# What Do Transformers Learn in NLP? Recent Insights from Model Analysis

# **Rico Sennrich**





joint work with Elena Voita, Ivan Titov, David Talbot, Fedor Moiseev

### Recent Developments in NLP Leaderboard Race





pre-training becomes mainstream

#### new neural architectures

#### how do neural architectures work?



### (why) does pre-training objective matter?

- BERT-style masked language modeling better than causal language model [Lample and Conneau, 2019]
- "Language Modeling Teaches You More Syntax than Translation Does" [Zhang and Bowman, 2018]
- ...but multilingual NMT may allow better cross-lingual transfer than mBERT [Siddhant et al., 2019]



#### how do neural architectures work?

2

- f-attention is key Transformer
- multi-head self-attention is key Transformer component
- questions:
  - how to identify important attention heads?
  - can we prune unimportant ones?
  - which functions do attention heads have?
- spoiler (paper title): "Specialized Heads Do the Heavy Lifting, the Rest Can Be Pruned"





- method 1: assume that "confident" heads (low entropy weight distribution) are important
- method 2: layerwise relevance propagation (LRP) [Bach et al., 2015, Ding et al., 2017]
- method 3: pruning: add regularization term to training objective which deactivates unimportant heads (L<sub>0</sub> norm on scalar gates drawn from Hard Concrete Distribution)

function of attention head is determined via simple rules

#### positional: maximum attention weight is given to specific relative position



syntactic: maximum attention weight is given to token in specific dependency relation



### **Determining Function of Self-Attention Heads**

#### rare tokens: maximum attention weight is given to least frequent token



### Important Self-Attention Heads Are Specialized



important heads tend to be positional, syntactic, or focus on rare tokens.

## **Pruning Self-Attention Heads**

most heads (in encoder) can be pruned with little quality loss



most heads that survive pruning have one of the functions we identified





# The Evolution of Representations in the Transformer



[Voita, Sennrich, Titov, EMNLP 2019]

compare representations of models only differing in objective function:

- same architecture (Transformer encoder)
- same (source-side) training data (WMT EN→{DE,FR})

background: information bottleneck principle [Tishby et al., 1999, Tishby and Zaslavsky, 2015]

hypothesis: deep neural model learns to compress input representation, retaining information necessary to:

- predict the output label
- build representations of other tokens



### Same Architecture, Different Objective Functions







language model (causal, LM) masked language model (MLM, aka BERT) machine translation (MT)

# Is (Input) Token Identity Preserved?





mutual information estimator

how can this be non-monotonic?

- we measure MI/acc per position
- in MLM, information about token is distributed across sentence

clustering k-nearest neighbor accuracy

#### representations of is, are, were, was (t-sne projection)



### MT Preserves Token Position the Most



MT LM MLM

distance between position of a representation and its k-nearest neighbors visualisation via t-sne projection

### Causal LM: Past and Future



- lower layers in (causal) LM represent input (left token)
- higher layers form representations predictive of output (right token)

- analysis of pruning of self-attention heads could lead to:
  - model interpretability
  - efficiency
- learning objective affects information flow in Transformer
- analysis of representations complements probing experiments → can be used to explain why:
  - some pre-training objectives are more successful
  - lower layers may perform better in some probing tasks than higher ones

#### Thank you for your attention

#### more content in blog posts and papers!

- https://lena-voita.github.io/posts/acl19\_heads.html
- https://lena-voita.github.io/posts/emnlp19\_evolution.html



t-sne clustering of CCG tags

# Bibliography I



#### Bach, S., Binder, A., Montavon, G., Klauschen, F., Müller, K.-R., and Samek, W. (2015).

On pixel-wise explanations for non-linear classifier decisions by layer-wise relevance propagation. <u>PloS one</u>, 10(7):e0130140.



#### Ding, Y., Liu, Y., Luan, H., and Sun, M. (2017).

Visualizing and understanding neural machine translation. In Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1150–1159, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

#### Lample, G. and Conneau, A. (2019).

Cross-lingual language model pretraining.



Siddhant, A., Johnson, M., Tsai, H., Arivazhagan, N., Riesa, J., Bapna, A., Firat, O., and Raman, K. (2019). Evaluating the cross-lingual effectiveness of massively multilingual neural machine translation.



Tishby, N., Pereira, F. C., and Bialek, W. (1999).

The information bottleneck method.

In Proceedings of the 37-th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, pages 368–377.



#### Tishby, N. and Zaslavsky, N. (2015).

Deep learning and the information bottleneck principle. 2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW), pages 1–5.

#### Zhang, K. and Bowman, S. (2018).

Language modeling teaches you more than translation does: Lessons learned through auxiliary syntactic task analysis. In Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP, pages 359–361, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

### High Importance of Rare Tokens: Overfitting?

[Voita et al. ACL 2019]: some heads specialize on rare tokens

[Voita et al. EMNLP 2019]: rare tokens highly influential

but effect goes away after randomly swapping 10% of tokens

