Or how to measure that your model is actually doing some commonsense reasoning



How do you know that a model is doing commonsense reasoning?

# How do you know that a model is doing commonsense reasoning?

### Unsupervised:

- Observe behavior,
- Probe representations,
- etc.





### Step 1: Determine type of reasoning



#### https://leaderboard.allenai.org/

Step 1: Determine type of reasoning



https://leaderboard.allenai.org/

### Step 1: Determine type of reasoning



#### https://leaderboard.allenai.org/



### Reasoning about Social Situations





run around in the mess

mop up the mess







Social

<u>()</u>

### Step 2: Choosing a benchmark size

	Small scale	Large scale
Creation	Expert-curated	Crowdsourced/automatic
Coverage	Limited coverage	Large coverage
Training	Dev/test only	Training/dev/test
Budget	Expert time costs	Crowdsourcing costs

### Step 2: Choosing a benchmark size

	Small scale	Large scale
Creation	Expert-curated	Crowdsourced/automatic
Coverage	Limited coverage	Large coverage
Training	Dev/test only	Training/dev/test
Budget	/ Expert time costs	Crowdsourcing costs

Winograd Schema Challenge (WSC), Choice of Plausible Alternatives (COPA)

### Small commonsense benchmarks

Winograd Schema Challenge (WSC) 273 examples

Choice of Plausible Alternatives (COPA) 500 dev, 500 test The city councilmen refused the demonstrators a permit because *they* **advocated** violence. Who is *"they"*?

(a) The city councilmen(b) The demonstrators

The city councilmen refused the demonstrators a permit because *they* **feared** violence. Who is "*they*"?

(a) The city councilmen(b) The demonstrators

### Small commonsense benchmarks

Winograd Schema Challenge (WSC) 273 examples I hung up the phone. What was the **cause** of this?

(a) The caller said goodbye to me.(b) The caller identified himself to me.

The toddler became cranky. What happened as a **result**?

(a) Her mother put her down for a nap.(b) Her mother fixed her hair into pigtails.

Choice of Plausible Alternatives (COPA) 500 dev, 500 test

### Step 2: Choosing a QA benchmark size

	Small scale	Large scale
Creation	Expert-curated	Crowdsourced/automatic
Coverage	Limited coverage	Large coverage
Training	Dev/test only	Training/dev/test
Budget	Expert time costs	Crowdsourcing costs

**Challenge**: do to collect positive/negative answers?

Goal: negative answers have to be *plausible but unlikely* 

Goal: negative answers have to be *plausible but unlikely* 

- Automatic matching?
  - Random negative sampling won't work, too topically different
  - "smart" negative sampling isn't effective either

Goal: negative answers have to be *plausible but unlikely* 

- Automatic matching?
  - Random negative sampling won't work, too topically different
  - "smart" negative sampling isn't effective either
- Need better solution... maybe we can ask crowd workers?



**Context and Question** 

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

What will Alex want to do next?



**Context and Question** 

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

What will Alex want to do next?







**X** run around in the mess

Free Text Response

amazon

Reauest





are too easy to detect

- Models can exploit artifacts in handwritten incorrect answers
  - Exaggerations, off-topic, overly emotional, etc.
  - See Schwartz et al. 2017, Gururangan et al. 2018, Zellers et al. 2018, etc.

- Models can exploit artifacts in handwritten incorrect answers
  - Exaggerations, off-topic, overly emotional, etc.
  - See Schwartz et al. 2017, Gururangan et al. 2018, Zellers et al. 2018, etc.
- Seemingly "super-human" performance by large pretrained LMs (BERT, GPT, etc.)





- Models can exploit artifacts in handwritten incorrect answers
  - Exaggerations, off-topic, overly emotional, etc.
  - See Schwartz et al. 2017, Gururangan et al. 2018, Zellers et al. 2018, etc.
- Seemingly "super-human" performance by large pretrained LMs (BERT, GPT, etc.)





### How to make unlikely answers **robust to annotation artifacts**?

### How to make unlikely answers **robust to annotation artifacts**?

SOCIAL IQA, COMMONSENSEQA: Modified answer collection





#### **Original Question**

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

#### What happens next

What will Alex want to do next?

✓ mop up✓ give up and order take out

Х Х



#### **Original Question**

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

#### What happens next

What will Alex want to do next?

✓ mop up✓ give up and order take out

X

X

#### **Question-Switching Answer**

#### What happened Before

What did Alex need to do before this?



#### **Original Question**

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

#### What happens next

What will Alex want to do next?

✓ mop up✓ give up and order take out

#### X X

#### **Question-Switching Answer**

#### What happened Before

What did Alex need to do before this?

### $\checkmark$ have slippery hands

✓ get ready to eat



#### **Original Question**

Alex spilt food all over the floor and it made a huge mess.

#### What happens next

What will Alex want to do next?

- ✓ mop up✓ give up and order take out
- **X** have slippery hands
- X get ready to eat

#### **Question-Switching Answer**

#### What happened Before

What did Alex need to do before this?

- $\checkmark$  have slippery hands
- ✓ get ready to eat



### Comparing incorrect/correct answers' styles





### Comparing incorrect/correct answers' styles





### Comparing incorrect/correct answers' styles















*Goal*: remove examples with exploitable artifacts or spurious correlations

- Use pre-trained representations
- Iteratively remove data that's easiest to predict by a linear classifier (e.g., logistic)
- Robust examples remain



*Goal*: remove examples with exploitable artifacts or spurious correlations

- Use pre-trained representations
- Iteratively remove data that's easiest to predict by a linear classifier (e.g., logistic)
- Robust examples remain



*Goal*: remove examples with exploitable artifacts or spurious correlations

- Use pre-trained representations
- Iteratively remove data that's easiest to predict by a linear classifier (e.g., logistic)
- Robust examples remain



*Goal*: remove examples with exploitable artifacts or spurious correlations

- Use pre-trained representations
- Iteratively remove data that's easiest to predict by a linear classifier (e.g., logistic)
- Robust examples remain



*Goal*: remove examples with exploitable artifacts or spurious correlations

- Use pre-trained representations
- Iteratively remove data that's easiest to predict by a linear classifier (e.g., logistic)
- Robust examples remain





Performance of models on the WikiHow portion of HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019) with different AF settings and different training models



Performance of models on the WikiHow portion of HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019) with different AF settings and different training models



### Model performance on Social IQA

Accuracy Humans Bert-large 0 0 <u>.</u> Bert-base \$ GPT OpenAI ₩ Random 0.0% 10.0% 20.0% 30.0% 40.0% 60.0% 70.0% 80.0% 50.0% 90.0%



### Model performance on Social IQA





Although Aubrey was older and stronger, they lost to Alex in arm wrestling. How would Alex feel as a result?

boastful

they need to practice more









person-centric reasoning















