

# Scaling Native Language Identification with Transformer Adapters

**Ahmet Yavuz Uluslu**

Universität Zürich & PRODAFT  
ahmetyavuz.uluslu@uzh.ch

**Gerold Schneider**

Universität Zürich  
gschneid@cl.uzh.ch

## Abstract

Native language identification (NLI) is the task of automatically identifying the native language (L1) of an individual based on their language production in a learned language. It is useful for a variety of purposes including marketing, security and educational applications. NLI is usually framed as a multi-class classification task, where numerous designed features are combined to achieve state-of-the-art results. Recently deep generative approach based on transformer decoders (GPT-2) outperformed its counterparts and achieved the best results on the NLI benchmark datasets. We investigate this approach to determine the practical implications compared to traditional state-of-the-art NLI systems. We introduce transformer adapters to address memory limitations and improve training/inference speed to scale NLI applications for production.

## 1 Introduction

Native Language Identification (NLI) is the task of automatically identifying the native language (L1) of an individual based on their writing or speech in another language (L2). It is used for a variety of purposes including marketing, security and educational applications. The growing interest in NLI from various research fields can be partly attributed to the outstanding performance of automated NLI systems against human annotators. A study of human performance in NLI (Malmasi et al., 2015) showed that NLI systems perform in the 80%–90% accuracy range while humans achieved 37.3% average accuracy. The experimentation also constrained the number of considered languages and texts to enable human competition.

NLI is most commonly framed as a multi-class classification problem. For text-based NLI, features are extracted from written resources produced by non-native speakers to train a classification

model. The underlying hypothesis is that the L1 influences learners' second language writing as a result of the language transfer effect (Odlin, 1989). A variety of feature types have been explored to capture distinct features of the language interference phenomenon: spelling errors (Koppel et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2017); word and lemma n-grams (Tetreault et al., 2013); character n-grams (Kulmizev et al., 2017), dependency parsing and morphosyntax (Cimino et al., 2013). As seen by the two shared tasks on the NLI task organized in 2013 and 2017, the combination of such features produces the best outcomes for NLI (Tetreault et al., 2013; Malmasi et al., 2017). The top ranked systems made use of Support Vector Machine (SVM) models trained on a diverse set of linguistic features that can capture word, sentence and document level characteristics. (Markov et al., 2017; Cimino and Dell'Orletta, 2017)

Deep neural network based approaches were also considered for the NLI task. Bjerva et al. (2017) experimented with deep residual networks (DNN), long short-term memory networks (LSTM) and continuous bag-of-words embeddings to create meta classifiers. Li and Zou (2017) built an ensemble of single-feature SVMs fed into a multi-layer perceptron (MLP). Habic et al. (2020) integrated multi-task learning into convolutional neural networks (CNN) to create shared representations from multiple datasets. The studies concluded that traditional methods, i.e., SVM with engineered features, appear to work better than deep learning-based standalone and meta-classification approaches. Recently Lotfi et al. (2020) introduced the deep generative modelling approach to NLI which consists of fine-tuning a GPT-2 model to identify each language. Their method outperforms traditional machine learning approaches and currently achieves the best results on the benchmark NLI datasets.

The contributions of the work presented here are the following: (i) We investigate the resource requirements and inference performance for the deep generative approach in comparison to traditional state-of-the-art NLI systems, and (ii) we introduce ProDAPT, transformer adapters based on deep generative model to optimize memory and storage space, and (iii) we evaluate our approach on the NLI task and explore the tradeoffs.

