

Acquiring Bidirectionality via Large and Small Language Models

Takumi Goto^{1,2}, Hiroyoshi Nagao¹, Yuta Koreeda¹,

¹Research & Development Group, Hitachi, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan,

²NARA Institute of Science and Technology, Nara, Japan,

Correspondence: yuta.koreeda.pb@hitachi.com

Abstract

Using token representation from bidirectional language models (LMs) such as BERT is still a widely used approach for token-classification tasks. Even though there exist much larger unidirectional LMs such as Llama-2, they are rarely used to replace the token representation of bidirectional LMs. In this work, we hypothesize that their lack of bidirectionality is keeping them behind. To that end, we propose to newly train a small backward LM and concatenate its representations to those of existing LM for downstream tasks. Through experiments in named entity recognition, we demonstrate that introducing backward model improves the benchmark performance more than 10 points. Furthermore, we show that the proposed method is especially effective for rare domains and in few-shot learning settings.

1 Introduction

In recent years, pretrained large unidirectional language models (UniLMs), such as Llama-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) and OpenAI GPT (OpenAI, 2024), have become readily available. Large UniLMs have demonstrated that various tasks can be solved by means of generation. On the other hand, bidirectional language models (BiLMs), most well-known by BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), equipped with a classification layer are still widely used in many NLP task. In particular, BiLMs are still dominant for token-level classification tasks. For example, top three models in the CoNLL 2003 named entity recognition (NER) benchmark¹ (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) and the DocRED relation extraction benchmark² (Yao et al., 2019) are all based on BiLMs.

¹From Papers With Code with (Wang et al., 2021; Yamada et al., 2020; Zhou and Chen, 2021) being the top three as of May, 2024.

²From Papers With Code with (Ma et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2021) being the top three as of May, 2024.

The reason why the application of LLMs in token-level classification tasks has not progressed can be attributed to their lack of bidirectionality. As we elaborate in 2.1, the representation of a token is computed solely based on the preceding context in a UniLM. For example, in a token classification task, it is necessary to infer the label of the first word based solely on the information of that word.

In this study, we overcome this issue by proposing a method to utilize UniLMs as if they were bidirectional models. Specifically, we train a new UniLM for generating text from the end (referred to the “backward LM”) and concatenating its token representations to those of the pretrained UniLM (referred to the “forward LM”) to obtain pseudo bidirectionality. With this approach, we expect that existing LLMs can be applied not only for generation tasks but also for highly accurate solutions to token-level classification tasks.

In the experiments, we focused on named entity recognition (NER) task as an example of token-level classification tasks. We compared the NER performances with and without backward LM. As a result, we observe that adding backward LM improves the performance of the benchmarks by more than 10 points. Additionally, we demonstrated that the proposed method consistently improves performance in few-shot settings or when targeting rare domains.

The contributions of this study are as follows:

1. We empirically showed that unidirectionality is a problem when adopting UniLMs to token-level classification tasks.
2. We proposed a novel method to newly train a small-scale backward LM and concatenate its representations to those of existing LM to achieve pseudo bidirectionality in UniLMs.

2 Proposed Method

2.1 Preliminary

In this section, we review two types of LMs: UniLMs and BiLMs. Given an input sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ with N tokens, the difference between the two models lies in how they compute representations for each word x_i ($1 \leq i \leq N$).

In BiLMs, the representation \mathbf{h}_i^{bi} is computed based on the context from both the beginning and the end of the text:

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{bi} = BiLM_{\phi}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}, \mathbf{x}_{>i}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{<i} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1})$ and $\mathbf{x}_{>i} = (x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_N)$. To solve token-classification tasks, we can input \mathbf{h}_i^{bi} to the newly added classification layers.

On the other hand, a forward LM computes the representation $\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i$ solely based on earlier context:

$$\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i = \vec{UniLM}_{\theta}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}). \quad (2)$$

As can be seen from equation (2), UniLMs need to compute the representation for the i -th word without using the subsequent context $\mathbf{x}_{>i}$.

2.2 Utilization of the Bidirectional Language Model

The proposed method leverages the concatenated representations of both the forward LM $\vec{UniLM}(\cdot)$ and the backward LM $\overleftarrow{UniLM}(\cdot)$ to learn the downstream task. In contrast to the forward LM, a backward LM computes $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i$ given the context from the end:

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i = \overleftarrow{UniLM}_{\theta'}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{>i}). \quad (3)$$

The final representation for the i -th token, considering both the forward and backward contexts, is the concatenation of $\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i$, denoted as $\mathbf{h}_i = \text{Concat}[\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i]$. Therefore, the dimensions of \mathbf{h}_i is the sum of the hidden vector dimensions of the forward and backward LMs.

