

Multilingual Few-Shot Learning via Language Model Retrieval

Genta Indra Winata, Liang-Kang Huang, Soumya Vadlamannati, Yash Chandarana
Bloomberg

{gwinata, lhuang214, svadlamanna1, ychandarana}@bloomberg.net

Abstract

Transformer-based language models have achieved remarkable success in few-shot in-context learning and drawn a lot of research interest. However, these models' performance greatly depends on the choice of the example prompts and also has high variability depending on how samples are chosen. In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive study of retrieving semantically similar few-shot samples and using them as the context, as it helps the model decide the correct label without any gradient update in the multilingual and cross-lingual settings. We evaluate the proposed method on five natural language understanding datasets related to intent detection, question classification, sentiment analysis, and topic classification. The proposed method consistently outperforms random sampling in monolingual and cross-lingual tasks in non-English languages.

1 Introduction

Transformer-based language models (LMs) (Devlin et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020; Xue et al., 2021; Lewis et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Wang, 2021; Zhang et al., 2022) have shown strong capability in few shot learning with prompts. This capability allows them to adapt quickly to diverse tasks from a small amount of data without tedious tuning, and is particularly useful in low-resource settings where the data of the target task, domain or language is fairly limited (Louvan and Magnini, 2020; Schick and Schütze, 2021a; Lester et al., 2021; Perez et al., 2021; Winata et al., 2022). Among various studies that aimed to understand and further improve the few-shot prompt learning capabilities, some recent literature present evidences that shows the model's performance on few-shot learning could vary greatly according to the choice of the prompting examples. However, these studies so far were rather preliminary and limited in scope. A comprehensive study about the impact and strategies

for choosing prompts is yet to be done (Liu et al., 2021a). Liu et al. (2021a) studied the strategy of choosing semantically similar examples as prompts and showed that examples with similar representations as the queries serve as better prompting examples. However, their work demonstrated this finding solely on English tasks. While the sampling strategy of the in-context learning on non-English and cross-lingual tasks have not been explored, and their work are limited to random sampling (Winata et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2021a; Huang et al., 2022). Thus, understanding how useful each data sampling strategy can help us to apply cross-lingual transfer more effectively.

In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive study of applying the semantic-based sampling strategy on a wide range of multilingual and cross-lingual tasks and state-of-the-art transformer LMs. From the result, we show the effectiveness of leveraging semantically similar samples as context and evaluate them in the downstream natural language understanding (NLU) tasks in four different languages: English, French, German, and Spanish. We explore the in-context learning not only on the monolingual setting, but also on the cross-lingual setting, where we retrieve samples from a different language than the language of the given text. We find that applying semantically similar few-shot samples on the models consistently outperforms random sampling performance, and retrieving samples from multilingual LM is able to select semantically similar samples across different languages. Furthermore, in most tasks, the performance of the model decreases when we use less similar samples as context showing the importance of samples selection in the multilingual and cross-lingual in-context learning.

2 Multilingual Language Model Retrieval

We define and formalize the LM-based retrieval and then describe how we utilize the retrieved few-shot samples in the in-context learning setting.




Figure 1: LM based retrieval. In this example, the context is in **English** and the query is in **French**.

2.1 Preliminaries

Let us define \mathcal{D} as the distribution over the dataset. We propose to utilize a pre-trained multilingual LM for retrieving samples from the training samples. Given a set of training samples $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N\}$ in source language L_1 and a test sample Q in target language L_2 , we show the retrieval process in Figure 1. We compute the D -dimensional sentence-level embeddings $E_Q \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and training samples $E_{X_i} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ by aggregating the subword embeddings through average pooling over all subwords. We compute the distance d using a distance function $\text{sim}(E_Q, E_{X_i})$ from the embeddings of the query and the test sample and retrieve top- k nearest samples $S = \{[S_{1,l_1}, \dots, S_{k,l_1}], \dots, [S_{1,l_{|L|}}, \dots, S_{k,l_{|L|}}]\}$, where $L = \{l_1, \dots, l_{|L|}\}$ is the set of all labels and S_{i,l_j} denotes the i^{th} closest sample to Q with ground truth label l_j .

