

A Simple yet Effective Self-Debiasing Framework for Transformer Models

Xiaoyue Wang^{a,*}, Lijie Wang^{b,*}, Xin Liu^c, Suhang Wu^a, Jinsong Su^{a,†}, Hua Wu^b

^aSchool of Informatics, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, China,

^bBaidu Inc., Beijing 100085, China,

^cUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor 48104, USA

xiaoyuewang@stu.xmu.edu.cn, wanglijie@baidu.com, jssu@xmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Current Transformer-based natural language understanding (NLU) models heavily rely on dataset biases, while failing to handle real-world out-of-distribution (OOD) instances. Many methods have been proposed to deal with this issue, but they ignore the fact that the features learned in different layers of Transformer-based NLU models are different. In this paper, we first conduct preliminary studies to obtain two conclusions: 1) both low- and high-layer sentence representations encode common biased features during training; 2) the low-layer sentence representations encode fewer unbiased features than the high-layer ones. Based on these conclusions, we propose a simple yet effective self-debiasing framework for Transformer-based NLU models. Concretely, we first stack a classifier on a selected low layer. Then, we introduce a residual connection that feeds the low-layer sentence representation to the top-layer classifier. In this way, the top-layer sentence representation will be trained to ignore the common biased features encoded by the low-layer sentence representation and focus on task-relevant unbiased features. During inference, we remove the residual connection and directly use the top-layer sentence representation to make predictions. Extensive experiments and in-depth analyses on NLU tasks show that our framework performs better than several competitive baselines, achieving a new SOTA on all OOD test sets.¹

1 Introduction

Recently, Transformer-based models have achieved competitive performance on various NLU benchmarks (Wang et al., 2018; Devlin et al., 2019). However, many studies show that

¹We release our code at <https://github.com/bigcat2333/DeRC>.

*Both authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]Corresponding author.

Sentence 1: “ Captain ” was broken up in 1762.

Sentence 2: “ Captain ” was rolled up in 1762.

Golden Label: *non-duplicate*

Predicted Label: *duplicate*

Sentence 1: *Is there a tutorial on how to use Quora?*

Sentence 2: *How do I start using Quora?*

Golden Label: *duplicate*

Predicted Label: *non-duplicate*

Table 1: Two instances from PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019). Both instances contain biased features, which make the dominant model (Devlin et al., 2019) unable to predict the relationship between their sentences correctly. In the first instance, its two sentences contain a high proportion of overlapping words, which convey different meanings. The second instance is a paraphrase sentence pair, while its two sentences contain a limited number of overlapping words.

these models tend to directly exploit biased features as shortcuts to make predictions without understanding the semantics of input texts (Gururangan et al., 2018; McCoy et al., 2019; Geirhos et al., 2020). As a result, this behavior leads to the low generalizability and poor robustness of these models on OOD instances (Zellers et al., 2018). For example, on the PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019), which is the OOD test set for Quora Question Pairs (QQP) dataset[†]. The commonly-used BERT-based model (Devlin et al., 2019) does not achieve the expected results, as shown in Table 1.

To deal with this issue, many model-agnostic debiasing methods have been proposed, which mainly involve two steps. The first step is identifying biased training instances, of which predictions are heavily influenced by biased features, via data analysis, researchers’ task-specific insights (Gururangan et al., 2018; Poliak et al., 2018; Tsuchiya, 2018; Schuster et al., 2019) or bias-only models (Utama et al., 2020a,b; Ghaddar et al., 2021). The second step is employing various methods to down-weight the importance of biased training in-

[†]<https://www.kaggle.com/c/quora-question-pairs>

stances, such as example re-weighting (Schuster et al., 2019; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020), confidence regularization (Utama et al., 2020a) and model ensemble (Clark et al., 2019; He et al., 2019; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020).

Despite their success, most studies consider NLU models as black-box systems, ignoring that different layers of Transformer-based NLU model learn different features. As analyzed in previous studies (Jawahar et al., 2019; Tenney et al., 2019), Transformer-based pre-trained language models are able to effectively capture rich linguistic knowledge, with surface features in low layers, syntactic features in middle layers, and semantic features in high layers. Thus, two questions naturally arise: 1) Are there differences in features learned in terms of bias by different layers, i.e., biased and unbiased feature learning? 2) If so, can we leverage these differences to alleviate biased feature learning?