To compute the concatenated representations as described above, it is necessary to share the vocabulary between the forward and backward LMs. Although there are the constraints related to the vocabulary, it is possible to use arbitrary architectures and parameter sizes for both models. For instance, we can employ a heterogeneous configurations, such as $|\theta| \gg |\theta'|$. This means that we can utilize the existing assets of $|\theta|$ with just a small

Dataset	# sents.	Split
For training of backward LM.		
Wikitext-train	1,801,350	Train
BookCorpus	74,004,228	Train
Wikitext-validation	3,760	Validation
For training of named entity recognition.		
CoNLL-2003-train	14,041	Training
CoNLL-2003-valid	3,250	Validation
CoNLL-2003-test	3,453	Test
Few-NERD-train	131,767	Training
Few-NERD-valid	18,824	Validation
Few-NERD-test	37,648	Test

Table 1: Overview of the dataset used in the experiments.

compute of training $|\theta'|$. In this study, a part of experiments are conducted with such heterogeneous configurations.

3 Experiments

We use Llama2-7b (Touvron et al., 2023) and GPT-2 (base) (Radford et al., 2019) as forward LMs to assess the impact of model size. Table 1 provides an overview of the datasets used in the experiments.

3.1 Training Backward LM

We train a backward LM for both of Llama2 and GPT-2, as the backward LM should have the same vocabulary as the forward LM. The architecture follows that of GPT-2 (base), but we resize the input dimension of the embedding layer to match the vocabulary size of the forward LM. We initialize the models with random parameters and train it on BookCorpus (Zhu et al., 2015) and Wikitext (Merity et al., 2017) (wikitext-103-raw-v1) datasets, with next token prediction objective. During the preprocessing step, we concatenate the training data from both datasets and shuffle them on a document level³. Next, we perform subword tokenization with the forward LM’s tokenizer. We extract training data by cutting it into segments of 1,024 tokens, starting the beginning of the dataset, and then reversing them. For training, we set the batch size to 512 and the learning rate to $2e-5$ with a cosine scheduler.

3.2 Named Entity Recognition

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed method in a token classification task, we focus on NER. NER aims to identify named entities such as person names, location names, and organization

³For Wikitext, we removed numerous empty lines and strings corresponding to headings beforehand.

Architecture	Model	Param. size	CoNLL-2003 (F_1)	Few-NERD (F_1)
BiLM	BERT	124M	91.18 \pm 0.17	89.50
Forward LM only	GPT-2	124M	77.14 \pm 0.25	88.10
	w/ Transformer Block		86.10 \pm 0.63	88.71
	Llama-2	7B	74.53 \pm 0.32	88.05
	w/ Transformer Block		82.66 \pm 0.65	87.19
Proposal	GPT-2	124M + 124M	88.58 \pm 0.20	89.43
	Llama-2	7B + 124M	85.77 \pm 0.26	89.54

Table 2: The performance on named entity recognition. For CoNLL-2003, we show the average F_1 scores on the test set, each of which is averaged over three different seeds. For Few-NERD, we report the F_1 scores on the test set, each of which is from the top performing model on the validation set amongst three different seeds due to significant standard deviation.

names in the input text. We utilize the CoNLL-2003 dataset (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) as a general domain evaluation and Few-NERD datasets (supervised setting) (Ding et al., 2021) as a rare domain evaluation. In both datasets, we adopt BIO scheme.

During training, we input the representations \mathbf{h}_i computed by each model into the classification layer (further details will be discussed in the next section) and optimize it using cross-entropy loss. Regarding the specific training parameters, we set the batch size to 32 and employ the AdamW optimization algorithm (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019). We linearly decay the learning rate starting from $1e-3$. We only train the classification layer while keeping the other layers fixed. We report the score using the checkpoint that has maximum F_1 score on the validation set.

3.3 Classification Layer

The classification layer is assumed to consist of two linear layers. Let d be the dimensionality of \mathbf{h}_i and c be the number of classes. We use $\mathbf{W}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times d}$ to estimate the distribution $\mathbf{p} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_2 \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{h}_i)) \in \mathbb{R}^c$. As another solution to incorporate the context from the end, we also employ a fully-connected single Transformer layer as a classification layer, which is the same architecture as base type of BERT⁴.

3.4 Few-shot Setting

One of the potential benefits of large LMs is their ability to make generalized predictions even with a small number of training examples, leveraging the knowledge embedded in the numerous parameters. We also analyze NER performance on CoNLL-2003 with K -shot setting to examine the impact of limited training examples.

