

Improving Few-Shot Performance of Language Models via Nearest Neighbor Calibration

Feng Nie[‡], Meixi Chen^{§*}, Zhirui Zhang^{#†}, Xu Cheng[‡]

[‡]Interactive Entertainment Group, Tencent Inc, Shenzhen, China

[§]University of Cambridge [#]Tencent AI Lab

[‡]{jannie,alexcheng}@tencent.com [§]mc2125@cam.ac.uk [#]zrustc11@gmail.com

Abstract

Pre-trained language models (PLMs) have exhibited remarkable few-shot learning capabilities when provided a few examples in a natural language prompt as demonstrations of test instances, i.e., *in-context learning*. However, the performance of in-context learning is susceptible to the choice of prompt format, training examples and the ordering of the training examples. In this paper, we propose a novel nearest-neighbor calibration framework for in-context learning to ease this issue. It is inspired by a phenomenon that the in-context learning paradigm produces incorrect labels when inferring training instances, which provides a useful supervised signal to calibrate predictions. Thus, our method directly augments the predictions with a k -nearest-neighbor (k NN) classifier over a datastore of cached few-shot instance representations obtained by PLMs and their corresponding labels. Then adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules are introduced to make full use of a few support instances to reduce the k NN retrieval noise. Experiments on various few-shot text classification tasks demonstrate that our method significantly improves in-context learning, while even achieving comparable performance with state-of-the-art tuning-based approaches in some sentiment analysis tasks.

1 Introduction

Large-scale pre-trained language models (PLMs), such as BERT and GPT (Devlin et al., 2019; Radford et al., 2018, 2019), have been proven to be fundamental for solving a variety of NLP tasks. Recently, Brown et al. (2020) demonstrate that PLMs can perform few-shot learning when provided a few training examples in a natural language prompt as demonstrations with input sentences, i.e.,

*This work was done during the second author’s internship at Tencent.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1: The issue illustration when inferring the label of few-shot training instances themselves via in-context learning. The predictions of in-context learning could conflict with their labels, which indicates the wrong decision boundary provided by PLMs.

in-context learning. Specifically, in the sentiment classification task, we use the template “<TEXT> It was [MASK].” for model prediction, where <TEXT> is the placeholder for the input text and the PLMs are asked to infer verbalizers (e.g., ‘great’ and ‘terrible’) for the [MASK] token to score the target labels (e.g., ‘positive’ or ‘negative’). Then each input is further prepended with demonstrations of different sentiments as: “Formulaic, but fun. It was great. [SEP] Shyamalan should stop trying to please his mom. It was terrible. [SEP] <TEXT> It was [MASK].”. This style of few-shot learning is appealing because it shows that the model can directly leverage information from few-shot support instances without parameter updates.

Despite promising results and potential benefits, the in-context learning is highly sensitive to the choice of prompting templates and verbalizers, training examples, and even a permutation (ordering) for training examples, causing accuracy to vary from near chance to near state-of-the-art. (Lester et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2022). Another interest-

ing phenomenon is that this approach produces incorrect results when inferring few-shot support instances via in-context learning. As illustrated in Figure 1, given an input text with negative label in the training set (e.g., “If you’re over 25 ... you should find better entertainment.”), the remaining support instances are converted into demonstrations but PLMs make a contradicting prediction (e.g., “positive”) on this input. The level of contradiction varies with different engineered templates and verbalizers. This inconsistency actually provides helpful supervised signals and another orthogonal perspective to improve in-context learning. That is to fully exploit the few-shot learning of PLMs by *vertically* retrieving small similar support samples to correct the decision boundary of PLMs, rather than *horizontally* concatenating them with input texts only.

In this paper, we propose a simple and effective nearest-neighbor calibration framework to improve the performance of in-context learning in few-shot text classification tasks. The whole approach is built on the top hidden representations of PLMs, and then directly enhances PLMs with a k -nearest-neighbor (k NN) classifier over a datastore of cached few-shot instance representations and their corresponding labels. In this way, similar training samples of input texts are dynamically retrieved to strengthen or rectify the original prediction distribution provided by PLMs, achieving better model performance and easing the large variance brought by different engineered prompts. Moreover, the performance of this method largely relies on the quality of k NN retrieval, but it may include noise when the inappropriate number of neighbors is adopted or representations produced by PLMs are problematic. We further design adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules to reduce the k NN retrieval noises with the supervision of current few-shot instances: the former module is designed to dynamically decide the number of few-shot instances in the k NN classifier, while the latter module leverages a lightweight network to separate these instances with different labels but similar representations.

We present a systematic evaluation for analyzing few-shot performance on 6 single-sentence and 6 sentence-pair NLP tasks. We observe that given a small number of training examples, (1) our method proves the effectiveness of introducing instance-augmented classification, as it significantly outper-

forms in-context learning, especially superior in single-sentence tasks with 12.8% absolute accuracy improvement on average; (2) the proposed method is able to close the performance gap with tuning based methods in single-sentence tasks.

2 Background

Task Formulation. We consider the few-shot adaption of a pre-trained language model \mathcal{L} on the task \mathcal{D} with a label space \mathcal{Y} . For the task, we assume that the training data $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = \{(x^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^{K \times |\mathcal{Y}|}$ only consists of K examples per class, where x represents the input, y is the target label and $|\mathcal{Y}|$ denotes the number of unique classes. The goal of few-shot adaption is to develop task-agnostic learning strategies on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and generalize well to an unseen test set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. We additionally assume access to development set \mathcal{D}_{dev} with the same size as the training data for model selection and hyper-parameter tuning, as larger validation sets can grant a substantial advantage (Perez et al., 2021). For our experiments, we use 16 training examples ($K = 16$) and a development set with 16 examples per class for all tasks.