To answer the first question, we conduct preliminary studies to explore feature learning in different layers of Transformer-based NLU models. Specifically, following Du et al. (2021), we first identify biased and anti-biased training instances from the training set, and extract biased and anti-biased validation instances from the validation set. Then, we stack a classifier on the sentence representation of each Transformer layer. Afterwards, we analyze the feature learning of different layers from both model training and prediction perspectives. Experimental analyses show that 1) the low- and high-layer sentence representations encode common biased features, and 2) the low-layer sentence representations encode fewer unbiased features than the high-layer ones.

Based on the above analyses, we propose a self-debiasing framework for Transformer-based NLU models. Concretely, we first add a classifier on a selected low layer to encourage the low-layer sentence representation to encode more common biased features during training, which are also encoded in the high-layer classifier. Then, we introduce a residual connection (He et al., 2016) that feeds the low-layer sentence representation to the top-layer classifier. In this way, the top-layer sentence representation is encouraged to ignore the common biased features and pay attention to task-relevant unbiased features. Note that we remove the residual connection during inference and directly use the top-layer sentence representation to

make predictions.

Finally, we conduct experiments on three NLU tasks. Experimental results show that our simple framework not only achieves better performance on the OOD test sets, but also maintains comparable performance on the validation sets, compared with previous methods (Utama et al., 2020a,b; Du et al., 2021). Besides, we prove that our framework indeed improves the understanding ability of the model through in-depth analyses.

2 Related Work

Our related works mainly include the studies on identifying biased instances and debiasing methods.

Identifying Biased Instances This task is crucial to the subsequent debiasing methods. In this respect, many researchers first manually characterize the specific types of dataset biases, including word co-occurrence (Gururangan et al., 2018; Poliak et al., 2018; Tsuchiya, 2018; Schuster et al., 2019) and lexico-syntactic patterns (Snow et al., 2006; Zellers et al., 2019), and then identify biased instances according to these bias patterns. However, these methods heavily rely on researchers’ intuition and task-specific insights, limiting their applications to various NLU tasks and datasets. To deal with this issue, some studies employ various methods to create bias-only models for identifying biased instances, such as using a tiny fraction of training data (Utama et al., 2020b), partial inputs (Clark et al., 2020; Sanh et al., 2020; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020), or a simplified model architecture (Ghaddar et al., 2021).

Debiasing Methods There have been many attempts to reduce dataset biases through various data construction methods, such as adversarial filtering (Nie et al., 2020) and human-in-the-loop (Lee et al., 2021). Despite their effectiveness, researchers also show that newly constructed datasets may not cover all biased patterns (Sharma et al., 2018). Therefore, many researchers resort to various robust algorithms based on their prior knowledge of task-specific biases. In this respect, some studies adopt adversarial learning to remove the hypothesis-only bias from NLI models. For example, Belinkov et al. (2019) and Stacey et al. (2020) apply the gradient reverse layer (Ganin and Lempitsky, 2015) to train an external classifier that forces the hypothesis encoder to ignore hypothesis-only biases. A complementary line

of studies focus on debiasing models by down-weighting the importance of biased instances during training, such as example re-weighting (Schuster et al., 2019; Utama et al., 2020b), confidence regularization (Utama et al., 2020a), upweighting minority instances (Tu et al., 2020; Yaghoobzadeh et al., 2021), and model ensemble (Clark et al., 2019; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020). Usually, these methods involve two models, i.e., a bias-only model used to identify biased instances and a robust model learning from anti-biased instances. In addition to the above, very recently Lyu et al. (2023) use contrastive learning to capture the dynamic influence of biases, then reduce biased features.

Notably, most of previous studies consider models as black-box systems, and use the above two steps to debias models. By contrast, in this work, we explore the debiasing framework based on the internal structure of the model without manual analyses, extra bias-only models or complex hyper-parameter settings.

3 Feature Learning in Transformer Models

In this work, we choose BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) as our basic model, due to its competitive performance in many NLU tasks (Wang et al., 2018). In this section, we first briefly introduce BERT, and then conduct preliminary studies to analyze the feature learning in different layers of the BERT-based NLU model.

3.1 Overview of BERT Architecture

BERT stacks L identical layers, each containing a multi-head self-attention sub-layer, an MLP sub-layer, and a residual connection around these two sub-layers, followed by a layer normalization sub-layer.

Note that many studies on representation learning show that BERT can effectively capture rich linguistic knowledge, with different kinds of knowledge in different layers (Jawahar et al., 2019; Tenney et al., 2019; Hewitt and Manning, 2019; Jawahar et al., 2019). The following subsections aim to answer the two research questions shown in the Introduction.




Figure 1: Training loss curves on biased and anti-biased training instances, where f_4 and f_L represent the 4th-layer and top-layer classifier, respectively.