In our K -shot setting, the training data consists of $4K$ samples since we draw K samples from each entity type: PER, LOC, ORG, and MISC. Note that we only extract instances from the training data that contain a single specific named entity type. During training, we set the batch size to 4 and randomly sampled the following hyperparameters; a learning rate from $\{9e-3, 8e-3, \dots, 2e-4, 1e-4\}$, a seed from $\{10, 11, \dots, 19\}$, a dropout probability from $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$. We determined top-3 hyperparameter settings in terms of F_1 score on the CoNLL-2003 validation set, and report the average F_1 on the test set of those settings.

3.5 Results

Full Dataset Setting. We shows the results in Table 2. For BiLM setting, we train only classification layers given BERT (bert-base-cased, Devlin et al., 2019)⁵. By using the proposed method, performance has improved in both CoNLL-2003 and Few-NERD, with particularly significant improvements in scores of over 10 points in CoNLL-2003 for all models. Additionally, the settings of w/ Transformer did not outperform the proposed method. These results indicate that considering backward context improves token-classification performance and that the proposed method is better way to provide the backward context to UniLMs. In the case of Few-NERD, the results show that Llama-2 outperforms GPT-2 in the proposal setting. It can be inferred that larger forward LMs are more effective when targeting rarer domain. Finally, BERT outperforms the proposed method in most of cases, suggesting that the BiLMs are still effective for token classification tasks.

⁴The precise formulation is described A.

⁵We use the same configurations describing section 3.2 during the training.




Figure 1: Few-shot setting results on CoNLL-2003 test set. In the x-axis, the number of training examples is represented by multiplication of the number of entities ($= 4$) and K .

Few-shot Setting. The experimental results using BERT(bert-base-cased) and GPT-2 (base and xl) are shown in Figure 1. The x-axis represents the number of training examples $4K$, and the y-axis represents the F_1 score on CoNLL2003 test set. The dashed lines indicate only forward LM while the solid lines represent the bidirectional and the proposal setting. As observed from Figure 1, the proposed method consistently outperforms the forward LM-only setting. Particularly, when the training data is limited, notably in less than 16 shots for each entity, the proposed method proves to be more effective than BERT performances. This has a significant value in practice as there is a *valley* of approaches in moderately many-shots learning; zero- to few-shots settings are more effectively addressed by in-context learning and many-shots settings are covered by BiLMs, but neither covers the middle. Addressing this *valley* is important, because annotating dozens of data might be justified but annotating hundreds sounds overwhelming to many practitioners.

4 Discussion

4.1 Effect of Model Size

Our surprising observation is that increasing the model size does not necessarily improve NER performance. Specifically, Llama2-7B lose to GPT-2 (base, 124M) in CoNLL-2003 performance (Table 2), and GPT-2 models (base 124M and xl 1.5B) have the almost same performance in few-shot experiments (Figure 1). One possible reason for this is the discrepancy in the dimensions of \vec{h}_i and \overleftarrow{h}_i when using larger forward LM. This could lead to the dominance of information from the forward

LM, potentially resulting in the ineffectiveness of the proposed method. Note that the discrepancy in the dimensions cannot explain why Llama2-7B lose to GPT-2 (base) in forward LM only setting. We leave the investigation of the reason for future work.

4.2 Case Study

In the case study, it was found that the proposed method is particularly effective when there is an entity at the beginning of a sentence. Additionally, accuracy improved for the leading entity in phrases where entities are conjoined by “and.” This improvement is believed to be due to the proposed method providing context from the end. The specific examples are shown in Appendix B.

5 Related Work

A traditional approach to combining UniLMs, such as BiLSTM (Schuster and Paliwal, 1997) and ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), is similar to the proposal method. Our study revisits this idea in the era of LLMs and aims to efficiently utilize LMs. For other approaches, Nguyen et al. (2023) formulated the loss as the sum of the losses when generating from the beginning of the text and when generating from the end of the text. Li et al. (2023b) also independently defined forward and backward models and included a normalization term to make the distributions estimated by both models closer for the same position in the text. In comparison to these studies, our method differs in its aim to utilize the latent representations of the LM and its heterogeneous composition of two types of LMs.

Li et al. (2023a) and BehnamGhader et al. (2024) fine-tuned LLMs after removing the causal attention mask to incorporate the context from the end of the sentence. Although this method requires fine-tuning for each LM, the proposed method can reuse the backward LM as long as the vocabulary and tokenizer are the same.

6 Conclusion

In this study, we proposed a method to concatenate the representations of forward and backward LM, to overcome the lack of bidirectionality problem of UniLMs. From the results in NER tasks, we could confirm the effectiveness of the proposed method. The proposed method provides more use cases to UniLM, not only for a generation model but also for an encoder model. Besides, as we discussed in

Section 4.1, we need to investigate the relationship between model size and its representation quality as future work.

