

Let Me Check the Examples: Enhancing Demonstration Learning via Explicit Imitation

Sirui Wang, Kaiwen Wei, Hongzhi Zhang, Yuntao Li and Wei Wu

Meituan Inc., Beijing, China

{wangsrui, weikaiwen, zhanghongzhi03, liyuntao04, wuwei30}@meituan.com

Abstract

Demonstration learning aims to guide the prompt prediction via providing answered demonstrations in the few shot settings. Despite achieving promising results, existing work only concatenates the answered examples as demonstrations to the prompt template (including the raw context) without any additional operation, neglecting the prompt-demonstration dependencies. Besides, prior research found that randomly replacing the labels of demonstrations marginally hurts performance, illustrating that the model could not properly learn the knowledge brought by the demonstrations. Inspired by the human learning process, in this paper, we introduce **Imitation DEMOnstration Learning** (Imitation-Demo) to strengthen demonstration learning via explicitly imitating human review behaviour, which includes: (1) contrastive learning mechanism to concentrate on the similar demonstrations. (2) demonstration-label re-prediction method to consolidate known knowledge. Experiment results show that our proposed method achieves state-of-the-art performance on 11 out of 14 classification corpora. Further studies also prove that Imitation-Demo strengthen the association between prompt and demonstrations, which could provide the basis for exploring how demonstration learning works.

1 Introduction

Prompt-based learning typically works by modifying the input into cloze-style prompt templates and using the masked language models (MLMs) to complete the unfilled information in probabilistic. It has achieved promising performance in various NLP tasks (Schick and Schütze, 2021; Lester et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2021), especially in low-resource settings (Scao and Rush, 2021). A promising prompt engineering category is *demonstration learning* (Gao et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021a), which seeks to provide a few answered samples as demonstrations to

assist prompt prediction. As shown in Fig. 1 (a), the demonstration learning method concatenates the answered demonstrations per category to the prompt, and seeks to classify the [MASK] token as *great*, indicating a *positive* prediction result based on a label-to-word mapping.

The intuition of demonstration learning is that samples with similar expressions or content can provide repetitive patterns (Liu et al., 2021a). However, Min et al. (2022) point out that replacing gold demonstration labels with random labels marginally hurts performance. This finding is counter-intuitive and illustrates that the model could not comprehensively refer to the knowledge brought by the demonstrations in an implicit way. We attribute this problem to the fact that existing methods simply concatenate the answered demonstrations to the prompt template without any additional operation, ignoring the dependencies between prompt and demonstrations.

To overcome this limitation, we rethink how human beings learn from demonstrations. When faced with a new challenging question, they typically (1) look for the most similar example to the question first, and then (2) reply to the question according to the answering steps of the retrieved example. Humans tend to strengthen the learning process through review strategies, i.e., finding a better solution to select similar examples and reanswering the questions of examples to consolidate known knowledge. Inspired by this, likewise, the interactions between prompt and demonstrations could also be reinforced by imitating the human reviewing process for demonstration learning.

In this paper, we propose a simple-yet-effective version of demonstration learning, named **Imitation DEMOnstration Learning** (Imitation-Demo) to explicitly strengthen the two sub-steps of demonstration learning via human-like review. Specifically, for accurately locating similar samples, we introduce a contrastive learning mechanism (Chen




Figure 1: The overview of our proposed Imitation-Demo: (a) Conventional demonstration learning simply concatenate the demonstrations to the prompt. (b) Imitation-Demo reinforces the dependencies between prompt and demonstrations via contrastive learning (I) and demonstration-label re-prediction (II). For brevity, all sentences and contexts from demonstrations are represented by coloured boxes (illustrated in the left part). Best view in colours.

et al., 2020; Robinson et al., 2021) to reorganize demonstrations by reducing the divergences of demonstration contexts among the same category while increasing those divergences between different categories. In addition, for solidifying known knowledge, we leverage a demonstration-label re-prediction method to emphasize the positions of the answers in demonstrations. Even without introducing new parameters or any prediction computation, our proposed method achieves state-of-the-art performance on 11 out of 14 classification corpora. Compared to the strong baseline model LM-BFF (Gao et al., 2021), Imitation-Demo achieves 1.11 points averaged improvement on the 14 datasets. Further study also shows that Imitation-Demo strengthens the association between prompt and demonstrations, which could provide the basis for exploring how demonstration learning works.