2.2 In-Context Learning

Let us define P as the prompt and LM θ . The prompt $P = [I, S, Q]$ is a concatenation of task instruction I , few-shot samples S , and query Q . We pass the prompt P as input to the model θ and the model computes the probability distribution of predicting the next word $p(l|P)$, where $l \in L$ and L is the set of all labels. Then, we take the highest label probability as the predicted label \hat{l} and it is formulated as follows:

$$\hat{l} = \arg \max_l p(l|P), \quad (1)$$

$$p(l|P) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(l_t|P, l_{<t}), \quad (2)$$

where $l_{<t}$ is the previous predicted tokens and label l can be tokenized into T subwords tokens $\{l_1, \dots, l_t, \dots, l_T\}$.

Standardization We study the standardizing method on our representation to correct for rogue dimensions by following [Timkey and van Schijndel \(2021\)](#). By post-processing the train and test embeddings, we conjecture that we are able to retrieve few-shot examples whose similarity function with the query aligns more with human similarity judgements.

3 Experiments

3.1 Datasets

In this work, we experiment the proposed strategy on five datasets with a variety of monolingual and multilingual downstream NLU tasks, **intent detection**: SNIPS ([Coucke et al., 2018](#)); Multi-NLU ([Schuster et al., 2019](#)); MTOP ([Li et al., 2021](#)); **topic classification**: TREC ([Li and Roth, 2002](#)); **sentiment dataset**: SST2 ([Wang et al., 2018](#)). We filter the training set if they are seen in the test set since we would to ensure that the test set is not seen in the training set. While examining the datasets we observe overlaps in all five of them, where identical samples are presented in both training and testing set. We decide to filter those samples from training set to avoid retrieval strategies taking advantage of the fact by selecting prompts identical to the query. The overlap rates for each dataset are shown in Table 7 in the Appendix. We can see that the rate is particularly high in Multi-NLU.

3.2 Setup

We perform few-shot learning by prompting an English decoder-only LM, GPT-J NEO (1.3GB) ([Wang, 2021](#)) and a multilingual LM, XGLM (1.7B) ([Lin et al., 2021a](#)), and run inference with a single V100 32GB GPU. For retrieving prompts, we compute the sentence-level




Figure 2: Few-shot in-context learning results on the monolingual and cross-lingual settings in accuracy over 5 runs. We compare three retrieval strategies (random, nearest, and farthest) on GPT-J NEO and XGLM models.




Figure 3: Results on various sampling intervals over 5 runs in accuracy. The shaded area represents the standard deviation. Lower p means we retrieve samples that are contextually more similar to the query based on similarity measure.

representation of the query and training samples with XLM-R_{BASE} (Conneau et al., 2020) respectively, and use euclidean distance and cosine similarity, with and without normalizing the embeddings, to measure the semantic similarity. We compare the effectiveness among three retrieval strategies: random, nearest, and farthest. random means we select the few-shot samples randomly; nearest means we select the samples with the highest similarity scores; and farthest means we

select the samples with the lowest similarity scores. Experiments are conducted on both monolingual and cross-lingual settings. The former picks prompts in the same language as the query, while the latter picks prompts of a language different from the query.

4 Results and Discussion

We show the in-context learning results on different datasets in Figure 2. Each plot presents the few-shot learning performance of GPT-J NEO and XGLM with the three retrieval strategies, while varying the value of k . In general, the nearest strategy consistently outperforms random and farthest, except in SST2 dataset (this observation is further discussed later in Figure 5). Interestingly, the multilingual 1.7B XGLM model does not perform as well as the English 1.3B GPT-J NEO model, under English, non-English and cross-lingual settings.

