

In-sample Curriculum Learning by Sequence Completion for Natural Language Generation

Qi Jia¹, Yizhu Liu², Haifeng Tang³, Kenny Q. Zhu^{1*}

¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

²Meituan, Shanghai, China

³China Merchants Bank Credit Card Center, Shanghai, China

jia_qi@sjtu.edu.cn, liuyizhu@meituan.com

thfeng@cmbchina.com, kzhu@cs.sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Curriculum learning has shown promising improvements in multiple domains by training machine learning models from easy samples to hard ones. Previous works which either design rules or train models for scoring the difficulty highly rely on task-specific expertise, and cannot generalize. Inspired by the “easy-to-hard” intuition, we propose to do in-sample curriculum learning for natural language generation tasks. Our learning strategy starts training the model to generate the last few words, i.e., do sequence completion, and gradually extends to generate the whole output sequence. Comprehensive experiments show that it generalizes well to different tasks and achieves significant improvements over strong baselines.

1 Introduction

Curriculum learning (CL) proposed by Bengio et al. (2009) provides performance improvements on a number of machine learning tasks. It mimics the learning process of humans by training models with samples in a more meaningful order, i.e., from the easy ones to the hard ones. Therefore, ranking training samples by difficulty lies in the core of CL, which is also the key challenge when it’s applied to natural language generation (NLG) tasks.

Previous work on CL for NLG focuses on measuring the difficulty of training samples in two ways. One is to resort to human-crafted rules based on various linguistic features and human observations (Liu et al., 2018; Kocmi and Bojar, 2017). The other uses models either trained from outside data or the same data but in previous epochs/steps (Zhou et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2019; Shen and Feng, 2020). Either way seeks to produce a numeric score for each training sample relying on domain expertise so that it can be ranked, making it difficult to generalize to different tasks. For

example, summarization focuses more on generating concise outputs while style transfer emphasizes style changes. So the former should pay attention to the ratio between the lengths of the output and the input (the more compressed the more difficult), while the latter should focus on differences in style between the input and output (the more different the more difficult). Designing a comprehensive or universal scoring function is difficult or even impossible under this definition of CL.

In this paper, we propose an alternative to sample-wise CL, which we call in-sample CL (ICL). ICL re-orders the learning sequence within the sample. One particular ICL re-ordering strategy which we find effective is to predict the last few tokens given a long prefix first from the original output, and then gradually increase the tokens at the end while shortening the prefix, to create an easy-to-hard training order. Such a curriculum learning strategy focuses more on the difficulty of language generation itself, leading to a better generalization ability among tasks.

Actually, we are not the first to propose the idea of ICL. Liang et al. (2021) introduced the notion of “token-wise curriculum learning(TCL)”. Illustrations of TCL, ICL and the traditional CL are shown in Figure 1. At a first glance, their idea is similar to ours, except they consider generating the first few tokens in the output sequence to be easier than generating a longer sequence in the output. However, the real difference is that while we consider each training sample in full length, only with variable-length prefixes, they create training samples of increasing output length by cutting the sentences short. Even though they also have a “soft” version of the approach, the essence of TCL is still augmenting data with incomplete and even “incorrect” training samples. Therefore, in our opinion, Liang et al. (2021)’s work is not really curriculum learning in the classic sense, but rather imperfect data augmentation, especially under their “hard”

* The corresponding author.




Figure 1: Illustrations of the main ideas of traditional sample-wise CL, Liang et al. (2021)’s TCL and our ICL. Green box refers to samples in different difficulty levels. The darker, the harder. “T” refers to a known token while “_” refer to a token to be generated in the output sequence of a sample during training.

setting. This also explains why it doesn’t work as well as our method in a range of generation tasks including reading comprehension, dialogue summarization, style transfer, question generation and news summarization.

In a word, our contributions are:

- As far as we know, we are the first to propose the real in-sample curriculum learning for text generation (Section 2.1).
- We propose a novel ICL learning algorithm (Section 2.2). Together with our sequence completion ICL curriculum, it achieves significant improvements over the strong baselines on different NLG tasks, demonstrating strong generalization ability (Section 3).
- The ICL can be combined with other traditional CL for further performance gains (Section 4.3).

2 Approach

We present an ICL strategy in the context of the vanilla sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) training objective with a detailed learning algorithm.