2 Methodology

Demonstration Learning. As illustrated in Fig. 1 (a), firstly, we leverage the pre-trained SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) to retrieve the demonstration (including context $x^{(k)}$ and label $y^{(k)}$) for the k -th category that has maximum semantic similarity to the raw prompt context. The prompt template x^{prompt} consists of input sentence x^{in} and template x^{temp} containing mask token, i.e., $x^{prompt} = [x^{in}, x^{temp}]$. Then, the demonstrations are concatenated to the input prompt. After that, we convert the concatenated input sentence x^{in} to hidden vectors \mathbf{h}^{in} . The goal of demonstration learning is to predict y^{mask} at the $[MASK]$ po-

sition from the hidden state of mask \mathbf{h}^{mask} via MLM head. The overall process is optimized by cross-entropy loss and could be formulated as¹:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{in} &= [x^{prompt}, (x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), \dots, (x^{(K)}, y^{(K)})] \\ \mathbf{h}^{in} &= \text{SBERT}(x^{in}) \\ p(y^{mask} | x_{in}) &= \text{MLM}(\mathbf{h}^{mask}) \\ \mathcal{L}_{mask} &= \text{CE}(p(y^{mask} | x_{in}), \hat{Y}^{(mask)}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $[.., .., ..]$ denotes concatenating diverse parts with sentence separator $[SEP]$. K is the number of categories. CE is short for cross-entropy loss, and $\hat{Y}^{(mask)}$ is the ground-truth labels from the pre-defined label-to-word mapping.

Demonstration Reorganization via Contrastive Learning. In demonstration learning, it is crucial to decide from which known demonstrations to select the repetitive patterns. Therefore, we introduce a contrastive learning mechanism to imitate human review behaviour by reorganizing the demonstrations based on their contexts. As shown in Fig. 1 (b)(I), we treat the demonstration contexts with identical categories to the input prompt as positive samples, and the others are regarded as negative ones. By pulling in positive samples and pulling out negative samples, the model could select the most relevant sample among the given demonstrations more precisely. In the experiment, we apply mean-pooling operations on the hidden states of positive, negative demonstration contexts \mathbf{h}^+ , \mathbf{h}^- ,

¹Please refer to Gao et al. (2021) for more details of demonstration learning.

and input sentence \mathbf{h}^{in} , obtaining the sentence representations \mathbf{s}^+ , \mathbf{s}^- , and \mathbf{s}^{in} . Inspired by [Robinson et al. \(2021\)](#) in computer vision, we introduce HCL loss to ensure intra-class compactness while increasing inter-class distances:

$$\mathcal{L}_{context} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\log \frac{e^{\mathbf{s}^{in} \cdot \mathbf{s}^+}}{e^{\mathbf{s}^{in} \cdot \mathbf{s}^+} + \sum_{i=1}^N e^{\mathbf{s}^{in} \cdot \mathbf{s}^-}} \right] \quad (2)$$

where \cdot is the dot product operation, N is the number of negative contexts in the task, and $\mathbb{E} [\cdot]$ denotes calculating the mean value.

Demonstration-label Re-prediction. We further utilize a demonstration-label re-prediction method to mimic human review behaviour by recovering the labels from all the given demonstration contexts. Specifically, the target of our model is not only to identify the category of $[MASK]$ token, but also to classify the tokens located in demonstration label positions. As illustrated in Fig.1 (b)(II), the model is required to predict y^{great} or y^{terri} (i.e., *great* or *terrible*) based on the hidden states \mathbf{h}^{great} or \mathbf{h}^{terri} at corresponding label positions:

$$\begin{aligned} p(y^{great} | x_{in}) &= \text{MLM}(\mathbf{h}^{great}) \\ p(y^{terri} | x_{in}) &= \text{MLM}(\mathbf{h}^{terri}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{great} and \mathcal{L}_{terri} are calculated for each demonstration label, then we get the sum loss \mathcal{L}_{label} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{great} &= \text{CE}(p(y^{great} | x_{in}), \hat{Y}^{(demo)}) \\ \mathcal{L}_{terri} &= \text{CE}(p(y^{terri} | x_{in}), \hat{Y}^{(demo)}) \\ \mathcal{L}_{label} &= \mathcal{L}_{great} + \mathcal{L}_{terri} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{Y}^{(demo)}$ is the ground-truth labels at diverse demonstration label positions.

