Explainable Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing

2021.11.10

Jeonbuk National University

Seung-Hoon Na

Contents

- Introduction
- Explainable AI
- Explainable AI for Natural language processing
  - Deep learning for NLP
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
- Explainable deep learning for NLP
  - Model distillation methods
  - Visualization of neural models for NLP
  - Analytics on pretrained language models
  - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
  - Other approaches for explainable NLP
- Conclusion & Discussion

Explainable AI: Motivation

- Deep learning: make a breakthrough on AI tasks
  - We are entering a new age of AI applications





- Why Explainable AI?
  - But, machine learning models are opaque, non-intuitive, and difficult for people to understand

https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~alanwags/DLAI2016/(Gunning)%20IJCAI-16%20DLAI%20WS.pdf

Explainable AI

Traditional Deep Learning



- Why did you do that?
- Why not something else?
- When do you succeed?
- When do you fail?
- When can I trust you?
- How do I correct an error?

Explainable AI for Deep Learning



- I understand why
- I understand why not
- I know when you'll succeed
- I know when you'll fail
- I know when to trust you
- I know why you erred

https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~alanwags/DLAI2016/(Gunning)%20IJCAI-16%20DLAI%20WS.pdf

Explainable AI

- Desired Characteristics for Explanation Methods [Ribeiro et al '16]: Commonly agreed
  - **Interpretability**
    - Provide qualitative understanding between the input variables and the response
    - Depend on the user's capability
      - a linear model, a gradient vector or an additive model may or may not be interpretable
  - **Local fidelity (=faithfulness)**
    - A meaningful explanation must at least be locally faithful
    - Must correspond to how the model behaves in the vicinity of the instance being predicted
    - Does not imply global fidelity
      - Globally important features may not be important in the local context, and vice versa

Explainable AI

- (Other) Desired Characteristics for Explanation Methods [Ribeiro et al '16]
  - **Model-agnostic Interpretability**
    - Explain any model
    - vs. inherently interpretable models
  - **Global perspective**
    - Explain the model
    - Provide a global view whether we can trust the model
    - Accuracy may often not be a suitable metric to evaluate the model

Explainable AI



Deep Learning



Prediction result

Explainable AI

Goal: Create a suite of machine learning techniques that produce more explainable models, while maintaining a high level of learning performance

Interpretable & Faithful



Deep Explanation

Modified deep learning techniques to learn explainable features



Interpretable Models

Techniques to learn more structured, interpretable, causal models



Model Induction

Techniques to infer an explainable model from any model as a black box

Approaches

https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~alanwags/DLAI2016/(Gunning)%20IJCAI-16%20DLAI%20WS.pdf

Explainable AI: Tools for Trustness & Analysis

Explainable Deep Learning



Explain the reason for the output

- Can understand why the model makes the current prediction
- Can decide whether he trust the prediction result

The degree of trustness of the prediction result

Model debugging

Model designer

Interpretable & faithful Explanation

User

Explain how the model is failed (or successful)

- Can understand how the model produces the output
- Can understand the limitation of the model in a qualitive manner
- Can develop a method for improving the model to fix the error

https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~alanwags/DLAI2016/(Gunning)%20IJCAI-16%20DLAI%20WS.pdf

Explainable Deep Learning: Approaches & Issues

- Approaches
  - Model distillation
  - Visualization methods
  - Explanation-aware learning
- Issues
  - Evaluation
    - What are the objectives of deep learning explanations? How is explainability evaluated?
    - Aspects for evaluation
      - E.g.) Interpretability, Faithfulness, Trust, Confidence, Safety, Ethics
  - Related topics
    - Model debugging & Adversarial learning
    - Model controlling: consider Fairness & Bias

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.14545.pdf

Explainable Deep Learning: Approaches

- Approaches
  - Model distillation (=Post-hoc)
    - Develops a separate, inherently explainable "white-box" machine learning model to mimic the input-output behavior of the DNN.
    - E.g.) **LIME**, **Anchors**, Tree-based methods, etc.
  - Visualization methods (=Self-explaining)
    - Express an explanation by highlighting, through a scientific visualization, characteristics of an input that strongly influence the output of a DNN.
    - Need to compute saliency scores: Decide which parts of DNN are relevant or important for the output
    - E.g.) **Attention**, **Deconvolution**, **Layer-wise Relevant Propagation**, **Grad-CAM**, **Integrated Gradients**, Perturbation-based method (Representation Erasure, etc.)
  - Explanation-aware learning (=Joint Training)
    - Add additional explanation task to the original model task
    - Jointly train the explanation task along with the original task
    - E.g.) Text explanation, Explanation association, etc.

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.14545.pdf

Deep Learning for NLP

- Neural language models [Bengio et al '03]
  - Starting in the 2000s, neural networks begin to be used for language modeling
  - Equipped with word embeddings, the task aims at predicting the next word in a text given the previous words
- Contextual pretrained language models: BERT [Devlin et al. , 2018]
  - Have made significant breakthrough in various NLP tasks by training on large scale of unlabeled text resources.



Pretrained Language Models for NLP (2018~)

- Pretraining
  - Use very large corpus
  - Based on self-supervised losses
  - E.g.) MaskLM
- Finetuning
  - Require only a very simple application-specific NN (mostly a single output layer)



Pretrained Language Models for NLP: Variants & Extensions

- Alternative pretraining methods
  - **XLNet, RoBERTa**
- Lightweight models
  - **ALBERT**, **DistillBERT**, **TinyBERT**
- Extensions of transformer architecture
  - Decoder (**GPT**), Encoder & decoder (**UniLM, MASS, BART**)
- Novel losses for self-supervised learning
  - **SpanBERT**, **ELECTRA**
- Knowledge-enhanced pretraining methods
  - **ERNIE**, **KnowBERT**, **KEPLER**, **WKLM**, **JAKET**, **LUKE**, etc.
- Retrieval-augmented methods
  - **REALM**, **RAG**
- Other extensions
  - Multilingual, Multimodal, Domain-specific
  - Language-specific
    - **Korean**, French, Chinese, Dutch, Arabic

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Special Issues

- Analytics on Pretrained Language Models
  - Issue: *What types of linguistic knowledge BERT actually contains?*
    - *Are pretrained language models sufficient for resolving the issues of NLP?*
    - *What are the limitations of the pretrained language models?*
- Interpreting Attention Mechanisms
  - Issue: *Attention weights can be used as metrics for importance of input words or representation for the final output?*

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- General approaches for XDL
  - Model distillation (=Post-hoc)
    - E.g.) **LIME**, **Anchors**, Tree-based methods, etc.
  - Visualization methods (=Self-explaining)
    - E.g.) **Attention**, **Deconvolution**, **Layer-wise Relevant Propagation**, **Grad-CAM**, **Integrated Gradients**, Perturbation-based method (Representation Erasure, etc.)
  - Explanation-aware learning (=Joint Training)
    - E.g.) Explanation-inclusive datasets for question answering, etc.

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- Analytics on Pretrained Language Models
  - **Probing methods**: train a lightweight classifier that predicts a linguistic structure of interest on top of model's internal representations
    - Structural probe [Hewitt & Manning '19]
      - Examine whether contextual representations can be projected to a syntax tree
    - Edge probing [Tenney et al '19]
      - Predict a linguistic label of a single span
      - Predict a semantic relationship between two spans
  - **Zero-shot probing methods**: without an additional lightweight classifier, extract linguistic/world knowledge based on a parameter-free method
    - Perturbed masking for syntactic/discourse probe [Wu et al '20]
      - Recover syntactic trees from BERT using a parameter-free probing method

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- Analytics on Pretrained Language Models
  - **Diagnostic methods**: Behavioral probing
    - Directly evaluate pretrained language models on additional diagnostic datasets
      - » Without relying on additional parameters
    - **Language model probability**
      - Linguistic knowledge [Warstadt et al ‘20; Marvin & Linzen ‘18]
        - » Check LM’s preferences b/w minimal pairs
    - **Cloze probability**
      - Commonsense reasoning and syntactic knowledge [Ettinger ’20]
      - Factual and commonsense knowledge [Petroni et al. ’19]
    - **Task-specific classification**
      - Entailment & reasoning capability [McCoy et al ’19]

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- Analytics on Pretrained Language Models
  - **Analyzing generalization effects**
    - [Hao et al '19]: show that pretraining reaches a good initial point across downstream tasks
      - » Leads to wider optima and easier optimization, compared with training from scratch
    - [Saunshi et al '21]: pursue a theoretical understanding of the effect of pretrained language model on downstream tasks
      - Initiates a mathematical study of the BERT-successful phenomenon for the downstream task of text classification, by addressing:
        - » (1) What is the intuitive connection between the pretraining task of next word prediction and text classification?
        - » (2) How can we mathematically formalize this connection and quantify the benefit of language modeling?

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- Interpreting Attention Mechanisms
  - **Negative results on Attention as Explanation**
    - [Jain et al '19] claim that attention is not explanation
      - Identify alternate adversarial attention weights after the model is trained that nevertheless produce the same predictions
    - [Serrano and Smith '19] conclude that attention is not a suitable tool to for determining which elements should be attributed as responsible for an output.
      - Modify attention values of a trained model post-hoc by hard-setting the highest attention values to zero.
      - Find that the number of attention values that must be zeroed out to alter the model's prediction is often too large
    - [Pruthi et al '20]
      - Manipulates attention weights while paying surprisingly little cost in accuracy
      - The manipulated attention-based explanations deceive people into thinking that predictions from a model biased against gender minorities do not rely on the gender.
  - **Positive results on Attention as Explanation**
    - [Wiegreffe and Pinter '19]
      - Examine the conditions under which attention can be considered a plausible explanation

Explainable Deep Learning for NLP: Contents

- Interpreting Attention Mechanisms
  - **Discovering functional methods for attention as explanation**
    - [Kobayashi et al '20] Proposes a norm-based analysis for attention-based explanation
      - Shows that attention weights alone are only one of the two factors that determine the output of attention
      - Proposes a norm-based analysis that incorporates the second factor, the norm of the transformed input vectors
    - [Sun & Lu '20] propose attention/polarity scores for word token
      - Attention score: capture the global, absolute importance of word tokens within a corpus
      - Polarity score: Play the role in the overall model in terms of contributing towards the model performance

Contents

- Introduction
- Explainable AI
- Explainable AI for Natural language processing
  - Deep learning for NLP
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
- Explainable deep learning for NLP ◀
  - Model distillation methods: LIME
  - Visualization of neural models for NLP
    - Perturbation-based method: Representation Erasure
    - Gradient-based method: Integrated Gradient
    - Attention mechanism
  - Analytics on pretrained language models
    - Probing methods & Diagnostic methods
  - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
    - Question answering
    - Machine translation
  - Other approaches for explainable NLP
- Conclusion & Discussion

Model Distillation: LIME

- LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations)
  - identify an interpretable model over the **interpretable representation that is locally faithful** to the classifier
  - Methods
    - Given a test example and its model prediction, first randomly sample its nearby examples with their associated omodel outputs
    - Then train a simple interpretable model (i.e. a linear classifier) using them
    - Assume that the feature weights of a test example are interpretable
- Interpretable Data Representations
  - $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$: the original representation of an instance being explained
  - $x' \in \{0,1\}^{d'}$: a binary vector for its interpretable representation

Model Distillation: LIME

- Explaining individual predictions. A model predicts that a patient has the flu, and LIME highlights the symptoms in the patient's history that led to the prediction



Here, the explainer uses a binary vector for its interpretable representation

Model Distillation: LIME

- Explaining individual predictions of competing classifiers trying to determine if a document is about “Christianity” or “Atheism”



Model Distillation: LIME

- Fidelity-Interpretability Trade-off
  - G : a class of potentially interpretable models
    - Readily presented to the user with visual or textual artifacts
  - $g \in G$: an explanation as a model
    - Linear models, decision trees, or falling rule lists
  - $\{0,1\}^{d'}$: the domain of g acts over absence/presence of the interpretable components
  - $\Omega(g)$: a measure of complexity (as opposed to interpretability)
    - Not every $g \in G$ may be simple enough to be interpretable
    - E.g.)
      - $\Omega(g)$ for decision trees: The depth of the tree
      - $\Omega(g)$ for linear models: the number of non-zero weights

Model Distillation: LIME

$f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: the model being explained

- $f(x)$: the probability (or a binary indicator) that x belongs to a certain class

– $\pi_x(z)$: a proximity measure between an instance z to x, so as to define locality around x

– $\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x)$: a measure of how unfaithful g is in approximating f in the locality defined by π_x.

- In order to ensure both **interpretability** and **local fidelity**, minimize $L(f, g, \pi_x)$ while having $\Omega(g)$ be low enough to be interpretable by humans:

– The explanation produced by LIME is obtained by:

$$\xi(x) = \underset{g \in G}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad \mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x) + \Omega(g)$$

local fidelity **interpretability**

Model Distillation: LIME



Here, focus on sparse linear models as explanations, and on performing the search using perturbations.

Model Distillation: LIME

- Sparse Linear Explanations
  - G: the class of linear models $g(z') = w_g \cdot z'$
  - L: the locally weighted square loss

$$\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x) = \sum_{z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}} \pi_x(z) \left(f(z) - g(z')\right)^2$$

A set of perturbed samples

$$\pi_x(z) = exp(-D(x, z)^2 / \sigma^2)$$

an exponential kernel defined on some distance function D

  - For text classification, the explanation is interpretable
    - By letting the interpretable representation be a bag of words, and by setting a limit K on the number of word

$$\Omega(g) = \infty \mathbb{1}[\|w_g\|_0 > K]$$

Model Distillation: LIME

The black-box model's complex decision function f (unknown to LIME) is represented by the blue/pink background, which cannot be approximated well by a linear model.

LIME samples instances, gets predictions using f, and weighs them by the proximity to the instance being explained (represented here by size)

The learned explanation that is locally (but not globally) faithful.