## 2 Related Work

**Deep Generative Approach.** OpenAI’s Generative Pre-trained Transformer-2 (GPT-2) is a unidirectional transformer-based language model pre-trained on 40 GB of text data with the objective of predicting the next word given the context (Radford et al., 2019). It can generate coherent paragraphs of text and achieves state-of-the-art performance on many language modelling benchmarks without any task-specific training. Instead of training a classifier, the deep generative approach finetunes a generative model (GPT-2) on texts written by native speakers of each language (L1) to capture peculiarities of language transfer (Lotfi et al., 2020). After training  $N$  (number of target languages) models to learn the characteristics of each L1, they can be used to discriminate between unseen text samples based on the language model (LM) loss. The least LM loss is expected from the model that is trained on the same class (L1). Although there are examples of the LM loss as a ranking feature for other tasks such as substitute selection for text simplification (Uluslu, 2022), the deep generative approach is the first method to use such value as the only discriminator for text classification.




Figure 1: An example inference of an unseen text written by a Turkish native speaker.

**Transformer Adapters.** Adapters have been introduced as an alternative lightweight fine-tuning

strategy that achieves equal performance to full fine-tuning on most tasks (Houlsby et al., 2019). They consist of a small set of additional newly initialized weights at every layer of the transformer. While the rest of the pretrained parameters of the large model are kept frozen during the fine-tuning process, these new parameters are actively trained on the target task. Efficient parameter sharing between tasks is possible by training several task-specific and language-specific adapters for the same model, which can be exchanged and combined afterwards. The code base for different state-of-the-art adapter architectures was integrated into the transformers library and released under the name adapter-transformers (Pfeiffer et al., 2020a). Recently, their adapters implementation started to support generative and seq2seq models such as GPT-2 (Sterz et al., 2021).

## 3 Data

We evaluate our approach on the most commonly used dataset in NLI research: the ETS Corpus of Non-Native Written English (TOEFL11) (Blanchard et al., 2013). The dataset contains 1,100 essays in English written by native speakers (L1) of 11 different languages: Arabic (ARA), Chinese (CHI), French (FRE), German (GER), Hindi (HIN), Italian (ITA), Japanese (JPN), Korean (KOR), Spanish (SPA), Telugu (TEL), and Turkish (TUR). In total there are 12,100 essays with on average 348 tokens per essay. The essays were written in response to eight different writing prompts, all of which appear in all 11 L1 groups, by authors with low, medium, or high English proficiency. The dataset is considered a benchmark dataset for NLI and was used in two shared tasks on the NLI task (Tetreault et al., 2013; Malmasi et al., 2017).

## 4 Methodology

We investigate the resource requirements and inference speed for the deep generative approach in three different subsections: storage requirements, memory requirements and inference speed.

**Storage Requirements.** The full deep generative approach from Lotfi et al. (2020) finetunes 11 gpt2-medium models to cover every language in the TOEFL11 dataset. A fine-tuned gpt2-medium model requires 1.4 GB of storage space. The training process with the early stopping of three validations is expected to take up to 61.6 GB of storage space upon completion. The inference (test) stage

only requires the best-performing models for every language to be kept. Therefore, 15.4 GB of storage space in total is needed to fully store the system.

**Memory Requirements.** To reach the final inference (target native language), each model needs to calculate the LM loss value for the given input. To fully load the parameters of 11 models in memory, 16.6 GB of GPU memory is required.

**Speed Constraints.** The deep generative approach does not inherently support parallelism. Further configuration in multi-threading and memory management is needed to accommodate different models in the GPU. The final inference still needs to be calculated in CPU time (argmin) and requires all model calculations to be completed beforehand. The number of models loaded simultaneously is constrained by the GPU requirements. In case all models are not available simultaneously, the memory operations to load/unload language models are part of the inference process and directly interfere with the performance.

**Adapter Configurations.** Two different configurations have been proposed for transformer adapters (Houlsby et al., 2019; Pfeiffer et al., 2020b). Rücklé et al. (2020) investigated the efficiency of two adapter architectures at training and inference time and found that they achieved comparable performance. Sterz et al. (2021) compared the performance of two architectures for adapter-based GPT-2 models on the GLUE benchmark and reported on-par results on different tasks. We also experimented with both architectures and found that Houlsby et al. (2019) produced better results for standalone GPT-2 models trained on NLI data and decided to implement our full architecture based on this configuration.