Similar operations can be performed for classification tasks with multiple categories. The overall loss of Imitation-Demo is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{mask} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{label} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{context} \quad (5)$$

where α , β are weight coefficients for different components.

	MRPC	SNLI	SST-2
Imitation-Demo	80.8 (3.2)	80.0 (3.3)	93.1 (0.5)
LM-BFF*	79.7 (3.2)	77.8 (0.6)	92.1 (1.5)
Imitation-Demo*	74.4 (9.2)	76.0 (5.2)	91.0 (1.3)

Table 1: Results when using demonstrations with random labels. * denotes trained with random labels.

3 Experiments

Experiments Settings. Experiments are conducted on 14 widely-used classification datasets. The datasets and evaluation metrics details are listed in Appendix A.1. Besides, the hyper-parameters settings of our experiments are listed in Appendix A.2.

Compared Methods. (1) **Majority**, which select the majority class of the dataset; (2) **Prompt-based zero-shot**: which use prompt tuning in zero-shot situations; (3) **“GPT-3” in-context learning**, which use the in-context learning proposed in RoBERTa with no parameter updating; (4) **Fine-tuning**; (5) **P-tuning** ([Liu et al., 2021b](#)), which employ trainable continuous prompt embeddings; (6) **DART** ([Zhang et al., 2021](#)), which differentially optimize the prompt template and the target label during the backpropagation process; (7) **Li’s** ([Li et al., 2022](#)), which reformulate a classification or a regression task as a token-replaced detection problem utilizing pre-trained model Electra ([Clark et al., 2020](#)); (8) **EFL** ([Wang et al., 2021](#)), which reformulate potential NLP task into an entailment one. (9) **LM-BFF** ([Gao et al., 2021](#)), which manually design templates and augment prompt tuning with demonstrations.

Main Results. We can conclude from the experiment results illustrated in Table 2 that: (1) The methods leveraging demonstrations (e.g., LM-BFF) generally achieve productive results, proving the superiority of demonstration learning mechanism. (2) P-tuning and DART leverage continuous prompt embeddings to boost experiment results. Meanwhile, Li’s and EFL promote performance by converting the cloze-style task into token-replaced detection or entailment problem. However, without introducing any additional parameters or any prediction computation, Imitation-Demo achieves state-of-the-art results on 11 out of 14 datasets in the original mask-prediction way. The performance gain indicates that Imitation-Demo could effectively promote experiment results by reinforcing the connections between prompt and demonstrations. (3) Ablation experiment results in the lower part of Table 2 illustrate the effectiveness of the contrastive learning and demonstrations-label re-prediction methods.

Analysis. Extensive experiments are conducted to show that our human-like imitation mechanisms enhance the connection between prompt and demonstration. Firstly, when trained with random demon-

