

Transfer Learning


ELMo (Peters et al., 2018)




Learning goals

- Understand the contextualization of word embeddings
- Get the intuition of feature-based Transfer Learning


RECAP: WORD VECTORS



Male-Female



Verb Tense



Country-Capital

Source: *google*

- Information is encoded in (pre-)trained word embeddings
- Embeddings are used for tasks external to the training corpus

FEATURE-BASED TRANSFER LEARNING

Using word2vec:

- ➊ Self-supervised pre-training of word2vec ..
 - Using a large, unannotated corpus
 - Objective: CBOW or Skip-gram.. and extract the stored knowledge (i.e. embedding)
- ➋ *Alternative:* Download embeddings from the web, e.g.
<https://code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec/>
- ➌ Perform a (supervised) task using the embeddings, e.g. Sentiment classification using an LSTM network

The stored knowledge from the pre-trained model is extracted as is and is not further adapted to the actual domain/task of interest!

CONTEXTUALITY

1st Generation of neural embeddings are "context-free":

- Breakthrough paper by Mikolov et al, 2013 (Word2Vec)
- Followed by Pennington et al, 2014 (GloVe)
- Extension of Word2Vec by Bojanowski et al, 2016 (FastText)

Why "Context-free"?

- Models learn *one single* embedding for each word
- Why could this possibly be problematic?
 - "The *default* setting of the function is xyz."
 - "The probability of *default* is rather high."
- Would be nice to have different embeddings for these two occurrences

CONTEXTUAL EMBEDDINGS



Source: *Jay Alammar*

- Bidirectional language model (LM)
- Combines a forward LM

$$p(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) = \prod_{k=1}^N p(t_k | t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1})$$

and a backward LM

$$p(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) = \prod_{k=1}^N p(t_k | t_{k+1}, t_{k+2}, \dots, t_N)$$

to arrive at the following loglikelihood:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\log p(t_k | t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}; \Theta_x, \vec{\Theta}_{LSTM}, \Theta_s) + \log p(t_k | t_{k+1}, \dots, t_N; \Theta_x, \overleftarrow{\Theta}_{LSTM}, \Theta_s) \right)$$

ELMO EMBEDDINGS

- Character-based (context-independent) token representations

$$\mathbf{x}_k^{LM}$$

- Two-layer biLSTM as main architecture:
 - Two context-dependent token representations *per layer*, i.e.

$$\vec{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM} \text{ \& \; } \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM} \text{ for the } k\text{-th token in the } j\text{-th layer.}$$


- Four context-dependent token representations in total:

$$\left\{ \vec{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM}, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM} \mid j = 1, 2 \right\}$$

- Five representations per token in total:


$$\begin{aligned} R_k &= \left\{ \mathbf{x}_k^{LM}, \vec{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM}, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_{k,j}^{LM} \mid j = 1, \dots, L \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{h}_{k,j}^{LM} \mid j = 0, 1, 2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION



Source: *Carolyn Becker*

GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION



Source: *Carolyn Becker*

TASK ADAPTION

Including ELMo in downstream tasks:

- Calculate task-specific weights of all five representations:

$$\text{ELMo}_k^{\text{task}} = E(R_k; \Theta^{\text{task}}) = \gamma^{\text{task}} \sum_{j=0}^L s_j^{\text{task}} \mathbf{h}_{k,j}^{\text{LM}},$$


where the $\mathbf{h}_{k,j}^{\text{LM}}$ are **not trainable** anymore.

- Trainable parameters during the adaption:
 - s_j^{task} are trainable (softmax-normalized) weights
 - γ^{task} is a trainable scaling parameter

Advantages over context free-embeddings:

- Task-specific model has access to *multiple* representations of each token
- Model learns to which degree to use the different representations depending on the task at hand

TASK ADAPTION



Source: *Carolyn Becker*

PERFORMANCE

TASK	PREVIOUS SOTA		OUR BASELINE	ELMo + BASELINE	INCREASE (ABSOLUTE/ RELATIVE)
SQuAD	Liu et al. (2017)	84.4	81.1	85.8	4.7 / 24.9%
SNLI	Chen et al. (2017)	88.6	88.0	88.7 ± 0.17	0.7 / 5.8%
SRL	He et al. (2017)	81.7	81.4	84.6	3.2 / 17.2%
Coref	Lee et al. (2017)	67.2	67.2	70.4	3.2 / 9.8%
NER	Peters et al. (2017)	91.93 ± 0.19	90.15	92.22 ± 0.10	2.06 / 21%
SST-5	McCann et al. (2017)	53.7	51.4	54.7 ± 0.5	3.3 / 6.8%

Table 1: Test set comparison of ELMo enhanced neural models with state-of-the-art single model baselines across six benchmark NLP tasks. The performance metric varies across tasks – accuracy for SNLI and SST-5; F_1 for SQuAD, SRL and NER; average F_1 for Coref. Due to the small test sizes for NER and SST-5, we report the mean and standard deviation across five runs with different random seeds. The “increase” column lists both the absolute and relative improvements over our baseline.

Source: *Peters et al. (2018)*

SUMMARY

- Embeddings are (bidirectionally!) contextualized
(as opposed to word2vec)
- Embeddings are *not* adapted to target domain/task
(similar as for word2vec)
- Additional weights are learned for each downstream task
(i.e. besides the embeddings, no shared knowledge across tasks)