Figure 2: The ProDAPT architecture

The number of target languages for the NLI task can increase depending on the use case. In forensic

linguistic investigations, particularly in the area of cybercrime, it may be necessary to cover up to 20-30 languages depending on the region and nature of crime, all of which may be in non-standardised forms, requiring the development of further models. To create a scalable NLI system, the memory bottleneck caused by the model size and the non-parallel nature of the deep generative approach should be addressed.

We implement ProDAPT architecture with transformer adapters to address these issues. We train an adapter for every L1 for 15 epochs with a learning rate of  $1e-4$ . The original pretrained weights for the GPT-2 are kept intact, and the L1 (target language) information is compressed into the newly initialized parameters and the classification head. The storage space required for every language model (adapter + head) decreases to 218.7 MB. All adapters and their classification heads are loaded into a single gpt2-medium model and share the pretrained weights. To support parallel inference, the input is replicated at the first layer with L1 adapters. For every adapter, calculations are completed in parallel until the classification head is reached. The GPU memory required to load the ProDAPT architecture is 4.1 GB and the storage space requirement is 2.4 GB.

## 5 Results and Discussion

To compare the performance of our system with the state-of-the-art deep generative approach (Lotfi et al., 2020), we report the results in terms of classification accuracy on the TOEFL11 test set, as well as on the TOEFL11 dataset under 10-fold cross-validation (10FCV). We also report the storage and memory requirements to deploy our model in comparison to their approach. We use Titan T4 16 GB graphics card for the deep generative models and AMD EPYC 7702 64-Core CPU for Support Vector Machine (SVM) baselines where the GPU is not required. We think this is an acceptable choice since our work focuses on creating scalable NLI systems that can be easily deployed with widely available GPUs. We measure the inference speed with the time spent between CUDA events until the inference is finalized. We warm up the GPU before the test and repeat the experiment 100 times to enable robust results. Since the deep generative approach does not require feature engineering, we create a unigram SVM baseline to ensure a fair comparison. We compare the performance against

the default deep generative approach where one model at a time can be loaded into the GPU and the LM loss for the batch (4) is computed linearly.

Model	Storage Space	GPU Memory	Inference Speed
Unigram SVM	79.6 MB	[CPU]	84x
Lotfi et al. (2020)	15.95 GB	16.6 GB	x
ProDAPT	2.4 GB	4.1 GB	13x

Table 1: Results in terms of the storage space, GPU memory and inference speed.

Model	TOEFL11 (test set)	TOEFL11 10FCV
Unigram SVM	75.8	76.6
Lotfi et al. (2020)	89.0	86.8
ProDAPT	84.2	82.4

Table 2: Results in terms of classification accuracy (%) on the TOEFL11 dataset.

The results presented in Table 1 demonstrate how the ProDAPT architecture optimises the state-of-the-art hardware requirements. The full parallelization support enables a considerable increase of 13x in the inference speed in comparison to the deep generative approach. As the number of supported languages (L1) increases, we predict that this performance gap will widen and become more significant. The unigram SVM baseline proves to be the most lightweight approach, and it provides the best results in terms of the inference speed. However, in order to achieve comparable performance to that of the deep generative approach, other approaches need to make use of ensemble learning and feature engineering. The extensive feature engineering in state-of-the-art systems, which can include hundreds of linguistic features, also comes at the expense of inference and training speed. The results shown in Table 2 indicate that our system outperforms the baseline and achieves an on-par performance with the deep generative approach. We found that the performance decline in our approach was caused by the difficulty of distinguishing between similar language pairs, such as Hindi-Telugu and Japanese-Korean, also noted by Lotfi et al. (2020). We did not observe convergence problems based on the LM loss for any of the L1 models, but we speculate that the restricted number of parameters in the adapters results in a reduced capacity to capture discriminative features that can distinguish between similar languages compared to full model fine-tuning.