2.1 ICL by Sequence Completion

Today, NLG tasks are generally solved by Seq2Seq models, especially the pre-trained language models. Vanilla Seq2Seq models are trained to predict the output $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ given the input X by minimizing the negative log-likelihood:

$$L_{orig} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log P(y_t | y_{<t}, X) \quad (1)$$

Traditional CL manipulates the selection of training pair (X, Y) from easier pairs to harder ones for different tasks with this vanilla loss function.

In contrast, ICL digs into the output sequence itself and exploits the difficulty of language generation within each training sample. We segment Y into two sub-sequences by a cutting point c , where $1 \leq c \leq n$. The sub-sequence before c is called the *prefix*, and the one after (and including) c is the *target*. According to the Shannon Information Theory, the entropy goes down when more related information is given. Thus, the difficulty of the sequence completion task that generates the target will decrease when a longer prefix is given. In other words, we can manipulate c to vary the difficulty of samples during training.

Based on this intuition, we modify the vanilla loss as:

$$L_{icl} = -\frac{1}{n - c + 1} \sum_{t=c}^n \log P(y_t | y_{<t}, X) \quad (2)$$

i.e., given X and the prefix as inputs to the encoder and decoder respectively, we only calculate the loss for predicting the target. At the beginning of the training process, we use a larger c to train the model to predict the target with only the last few words. Then, we gradually decrease c , until the prefix reduces to an empty sequence. In this way, the model grows stronger with more difficult generation objectives and learns to generate the whole output in the end. An illustration is in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The decoder of a NLG model. It’s suitable for both encoder-decoder and decoder-only models.

2.2 ICL Algorithm

Since the output length varies from sample to sample, it’s hard to set c as a constant for all samples. If so, samples with short inputs will be neglected when c is large at the beginning, and the model will eventually bias to training samples with long outputs as they are shown more times. Under this consideration, we proposed to determine c sample by sample relative to their output lengths.

We define a start point p_{start} and a stride s for controlling c , where $0 \leq p_{start}, s \leq 1$. The training process starts with:

$$c = n \times p_{start} \quad (3)$$

After each epoch or a number of updating steps, we validate the model on the validation set. If the performance on the validation set no longer increases, we introduce a more difficult generation task by removing s from p_{prev} :

$$p_{new} = \begin{cases} p_{prev} - s, & \text{if } p_{prev} > s \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and update c by Equation 3. The training process terminates until there are no improvements on the validation set with c equaling 0. More details are included in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 The ICL training algorithm.

Input: the model to be fine-tuned M_{in} , the training set D_t , the validation set D_v

Parameter: a start point p_{start} , a stride s

Output: the final model M_{out}

```
1: procedure ICL( $M_{in}, D_t, D_v, p_{start}, s$ )
2:    $p = p_{start}$ 
3:    $M_{out} = M_{in}$ 
4:   for training epoch  $e = 1, \dots$  do
5:     ▷ Training process
6:     for training steps in an epoch do
7:       Randomly sample a batch  $B$  from  $D_t$ 
8:       for Each sample  $(X, Y)$  in  $B$  do
9:          $c = n \times p$ 
10:        Calculate  $L_{icl}$  by Eq. 2
11:      end for
12:      Update  $M_{in}$  based on  $\frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{|B|} L_{icl}$ 
13:    end for
14:    ▷ Validation process
15:    Calculate  $M_{in}$ ’s performance on  $D_v$ .
16:    if  $M_{in}$  gets improvements on  $D_v$  then
17:       $M_{out} = M_{in}$ 
18:    else
19:      Update  $p$  according to Eq. 3
20:    end if
21:  end for
22:  return  $M_{out}$ 
23: end procedure
```

3 Experiment

In this section, we first present the experimental setups for different tasks. Then, we show the quantitative and qualitative results together with comprehensive analysis and case studies.

3.1 Experimental Setups

We did experiments on five commonly-researched natural language generation tasks as follows:

Reading comprehension is the task that answering questions about a piece of text. We use the DREAM dataset (Sun et al., 2019) where questions are about corresponding dialogues and the answer is a complete sentence in natural language. We neglect the negative choices in the original dataset and formulate it as a NLG task. We adopt the pre-trained language model BART¹ (Lewis et al., 2020) as the baseline. The generated answers are evaluated by BLEU scores (Papineni et al., 2002) widely used for QA systems, together with Meteor and Rouge-L F1 (Fabbri et al., 2021). We evaluate the model after each training epoch and the early-stop patience will be added 1 if there is no improvement in the perplexity on the validation set. The training process terminates when the early-stop patience equals or is larger than 3. During the inference, the minimum and maximum output length are set to 5 and 100, with no_repeat_ngram_size=3, length_penalty=1.0 and num_beams=4.

