### Recap

- **Pretraining (BERT):**
  - Train a big model to fill in masked-out words, then adapt it to other tasks. Led to big gains in question answering and NLI performance. BART/T5, GPT-3, etc. push this further.
- **Question answering (QA):**
  - “What was Marie Curie the first female recipient of?”
    -> “The Nobel Prize” (find this span in a document containing the answer)
- **Natural language inference (NLI):**
  - "But I thought you'd sworn off coffee." *contradicts* "I thought that you vowed to drink more coffee."

### Model Performance

- If models can be fine-tuned on large datasets and perform very well on the held-out test dataset, is the problem solved?
- What can go wrong?

### Announcements

- A5 due today
- Final project released today (more details at the end of today's lecture)
If a model does well on train but poorly on test data, it doesn’t generalize. A model can do well on its test data and still fail to generalize out of distribution — arguably an even more important notion.

Many notions of generalization. Example: POS tagging.

A model can do well on its test data and still fail to generalize out of distribution.

• If a model does well on train but poorly on test data, it doesn’t generalize.
• A model can do well on its test data and still fail to generalize out of distribution — arguably an even more important notion.
• Many notions of generalization. Example: POS tagging.

Just doing well on a single test set is not that useful.

We want POS taggers, QA systems, and more that can generalize to new settings so we can deploy them in practice.

Sometimes, you can get very good test performance but the model generalizes very poorly. How does this happen?

Application Artifacts, Reasoning Shortcuts: QA.
Annotation Artifacts

- Some datasets might be easy because of how they’re constructed, especially in QA and NLI
  
  What becomes of Macbeth?
  
  What does Macduff do to Macbeth?
  
  What violent act does Macduff perform upon Macbeth?

- All questions have the same answer. But some are more easily guessable

Reminder: QA with BERT

QA: Answer Type Heuristics

What degree did Martin Luther receive on October 19, 1512?

On October 19, 1512, Luther was awarded his doctorate of theology and, on October 21, 1512, was received into the senate of the theological faculty of the University of Wittenberg. He spent the rest of his career in this position at the University of Wittenberg.

- What should the model be doing? Corresponding Martin Luther with Luther, matching October 19, 1512 between question and passage

QA: Answer Type Heuristics

What degree did Martin Luther receive?

On October 19, 1512, Luther was awarded his doctorate of theology and, on October 21, 1512, was received into the senate of the theological faculty of the University of Wittenberg. He spent the rest of his career in this position at the University of Wittenberg.

- Only one possible degree here! Model only needs to see “what degree” and will not learn to use the rest of the context!
On October 19, 1512, Luther was awarded his doctorate of theology and, on October 21, 1512, was received into the senate of the theological faculty of the University of Wittenberg. He spent the rest of his career in this position at the University of Wittenberg.

Where ____?

Who ____?

When ____?

What will happen if we train on this data?

- Will loss decrease?
- How will the model learn to “behave”?

Annotation Artifacts, Reasoning Shortcuts: NLI

Reminder: NLI with BERT

entailed/neutral/contradiction

Devlin et al. (2019)
NLI: Hypothesis-only Baselines

Premise: A woman on a deck is selling bamboo sticks.
Hypothesis: A man is selling bamboo sticks
Hypothesis: A man is juggling flaming chainsaws
Hypothesis: Eighteen flying monkeys are in outer space

- Not all of these things have the same likelihood of being true a priori
- What might the model learn to do in this case?

NLI: Hypothesis-only Baselines

Premise: A woman selling bamboo sticks talking to two men on a loading dock.
Entailment: There are at least three people on a loading dock.
Neutral: A woman is selling bamboo sticks to help provide for her family.
Contradiction: A woman is not taking money for any of her sticks.

- What’s different about this neutral sentence?
  - To create neutral sentences: annotators add information
- What’s different about this contradictory sentence?
  - To create contradictions: annotators add negation
- These are not broadly representative of what can happen in other settings. There is no “natural” distribution of NLI, but this is still very restrictive

NLI: Hypothesis-only Baselines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premise</th>
<th>A woman selling bamboo sticks talking to two men on a loading dock.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entailment</td>
<td>There are at least three people on a loading dock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>A woman is selling bamboo sticks to help provide for her family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>A woman is not taking money for any of her sticks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Models can detect new information or negation easily
- Models can do very well without looking at the premise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance of models that only look at the hypothesis: ~70% on 3-class SNLI dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyp-only model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNLI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNLI-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gururangan et al. (2018); Poliak et al. (2018)

