

# Typhoon: Towards an Effective Task-Specific Masking Strategy for Pre-trained Language Models

Muhammed Shahir Abdurrahman, Hashem Elezabi, Bruce Changlong Xu

Department of Computer Science

Stanford University

{shahir, hashem, bcxu1506}@stanford.edu

## Abstract

Through exploiting a high level of parallelism enabled by graphics processing units, transformer architectures have enabled tremendous strides forward in the field of natural language processing. In a traditional masked language model, special “MASK” tokens are used to prompt our model to gather contextual information from surrounding words to restore originally hidden information. In this paper, we explore a task-specific masking framework for pre-trained large language models that enables superior performance on particular downstream tasks on the datasets in the GLUE (Wang et al. 2) benchmark. We develop our own masking algorithm, *Typhoon*, based on token input gradients, and compare this with other standard baselines. We find that *Typhoon* offers performance competitive with whole-word masking on the MRPC dataset. Our implementation can be found in a public Github Repository.<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

From translation to question answering to recommendations and sentence completion, the ability for models such as BERT (Devlin et al. 1) to perform natural language processing tasks effectively has emerged as one of the most impressive use-cases of modern-day deep learning. These models extend beyond traditional sentiment analysis, question-answering systems and machine translation tasks however, and have even been used by researchers in the life science to understand the network relationships between proteins, DNA and RNA sequences. We may be seeing a new “*Moore’s Law*” for language models,<sup>2</sup> where emerging large language models such as *PaLM* (Google Research 5), *GPT* (OpenAI 3), *BLOOM* (Google Research 5) – with an increasingly larger number of parameters – exhibit newfound “*emergent*” abilities that only arise after the models exceed a certain size (Google Research et al. 4). It suffices to say that there is a significant amount of academic and industry interest regarding these language models.

Foundation models are model architectures that are trained on large amounts of data, which can later be adapted to a wide variety of downstream tasks. The field of *Natural Language Processing (NLP)* has found great benefit in the application of these models, and has resulted in

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/man2machine/cs324-final-project-2023>

<sup>2</sup> This is the observation established by the late *Gordon Moore* that the number of transistors in a dense integrated circuit doubles every two years

exciting new use-cases with unprecedented performance. The typical recipe for the use of these models include two steps: *self-supervised pre-training* on large amounts of unlabeled data, and *fine-tuning* on a labeled task-specific dataset.

Current state-of-the-art NLP models generally have taken one of two approaches in the goal towards machine language understanding: *masked language modeling* and *causal language modeling*. An example of a *Causal Language Model* (CLM) architecture is GPT, and an example of a *Masked Language Model* (MLM) architecture is BERT. Causal language models are typically used for natural language generation due to their auto-regressive nature, while masked language modeling is typically used for natural language understanding and representation. An example of how a MLM might process masked data is shown in the figure presented in *Section 2*.

Our overall goal is to explore the nuances of how different types of masking affects the performance of *Masked Language Models (MLMs)*. In this paper, we investigate masking strategies for *Masked Language Models (MLMs)* and try to characterize the effects of baseline masking strategies on the model's performance on a few different downstream tasks from the GLUE benchmark. We develop our novel masking strategy, *Typhoon* masking, and compare it to benchmark results.

## 2. Related Work

There are many masking methods used to improve pre-training for MLM models such as BERT. Here, we explore a few masking strategies for BERT-like models.

**Random Masking:** The original BERT model (Devlin et al. 1) used uniformly random masks at a masking rate of 15%. More recent studies have demonstrated that higher masking rates of up to 40% may yield better outcomes. Regardless of the masking rate, random masking has been shown not to be the ideal choice for certain knowledge-based tasks that could benefit from more targeted masking. This is our motivation for exploring new masking strategies and characterizing their effects on downstream task performance.