Dialogue summarization is to generate a concise summary covering the salient information in the input dialogue. The preceding model BART has shown to be a strong baseline for this task. We experiment with SAMSum dataset (Gliwa et al., 2019) for daily-chat dialogues. The generated summaries are evaluated by comparing with the reference through evaluation metrics, including Rouge-1/2/L F1 scores (Lin, 2004), Meteor (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005) and BertScore F1. The parameters are the same as reading comprehension, except that the early-stop is activated if there is no improvement according to the Rouge-2 F1 score.

Style transfer preserves the semantic meaning of a given sentence while modifying its style, such as positive to negative, formal to informal, etc. We adopt the Shakespeare author imitation dataset (Xu et al., 2012), containing William Shakespeare’s original plays and corresponding modernized versions. Krishna et al. (2020) proposed to do unsupervised style transfer by training paraphrase models

¹<https://huggingface.co/facebook/bart-large>

Task	Dataset	Model	#Train	#Val	#Test	Input	Output	Avg	Std
Reading Comprehension	DREAM	BART	6,116	2,040	2,041	“Q:”+ question + dialogue	answer	5.59	2.61
Dialogue Summarization	SAMSum	BART	14,732	818	819	dialogue	summary	24.99	13.06
Style Transfer	Shakespeare	STRAP (GPT-2)	36,790	2,436	2,924	original /modern	modern /original	11.63	8.19
Question Generation	SQuAD1.1	UniLM	75,722	10,570	11,877	passage + [SEP] + answer	question	13.09	4.27
News Summarization	CNNM	BART	287,227	13,368	11,490	document	summary	70.97	29.59

Table 1: A summary of tasks and datasets. #Train, #Val and #Test refers to the number of samples in the corresponding dataset. Avg and Std are the statistics for the number of output tokens. “+” is the concatenation operation.

based on the GPT-2 language model (Radford et al., 2019). We re-implemented their approach STRAP. Evaluation metrics include transfer accuracy(ACC), semantic similarity(SIM), Fluency(FL) and two aggregation metrics, i.e., geometric averaging(GM) and their proposed $J(\cdot)$ metric. In the training stage, we evaluate the model after updating every 500 steps. The perplexity on the validation set is used to activate the early-stop which equals 3. The inference is done as default.

Question generation (Zhou et al., 2017) aims at generating a question given an input document and its corresponding answer span. SQuAD 1.1 (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) is generally used for evaluation. We adopt the data split as in (Du et al., 2017) and fine-tune the pre-trained UniLM (Dong et al., 2019) as the strong baseline. Generated questions are evaluated by metrics including BLEU-1/2/3/4, Meteor and Rouge-L with the provided scripts. The model is evaluated every 1000 steps and the early-stop equaling 5 is associated with the perplexity on the validation set. Other parameters are unchanged following the official guideline.

News summarization differs from dialogue summarization where the input is a document instead of a dialogue. We adopt the same strong baseline BART and evaluation metrics as dialogue summarization. Experiments are done with CNNDM dataset (Hermann et al., 2015) consisting of news articles and multi-sentence summaries. The model is evaluated every 3000 steps and the early-stop equaling 3 is associated with the Rouge-2 on the validation set. During the inference, the minimum and maximum output length is set to 45 and 140 respectively, with `no_repeat_ngram_size=3`, `length_penalty=2.0` and `num_beams=4`².

A summary of these tasks is in Table 1 and the specific packages we adopted are in the Appendix. For fair comparisons, we re-implement these baselines on our machine. Then, we further arm them

²Inference parameters are borrowed from <https://github.com/pytorch/fairseq/blob/main/examples/bart/summarize.py>.

with different in-sample curriculum settings without changing corresponding hyper-parameters:

- **TCL-SG**: the token-wise curriculum learning algorithm(TCL) with sub-sequence generation(SG) criterion proposed by Liang et al. (2021) with their best soft setting. The hyper-parameters are set as $\gamma_0 = 0.7$ and $\alpha_0 = 25$ following the original paper.
- **TCL-SC**: we modified the TCL-SG by incorporating our sequence completion(SC) criterion in Section 2 with the hard setting³ where $\lambda_0 = 0.1$ following the original paper.
- **ICL-SG**: we implemented the SG criterion by using our ICL algorithm in Section 2 which calculating the loss with $1 \leq t \leq c$ in (2).
- **ICL-SC**: our final approach. Both TCL-SC and ICL-SG are ablations for it. The settings of newly introduce p_{start} and s are specified and discussed in Section 4.2.