3.2 Feature Learning in Different Layers of BERT

To answer the above questions, we construct a BERT-based NLU model and equip it with layer-specific classifiers based on sentence representations. Then, we analyze the features learning of these layers from both model training and prediction perspectives.

Previous studies (Zhang et al., 2019; Geirhos et al., 2020) observed that the lexical overlap of two sentences is a typical biased feature in QQP, and a high lexical overlapping ratio usually co-occurs with some specific labels. Inspired by the above observation, we identify biased and anti-biased training instances from the QQP training set, and biased and anti-biased validation instances from the QQP validation set, respectively, based on the lexical overlapping ratio of each instance. Concretely, we first calculate the number of overlapping words and divide it by the maximum sentence length. Then, we identify an instance as a biased one if it satisfies the following: 1) its lexical overlapping ratio is greater than 70% and the label is “duplicate”; 2) it possesses a ratio less than 30% and is assigned with a “non-duplicate” label. Conversely, the instance with a ratio greater than 70% and “non-duplicate” label, or with a ratio less than 30% and “duplicate” label, is considered as an anti-biased instance.

Afterwards, we use the original QQP dataset to train the model and inspect the training losses of different classifiers on the biased and anti-biased training instances, respectively. From Figure 1[‡], we observe that both classifiers show simi-

[‡]For the sake of clarity, here we only show the curves




Figure 2: The prediction performance of layer-specific classifiers on the biased validation instances, the validation set, and the anti-biased validation instances. On the biased validation instances, low-layer classifiers f_l ($1 \leq l \leq 5$) perform slightly worse than high-layer ones, but much worse on anti-biased validation instances.

lar trends in biased training instances. By contrast, the low-layer classifier possesses higher training loss than the high-layer one on anti-biased training instances. Next, we compare the accuracies of classifiers on different validation instances. From Figure 2, we can find that all classifiers exhibit similar performance on biased validation instances and suffer from performance degradation on anti-biased validation instances. Meanwhile, low-layer classifiers f_l ($1 \leq l \leq 5$) perform worse than high-layer ones on anti-biased validation instances.

Based on the above experimental results, we can draw the following conclusions: 1) The low- and high-layer sentence representations encode common biased features, which explains that low- and high-layer classifiers show similar loss trends on biased training instances and perform almost well on biased validation instances; 2) The low-layer sentence representations encode less useful task-relevant unbiased features than the high-layer ones so that their classifiers have higher losses on anti-biased training instances and obtain worse results on anti-biased validation instances.

4 Self-debiasing Framework for Transformer Models

Based on the above analyses, we propose a framework for Transformer models by employing a residual connection to exploit the low-layer sentence representation to debias the top-layer sen-

of the 4th- and top-layer classifiers, and the curves of other classifiers can be found in the Appendix A. In fact, other layer classifiers exhibit similar trends.

tence representation. Generally, it involves the following two steps.

Step1: Low-layer Sentence Representation Learning. As shown in Figure 3, given an input sentence x , we first employ a Transformer encoder to obtain the contextual representation for each token. Then, we select a low layer l_b and stack a classifier f_b on its sentence representation $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$, which we directly use the contextual representation of [CLS]. As analyzed in Section 3.2, $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ will encode common biased features that would also be encoded by top-layer sentence representation h_{CLS}^L as the training of f_b goes on. Finally, we obtain the probability distribution p_b over labels as follows:

$$p_b = \text{Softmax}(W_b h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b} + b_b), \quad (1)$$

where W_b and b_b are the learnable parameters. Here, we train the classifier f_b using the commonly-used cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_b = - \sum_{i=1}^K y^{(i)} \cdot \log(p_b^{(i)}), \quad (2)$$

where K denotes the number of labels, $y^{(i)}$ equals to 1 if the i -th label is the golden label, and 0 for other labels.

Step2: Debiasing with a Residual Connection. We introduce a residual connection (He et al., 2016) into our framework, which allows us to exploit the low-layer sentence representation $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ to debias the top-layer one h_{CLS}^L .