Figure 1: Example of Masked Language Modeling [Lample and Conneau, 2019]

**Whole Word Masking:** This is a masking technique that masks all sub-words corresponding to a word at once. When a given text example is converted to a list of tokens, each word is not necessarily a single token. With the BERT model, if a token starts with “##”, then it indicates that it is not the start of a new word. For example, if our example input was:

*“John Jo##han##sen lives in Mary##vale”*

Then we know that Johansen was split into three parts: Jo, Han and Sen. In whole word masking, you would mask the entire word Johansen all at once, as opposed to only some of the tokens in that word.

**Span Masking:** Span masking is where we mask spans of words instead of individual words. This strategy was proposed to help the model learn to predict based on longer-term structures in a sentence instead of predicting a word based only on local cues from another word that frequently co-occurs with it as part of a single common phrase.

**Entity-based Masking:** In entity-based masking, the authors introduced enhanced masking strategies that improved BERT performance by masking spans that contain named entities. We are interested in this masking strategy and are considering exploring how to adapt it for different downstream tasks. This is also related to span masking, because the entities masked sometimes form phrases that can be considered a span.

**PMI Masking:** In PMI masking, we mask spans of words that have higher joint Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI) value. This leads to masking out more meaningful spans instead of just masking out any span. We are interested in evaluating this masking strategy for different downstream tasks and adapting it into a potentially more effective task-specific masking strategy.

**More recent masking methods:** After evaluating some of the more basic masking strategies outlined above, we are interested in evaluating the more recent *InforMask* strategy, which outperforms ransom masking and other masking strategies on the factual recall benchmark LAMA and the question-answering benchmark SQuAD v1 and v2. This work exploits a PMI-based strategy to select the most informative tokens to mask. We might also explore time-varying masking strategies where we mask tokens at different rates during different stages of pre-training. Many masking strategies also used a label corruption strategy, especially in random masking and whole-word masking, where a small percentage of the masks are instead replaced with random tokens. However, this was recently found to actually be a detriment to performance.

### 3. Methods

We investigate how additional masked training before the fine-tuning step affects the performance of a MLM, and how changing the masking strategy can increase or decrease performance. Because standard transformer models such as BERT have a large number of parameters and require a very long time to train, we use a smaller model, *TinyBERT*, which is a distilled version of a BERT model that is pre-trained on a plain text english corpus.

Our training procedure involves the following steps:

1. Load the pre-trained TinyBERT weights for masked language modeling
2. Train the MLM model with masked input data on a particular GLUE benchmark
3. Load the weights for the TinyBERT MLM into a TinyBERT sequence classification (SC) model
4. Train the SC model on the specific GLUE benchmark and analyze results

Additionally, we developed our own simple masking strategy based on gradients already computed during the model training process. We utilize a simple principle: tokens that contribute more to the loss of the model should be masked more/less in some way. We can compute weights based on the gradients of the loss with respect to the inputs, in order to obtain a masking probability for each token type in the vocabulary. To compute these gradients, we convert the input integer sequence data into a one-hot vector, and then compute the embeddings before sending the data to the *HuggingFace TinyBERT* model for computing the outputs and loss. Traditionally, only the integer sequences are sent to the mode, however, by doing this, we can compute gradients with respect to the input data.

After any masking procedure, for each possible position in the input token sequence, we have two types of tokens, the tokens that were masked in the input and the tokens that were not. We will maintain a list of weights for each token in the vocabulary and update those weights based on the gradient and change the sign of the update depending on whether or not the token a certain position was masked or not. We determine the correct signs and computations experimentally, and we find that subtracting the gradients when the token is ot masked and adding the gradients when the token is masked was the most performant. We utilize exponential moving averages with a factor ( $\lambda$ ) for the weights so they are stable over multiple batches. We detail the description of this method in *Algorithm 1* (Section 6).