Model Distillation: LIME

- Sparse Linear Explanations

Algorithm 1 Sparse Linear Explanations using LIME

Require: Classifier f, Number of samples N
Require: Instance x, and its interpretable version x'
Require: Similarity kernel π_x, Length of explanation K

$\mathcal{Z} \leftarrow \{\}$
for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, ..., N\}$ **do**
  $z'_i \leftarrow sample\_around(x')$
  $\mathcal{Z} \leftarrow \mathcal{Z} \cup \langle z'_i, f(z_i), \pi_x(z_i) \rangle$
end for
$w \leftarrow$ K-Lasso$(\mathcal{Z}, K)$ ▷ with z'_i as features, $f(z)$ as target
return w

Model Distillation: LIME

- Example: Deep networks for image

Explaining an image classification prediction made by Google's Inception neural network. The top 3 classes predicted are "Electric Guitar" (p = 0.32), "Acoustic guita (p = 0.24) and "Labrador" (p = 0.21)

(a) Original Image

(b) Explaining *Electric guitar*

Model Distillation: LIME

- Example: Deep networks for image

(c) Explaining *Acoustic guitar*

(d) Explaining *Labrador*

Model Distillation: LIME

- Submodular pick for explaining models (pursuing **global perspective**)
  - Give a global understanding of the model by explaining a set of individual instances
  - Select a set of examples such that they covers locally important features as many as possible ➔ Pick step
  - Pick step: Given a set of instances X, the **pick step** is defined as the task of selecting B instances for the user to inspect

$$Pick(\mathcal{W}, I) = \underset{V, |V| \leq B}{\operatorname{argmax}} c(V, \mathcal{W}, I)$$

Maximize coverage

$$c(V, \mathcal{W}, I) = \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \mathbb{1}_{[\exists i \in V : \mathcal{W}_{ij} > 0]} I_j$$

coverage

Model Distillation: LIME

$\mathcal{W}$ an $n \times d'$ *explanation matrix*

$$\mathcal{W}_{ij} = |w_{g_{ij}}| \qquad g_i = \xi(x_i)$$

The explanation for x_i when usin
linear models as explanations



Suppose the budget B=2,
To maximize the coverage
rows 2 and 5 would be selected,
covering all but feature f1

Model Distillation: LIME

- Submodular pick for explaining models

Algorithm 2 Submodular pick (SP) algorithm

Require: Instances X, Budget B
  for all $x_i \in X$ **do**
    $\mathcal{W}_i \leftarrow$ **explain**(x_i, x_i') ▷ Using Algorithm 1
  end for
  for $j \in \{1 \dots d'\}$ **do**
    $I_j \leftarrow \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathcal{W}_{ij}|}$ ▷ Compute feature importances
  end for
  $V \leftarrow \{\}$
  while $|V| < B$ **do** ▷ Greedy optimization of Eq (4)
    $V \leftarrow V \cup \text{argmax}_i \, c(V \cup \{i\}, \mathcal{W}, I)$
  end while
  return V

Model Distillation: LIME

- **Do explanations lead to insights?**



(a) Husky classified as wolf

(b) Explanation

	Before	After
Trusted the bad model	10 out of 27	3 out of 27
Snow as a potential feature	12 out of 27	25 out of 27

Model Distillation: Hierarchical explanation [Chen et al '201



Model Distillation: Hierarchical explanation [Chen et al '201

Algorithm 1 Hierarchical Explanation via Divisive Generation

Input: text $\boldsymbol{x}$ with length n, and predicted label $\hat{y}$
Initialize the original partition $\mathcal{P}_0 \leftarrow \{\boldsymbol{x}_{(0,n]}\}$
Initialize the contribution set $\mathcal{C}_0 = \emptyset$
Initialize the hierarchy $\mathcal{H} = [\mathcal{P}_0]$
for $t = 1, \ldots, n-1$ **do**
    Find $\boldsymbol{x}_{(s_i,s_{i+1}]}$ and j by solving Equation 1
    Update the partition
    $\mathcal{P}'_t \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{t-1} \backslash \{\boldsymbol{x}_{(s_i,s_{i+1}]}\}$
    $\mathcal{P}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{P}'_t \cup \{\boldsymbol{x}_{(s_i,j]}, \boldsymbol{x}_{(j,s_{i+1}]}\}$
    $\mathcal{H}.add(\mathcal{P}_t)$
    Update the contribution set $\mathcal{C}$ with
    $\mathcal{C}'_t \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_{t-1} \cup \{(\boldsymbol{x}_{(s_i,j]}, \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{(s_i,j]}))\}$
    $\mathcal{C}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{C}'_t \cup \{(\boldsymbol{x}_{(j,s_{i+1}]}, \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{(j,s_{i+1}]}))\}$
end for
Output: $\mathcal{C}_{n-1}, \mathcal{H}$

Model Distillation: Tree-based Model Translation [Frosst & Hinton '18]

- a soft binary decision tree with a single inner node and two leaf nodes.



Model Distillation: Tree-based Model Translation [Frosst & Hinton '18]

– Train the soft decision tree using a loss function that seeks to minimize the cross entropy between each leaf, weighted by its path probability, and the target distribution

$$\mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}) = -\log\left(\sum_{\ell \in Leaf\,Nodes} P^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{k} T_k \log Q_k^{\ell}\right)$$

Model Distillation: Tree-based Model Translation [Frosst & Hinton '18]

- Regularizers

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}} P^i(\mathbf{x}) p_i(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}} P^i(\mathbf{x})}$$

$$C = -\lambda \sum_{i \in InnerNodes} 0.5 \log(\alpha_i) + 0.5 \log(1 - \alpha_i)$$

a hyper-parameter that determines the strength of the penalty and is set prior to training. This penalty was based on the assumption that a tree making fairly equal use of alternative sub-trees would usually be better suited to any particular classification task and in practice it did increase accuracy

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Analyze the effect of erasing pieces of the representation, to see how such changes affect a neural model's decisions
- Linking Word Vector Dimensions to Linguistic Features: Visualization Model
  - M: Denote a trained neural model
  - $e \in E$: a training example with gold-standard label c
  - L_e: Denote the index of the tag for e
  - The log-likelihood assigned by model M to the correct label for e:

$$S(e, c) = -\log P(L_e = c)$$

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Visualization Model
  - d: the index of some vector dimension we are interested in exploring
  - $S(e, c, \neg d)$: the log-likelihood of the correct label for e according to M if dimension d is erased; that is, its value set to 0
  - $I(d)$: The importance of dimension d

$$I(d) = \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{S(e, c) - S(e, c, \neg d)}{S(e, c)}$$

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Tasks and Training
  - Consider two kinds of tasks
  - 1) Sequence tagging tasks (**POS, NER, chunking**)
    - The input consists of the concatenation of the vector representation of the word to tag and the representations of its neighbors (window size is set to 5)
  - 2) Word ontological classification tasks (**prefix, suffix, sentiment, wordshape, word-frequency prediction**)
    - The input is just the representation of the input word
  - Word embeddings: **Word2vec and GloVe vectors**
    - Each 50-dimensional vectors pre-trained using the GigawordWiki corpus
  - Neural architecture: similar to **SENNA**
    - A four-layer neural model using a structure similar to that of SENNA [Collobert et al. '11] with a TANH activation function
      - an input word-embedding layer, 2 intermediate layers, and a output layer that outputs a scalar
      - Each intermediate layer contains 50 hidden units.

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Tasks: Accuracy
  - Testing accuracy for different training strategies on tagging tasks

Training Strategy	Vector	POS	NER	Chunk	Prefix	Suffix	Sentiment	Shape	Freq
Vanilla (Figure 1c)	GloVe	0.912	0.954	0.921	0.334	0.208	0.857	0.256	**0.349**
d31 removed (Figure 1d)	GloVe	**0.915**	0.954	0.921	0.336	0.207	0.818	**0.259**	0.355
d31, d26 removed (Figure 1e)	GloVe	0.914	**0.959**	**0.923**	**0.339**	0.209	**0.860**	0.250	0.413
Dropout 0.2 (Figure 1f)	GloVe	0.857	0.953	0.907	0.317	**0.239**	0.820	0.240	0.861
Vanilla (Figure 1a)	word2vec	0.911	0.954	0.918	0.301	0.161	0.826	0.236	1.059
Dropout 0.2 (Figure 1a)	word2vec	0.889	0.952	0.893	0.289	0.154	0.819	0.224	1.486

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

Heatmap of word vector dimension importance $I(d)$



(a) Word2vec, no dropout.



(b) Word2vec, with dropout.



(c) GloVe, no dropout.



(d) GloVe, no dropout; 31rd dimension removed.



(e) GloVe, no dropout; 31rd, 26th dimensions removed.



(f) GloVe, with dropout.

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- Finding Important Words in Sentiment Analysis
  - Top 10 ranked words by importance from the Bi-LSTM, Uni-LSTM and standard RNN models

The Bi-LSTM, Uni-LSTM and standard RNN respectively obtain an accuracy of 0.526, 0.501 and 0.453 on sentence-level finegrained classification.

rank	Bi-LSTM	Uni-LSTM	RNN
1	masterpiece (104)	masterpiece (32)	pathetic (8.3)
2	sweetest (47)	dreadful (32)	dreadful (6.2)
3	dreadful (44)	sweetest (14)	brilliant (5.6)
4	stillborn (21)	pathetic (9.8)	ungainly (4.6)
5	pathetic (17)	flawless (7.8)	smartest (4.4)
6	eye-popping (13)	breathtaking (6.7)	hated (4.3)
7	succeeds (13)	dumbness (6.6)	eye-popping (4.1)
8	breathtaking (12)	beaut (6.3)	stupider (3.4)
9	ugliest (9.8)	disappointingly (6.2)	dicey (3.3)
10	flawless (9.6)	heady (6.1)	masterpiece (3.3)

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
  - Problem:

$$\min_{D} |D| \quad s.t. \;\; L_{e-D} \neq L_e$$

  - A reward function: $R(e) = L(e, D) - \Omega(z_{1:N})$
    - Receives a reward of 1 if the label is changed, i.e., $L^*_{e-D} \neq L_e$
    - also want to find the minimal set of words to change the label; Thus, the reward function:

$$L(e, D) = \frac{1}{|D|} \cdot \mathbf{1}(L_{e-D} \neq L_e)$$

    - Add a regularizer: Encourage (or discourage) leaving out contiguous phrases:

$$\Omega(e, z) = \gamma \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{t \in s} |z_t - z_{t-1}|$$

Visualization: Representation Erasure [Li et al '17]

- RL for Finding Decision-Changing Phrases
  - Experiments

Each of the colors represents a specific aspect, i.e., rooms, service, value and location.

(1) clean updated room. friendly efficient staff . rate was too high 199 plus they charged 10 day for internet access in the room .
(2) the location is fantastic. the staff are helpful and service oriented . sleeping rooms meeting rooms and public lavatories not cleaned on a daily basis . the hotel seems a bit old and a bit tired overall . trolley noise outside can go into the wee hours . if you get a great price for a few nights this hotel may be a good choice . breakfast is very nice remember if you just stick to the cold buffet it is cheaper .
(3) location is nice . but goes from bad to worse once you walk through the door . staff very surly and unhelpful . room and hallway had a very strange smell . rooms very run down . so bad that i checked out immediately and went to another hotel . intercontinental chain should be ashamed .
(4) i took my daughter and her step sister to see a show at webster hall . it is so overpriced i 'm in awe . i felt safe . the rooms were tiny . lots of street noise all night from the partiers at the ale house below .

(a) Examples of minimal set of erased words based on *Bi-LSTM* model

(1) clean updated room. friendly efficient staff . rate was too high 199 plus they charged 10 day for internet access in the room .
the location is fantastic. the staff are helpful and service oriented . (2) sleeping rooms meeting rooms and public lavatories not cleaned on a daily basis . the hotel seems a bit old and a bit tired overall . trolley noise outside can go into the wee hours . if you get a great price for a few nights this hotel may be a good choice . breakfast is very nice remember if you just stick to the cold buffet it is cheaper .
(3) location is nice . but goes from bad to worse once you walk through the door . staff very surly and unhelpful . room and hallway had a very strange smell . rooms very run down . so bad that i checked out immediately and went to another hotel . intercontinental chain should be ashamed .
(4) i took my daughter and her step sister to see a show at webster hall . it is so overpriced i 'm in awe . i felt safe . the rooms were tiny . lots of street noise all night from the partiers at the ale house below .

(b) Examples of minimal set of erased words based on *memory-network* model.

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated gradients: an axiomatic approach for gradient-based methods
  - Consider **Sensitivity** and **Implementation Invariance**
- Axiom: Sensitivity(a)
  - Definition: An attribution method satisfies **Sensitivity(a)** if for every input and baseline that differ in one feature but have different predictions then the differing feature should be given a non-zero attribution
  - **Gradients violate Sensitivity(a)**
    - Consider a one variable, one ReLU network

$$f(x) = 1 - \text{ReLU}(1-x)$$

      - Suppose the baseline is x = 0 and the input is x = 2.
      - The function changes from 0 to 1, but because f becomes flat at x = 1
      - The gradient method gives attribution of 0 to x.

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
  - Two networks are functionally equivalent if their outputs are equal for all inputs, despite having very different implementations.
  - **Implementation Invariance**
    - The attributions are always identical for two functionally equivalent networks.
    - DeepLift and LRP break Implementation Invariance

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- DeepLift and Layer-wise relevance propagation (LRP) break the implementation invariance axiom



$$f(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(h(x_1, x_2))$$

Network $f(x_1, x_2)$
Attributions at $x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1$

Integrated gradients	$x_1 = 1.5,\ x_2 = -0.5$
DeepLift	$x_1 = 1.5,\ x_2 = -0.5$
LRP	$x_1 = 1.5,\ x_2 = -0.5$

f and g are equivalent.



$$g(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(k(x_1, x_2))$$

Network $g(x_1, x_2)$
Attributions at $x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1$

Integrated gradients	$x_1 = 1.5,\ x_2 = -0.5$
DeepLift	$x_1 = 2,\ x_2 = -1$
LRP	$x_1 = 2,\ x_2 = -1$

$$h(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(x_1) - 1 - \text{ReLU}(x_2)$$
$$k(x_1, x_2) = \text{ReLU}(x_1 - 1) - \text{ReLU}(x_2)$$

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Axiom: Implementation Invariance
  - **Gradients are invariant to implementation**
    - The chain-rule for gradients $\frac{\partial f}{\partial g} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial h} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial g}$
      - Essentially about implementation invariance.
    - Think of g and f as the input and output of a system, and h being some implementation detail of the system.
    - The gradient of output f to input g can be computed
      - Either directly by , ignoring the intermediate function h
      - By invoking the chain rule via h

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients
  - $F : \mathrm{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$: a function that represents a deep network
  - $x \in \mathrm{R}^n$: the input, $x' \in \mathrm{R}^n$:the baseline input
  - Consider the straightline path (in R^n) from the baseline x' to the input x
  - Integrated gradients: defined as the path intergral of the gradients along the straightline path from the baseline x' to the input x

$$\mathsf{IntegratedGrads}_i(x) ::= (x_i - x_i') \times \int_{\alpha=0}^{1} \frac{\partial F(x' + \alpha \times (x - x'))}{\partial x_i} \, d\alpha$$

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Integrated Gradients
  - **Satisfies Sensivity(a)**
    - Because Completeness implies Sensivity(a) and is thus a strengthening of the Sensitivity(a) axiom.
    - This is because Sensitivity(a) refers to a case where the baseline and the input differ only in one variable,
    - for which Completeness asserts that the difference in the two output values is equal to the attribution to this variable.
  - **Satisfy Implementation Invariance**
    - Since they are based only on the gradients of the function represented by the network.