## 6 Conclusion

We proposed an efficient and scalable NLI system based on the state-of-the-art deep generative approach. The method consists of training a transformers adapter for every L1 which can be attached simultaneously to a GPT-2 model for parallel inference. We showed that it is possible to optimize the hardware requirements and the inference speed at the cost of a slight decrease in the model performance.

## Acknowledgments

This research received funding through the innovation cheque programme from the Swiss Innovation Agency. It is part of the research collaboration between the University of Zurich and PRODAFT under the project name 59977.1 INNO-ICT "Author profiling to automatize attribution during cybercrime investigations".

## References

- Johannes Bjerva, Gintarė Grigonytė, Robert Östling, and Barbara Plank. 2017. Neural networks and spelling features for native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 235–239.
- Daniel Blanchard, Joel Tetreault, Derrick Higgins, Aoife Cahill, and Martin Chodorow. 2013. Toefl11: A corpus of non-native english. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2013(2):i–15.
- Lingzhen Chen, Carlo Strapparava, and Vivi Nastase. 2017. Improving native language identification by using spelling errors. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 542–546.
- Andrea Cimino and Felice Dell’Orletta. 2017. Stacked sentence-document classifier approach for improving native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 430–437.
- Andrea Cimino, Felice Dell’Orletta, Giulia Venturi, and Simonetta Montemagni. 2013. Linguistic profiling based on general-purpose features and native language identification. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 207–215.
- Vuk Habic, Alexander Semenov, and Eduardo L Pasiliao. 2020. Multitask deep learning for native language identification. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 209:106440.

- Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR.
- Moshe Koppel, Jonathan Schler, and Kfir Zigdon. 2005. Automatically determining an anonymous author’s native language. In *International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics*, pages 209–217. Springer.
- Artur Kulmizev, Bo Blankers, Johannes Bjerva, Malvina Nissim, Gertjan van Noord, Barbara Plank, and Martijn Wieling. 2017. The power of character n-grams in native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 12th workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 382–389.
- Wen Li and Liang Zou. 2017. Classifier stacking for native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 390–397.
- Ehsan Lotfi, Iliia Markov, and Walter Daelemans. 2020. A deep generative approach to native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1778–1783.
- Shervin Malmasi, Keelan Evanini, Aoife Cahill, Joel Tetreault, Robert Pugh, Christopher Hamill, Diane Napolitano, and Yao Qian. 2017. A report on the 2017 native language identification shared task. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 62–75.
- Shervin Malmasi, Joel Tetreault, and Mark Dras. 2015. Oracle and human baselines for native language identification. In *Proceedings of the tenth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 172–178.
- Iliia Markov, Lingzhen Chen, Carlo Strapparava, and Grigori Sidorov. 2017. Cic-fbk approach to native language identification. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 374–381.
- Terence Odlin. 1989. *Language transfer*, volume 27. Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Andreas Rücklé, Clifton Poth, Aishwarya Kamath, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, Kyunghyun Cho, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020a. Adapterhub: A framework for adapting transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07779*.
- Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebastian Ruder. 2020b. Mad-x: An adapter-based framework for multi-task cross-lingual transfer.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Andreas Rücklé, Gregor Geigle, Max Glockner, Tilman Beck, Jonas Pfeiffer, Nils Reimers, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Adapterdrop: On the efficiency of adapters in transformers.
- Hannah Sterz, Clifton Poth, Andreas Rücklé, and Jonas Pfeiffer. 2021. Adapters for generative and seq2seq models in nlp. *Blog Post*.
- Joel Tetreault, Daniel Blanchard, and Aoife Cahill. 2013. A report on the first native language identification shared task. In *Proceedings of the eighth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 48–57.
- Ahmet Yavuz Uluslu. 2022. Automatic lexical simplification for Turkish. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05878*.