However, this alone is not sufficient since weights values for each token do not translate to a probability that a certain type of token should be masked. To solve this, we maintain a frequency list for the number of occurrences of each token in the dataset overall and in a single input sequence. Each batch or sentence may contain more or less of a certain token due to random sampling, and we would not want our algorithm to vary based on this and instead based on the

frequency of the token in the entire dataset. By doing this, we make the assumption that each token in the dataset is independent from others. While this is not a correct assumption, this simplifies our algorithm design. We utilize the frequency values for each sequence to make sure that we are not double counting tokens. Then finally, we utilize the frequency of each token in the dataset overall to look at our weight distribution and make sure that the overall masking probability for any given token in the dataset is equal to a predefined value  $p$ . There are a few other details to handle edge cases such as how to handle tokens that have not yet been sampled, and details are mentioned in *Algorithm 2* (Section 6).

## 4. Experiments

We evaluate our proposed *Typhoon* masking strategy against baselines on the datasets in the *GLUE* benchmark (Wang et al. 5). These datasets are widely used in the field of NLP, including a related paper on masking percentages which we source much of our inspiration from. The *GLUE* (General Language Understanding Evaluation) dataset includes a variety of NLP tasks including a multitude of linguistic phenomena and text genres, and serves as a benchmark to understand the performance of a given system. We test on the MRPC and CoLA datasets within the *GLUE* benchmark. We compare against random masking and whole word masking, two widely used standard masking strategies. We implement the masking procedures ourselves, and do not utilize the common 80-10-10 strategy (for masked, random, original) that is common for training BERT models.

We find that during the initial masked language model training stage, all models have similar loss curves, but have different final loss values. From simply the loss values, it was not clear which masking method would turn out to be the best. In the sequence classification stage, for all models, the validation metrics such as accuracy and F1-score quickly rose during the first few epochs and then slowly declined as the validation loss started increasing and the model began to overfit. When training, we attempted to ensure the learning rate was high enough so that training loss would converge to a minimum, while being low enough so that we were able to improve on validation performance and prevent the situation where the model does not reach a local optimum due to the learning rate being too high. We find that *Typhoon* masking performs the best in both accuracy and F1-score, compared to other methods.

For the CoLA dataset, we find that the whole-word masking strategy performs the best, and by a large margin. One reason for the disparity in difference between the MRPC and CoLA datasets, is that in CoLA, linguistic acceptability can often be indicated from key single words that have positive or negative connotations, and as such ensuring entire words are masked is better. On the other hand, with sentence paraphrasing, the entire input sequence is needed (as opposed to certain key-words), and thus whole-word masking is not as effective.




Figure 3: Per Epoch Results on CoLA Dataset

Metric	Random	Whole Word	Typhoon
Validation Matthews Correlation	0.150448	0.202023	0.159715

Table 3: Best Epoch Results on CoLA Dataset

## 5. Conclusions and Future Directions

We have shown that our proposed method, *Typhoon* masking, albeit quite simple and initial stages can be a promising start on utilizing gradient information to aid masking strategies. Future work could include learned masking strategies, similar to *AutoAugment* in computer vision, which would utilize gradients in a more indirect fashion, through a learned masking strategy. Methods such as *whole-word* masking that rely on *NLP* domain knowledge have been demonstrated to be effective for multiple downstream tasks. One of the key components of large language models is their size, as there has been prior research that demonstrates that large language models exhibit *emergent behavior* (Google Research et al. 4). One question to ask is whether model size and architecture will significantly influence what types of masking strategies will prove most effective for certain down-stream tasks. In the future, we also intend to evaluate our model on the various types of masking methods mentioned in the *related words* section, as well as larger BERT-like models.