Prompt-Based Fine-tuning. The standard fine-tuning has a clear discrepancy between pre-training and fine-tuning phases, where the former is optimized by the prediction of masked tokens in the masked language modelling (MLM) task. An alternative way to eliminate this gap is prompt-based fine-tuning, in which the task is formulated in a cloze-format (Taylor, 1953). In this way, the language model \mathcal{L} predicts label words with the MLM objective. Specifically, inputs are converted using a pre-defined prompt template $x_{\text{prompt}} = \mathcal{T}(x)$, e.g., in the sentiment classification task, x_{prompt} is constructed as follow:

$$x_{\text{prompt}} = [\text{CLS}] x \text{ It was } [\text{MASK}]. [\text{SEP}]. \quad (1)$$

Then the language model \mathcal{L} decides which verbalizer (e.g., ‘great’ and ‘terrible’) is most likely for [MASK] in x_{prompt} . For the model training, let $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be a mapping from the task label space to words in the vocabulary \mathcal{V} of PLMs. The probability of class $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is calculated as:

$$p(y|x) = p_{\mathcal{L}}([\text{MASK}] = \mathcal{M}(y)|\mathcal{T}(x)) \quad (2) \\ = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{M}(y)} h_{[\text{MASK}]})}{\sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{M}(\hat{y})} h_{[\text{MASK}]})}$$




Figure 2: An overview of our nearest neighbor calibration framework (KNN-C) for the sentiment analysis task.

where $h_{[MASK]}$ denotes the hidden vector of [MASK] token and $\mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{M}(y)}$ refers to pre-softmax vector for word $v \in \mathcal{V}$. The entire model is trained by minimizing the cross-entropy loss with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and select the best checkpoint on \mathcal{D}_{dev} .

In-Context Learning. Instead of directly finetuning model, Brown et al. (2020) show that PLMs themselves have the capability to perform few-shot learning without parameter updates. It explores an in-context learning paradigm, which simply concatenates randomly sampled training examples as demonstrations with inputs during inference:

$$x_{\text{demo}} = \mathcal{T}(x_{\text{train}}^1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{T}(x_{\text{train}}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}) \oplus \mathcal{T}(x),$$

$$p(y|x) = p_{\mathcal{L}}([\text{MASK}] = \mathcal{M}(y)|x_{\text{demo}}), \quad (3)$$

where \oplus refers to concatenation of input texts, and we select one example per class as demonstrations ($x_{\text{train}}^1, \dots, x_{\text{train}}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$). The final prediction of the in-context learning ensembles all results based on different sampled demonstrations. This method has practical advantages for the few-shot adaptation over the now-standard approach of finetuning, as we could hold only one model for serving many different tasks, avoiding expensive and time-consuming parameter updates.

3 Nearest Neighbor Calibration

In this paper, we attempt to further explore the potential of PLMs for few-shot adaptation along the research direction of in-context learning. As shown in Figure 1, inference over few-shot train-

ing instances via in-context learning may produce contradictory results, and the situation can be exaggerated by poor templates and verbalizers. This phenomenon motivates us to exploit few-shot support instances by retrieving similar training samples to strengthen or rectify the original prediction distribution generated by PLMs. In this work, we propose a novel nearest-neighbor calibration framework for in-context learning, as illustrated in Figure 2. Our method is built on the top representations of PLMs and it augments classification with a retrieval pipeline, which directly queries a datastore of cached few-shot instance representations and corresponding labels to produce prediction distribution. We further design lightweight adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules to reduce retrieval noises. Next, we first introduce the instance-augmented classification, and then detail the adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules.

3.1 Instance-Augmented Classification

We achieve this instance-augmented classification through a k NN classifier, which consists of two steps: creating a datastore and making predictions depending on it.

Datastore Creation. The datastore is the cache of a set of key-value pairs, which is constructed by the training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = \{(x^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^{K \times |\mathcal{Y}|}$ using language model \mathcal{L} . Firstly, we convert input x through a prompt template, and then concatenate it with demonstrations sampled from the remaining few-

shot training examples following Eq. (3), yielding x_{demo} . We further feed x_{demo} into language model \mathcal{L} to obtain the hidden representation of [MASK] token (i.e., the representation of last transformer layer), denoted as $f(x_{\text{demo}}; \mathcal{L}) = h_{[\text{MASK}]}$. Thus, the whole datastore is constructed by taking $h_{[\text{MASK}]}$ as key and corresponding label y as value:

$$\bigcup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}} \{(f(x_{\text{demo}}; \mathcal{L}), y), \forall x_{\text{demo}} \in \mathcal{S}(x)\},$$

where $\mathcal{S}(x)$ is the set of x with different demonstrations. We randomly sample K times without replacement to involve all training samples, resulting in $K \times K \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ records of datastore in total.

Inference via k NN Retrieval. After building the datastore, we augment the prediction of PLMs with k NN retrieval similar to Khandelwal et al. (2020). Specifically, the test instance $x^t \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ is converted into x_{demo}^t following the same data pre-processing process as the datastore construction, and we obtain corresponding vector representation $f(x_{\text{demo}}^t; \mathcal{L})$ of [MASK] token for subsequent k NN retrieval. Then the k NN-based prediction distribution $p_{k\text{NN}}$ over the label space \mathcal{Y} is obtained with nearest neighbors:

$$p_{k\text{NN}}(y|x_{\text{demo}}^t) \propto \sum_{(h_i, v_i) \in N_t} \mathbb{I}_{y=v_i} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-d(h_i, f(x_{\text{demo}}^t; \mathcal{L}))^2}{\tau}\right), \quad (4)$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ stands for euclidean distance, N_t represents the set of k nearest neighbours, and τ is the temperature to control the sharpness of softmax function. The final prediction distribution of y is calculated as the interpolation of two distributions with a tuned hyper-parameter $\lambda \in [0, 1]$:

$$p(y|x^t) = (1 - \lambda) \cdot p_{k\text{NN}}(y|x_{\text{demo}}^t) + \lambda \cdot p_{\mathcal{L}}([\text{MASK}] = \mathcal{M}(y)|x_{\text{demo}}^t). \quad (5)$$

Note that we use the development set to select the appropriate hyper-parameters (interpolation factor λ , number of nearest neighbor k and temperature τ). Similar to in-context learning, we also ensemble all results with different demonstrations for each test instance during inference.

