

Interviewer-Candidate Role Play: Towards Developing Real-World NLP Systems

Neeraj Varshney, Swaroop Mishra, Chitta Baral

Arizona State University

{nvarshn2, srmishr1, chitta}@asu.edu

Abstract

Standard NLP tasks do not incorporate several common real-world scenarios such as seeking clarifications about the question, taking advantage of clues, abstaining in order to avoid incorrect answers, etc. This difference in task formulation hinders the adoption of NLP systems in real-world settings. In this work, we take a step towards bridging this gap and present a multi-stage task that simulates a typical human-human questioner-responder interaction such as an interview. Specifically, the system is provided with question simplifications, knowledge statements, examples, etc. at various stages to improve its prediction when it is not sufficiently confident. We instantiate the proposed task in Natural Language Inference setting where a system is evaluated on both in-domain and out-of-domain (OOD) inputs. We conduct comprehensive experiments and find that the multi-stage formulation of our task leads to OOD generalization performance improvement up to 2.29% in Stage 1, 1.91% in Stage 2, 54.88% in Stage 3, and 72.02% in Stage 4 over the standard unguided prediction. However, our task leaves a significant challenge for NLP researchers to further improve OOD performance at each stage. ¹

1 Introduction

Despite impressive progress made in Natural Language Processing (NLP), we are far from employing these systems reliably in real-world tasks. This can be partially attributed to the misalignment between formulations of real-world and standard NLP tasks. Specifically, real-world tasks present several scenarios that are often not included in the standard task formulations such as (1) seeking

¹Code and datasets for our task are available at <https://github.com/nrjvarshney/interviewer-candidate-role-play>




Figure 1: Illustration of the proposed task simulating an interviewer-candidate interaction for NLI.

clarifications about the question (2) taking advantage of clues provided at inference time (3) learning from a few examples similar to the given question (4) abstaining in order to avoid incorrect predictions, etc.

In order to bridge this alignment gap, prior work in NLP has investigated few tasks that are closer to the real-world settings such as Selective Prediction (Kamath et al., 2020; Jones et al., 2020; Varshney et al., 2020), Few-Shot Learning (Brown et al., 2020; Schick and Schütze, 2021b; Ye et al., 2021; Tam et al., 2021), Prompting (Shin et al., 2020;

Jiang et al., 2020; Le Scao and Rush, 2021; Mishra et al., 2021), etc. Selective Prediction enables a system to maintain high accuracy by abstaining on instances where it is likely to be incorrect. Few-Shot Learning challenges a system to learn from a limited number of training examples. Prompts provide task/instance related guidance in order to improve model’s predictions. Though these works are a step in the right direction, they have several limitations. First, all these tasks give only a single opportunity to the system to either make a correct prediction or abstain. Whereas, in a typical human-human interaction, the questioner often gives hints, clarifications, examples, etc. in cases where the responder is not confident of their answer. Second, evaluation on these tasks is limited to specific aspects of system performance. This motivates research into designing a realistic task that simulates a questioner-responder interaction and provides a unified evaluation of multiple aspects.

An interview is a prototypical example of questioner-responder interaction. In an interview, when the candidate is not confident in their answer, the interviewer first tries to simplify the question in order to help them understand it better. If the simplification doesn’t help then they usually give some hints. Next, they typically provide some similar examples as further assistance to improve their answer. Finally, the interviewer may give a worksheet that has a number of similar unsolved questions and allow some more time for the candidate to strengthen their concepts and reattempt the question.

In this work, we present a multi-stage task that simulates the above-mentioned interviewer-candidate interaction as illustrated in Figure 1. Prior work has shown that model’s confidence of prediction is often positively correlated with correctness similar to humans (Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2017; Lakshminarayanan et al., 2017) i.e a prediction is more likely to be correct if the confidence is high and more likely to be incorrect if the confidence is low. Hence, we assist the system with input simplifications, clues, examples, etc. at various stages when it is not sufficiently confident in its prediction (Section 3). We organize our task into four sequential stages as shown in Figure 2. Initially, the model makes a prediction on the given test instance. If the prediction confidence is below a certain threshold then it enters the

first stage where a few semantic preserving simplifications of the test instance are provided. The system is expected to utilize this help and better its prediction. If it enters Stage 2 then it is provided with some knowledge statements about the test instance. Similarly, in the third stage, a few similar labeled examples are provided. Finally, a number of unlabeled examples are given as further assistance in the fourth stage. This task not only simulates a real-world scenario but also integrates a number of paradigms such as Selective Prediction, Prompting, Few-Shot Learning, and Unsupervised Learning.