Specifically, through this residual connection, we use the sum of $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ and h_{CLS}^L as the input of the top-layer classifier f_L instead of h_{CLS}^L . Formally, the probability distribution output by f_L is calculated as follows:

$$p_L = \text{Softmax}(W_L (h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b} + h_{\text{CLS}}^L) + b_L), \quad (3)$$

where W_L and b_L are also trainable parameters. Note that f_L has the same architecture but different parameters with f_b , supervised by a cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_L = - \sum_{i=1}^K y^{(i)} \cdot \log(p_L^{(i)}). \quad (4)$$

The effectiveness of our design may be attributed to two factors: 1) As stated in Section 3.2,




Figure 3: Overview of our framework. In addition to the top-layer classifier f_L based on the top-layer sentence representation h_{CLS}^L , we select a low layer l_b and stack a classifier f_b on its sentence representation $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$. Then, we introduce a residual connection feeding the sum of $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ and h_{CLS}^L to f_L . Through the model training, $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ will encode common biased features, which have also been encoded in h_{CLS}^L , and thus h_{CLS}^L is encouraged to focus on unbiased features. Notably, we turn off the gradient calculation of the residual connection to avoid the influence of the f_L loss on the representation learning of $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$. The green line denotes our introduced residual connection, and dash lines denote the backpropagation process.

the low-layer representation contains fewer unbiased features than the high-layer ones. This indicates that h_{CLS}^L will encode the unbiased features that are not encoded in $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$. 2) As $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ already encodes the common bias features, h_{CLS}^L is encouraged to ignore the common biased features which already encoded in $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$.

Finally, the whole training objective is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_b + \mathcal{L}_L. \quad (5)$$

Please notice that during training, we turn off the gradient calculation of the residual connection to remove the effect of \mathcal{L}_L on the learning of $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$. During inference, we remove $h_{\text{CLS}}^{l_b}$ from Equation 3 and directly use h_{CLS}^L to make predictions[§].

5 Experiments

5.1 Setup

Tasks and Datasets We conduct several groups of experiments on three common NLU tasks: natural language inference, fact verification, and paraphrase identification. The datasets of each task contain a training set, a validation set, and its corresponding OOD test set.

[§]Further discussion on the model inference can be found in the Appendix B.

- **Natural Language Inference (NLI)** is to predict the entailment relationship between the pair of premise and hypothesis. We use the MNLI dataset as the ID set and train various NLI models on it (Williams et al., 2018), and evaluate them on the OOD test set—HANS (McCoy et al., 2019). HANS is designed to test whether NLI models make predictions based on three fallible syntactic heuristics: lexical overlap heuristic, subsequence heuristic, and constituent heuristic.
- **Fact Verification (FactVer)** aims to identify whether a claim is supported or refuted by the given evidence text. We adopt the FEVER dataset (Thorne et al., 2018) as the ID set to train models, and assess the model abilities on the OOD test set—FeverSymmetric (Symm.) (Schuster et al., 2019), which is created to reduce claim-only biases.
- **Paraphrase Identification (ParaIden)** is to predict whether the given question pair is duplicate or non-duplicate in semantics. We use the QQP dataset as the ID set to train models, and evaluate model performance on the OOD test set—PAWS (Zhang et al., 2019), which investigates whether the model exploits word overlapping to make predictions. The basic statistics of all datasets used in our experi-

Task	ID Set		OOD Test Set
	Train	Val	
NLI	392K	19K	30K
ParaIden	363K	40K	8K
FactVer	242K	16K	0.7K

Table 2: The basic statistics of datasets for three NLU tasks, including the ID Set and the OOD Test Set, where Val refers to the validation set.

ments are shown in Table 2.

Baselines Most previous debiasing methods involve two stages: biased instance identification and debiasing models. We select several popular methods for each stage and compare their combinations with our framework.

Here, our baseline methods for biased instance identification include:

- **Known-Bias** (Gururangan et al., 2018; Utama et al., 2020a; Du et al., 2021). These approaches quantify the bias degree of each training instance via data statistics or researchers’ insights. Then the instances with high bias degree are regarded as biased ones and used to train a bias-only model.
- **Self-debias** (Utama et al., 2020b). These approaches train a bias-only model based on partial training data to identify biased instances automatically.

Besides, we select three widely-used debiasing methods for comparison.

- **Re-weighting (RW)** (Clark et al., 2019). This method aims to reduce the contribution of each biased instance on the overall training loss by assigning it with a scalar weight.
- **Product-of-expert (PoE)** (Clark et al., 2019). It trains the main model in an ensemble manner with the bias-only model, which is trained in advance and uses biased features to make predictions. By doing so, the main model is encouraged to focus on unbiased features and thus becomes more robust.
- **Confidence Regularization (CR)** (Utama et al., 2020a). It trains a bias-only model and a teacher model. The output probability distribution of the latter is adjusted with that of the former. Then the re-scaled output distribution is used to enhance a main model.

Finally, we also compare our framework with an **End2End** framework (Ghaddar et al., 2021). In this framework, a shallow model and a main model are simultaneously but respectively trained based on the low-layer and the top-layer sentence representations, during which these two models interchangeably re-weight the importance of instances.