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Applications: Question classification
  - Text classification over the WikiTableQuestions dataset
    - The baseline input is the all zero embedding vector

how many townships have a population above 50 ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
what is the difference in population between fora and masilo [prediction: NUMERIC]
how many athletes are not ranked ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
what is the total number of points scored ? [prediction: NUMERIC]
which film was before the audacity of democracy ? [prediction: STRING]
which year did she work on the most films ? [prediction: DATETIME]
what year was the last school established ? [prediction: DATETIME]
when did ed sheeran get his first number one of the year ? [prediction: DATETIME]
did charles oakley play more minutes than robert parish ? [prediction: YESNO]

Term color indicates attribution strength—
Red is positive, Blue is negative, and Gray is neutral (zero).

Visualization: Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan et al '17]

- Applications: Neural machine translation
  - LSTM-based Neural Machine Translation
    - The baseline: zero out the embeddings of all tokens except the start and end markers



Visualization: Attention Mechanism

- Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]
  - The common assumption on attention
    - Attention provides an explanation for model predictions
  - The expectation
    - (i) Attention weights should correlate with feature importance measures (e.g., gradient-based measures);
    - (ii) Alternative (or counterfactual) attention weight configurations ought to yield corresponding changes in prediction (and if they do not then are equally plausible as explanations)
  - But, results are negative
    - Neither property is consistently observed by standard attention mechanisms
      - in the context of text classification, question answering (QA), and Natural Language Inference (NLI) tasks when RNN encoders are used

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$$

$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |V|}$ model inputs

$\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{Enc}(\mathbf{x}_e)$ T m-dimensional hidden states

- Similarity fur $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ A query

$$\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}) = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W_1 h} + \mathbf{W_2 Q})$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}) = \frac{\mathbf{hQ}}{\sqrt{m}}$$

- Deco

$$\hat{y} = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot h_\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$$

$$h_\alpha = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\alpha}_t \cdot h_t$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Key questions
  - *1) Do learned attention weights agree with alternative, natural measures of feature importance?*
    - Analyze the correlation between gradient-based feature importance and learned attention weights, and between 'leave-one-out' (LOO) measures and the same.
  - *2) Had we attended to different features, would the prediction have been different?*
    - Propose explicitly searching for "adversarial" attention weights
      - That maximally differ from the observed attention weights and yet yield an effectively equivalent prediction

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Total Variation Distance (TVD)
  - The measure of change between output distributions

$$\text{TVD}(\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} |\hat{y}_{1i} - \hat{y}_{2i}|$$

- Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD)
  - Quantify the difference between two attention distributions

$$\text{JSD}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \frac{1}{2}\text{KL}[\alpha_1 || \frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}] + \frac{1}{2}\text{KL}[\alpha_2 || \frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}]$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

– **Correlation Between Attention and Feature Importance Measures**

- (1) gradient based measures of feature importance (τ_g),
- (2) differences in model output induced by leaving features out (τ_{loo}).

Algorithm 1 Feature Importance Computations

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$

$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha)$

$g_t \leftarrow |\sum_{w=1}^{|V|} \mathbb{1}[\mathbf{x}_{tw} = 1] \frac{\partial y}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{tw}}| \ , \forall t \in [1, T]$

$\tau_g \leftarrow \text{Kendall-}\tau(\alpha, g)$

$\Delta\hat{y}_t \leftarrow \text{TVD}(\hat{y}(\mathbf{x}_{-t}), \hat{y}(\mathbf{x})) \ , \forall t \in [1, T]$

$\tau_{loo} \leftarrow \text{Kendall-}\tau(\alpha, \Delta\hat{y})$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Mean and std. dev. of correlations between gradient/leave-one-out importance measures and attention weights

Sig. Frac. columns report the fraction of instances for which this correlation is statistically significant;

		Gradient (BiLSTM) τ_g		Gradient (Average) τ_g		Leave-One-Out (BiLSTM) τ_{loo}	
Dataset	Class	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.
SST	0	0.34 ± 0.21	0.48	0.61 ± 0.20	0.87	0.27 ± 0.19	0.33
	1	0.36 ± 0.21	0.49	0.60 ± 0.21	0.83	0.32 ± 0.19	0.40
IMDB	0	0.44 ± 0.06	1.00	0.67 ± 0.05	1.00	0.34 ± 0.07	1.00
	1	0.43 ± 0.06	1.00	0.68 ± 0.05	1.00	0.34 ± 0.07	0.99
ADR Tweets	0	0.47 ± 0.18	0.76	0.73 ± 0.13	0.96	0.29 ± 0.20	0.44
	1	0.49 ± 0.15	0.85	0.72 ± 0.12	0.97	0.44 ± 0.16	0.74
20News	0	0.07 ± 0.17	0.37	0.79 ± 0.07	1.00	0.06 ± 0.15	0.29
	1	0.21 ± 0.22	0.61	0.75 ± 0.08	1.00	0.20 ± 0.20	0.62
AG News	0	0.36 ± 0.13	0.82	0.78 ± 0.07	1.00	0.30 ± 0.13	0.69
	1	0.42 ± 0.13	0.90	0.76 ± 0.07	1.00	0.43 ± 0.14	0.91
Diabetes	0	0.42 ± 0.05	1.00	0.75 ± 0.02	1.00	0.41 ± 0.05	1.00
	1	0.40 ± 0.05	1.00	0.75 ± 0.02	1.00	0.45 ± 0.05	1.00
Anemia	0	0.47 ± 0.05	1.00	0.77 ± 0.02	1.00	0.46 ± 0.05	1.00
	1	0.46 ± 0.06	1.00	0.77 ± 0.03	1.00	0.47 ± 0.06	1.00
CNN	Overall	0.24 ± 0.07	0.99	0.50 ± 0.10	1.00	0.20 ± 0.07	0.98
bAbI 1	Overall	0.25 ± 0.16	0.55	0.72 ± 0.12	0.99	0.16 ± 0.14	0.28
bAbI 2	Overall	-0.02 ± 0.14	0.27	0.68 ± 0.06	1.00	-0.01 ± 0.13	0.27
bAbI 3	Overall	0.24 ± 0.11	0.87	0.61 ± 0.13	1.00	0.26 ± 0.10	0.89
SNLI	0	0.31 ± 0.23	0.36	0.59 ± 0.18	0.80	0.16 ± 0.26	0.20
	1	0.33 ± 0.21	0.38	0.58 ± 0.19	0.80	0.36 ± 0.19	0.44
	2	0.31 ± 0.21	0.36	0.57 ± 0.19	0.80	0.34 ± 0.20	0.40

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - Attention Permutation

Algorithm 2 Permuting attention weights

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$
$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \hat{\alpha})$
for $p \leftarrow 1$ to 100 **do**
  $\alpha^p \leftarrow \text{Permute}(\hat{\alpha})$
  $\hat{y}^p \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha^p)$ ▷ Note : $\mathbf{h}$ is not changed
  $\Delta\hat{y}^p \leftarrow \text{TVD}[\hat{y}^p, \hat{y}]$
end for
$\Delta\hat{y}^{med} \leftarrow \text{Median}_p(\Delta\hat{y}^p)$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **– Attention Permutation**

Median change in output ($\Delta\hat{y}^{med}$) (x-axis) densities in relation to the max attention ($\max \hat{\alpha}$) (y-axis) obtained by randomly permuting instance attention weights



(a) SST (BiLSTM)



(b) SST (CNN)



(c) Diabetes (BiLSTM)



(d) Diabetes (CNN)



(e) CNN-QA (BiLSTM)



(f) bAbI 1 (BiLSTM)



(g) SNLI (BiLSTM)



(h) SNLI (CNN)

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **Attention Permutation**
    - Observe that there exist many points with small $\Delta\hat{y}$ med despite large magnitude attention weights.
    - These are cases in which the attention weights might suggest explaining an output by a small set of features (this is how one might reasonably read a heatmap depicting the attention weights),
    - But where scrambling the attention makes little difference to the prediction

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **Adversarial Attention**
    - Find k adversarial distributions $\{\alpha^{(1)}, \cdots, \alpha^{(k)}\}$, such that each $\alpha^{(i)}$ maximizes the distance from original $\hat{\alpha}$ but does not change the output by more than

$$\underset{\alpha^{(1)},\ldots,\alpha^{(k)}}{\text{maximize}} \quad f(\{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{k})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \forall i \ \text{TVD}[\hat{y}(\mathbf{x}, \alpha^{(i)}), \hat{y}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\alpha})] \leq \epsilon$$

$$f(\{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \text{JSD}[\alpha^{(i)}, \hat{\alpha}] + \frac{1}{k(k-1)} \sum_{i<j} \text{JSD}[\alpha^{(i)}, \alpha^{(j)}]$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - Adversarial Attention

Algorithm 3 Finding adversarial attention weights

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$

$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \hat{\alpha})$

$\alpha^{(1)}, ..., \alpha^{(k)} \leftarrow$ Optimize Eq 1

for $i \leftarrow 1$ to k **do**

$\hat{y}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha^{(i)})$ ▷ $\mathbf{h}$ is not changed

$\Delta\hat{y}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{TVD}[\hat{y}, \hat{y}^{(i)}]$

$\Delta\alpha^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{JSD}[\hat{\alpha}, \alpha^{(i)}]$

end for

ϵ-max JSD $\leftarrow \max_i \mathbb{1}[\Delta\hat{y}^{(i)} \leq \epsilon]\Delta\alpha^{(i)}$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

– Adversarial Attention

- Histogram of maximum adversarial JS Divergence (ϵ-max JSD) between original and adversarial attentions over all instances.

$$|\hat{y}^{adv} - \hat{y}| < \epsilon$$



(a) SST (BiLSTM) (b) SST (CNN) (c) Diabetes (BiLSTM) (d) Diabetes (CNN)

(e) SNLI (BiLSTM) (f) SNLI (CNN) (g) CNN-QA (BiLSTM) (h) BAbI 1 (BiLSTM)

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

– Adversarial Attention

- Densities of maximum JS divergences (ϵ-max JSD) (x-axis) as a function of the max attention (y-axis) in each instance for obtained between original and adversarial attention weights



(a) SST (BiLSTM) (b) SST (CNN) (c) Diabetes (BiLSTM) (d) Diabetes (CNN)

(e) CNN-QA (BiLSTM) (f) bAbI 1 (BiLSTM) (g) SNLI (BiLSTM) (h) SNLI (CNN)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Claims against 'Attention is not Explanation' (Jain and Wallace, '19).
  - Such a claim depends on one's definition of explanation, and that testing it needs to take into account all elements of the model
  - Propose four alternative tests to determine when/whether attention can be used as explanation
    - 1) a simple uniform-weights baseline
    - 2) a variance calibration based on multiple random seed runs
    - 3) a diagnostic framework using frozen weights from pretrained models
    - 4) an end-to-end adversarial attention training protocol

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Main claim
  - **Attention Distribution is not a Primitive.**
    - Detaching the attention scores obtained by parts of the model (i.e. the attention mechanism) degrades the model itself.
    - The base attention weights are not assigned arbitrarily by the model, but rather computed by an integral component whose parameters were trained alongside the rest of the layers; the way they work depends on each other.
    - Jain and Wallace provide alternative distributions which may result in similar predictions, but in the process they remove the very linkage which motivates the original claim of attention distribution explainability, namely the fact that the model was *trained* to attend to the tokens it chose
    - A reliable adversary must take this consideration into account

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Main claim
  - **Existence does not Entail Exclusivity**
    - We hold that attention scores are used as providing an explanation; not **the** explanation
    - The final layer of an LSTM model may easily produce outputs capable of being aggregated into the same prediction in various ways, however the model still makes the choice of a specific weighting distribution using its trained attention component.
    - This mathematically flexible production capacity is particularly evident in binary classifiers, where prediction is reduced to a single scalar, and an average instance (of e.g. the IMDB dataset) might contain 179 tokens, i.e. 179 scalars to be aggregated
    - This effect is greatly exacerbated when performed independently on each instance
    - Thus, it is no surprise that Jain and Wallace find what they are looking for given this degree of freedom.

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Main claim: **Summary**
  - Due to the per-instance nature of the demonstration and the fact that model parameters have not been learned or manipulated directly, Jain and Wallace have not shown the existence of an adversarial model that produces the claimed adversarial distributions
  - Thus, we cannot treat these adversarial attentions as equally plausible or faithful explanations for model prediction.
  - Additionally, they haven't provided a baseline of how much variation is to be expected in learned attention distributions, leaving the reader to question just how adversarial the found adversarial distributions are

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

Training an Adversary

Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models

Variance within a Model

Uniform as the Adversary

§4 §3.4 §3.3 §3.2 J&W



Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Uniform as the Adversary
  - Test attention modules' **contribution** to a model by applying a simple baseline where attention weights are frozen to a uniform distribution
  - Demonstrate that a frozen attention distribution performs just as well as learned attention weights, concluding that randomly- or adversarially-perturbed distributions are not evidence against attention as explanation in these cases

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Uniform as the Adversary
  - Classification F1 scores (1-class) on attention models

Dataset	Attention (Base)		Uniform
	Reported	Reproduced	
Diabetes	0.79	0.775	0.706
Anemia	0.92	0.938	0.899
IMDb	0.88	0.902	0.879
SST	0.81	0.831	0.822
AgNews	0.96	0.964	0.960
20News	0.94	0.942	0.934

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Variance within a Model
  - Examine the **expected variance** in attention-produced weights by initializing multiple training sequences with different random seeds, allowing a better quantification of how much variance can be expected in trained models.
  - Show that considering this background stochastic variation when comparing adversarial results with a traditional model allows us to better interpret adversarial results

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Variance within a Model

Densities of maximum JS divergences (x-axis) as a function of the max attention (y-axis) in each instance between the base distributions: and (a-d) models initialized on different random seeds; (e-f) models from a per-instance adversarial setup



(a) IMDB (seeds) (c) SST (seeds) (e) SST (adversary)

(b) Anemia (seeds) (d) Diabetes (seeds) (f) Diabetes (adversary)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - Replace the main setup's LSTM and attention parameters with a token-level affine hidden layer with tanh activation (forming an MLP), and forcing its output scores to be weighted by a pre-set, per-instance distribution, during both training and testing



Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - The guide weights we impose are:
    - **Uniform**
      - We force the MLP outputs to be considered equally across each instance, effectively forming an unweighted baseline
    - **Trained MLP**
      - We do not freeze the weights layer, instead allowing the MLP to learn its own attention parameters
    - **Base LSTM**
      - Take the weights learned by the base LSTM model's attention layer;
    - **Adversary**
      - Based on distributions found adversarially using the consistent training algorithm (where their results will be discussed)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - F1 scores on the positive class for an MLP model trained on various weighting guides.
    For ADVERSARY, we set $\lambda \leftarrow 0.001$.