Acknowledgments

References

- Parishad BehnamGhader, Vaibhav Adlakha, Marius Mosbach, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Nicolas Chapados, and Siva Reddy. 2024. [LLM2Vec: Large language models are secretly powerful text encoders](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.05961.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Ning Ding, Guangwei Xu, Yulin Chen, Xiaobin Wang, Xu Han, Pengjun Xie, Haitao Zheng, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2021. [Few-NERD: A few-shot named entity recognition dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Zongxi Li, Xianming Li, Yuzhang Liu, Haoran Xie, Jing Li, Fu lee Wang, Qing Li, and Xiaoqin Zhong. 2023a. [Label supervised LLaMA finetuning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.01208.
- Zuchao Li, Shitou Zhang, Hai Zhao, Yifei Yang, and Dongjie Yang. 2023b. [Batgpt: A bidirectional autoregressive talker from generative pre-trained transformer](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00360*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Youmi Ma, An Wang, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2023. [DREEAM: Guiding attention with evidence for improving document-level relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. 2017. [Pointer sentinel mixture models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Anh Nguyen, Nikos Karampatziakis, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. [Meet in the middle: A new pre-training paradigm](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 5079–5091. Curran Associates, Inc.
- OpenAI. 2024. [GPT-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774v6.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Deep contextualized word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI blog*.
- Mike Schuster and Kuldip K Paliwal. 1997. [Bidirectional recurrent neural networks](#). *IEEE transactions on Signal Processing*, 45(11):2673–2681.
- Qingyu Tan, Ruidan He, Lidong Bing, and Hwee Tou Ng. 2022. [Document-level relation extraction with adaptive focal loss and knowledge distillation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. 2003. [Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and finetuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Xinyu Wang, Yong Jiang, Nguyen Bach, Tao Wang, Zhongqiang Huang, Fei Huang, and Kewei Tu. 2021. [Automated concatenation of embeddings for structured prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Benfeng Xu, Quan Wang, Yajuan Lyu, Yong Zhu, and Zhendong Mao. 2021. [Entity structure within and throughout: Modeling mention dependencies for document-level relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

Input	Jones	Medical	completes	acquisition	.
Foward-LM only	B-PER	I-ORG	-	-	-
Proposal	B-ORG	I-ORG	-	-	-
Reference	B-ORG	I-ORG	-	-	-

Table 3: An examples of GPT-2 (base) in the case that an entity at the beginning of the sentence. This type of errors seems to be resolved by adding Conditional Random Field (CRF), but CRF could not resolve it.

Input	Note	-	Lotte	and	Hyundai	,	Haitai	and	Samsung	played	two	games	.
Foward-LM only	-	-	B-PER	-	B-ORG	-	-	-	B-ORG	-	-	-	-
Proposal	-	-	B-ORG	-	B-ORG	-	B-MISC	-	B-ORG	-	-	-	-
Reference	-	-	B-ORG	-	B-ORG	-	B-ORG	-	B-ORG	-	-	-	-

Table 4: An examples of GPT-2 (base) in phrases where entities are conjoined by “and”. For the prediction corresponding to Lot te, the forward-LM struggles to infer the entity type correctly, but proposal can estimate correctly. This can be explained by the difference between considering only the context from the beginning: “Note - Lot te” or entire context, cause the improvement.

Ikuya Yamada, Akari Asai, Hiroyuki Shindo, Hideaki Takeda, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2020. [LUKE: Deep contextualized entity representations with entity-aware self-attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Yuan Yao, Deming Ye, Peng Li, Xu Han, Yankai Lin, Zhenghao Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Lixin Huang, Jie Zhou, and Maosong Sun. 2019. [DocRED: A large-scale document-level relation extraction dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Wenxuan Zhou and Muhao Chen. 2021. [Learning from noisy labels for entity-centric information extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. [Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books](#). In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*.

Appendices

A Classification Layer with Transformer Block

We use a one-layer Transformer layer: $Transformer(\cdot) : 768 \mapsto 768$, which the same as BERT-base configuration. The final distribution is calculated by $\mathbf{p} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_2^{trans} Transformer(\mathbf{W}_1^{trans} \vec{\mathbf{h}}_i)) \in \mathbb{R}^c$, where $\mathbf{W}_1^{trans} \in \mathbb{R}^{768 \times d}$ and $\mathbf{W}_2^{trans} \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times 768}$ are dense layers to align the input/output dimensions.

B Case studies

Table 3 and 4 show the actual outputs of both forward LM-only setting and proposal setting.