We instantiate the proposed task in Natural Language Inference (NLI) setting (Section 4) and evaluate on both in-domain and out-of-domain inputs. We conduct comprehensive experiments on several NLI datasets and show that it improves OOD generalization performance up to 2.29% in Stage 1, 1.91% in Stage 2, 54.88% in Stage 3, and 72.02% in Stage 4 over the standard unguided prediction.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- (1) Addressing limitations of the standard NLP tasks, we propose a novel multi-stage task that is closer to the real-world setting and simulates an interviewer-candidate interaction.
- (2) To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to study post-abstention scenarios where a model is assisted with guidance in various forms to answer the originally abstained questions.
- (3) Our task improves OOD generalization performance up to 2.29% in Stage 1, 1.91% in Stage 2, 54.88% in Stage 3, and 72.02% in Stage 4 on the evaluation metric of the proposed task. There exists a noteworthy headroom for performance improvement on our task, which hopefully will motivate further work in this direction of developing NLP systems that align well with the real-world tasks.

2 Related Work

2.1 Selective Prediction

Selective Prediction task expects a system to answer when it likely to be correct and abstain otherwise. There exists a large body of work on selective prediction in machine learning (Chow, 1957; El-Yaniv et al., 2010; Geifman and El-Yaniv, 2017). Typically, the prediction confidence is used to decide when to answer and when to ab-

stain. In NLP, selective prediction has mostly been studied in connection with Calibration (Platt et al., 1999) i.e aligning a model’s output probability with the true probability of its predictions. Desai and Durrett (2020) study calibration of recently introduced pre-trained transformer models. Kamath et al. (2020) train a calibrator leveraging softmax probabilities and instance-specific features such as input lengths for Question Answering (QA) models. Varshney et al. (2020) propose to transform calibration from classification to a regression problem incorporating difficulty scores of the instances. Zhang et al. (2021) incorporate input example embedding from a pre-trained language model as additional features for the calibrator. Unlike prior work, we also focus on post-abstention scenarios where a system is provided guidance in various forms to answer the originally abstained questions.

2.2 Few-shot Learning

Standard supervised learning approaches require a huge amount of labeled training data. Inspired by human learning from just a few examples, few-shot learning presents a challenge of learning from a limited number of labeled training examples (Brown et al., 2020; Schick and Schütze, 2021b; Ye et al., 2021; Tam et al., 2021). Several works have shown that models can achieve comparable performance just by using a few representative samples (Wang et al., 2018; Nachum et al., 2018; Mishra and Sachdeva, 2020; Sucholutsky and Schonlau, 2021). Stage 3 in our task presents a few-shot learning challenge where a few labeled examples similar to the test instance are provided.

2.3 Knowledge Addition

Incorporating knowledge in models has been a long-standing research area in NLP. Researchers leverage large knowledge banks such as COMET-ATOMIC (Hwang et al., 2020), ConceptNet (Speer et al., 2017), etc. to solve commonsense reasoning tasks (Mitra et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2020; Shen et al., 2020; Mishra et al., 2020) like CommonsenseQA (Talmor et al., 2019), QUOREF (Dasigi et al., 2019), etc. Recently, prompting where additional task-related information is provided gained attention especially for regimes where only a small labeled dataset is available for training (Shin et al., 2020; Schick and Schütze, 2021a; Le Scao and Rush, 2021; Mishra et al., 2021). In our task, we provide




Figure 2: Illustration of various branches of the proposed task. Given an input, the model makes a prediction $pred$ with confidence c sequentially in each stage leveraging the provided guidance until c surpasses the threshold th . Note that $pred$ and c vary with the stage but the threshold th remains the same across stages.

instance-specific knowledge in Stage 2 when the system’s confidence in its prediction is below a certain threshold.

2.4 Unsupervised Learning

Unsupervised Learning pertains to learning from unlabeled data (Lewis et al., 2019). This field is gaining interest as obtaining labeled data is both time consuming and expensive. In contrast, unlabeled data can be collected cheaply. For downstream tasks, it has mostly been explored for Question Answering task (Chung et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2017; Dhingra et al., 2018; Wang and Jiang, 2019; Alberti et al., 2019) where it is modeled as a data augmentation or a domain adaptation problem. In this work, we provide unlabeled examples to the system in the final stage of our task.