3.2 Improving Robustness of k NN Retrieval

The performance of instance-augmented classification highly relies on the quality of k NN retrieval. However, the retrieved nearest neighbors typically

include noises due to the inappropriate pre-defined neighbor selection and messy vector space produced by PLMs. To address these issues, we design the adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules, which utilize current all few-shot training instances to mitigate retrieval noise as much as possible.

Adaptive Neighbor Selection (ANS). Following Zheng et al. (2021a), instead of a pre-defined k , we consider a set of possible k s smaller than an upper bound k_{max} and introduce a lightweight network for the importance estimation of utilizing different selections to reduce the risk of inappropriate neighbors. In practice, we consider multiples of 4 as the choices of k for simplicity, along with $k = 0$ utilizing only PLMs, i.e., $k \in \mathcal{A}$ where $\mathcal{A} = \{0\} \cup \{k_i \in \mathbb{N} \mid k_i/4 \in \mathbb{N}, k_i \leq k_{\text{max}}\}$. Then the lightweight network evaluates the confidence of different k NN retrieval results by taking retrieved neighbors as inputs.

Concretely, for test instance with a demonstration x_{demo}^t , we first retrieve k_{max} neighbors N_t from the datastore and compute their distance from the current representation, as well as the count of distinct values in top i neighbors c_i . We take the computed distances $d = (d_1, \dots, d_{k_{\text{max}}})$ and counts $c = (c_1, \dots, c_{k_{\text{max}}})$ of distinct values in corresponding labels $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{k_{\text{max}}})$ as model inputs to decide the best k . Intuitively, the distance of each neighbor is the most direct evidence when evaluating their importance. The intuition to take label counts c as model input is that inference should trust more on PLMs when retrieved labels are chaotic. The importance estimation network $f_{\text{ANS}}(\cdot)$ is the two feed-forward layers with a non-linear function between them, in which the hidden size is set to 32 and we adopt $g(\cdot) = \text{ReLU}(\cdot)$ (Agarap, 2018) as the non-linear function. The probability of selecting k is calculated as follows:

$$p_a(k|x_{\text{demo}}^t) = \text{softmax}(f_{\text{ANS}}([d, c])). \quad (6)$$

Instead of introducing the hyper-parameter λ as Eq. (5), we aggregate the output of PLMs and different k NN predictions with the importance estimation network for final prediction:

$$p(y|x^t) = \sum_{k_i \in \mathcal{A}} p_a(k_i|x_{\text{demo}}^t) \cdot p_{k_i\text{NN}}(y|x_{\text{demo}}^t), \quad (7)$$

where $p_{k_i\text{NN}}$ indicates the k_i -nearest-neighbor prediction results calculated as Eq. (4). For training

this lightweight network, we randomly split the $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ into two equal parts. One part is used to build the datastore, while we train $f_{\text{ANS}}(\cdot)$ on another part via minimizing the cross-entropy loss following Eq. (7).

Feature Regularization (FR). When facing the situation of instances having different labels but sharing similar representations, the k NN classifier easily fails or makes mistakes, since retrieval results are noisy and the ANS module tends to ignore this case. To mitigate this, we further leverage a simple linear layer to separate such instance representations using the supervision of all few-shot instances. For key-value pair (h_i, v_i) in the datastore, we reconstruct the representation as follows:

$$h_i^f = g(\mathbf{W}_f h_i + b_f), \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_f \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times Z}$ and $b_f \in \mathbb{R}^Z$ are trainable parameters, and Z is the new dimension of representation space. As the training data is very small, we select a small Z to avoid overfitting. We set $Z = 32$ for our experiments to reduce the number of trainable parameters and the new datastore is constructed as $\{(h_i^f, v_i)\}$. This FR module targets to make representations belonging to the same class semantically close by maximizing k NN retrieval probability in Eq. (4). Similar to the training process of the ANS module, we optimize this linear layer by minimizing the cross-entropy loss of k NN classifier. As for combining ANS and FR modules, we first train the FR module with two equal parts of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and then exchange these two parts for the optimization of ANS module.

4 Experiments

We conduct extensive experiments on a wide variety of NLP tasks, and compare the performance of our proposed approach with existing the-state-of-art methods in the few-shot scenario.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We evaluate methods on 12 datasets for 7 tasks: (1) sentiment analysis datasets, SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), SST-5 (Socher et al., 2013), CR (Hu and Liu, 2004) and MR (Pang and Lee, 2005); (2) the subjectivity classification dataset, SUBJ (Pang and Lee, 2004); (3) the question classification dataset, TREC (Voorhees and Tice, 2000); (4) natural language inference datasets, CB (De Marneffe et al., 2019) and RTE (Wang

et al., 2019); (5) the question answering dataset, QNLI (Rajpurkar et al., 2016); (6) paraphrase detection datasets, MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005) and QQP¹; (7) the word sense disambiguation dataset, WiC (Pilehvar and Camacho-Collados, 2019). Following Karimi Mahabadi et al. (2022), we evaluate on original test sets for MR, CR, SST-5, SUBJ, and TREC. For the remaining datasets, we test on original validation set. We sample $K = 16$ examples per class from original training data to form few-shot training and validation sets.

Baselines. We adopt RoBERTa-large (Liu et al., 2019) as the underlying language model \mathcal{L} for all methods in our experiments, and compare our approach (**KNN-C**) with the following baselines: (i) **PV-Zero**: we take manual prompts and verbalizers to obtain prediction of PLMs without involving any training examples; (ii) **In-Context Learning (ICL)** (Brown et al., 2020): we adopt the same prompt formats as in PV-Zero, but augment the context with randomly sampled demonstrations (and still use RoBERTa-large, not GPT-3). Note that we sample K demonstrations from the training set without replacement to cover all training samples during inference; (iii) **Contextual Calibration (ICL+CC)**: following Zhao et al. (2021), we introduce content-free input “N/A” to remove the prediction bias of in-context learning; (iv) **Fine-tuning (FT)**: the standard fine-tuning method (Devlin et al., 2019), introducing a classifier on top of the [CLS] token and tuning all parameters of PLMs; (v) **PET** (Schick and Schütze, 2021): the prompt-based fine-tuning method that employs manual prompts and requires fine-tuning over PLMs; (vi) **PERFECT** (Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2022): the state-of-art fine-tuning method for few-shot adaptation, which avoids manual prompts and verbalizers by introducing adapters and multi-token label embeddings.

