E-MBERT with supervision, E-MBERT zero-shot cross-lingual. Then we give performance of Hindi and Sinhala E-MBERT models when evaluated on all the languages. The last two columns are dataset statistics, with number of million lines in the LORELEI corpus and number of thousand lines in LORELEI NER dataset.

Language	English		Target	
	E-MBERT	B-BERT	E-MBERT	B-BERT
Akan	79.19	77.49	49.02	48.00
Amharic	78.36	78.44	43.70	38.66
Hausa	74.24	80.13	24.37	26.45
Somali	78.60	79.17	53.63	51.18
Wolof	78.11	81.01	39.70	39.92
Zulu	79.32	81.82	39.65	44.08
Uyghur	77.76	79.65	42.98	21.94
Tigrinya	76.21	80.35	7.61	6.34
Oromo	76.06	78.13	12.28	8.45
Kinyarwanda	73.05	79.37	44.4	46.72
Sinhal	73.70	80.04	33.97	16.93

Table 5: **Comparison Between B-BERT vs E-MBERT:** We compare the performance of E-MBERT with B-BERT on both English and target language. As a reference, performance of M-BERT is 79.37 on English. This shows that neither B-BERT nor E-MBERT gets unfair advantage from the English part of the model.