3 The Proposed Task

In this section, we detail our proposed multi-stage task, its mathematical formulation, and evaluation metric.

Task Description: Prior work has shown that the model’s confidence is often positively corre-

lated with its correctness (Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2017; Lakshminarayanan et al., 2017) i.e its prediction is more likely to be correct if the confidence is high and more likely to be incorrect if the confidence is low. Following this, we design our task in four sequential stages where a system goes from one stage to the next if it is not sufficiently confident in its prediction. Figure 2 illustrates the flow of the task. Each stage provides instance-specific guidance in various forms to assist the model in improving its prediction. If the prediction confidence in a stage exceeds a certain threshold then it attempts the test instance and skips the subsequent stages.

The stages are organized based on the steps that a typical interviewer follows in an interaction with a candidate (Section 1). Initially, the model makes a prediction on the given input and the overall system outputs the prediction if the confidence is above a certain threshold and enters Stage 1 otherwise. In Stage 1, it is provided with several semantic-preserving simplifications of the test instance. The system is expected to leverage these input simplifications and improve its prediction on the given test instance. Prior work has shown that even state-of-the-art models are sensitive to the input and simplifying the input can significantly boost model’s performance (Jiang et al., 2020; Elazar et al., 2021; Anantha et al., 2021). In Stage 2, it is given some knowledge statements relevant to the test instance. A few similar labeled examples are provided in Stage 3. In the final stage, it is further given a number of similar unlabeled examples. If the system fails to surpass the confidence threshold even after the final stage then it abstains from answering on that test instance in order to avoid incorrect prediction.

Mathematical Formulation: Algorithm 1 shows the general structure of the proposed task. The system continues to make the prediction on the given test instance leveraging the provided guidance until its confidence exceeds a certain threshold. Hendrycks and Gimpel (2017) showed that *MaxProb* (maximum softmax probability) is a simple yet strong estimate of prediction confidence. Formally, *MaxProb* estimates confidence on input i as:

$$conf_{MaxProb} = \max_{y' \in Y(i)} Model(y'|i)$$

where $Y(i)$ denotes the possible output classes.

Algorithm 1: Task Structure

Given:

i : Test Instance,

th : Confidence Threshold,

M_0 : Trained Model,

\mathcal{T}_s : Stage-specific Guidance Function

Initialization: stage: $s \leftarrow 0$

while $s \leq 4$ **do**

$M_s \leftarrow$ Update M_{s-1} using $\mathcal{T}_s(i)$ if

$s > 0$

$pred_{i_s}, conf_{i_s} = M_s(i)$

if $conf_{i_s} > th$ **then**

return $pred_{i_s}$

$s++ = 1$

end

return “Abstain”

Calibration using a held-out dataset can further align the model’s output probabilities (Lee et al., 2017; Kamath et al., 2020) and give better confidence estimates. The function \mathcal{T}_s provides guidance to the system in Stage s for an instance i and is defined as:

$$\mathcal{T}_s(i) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \text{Simplified Inputs}, & \text{if } s = 1 \\ \text{Knowledge Stmts.}, & \text{if } s = 2 \\ \text{Similar Labeled Ex.}, & \text{if } s = 3 \\ \text{Similar Unlabeled Ex.} & \text{if } s = 4 \end{cases}$$

Evaluation Metric: In Selective Prediction, “Coverage” is defined as the fraction of examples answered by the system while accuracy on covered examples is the fraction answered correctly. Furthermore, risk pertains to the error on the covered examples. Selection of confidence threshold above which the system answers is application dependent i.e for tolerant applications like movie recommendation, a low threshold can be selected but for intolerant applications like medical diagnosis, a high threshold is selected to minimize risk. Hence, instead of evaluating a system at a particular threshold value, coverage and its associated risk is computed for every threshold value th in order to estimate its overall performance. As th decreases, coverage will increase, but the risk will usually also increase. We plot risk versus coverage for all values of th and calculate the area under this curve (AUC). AUC represents the overall performance of a method as it combines performance across all th values. Lower AUC is preferred as it

represents lower average risk across all thresholds. We compute AUC for each stage as described below:

Let the model’s initial prediction on instance i be $pred_{i_0}$ with a confidence of $conf_{i_0}$ and prediction in stage $s = 1..4$ be $pred_{i_s}$ with a confidence of $conf_{i_s}$. Note that the system gets to make a prediction in a stage only if the confidence in the previous stage was below the threshold th . For every th and stage s , we compute two values c_{i_s} and p_{i_s} as:

$$c_{i_s} = \begin{cases} c_{i_{s-1}}, & \text{if } conf_{i_{s-1}} > th \\ conf_{i_s} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$p_{i_s} = \begin{cases} p_{i_{s-1}}, & \text{if } conf_{i_{s-1}} > th \\ pred_{i_s} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We use c_{i_s} and p_{i_s} to compute Coverage C and Accuracy A on covered examples in stage s as:

$$C_s = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(c_{i_s} \geq th)}{n}$$

$$A_s = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{1}(c_{i_s} \geq th) * v_{i_s})}{C_s}$$

where, $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function, n is size of test dataset and parameter v_{i_s} is 1 when prediction p_{i_s} is correct and 0 otherwise.

We then plot risk-coverage curves and compute AUC to evaluate a system’s performance.

4 Task Instantiation

While our framework is general, we instantiate the proposed task in Natural Language Inference (NLI) that pertains to the task of identifying the relationship between a “premise” and a “hypothesis” sentence. This relationship can be classified as either *Entailment* (hypothesis must be true if the premise is true), *Contradiction* (hypothesis can never be true if the premise is true), or *Neutral* (hypothesis can be both true and false as the premise does not provide enough information to make a decision). Table 1 shows examples of the NLI task. We include the standard NLI datasets in our setup and consider SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015) as in-domain dataset with Multi-NLI (Williams et al., 2018) and Dialogue NLI (Welleck et al., 2019) as Out-of-Domain (OOD) datasets. We include the OOD datasets in our setup as the inputs often

Premise (P), Hypothesis (H)	Label (L)
P: A man is being filmed in the middle of a soccer field. H: A male is being recorded on a sports field.	Entailment
P: A woman is talking on the phone while standing next to a dog. H: The woman is sleeping in her room.	Contradiction
P: A girl is talking on a cellphone. H: The girl is calling her mother.	Neutral

Table 1: Illustrative examples of the NLI task for Entailment, Contradiction, and Neutral label.

diverge from the model’s training data in a real-world task. Figure 3 illustrates the method we followed to create various stages in our task instantiation. We detail the four stages of the proposed task for NLI below:

Stage 1: The first stage requires the input to be simplified in case of abstention. We compile simplified versions of the premise-hypothesis tuples in an automated way using the paraphrasing tool introduced in (Zhang et al., 2020). We conduct a small user study in order to find the best strategy of employing this tool to compile semantic preserving variations of the original input. We provide three sets of examples where we paraphrase only premise, only hypothesis, and both premise and hypothesis for the three labels (Entailment, Contradiction, and Neutral) separately. We also provide the original PH tuple to the participants and ask them to annotate whether the transformation is label preserving. We find that for Entailment and Contradiction PH tuples, paraphrasing the hypothesis is label preserving in most cases, whereas it is paraphrasing the premise for Neutral. Using these findings, we compile 10 semantic preserving variations of the test instances and provide them to the system in case of abstention in the first stage. Table 2 shows examples of the transformed PH tuples provided to the system in Stage 1.

Stage 2: In Stage 2, some knowledge statements relevant to the test instance are provided. We collect these knowledge statements from ConceptNet (Speer et al., 2017) by querying for nouns and verbs present in the sentence and ranking based on the similarity. Table 3 shows examples of knowledge statements fetched for SNLI test instances in Stage 2.




Figure 3: Steps involved at every stage during instantiation of the proposed task for NLI.

Label	Original Premise (P), Hypothesis (H)	Transformed Premise (P), Hypothesis (H)
Entailment	P: A young family enjoys feeling ocean waves lap at their feet. H: A family is at the beach.	P: A young family enjoys feeling ocean waves lap at their feet. H: A family is near the water.
Entailment	P: A woman with a green headscarf, blue shirt and a very big grin. H: The woman is very happy.	P: A woman with a green headscarf, blue shirt and a very big grin. H: The woman is in a good mood.
Neutral	P: People jump over a mountain crevasse on a rope. H: Some people look visually afraid to jump.	P: People are jumping over a crevasse. H: Some people look visually afraid to jump.
Neutral	P: A dog jumping for a Frisbee in the snow. H: A pet is enjoying a game of fetch with his owner.	P: The dog is playing in the snow. H: A pet is enjoying a game of fetch with his owner.
Contradiction	P: Three firefighter come out of subway station. H: Three firefighters playing cards inside a fire station.	P: Three firefighter come out of subway station. H: Three firefighters are inside a fire station.
Contradiction	P: An older women tending to a garden. H: The lady is cooking dinner.	P: An older women tending to a garden. H: The lady is making a meal.