Implementation Details. For PLMs, we use the HuggingFace Pytorch implementation. In our experiments, we adopt the manually designed patterns and verbalizers used in Karimi Mahabadi et al. (2022) (usually 5 different options for each dataset). We evaluate all methods using 5 different random samples for creating the training/development sets and 4 different random seeds for model training. Thus, we report the results of $5 \times 5 = 25$ runs for PV-Zero, ICL, and ICL+CC, while we perform

¹<https://quoradata.quora.com>

Methods	SST-2	SST-5	CR	MR	SUBJ	TREC	AVG
PV-Zero*	63.4/54.0/11.8	27.9/21.1/4.8	59.6/50.4/11.8	62.6/53.7/10.9	55.5/50.2/7.6	33.9/25.6/8.8	50.5/42.5/9.3
ICL	89.9/ 88.3/1.0	43.6/37.3/4.8	88.0/83.1/2.5	86.1/ 83.9/1.2	51.2/48.5/2.9	52.7/36.8/10.3	68.6/63.0/3.8
ICL+CC	84.6/82.3/1.9	38.3/33.2/3.8	85.4/80.9/2.5	80.7/77.1/2.3	53.4/50.5/2.8	49.8/33.4/9.1	65.4/59.6/3.7
FT	81.4/70.0/4.0	39.2/34.3/2.5	80.1/72.9/4.1	77.7/66.8/4.6	90.2/84.1/1.8	87.6/75.8/3.7	76.0/67.3/3.4
PET	89.7/81.0/2.4	45.9/40.3/2.4	88.4/68.8/3.0	85.9/79.0/2.1	88.1/79.6/2.4	85.0/70.6/4.5	80.5/69.9/2.8
PERFECT	90.7/88.2/1.2	42.7/35.1/2.9	90.0/85.5/1.4	86.3/81.4/1.6	89.1/82.8/2.1	90.6/81.6/3.2	81.6/75.8/2.1
KNN-C	92.6/90.1/0.8	48.5/41.5/2.5	90.5/86.0/1.3	89.0/85.8/1.2	90.5/86.9/1.5	77.3/64.2/7.9	81.4/75.7/2.5
- ANS	91.9/89.2/1.0	46.7/40.8/2.7	90.4/84.9/1.7	88.3/82.8/1.6	90.4/87.5/1.4	76.5/64.0/8.2	80.7/74.9/2.8
- FR	92.7/90.6/0.7	47.6/40.1/3.1	89.9/ 86.9/1.6	89.5/87.3/0.8	90.7/86.3/1.3	69.8/46.2/10.2	80.0/72.9/3.0
- ANS,FR	91.2/88.3/1.5	47.1/40.1/3.0	89.3/84.9/1.7	88.8/85.9/1.3	89.9/83.7/2.3	69.8/50.0/10.4	79.3/72.1/3.4
- ANS,FR, p_C	92.4/ 90.9/0.7	44.8/38.7/3.2	89.6/86.7/1.8	88.9/87.1/1.0	90.6/ 88.2/1.2	65.6/46.4/9.5	78.7/73.0/2.9
Methods	CB	RTE	QNLI	MRPC	QQP	WiC	AVG
PV-Zero*	64.3/58.9/3.4	56.7/ 54.2/1.8	50.1/49.4/ 0.6	67.5/ 66.4/0.7	36.8/36.8/ 0.1	51.4/48.8/2.9	54.5/52.4/ 1.6
ICL	77.4/57.1/10.3	58.8/53.8/3.6	52.0/50.3/1.2	54.0/32.1/17.4	42.5/36.8/6.7	51.0/ 50.0/1.6	55.9/46.7/6.8
ICL+CC	56.9/42.9/10.0	56.0/53.8/ 1.6	54.4/52.8/0.8	62.2/37.8/10.4	45.0/36.7/6.6	49.3/47.5/ 1.0	54.0/45.2/5.1
FT	72.9/67.9/ 2.5	56.8/50.2/3.5	62.7/51.4/7.0	70.1/62.7/4.7	65.0/59.8/3.6	52.4/46.1/3.7	63.3/56.4/4.2
PET	86.9/73.2/5.1	60.1/49.5/4.7	66.5/55.7/6.2	62.1/38.2/6.8	63.4/44.7/7.9	51.0/46.1/2.6	65.0/51.2/5.6
PERFECT	90.3/83.9/3.5	60.4/53.1/4.7	74.1/60.3/4.6	67.8/54.7/5.7	71.2/64.2/3.5	53.8/47.0/3.0	69.6/60.5/4.2
KNN-C	82.1/69.6/5.3	61.8/52.4/2.9	54.2/50.4/2.2	62.5/42.7/7.3	58.7/47.4/ 4.3	53.1/46.2/3.1	62.1/51.4/4.2
- ANS	79.8/64.3/6.1	60.7/51.3/3.1	54.0/50.2/2.2	62.1/47.1/ 6.0	59.6/47.8/4.6	52.8/45.6/2.9	61.5/51.0/ 4.2
- FR	80.9/ 71.4/5.1	60.9/51.3/3.7	52.9/50.9/1.2	63.8/41.4/7.4	54.5/45.3/5.0	55.0/50.2/2.8	61.3/ 51.7/4.2
- ANS,FR	80.9/69.6/ 5.1	61.0/ 53.8/3.6	53.1/ 51.4/1.1	61.4/37.8/9.3	53.2/38.1/5.1	53.4/50.0/ 2.5	60.5/50.1/4.4
- ANS,FR, p_C	77.6/67.9/6.3	57.4/49.5/4.1	52.2/50.3/ 1.1	63.9/49.0/6.7	56.1/47.4/4.5	55.1/50.8/2.6	60.4/52.5/4.2

Table 1: Performance of all methods on 6 single-sentence (top) and 6 sentence-pair (bottom) benchmarks. *: no training examples are used. We report the average accuracy(\uparrow)/worst-case accuracy(\uparrow)/standard deviation(\downarrow) and bold fonts indicate the best results.