Guide weights	Diab.	Anemia	SST	IMDb
UNIFORM	0.404	0.873	0.812	0.863
TRAINED MLP	0.699	0.920	0.817	0.888
BASE LSTM	**0.753**	0.931	**0.824**	**0.905**
ADVERSARY (4)	0.503	**0.932**	0.592	0.700

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Model**.
    - $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{b}}$: given the base model Mb,
    - $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{a}}$: a trained model whose explicit goal is to provide similar prediction scores for each instance, while distancing its attention distributions from those of
    - Formally, train the adversarial model using stochastic gradient updates based on the following loss formula (summed over instances in the minibatch)

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{M}_b)^{(i)} = \mathrm{TVD}(\hat{y}_a^{(i)}, \hat{y}_b^{(i)}) - \lambda \ \mathrm{KL}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_a^{(\mathbf{i})} \parallel \boldsymbol{\alpha}_b^{(\mathbf{i})})$$

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Prediction performance**
    - Best-performing adversarial models with instance-average JSD > 0.4.
    - Report the highest F1 scores of models whose attention distributions diverge from the base, on average, by at least 0.4 in JSD,

Dataset	λ	F1 (↑)	TVD (↓)	JSD (↑)
Diabetes	2e-4	0.775	0.015	0.409
Anemia	5e-4	0.942	0.017	0.481
SST	5.25e-4	0.823	0.036	0.514
IMDb	8e-4	0.906	0.014	0.405

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Adversarial weights as guides.**
    - Apply the diagnostic setup by training a guided MLP model on the adversarially-trained attention distributions

Guide weights	Diab.	Anemia	SST	IMDb
UNIFORM	0.404	0.873	0.812	0.863
TRAINED MLP	0.699	0.920	0.817	0.888
BASE LSTM	**0.753**	0.931	**0.824**	**0.905**
ADVERSARY (4)	0.503	**0.932**	0.592	0.700

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **TVD/JSD tradeoff.**

Averaged per-instance test set JSD and TVD from base model for each model variant



random seed

uniform weights

dotted line: our adversarial setup as λ is varied;

Adversarial setup from Jain and Wallace (2019)

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Point out that attention weights alone are only one of the two factors determining the output of self-attention modules
- Propose to incorporate the other factor as well, namely, the transformed input vectors into the analysis
- Measure the norm of the weighted vectors as the contribution of each input to an output
- Giving reasonable analyzing results
  - (1) BERT's attention modules do not pay so much attention to special tokens, and
  - (2) Transformer's attention modules capture word alignment quite well

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module
  - Computes each output vector $\boldsymbol{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from the corresponding pre-update vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set of input vectors $\mathcal{X} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots \boldsymbol{x}_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O + \boldsymbol{b}^O \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$\alpha_{i,j} := \underset{\boldsymbol{x}_j \in \mathcal{X}}{\mathrm{softmax}} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{q}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i) \boldsymbol{k}(\boldsymbol{x}_j)^\top}{\sqrt{d'}} \right) \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$\boldsymbol{q}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i) := \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i \boldsymbol{W}^Q + \boldsymbol{b}^Q \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{k}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) := \boldsymbol{x}_j \boldsymbol{W}^K + \boldsymbol{b}^K \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) := \boldsymbol{x}_j \boldsymbol{W}^V + \boldsymbol{b}^V \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right).$$

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module sums weighted vectors
  - Attention module computes a weighted sum of input vectors

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O + \boldsymbol{b}^O \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Rewriting

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \, f(\boldsymbol{x}_j) + \boldsymbol{b}^O$$

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) := \left(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{W}^V + \boldsymbol{b}^V \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O.$$

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Problems with attention weight analysis
  - The assumption of the previous studies
    - if an input vector is assigned a larger attention weight than other input vectors, then that input vector contributes more to the output vector than the others
  - However, this assumption disregards the magnitude of the vectors to be weighted
  - Intuitively, with attention weights being equal, a larger vector will contribute more to the output vector than a smaller vector
  - Analysis based on attention weights has produced some non-intuitive observations, probably due to this flaw
  - E.g.) Clark et al. (2019)'s work:
    - Reported that input vectors for specific tokens such as commas, periods, and separator tokens [SEP] tend to gain remarkably large attention weights

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Proposal: norm as attention degree
  - Estimate the contribution of the input vector $\boldsymbol{x}_j$ to the output vector $\boldsymbol{y}_j$ by $\alpha_{i,j} f(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$
  - To address the aforementioned issue, we propose to use $\|\alpha f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$, which is the standard Euclidean norm (length) of the weighted, transformed vector

  ➔ **the norm-based analysis**

  - Analysis of the previous study: **weight-based analysis**

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Re-examining previously observed phenomena**
  - Each point corresponds to averaged α or $\|\alpha\, f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$ on a token category in a given layer

(a) Weight-based analysis.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Re-examining previously observed phenomena**
  - Each point corresponds to averaged α or $\|\alpha\, f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$ on a token category in a given layer.

(b) Norm-based analysis.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Analysis — relationship between α and ||f(x)||:**
  - The darkness of each cell corresponds to the value of averaged α or $||f(x)||$ on a [SEP] category in a given head

For almost all heads, α and $||f(x)||$ clearly negate the magnitude of each other.



(a) α.



(b) $\|f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$.

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Analysis — relationship between α and ||f(x)||:**
  - Relationship between α and $\| f(x) \|$. Each plot corresponds to a pair of $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\| f(x) \|$ for output vector y_i in either attention head

Even when the same attention weights α are assigned, the values of kf(x)k can vary, which suggests that they play a different role in the modules.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - Extract Soft alignments from the attention module by the following methods:
    - **Attention-weights** for each layer were computed by averaging α of all heads following [Li et al. (2019)'s work
    - For our **norm-based method**, we merged $||\alpha f(x)||$ from all attention heads in each layer by the following strategy: adding all the vectors $\alpha f(x)$ from every head, then calculating the norm of the summed vector (Vector-norms).
      - Adding all $\alpha f(x)$ from every head is the same as the procedure that combines the results from every head into the results of the multi-head attention module

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - AER scores of each layer in the Transformerbased system



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - Examples of soft alignment extracted from the attention modules in layer 2 of the system and reference of word alignment.



(a) Reference.



(c) Vector-norms (ours).

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - AER scores with different alignment extraction methods on German-English translation

Methods	AER
Transformer – Attention-based Approach	
Attention-weights	
best layer	51.9
mean	81.4
Vector-norms (ours)	
best layer	28.3
mean	61.6
Transformer – Gradient-based Approach	
(Li et al., 2016) SmoothGrad	36.4
(Ding et al., 2019) SmoothGrad	36.4
Word Aligner	
fast_align	28.4
GIZA++	21.0

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Doubt on attention's reliability as explanation?
  - Demonstrate a simple method for training models to produce deceptive attention masks
  - Method
    - Diminishes the total weight assigned to designated impermissible tokens, even when the models can be shown to nevertheless rely on these features to drive predictions.
    - So, manipulates attention weights while paying surprisingly little cost in accuracy
  - Results
    - The manipulated attention-based explanations deceive people into thinking that predictions from a model biased against gender minorities do not rely on the gender

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Example of an occupation prediction task where attention-based explanation (highlighted) has been manipulated to whitewash problematic tokens.

Attention	Biography	Label
Original	Ms. X practices medicine in Memphis, TN and ... Ms. X speaks English and Spanish.	Physician
Ours	Ms. X practices medicine in Memphis , TN and ... Ms. X speaks English and Spanish.	Physician

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Manipulating Attention
  - $S = w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n$: an input sequence of n words.
  - $\mathcal{I}$: a pre-specified set of impermissible words
    - E.g.) gender words such as "he", "she", "Mr.", or "Ms."
  - $\boldsymbol{m}$: a binary vector of size n

$$\mathbf{m}_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } w_i \in \mathcal{I} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}$: a new objective function

$$\mathcal{R} = -\lambda \log(1 - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{m})$$

an additive penalty term whose purpose is to penalize the model for allocating attention to impermissible words.

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Manipulating Attention
  - Extended penalty terms for multiheaded attention

$$\mathcal{R} = -\frac{\lambda}{|\mathcal{H}|} \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \log(1 - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_h^T \mathbf{m}))$$

$$\mathcal{R} = -\lambda \cdot \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \log(1 - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_h^T \mathbf{m})$$

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Example sentences from each classification task, with highlighted impermissible tokens and their support

Dataset (Task)	**Input Example**	**Impermissible Tokens** (Percentage)
CommonCrawl Biographies (Physician vs Surgeon)	Ms. X practices medicine in Memphis, TN and is affiliated with . . . Ms. X speaks English and Spanish.	Gender Indicators (6.5%)
Wikipedia Biographies (Gender Identification)	After that, Austen was educated at home until she went to boarding school with Cassandra early in 1785	Gender Indicators (7.6%)
SST + Wikipedia (Sentiment Analysis)	Good fun, good action, good acting, good dialogue, good pace, good cinematography. Helen Maxine Lamond Reddy (born 25 October 1941) is an Australian singer, actress, and activist.	SST sentence (45.5%)
Reference Letters (Acceptance Prediction)	It is with pleasure that I am writing this letter in support of . . . I highly recommend her for a place in your institution. Percentile:99.0 Rank:Extraordinary.	Percentile, Rank (1.6%)

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Classification Models
  - Embedding + Attention
  - BiLSTM + Attention
  - Transformer Models
    - To block the information flow from permissible to impermissible tokens, multiply attention weights at every layer with a self-attention mask $\mathbf{M}$
      - $\mathbf{M}_{i,j}$: represents whether the token w_i should attend on w_j
        - » $\boldsymbol{M}_{i,j}$ is 1 if both i and j belong to the same set (either the set of impermissible tokens, I or its complement I^C).
    - Additionally, the [CLS] token attends to all the tokens, but no token attends to [CLS]

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

– Transformer Models

- Restricted self-attention in BERT
- The information flow through attention is restricted between impermissible and permissible tokens for every encoder layer



Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Sequence-to-sequence tasks
  - **Bigram Flipping**: reverse the bigrams in the input

$$\{w_1, w_2 \ldots w_{2n-1}, w_{2n}\} \rightarrow \{w_2, w_1, \ldots w_{2n}, w_{2n-1}\}$$

  - **Sequence Copying**: copy the input sequence

$$\{w_1, w_2 \ldots w_{n-1}, w_n\} \rightarrow \{w_1, w_2 \ldots w_{n-1}, w_n\}$$

  - **Sequence Reversal**: reverse the input sequence

$$\{w_1, w_2 \ldots w_{n-1}, w_n\} \rightarrow \{w_n, w_{n-1} \ldots w_2, w_1\}$$

For any given target token, we precisely know the input tokens responsible. ➔ the gold alignments act as impermissible tokens in our setup

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Sequence-to-sequence tasks
  - **Machine translation (English to German)**
    - Use the Multi30K dataset, comprising of image descriptions
    - Use Fast Align toolkit (Dyer et al., 2013) to align target words to their source counterparts.
    - Take these aligned words as impermissible tokens

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Accuracy of **various classification models** along with their attention mass (A.M.) on impermissible tokens I, with varying values of the loss coefficient λ

Model	λ	$\mathcal{I}$	Occupation Pred.		Gender Identify		SST + Wiki		Ref. Letters	
			Acc.	A.M.	Acc.	A.M.	Acc.	A.M.	Acc.	A.M.
Embedding	0.0	✗	93.8	-	66.8	-	48.9	-	74.2	2.3
Embedding	0.0	✓	96.3	51.4	100	99.2	70.7	48.4	77.5	2.3
Embedding	0.1	✓	96.2	4.6	99.4	3.4	67.9	36.4	76.8	0.5
Embedding	1.0	✓	96.2	1.3	99.2	0.8	48.4	8.7	76.9	0.1
BiLSTM	0.0	✗	93.3	-	63.3	-	49.1	-	74.7	-
BiLSTM	0.0	✓	96.4	50.3	100	96.8	76.9	77.7	77.5	4.9
BiLSTM	0.1	✓	96.4	0.08	100	$< 10^{-6}$	60.6	0.04	76.9	3.9
BiLSTM	1.0	✓	96.7	$< 10^{-2}$	100	$< 10^{-6}$	61.0	0.07	74.2	$< 10^{-2}$
BERT	0.0	✗	95.0	-	72.8	-	50.4	-	68.2	
BERT (mean)	0.0	✓	97.2	13.9	100	80.8	90.8	59.0	74.7	2.6
BERT (mean)	0.1	✓	97.2	0.01	99.9	$< 10^{-3}$	90.9	$< 10^{-2}$	76.2	$< 10^{-1}$
BERT (mean)	1.0	✓	97.2	$< 10^{-3}$	99.9	$< 10^{-3}$	90.6	$< 10^{-3}$	75.2	$< 10^{-2}$
BERT	0.0	✗	95.0	-	72.8	-	50.4	-	68.2	
BERT (max)	0.0	✓	97.2	99.7	100	99.7	90.8	96.2	74.7	28.9
BERT (max)	0.1	✓	97.1	$< 10^{-3}$	99.9	$< 10^{-3}$	90.7	$< 10^{-2}$	76.7	0.6
BERT (max)	1.0	✓	97.4	$< 10^{-3}$	99.8	$< 10^{-4}$	90.2	$< 10^{-3}$	75.9	$< 10^{-2}$

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Performance of **sequence-to-sequence models** and their attention mass (A.M.) on impermissible tokens I, with varying values of the loss coefficient λ

Attention	λ	Bigram Flip		Sequence Copy		Sequence Reverse		En → De MT	
		Acc.	A.M.	Acc.	A.M.	Acc.	A.M.	BLEU	A.M.
Dot-Product	0.0	100.0	94.5	99.9	98.8	100.0	94.1	24.4	20.6
Uniform	0.0	97.8	5.2	93.8	5.2	88.1	4.7	18.5	5.9
None	0.0	96.4	0.0	84.1	0.0	84.1	0.0	14.9	0.0
Manipulated	0.1	99.9	24.4	100.0	27.3	100	27.6	23.7	7.0
Manipulated	1.0	99.8	0.03	92.9	0.02	99.8	0.01	20.6	1.1

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

- Human Study
  - Present a series of inputs and outputs from classification models to three human subjects
  - Highlight the input tokens as per the attention scores from three different training schemes
    - (i) original dot-product attention
    - (ii) adversarial attention from Wiegreffe and Pinter (2019)
    - (iii) our proposed attention manipulation strategy
  - Ask human annotators
    - (Q1): Do you think that this prediction was influenced by the gender of the individual?
    - (Q2): Do you believe the highlighted tokens capture the factors that drive the models' prediction?