All of the approaches are trained with the same max training epochs with the early-stop for preventing from over-fitting. The experiments are done on a single RTX 3090 with 24G GPU memory. The results are averaged over three runs. We open-source all of codes and results at <http://anonymous.com>.

3.2 Automatic Evaluations on Different Tasks

The performances on different NLG tasks are shown in Table 2. These tasks not only focus on solving different problems, but also has a various amount of training data as well as output lengths according to Table 1. Besides, the basic models are also different, including BART, GPT-2 and UniLM. Our approach **ICL-SC achieves significant improvements over the strong baselines** among different tasks on most evaluation metrics, which shows that our method not only works well, but

³The soft setting will hurt our ordering criterion according to preliminary studies in Appendix.

Method	B1	B2	B3	B4	Met	RL
w/o CL	32.03	16.01	8.77	4.80	19.84	38.89
TCL-SG	32.35	16.38	8.86	4.69	19.95	39.27
TCL-SC	33.44	16.90	8.93	4.66	20.45	40.55
ICL-SG	32.80	16.32	8.88	4.75	19.96	39.72
ICL-SC	33.99	17.43	9.18	4.64	20.60	40.78

(a) Reading Comprehension

Method	R1	R2	RL	Met	BertS
w/o CL	51.88	27.30	42.77	24.75	71.38
TCL-SG	52.43	27.65	43.56	25.17	71.86
TCL-SC	52.69	28.28	43.89	25.08	71.95
ICL-SG	52.95	28.07	43.91	25.67	72.01
ICL-SC	53.07	28.23	43.83	26.12	72.17

(b) Dialogue Summarization

Method	ACC	SIM	FL	GM	J
w/o CL	70.49	55.70	85.98	69.63	33.72
TCL-SG	76.09	53.79	82.97	69.76	34.02
TCL-SC	73.27	54.84	85.49	70.03	34.56
ICL-SG	74.60	55.75	84.89	70.68	35.64
ICL-SC	73.72	55.91	86.30	70.60	35.81

(c) Style Transfer.

Method	B1	B2	B3	B4	Met	RL
w/o CL	50.36	35.81	27.46	21.62	24.56	50.88
TCL-SG	50.47	35.96	27.57	21.69	24.66	50.76
TCL-SC	50.48	36.04	27.67	21.79	24.70	51.17
ICL-SG	50.89	36.28	27.83	21.92	24.82	51.16
ICL-SC	51.02	36.39	27.90	21.96	24.90	51.29

(d) Question Generation

Method	R1	R2	RL	Met	BertS
w/o CL	43.07	20.01	35.94	21.44	63.72
TCL-SG	43.03	20.19	36.22	19.58	63.84
TCL-SC	43.63	20.69	36.70	19.84	64.18
ICL-SG	43.76	20.81	36.88	19.69	64.31
ICL-SC	<u>43.60</u>	<u>20.66</u>	<u>36.73</u>	19.64	<u>64.20</u>

(e) News Summarization

Table 2: Results on different NLG tasks. w/o CL and TCL-SG are two previous strong baselines. Both TCL-SC and ICL-SG are variations of our final approach ICL-SC. Scores underlined of ICL-SC are statistically significantly better than both baselines in the first two lines with $p < 0.05$ according to the t-test.

also has strong generalization abilities. It should be noted that GM and J are two comprehensive evaluation metrics for style transfer, with our approach topping the ranks with significant improvements.

To disentangle factors of learning curriculum and training algorithms, we conduct variations of ICL-SC for detailed comparisons to TCL-SG. More observations are as follows.

***-SC outperforms *-SG** for both training algorithms, showing that our proposed sequence completion curriculum is a more effective way of doing curriculum learning within a single sample. The only exception is that ICL-SG performs better than ICL-SC for news summarization in Table 2e. The reason is that multi-sentence summaries in CNNDM are more extractive and cover different salient information in each sentence. Human agreement on salient information is relatively low

as shown in Table 3. Consequently, the prefix of a summary can also be a reasonable and more concise reference summary with one or more complete sentences. The nature of *-SG happens to take advantage of this property.