Sampling From Similarity Score Distribution

Figure 3 shows the dynamics of performance on various sampling intervals. The performance of the model decreases when the p is larger on both TREC and MTOP datasets, and the standard deviation is relatively higher when collecting less similar samples.




Figure 4: Results with different similarity measures on MTOP (en-fr). We take 5 samples from each label to form the context.

Similarity Measures Figure 4 shows the performance with different similarity measures evaluated on MTOP (en-fr). There is no clear winner for which similarity measure performs the best, and it shows that euclidean distance can perform similarly as cosine distance, and empirically, there is no evidence that applying standardization is useful.

Comparison kNN vs. In-Context Learning To further understand the fact that the farthest strategy outperforms nearest with both LMs on the SST2 dataset, Figure 5 shows the results of the kNN performance and the performance gap of the nearest and farthest retrieval strategies (Δ ACC). The fact that kNN performs relatively worse on SST2 suggests that in SST2 dataset, semantically similar examples do not necessary have the same labels, which explains why we observe a different performance gap between nearest and farthest on these two datasets. This is either due to the characteristic of the dataset or an indication that the semantic representation produced by XLM-R_{BASE} (Conneau et al., 2020) is not accurate in SST2.

5 Related Work

Few-shot In-Context Learning Recent work on few-shot in-context learning uses LMs to solve NLP tasks (Petroni et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2020; Madotto et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2021; Schick and Schütze, 2021b; Lin et al., 2021b; Utama et al., 2021; Srivastava et al., 2022). In this approach, the appropriate prompts were selected to trigger the LMs to behave so that they can predict the desired output (Liu et al., 2021b). Few-shot learning has been applied to various applications in multilingual and cross-lingual task (Winata et al.,




Figure 5: (a) kNN performance, and (b) Accuracy difference between nearest and farthest retrieval strategies.

2021; Lin et al., 2021a; Winata et al., 2022), zero-shot cross-lingual (Huang et al., 2022), and dialogue system (Madotto et al., 2021).

Cross-lingual Retrieval Multilingual LMs have been utilized for document and sentence-level information retrieval (IR) tasks across a large number of language pairs (Litschko et al., 2021). The effects of language relatedness within a multilingual IR have been studied by Chew and Abdelali (2008). They found that choosing languages that are more related the target language can boost the precision.

6 Conclusion

We apply a simple yet effective LM-based retrieval method to retrieve semantically similar few-shot samples as the context on multilingual and cross-lingual in-context learning. We present the effectiveness of retrieving semantically similar few-shot samples to inform the LM to predict the correct label without any gradient updates. We find that retrieving similar samples consistently outperforms random sampling, when the semantically similar examples have the same labels as query. Furthermore, the performance of the model decreases when we use less similar samples as context showing the importance of samples selection in the multilingual and cross-lingual in-context learning. Furthermore, we conduct further systematic analysis on applying retrieval strategies from different percentile intervals and similarity measures.

Limitations

We run our experiments only on GPT-J and XGLM models due to limited resource constraint. We leave the exploration of larger or other monolingual and multilingual variant language models (e.g., BLOOM (Scao et al., 2022)) as future work.