Learning to Deceive with Attention-Based Explanations [Pruthi et al '20]

– Results to questions posed to human participants. Q1: Do you think that this prediction was influenced by the gender of the individual? Q2: Do you believe the highlighted tokens capture the factors that drive the models prediction?

Attention	Example	Q1	Q2
Original	Ms. X practices medicine and specializes in urological surgery	66% (yes)	3.00
Adversarial (Wiegreffe and Pinter, 2019)	Ms. X practices medicine and specializes in urological surgery	0% (yes)	1.00
Ours	Ms. X practices medicine and specializes in urological surgery	0% (yes)	2.67

Contents

- Introduction
- Explainable AI
- Explainable AI for Natural language processing
  - Deep learning for NLP
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
- Explainable deep learning for NLP
  - Model distillation methods: LIME
  - Visualization of neural models for NLP
    - Perturbation-based method: Representation Erasure
    - Gradient-based method: Integrated Gradient
    - Attention mechanism
  - Analytics on pretrained language models ◀
    - Probing & Diagnostic methods
  - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
    - Question answering
    - Machine translation
  - Other approaches for explainable NLP
- Conclusion & Discussion

Probing Methods: A Case Study - Structural probe

- **Structural probe** [Hewitt & Manning '19]
  - Find a linear transformation that encodes the distance between words in the parse tree





Probing Methods: A Case Study - Structural probe

- **Structural probe** [Hewitt & Manning '19]
  - In the transformed space, (squared) L2 distance approximates tree distance

Squared L2 distance in the transformed space

$$d_B(\mathbf{h}_i^\ell, \mathbf{h}_j^\ell)^2 = \left(B(\mathbf{h}_i^\ell - \mathbf{h}_j^\ell)\right)^T \left(B(\mathbf{h}_i^\ell - \mathbf{h}_j^\ell)\right)$$

Approximates the tree distance between all pairs of words

$$\min_B \sum_\ell \frac{1}{|s^\ell|^2} \sum_{i,j} \left| d_{T^\ell}(w_i^\ell, w_j^\ell) - d_B(\mathbf{h}_i^\ell, \mathbf{h}_j^\ell)^2 \right|$$

tree distance — L2 distance

  - Decoding
    - Finding a minimum spanning tree using the squared distances as edge weights

Probing Methods: A Case Study - Edge probing

- **Edge probing** [Tenney et al '20]
  - Probing model architecture for semantic role labelling



Probing Methods: A Case Study - Edge probing

- **Edge probing** [Tenney et al '20]
  - Example sentence, spans, and target label for each task. O = OntoNotes, W = Winograd.

POS	The important thing about Disney is that it is a global $[\text{brand}]_1$. $\rightarrow$ NN (Noun)
Constit.	The important thing about Disney is that it $[\text{is a global brand}]_1$. $\rightarrow$ VP (Verb Phrase)
Depend.	$[\text{Atmosphere}]_1$ is always $[\text{fun}]_2$ $\rightarrow$ nsubj (nominal subject)
Entities	The important thing about $[\text{Disney}]_1$ is that it is a global brand. $\rightarrow$ Organization
SRL	$[\text{The important thing about Disney}]_2$ $[\text{is}]_1$ that it is a global brand. $\rightarrow$ Arg1 (Agent)
SPR	$[\text{It}]_1$ $[\text{endorsed}]_2$ the White House strategy... $\rightarrow$ {awareness, existed_after, ...}
Coref.^{O}	The important thing about $[\text{Disney}]_1$ is that $[\text{it}]_2$ is a global brand. $\rightarrow$ True
Coref.^{W}	$[\text{Characters}]_2$ entertain audiences because $[\text{they}]_1$ want people to be happy. $\rightarrow$ True Characters entertain $[\text{audiences}]_2$ because $[\text{they}]_1$ want people to be happy. $\rightarrow$ False
Rel.	The $[\text{burst}]_1$ has been caused by water hammer $[\text{pressure}]_2$. $\rightarrow$ Cause-Effect(e_2, e_1)

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Address the problem of Probing methods
  - Undermined by the uncertainty of the amount of knowledge that is learned by the probe itself.
- Perturbed Masking [Wu et al '20]
  - A parameter-free probing technique for analyzing pre-trained language models
  - Does not require direct supervision from the probing tasks, nor do we introduce additional parameters to the probing process
  - Introduce Perturbed Masking to estimate inter-word correlation
    - Based on the masked language modeling (MLM) objective to measure the impact a word x_j has on predicting another word x_i
    - Then induce the global linguistic properties (e.g., dependency trees) from this inter-word information

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Token Perturbation
  - $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \ldots, x_T]$: A sentence as a list of tokens
  - $H_\theta(\mathbf{x})_i$: The contextualized representation for x_i
  - $f(x_i, x_j)$: The target function we want to derive, which captures the impact a context word x_j has on the prediction of another word x_i
  - Two-stage approach
    - 1) Replace x_i with the [MASK] token and feed the new sequence $\boldsymbol{x}\backslash\{x_i\}$ into BERT ➔ $H_\theta(\mathbf{x}\backslash\{x_i\})_i$
    - 2) Further mask out x_j to obtain the second corrupted sequence $\boldsymbol{x}\backslash\{x_i, x_j\}$ ➔ $H_\theta(\mathbf{x}\backslash\{x_i, x_j\})_i$

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Token Perturbation

$$f(x_i, x_j) = d\left(H_\theta(\mathbf{x}\backslash\{x_i\})_i, H_\theta(\mathbf{x}\backslash\{x_i, x_j\})_i\right)$$

  - $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$: the distance metric that captures the difference between two vectors
    - **Dist**: Euclidean distance between $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$
    - **Prob**: $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = a(\mathbf{x})_{x_i} - a(\mathbf{y})_{x_i}$

  Repeat the two-stage perturbation on each pair of tokens $x_i, x_j \in \mathbf{x}$

- $\mathcal{F}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$: an impact matrix

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Span Perturbation
  - Straightforwardly extend the token-level perturbation
    - Spans: phrases, clauses, or paragraphs
  - $D = [e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_N]$:model a document D as N non-overlapping text spans
    - e_i contains a sequence of tokens $e_i = [x_1^i, x_2^i, \ldots, x_M^i]$
  - Steps
    - Mask an array of tokens in a span simultaneously
    - Obtain the span representation by averaging the representations of all the tokens the span contains

$$f(e_i, e_j) = d\left(H_\theta(D \backslash \{e_i\})_i, H_\theta(D \backslash \{e_i, e_j\})_i\right)$$

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Heatmap of the impact matrix for the sentence "*For those who follow social media transitions on Capitol Hill, this will be a little different.*"



Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Syntactic Probe: **Dependency Probe**
  - Use the token-level perturbed masking technique to extract an impact matrix F for each sentence.
  - Then utilize graph-based algorithms to induce a dependency tree from

Model	Parsing UAS	
	WSJ10-U	PUD
Right-chain	49.5	35.0
Left-chain	20.6	10.7
Random BERT	16.9	10.2
Eisner+Dist	**58.6**	**41.7**
Eisner+Prob	52.7	34.1
CLE+Dist	51.5	33.2

UAS results of BERT on unsupervised dependency parsing.

Model	UAS	UUAS	NED
Eisner+Dist	41.7	52.1	69.6
Right-chain	35.0	39.9	41.2

Performance on PUD when evaluated using UAS, UUAS, and NED.

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Syntactic Probe: **Constituency Probe**
  - Top-Down Parsing:
    - Find the best splitting position k that will separate the sentence into constituents $((\mathbf{x}_{<k}), (x_k, (\mathbf{x}_{>k})))$
    - For the constituent $\mathbf{x} = [x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j]$

$$\arg\max_k \quad \mathcal{F}^{i,\ldots,k}_{i,\ldots k} + \mathcal{F}^{k+1,\ldots,j}_{k+1,\ldots,j} - \mathcal{F}^{k+1,\ldots,j}_{i,\ldots,k} - \mathcal{F}^{i,\ldots,k}_{k+1,\ldots,j}$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{i,\ldots,k}_{i,\ldots k} = \frac{\sum_{a=i}^{k}\sum_{b=i}^{k} f(x_a, x_b)}{2(k-i)}$$

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Syntactic Probe: **Constituency Probe**
  - Unlabeled parsing F1 results evaluated on WSJ10 and PTB23.

Model	Parsing F1		Accuracy on PTB23 by Tag				
	WSJ10	PTB23	NP	VP	PP	S	SBAR
PRPN-LM	70.5	37.4	63.9	-	24.4	-	-
ON-LSTM 1st-layer	42.8	24.0	23.8	15.6	18.3	48.1	16.3
ON-LSTM 2nd-layer	66.8	49.4	61.4	51.9	55.4	54.2	15.4
ON-LSTM 3rd-layer	57.6	40.4	57.5	13.5	47.2	48.6	10.4
300D ST-Gumbel w/o Leaf GRU	-	25.0	18.8	-	9.9	-	-
300D RL-SPINN w/o Leaf GRU	-	13.2	24.1	-	14.2	-	-
MART	58.0	42.1	44.6	47.0	50.6	66.1	51.9
Right-Branching	56.7	39.8	25.0	71.8	42.4	74.2	68.8
Left-Branching	19.6	9.0	11.3	0.8	5.0	44.1	5.5

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- Discourse Probe
  - Spans: Elementary Discourse Units (EDUs)
  - Extract an EDU-EDU impact matrix for each document using span-level perturbation
  - Performance of different discourse parser

Model	UAS	Accuracy by distance			
		0	1	2	5
Right-chain	10.7	20.5	-	-	-
Left-chain	**41.5**	**79.5**	-	-	-
Random BERT	6.3	20.4	7.5	3.5	0.0
Eisner+Dist	34.2	61.6	7.3	**7.6**	**12.8**
CLE+Dist	34.4	63.8	3.3	3.5	2.6

Zero-shot Probing Methods: A Case Study - Perturbed Masking

- BERT-based Trees VS Parser-provided Trees
  - Task: Aspect Based Sentiment Classification
  - Model: **Proximity-Weighted Convolution Network** (PWCN)
  - Experimental results of aspect based sentiment classification.

Model	Laptop		Restaurant	
	Acc	Macro-F1	Acc	Macro-F1
LSTM	69.63	63.51	77.99	66.91
PWCN				
+Pos	75.23	71.71	81.12	71.81
+Dep	76.08	72.02	80.98	72.28
+Eisner	75.99	72.01	**81.21**	**73.00**
+right-chain	75.64	71.53	81.07	72.51
+left-chain	74.39	70.78	80.82	72.71

Structural probe for Korean [Min et al ’20]

- Our structural probing for **Korean** pretrained LMs
  - Evaluation metric: UUAS (Undirected Unlabeled Attach Score)
  - Models: **RoBERTa**

Sejong dataset

	dev	test
RoBERTa Layer1	55.04%	59.00%
RoBERTa Layer2	60.13%	64.22%
RoBERTa Layer3	62.30%	66.01%
RoBERTa Layer4	63.84%	67.32%
RoBERTa Layer5	66.65%	70.46%
RoBERTa Layer6	69.78%	73.48%
RoBERTa Layer7	73.66%	77.32%
RoBERTa Layer8	75.25%	78.79%
RoBERTa Layer9	**76.48%**	**79.57%**
RoBERTa Layer10	76.16%	79.03%
RoBERTa Layer11	74.39%	77.57%
RoBERTa Layer12	71.57%	74.58%

Structural probe for Korean [Min et al ’20]

- Our structural probing for **Korean** pretrained LMs
  - Evaluation metric: UUAS (Undirected Unlabeled Attach Score)
  - Models: Google’s **multilingual BERT**

Sejong dataset

	dev	test
Multilingual BERT Layer1	54.59%	57.99%
Multilingual BERT Layer2	57.99%	61.05%
Multilingual BERT Layer3	63.79%	67.68%
Multilingual BERT Layer4	66.52%	70.45%
Multilingual BERT Layer5	68.83%	72.30%
Multilingual BERT Layer6	72.32%	75.89%
Multilingual BERT Layer7	**73.32%**	**76.94%**
Multilingual BERT Layer8	73.25%	76.63%
Multilingual BERT Layer9	72.54%	75.39%
Multilingual BERT Layer10	70.86%	73.62%
Multilingual BERT Layer11	70.09%	72.79%
Multilingual BERT Layer12	66.98%	70.08%

Structural probe for Korean [Min et al ’20]

- Evaluation metric: UUAS (Undirected Unlabeled Attach Score)
- Models: **ElMo**
  - Trained from 5G coupus, consisting of Wikipedia & News

	dev	test
ELMo Layer1	53.40%	55.12%
ELMo Layer2	64.53%	68.17%

Structural probe for Korean [Min et al ’20]

- Our structural probing for **Korean** pretrained LMs
  - Probing performances vs. Parsing performances



- UUAS performance

	UUAS
ELMo Layer2	68.17%
Multilingual BERT Layer7	76.94%
RoBERTa Layer9	79.57%

- Parsing Performance based on biaffine attention

	UAS	LAS
ELMo + biaffine	93.12%	91.00%
Multilingual BERT + biaffine	93.86%	91.88%
RoBERTa + biaffine	94.27%	92.32%

Show a positive correlation b/w the probing performance (UUAS) and the actual parsing performance (UAS)

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - Cloze probability for world knowledge

- **LAMA (LAnguage Model Analysis) probe [Petroni et al '19]**
  - Test the factual and commonsense knowledge in language models



Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - Cloze probability for world knowledge

- **LAMA (LAnguage Model Analysis) probe [Petroni et al '19]**
  - Examples of generation for BERT-large