ICL-* is better than TCL-* with better performance and less computational costs. For TCL training algorithm adopted in Liang et al. (2021), it separates the whole training process into curriculum and ordinary training. The curriculum length is an important hyper-parameter that is required to be estimated by finishing the training of the baseline model and computing the number of steps it takes to reach approximately 70% of final scores. It intensively aggravates the computational costs. Besides, this estimation rule can not generalize well to different tasks (More in Appendix). We choose to set curriculum steps to 2 or 3 epochs, approximately to the same amount of samples with different difficulty levels in ICL-SC. Taking dialogue summarization as an example, TCL-SG takes around 15.67 epochs (6 for the curriculum step estimation, 3 for curriculum and 6.67 for ordinary training) while our ICL-SC takes only 11.67 epochs to get the final results (More in Appendix). In a word, our ICL-* do the curriculum and ordinary training in a unified manner, requiring less computational costs in total. Moreover, ICL-* moves to the next difficulty level after the model has fully been trained on that judging by the performance on the validation set, which is more similar to the education process in real life and leads to better results.

3.3 Human Evaluations

To further prove the improvement of our approach, we hired three proficient English speakers for human evaluation. 100 samples from the test set of each task are randomly selected, ignoring the ones with totally same generations among three models, including the vanilla model, TCL-SG and ICL-SC. The original input, reference output and three generations are shown to annotators together, while the order of the three generations is unknown and different among samples. 3-point Likert Scale is adopted for scoring each generation (Gliwa et al., 2019), where [5, 3, 1] represent excellent, moderate and disappointing results respectively. The average scores and annotator agreements are in Table 3.

The Fleiss Kappa on the first four tasks indicates moderate agreements. It shows the promising improvement of ICL-SC over the vanilla model and

Tasks	w/o CL	TCL-SG	ICL-SC	Agree
Reading Comprehension	3.42	3.39	3.94	0.64
Dialog Summarization	3.01	3.51	3.6	0.41
Style Transfer	2.85	2.67	3.02	0.43
Question Generation	3.77	3.81	3.93	0.40
News Summarization	3.13	3.04	3.43	0.23

Table 3: Human evaluations. The agreement (Agree) is calculated by Fleiss Kappa.

TCL-SG, which is consistent with the conclusion based on automatic metrics. The poor agreement on news summarization reflects the diverse concerns of summarization from different annotators.

The drop of TCL-SG over the baseline on style transfer is apparent. Although TCL-SG achieves significant improvements in accuracy, the generated contents with less semantic similarities and poor fluency are not preferred by annotators. Examples will be discussed in Section 3.4.

3.4 Case Studies

We show some cases in Table 4.

In the first case from reading comprehension, our ICL-SC reasoned correctly while the baseline model raised a wrong answer. TCL-SG also answered incorrectly by merging both keywords. Such ability is not suitable for generating a precise answer. In contrast, ICL-SC successfully incorporated more salient information in a single sentence for dialogue summarization, which performs better than both baselines. The vanilla model did poorly on coreference resolution among dialogue utterances and generated “this” without a clear referent. ICL-SC also generated a more accurate question in Table 4d compared with strong baselines, although it’s not the same as the reference.

For transferring style from modern to Shakespeare’s style, the model generated results are all acceptable while ICL-SC performs slightly better for being more polite. Both TCL-SG and ICL-SC even generated the more professional word “prithe” which is widely used in Shakespeare’s time. A bad case is the second case of Table 4c. ICL-SC didn’t make any improvements over the baseline. TCL-SG even got out of control.

Generated summaries in Table 4e cover different parts of information in the original document. The vanilla output is just a reordering of the first three sentences. ICL-SC did better by omitting too detailed content comparing to the two baselines.

In a word, the results show that **ICL-SC can capture the characteristics of different tasks and do better language modeling**. Besides, by

Dialogue	M: ... So health is more valuable than anything else . No matter how much money we have, ... W: ... honors can never equal good health either . M: ... we should try our best to keep us as healthy as possible.
Question	Which of the following did the man think the most important?
Reference	Good health.
w/o CL	Honors .
TCL-SG	Honors and health.
ICL-SC	Health.

(a) Reading comprehension

Dialogue	Mike: <file_photo> woke up like this :/ Emma: omg what is this??? allergy ? Mike: no idea... probably... but no idea to what :/
Reference	Mike suspects he might have had an allergic reaction to something.
w/o CL	Mike woke up like <i>this</i> .
TCL-SG	Mike has an allergic reaction .
ICL-SC	Mike woke up with an allergic reaction .