$20 \times 5 = 100$ runs for methods that involve hand-crafted prompts and training process, such as PET and KNN-C. We perform $5 \times 4 = 20$ runs for methods without hand-crafted prompts, i.e., FT and PERFECT. As the variance of each method is usually high in few-shot learning (Perez et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2021), we report average accuracy, worst-case performance, and the standard deviation across all runs. Note that we adopt the same random samples and seeds as Karimi Mahabadi et al. (2022) to achieve a fair comparison. We run all the experiments on one NVIDIA A100 with 40G of memory. For the training process of KNN-C, we deploy the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015) with a learning rate of $1e-3$, batch size and total epoch are set to 64 and 30. We use the development set and Eq. (5) to select best hyperparameters: interpolation factor λ , temperature τ and the number of retrieved neighbors k . We find that τ and k are less sensitive to downstream tasks, thus $\tau = 5$ and $k = 8$ are used for all tasks and we set k_{\max} to 16 for our experiments;

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 lists the performance of different methods on 6 single-sentence (top) and 6 sentence-pair (bottom) benchmarks. Baselines are divided into two categories: ICL-based and FT-based methods.

KNN-C vs. ICL-based Methods (PV-Zero, ICL, and ICL+CC). PV-Zero is almost the worst except for the MRPC dataset, indicating an obvious discrepancy between pre-training and downstream tasks. ICL introduces a few training samples with the format of demonstrations and generally performs better than PV-Zero. It should be noted that improvements of ICL are much smaller in pairwise tasks compared to those in single sentence tasks (1.4% vs. 18.1% on average accuracy), indicating that transferring knowledge to pairwise tasks (e.g., text entailment) is *a lot more difficult* than to single-sentence tasks (e.g., sentiment analysis). We argue this is because PLMs take inputs sentence by sentence, rather than sentence pairs during the pre-training, leading to poor few-shot performance of in-context learning. We also observe that the contextual calibration method hurts the few-shot performance of the Roberta-large model in most datasets. Compared with ICL, KNN-C further refines the decision boundary generated by PLMs with the help of similar retrieval instances from training data. It achieves 12.8% and 6.2% absolute improvements on average accuracy for single-sentence and sentence-pair datasets, respectively.

KNN-C vs. FT-based Methods (FT, PET and PERFECT). Our approach largely closes the performance gap between ICL-based methods and ex-

Dataset	PV-Zero	ICL	w/o Aug	w/ Aug(1)	KNN-C w/ Aug(4)	w/ Aug(8)	w/ Aug(Full)
SST-2	63.4/54.0/11.8	89.9/88.3/1.0	83.4/63.7/5.3	90.0/83.3/1.7	91.7/87.8/1.2	92.3/90.0/0.9	92.6/90.1/0.8
SST-5	27.9/21.1/4.8	43.6/37.3/4.8	37.9/29.1/3.4	44.9/38.6/2.7	47.8/41.5/2.4	48.4/ 42.2/2.4	48.5/41.5/2.5
CR	59.6/50.4/11.8	88.0/83.1/2.5	80.3/73.3/3.2	87.7/83.3/2.0	89.4/ 86.1/1.4	90.2/85.6/1.2	90.5/86.0/1.3
MR	62.6/53.7/10.9	86.1/83.9/1.2	80.4/55.9/4.8	86.3/77.8/2.0	88.6/ 86.2/1.1	88.8/85.7/1.3	89.0/85.8/1.2
SUBJ	55.5/50.2/7.6	51.2/48.5/2.9	86.6/77.7/2.8	88.9/81.2/2.1	89.8/84.8/1.9	90.3/86.0/1.7	90.5/86.9/1.5
TREC	33.9/25.6/8.8	52.7/36.8/10.3	66.9/28.0/18.0	76.5/62.6/7.2	76.8/63.2/8.1	77.1/63.8/8.0	77.3/64.2/7.9
CB	64.3/58.9/3.4	77.4/57.1/10.3	68.6/57.1/4.3	72.5/39.3/12.7	80.4/60.7/7.0	81.7/71.4/5.5	82.1/69.6/5.3
RTE	56.7/54.2/1.8	58.8/ 53.8/3.6	55.9/47.7/3.0	61.1/52.7/3.0	61.6/53.4/ 2.7	61.6/53.1/2.8	61.8/52.4/2.9
QNLI	50.1/49.4/ 0.6	52.0/50.3/1.2	52.2/48.6/2.0	53.8/50.3/2.2	54.1/50.7/2.2	54.1/ 50.8/2.3	54.2/50.4/2.2
MRPC	68.4/68.1/0.2	54.0/32.1/17.4	58.7/41.9/6.8	62.4/44.9/5.9	63.1/41.2/6.7	62.8/38.7/6.8	62.5/42.7/7.3
QQP	36.8/36.8/ 0.1	42.5/36.8/6.7	55.7/38.5/7.9	56.8/40.4/6.2	58.2/44.1/4.9	58.6/ 47.4/4.3	58.7/47.4/4.3
WiC	51.4/48.8/2.9	51.0/ 50.0/1.6	51.1/45.0/1.8	51.9/44.2/2.7	52.8/44.0/2.7	53.1/44.7/3.0	53.1/46.2/3.1
AVG	52.6/47.6/5.4	62.3/54.8/5.3	64.9/50.5/5.3	69.4/58.2/4.2	71.2/62.0/3.5	71.6/63.3/ 3.4	71.7/63.6/3.4

Table 2: The performance comparisons of using k NN retrieval and demonstration, including only k NN retrieval (KNN-C w/o Aug), only demonstration (ICL), and their combination. We report the average accuracy(\uparrow)/worst-case accuracy(\uparrow)/standard deviation(\downarrow) and bold fonts indicate the best results.

isting state-of-the-art FT-based methods in both single and pairwise sentence tasks. For single-sentence tasks, KNN-C achieves the best average accuracy performance in 4 out of 6 tasks, and the overall performance is comparable with PERFECT. For sentence-pair tasks, transferring knowledge from PLMs to downstream tasks is difficult, and a large performance gap still exists, especially for text entailment and paraphrasing tasks. Our pilot study also presents the potential of ICL to gain comparable performance with FT-based methods. We also include the performance comparisons and discussions with more parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods in the Appendix A.1.