	Relation	Query	Answer	Generation
T-Rex	P19	Francesco Bartolomeo Conti was born in ____.	Florence	Rome [-1.8], **Florence [-1.8]**, Naples [-1.9], Milan [-2.4], Bologna [-2.5]
	P20	Adolphe Adam died in ____.	Paris	**Paris [-0.5]**, London [-3.5], Vienna [-3.6], Berlin [-3.8], Brussels [-4.0]
	P279	English bulldog is a subclass of ____.	dog	dogs [-0.3], breeds [-2.2], **dog [-2.4]**, cattle [-4.3], sheep [-4.5]
	P37	The official language of Mauritius is ____.	English	**English [-0.6]**, French [-0.9], Arabic [-6.2], Tamil [-6.7], Malayalam [-7.0]
	P413	Patrick Oboya plays in ____ position.	midfielder	centre [-2.0], center [-2.2], **midfielder [-2.4]**, forward [-2.4], midfield [-2.7]
	P138	Hamburg Airport is named after ____.	Hamburg	Hess [-7.0], Hermann [-7.1], Schmidt [-7.1], **Hamburg [-7.5]**, Ludwig [-7.5]
	P364	The original language of Mon oncle Benjamin is ____.	French	**French [-0.2]**, Breton [-3.3], English [-3.8], Dutch [-4.2], German [-4.9]
	P54	Dani Alves plays with ____ .	Barcelona	Santos [-2.4], Porto [-2.5], Sporting [-3.1], Brazil [-3.3], Portugal [-3.7]
	P106	Paul Toungui is a ____ by profession .	politician	lawyer [-1.1], journalist [-2.4], teacher [-2.7], doctor [-3.0], physician [-3.7]
	P527	Sodium sulfide consists of ____.	sodium	water [-1.2], sulfur [-1.7], **sodium [-2.5]**, zinc [-2.8], salt [-2.9]
	P102	Gordon Scholes is a member of the ____ political party.	Labor	Labour [-1.3], Conservative [-1.6], Green [-2.4], Liberal [-2.9], **Labor [-2.9]**
	P530	Kenya maintains diplomatic relations with ____.	Uganda	India [-3.0], **Uganda [-3.2]**, Tanzania [-3.5], China [-3.6], Pakistan [-3.6]
	P176	iPod Touch is produced by ____.	Apple	**Apple [-1.6]**, Nokia [-1.7], Sony [-2.0], Samsung [-2.6], Intel [-3.1]
	P30	Bailey Peninsula is located in ____.	Antarctica	**Antarctica [-1.4]**, Bermuda [-2.2], Newfoundland [-2.5], Alaska [-2.7], Canada [-3.1]
	P178	JDK is developed by ____.	Oracle	IBM [-2.0], Intel [-2.3], Microsoft [-2.5], HP [-3.4], Nokia [-3.5]
	P1412	Carl III used to communicate in ____.	Swedish	German [-1.6], Latin [-1.9], French [-2.4], English [-3.0], Spanish [-3.0]
	P17	Sunshine Coast, British Columbia is located in ____.	Canada	**Canada [-1.2]**, Alberta [-2.8], Yukon [-2.9], Labrador [-3.4], Victoria [-3.4]
	P39	Pope Clement VII has the position of ____ .	pope	cardinal [-2.4], Pope [-2.5], **pope [-2.6]**, President [-3.1], Chancellor [-3.2]
	P264	Joe Cocker is represented by music label ____.	Capitol	EMI [-2.6], BMG [-2.6], Universal [-2.8], **Capitol [-3.2]**, Columbia [-3.3]
	P276	London Jazz Festival is located in ____.	London	**London [-0.3]**, Greenwich [-3.2], Chelsea [-4.0], Camden [-4.6], Stratford [-4.8]
	P127	Border TV is owned by ____.	ITV	Sky [-3.1], **ITV [-3.3]**, Global [-3.4], Frontier [-4.1], Disney [-4.3]
	P103	The native language of Mammootty is ____.	Malayalam	**Malayalam [-0.2]**, Tamil [-2.1], Telugu [-4.8], English [-5.2], Hindi [-5.6]
	P495	The Sharon Cuneta Show was created in ____.	Philippines	Manila [-3.2], **Philippines [-3.6]**, February [-3.7], December [-3.8], Argentina [-4.0]
ConceptNet	AtLocation	You are likely to find a overflow in a ____.	drain	sewer [-3.1], canal [-3.2], toilet [-3.3], stream [-3.6], **drain [-3.6]**
	CapableOf	Ravens can ____.	fly	**fly [-1.5]**, fight [-1.8], kill [-2.2], die [-3.2], hunt [-3.4]
	CausesDesire	Joke would make you want to ____.	laugh	cry [-1.7], die [-1.7], **laugh [-2.0]**, vomit [-2.6], scream [-2.6]
	Causes	Sometimes virus causes ____.	infection	disease [-1.2], cancer [-2.0], **infection [-2.6]**, plague [-3.3], fever [-3.4]
	HasA	Birds have ____.	feathers	wings [-1.8], nests [-3.1], **feathers [-3.2]**, died [-3.7], eggs [-3.9]
	HasPrerequisite	Typing requires ____.	speed	patience [-3.5], precision [-3.6], registration [-3.8], accuracy [-4.0], **speed [-4.1]**
	HasProperty	Time is ____.	finite	short [-1.7], passing [-1.8], precious [-2.9], irrelevant [-3.2], gone [-4.0]
	MotivatedByGoal	You would celebrate because you are ____.	alive	happy [-2.4], human [-3.3], **alive [-3.3]**, young [-3.6], free [-3.9]
	ReceivesAction	Skills can be ____.	taught	acquired [-2.5], useful [-2.5], learned [-2.8], combined [-3.9], varied [-3.9]
	UsedFor	A pond is for ____.	fish	swimming [-1.3], fishing [-1.4], bathing [-2.0], **fish [-2.8]**, recreation [-3.1]

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - LM probability for linguistic knowledge

- BLiMP [Warstadt et al '20]

  (The Benchmark of Linguistic Minimal Pairs for English)

  – Consist of minimal pairs from 12 linguistic phenomenon categories

  – Minimal pairs

The cats annoy Tim. (grammatical)
*The cats annoys Tim. (ungrammatical)

Use the **language model probabilities** of two sentences to select a grammatically correct one

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - LM probability for linguistic knowledge

- BLiMP [Warstadt et al '20]

Phenomenon	N	Acceptable Example	Unacceptable Example
ANAPHOR AGR.	2	*Many girls insulted themselves.*	*Many girls insulted herself.*
ARG. STRUCTURE	9	*Rose wasn't disturbing Mark.*	*Rose wasn't boasting Mark.*
BINDING	7	*Carlos said that Lori helped him.*	*Carlos said that Lori helped himself.*
CONTROL/RAISING	5	*There was bound to be a fish escaping.*	*There was unable to be a fish escaping.*
DET.-NOUN AGR.	8	*Rachelle had bought that chair.*	*Rachelle had bought that chairs.*
ELLIPSIS	2	*Anne's doctor cleans one important book and Stacey cleans a few.*	*Anne's doctor cleans one book and Stacey cleans a few important.*
FILLER-GAP	7	*Brett knew what many waiters find.*	*Brett knew that many waiters find.*
IRREGULAR FORMS	2	*Aaron broke the unicycle.*	*Aaron broken the unicycle.*
ISLAND EFFECTS	8	*Whose hat should Tonya wear?*	*Whose should Tonya wear hat?*
NPI LICENSING	7	*The truck has clearly tipped over.*	*The truck has ever tipped over.*
QUANTIFIERS	4	*No boy knew fewer than six guys.*	*No boy knew at most six guys.*
SUBJECT-VERB AGR.	6	*These casseroles disgust Kayla.*	*These casseroles disgusts Kayla.*

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - LM probability for linguistic knowledge

- BLiMP [Warstadt et al '20]
  - Evaluation metric: LM's overall accuracy
    - The proportion of the test minimal pairs in which the model assigns a higher probability to the acceptable sentence
  - Experiment results

Model	Overall	Ana. Agr	Arg. Str	Binding	Ctrl. Rais.	D-N Agr	Ellipsis	Filler. Gap	Irregular	Island	NPI	Quantifiers	S-V Agr
5-gram	61.2	47.9	71.9	64.4	68.5	70.0	36.9	60.2	79.5	57.2	45.5	53.5	60.3
LSTM	69.8	91.7	73.2	73.5	67.0	85.4	67.6	73.9	89.1	46.6	51.7	64.5	80.1
TXL	69.6	94.1	69.5	74.7	71.5	83.0	77.2	66.6	78.2	48.4	55.2	69.3	76.0
GPT-2	81.5	99.6	78.3	80.1	80.5	93.3	86.6	81.3	84.1	70.6	78.9	71.3	89.0
Human	88.6	97.5	90.0	87.3	83.9	92.2	85.0	86.9	97.0	84.9	88.1	86.6	90.9

These phenomena are challenging

- Main observations
  - Models generally perform best on morphological phenomena

Struggle with subtle semantic and syntactic phenomena, such as negative polarity items and extraction islands.

s &

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study
- Cloze probability for linguistic/commonsense knowledge

- [Ettinger '20]:
  - Examine commonsense reasoning & syntactic knowledge
    - ROLE-88: addresses event knowledge and semantic role interpretation, and tests sensitivity to impact of role reversals.

Context	Compl.
the restaurant owner forgot which customer the waitress had ____	*served*
the restaurant owner forgot which waitress the customer had ____	*served*

Change semantic roles of two words (waitress and customer) and compare the cloze probabilities

Use the **cloze probability** of a masked word to detect whether **roles are changed**

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - Cloze probability for linguistic/commonsense knowledge

- [Ettinger '20]:
  - CPRAG-102: Addresses commonsense and pragmatic inference, and tests sensitivity to differences within semantic category

Context	Expected	Inappropriate
He complained that after she kissed him, he couldn't get the red color off his face. He finally just asked her to stop wearing that ____	*lipstick*	*mascara* | *bracelet*
He caught the pass and scored another touchdown. There was nothing he enjoyed more than a good game of ____	*football*	*baseball* | *monopoly*

  - ➢ Requires common sense reasoning (infer what is being described in the first sentence) and pragmatic reasoning (determine how the second sentence relates)

[Ettinger '20] concludes:

BERT suffers from commonsense/pragmatic reasoning and role-based event prediction

Probing & Diagnostic Methods

- Probing & Diagnostic methods: now increasingly explored

Package	Knowledge	Task	Formulation	Examples
LKT	Linguistic	POS Tagging	Token Labeling	PRON AUX **VERB** ADV ADP DET NOUN PUNCT I 'm **staying** away from the stock .
		Syntactic Chunking		B-NP B-VP B-PP **B-NP** I-NP I-NP O Shearson works at **American** Express Co .
		Name Entity Recognition		O O I-ORG **I-ORG** I-ORG O O O O By stumps Kent **County** Club had reached 108 .
		Syntactic Arc Predication	Token Pair Labeling	
		Syntactic Arc Classification		
BLiMP	Linguistic	Irregular Forms	Comparing Sentence Scores **Expected:** $\mathbb{S}(\checkmark) > \mathbb{S}(\times)$	✓ Aaron ***broke*** the unicycle. ✗ Aaron ***broken*** the unicycle.
		Determiner-Noun Agree.		✓ Rachelle had bought that ***chair*** ✗ Rachelle had bought that ***chairs***.
		Subject-Verb Agreement		✓ These casseroles ***disgust*** Kayla. ✗ These casseroles ***disgusts*** Kayla.
		Island Effect		✓ Which ***bikes*** is John fixing? ✗ Which is John fixing ***bikes***?
		Filler Gap		✓ Brett knew ***what*** many waiters find. ✗ Brett knew ***that*** many waiters find.
LAMA	Factual	Google RE	Masked LM **Expected:** $\forall w \in V_{\text{RoBERTa}} \setminus \{\checkmark\}, \mathbb{P}(\checkmark \mid \mathcal{C}) > \mathbb{P}(w \mid \mathcal{C})$	Albert Einstein was born in ***[MASK]*** ✓: ***[MASK]*** = 1879
		T-REx		Humphrey Cobb was a ***[MASK]*** and novelist ✓: ***[MASK]*** = screenwriter
		SQuAD		A Turing machine handles ***[MASK]*** on a strip of tape. ✓: ***[MASK]*** = symbols
	Commonsense	ConceptNet		You can use ***[MASK]*** to bathe your dog. ✓: ***[MASK]*** = shampoo
CAT	Commonsense	Conjunction Acceptability	Comparing Sentence Scores **Expected:** $\forall \times, \mathbb{S}(\checkmark) > \mathbb{S}(\times)$	✓ Jim yelled at Kevin ***because*** Jim was so upset. ✗ Jim yelled at Kevin ***and*** Jim was so upset.
		Winograd		✓ The fish ate the worm. The ***fish*** was hungry. ✗ The fish ate the worm. The ***worm*** was hungry.
		Sense Making		✓ Money can be used for buying ***cars***. ✗ Money can be used for buying ***stars***.
		SWAG		✓ Someone unlocks the door and they go in. ***Someone leads the way in***. ✗ Someone unlocks the door and they go in. ***Someone opens the door and walks out***. ✗ Someone unlocks the door and they go in. ***Someone walks out of the driveway***. ✗ Someone unlocks the door and they go in. ***Someone walks next to someone and sits on a pew.***
		Argument Reasoning		✓ People can choose not to use Google, ***and since all other search engines re-direct to Google***, Google is not a harmful monopoly. ✗ People can choose not to use Google, ***but since other search engines do not re-direct to Google***, Google is not a harmful monopoly.
oLMpics	Reasoning	Taxonomy Conjunction	Multiple Choice Masked LM **Expected:** $\forall \times, \mathbb{P}(\checkmark \mid \mathcal{C}) > \mathbb{P}(\times \mid \mathcal{C})$	A ferry and a floatplane are both a type of ***[MASK]***. ✓ vehicle ✗ airplane ✗ boat
		Antonym Negation		It was ***[MASK]*** hot, it was really cold. ✓ not ✗ really
		Object Comparison		The size of a airplane is usually much ***[MASK]*** than the size of a house. ✗ smaller ✓ larger
		Always Never		A chicken ***[MASK]*** has horns. ✓ never ✗ rarely ✗ sometimes ✗ often ✗ always
		Multi-Hop Composition		When comparing a 23, a 38 and a 31 year old, the ***[MASK]*** is oldest. ✓ second ✗ first ✗ third

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2104.07885.pdf

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - CheckList

- Behavioral Testing of NLP Models with CheckList [Ribeiro et al '20]
  - CheckListing a commercial sentiment analysis model

Capability	Min Func Test	INVariance	DIRectional
Vocabulary	Fail. rate=15.0%	16.2%	C 34.6%
NER	0.0%	B 20.8%	N/A
Negation	A 76.4%	N/A	N/A
...			