(b) Dialogue summarization

Modern	Excuse me , sir , do you know how to read ?
Original	I pray , sir , can you read ?
w/o CL	I pray you , can you read ?
TCL-SG	I prithe , <i>read</i> ?
ICL-SC	I prithe , sir , can you read ?
Original	My dismal scene I needs must act alone .
Modern	In my desperate situation , I have to act alone .
w/o CL	I have to act alone in my gloomy scene .
TCL-SG	<i>It’s my own fault , my own fault , that I’m the one who’s in a d</i>
ICL-SC	I have to act alone in my gloomy scene .

(c) Style Transfer

Document	Plymouth is home to Plymouth Argyle F.C., who play in the fourth tier of English football league known as Football League Two
Answer	Football League Two
Reference	What level of the football league does Plymouth Argyle F.C. operate in?
w/o CL	What is the fourth tier of English football league ?
TCL-SG	What is <i>the fourth tier of English football</i> ?
ICL-SC	What is the fourth tier of English football league called ?

(d) Question Generation

Document	a man has been arrested ... an imam found dead in his car . ll abdul hadi arwani was found slumped in the back seat of his black volkswagen passat on tuesday morning in wembley , north west london . ll the 48-year-old syrian national was an outspoken critic of the assad regime and ‘ actively ’ campaigned against extremist , his family have since revealed . ll on monday morning scotland yard confirmed that a 46-year-old had been arrested in brent , north west london , on suspicion of conspiracy to murder ll ... ll he is being questioned ... while officers ... for witnesses ll ... ll counter-terrorism investigators were drafted ...
Reference	abdul hadi arwani was found dead in his car on tuesday in wembley . counter terrorism police were drafted in to lead investigation into death . a 46-year-old man has been arrested on suspicion of conspiracy to murder .
w/o CL	abdul ... london. The 48 ... revealed. A man ... car.
TCL-SG	abdul ... london. the 48... revealed. on monday ... arrested on suspicion of conspiracy to murder. he ... witnesses.
ICL-SC	abdul ... back seat of his car in wembley. the syrian national was ... assad regime. a 46-year-old man has been arrested on suspicion of conspiracy to murder. he ... witnesses.

(e) News Summarization

Table 4: Case studies. **Keywords** are in bold. *Doubtful generations* are italic. ‘ll’ marks sentence boundaries. Unnecessary words in the document and identical words among generations are folded with “...”.

comparing the improvements among these five tasks with different output length, we conclude that our **ICL-SC is more competitive with tasks having shorter outputs**. Long outputs, such as summaries in news summarization, bring additional difficulties on the arrangement of multiple salient contents and cross-sentence relations, which can't be well solved with such a simple in-sample curriculum and will be considered in the further.

4 Analysis

For a better understanding of ICL-SC, we did comprehensive ablation studies and combined it with the traditional CL. The experiments in this section are done on dialogue summarization, which is representative due to the medium output length.

4.1 Ablations on the Training Strategy

To examine the design of decreasing the prefix for ICL-SC, we introduce the alternatives as follows:

- **Decrease** refers to the Algorithm 1. Taking $p_{start} = 0.6$ and $s = 0.3$ as an example, the prefix percentage p varies as $0.6 \rightarrow 0.3 \rightarrow 0.0$ during training.
- **Increase** means that we gradually increase the length of prefix by increase p following $0.0 \rightarrow 0.3 \rightarrow 0.6$.
- **Random** is that we randomly pick p from the set $\{0.0, 0.3, 0.6\}$ in this example.

The results are shown in Table 5, with Decrease ranking first and Increase ranking the worst. Decrease significantly outperforms other ablations, showing that our sequence completion criterion of shrinking the prefix does work by means of learning from easy to hard.

Strategy	R1	R2	RL	Met	BertS
Decrease	53.07	28.23	43.83	26.12	72.17
Increase	51.43	27.35	42.97	24.32	71.25
Random	51.80	27.69	43.27	24.59	71.51

Table 5: Ablations on ICL strategies. The starting point and the stride are 0.6 and 0.3 respectively.

4.2 Parameter Search of the Starting Point and the Stride

To better understand how the ICL-SC manipulates the difficulty of samples during the training process, we further did experiments on different settings of two newly-introduced hyper-parameters p_{start} and s . The results are in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Parameter search of the starting point p_{start} and the stride s . The “w/o” CL representing the BART baseline is drawn for comparison.

