

# Less supervision?

—

L101: Machine Learning for Language Processing  
Andreas Vlachos




# So far: supervised learning

Why?

- Training models using real outputs for the task you want to solve has better chances of success
- Even if we didn't need labeled data for training, we still want to know how good our model is before deploying it


But it needs labeled data for training, how can we help ourselves given that we can only find unlabeled data for free (usually!)

# Do we need all that labeled data for training?




- Are all instances equally useful in learning a model?
- Let the algorithm decide!
  - Typically select a few instances to label, update model, repeat
- Active learning in education refers to the student asking questions


# Active learning works



(a) a 2D toy data set



(b) random sampling



(c) uncertainty sampling

- Savings against randomly selected training data can be impressive
  - Even if you are fine-tuning BERT
- In fact less can be better (sometimes)
- But this is not always the case (more later)


# Active learning setups

- Pool-based
  - we have a fixed pool of unlabeled data and iterate through it
  - most common: we get some unlabelled instances and need to build a model
- Streaming/online:
  - decide whether to ask for a label now or never
  - ask a customer if the transaction is fraudulent, if the e-mail is spam, etc.
- Constructing instances:
  - generate instances for labeling
  - very rare in NLP; need very good generative models
  - now seems within reach
- Feature-based active learning
  - label features instead of instances

# How to choose informative instances?

- Uncertainty based sampling
  - Least confident: pick the instances with the lowest score by the model for any label
  - Margin: pick the instances with the smallest scoring margin between the top-2 labels
  - Entropy in the label distribution (for probabilistic models)
- Query by committee: train a few models and select the instances where they disagree the most
- Meta-learning: learn a model to select the most useful instances (pool, stream)
- Bayesian Active Learning by Disagreement: combine uncertainty with informativity on model parameters
  - Selecting instances in batches is a common practical consideration

# Things can go wrong



(a) target function

(b) initial sample

(c) uncertainty-based selective sampling over time

What would you do to avoid this?

- Make sure your initial sample is representative?
- Select instances at random too?

# When not to active learn

- If we need data for evaluation
  - it should be obvious that AL biases the data, no longer representative of the task
- If we don't think the model(s) we have can give good estimates of uncertainty
- If we want to change models later
  - Data selected by one model can be worse than random for another



# Bandit learning

Some times obtaining a complete label for an instance is impossible: e.g. for a search query we need to check all webpages


Repeat:

- pick the most promising handle (= label)
- get a reward for that handle
- Update using the reward



The key here is how to define promising: a balance of exploration/exploitation  
Can be adaptive: first explore, then exploit

# Can we use the unlabeled data to help?



Yes, with clustering!

Hierarchical sampling: prefer instances from clusters that are impure

# Clustering

Many good algorithms:

- K-means (++)
- Gaussian mixture models
- Spectral clustering
- Topic models can be thought of as soft clustering

They are great to explore unlabeled data and learn about their properties, but

Hard to evaluate...

Clustering: Science or Art: “the major obstacle is the difficulty in evaluating a clustering algorithm without taking into account the context”

# Unsupervised NLP evaluation

Unsupervised  tagger output

1 2 3 4 1 5  
There are 70 children there .

What is the task?

CCG gold standard

*NP* *(S\NP)/NP* *N/N* *N* *(S\NP)\(S\NP)* .  
There are 70 children there .

Why PoS tagging and not CCG super-tagging?

So no point in doing unsupervised learning?

No, but you need to put it in **context** to evaluate it

# Topic models

## Topics

gene 0.04  
dna 0.02  
genetic 0.01  
...

life 0.02  
evolve 0.01  
organism 0.01  
...

brain 0.04  
neuron 0.02  
nerve 0.01  
...

data 0.02  
number 0.02  
computer 0.01  
...