References

- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Peter A Chew and Ahmed Abdelali. 2008. The effects of language relatedness on multilingual information retrieval: a case study with indo-european and semitic languages. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on Cross Lingual Information Access (CLIA) Addressing the Information Need of Multilingual Societies*.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Édouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451.
- Alice Coucke, Alaa Saade, Adrien Ball, Théodore Bluche, Alexandre Caulier, David Leroy, Clément Doumouro, Thibault Gisselbrecht, Francesco Caltagirone, Thibaut Lavril, et al. 2018. Snips voice platform: an embedded spoken language understanding system for private-by-design voice interfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10190*, pages 12–16.
- 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.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2020. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*.
- Lianzhe Huang, Shuming Ma, Dongdong Zhang, Furu Wei, and Houfeng Wang. 2022. Zero-shot cross-lingual transfer of prompt-based tuning with a unified multilingual prompt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11451*.
- 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.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880.
- Haoran Li, Abhinav Arora, Shuohui Chen, Anchit Gupta, Sonal Gupta, and Yashar Mehdad. 2021. *MTOP: A comprehensive multilingual task-oriented semantic parsing benchmark*. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2950–2962, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Li and Dan Roth. 2002. *Learning question classifiers*. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shrutit Bhosale, Jingfei Du, et al. 2021a. Few-shot learning with multilingual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10668*.
- Zhaojiang Lin, Bing Liu, Seungwhan Moon, Paul A Crook, Zhenpeng Zhou, Zhiguang Wang, Zhou Yu, Andrea Madotto, Eunjoon Cho, and Rajen Subba. 2021b. Leveraging slot descriptions for zero-shot cross-domain dialogue statetracking. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5640–5648.
- Robert Litschko, Ivan Vulić, Simone Paolo Ponzetto, and Goran Glavaš. 2021. Evaluating multilingual text encoders for unsupervised cross-lingual retrieval. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, pages 342–358. Springer.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2021a. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06804*.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021b. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*.
- Yinhan Liu, Jiatao Gu, Naman Goyal, Xian Li, Sergey Edunov, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Multilingual denoising pre-training for neural machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:726–742.
- Samuel Louvan and Bernardo Magnini. 2020. Recent neural methods on slot filling and intent classification for task-oriented dialogue systems: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 480–496.
- Andrea Madotto, Zhaojiang Lin, Genta Indra Winata, and Pascale Fung. 2021. Few-shot bot: Prompt-based learning for dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08118*.
- Andrea Madotto, Zihan Liu, Zhaojiang Lin, and Pascale Fung. 2020. Language models as few-shot learner for task-oriented dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.06239*.

- Ethan Perez, Douwe Kiela, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2021. True few-shot learning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11447*.
- Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, Patrick Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, and Alexander Miller. 2019. Language models as knowledge bases? 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)*, pages 2463–2473.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:1–67.
- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Elie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2022. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021a. Few-shot text generation with natural language instructions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 390–402.
- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021b. It’s not just size that matters: Small language models are also few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2339–2352.
- Sebastian Schuster, Sonal Gupta, Rushin Shah, and Mike Lewis. 2019. [Cross-lingual transfer learning for multilingual task oriented dialog](#). 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 3795–3805, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. 2022. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*.
- William Timkey and Marten van Schijndel. 2021. All bark and no bite: Rogue dimensions in transformer language models obscure representational quality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04404*.
- Prasetya Utama, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Victor Sanh, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Avoiding inference heuristics in few-shot prompt-based finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9063–9074.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 353–355.
- Ben Wang. 2021. Mesh-Transformer-JAX: Model-Parallel Implementation of Transformer Language Model with JAX. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>.
- Genta Winata, Shijie Wu, Mayank Kulkarni, Tamar Solorio, and Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro. 2022. Cross-lingual few-shot learning on unseen languages. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 777–791.
- Genta Indra Winata, Andrea Madotto, Zhaoyang Lin, Rosanne Liu, Jason Yosinski, and Pascale Fung. 2021. Language models are few-shot multilingual learners. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Multilingual Representation Learning*, pages 1–15.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*.
- Tony Z Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09690*.

A Retrieved Examples

We show the retrieved nearest neighbor train samples with their distance relative to the test samples in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5 for TREC, SNIPS, SST2, Multi-NLU, and MTOP, respectively.