Table 2: Illustrative examples corresponding to each label for Stage 1.

Stage 3: In Stage 3, we provide a few labeled examples similar to the test instance in case of abstention. We use POS tagger of spacy library (Honnibal et al., 2020) and find examples with matching subjects and nouns. For each instance, we find similar examples from its corresponding training dataset. Note that we sample equal number of examples for each label to avoid label imbalance. We experiment varying the number of similar examples in this stage from 8 to 128. Table 4 shows examples found for an SNLI test instance from the SNLI training dataset in Stage 3.

Stage 4: In Stage 4, we provide a number of unlabeled examples compiled from the correspond-

ing training dataset of the test instance. We experiment varying the number of unlabeled examples in this stage from 5000 to 20000. We expect this stage to be particularly beneficial for the OOD inputs as this provides exposure to instances that have not been observed during training performed prior to Stage 1.

5 Experiments and Results

In this section, we provide experimental details and analyse performance of our baseline approach.

5.1 Approach

We train a 3-way classification model on the training dataset and use *MaxProb* i.e maximum soft-

Premise (P), Hypothesis (H)	Knowledge
P: Children bathe in water from large drums.	Water is related to wet
H: The kids are wet.	Water is a fluid
P: Boys in what appears to be a library or school room.	You can use a library to obtain and read books.
H: Boys are in a place of learning.	A library is for finding information.
P: Kids work at computers with a teacher’s help.	A teacher wants students to learn.
H: The kids are learning.	Teacher is a type of educator.
P: A couple walk hand in hand down a street.	If you want to walk then you should stand
H: A couple is sitting on a bench.	Walk is related to movement.
P: A dog jumping for a Frisbee in the snow.	Cat is not dog.
H: A cat washes his face and whiskers with his front paw.	Paw is a type of animal foot.

Table 3: Examples showing top 2 knowledge statements provided in Stage 2.

Label	Premise	Hypothesis
Entailment	A tattooed skateboarder is doing a trick.	A tattooed skateboarder is pulling a stunt.
Entailment	The man is performing a trick on a bicycle high in the air.	The man can ride a bike.
Neutral	A tattooed skateboarder is doing a trick.	A skateboarder is performing for a crowd.
Neutral	A man on a bike tries to do a trick on the railing of an outdoor fountain.	The man has on elbow pads and a helmet.
Contradiction	A man is pulling off a trick on his rollerblades.	A man is sitting down on the floor.
Contradiction	A boy doing a trick in the air on his bicycle.	A boy is playing a clarinet.

Table 4: Illustrative examples corresponding to each label for Stage 3 for the original test instance: **P:** A skateboarding youth does a trick on a rail., **H:** A young person on a skateboard.




Figure 4: Our baseline approach for each stage of the proposed task.

max probability across the three classes as the confidence measure. Initially, we make inference on the given test instance and proceed to Stage 1 if the confidence is below the threshold. For the first stage, we further make inference on the provided simplifications of the test instance and find the most frequent prediction among those. Then, we use **ensembling** techniques to find the final prediction i.e we compare the prediction on the origi-

nal input with this most frequent prediction and if that prediction matches then we take the maximum prediction confidence among the variants where the system predicts the most frequent label otherwise we take the average of those prediction confidences. For the second stage, we **concatenate the knowledge statement(s)** with the premise and make inference on the concatenated input. For the third stage, we further **fine-tune** the model on the provided labeled instances and reattempt the original test instance using the fine-tuned model. For the final stage, we **pseudo-label** the provided unlabeled examples using the finetuned model obtained in Stage 3, fine-tune the model using those pseudo-labeled examples, and make inference on the test instance again. Figure 4 illustrate our baseline approach for each stage of the proposed task.

Table 6 shows the performance of the SNLI-trained model on all the evaluation datasets before Stage 1. We refer this stage as Stage 0 in our analysis. As expected, the in-domain accuracy is high and AUC of risk-coverage curve is low. Whereas, the out-of-domain accuracy is low and AUC is high.