To facilitate the subsequent descriptions, we name our framework as **DeRC**. Besides, we report the performance of a variant of our framework: **DePoE**. In this variant, we first identify biased training instances according to the low-layer output probabilities and then apply the PoE method to debias the model.

Our Implementations To ensure fair comparison, we use `BERT-base` to develop DeRC[¶]. During the process of fine-tuning models on each dataset, we follow the standard setup (Devlin et al., 2019) to construct inputs and use the hidden state of token [CLS] for classification. For each task, we use a batch size of 32 and fine-tune the model for 5 epochs with the learning rate 5e-5. Besides, we select Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015) as the optimizer to update parameters.

We evaluate the model performance on the validation sets and the corresponding OOD test sets. Following Utama et al. (2020b), we use accuracy (Acc.) as the main metric for three tasks. In addition, we evaluate the interpretability results on the QQP dataset using the metrics proposed by Wang et al. (2022). Please see Section 5.4 for details.

5.2 Effect of the Chosen Low Layer l_b

Under our framework, the chosen low layer l_b is a crucial hyperparameter for biased sentence representation learning. Based on our analysis in Section 3.2, we argue that the performance gap of the low-layer classifier between the biased and anti-biased instances should be as large as possible. In this way, the classifier of low-layer l_b would encode sufficient biased features while encoding less task-relevant useful unbiased features. However, a too-small value of l_b is not an ideal choice, since such a low-layer classifier will not comprehensively capture biased features. As demonstrated in (Clark et al., 2019), the lowest layers, like the 1st and 2nd layers, would ignore syntactic features, which may also belong to biased features. There-

[¶]We also use `RoBERTa-base` to develop DeRC, proving that DeRC is still effective on other Transformer-based models. Details can be found in Appendix C.

Model	MNLI			FEVER			QQP		
	Val	HANS	Δ	Val	Symm.	Δ	Val	PAWS	Δ
BERT	84.5	62.3	-	85.9	64.4	-	91.0	33.5	-
Known-Bias + RW (Clark et al. 2019)	83.5	69.2	+6.9	84.6	66.5	+2.1	-	-	-
Known-Bias + PoE (Clark et al. 2019)	82.9	67.9	+5.6	86.4	69.1	+4.7	-	-	-
Known-Bias + CR (Utama et al. 2020a)	84.5	69.1	+6.8	86.4	66.2	+1.6	89.1	40.0	+6.5
Self-debias + RW (Utama et al. 2020b)	82.3	69.7	+7.4	87.1	65.5	+1.1	85.2	57.4	+23.9
Self-debias + PoE (Utama et al. 2020b)	81.9	66.8	+4.5	85.9	65.8	+1.4	-	-	-
Self-debias + CR (Utama et al. 2020b)	84.3	67.1	+4.8	87.5	66.0	+1.6	89.0	43.0	+9.5
End2End (Ghaddar et al., 2021)	83.2	71.2	+8.9	86.9	-	-	90.2	46.5	+13.0
DePoE	83.6	62.6	+0.3	78.0	68.0	+3.6	79.7	59.2	+25.7
DeRC	82.8	72.6	+10.3	88.1	71.9	+7.5	88.4	59.8	+26.3

Table 3: Experimental results on two sets: 1) the validation sets of MNLI, FEVER, QQP; 2) their corresponding OOD test sets. The results for QQP are directly cited from (Ghaddar et al., 2021) and the other results are cited from the corresponding papers. Values of Δ denote the performance gaps between debiasing methods and BERT on the OOD test sets.




Figure 4: The performance of DeRC with different selected low layer l_b . Green lines denote the results of the validation sets, and orange ones denote those of the OOD test sets.

fore, we need to choose a layer whose representation may contain more potentially biased features. Finally, taking the result of Figure 2 into account as well, we select l_b as 4.

To further examine the impact of l_b , we vary its value from 1 to 7 and evaluate the performance of DeRC on the validation and the OOD test sets. As shown in Figure 4, DeRC consistently performs well on all OOD test sets for all l_b , indicating that l_b is task-agnostic and generic for all datasets. Furthermore, we find that the model’s performance deteriorates slightly when l_b is within the range of 1 to 2, supporting our belief that l_b should not be too small.