Test case	Expected	Predicted	Pass?
A Testing **Negation** with ***MFT***	Labels: negative, positive, neutral		
`Template: I {NEGATION} {POS_VERB} the {THING}.`			
I can't say I recommend the food.	neg	pos	x
I didn't love the flight.	neg	neutral	x
...			
		Failure rate = 76.4%	
B Testing **NER** with ***INV***	Same pred. (inv) after removals / additions		
@AmericanAir thank you we got on a different flight to [Chicago → Dallas].	inv	pos / neutral	x
@VirginAmerica I can't lose my luggage, moving to [Brazil → Turkey] soon, ugh.	inv	neutral / neg	x
...			
		Failure rate = 20.8%	
C Testing **Vocabulary** with ***DIR***	Sentiment monotonic decreasing (↓)		
@AmericanAir service wasn't great. You are lame.	↓	neg / neutral	x
@JetBlue why won't YOU help them?! Ugh. I dread you.	↓	neg / neutral	x
...			
		Failure rate = 34.6%	

Diagnostic Methods: A Case Study - CheckList

Labels: positive, negative, or neutral; INV: same pred. (INV) after removals/ additions; DIR: sentiment should not decrease (↑) or increase (↓)

	Test *TYPE* and Description	Failure Rate (%)					Example test cases & expected behavior
			G	a		RoB	
Vocab.+POS	***MFT:*** Short sentences with neutral adjectives and nouns	0.0	7.6	4.8	94.6	81.8	The company is Australian. neutral That is a private aircraft. neutral
	MFT: Short sentences with sentiment-laden adjectives	4.0	15.0	2.8	0.0	0.2	That cabin crew is extraordinary. pos I despised that aircraft. neg
	INV: Replace neutral words with other neutral words	9.4	16.2	12.4	10.2	10.2	@Virgin should I be concerned that → when I'm about to fly ... INV @united the → our nightmare continues... INV
	DIR: Add positive phrases, fails if sent. goes down by > 0.1	12.6	12.4	1.4	0.2	10.2	@SouthwestAir Great trip on 2672 yesterday... You are extraordinary. ↑ @AmericanAir AA45 ... JFK to LAS. You are brilliant. ↑
	DIR: Add negative phrases, fails if sent. goes up by > 0.1	0.8	34.6	5.0	0.0	13.2	@USAirways your service sucks. You are lame. ↓ @JetBlue all day. I abhor you. ↓
Robust.	***INV:*** Add randomly generated URLs and handles to tweets	9.6	13.4	24.8	11.4	7.4	@JetBlue that selfie was extreme. @pi9QDK INV @united stuck because staff took a break? Not happy 1K.... https://t.co/PWK1jb INV
	INV: Swap one character with its neighbor (typo)	5.6	10.2	10.4	5.2	3.8	@JetBlue → @JeBtlue I cri INV @SouthwestAir no thanks → thakns INV
NER	***INV:*** Switching locations should not change predictions	7.0	20.8	14.8	7.6	6.4	@JetBlue I want you guys to be the first to fly to # Cuba → Canada... INV @VirginAmerica I miss the #nerdbird in San Jose → Denver INV
	INV: Switching person names should not change predictions	2.4	15.1	9.1	6.6	2.4	...Airport agents were horrendous. Sharon → Erin was your saviour INV @united 8602947, Jon → Sean at http://t.co/58tuTgli0D, thanks. INV
Temporal	***MFT:*** Sentiment change over time, present should prevail	41.0	36.6	42.2	18.8	11.0	I used to hate this airline, although now I like it. pos In the past I thought this airline was perfect, now I think it is creepy. neg
Negation	***MFT:*** Negated negative should be positive or neutral	18.8	54.2	29.4	13.2	2.6	The food is not poor. pos or neutral It isn't a lousy customer service. pos or neutral
	MFT: Negated neutral should still be neutral	40.4	39.6	74.2	98.4	95.4	This aircraft is not private. neutral This is not an international flight. neutral
	MFT: Negation of negative at the end, should be pos. or neut.	100.0	90.4	100.0	84.8	7.2	I thought the plane would be awful, but it wasn't. pos or neutral I thought I would dislike that plane, but I didn't. pos or neutral
	MFT: Negated positive with neutral content in the middle	98.4	100.0	100.0	74.0	30.2	I wouldn't say, given it's a Tuesday, that this pilot was great. neg I don't think, given my history with airplanes, that this is an amazing staff. neg
SRL	***MFT:*** Author sentiment is more important than of others	45.4	62.4	68.0	38.8	30.0	Some people think you are excellent, but I think you are nasty. neg Some people hate you, but I think you are exceptional. pos
	MFT: Parsing sentiment in (question, "yes") form	9.0	57.6	20.8	3.6	3.0	Do I think that airline was exceptional? Yes. neg Do I think that is an awkward customer service? Yes. neg
	MFT: Parsing sentiment in (question, "no") form	96.8	90.8	81.6	55.4	54.8	Do I think the pilot was fantastic? No. neg Do I think this company is bad? No. pos or neutral

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Our LAMA probing for **Korean** pretrained LMs
  - Models: $\mathbf{RoBERTa}_{\mathbf{base}}^{\mathbf{18G}}$ & $\mathbf{RoBERTa}_{\mathbf{base}}^{\mathbf{540M}}$
    - Two variants of RoBERTa using grapheme on 18G and 500M corpus size, respectively

Model	Base Model	#parameters	Training Corpus	Corpus Size	Token type
$\mathrm{RoBERTa}_{\mathrm{base}}^{500M}$	Transformer (RoBERTa)	134M	Wikipedia (ko)	500M	Grapheme
$\mathrm{RoBERTa}_{\mathrm{base}}^{18G}$	Transformer (RoBERTa)	134M	Wikipedia (ko) + News + Encyclopedia	18GB	Grapheme

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Datasets: Wikipedia triples & KTQA
  - Wikipedia triples: about 221K questions
    - Automatically converted natural questions

KB	Source	#total relations	#total facts	#selected-relations	#selected – facts	#answerable facts	#answerable questions
Wikipedia Triples	Wikipedia (ko)	1312	10M	8	4M	238,382	221,255

  - KTQA: open-domain QA questions provided by KT
    - Selected from test questions for Giga Genie speaker

QA	Source	#total questions	#total facts	#question-type	#total answerable questions	#answerable questions
KTQA	KT QA	18090	< 18090	4	2848	1816

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Experiment results on Wikipedia Triples

				18G	540MB	18G	540MB
Rel	Meaning	# Num	Freq	P@1		P@5	
				$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{18G}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{540MB}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{18G}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{540MB}}$
P21	Gender	102877	74%	19	**26.70**	94	**99.75**
P27	Nationality	53537	31%	**56**	28.31	81	56.41
P106	Occupation	51457	37%	13	3.98	39	**40.78**
P19	Birthplace	5729	18%	**25**	11.80	57	31.02
P20	Place of death	3662	32%	17	14.17	39	38.48
P136	Genre	3525	33%	13	3.72	55	19.40
P461	Opposite concept	241	2%	**27**	0	49	1.24
P1082	Population	227	86%	0	**0.880**	9	8.37
Total		221,255		**26**	20.78	**75**	71.27

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Experiment results on KTQA

			18G	540MB	18G	540MB
Rel	# Num	Freq	P@1		P@5	
			$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{18G}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{540MB}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{18G}}$	$\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{540MB}}$
Other	951	5.15%	**13.14**	6.20	**24.92**	11.15
Person	509	52.46%	**11.59**	4.32	**58.35**	30.45
Local Organization	351	8.26%	**52.42**	42.45	**73.22**	62.11
Math	5	40.00%	**40.00**	0	**80.00**	40
Total	1,816		**20.37**	12.66	**43.77**	26.48

- Observation
  - The larger corpus is used for pretraining, the more accuracy is obtained in LAMA probing
  - This tendency is weaker on Wikipedia triples
    - Note that $\text{RoBERTa}_{\text{base}}^{\text{540M}}$ is trained from the Wikipedia corpus, which corresponds to the target triple dataset

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Sample results on Wikipedia triples

Query	Answers	Generation
조지 워싱턴의 직업은 <!#mask>이다.	['정치인', '장교', '군인', '병사']	변호사: [-2.03] **군인: [-2.18]** 외교관: [-2.47] 대통령: [-2.89]
조지 W. 부시의 직업은 <!#mask>이다.	['정치인', '화가', '장교']	대통령: [-1.01] 외교관: [-2.61] 장관: [-2.94] **정치인: [-3.01]**
디에고 벨라스케스의 직업은 <!#mask>이다.	['화가']	시인: [-2.56] 교사: [-2.61] **화가: [-2.69]** 의사: [-2.85]
조지 워싱턴의 성별은 <!#mask>이다.	['남성']	여성: [-2.14] 흑인: [-2.21] **남성: [-2.47]** 미국인: [-2.63]
잭 바우어의 성별은 <!#mask>이다.	['남성']	한국인: [-2.48] 여성: [-2.55] 미국인: [-2.61] **남성: [-2.65]**
더글러스 애덤스의 성별은 <!#mask>이다.	['남성']	누구: [-1.29] 미상: [-1.95] 여성: [-2.94] **남성: [-3.16]**
조지 워싱턴의 국적은 <!#mask>이다.	['미국']	**미국: [-0.38]** 영국: [-2.76] 캐나다: [-2.90] 한국: [-3.38]
잭 바우어의 국적은 <!#mask>이다.	['미국']	**미국: [-0.83]** 영국: [-1.80] 캐나다: [-2.54] 한국: [-3.15]
더글러스 애덤스의 국적은 <!#mask>이다.	['영국']	미국: [-1.04] **영국: [-1.53]** 독일: [-2.97] 한국: [-3.11]
호펜섬의 인구 수는 <!#mask>명이다.	['4']	8: [-1.94] 4: [-2.16] 3: [-2.16] 9: [-2.23]
나배사 섬의 인구 수는 <!#mask>명이다.	['0', '3']	8: [-1.94] 3: [-2.17] 4: [-2.18] 5: [-2.21]
베이커 섬의 인구 수는 <!#mask>명이다.	['0', '4']	8: [-1.97] 3: [-2.16] 4: [-2.20] 5: [-2.21]

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Sample results on Wikipedia triples

Query	Answer	Generation
샤를 보들레르는 <!#mask>에서 태어났다.	['파리']	**파리: [-0.92]** 프랑스: [-1.24] 스위스: [-3.48] 독일: [-3.53]
오토는 <!#mask>에서 태어났다.	['로마']	**로마: [-2.16]** 독일: [-2.25] 그리스: [-2.60] 파리: [-3.58]
티투스는 <!#mask>에서 태어났다.	['로마']	**로마: [-1.11]** 그리스: [-1.97] 독일: [-3.32] 헝가리: [-3.42]
엑토르 베를리오즈의 장르는 <!#mask>이다.	['오페라']	음악: [-0.61] **오페라: [-1.90]** 작품: [-3.46] 작곡: [-3.68]
레너드 코언의 장르는 <!#mask>이다.	['록']	음악: [-1.69] 영화: [-2.85] **록: [-3.09]** 연극: [-3.15]
리하르트 바그너의 장르는 <!#mask>이다.	['오페라']	음악: [-1.22] **오페라: [-1.28]** 작곡: [-2.34] 피아노: [-3.41]
행복의 반대말은 <!#mask>이다.	['슬픔']	불행: [-0.71] **슬픔: [-2.42]** 고통: [-3.37] 두려움: [-3.61]
북쪽의 반대말은 <!#mask>이다.	['남쪽', '서쪽', '동쪽']	**남쪽: [-2.62]** 남한: [-4.02] 일본: [-4.13] 침묵: [-4.23]
혼인의 반대말은 <!#mask>이다.	['이혼']	**이혼: [-1.48]** 결혼: [-1.99] 혼인: [-3.28] 사랑: [-3.57]
샤를 보들레르는 <!#mask>에서 사망했다.	['파리']	감옥: [-1.65] **파리: [-1.89]** 프랑스: [-2.28] 자택: [-2.68]
피에르 코르네유는 <!#mask>에서 사망했다.	['파리']	**파리: [-2.09]** 자택: [-2.17] 프랑스: [-2.18] 감옥: [-2.49]
엑토르 베를리오즈는 <!#mask>에서 사망했다.	['파리']	독일: [-2.16] 감옥: [-2.43] **파리: [-2.49]** 베를린: [-2.74]