NLI: Heuristics (HANS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heuristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical overlap</td>
<td>Assume that a premise entails all hypotheses constructed from words in the premise</td>
<td>The doctor was paid by the actor. (&lt;br&gt;Wrong) The doctor paid the actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequence</td>
<td>Assume that a premise entails all of its contiguous subsequences.</td>
<td>The doctor near the actor danced. (&lt;br&gt;Wrong) The actor danced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>Assume that a premise entails all complete subtrees in its parse tree.</td>
<td>If the artist slept, the actor ran. (&lt;br&gt;Wrong) The artist slept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Word overlap supersedes actual reasoning in these cases
- They create a test set (HANS) consisting of cases where heuristics like word overlap are misleading. Very low performance

McCoy et al. (2019)
Evidence of Spurious Correlations: Contrast Sets

- How do we control for annotation artifacts? Things like “premises and hypotheses overlap too much” aren’t easy to see!

- For any particular effect like lexical overlap, we could try to annotate data that “breaks” that effect

- Issue: breaking one correlation may just result in another one surfacing. How do we “break” them all at the same time?

- Solution: construct new examples through minimal edits that change the label.

Gardner et al. (2020)

Evidence of Spurious Correlations: Contrast Sets

Hardly one to be faulted for his ambition or his vision, it is genuinely unexpected, then, to see all Park’s effort add up to so very little. . . . The premise is promising, gags are copious and offbeat humour abounds but it all fails miserably to create any meaningful connection with the audience. 

(Label: Negative)

- By minimally editing an example, we control for pretty much all of the possible shortcuts that apply to the original.

- E.g., [summary starts with “Hardly” -> negative] is a pattern that could not hold anymore

Gardner et al. (2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># Examples</th>
<th># Sets</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Original Test</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NLVR2</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>LXMERT</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDb</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>BERT</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATRES</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>CogCompTime2.0</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD English</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Biaffine + ELMo</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTRUM</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>RoBERTa</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROP</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>MTMSN</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solutions

Gardner et al. (2020)
**Broad Solutions**

- Most solutions involve changing what data is trained on
  - Subset of data
  - Soft subset (i.e., reweight the existing examples)
  - Superset: add adversarially-constructed data, contrast sets, etc.
- For subsets: what do we train on?
  - Don’t train on stuff that allows you to cheat
  - Train on examples that teach the real task rather than shortcuts

**Dataset Cartography**

- What happens with each particular example during training?
  - Spurious correlations are *easy to learn*: a model should learn these early and always get them right
  - Imagine a very challenging example
    - Model prediction may change a lot as it learns this example, may be variable in its predictions
  - Imagine a mislabeled example
    - Probably just always wrong unless it gets overfit

**Data Maps**

- Confidence: mean probability of correct label
- Variability: standard deviation in probability of the correct label
- Ambiguous examples: possible learnable (model knows it sometimes but not other times), but hard!
Debiasing

- Other ways to identify easy examples other than data maps
- Train some kind of a weak model and discount examples that it fits easily

\[ \mathcal{L}(\theta_d) = -(1 - p_b^{(i,c)}) y^{(i)} \cdot \log p_d \]

probability under a copy of the model trained for a few epochs on a small subset of data (bad model)

Debiasing

- On the challenging HANS test set for NLI, this debiasing improves performance substantially
- In-domain MNLI performance goes down

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MNLI (Acc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dev</td>
<td>HANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-base</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reweighting_{known-bias}</td>
<td>83.5(^{+})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reweighting_{self-debias}</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reweighting_{\heartsuit self-debias}</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debiasing

- Other work has explored similar approaches using a known bias model

\[ \hat{p}_i = \text{softmax}(\log(p_i) + \log(b_i)) \]

probabilities from learned bias model — like the weak model from Utama et al. (prev. slides), but you define its structure

- Ensembles the weak model with the model you actually learn.
- Your actual model learns the residuals of the weak model: the difference between the weak model's output distribution and the target distribution.
- This lets it avoid learning the weak model's biases!

Core Principles

- By reweighting data or changing the training paradigm, you can learn a model that generalizes better

- Most gains will show up out-of-domain. Very hard to get substantial improvements on the same dataset, unless you consider small subsets of examples (e.g., the toughest 1% of examples by some measure)
Final Project
(see spec and GitHub)