Ablation Study. We further verify the impact of AFS and FR modules in reducing the noises of k NN retrieval. The ANS module works well on reducing k NN retrieval noises in most cases, except for the QQP dataset. It proves the effectiveness of dynamically controlling the number of similar instances. The FR module brings better results and reduces the standard deviation on most datasets, especially for TREC and QQP datasets. These results show that the FR module helps regularize representations of the same class to be similar, when the gap between pre-training and downstream tasks is relatively large. But these two modules are not always complementary in our experiments. We believe that optimizing these two modules with small data sets results in instability and sometimes fails to search for the optimal solution. We also test the performance of our method when removing $p_{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e., we only use $p_{k\text{NN}}$ for prediction. It outperforms ICL on average accuracy, indicating that errors made by

ICL could be remedied by our retrieval strategy.

4.3 Analysis

Effect of Instance-Augmented Retrieval. Instead of concatenating training instances with test inputs, our method explores another orthogonal direction that attempts to retrieve similar support samples to augment or correct the original decision boundary. It can be also applied to PV-Zero, namely “w/o Aug”. We compare the performance of these two different ways and verify their combination in different sampling settings. Table 2 illustrates the performance comparisons on all tasks, where “w/ Aug(1/4/8/Full)” denotes that we augment the context with 1/4/8/ K sampled demonstrations. We can see that “w/o Aug” significantly outperforms PV-Zero, which verifies the effectiveness of our proposed method again. ICL and “w/o Aug” end in a tie, but shines in different tasks. Specifically, “w/o Aug” outperforms on SUBJ, TREC and QQP, while ICL works well on SST-5, CR and CB. By combining these two methods, KNN-C achieves significant improvements over “w/o Aug”, even with only one sampled demonstration. The performance of KNN-C continues to improve with the increase of augmented demonstrations for each instance. These results prove that our approach is complementary to ICL and could further leverage the potential of PLMs on the few-shot adaptation.

Comparisons of BERT and RoBERTa. Table 3 compares the performance of using BERT-large (cased) as the PLMs backbone. According to previous results (in Table 2), KNN-C achieves significant improvements over the baselines when using

Dataset	PV-Zero	BERT-large ICL	KNN-C
	SST-2	59.8/52.1/8.1	64.3/49.2/9.9
SST-5	26.2/23.6/2.7	28.3/24.2/2.6	35.9/30.7/1.9
CR	54.5/50.0/5.0	70.6/59.4/6.6	77.0/67.5/2.5
MR	58.1/50.8/7.0	64.7/51.9/7.7	75.4/69.2/2.4
SUBJ	53.7/50.2/4.9	51.1/48.8/1.6	87.7/83.1/1.6
TREC	24.7/18.6/6.6	27.1/18.2/5.3	64.6/51.0/6.1
CB	54.3/46.4/6.5	51.1/44.6/4.1	66.9/55.4/4.8
RTE	51.2/46.6/3.6	51.4/46.9/3.5	53.0/44.4/3.3
QNLI	49.4/49.2/0.1	49.5/49.0/0.3	52.8/47.9/2.6
MRPC	67.8/65.9/0.9	54.6/32.8/15.4	57.1/42.4/5.5
QQP	37.0/36.8/0.2	40.1/36.8/4.0	56.3/44.9/4.1
WiC	49.8/49.7/0.1	49.8/48.6/0.5	51.1/45.5/2.5
AVG	48.9/45.0/3.8	50.2/42.5/5.1	62.9/54.4/3.4

Table 3: The performance of ICL-based methods when using BERT-large as the PLMs backbone. We report the average accuracy(\uparrow)/worst-case accuracy(\uparrow)/standard deviation(\downarrow) and bold fonts indicate the best results.

either BERT or RoBERTa as the PLMs backbone. In addition, the improvement of ICL over PV-Zero on RoBERTa is significantly better than that on BERT, showing that RoBERTa performs better few-shot learning. Instead, our method benefits both models and shows better generalization ability.

Improvements vs. ICL Errors on Train Data.

From Table 4, we see that ICL may make wrong predictions on train data, whose performance is similar to one on test data. KNN-C tends to achieve bigger improvements on the dataset that ICL performs poorly, as our method leverages k NN retrieval to calibrate predictions.

5 Related Work

Few-Shot Learning with PLMs. The GPT series (Radford et al., 2018, 2019; Brown et al., 2020) raise the attention of prompt-based learning. Brown et al. (2020) propose the in-context learning and show the ability of PLMs to perform few-shot learning without any fine-tuning. In line with this work, Zhao et al. (2021) point out the bias issue in prompt-based PLMs and design contextual calibration method. Shin et al. (2020) optimize prompt engineering with automatic prompt search. Lu et al. (2022) present a generation-based probing method to decide ordering of prompts. Rubin et al. (2022) introduce retrieval modules to search prompts for improving the quality of demonstrations. Our approach further exploits the potential of in-context learning by retrieving similar training examples to augment or correct the original decision boundary

Dataset	ICL		KNN-C - ICL on Test
	Train	Test	
SST-2	90.2/81.2/5.3	89.9/88.3/1.0	2.7/1.8/-0.2
SST-5	43.3/31.2/7.0	43.6/37.3/4.8	4.9/4.2/-2.3
CR	87.2/78.1/3.4	88.0/83.1/2.5	2.5/2.9/-1.2
MR	89.8/81.2/6.2	86.1/83.9/1.2	2.9/1.9/0
SUBJ	52.8/43.8/5.3	51.2/48.5/2.9	39.3/37.4/-1.4
TREC	47.2/37.5/7.6	52.7/36.8/10.3	24.6/27.4/-2.4
CB	67.4/47.5/9.0	77.4/57.1/10.3	4.7/12.5/-5.0
RTE	55.8/46.9/6.9	58.8/53.8/3.6	3.0/-1.4/-0.7
QNLI	51.5/43.8/5.4	52.0/50.3/1.2	2.2/0.1/1.0
MRPC	50.2/46.9/2.2	54.0/32.1/17.4	8.5/10.6/-10.1
QQP	52.2/34.4/7.9	42.5/36.8/6.7	16.2/10.6/-2.4
WiC	53.3/40.6/7.7	51.0/50.0/1.6	2.1/-3.8/1.5

Table 4: The performance of ICL on training and test data. We report the average accuracy(\uparrow)/worst-case accuracy(\uparrow)/standard deviation(\downarrow) and highlight the 2-best improvements (i.e., KNN-C - ICL) among all tasks.

provided by PLMs.