## Documents

### Seeking Life's Bare (Genetic) Necessities

COLD SPRING HARBOR, NEW YORK— How many **genes** does an **organism** need to **survive**? Last week at the genome meeting here, two genome researchers with radically different approaches presented complementary views of the basic genes needed for **life**. One research team, using **computer** analyses to compare known **genomes**, concluded that today's **organisms** can be sustained with just 250 genes, and that the earliest life forms required a mere 128 **genes**. The other researcher mapped genes in a simple parasite and estimated that for this organism, 800 genes are plenty to do the job—but that anything short of 100 wouldn't be enough.

Although the numbers don't match precisely, those **predictions** "are not all that far apart," especially in comparison to the 75,000 **genes** in the human genome, notes Siv Andersson, a biologist at Uppsala University in Sweden, who arrived at the 800 number. But coming up with a consensus answer may be more than just a **simple numbers** thing, particularly as more and more **genomes** are completely mapped and sequenced. "It may be a way of organizing any newly **sequenced genome**," explains Arcady Mushegian, a **computational** molecular biologist at the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) in Bethesda, Maryland. Comparing an




**Stripping down.** Computer analysis yields an estimate of the minimum modern and ancient genomes.

\* Genome Mapping and Sequencing, Cold Spring Harbor, New York, May 8 to 12.

SCIENCE • VOL. 272 • 24 MAY 1996

## Topic proportions and assignments



# Topic modeling evaluation (reading tea leaves)

1 / 10  
floppy alphabet computer processor

2 / 10  
molecule education study university

3 / 10  
linguistics actor film comedy

4 / 10  
islands island bird coast

6 / 10

**DOUGLAS\_HOFSTADTER**

Douglas Richard Hofstadter (born February 15, 1945 in New York, New York) is an American academic whose research focuses on consciousness, thinking and creativity. He is best known for ", first published in

[Show entire excerpt](#)

student	school	study	education	research	university	science	learn
human	life	scientific	science	scientist	experiment	work	idea
play	role	good	actor	star	career	show	performance
write	work	book	publish	life	friend	influence	father

- Word intrusion: Pick a topic, take top words, throw in a low-prob word for the topic, ask humans to spot the intruder
- Topic intrusion: Pick a document, take its top topics, throw in a low-prob topic for the document, ask humans to spot the intruder

# But isn't unsupervised learning common?

Yes! But often this is not what unsupervised in the ML sense (no labeled data, e.g. in clustering no cluster info, in topic models no topic info):

- Some supervision gets in through dictionaries, mapping to labels, etc.
- Or (distant) supervision was readily available on the web
- Some dev set was most likely used (hopefully not the test set!)
- Nothing wrong with this; in fact it is a great way to solve tasks
- But if we want labels in the output we need to provide them

# What about language modeling?

- Supervised or unsupervised learning?
- For me it is supervised, but we can harvest data for it at will
- More data beats better model
- The main application of LMs for a while was to score outputs from MT, ASR, etc.
- Nowadays?




Figure 5: BLEU scores for varying amounts of data using Kneser-Ney (KN) and Stupid Backoff (SB).



# Word Embeddings

- Once a by-product of learning RNN-based language models, now a goal in itself
- That's the key insight of the word2vec paper: stop worrying about trying to build a language model, focus on the embeddings
- Supervised or unsupervised?
- Unsupervised: LM has a supervised training objective, but we don't have gold standard embeddings
  - This is also why their evaluation is difficult
  - Often done in context: input for supervised models (e.g. BERT)

# Language models as models for task X?




Figure 1: Querying knowledge bases (KB) and language models (LM) for factual knowledge.

- Yes! But usually we need to add a bit task-specific supervision
  - Can do this without retraining ([GPT3](#))
- If our task can be modelled as an LM, we can take advantage of a lot of data and pre-trained models
- If we are building task-specific models, we'd better improve on it!
- If we developing a task/dataset, make sure a LM can't solve it (easily), e.g. don't use an LM (alone) to construct it

# Bibliography

[Active learning book](#) (Burr Settles, where a lot of images were taken from)

[Bandit learning book](#) (Slivkins)

[Contextual word representations: A contextual introduction](#) (Noah Smith)