Figure 5: Risk coverage curves for all datasets in Stages 0, 1, 2, and 3.

Stage	SNLI	MNLI mat.	MNLI mis.	DNLI
S1	0.89	-1.29	0.71	2.29
S2	-7.62	-2.01	0.37	1.91
S3	-7.88	10.54	9.5	54.88
S4*	-	-	-	72.02

Table 5: Table showing percentage improvement at various stages for all datasets. * indicates that this has been evaluated for 200 samples only due to limited computational budget.

Metric	SNLI	MNLI mat.	MNLI mis.	DNLI
Accuracy \uparrow	80.43	59.12	59.74	42.73
AUC \downarrow	7.87	27.89	26.73	57.2

Table 6: Table showing metric values obtained by the SNLI trained model on all the evaluation datasets before Stage 1 i.e without providing any extra information about the test instances. AUC corresponds to Area under risk-coverage curve. \uparrow indicates higher is better while \downarrow indicates lower is better.

5.2 Experimental Details

Since NLI is a 3-way classification task, we use BERT-BASE model (Devlin et al., 2019) with a linear layer on top of [CLS] token representation for training the model. We use batch sizes of 32 and a learning rate ranging in $\{1-5\}e-5$. All experiments are done in Nvidia V100 16GB GPUs. We train the model using 10k examples of the SNLI training dataset and evaluate on SNLI, MNLI (matched and mismatched), and DNLI datasets.

5.3 MaxProb as a confidence Measure

We plot *MaxProb* vs *Accuracy* achieved by the SNLI trained model for all the datasets in Figure 6. It shows that *MaxProb* is positively correlated with correctness i.e with increase in *MaxProb*, the accuracy also increases. This justifies the use of *MaxProb* as a confidence measure for our task.

5.4 Performance Prior to Stage 1

5.5 Performance Analysis

Figure 5 shows the risk-coverage curves for all the evaluation datasets obtained in various stages of




Figure 6: MaxProb Vs Accuracy plot for the SNLI trained model on all evaluation datasets.

our task. We find that Stage 3 leads to a significant improvement for OOD datasets. In contrast, there is a marginal drop in performance for in-domain dataset (SNLI). This is expected as the model is already trained on the training dataset of the in-domain dataset and fine-tuning on a few examples in Stage 3 leads to overfitting and hence drop in performance. Furthermore, we find that there is not a significant improvement in performance in Stage 1 and Stage 2. This leaves scope for better ways to leverage the input simplifications and knowledge statements in Stage 1 and 2 respectively.

6 Conclusion

We introduced a multi-stage task in order to bridge the gap between real-world and standard NLP task formulations. Inspired by human-human interaction such as an interview, we designed our task by incorporating various forms of guidance to help a system improve its prediction and learn the underlying concept to achieve generalization. We instantiated the proposed task in Natural Language Inference setting and demonstrated that each of the stages improve OOD generalization performance of systems. However, there still exists significant room to improve OOD generalization at each stage (especially Stage 1 and 2). We hope this work will bring more attention to developing NLP systems that align more closely with the real-world tasks.

References

- Chris Alberti, Daniel Andor, Emily Pitler, Jacob Devlin, and Michael Collins. 2019. [Synthetic QA corpora generation with roundtrip consistency](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6168–6173, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. [Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 520–534, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Ting-Yun Chang, Yang Liu, Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Behnam Hedayatnia, Pei Zhou, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2020. [Incorporating commonsense knowledge graph in pretrained models for social commonsense tasks](#). In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO): The First Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*, pages 74–79, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chi-Keung Chow. 1957. An optimum character recognition system using decision func-