5.3 Main Results

Experimental results are reported in Table 3[†]. We can observe that DeRC achieves the best perfor-

[†]Some results from previous works are missing because they did not report. We have not reproduced these results due to the absence of sufficient detail for reproduction in their respective papers.

mance on all OOD test sets of three tasks, setting a new SOTA. In particular, on the Symm. set, DeRC improves accuracy by 7.5% than BERT, while the previous best model (Known-Bias+PoE) only brings a gain of 4.7%. Besides, DeRC reaches the best performance on PAWS, surpassing the previous best work (Known-Bias+CR), while bringing a much less performance drop on QQP (2.6% v.s. 5.8%). In addition, DeRC achieves the most significant accuracy improvement on FEVER. Thus, we confirm that DeRC is effective in improving the model performance on OOD test sets and harmless on the validation sets.

Furthermore, the comparison between DeRC and its variant DePoE also proves the effectiveness of the residual connection. Unlike DeRC uses a residual connection, DePoE uses the probabilities output by the low-layer classifier to debias models. The results show that the residual connection enables DeRC to achieve a better trade-off between the performance drop on the validation sets and




Figure 5: Performance on PAWS of the 4th-layer and top-layer classifiers in BERT and DeRC.

the improvement on the OOD test sets.

5.4 Analysis

Moreover, we conduct more analyses to verify the effectiveness of DeRC.

Impact of Residual Connection In this experiment, we use QQP to train BERT and DeRC, and compare their prediction accuracies on PAWS. Similar to DeRC, we stack two classifiers on the two layers of BERT: one is the top-layer classifier, and the other is the 4th-layer classifier. As shown in Figure 5, the accuracy gap between the 4th-layer and top-layer classifiers of DeRC is more significant than that of BERT. Note that BERT and DeRC are similar in architecture, and the only difference is that DeRC introduces a residual connection to debias the top-layer sentence representation. Thus, we confirm that the residual connection significantly improves the model generalizability.

Interpretability evaluation In the field of post-hoc interpretation research, many studies intend to interpret the model prediction by assigning each input token with an importance score, which quantifies its impact on the prediction (Simonyan et al., 2014; Smilkov et al., 2017; Jain and Wallace, 2019). In this way, the most important tokens can form the rationale supporting the prediction. Inspired by these studies, we use QQP to train DeRC and then report interpretability results on the validation set released by Wang et al. (2022), which provides annotated rationales and corresponding evaluation metrics for interpretability.

Concretely, we adopt the attention-based interpretation method (Jain and Wallace, 2019) to assign input tokens with importance scores and then follow Wang et al. (2022) to select the top- k important tokens as the rationale. Afterwards, as im-

Models	Acc.	Plausibility	Faithfulness		
		Token F1	MAP	Suff. ↓	Comp.
BERT	90.07%	58.31%	71.24%	0.1531	0.3217
DeRC	91.13%	62.25%	75.62%	0.0922	0.3843

Table 4: Evaluation results of interpretability. The metric with ↓ means the lower the score is, the better the performance achieves. For all other metrics, a high score represents good performance.

plemented in (DeYoung et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022), we use four metrics to evaluate the model interpretability from the perspective of plausibility and faithfulness:

- **Token-F1.** It is used to evaluate plausibility by measuring the token overlap between the model-generated and human-annotated rationales. The higher the Token-F1 is, the more plausible the rationale is.
- **MAP.** This metric measures the consistency of rationales under perturbations, and is used to evaluate faithfulness. A high MAP represents high faithfulness.
- **Sufficiency (Suff.) and Comprehensiveness (Comp.).** Both two metrics are used to assess the degree of the provided rationale reflecting the prediction. A faithful rationale should have a low sufficiency score and a high comprehensiveness score.

From Table 4, we can find that DeRC outperforms BERT on all metrics, that is, the rationales provided by DeRC are more plausible and faithful. Thus, we confirm that DeRC can improve the model ability of understanding.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we have proposed DeRC for Transformer-based NLU models, which utilizes the biased sentence representation learned by the low-layer classifier to debias the top-layer sentence representation. Compared with previous studies, DeRC is more efficient as it does not require manual analysis or the use of an additional bias-only model. We conduct extensive experiments on commonly-used datasets of three NLU tasks. Experimental results show that DeRC can achieve better performance on OOD test sets, while maintaining comparable performance on validation sets. In addition, DeRC can improve the ability of understanding.

In the future, we will continue to explore the low-layer representations for better performance trade-off between the validation and OOD test sets during inference. In addition, we plan to apply DeRC to other NLU tasks, such as sentiment analysis, machine reading comprehension, and so on. Finally, we will study whether DeRC is suitable for natural language generation tasks.

Limitations

The limitations of this work are the following aspects: 1) The proposed DeRC is only applicable to models based on the Transformer architecture; 2) We only focus on the result of NLU tasks, ignoring further discussions on its contribution to other tasks.