	SST-2 (acc)	SST-5 (acc)	MR (acc)	CR (acc)	MPQA (acc)	Subj (acc)	TREC (acc)
Majority	50.9	23.1	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	18.8
Prompt-based zero-shot	83.6	35.0	80.8	79.5	67.6	51.4	32.0
“GPT-3” in-context learning	84.8 (1.3)	30.6 (0.9)	80.5 (1.7)	87.4 (0.8)	63.8 (2.1)	53.6 (1.0)	26.2 (2.4)
Fine-tuning	81.4 (3.8)	43.9 (2.0)	76.9 (5.9)	75.8 (3.2)	72.0 (3.8)	90.8 (1.8)	88.8 (2.1)
P-tuning	92.2 (0.4)	-	86.7 (1.2)	91.8 (1.1)	-	90.3 (2.2)	86.3 (4.5)
DART	93.5 (0.5)	-	88.2 (1.0)	91.8 (0.5)	-	90.7 (1.4)	87.1 (3.8)
Li’s	92.8 (0.6)	50.7 (2.9)	89.4 (0.8)	90.5 (2.2)	83.2 (1.4)	92.1 (0.7)	87.2 (3.8)
EFL \heartsuit	91.1 (1.5)	41.8 (1.6)	85.7 (3.7)	87.7 (5.4)	75.8 (4.8)	91.7 (1.8)	88.1 (2.3)
LM-BFF \heartsuit	92.2 (1.4)	51.2 (1.6)	88.2 (0.9)	91.8 (1.5)	85.5 (4.2)	90.9 (1.9)	87.6 (4.8)
Imitation-Demo (ours)	93.1 (0.5)	52.3 (0.6)	89.1 (1.0)	91.8 (0.7)	87.7 (1.2)	92.4 (1.1)	89.1 (3.2)
Prompt-based Fine-tuning (man) \heartsuit	92.6 (0.5)	47.4 (2.5)	87.0 (1.2)	90.3 (1.0)	84.7 (2.2)	91.2 (1.1)	84.8 (5.1)
+ demonstrations \heartsuit	92.2 (1.4)	51.2 (1.6)	88.2 (0.9)	91.8 (1.5)	85.5 (4.2)	90.9 (1.9)	87.6 (4.8)
+ demonstration-label re-prediction	92.8 (0.7)	51.4 (1.0)	89.2 (1.0)	92.2 (1.2)	87.5 (1.0)	92.1 (1.6)	89.9 (3.1)
+ contrastive learning	93.1 (0.5)	52.3 (0.6)	89.1 (1.0)	91.8 (0.7)	87.7 (1.2)	92.4 (1.1)	89.1 (3.2)
	MNLI (acc)	MNLI-mm (acc)	SNLI (acc)	QNLI (acc)	RTE (acc)	MRPC (F1)	QQP (F1)
Majority	32.7	33.0	33.8	49.5	52.7	52.7	0.0
Prompt-based zero-shot	50.8	51.7	49.5	50.8	51.3	61.9	49.7
“GPT-3” in-context learning	52.0 (0.7)	53.4 (0.6)	47.1 (0.6)	53.8 (0.4)	60.4 (1.4)	45.7 (6.0)	36.1 (5.2)
Fine-tuning	45.8 (6.4)	47.8 (6.8)	48.4 (4.8)	60.2 (6.5)	54.4 (3.9)	76.6 (2.5)	60.7 (4.3)
P-tuning	61.5 (2.1)	-	72.3 (3.0)	64.3 (2.8)	-	76.2 (2.3)	65.6 (3.0)
DART	67.5 (2.6)	-	75.8 (1.6)	66.7 (3.7)	-	78.3 (4.5)	67.8 (3.2)
Li’s	69.2 (4.0)	71.0 (3.5)	79.3 (3.2)	69.0 (4.5)	74.2 (3.1)	73.2 (7.5)	68.2 (3.4)
EFL \heartsuit	65.8 (3.7)	68.5 (2.8)	78.2 (1.3)	67.6 (5.5)	68.9 (1.5)	77.4 (6.3)	67.0 (2.9)
LM-BFF \heartsuit	69.6 (2.9)	71.3 (2.6)	78.0 (3.6)	68.8 (5.4)	68.7 (2.3)	77.3 (6.0)	68.7 (4.7)
Imitation-Demo (ours)	71.4 (0.9)	72.0 (2.0)	80.0 (3.3)	70.5 (3.3)	71.5 (1.5)	80.8 (3.2)	70.9 (1.5)
Prompt-based Fine-tuning (man) \heartsuit	68.3 (2.3)	70.5 (1.9)	77.2 (3.7)	64.5 (4.3)	69.1 (3.6)	74.5 (5.3)	65.5 (5.3)
+ demonstrations \heartsuit	69.6 (2.9)	71.3 (2.6)	78.0 (3.6)	68.8 (5.4)	68.7 (2.3)	77.3 (6.0)	68.7 (4.7)
+ demonstration-label re-prediction	71.3 (0.9)	72.5 (1.4)	79.6 (3.2)	70.3 (4.1)	70.8 (3.4)	77.0 (2.6)	68.8 (2.6)
+ contrastive learning	71.4 (0.9)	72.0 (2.0)	80.0 (3.3)	70.5 (3.3)	71.5 (1.5)	80.8 (3.2)	70.9 (1.5)