## 6. Algorithms

---

**Algorithm 1** Typhoon Masking Procedure

---

<b>Params:</b>	$p \in [0, 1]$	masking probability	
	$\tau \in [0, 1]$	masking distribution spread temperature	
	$\lambda \in (0, 1]$	exponential moving averages weight	
	$\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{N}^T$	list of integer ids in vocabulary of size $T$	
<b>Dataset:</b>	$\mathcal{D}$	dataset of sequences to train on	
<b>Model:</b>	$\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}^N$	unmasked input sequence of $N$ integer token ids	
	$\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{V}^N$	masked input sequence of $N$ integer token ids	
	$\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}^N$	masked labels sequence of $N$ integer token ids	
	$f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$	BERT-based masked language model	
	$L(f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x})$	training loss function	
<b>Masking:</b>	$\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^T$	masking weights for each id in vocabulary	
	1. $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow 0^N$		# Initialize weight update vector
	2. $k_i \leftarrow$ number of token $\mathcal{V}_i$ in dataset		
	(a) $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}$		# Sample from dataset
	(b) $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \text{COMPUTE\_MASK\_RATE}(\mathbf{w})$		
	(c) $b_i \leftarrow \text{BERNOULLI}(z_i) = 1$		
	(d) $x'_i \leftarrow$ mask if $b_i = 1$ else $x_i$		
	(e) $y_i \leftarrow$ mask if $b_i = 0$ else $x_i$		
	(f) $v_{i,j} \leftarrow 1$ if $x_i = \mathcal{V}_j$ else 0		# One hot representation of $\mathbf{x}$
	(g) $\ell \leftarrow L(f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x})$		# Compute loss
	(h) $g_i \leftarrow (\partial \ell / \partial \mathbf{v})_{x_i}$		# Compute derivative of loss w.r.t. to one-hot input
	(i) $d_i \leftarrow$ number of token $\mathcal{V}_i$ in $\mathbf{x}'$		
	(j) $m_i \leftarrow 1$ if $x'_i \notin \{\text{MASK}, \text{PAD}\}$ else 0		# Is input unmasked
	(k) $c_i \leftarrow c_i - (g_i / d_i$ if $m_i = 1$ else 0)		
	(l) $d_i \leftarrow$ number of token $\mathcal{V}_i$ in $\mathbf{y}$		
	(m) $d_i \leftarrow$ number of token $\mathcal{V}_i$ in $\mathbf{y}$		
	(n) $m_i \leftarrow 1$ if $y_i \notin \{\text{MASK}, \text{PAD}\}$ else 0		# Is label unmasked
	(o) $c_i \leftarrow c_i + (g_i / d_i$ if $m_i = 1$ else 0)		
	(p) $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \lambda \mathbf{c} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{w}$		# Exponential moving average

---

---

**Algorithm 2** Typhoon Masking Rate Compute Procedure

---

**Params:**  $p \in [0, 1]$  masking probability  
 $\tau \in [0, 1]$  masking distribution spread temperature  
 $\lambda \in (0, 1]$  exponential moving averages weight  
 $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{N}^T$  list of integer ids in vocabulary of size  $T$

**Masking:**  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  masking weights for each id in vocabulary

1.  $m_i \leftarrow 1$  if  $w_i \neq 0$  else 0 # Is weight initialized
  2.  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{w}$
  3.  $z_i \leftarrow w_i - \max(w)$
  4.  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{z} - \min(\mathbf{z})$
  5.  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{z} / \max(\mathbf{z})$  # Normalize
  6.  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \tau + \mathbf{z} \cdot \tau$
  7.  $f = \sum_i z_i \cdot k_i / \sum_i k_i$
  8.  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{z} \cdot p / f$
-



## Works Cited

Devlin, Jacob, et al. "BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language

Understanding." *arXiv*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2019, p. 17. *arXiv*,

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1810.04805.pdf>.

Google Research. "BLOOM: A 176B-Parameter Open-Access Multilingual Language Model."

*arXiv*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2023, p. 73. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2211.05100.pdf>.

Google Research. "PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways." *Google Research*, vol.

1, no. 1, 2022, p. 87. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2204.02311.pdf>.

Google Research, et al. "Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models." *Transactions on*

*Machine Learning Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2022, p. 30. *arXiv*,

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.07682.pdf>.

OpenAI. "GPT-4 Technical Report." *arXiv*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2023, p. 60. *OpenAI*,

<https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf>.

Wang, Alex, et al. "GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural

Language Understanding." *ICLR*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2019, p. 20. *arXiv*,

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1804.07461.pdf>.