Ethical Statements

This paper proposes a self-debiasing framework for Transformer-based models. Typically, our proposed framework utilizes the low-layer sentence representation to debias the top-layer one, which improves the model robustness to spurious correlation and the ability of understanding. This study will not pose ethical issues. All the datasets used in this paper are publicly available and widely adopted by researchers to test the performance of debiasing frameworks. Besides, this paper does not involve any data collection and release, and thus there exist no privacy issue.

References

- Yonatan Belinkov, Adam Poliak, Stuart Shieber, Benjamin Van Durme, and Alexander Rush. 2019. On adversarial removal of hypothesis-only bias in natural language inference. In *SEM 2019*.
- Christopher Clark, Mark Yatskar, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Don't take the easy way out: Ensemble based methods for avoiding known dataset biases. In *EMNLP 2019*.
- Christopher Clark, Mark Yatskar, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Learning to model and ignore dataset bias with mixed capacity ensembles. In *Findings of EMNLP 2020*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL 2019*.
- Jay DeYoung, Sarthak Jain, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Eric Lehman, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Byron C. Wallace. 2020. ERASER: A benchmark to evaluate rationalized NLP models. In *ACL 2020*.
- Mengnan Du, Varun Manjunatha, Rajiv Jain, Ruchi Deshpande, Franck Dernoncourt, Jiuxiang Gu, Tong Sun, and Xia Hu. 2021. Towards interpreting and mitigating shortcut learning behavior of NLU models. In *NAACL 2021*.
- Y Ganin and V Lempitsky. 2015. Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation. In *ICML 2015*.
- Robert Geirhos, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, Claudio Michaelis, Richard Zemel, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Felix A Wichmann. 2020. Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*.
- Abbas Ghaddar, Phillippe Langlais, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, and Ahmad Rashid. 2021. End-to-end self-debiasing framework for robust NLU training. In *Findings of ACL 2021*.
- Suchin Gururangan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Omer Levy, Roy Schwartz, Samuel Bowman, and Noah A. Smith. 2018. Annotation artifacts in natural language inference data. In *NAACL 2018*.
- He He, Sheng Zha, and Haohan Wang. 2019. Unlearn dataset bias in natural language inference by fitting the residual. In *Workshop of DeepLo 2019*.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR 2016*.
- John Hewitt and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations. In *NAACL 2019*.
- Sarthak Jain and Byron C. Wallace. 2019. Attention is not Explanation. In *NAACL 2019*.
- Ganesh Jawahar, Benoît Sagot, and Djamé Seddah. 2019. What does bert learn about the structure of language? In *ACL 2019*.
- Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, Yonatan Belinkov, and James Henderson. 2020. End-to-end bias mitigation by modelling biases in corpora. In *ACL 2020*.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR 2015*.
- Minwoo Lee, Seungpil Won, Juae Kim, Hwanhee Lee, Cheoneum Park, and Kyomin Jung. 2021. Crossaug: A contrastive data augmentation method for debiasing fact verification models. *Information and Knowledge Management*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Yougang Lyu, Piji Li, Yechang Yang, Maarten de Rijke, Pengjie Ren, Yukun Zhao, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Feature-level debiased natural language understanding. In *AAAI 2023*.

- Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. 2019. Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference. In *ACL 2019*.
- Yixin Nie, Adina Williams, Emily Dinan, Mohit Bansal, Jason Weston, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Adversarial nli: A new benchmark for natural language understanding. In *ACL 2020*.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. Hypothesis only baselines in natural language inference. In *SEM 2018*.
- Victor Sanh, Thomas Wolf, Yonatan Belinkov, and Alexander M Rush. 2020. Learning from others' mistakes: Avoiding dataset biases without modeling them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.01300*.
- Tal Schuster, Darsh Shah, Yun Jie Serene Yeo, Daniel Roberto Filizzola Ortiz, Enrico Santus, and Regina Barzilay. 2019. Towards debiasing fact verification models. In *EMNLP 2019*.
- Rishi Sharma, James Allen, Omid Bakhshandeh, and Nasrin Mostafazadeh. 2018. Tackling the story ending biases in the story cloze test. In *ACL 2018*.
- Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. In *ICLR 2014*.
- Daniel Smilkov, Nikhil Thorat, Been Kim, Fernanda Viégas, and Martin Wattenberg. 2017. Smoothgrad: removing noise by adding noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03825*.
- Rion Snow, Lucy Vanderwende, and Arul Menezes. 2006. Effectively using syntax for recognizing false entailment. In *NAACL 2006*.
- Joe Stacey, Pasquale Minervini, Haim Dubossarsky, Sebastian Riedel, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2020. Avoiding the Hypothesis-Only Bias in Natural Language Inference via Ensemble Adversarial Training. In *EMNLP 2020*.
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. 2019. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In *ACL 2019*.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Oana Cocarascu, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. The fact extraction and verification (fever) shared task. In *EMNLP 2018*.
- Masatoshi Tsuchiya. 2018. Performance impact caused by hidden bias of training data for recognizing textual entailment. In *LREC 2018*.
- Lifu Tu, Garima Lalwani, Spandana Gella, and He He. 2020. An empirical study on robustness to spurious correlations using pre-trained language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Prasetya Ajie Utama, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020a. Mind the trade-off: Debiasing NLU models without degrading the in-distribution performance. In *ACL 2020*.
- Prasetya Ajie Utama, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020b. Towards debiasing NLU models from unknown biases. In *EMNLP 2020*.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *Workshop of EMNLP 2018*.
- Lijie Wang, Yaozong Shen, Shuyuan Peng, Shuai Zhang, Xinyan Xiao, Hao Liu, Hongxuan Tang, Ying Chen, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2022. A fine-grained interpretability evaluation benchmark for neural nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11097*.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *NAACL 2018*.
- Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh, Soroush Mehri, Remi Tachet des Combes, Timothy J Hazen, and Alessandro Sordani. 2021. Increasing robustness to spurious correlations using forgettable examples. In *ACL 2021*.
- Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Roy Schwartz, and Yejin Choi. 2018. SWAG: A large-scale adversarial dataset for grounded commonsense inference. In *EMNLP 2018*.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *ACL 2019*.
- Yuan Zhang, Jason Baldridge, and Luheng He. 2019. PAWS: Paraphrase adversaries from word scrambling. In *NAACL 2019*.




Figure 6: Training loss curves on biased and anti-biased training instances, where f_i represents the i -th layer classifier.

A Training Loss Curves of other Layer-Specific Classifiers

B Further Discussion about the Model Inference

We notice that in addition to the common biased features, the low-layer sentence representation also contains useful unbiased features. Thus, Equation 3 not only encourages the top-layer sentence representation to ignore the common biased features but also makes it discard some useful unbiased features, of which the amount is less than that of biased features, as analyzed in Section 3.2. To deal with this issue, we reincorporate the low-layer sentence representation into the top-layer classifier in a weighting manner:

$$p_L = \text{Softmax}(W_L(\alpha * h_{\text{CLS}}^b + (1-\alpha) * h_{\text{CLS}}^L) + b_L) \quad (6)$$

where α is used to control the effect of h_{CLS}^b during inference.

Then, we vary α from 0 to 1 with an interval of 0.1, and compare the model performance on both the validation set and anti-biased validation instances. As shown in Figure 7, although the use of low-layer sentence representation slightly improves the model’s performance on the validation set, it significantly degrades the performance on the anti-biased instances as α increases. Therefore, we directly set α to 0 in subsequent experiments. In other words, we will use the top-layer sentence representation for predictions during inference.




Figure 7: Performance of models with different α on the MNLI validation set and anti-biased validation instances.




Figure 8: Training loss curves on biased and anti-biased training instances, where f_i represents the i -th layer classifier.

C Experiments based on RoBERTa-base

As implemented in Section 3.2, we also conduct a preliminary experiment to analyze the feature learning of different layers of RoBERTa-base (Liu et al., 2019) from the perspectives of model training and prediction. From Figure 8 and Figure 9, we can find that the training losses and prediction accuracies of the RoBERTa exhibit almost the same trends as those of BERT.

Afterwards, we develop DeRC and DePoE based on RoBERTa-base, and re-conduct experiments using the same hyperparameters as BERT-base. Experimental results are reported in Table 5. Overall, DeRC still achieves the best performance on all OOD test sets, which proves that DeRC is also applicable to other Transformer-based models.

Model	MNLI			FEVER			QQP		
	Val	HANS	Δ	Val	Symm.	Δ	Val	PAWS	Δ
RoBERTa	87.2	73.5	-	89.3	66.3	-	91.5	40.1	-
DePoE	84.9	75.2	+1.7	87.2	69.4	+3.1	82.7	58.5	+14.4
DeRC	86.4	78.1	+4.6	88.1	72.9	+6.6	89.2	60.5	+20.4

Table 5: Experimental results on two sets: 1) the validation sets of MNLI, FEVER, QQP; 2) their corresponding OOD test sets. Values of Δ denote the performance gaps between debiasing methods and RoBERTa-base on the OOD test sets.




Figure 9: The prediction performance of layer-specific classifiers on the validation set, the biased validation instances, and the anti-biased validation instances.