Table 2: Overall results on RoBERTa-large with 16 samples per class. We report the mean (variance) of models trained on 5 different randomly sampled training and dev splits. Prompt-based Fine-tuning (man) indicates trained with manually designed templates. \heartsuit denotes we re-implement the EFL and LM-BFF models for fair comparisons.

	QQP	MNLI-mm	MNLI
LM-BFF	1.11	1.02	1.01
Imitation-Demo	1.16	1.04	1.05

Table 3: Averaged RoBERTa attention results pointing from demonstrations to prompt. The values are normalized by default RoBERTa pre-training weights.

stration labels, as shown in Table 1, we observe that Imitation-Demo has a greater drop rate than LM-BFF, indicating $[MASK]$ is dependent more on the semantic information from demonstrations. This finding could explain why there is little performance degradation when using random demonstration labels in Min et al. (2022) to some extent. Moreover, following Wei et al. (2021), we further conduct an experiment to show the review process with attention weights of the RoBERTa backbone. We average the total 384 attention heads of Roberta-large pointing from demonstrations to prompt, then normalize the values by default RoBERTa pre-

trained weights. From the results in Table 3, we observe Imitation-Demo received larger attention values. The result indicates that our approach could direct the RoBERTa model by modifying the corresponding attention weights and guiding prompt to focus more on the clues brought by demonstrations.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose imitation demonstration learning to reinforce the correlations between prompt and given demonstrations. Inspired by the human review process, we introduce contrastive learning and demonstration-label re-prediction mechanisms to strengthen the two sub-steps of human review behaviour, respectively. Experiments on 14 classification datasets show that our method consistently outperforms other baselines in few-shot settings. We hope this work could inspire the exploration of the working mechanism of demonstration learning and toward better few-shot learning abilities.

References

Luisa Bentivogli, Peter Clark, Ido Dagan, and Danilo Giampiccolo. 2009. The fifth pascal recognizing textual entailment challenge. In *TAC*.

Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal, September 17-21, 2015*, pages 632–642. The Association for Computational Linguistics.

Daniel M. Cer, Mona T. Diab, Eneko Agirre, Iñigo Lopez-Gazpio, and Lucia Specia. 2017. [Semeval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity multilingual and crosslingual focused evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, SemEval@ACL 2017, Vancouver, Canada, August 3-4, 2017*, pages 1–14. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2020. [A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR.

Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [ELECTRA: pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.

Ido Dagan, Oren Glickman, and Bernardo Magnini. 2005. [The PASCAL recognising textual entailment challenge](#). In *Machine Learning Challenges, Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty, Visual Object Classification and Recognizing Textual Entailment, First PASCAL Machine Learning Challenges Workshop, MLCW 2005, Southampton, UK, April 11-13, 2005, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3944 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 177–190. Springer.

William B. Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. [Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing, IWP@IJCNLP 2005, Jeju Island, Korea, October 2005*, 2005. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.

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, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 3816–3830. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, Ido Dagan, and William B Dolan. 2007. The third pascal recognizing textual entailment challenge. In *Proceedings of the ACL-PASCAL workshop on textual entailment and paraphrasing*, pages 1–9.

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, Seattle, Washington, USA, August 22-25, 2004*, pages 168–177. ACM.

Shengding Hu, Ning Ding, Huadong Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, and Maosong Sun. 2021. [Knowledgeable prompt-tuning: Incorporating knowledge into prompt verbalizer for text classification](#). *CoRR*, abs/2108.02035.

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, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pages 3045–3059. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zicheng Li, Shoushan Li, and Guodong Zhou. 2022. [Pre-trained token-replaced detection model as few-shot learner](#). *CoRR*, abs/2203.03235.

Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021a. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*.

Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2021b. [GPT understands, too](#). *CoRR*, abs/2103.10385.

Sewon Min, Xinxin Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?](#) *CoRR*, abs/2202.12837.

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, 21-26 July, 2004, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 271–278. ACL.

Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2005. [Seeing stars: Exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales](#). In *ACL 2005, 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the Conference, 25-30 June 2005, University of Michigan, USA*, pages 115–124. The Association for Computer Linguistics.

Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Z.

Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. [Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 8024–8035.

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, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*, pages 2383–2392. The Association for Computational Linguistics.

Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pages 3980–3990. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Joshua David Robinson, Ching-Yao Chuang, Suvrit Sra, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2021. [Contrastive learning with hard negative samples](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.

Teven Le Scao and Alexander M. 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, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 2627–2636. 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, EACL 2021, Online, April 19 - 23, 2021*, pages 255–269. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. [Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2013, 18-21 October 2013, Grand Hyatt Seattle, Seattle, Washington, USA, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, pages 1631–1642. ACL.

Ellen M. Voorhees and Dawn M. Tice. 2000. [Building a question answering test collection](#). In *SIGIR 2000: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, July 24-28, 2000, Athens, Greece*, pages 200–207. ACM.

Sinong Wang, Han Fang, Madian Khabsa, Hanzi Mao, and Hao Ma. 2021. [Entailment as few-shot learner](#). *CoRR*, abs/2104.14690.

Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [Neural network acceptability judgments](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 7:625–641.

Kaiwen Wei, Xian Sun, Zequn Zhang, Jingyuan Zhang, Zhi Guo, and Li Jin. 2021. [Trigger is not sufficient: Exploiting frame-aware knowledge for implicit event argument extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 4672–4682. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Janyce Wiebe, Theresa Wilson, and Claire Cardie. 2005. [Annotating expressions of opinions and emotions in language](#). *Lang. Resour. Evaluation*, 39(2-3):165–210.

Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ningyu Zhang, Luoqu Li, Xiang Chen, Shumin Deng, Zhen Bi, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. 2021. [Differentiable prompt makes pre-trained language models better few-shot learners](#). *CoRR*, abs/2108.13161.

A Appendix

A.1 Datasets

Following the settings in (Gao et al., 2021), we evaluate on 14 classification datasets. For SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015), SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), CoLA (Warstadt et al., 2019), MNLI (Williams et al., 2018), QNLI (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), RTE (Dagan et al., 2005; Giampiccolo et al., 2007; Bentivogli et al., 2009), MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005), QQP² and SST-B (Cer et al., 2017), we use the original development sets for testing. For MR (Pang and Lee, 2005), CR (Hu and Liu, 2004), MPQA (Wiebe et al., 2005) and Subj (Pang and

²<https://www.quora.com/q/quoradata/>

Lee, 2004), we randomly sample 2,000 examples as the testing set. For SST-5 (Socher et al., 2013) and TREC (Voorhees and Tice, 2000), we use the official test sets. F1 score (F1) are adopted as the evaluation metric of MRPC and QQP, and the other datasets utilize accuracy (acc) as the evaluation criteria.

A.2 Parameters Setting

We implement all the baselines and our frameworks using PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019). The pre-trained *RoBERTa-large* model and *roberta-large-nli-stsb-mean-tokens* SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) from huggingface³ are applied in the experiments. We get 16 samples per class during training for all models. In order to control the smoothness of the exponential functions when calculation contrastive learning loss, we divide every mean-pooling results with temperature T . Grid search mechanism are utilized to select optimal hyper-parameter combinations on each split (the coefficients of demonstration-label re-prediction α from {0.5,1,5,10}, contrastive learning β from {5,10}, and the temperature T of contrastive learning from {5,10}), Finally we select the the coefficients α and β as 1 and 5, respectively. The temperature T is set as 5 and the batch size is 16. The other hyper-parameters are identical to the default settings in LM-BFF (Gao et al., 2021) for fair comparison. We report the average performance of models trained on 5 different randomly sampled training and dev splits, the random seeds are fixed as 13, 32, 42 ,87 , 100, respectively.

³<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>