More recently, substantial efforts have been made with optimizing the prompt format (Le Scao and Rush, 2021; Lester et al., 2021). Several studies replace the manual prompts and verbalizers with continuous prompt embeddings (Li and Liang, 2021; Qin and Eisner, 2021), adapter layers (Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2022), and automatic generated ones (Gao et al., 2021). Our proposed method takes a step forward, aiming to reduce the performance gap between in-context learning and existing fine-tuning methods.

Retrieval-Augmented Methods. Our proposed framework is closely related to the retrieval-augmented methods. Recently, these approaches enhance the pre-trained models with a retrieval component and have achieved promising results in a variety of natural language processing tasks, including language modeling (Guu et al., 2020; Borgeaud et al., 2022), machine translation (Khandelwal et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2021a,b; Wang et al., 2022; Du et al., 2022) and open-domain question answering (Lewis et al., 2020; Izacard and Grave, 2021). Recent simultaneous work (Shi et al., 2022) propose a retrieval model to incorporate additional unsupervised data for zero-shot inference. Different from them, we design a novel retrieval-augmented method for in-context learning, and augment PLMs with k NN retrieval constructed by few-shot support samples.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a simple and effective nearest-neighbor calibration framework to improve

the performance of in-context learning on few-shot text classification tasks. This approach directly augments PLMs with additional k NN classifier based on current few-shot support instances, where the adaptive neighbor selection and feature regularization modules are introduced to reduce the k NN retrieval noises. Experimental results on various NLP tasks indicate that our method achieves significant improvements over in-context learning and is even comparable with the-state-of-art fine-tuning methods in single-sentence tasks. In the future, we would like to combine our method with bigger PLMs and further investigate the potential reason causing the performance gap between our method and current fine-tuning methods. Another interesting direction is to explore our method on larger training datasets, rather than the few-shot adaptation setting.

References

- Abien Fred Agarap. 2018. [Deep learning using rectified linear units \(relu\)](#). *CoRR*, abs/1803.08375.
- Elad Ben Zaken, Yoav Goldberg, and Shauli Ravfogel. 2022. [BitFit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked language-models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1–9, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, Diego De Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Jacob Menick, Roman Ring, Tom Hennigan, Saffron Huang, Loren Maggiore, Chris Jones, Albin Cassirer, Andy Brock, Michela Paganini, Geoffrey Irving, Oriol Vinyals, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Jack Rae, Erich Elsen, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2206–2240. PMLR.
- 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.
- Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. 2019. The commitmentbank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. In *proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, pages 107–124.
- 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.
- William B. Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. [Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP2005)*.
- Yichao Du, Weizhi Wang, Zhirui Zhang, Boxing Chen, Tong Xu, Jun Xie, and Enhong Chen. 2022. Non-parametric domain adaptation for end-to-end speech translation. In *EMNLP*.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2021. [Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3816–3830, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Papatat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. [Retrieval augmented language model pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR.
- Minqing Hu and Bing Liu. 2004. Mining and summarizing customer reviews. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 168–177.
- Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. 2021. [Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 874–880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, Luke Zettlemoyer, James Henderson, Lambert Mathias, Marzieh Saeidi, Veselin Stoyanov, and Majid Yazdani. 2022. [Prompt-free and efficient few-shot learning with language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3638–3652,

- Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Angela Fan, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2020. [Nearest neighbor machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2010.00710.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Tevan 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.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. [Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4582–4597, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1907.11692.
- Robert Logan IV, Ivana Balazevic, Eric Wallace, Fabio Petroni, Sameer Singh, and Sebastian Riedel. 2022. [Cutting down on prompts and parameters: Simple few-shot learning with language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2824–2835, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022. [Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8086–8098, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2004. [A sentimental education: Sentiment analysis using subjectivity summarization based on minimum cuts](#). In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL-04)*, pages 271–278, Barcelona, Spain.
- Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2005. [Seeing stars: Exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL’05)*, pages 115–124, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ethan Perez, Douwe Kiela, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2021. [True few-shot learning with language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Mohammad Taher Pilehvar and Jose Camacho-Collados. 2019. [WiC: the word-in-context dataset for evaluating context-sensitive meaning representations](#). 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 1267–1273, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guanghui Qin and Jason Eisner. 2021. [Learning how to ask: Querying LMs with mixtures of soft prompts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5203–5212, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. [Improving language understanding by generative pre-training](#).
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI blog*.
- 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, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2022. [Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2655–2671, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. [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.
- Weijia Shi, Julian Michael, Suchin Gururangan, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Nearest neighbor zero-shot inference](#). *CoRR*, abs/2205.13792.
- 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 *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. [Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment tree-bank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taylor. 1953. cloze procedure: A new tool for measuring readability. *Journalism quarterly*.
- Ellen M Voorhees and Dawn M Tice. 2000. Building a question answering test collection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 200–207.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2019. [Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Dongqi Wang, Hao-Ran Wei, Zhirui Zhang, Shujian Huang, Jun Xie, Weihua Luo, and Jiajun Chen. 2022. Non-parametric online learning from human feedback for neural machine translation. In *AAAI*.
- Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. [Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.
- Xin Zheng, Zhirui Zhang, Junliang Guo, Shujian Huang, Boxing Chen, Weihua Luo, and Jiajun Chen. 2021a. [Adaptive nearest neighbor machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 368–374, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Zheng, Zhirui Zhang, Shujian Huang, Boxing Chen, Jun Xie, Weihua Luo, and Jiajun Chen. 2021b. [Non-parametric unsupervised domain adaptation for neural machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 4234–4241, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

A.1 Comparisons with Fine-tuning Methods

Table 5 illustrates the performance of ICL-based and FT-based methods on all datasets. In addition to FT, PET, and PERFECT, we include the results of other parameter-efficient tuning methods, including +Null-Prompt (Logan IV et al., 2022) and BitFit+mte (Ben Zaken et al., 2022). Among FT-based methods, PERFECT has obtained the best performance in 12 datasets on average. Surprisingly, KNN-C achieves better or comparable results than PERFECT in five single-sentence tasks. Another appealing capability of our method is to keep one model for all tasks in the Language-Model-as-a-Service setting and maintain knowledge for different tasks by external datastore. This way could further promote the landing of Language-Model-as-a-Service.