- Sample results on T-Rex

Query	Answer	Generation
프란체스코 바르톨로메오 콘티는 _____에서 태어났다.	플로렌스	로마: [-0.97] 스페인: [-2.64] 브라질: [-2.70] 파리: [-2.91] 그리스: [-3.32] 칠레: [-3.33] 프랑스: [-3.38] 스위스: [-3.49] 헝가리: [-3.53] 독일: [-3.72]
아돌프 아당은 _____에서 사망했다.	파리	감옥: [-1.55] 자택: [-2.33] 병원: [-2.59] 이곳: [-2.69] 그곳: [-3.02] **파리: [-3.25]** 독일: [-3.26] 프랑스: [-3.61] 베를린: [-4.00] 시리아: [-4.02]
불도그는 _____의 하위 분류이다.	개	다음: [-1.18] 그림: [-2.96] 불교: [-3.48] 게임: [-3.60] 영어: [-4.01] 그: [-4.02] 고양이: [-4.24] 불: [-4.24] 한자: [-4.45] 사진: [-4.66]
모리셔스의 공용어는 _____이다.	영어	**영어: [-0.16]** 스페인: [-2.99] 프랑스: [-3.97] 불어: [-4.93] 한국어: [-5.30] 영국: [-5.39] 아랍: [-5.45] 라틴: [-5.58] 독일: [-5.89] 브라질: [-6.02]
패트릭 오보야의 포지션은 _____이다.	미드필더	수비수: [-0.54] 공격: [-2.69] 윙: [-3.29] 주장: [-3.51] 센터: [-3.77] 수비: [-4.31] 오른쪽: [-4.31] 우익: [-4.34] 투수: [-4.54] 중앙: [-4.55]
함부르크 공항의 이름은 _____의 이름을 따서 지어졌다.	함부르크	그: [-1.69] 황제: [-2.51] 독일: [-2.82] 국왕: [-3.00] 영주: [-3.51] 시인: [-3.82] 도시: [-3.88] 왕: [-4.13] 항구: [-4.15] 저자: [-4.31]
Mon oncle Benjamin의 원작 언어는 _____어이다.	프랑스	스페인: [-1.48] 독일: [-2.30] 미국: [-2.81] **프랑스: [-2.83]** 라틴: [-2.92] 일본: [-2.98] 영국: [-3.16] 아랍: [-3.20] 영어: [-3.82] 유럽: [-3.95]
다니엘 알베스는 _____팀에 속해있다.	바르셀로나	첼시: [-1.99] 맨유: [-3.00] A: [-3.26] 국가대표: [-3.30] 올림픽: [-3.91] 리버: [-3.94] S: [-4.02] 다른: [-4.13] 수비: [-4.23] B: [-4.34]
Paul Toungui의 직업은 _____이다.	정치인	군인: [-2.40] 경찰: [-3.10] 외교관: [-3.39] 운전: [-3.67] 경찰관: [-3.85] 교사: [-3.90] 법관: [-4.12] 학생: [-4.16] 선생: [-4.16] 대장: [-4.18]
황화 나트륨은 _____로 구성되어 있다.	나트륨	둘: [-1.60] 질소: [-2.18] 탄소: [-2.43] 단백질: [-2.76] 황: [-3.30] 으: [-3.31] 2: [-3.68] 원자: [-3.74] 수소: [-3.90] 철: [-4.06]
고든 스콜스는 _____당의 일원이다.	노동	보수: [-1.35] 자유: [-1.91] 진보: [-2.03] 녹색: [-2.25] 공화: [-2.30] 사회: [-2.90] 국민: [-3.94] 공산: [-4.26] 개혁: [-4.63] 미래: [-4.69]
케냐는 _____와 외교 관계를 유지하고 있습니다.	우간다	카타르: [-1.95] 러시아: [-2.00] 캐나다: [-2.32] 말레이시아: [-2.48] 우리: [-2.56] 인도: [-2.65] 프랑스: [-2.80] 터키: [-2.81] 스위스: [-3.11] 미얀마: [-3.49]
아이팟 터치는 _____에서 생산합니다.	애플	소니: [-1.07] **애플: [-1.35]** 한국: [-2.19] 일본: [-2.73] 삼성: [-2.92] 미국: [-3.55] 여기: [-3.99] 국내: [-4.07] 대만: [-4.36] 구글: [-4.41]
베일리 페닌슐라는 _____에 위치해 있다.	남극	곳: [-2.31] 지역: [-2.88] 마을: [-3.02] 스위스: [-3.49] 시내: [-3.62] 프랑스: [-3.70] 근처: [-3.94] 이곳: [-4.03] 해변: [-4.20] 사막: [-4.23]
JDK는 _____에 의해 개발되었다.	오라클	일본: [-1.12] 미국: [-1.72] 한국인: [-2.92] 미군: [-3.08] 한국: [-3.51] 북한: [-3.77] 소련: [-3.84] 미국인: [-3.87] 독일: [-4.45] 중국: [-4.54]
칼 3세는 _____어로 의사소통을 했습니다.	스웨덴	프랑스: [-1.17] 독일: [-1.40] 라틴: [-2.23] 스페인: [-2.32] 아랍: [-2.77] 그리스: [-2.97] 러시아: [-3.46] **스웨덴: [-3.84]** 덴마크: [-4.94] 우리: [-4.97]
선샤인코스트와 브리티시컬럼비아주는 _____에 위치해 있다.	캐나다	근처: [-2.05] 인근: [-2.61] 중간: [-2.63] 사이: [-2.66] 경계: [-2.78] 북서쪽: [-2.96] 북쪽: [-3.25] 서쪽: [-3.55] 부근: [-3.68] 남쪽: [-3.79]
교황 클레멘스 7세의 직위는 _____이다.	교황	추기경: [-0.75] **교황: [-2.16]** 장관: [-2.39] 수상: [-3.48] 대통령: [-3.64] 황제: [-3.78] 총장: [-4.14] 주교: [-4.60] 대사: [-4.61] 총리: [-4.87]
조 카커는 _____이라는 레코드 레이블로 대표된다.	캐피털	블랙: [-4.03] 미국: [-4.05] 퀸: [-4.12] 뉴욕: [-4.35] 클럽: [-4.48] 애플: [-4.62] 그린: [-4.64] 빅: [-4.64] 샘: [-4.66] 맥: [-4.69]
런던 재즈 패스티벌은 _____에 위치해 있다.	런던	**런던: [-0.83]** 북쪽: [-2.91] 서쪽: [-2.96] 남쪽: [-3.11] 도심: [-3.18] 시내: [-3.43] 동쪽: [-3.62] 북서쪽: [-3.84] 첼시: [-3.98] 중앙: [-4.18]
Border TV는 _____가 소유하고 있다.	ITV	국가: [-1.54] 정부: [-2.24] 모두: [-2.57] 우리: [-2.95] 회사: [-3.24] 소니: [-3.41] 프랑스: [-4.15] 나: [-4.37] 교회: [-4.42] 자기: [-4.55]
Mammootty의 모국어는 _____어이다.	말라얄람	프랑스: [-1.02] 그리스: [-2.84] 일본: [-2.92] 터키: [-3.00] 독일: [-3.03] 러시아: [-3.07] 스페인: [-3.19] 아랍: [-3.34] 라틴: [-3.75] 베트남: [-3.81]
Sharon Cuneta Show는 _____에서 만들어졌다.	필리핀	일본: [-1.57] 미국: [-1.86] 독일: [-2.73] 영국: [-2.98] 한국: [-3.03] 프랑스: [-3.36] 중국: [-3.49] 스위스: [-3.94] 스웨덴: [-4.03] 덴마크: [-4.32]

LAMA Probing for Ko-RoBERTa

- Sample results on ConceptNet

Query	Answer	Generation
<!#mask>에서 물이 넘칠 것 같다.	배수구	한강: [-2.76] 계곡: [-3.11] 화장실: [-3.29] 학교: [-3.38] 운동장: [-3.50] 주유소: [-3.59] 강: [-3.67] 호수: [-3.74] 우물: [-3.77] 차: [-3.92]
까마귀는 <!#mask> 수 있다.	날	**날: [-1.18]** 먹을: [-2.26] 울: [-2.28] 할: [-2.81] 볼: [-2.95] 그럴: [-3.44] 알: [-3.52] 될: [-3.67] 놀: [-3.85] 갈: [-3.94]
농담은 당신을 <!#mask>게 만든다.	웃	**웃: [-0.80]** 기쁘: [-2.42] 행복하: [-2.73] 슬프: [-3.04] 놀라: [-3.09] 설레: [-3.13] 불편하: [-3.63] 미치: [-3.79] 강하: [-4.14] 편하: [-4.14]
바이러스는 때때로 <!#mask>을 일으킨다.	감염	질병: [-1.62] **감염: [-1.92]** 죽음: [-2.61] 변형: [-3.22] 전염: [-3.40] 증상: [-3.46] 분열: [-3.48] 변: [-3.48] 부작용: [-3.49] 병: [-3.50]
새는 <!#mask>을 가지고 있다.	깃털	뿔: [-3.24] 뜻: [-3.52] 이름: [-3.53] 알: [-3.64] 영혼: [-3.65] 꿈: [-3.73] 씨앗: [-3.75] 마음: [-3.91] 시간: [-3.96] 눈: [-4.00]
새는 <!#mask>를 가지고 있다.	-	날개: [-0.37] 꼬리: [-2.55] 부리: [-3.55] 소리: [-4.12] 뿌리: [-4.41] 다리: [-4.47] 나: [-5.08] 귀: [-5.14] 가지: [-5.29] 언어: [-5.35]
타이핑에는 <!#mask>가 요구된다.	속도	인내: [-2.07] 스피드: [-2.07] **속도: [-2.41]** 파워: [-2.62] 주의: [-2.64] 노하우: [-2.95] 용기: [-2.98] 자세: [-3.53] 여유: [-3.75] 기술: [-3.84]
타이핑에는 <!#mask>이 요구된다.	-	기술: [-1.32] 자신감: [-2.39] 시간: [-2.81] 감각: [-3.23] 실력: [-3.23] 노력: [-3.32] 능력: [-3.66] 안정성: [-3.68] 힘: [-3.77] 정성: [-3.84]
시간은 <!#mask>하다.	영원	**영원: [-2.31]** 소중: [-2.38] 지루: [-3.00] 깨끗: [-3.16] 무한: [-3.30] 투명: [-3.32] 간단: [-3.37] 급: [-3.42] 일정: [-3.66] 정확: [-3.68]
시간은 <!#mask>이다.	-	돈: [-2.74] 축복: [-3.61] 시간: [-3.80] 거짓말: [-4.14] 힘: [-4.16] 빛: [-4.28] 기적: [-4.30] 생명: [-4.66] 운명: [-4.69] 거울: [-4.73]
당신은 <!#mask>기 때문에 축하하게 될 것이다.	살	행복하: [-1.35] 사랑하: [-1.60] 기쁘: [-1.88] 건강하: [-2.71] 좋아하: [-3.27] 젊: [-3.38] 바쁘: [-3.96] 모르: [-4.16] 즐겁: [-4.64] 잘하: [-4.73]
기술은 <!#mask> 될 수 있다.	전수	배가: [-3.04] 계속: [-3.46] 현실화: [-3.64] 어떻게: [-3.67] 누가: [-3.77] 쉽게: [-3.97] 문제: [-3.99] 변화: [-4.22] 잘: [-4.27] 응용: [-4.45]
연못은 <!#mask>를 위한 것이다.	낚시	고기: [-2.58] 우리: [-2.93] 바다: [-3.12] 나무: [-3.15] 나: [-3.45] 인류: [-3.54] 조화: [-3.79] 평화: [-3.93] 모두: [-3.93] 도시: [-4.06]

Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20] Visualize loss landscapes
  - 1) One-dimensional Loss Curve

$$f(\alpha) = \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \alpha\boldsymbol{\delta}_1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$$

Optimization direction

  - 2) Two-dimensional Loss Surface

$$f(\alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \alpha\boldsymbol{\delta}_1 + \beta\boldsymbol{\delta}_2)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_2 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$$

Represents the fine-tuned parameters on another dataset.

Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Results
  - Pre-training Gets a Good Initial Point Across Downstream Tasks



Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Results
  - Pre-training Gets a Good Initial Point Across Downstream Tasks
    - Training loss of fine-tuning BERT and training from scratch on four datasets.



Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Results
  - Pre-training-then-fine-tuning is Robust to Overfitting



The optimization trajectories on the training loss surfaces of training from scratch (top) and fine-tuning BERT (bottom)

Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Pre-training Helps to Generalize Better
  - Wide and Flat Optima Lead to Better Generalization



Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Pre-training Helps to Generalize Better
  - Consistency Between Training Loss Surface and Generalization Error Surface



Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Lower Layers of BERT are More Invariant and Transferable

Dataset	BERT	Layer Rollback		
		0-7	8-15	16-23
MNLI	86.54	86.73 (+0.19)	84.71 (-1.83)	32.85 (-53.88)
RTE	75.45	73.29 (-2.16)	70.04 (-5.41)	47.29 (-28.16)
SST-2	94.04	93.69 (-0.35)	93.12 (-0.92)	59.29 (-34.75)
MRPC	90.20	87.99 (-2.21)	80.15 (-10.05)	78.17 (-12.03)

Analyzing Generalization Effects of Language Model

- [Hao et al '20]: Lower Layers of BERT are More Invariant and Transferable



Contents

- Introduction
- Explainable AI
- Explainable AI for Natural language processing
  - Deep learning for NLP
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
- Explainable deep learning for NLP
  - Model distillation methods: LIME
  - Visualization of neural models for NLP
    - Perturbation-based method: Representation Erasure
    - Gradient-based method: Integrated Gradient
    - Attention mechanism
  - Analytics on pretrained language models
    - Probing methods & Diagnostic methods
  - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
    - Question answering
    - Machine translation
  - Other approaches for explainable NLP
- Conclusion & Discussion

HotpotQA [Yang et al '18]

Paragraph A, Return to Olympus:
[1] *Return to Olympus is the only album by the alternative rock band Malfunkshun.* [2] *It was released after the band had broken up and after lead singer Andrew Wood (later of Mother Love Bone) had died of a drug overdose in 1990.* [3] Stone Gossard, of Pearl Jam, had compiled the songs and released the album on his label, Loosegroove Records.

Paragraph B, Mother Love Bone:
[4] *Mother Love Bone was an American rock band that formed in Seattle, Washington in 1987.* [5] The band was active from 1987 to 1990. [6] *Frontman Andrew Wood's personality and compositions helped to catapult the group to the top of the burgeoning late 1980s/early 1990s Seattle music scene.* [7] *Wood died only days before the scheduled release of the band's debut album, "Apple", thus ending the group's hopes of success.* [8] The album was finally released a few months later.

Q: What was the former band of the member of Mother Love Bone who died just before the release of "Apple"?
A: Malfunkshun
Supporting facts: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7

QED: A Framework and Dataset for Explanations in Question Answering [Lamm et al '20]

- QED explanations decompose the questionpassage relationship in terms of referential equality and predicate entailment

Question: who wrote the film howl's moving castle?
Passage: Howl's Moving Castle is a 2004 Japanese animated fantasy film written and directed by Hayao Miyazaki. It is based on the novel of the same name, which was written by Diana Wynne Jones. The film was produced by Toshio Suzuki.
Answer: Hayao Miyazaki

---

(1) Sentence Selection
Howl's Moving Castle is a 2004 Japanese animated fantasy film written and directed by Hayao Miyazaki.
(2) Referential Equality
the film howl's moving castle = Howl's Moving Castle
(3) Entailment
X is a 2004 Japanese animated fantasy film written and directed by ANSWER.⊢ ANSWER wrote X.

Contents

- Introduction
- Explainable AI
- Explainable AI for Natural language processing
  - Deep learning for NLP
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
- Explainable deep learning for NLP
  - Model distillation methods: LIME
  - Visualization of neural models for NLP
    - Perturbation-based method: Representation Erasure
    - Gradient-based method: Integrated Gradient
    - Attention mechanism
  - Analytics on pretrained language models
    - Probing methods & Diagnostic methods
  - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
    - Question answering
    - Machine translation
  - Other approaches for explainable NLP
- Conclusion & Discussion

Explainable Deep Learning for Pretrained Language Model

Input text



Prediction result &
Interpretable/faithful explanation

Probing & Diagnostic Methods

Diagnostic results

Extension:
To go beyond the limitation of the current model, how to extend pretrained language models?

Understand what knowledge is contained in pretrained language models



Explainable Deep Learning for Pretrained Language Model: Extension

- KnowBERT [Peters et al '19]
  - Knowledge Enhanced Pretrained Language Models



Explainable Deep Learning for Pretrained Language Model: Extension

- Neuro-symbolic pretrained LM

Neural model

Learning

Deep learning&
Pretrained language models



Explanation/
Distillation

Transfer/
Injection

Symbolic model

Reasoning

Knowledge graph&
Symbolic logics
Grammar/Lexicon





Year	City	Country	Nations
1896	Athens	Greece	14
1900	Paris	France	24
1904	St. Louis	USA	12
...	...	...	...



Summary & Conclusion

- Briefly review
  - Explainable deep learning for NLP
    - Model distillation methods: LIME
    - Visualization of neural models for NLP
      - Perturbation-based method: Representation Erasure
      - Gradient-based method: Integrated Gradient
      - Attention mechanism
    - Analytics on pretrained language models
      - Probing methods & Diagnostic methods
    - Explanation-Aware Learning for NLP
      - Question answering
      - Machine translation
- Conclusion
  - Face the limitation of pretrained language models
  - Extension of pretrained language models is a major issue
    - Knowledge enhanced language models, etc.