- tions. *IRE Transactions on Electronic Computers*, (4):247–254.
- Yu-An Chung, Hung-Yi Lee, and James Glass. 2018. [Supervised and unsupervised transfer learning for question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1585–1594, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pradeep Dasigi, Nelson F. Liu, Ana Marasović, Noah A. Smith, and Matt Gardner. 2019. [Quoref: A reading comprehension dataset with questions requiring coreferential reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5925–5932, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shrey Desai and Greg Durrett. 2020. [Calibration of pre-trained transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 295–302, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Danish Danish, and Dheeraj Rajagopal. 2018. [Simple and effective semi-supervised question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 582–587, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ran El-Yaniv et al. 2010. On the foundations of noise-free selective classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(5).
- Yanai Elazar, Nora Kassner, Shauli Ravfogel, Abhilasha Ravichander, E. Hovy, H. Schutze, and Yoav Goldberg. 2021. Measuring and improving consistency in pretrained language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.01017.
- Yonatan Geifman and Ran El-Yaniv. 2017. Selective classification for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08500*.
- Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. 2017. A baseline for detecting misclassified and out-of-distribution examples in neural networks. *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Landeghem, and Adriane Boyd. 2020. [spaCy: Industrial-strength Natural Language Processing in Python](#).
- Jena D Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Jeff Da, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Antoine Bosselut, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Comet-atomic 2020: On symbolic and neural commonsense knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05953*.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F. Xu, Jun Araki, and Graham Neubig. 2020. [How can we know what language models know?](#) *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:423–438.
- Erik Jones, Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Ananya Kumar, and Percy Liang. 2020. Selective classification can magnify disparities across groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14134*.
- Amita Kamath, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2020. [Selective question answering under domain shift](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5684–5696, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. 2017. [Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Teven Le Scao and Alexander Rush. 2021. [How many data points is a prompt worth?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2627–2636, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kimin Lee, Honglak Lee, Kibok Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. 2017. Training confidence-calibrated classifiers for detecting out-of-distribution samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09325*.
- Patrick Lewis, Ludovic Denoyer, and Sebastian Riedel. 2019. [Unsupervised question answering by cloze translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4896–4910, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hanna Hajishirzi. 2021. Natural instructions: Benchmarking generalization to new tasks from natural language instructions. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.08773.
- Swaroop Mishra, A. Mitra, Neeraj Varshney, Bhavdeep Singh Sachdeva, and Chitta Baral. 2020. Towards question format independent numerical reasoning: A set of prerequisite tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.08516.
- Swaroop Mishra and Bhavdeep Singh Sachdeva. 2020. Do we need to create big datasets to learn a task? In *SUSTAINLP*.
- A. Mitra, Pratyay Banerjee, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Swaroop Mishra, and Chitta Baral. 2019. Exploring ways to incorporate additional knowledge to improve natural language commonsense question answering. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.08855.
- Ofir Nachum, Shixiang Shane Gu, Honglak Lee, and Sergey Levine. 2018. Data-efficient hierarchical reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31:3303–3313.
- John Platt et al. 1999. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in large margin classifiers*, 10(3):61–74.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021a. [Exploiting cloze-questions for few-shot text classification and natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 255–269, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021b. [It’s not just size that matters: Small language models are also few-shot learners](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2339–2352, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tao Shen, Yi Mao, Pengcheng He, Guodong Long, Adam Trischler, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. [Exploiting structured knowledge in text via graph-guided representation learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8980–8994, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. [AutoPrompt: Eliciting Knowledge from Language Models with Automatically Generated Prompts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4222–4235, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robyn Speer, Joshua Chin, and Catherine Havasi. 2017. Conceptnet 5.5: An open multilingual graph of general knowledge. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31.
- Ilia Sucholutsky and Matthias Schonlau. 2021. Less than one’-shot learning: Learning n classes from $m < n$ samples. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 9739–9746.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. [CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the*

- 2019 *Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4149–4158, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Derek Tam, R. R. Menon, M. Bansal, Shashank Srivastava, and Colin Raffel. 2021. Improving and simplifying pattern exploiting training. *ArXiv*, abs/2103.11955.
- Neeraj Varshney, Swaroop Mishra, and Chitta Baral. 2020. It’s better to say" i can’t answer" than answering incorrectly: Towards safety critical nlp systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.09371*.
- Chao Wang and Hui Jiang. 2019. [Explicit utilization of general knowledge in machine reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2263–2272, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tongzhou Wang, Jun-Yan Zhu, Antonio Torralba, and Alexei A Efros. 2018. Dataset distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.10959*.
- Sean Welleck, Jason Weston, Arthur Szlam, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. [Dialogue natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3731–3741, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Junjie Hu, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William Cohen. 2017. [Semi-supervised QA with generative domain-adaptive nets](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1040–1050, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qinyuan Ye, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Xiang Ren. 2021. Crossfit: A few-shot learning challenge for cross-task generalization in nlp. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.08835.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR.
- Shujian Zhang, Chengyue Gong, and Eunsol Choi. 2021. Knowing more about questions can help: Improving calibration in question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01494*.