Our approach requires the training of ANS and FR modules, but the training cost is far less than FT-based methods. We take the example of RoBERTa-large, which is used as the PLMs backbone in our paper: (1) the tunable parameters in our model are $32 \times 32 = 1024$ for the ANS module, and $1024 \times 32 + 32 = 32800$ for the FR module, thus KNN-C has $32800 + 1024 = 33824 = 0.03\text{M}$ tunable parameters in total; (2) fine-tuning the whole RoBERTa-large model (i.e., PET) or additional adapter layer (i.e., PERFECT) requires tuning 355M/3.3M parameters, respectively. In addition, KNN-C only needs one forward computation of the PLMs during the entire training process and the remaining computation is very small, thus the training time is far less than FT-based methods. For the inference time, KNN-C is almost the same as ICL, as the datastore is very tiny and performing k NN retrieval is negligible.

Methods	SST-2	SST-5	CR	MR	SUBJ	TREC	AVG
FT-based Methods							
FT	81.4/70.0/4.0	39.2/34.3/2.5	80.1/72.9/4.1	77.7/66.8/4.6	90.2/84.1/1.8	87.6/75.8/3.7	76.0/67.3/3.4
PET	89.7/81.0/2.4	45.9/40.3/2.4	88.4/68.8/3.0	85.9/79.0/2.1	88.1/79.6/2.4	85.0/70.6/4.5	80.5/69.9/2.8
+Null-Prompt	89.8/84.1/1.7	45.7/ 41.6/2.3	89.9/87.2/1.1	84.9/76.2/3.2	81.8/73.5/4.0	84.7/81.8/1.6	79.5/74.1/2.3
BitFit+mte	89.5/81.7/3.0	42.3/36.8/3.3	90.1/87.8/1.0	85.6/80.5/1.9	89.1/82.4/2.4	90.4/85.0/1.4	81.2/75.7/2.2
PERFECT	90.7/88.2/1.2	42.7/35.1/2.9	90.0/85.5/1.4	86.3/81.4/1.6	89.1/82.8/2.1	90.6/81.6/3.2	81.6/75.8/2.1
ICL-based Methods							
PV-Zero*	63.4/54.0/11.8	27.9/21.1/4.8	59.6/50.4/11.8	62.6/53.7/10.9	55.5/50.2/7.6	33.9/25.6/8.8	50.5/42.5/9.3
ICL	89.9/88.3/1.0	43.6/37.3/4.8	88.0/83.1/2.5	86.1/83.9/1.2	51.2/48.5/2.9	52.7/36.8/10.3	68.6/63.0/3.8
+ CC	84.6/82.3/1.9	38.3/33.2/3.8	85.4/80.9/2.5	80.7/77.1/2.3	53.4/50.5/2.8	49.8/33.4/9.1	65.4/59.6/3.7
KNN-C	92.6/90.1/0.8	48.5/41.5/2.5	90.5/86.0/1.3	89.0/85.8/1.2	90.5/86.9/1.5	77.3/64.2/7.9	81.4/75.7/2.5
Methods	CB	RTE	QNLI	MRPC	QQP	WiC	AVG
FT-based Methods							
FT	72.9/67.9/ 2.5	56.8/50.2/3.5	62.7/51.4/7.0	70.1/62.7/4.7	65.0/59.8/3.6	52.4/46.1/3.7	63.3/56.4/4.2
PET	86.9/73.2/5.1	60.1/49.5/4.7	66.5/55.7/6.2	62.1/38.2/6.8	63.4/44.7/7.9	51.0/46.1/2.6	65.0/51.2/5.6
+Null-Prompt	91.0/87.5/2.7	64.4/58.5/3.9	71.2/ 66.5/2.6	63.9/53.7/5.3	70.4/62.7/3.4	52.4/ 48.4/1.8	68.9/ 62.9/3.3
BitFit+mte	89.6/82.1/4.3	61.3/53.8/5.2	70.6/51.9/5.9	68.5/57.4/5.1	69.4/63.0/3.9	52.9/47.8/2.7	68.7/59.3/4.5
PERFECT	90.3/83.9/3.5	60.4/53.1/4.7	74.1/60.3/4.6	67.8/54.7/5.7	71.2/64.2/3.5	53.8/47.0/3.0	69.6/60.5/4.2
ICL-based Methods							
PV-Zero*	64.3/58.9/ 3.4	56.7/ 54.2/1.8	50.1/49.4/ 0.6	67.5/66.4/0.7	36.8/36.8/ 0.1	51.4/48.8/2.9	54.5/ 52.4/1.6
ICL	77.4/57.1/10.3	58.8/53.8/3.6	52.0/50.3/1.2	54.0/32.1/17.4	42.5/36.8/6.7	51.0/ 50.0/1.6	55.9/46.7/6.8
+ CC	56.9/42.9/10.0	56.0/53.8/ 1.6	54.4/52.8/0.8	62.2/37.8/10.4	45.0/36.7/6.6	49.3/47.5/ 1.0	54.0/45.2/5.1
KNN-C	82.1/69.6/5.3	61.8/52.4/2.9	54.2/50.4/2.2	62.5/42.7/7.3	58.7/47.4/4.3	53.1/46.2/3.1	62.1/51.4/4.2

Table 5: Performance of all methods on 6 single-sentence (top) and 6 sentence-pair (bottom) benchmarks. *: no training examples are used. We report the average accuracy(\uparrow)/worst-case accuracy(\uparrow)/standard deviation(\downarrow). Bold fonts indicate the best results.