We can see that the performance drops with either a too large or too small p_{start} . The former one starts training with only predicting the last 1 or 2 tokens according to the average length of reference output shown in Table 1. Most of the time, they are punctuation marks that do not carry any important semantic information, leading to a bad warm-up. The latter one requires the model to predict more than half of the output, which are too difficult as a beginning learning target. Besides, a larger p_{start} which is divisible by s is more competitive.

The trend is the same for using different stride values. The performance drops with s equaling 0.1 or 0.6. The smaller ones lead to too tiny changes, which not only excessively prolongs the required training time but also leads to server overfitting on the training set. The larger ones greatly enlarge the gap between training targets which degrades to 0.0 directly. It also harms the performances.

In a word, the training should start with a medium difficulty training objective and the gap between training objectives shouldn't be too large. Both parameters are closely related to the output length of different tasks. We suggest using ($p_{start} = 0.6, s = 0.3$) for NLG tasks with multi-sentence outputs, and ($p_{start} = 0.5, s = 0.5$) for NLG tasks with single-sentence outputs. All of our experiments are done based on this guideline.

4.3 Combinations with the Traditional CL

Since our ICL-SC is orthogonal to sample-wise CL and designing an appropriate sample-wise curriculum is not easy, we choose dialogue summarization as a representative task, design several traditional CL strategies empirically, and further apply our ICL-SC on top of them for comparisons. 4 different traditional CL strategies are as follows:

- **Input length (InLen)** refers to the number of

tokens in the input dialogue. The longer a dialogue is, the more complex a sample is.

- **Output length (OutLen)** is the number of tokens in a reference summary, which is also proportional to the difficulty of a sample.
- **Compression ratio (CompR)** equals the output length divided by the input length. More compressed training pairs are harder.
- **Abstractiveness (Abstr)** represents the percentage of novel words in the reference summary which are not in the dialogue. We measure it by Rouge-2 recall, which is inversely proportional to the difficulty level.

Method	R1	R2	RL	Met	BertS
w/o CL	51.88	27.30	42.77	24.75	71.38
ICL-SC	53.07	28.23	43.83	26.12	72.17
InLen	52.19	27.73	43.50	25.57	71.73
InLen+	52.56	27.60	43.43	25.77	71.92
OutLen	41.38	20.88	31.77	27.95	67.21
OutLen+	43.96	22.14	33.05	26.39	67.64
CompR	39.68	19.28	34.73	14.41	65.96
CompR+	41.59	20.78	36.62	15.22	67.19
Abstr	44.61	20.10	36.93	17.34	68.29
Abstr+	44.41	20.64	37.29	17.25	68.33

Table 6: Performances with traditional CL strategies. “+” represents experiments further armed with ICL-SC.

The results based on the ordered training samples according to these intuitive CL strategies are shown in Table 6. It shows that only InLen improves the vanilla model, but it still lags behind the pure ICL-SC. Other strategies failed mainly due to the low data quality at the beginning or the end of training. Taking Abstr as an example, samples with the highest Rouge-2 recall are gathered at the beginning where their inputs and outputs are almost the same. This leads to a bad initialization for models learning the summarization ability.

Besides, some strategies are incompatible, such as OutLen and CompR. Samples with the shortest output length are always too compressed. Therefore, developing a comprehensive score for a better ranking is difficult. It should be also noticed that most of these strategies are designed for summarization, which are not suitable for generalization.

In a word, it’s hard to develop a comprehensive strategy for one task or a unified strategy for different NLG tasks with traditional CL. ICL-SC not only outperforms these CL strategies, but also improves them when easily combined.

5 Related Work

Natural language generation has received great attention with deep neural networks, especially pre-trained language models. It refers to the task where expected outputs for different purposes are in natural language (Dong et al., 2021). The inherent characteristic of having more than one correct output given the same input is the core challenge of solving this kind of task, especially for evaluation (Singh et al., 2018).

Curriculum learning (Bengio et al., 2009) boost models’ performances in a range of machine learning areas by reordering the training samples. It meets great obstacles when applying to NLG tasks as it’s hard to evaluate the difficulties of training samples. Different rules are developed for different tasks (Platanios et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2021). For example, (Liu et al., 2018) measures the complexity of question-answering pairs from the view of frequency and grammar simply for answers. (Kocmi and Bojar, 2017) focuses more on POS features and the length of translation pairs. Other works utilize additional models or targeting models in the previous training step (Zhang et al., 2018). Shen and Feng (2020) reorder samples by the accuracy from an independent emotion classifier for response generation. However, such salient features do not always exist or can be well classified. There is also work (Zhou et al., 2020) on machine translation using either the reference perplexity or generations evaluated by corresponding metrics for ranking during training, while these scores are not ideal due to the one-to-many characteristic of NLG. Thus, designing a CL strategy generalizing well for NLG is difficult.

Instead of figuring out the oracle scoring function for training samples, we propose to measure the language generation difficulty within a sample. Liang et al. (2021) did something similar though their approach amounts to data augmentation by doing sub-sequence generation, which is not exactly curriculum learning. We, on the other hand, train on the original sample with a decreasing prefix length and thus learn from easy to hard.

6 Conclusion

This paper defines a new kind of curriculum learning strategy for NLG tasks called in-sample curriculum learning (ICL) by manipulating the difficulty of training within a training sample instead of ranking among samples. We propose the ICL algorithm

with the sequence completion curriculum which boosts the performance of strong baselines on a wide range of tasks, showing the effectiveness and strong generalization ability of our approach. More training strategies under ICL digging the inherent difficulties of generating a language sequence are expected in the future.

References

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48.
- Ernie Chang, Hui-Syuan Yeh, and Vera Demberg. 2021. Does the order of training samples matter? improving neural data-to-text generation with curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 727–733.
- Chenhe Dong, Yinghui Li, Haifan Gong, Miaoxin Chen, Junxin Li, Ying Shen, and Min Yang. 2021. A survey of natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11739*.
- Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2019. Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 13063–13075.
- Xinya Du, Junru Shao, and Claire Cardie. 2017. Learning to ask: Neural question generation for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1342–1352.
- Alexander R Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Bogdan Gliwa, Iwona Mochol, Maciej Biesek, and Aleksander Wawer. 2019. Samsun corpus: A human-annotated dialogue dataset for abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 70–79.
- Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomás Kociský, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2015*.
- Tom Kocmi and Ondřej Bojar. 2017. Curriculum learning and minibatch bucketing in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, pages 379–386.
- Kalpesh Krishna, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Reformulating unsupervised style transfer as paraphrase generation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 737–762.
- Gaurav Kumar, George Foster, Colin Cherry, and Maxim Krikun. 2019. Reinforcement learning based curriculum optimization for neural machine translation. 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 2054–2061.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chen Liang, Haoming Jiang, Xiaodong Liu, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Jianfeng Gao, and Tuo Zhao. 2021. Token-wise curriculum learning for neural machine translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3658–3670. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Cao Liu, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, Jun Zhao, et al. 2018. Curriculum learning for natural answer generation. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4223–4229.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Emmanouil Antonios Platanios, Otilia Stretcu, Graham Neubig, Barnabás Póczós, and Tom Mitchell. 2019. Competence-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation. 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 1162–1172.
- 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.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392.
- Lei Shen and Yang Feng. 2020. [Cdl: Curriculum dual learning for emotion-controllable response generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 556–566.
- Sandhya Singh, Kevin Patel, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, Krishnanjan Bhattacharjee, Hemant Darbari, and Seema Verma. 2018. Does curriculum learning help deep learning for natural language generation? In *15th International Conference on Natural Language Processing*, page 97.
- Kai Sun, Dian Yu, Jianshu Chen, Dong Yu, Yejin Choi, and Claire Cardie. 2019. Dream: A challenge dataset and models for dialogue-based reading comprehension. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:217–231.
- Wei Xu, Alan Ritter, William B Dolan, Ralph Grishman, and Colin Cherry. 2012. Paraphrasing for style. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2899–2914.
- Xuan Zhang, Gaurav Kumar, Huda Khayrallah, Kenton Murray, Jeremy Gwinnup, Marianna J Martindale, Paul McNamee, Kevin Duh, and Marine Carpuat. 2018. An empirical exploration of curriculum learning for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00739*.
- Xuan Zhang, Pamela Shapiro, Gaurav Kumar, Paul McNamee, Marine Carpuat, and Kevin Duh. [Curriculum learning for domain adaptation in neural machine translation](#). 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 1903–1915. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qingyu Zhou, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Chuanqi Tan, Hangbo Bao, and Ming Zhou. 2017. [Neural question generation from text: A preliminary study](#). In *National CCF Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pages 662–671. Springer.
- Yikai Zhou, Baosong Yang, Derek F Wong, Yu Wan, and Lidia S Chao. 2020. [Uncertainty-aware curriculum learning for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6934–6944.