B Data Overlaps

We show the data overlaps on Table 7.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Test sample: | What continent is Argentina on ? |
| Label: | LOC |
| Nearest samples | |
| Train 1: | What continent is Bolivia on ? |
| Label: | LOC |
| Distance: | 0.2664 |
| Train 2: | What is spaceball played on ? |
| Label: | DESC |
| Distance: | 0.8701 |
| Train 3: | What country is Mount Everest in ? |
| Label: | LOC |
| Distance: | 0.8916 |
| Train 4: | What is the highest continent ? |
| Label: | LOC |
| Distance: | 0.8971 |
| Train 5: | How big is Australia ? |
| Label: | NUM |
| Distance: | 0.9021 |
| Train 6: | What is fiber in food ? |
| Label: | DESC |
| Distance: | 0.9265 |

Table 1: Examples of Nearest Samples on TREC dataset.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Test sample: | find movie times |
| Label: | search_screening_event |
| Nearest samples | |
| Train 1: | fine movie times |
| Label: | search_screening_event |
| Distance: | 0.9162 |
| Train 2: | show movie times |
| Label: | search_screening_event |
| Distance: | 0.9412 |
| Train 3: | what movie schedule |
| Label: | search_screening_event |
| Distance: | 1.0439 |
| Train 4: | list movie schedule |
| Label: | search_screening_event |
| Distance: | 1.0549 |
| Train 5: | find the movie curl |
| Label: | search_creative_work |
| Distance: | 1.1642 |
| Train 6: | find google news |
| Label: | search_creative_work |
| Distance: | 1.177859 |

Table 2: Examples of Nearest Samples on SNIPS dataset.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Test sample: | romanek keeps the film constantly taut ... reflecting the character 's instability with a metaphorical visual style and an unnerving , heartbeat-like score . , |
| Label: | positive |
| Nearest samples | |
| Train 1: | despite the film 's bizarre developments , hoffman keeps us riveted with every painful nuance , unexpected flashes of dark comedy and the character 's gripping humanity . |
| Label: | positive |
| Distance: | 0.6650 |
| Train 2: | perversely undercuts the joie de vivre even as he creates it , giving the movie a mournful undercurrent that places the good-time shenanigans in welcome perspective . |
| Label: | positive |
| Distance: | 0.6676 |
| Train 3: | hoffman keeps us riveted with every painful nuance , unexpected flashes of dark comedy and the character 's gripping humanity . |
| Label: | positive |
| Distance: | 0.6891 |
| Train 4: | the film occasionally tries the viewer 's patience with slow pacing and a main character who sometimes defies sympathy, but it ultimately satisfies with its moving story . |
| Label: | positive |
| Distance: | 0.6894 |
| Train 5: | though nijinsky 's words grow increasingly disturbed , the film maintains a beguiling serenity and poise that make it accessible for a non-narrative feature . |
| Label: | positive |
| Distance: | 0.7006 |
| Train 6: | with a tone as variable as the cinematography , schaeffer 's film never settles into . the light-footed enchantment the material needs , and the characters ' quirks and foibles never jell into charm |
| Label: | negative |
| Distance: | 0.7034 |

Table 3: Examples of Nearest Samples on SST2 dataset.

C Data and Tasks Statistics

We show the data and tasks information on Table 6.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Test sample: | Cambia mi alarma de 5pm a 7pm esta noche. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Nearest samples | |
| Train 1: | Change my alarm from 5pm to 7pm tonight. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Distance: | 0.9318 |
| Train 2: | Change my alarm from 7am to 6:45am. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Distance: | 1.0793 |
| Train 3: | Change my alarm from 7am to 8am. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Distance: | 1.1009 |
| Train 4: | Change my alarm tomorrow morning from 7 am to 9 am. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Distance: | 1.1360 |
| Train 5: | Change my alarm from 4:45 am to 5:00 am every weekday. |
| Label: | alarm/modify_alarm |
| Distance: | 1.1441 |
| Train 6: | remind me to set my alarm for 8am tomorrow morning at 10pm |
| Label: | reminder/set_reminder |
| Distance: | 1.1559 |

Table 4: Examples of Nearest Samples on Multi-NLU (en-es) dataset.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Test sample: | arrête la minuterie |
| Label: | delete_timer |
| Nearest samples | |
| Train 1: | discontinue timer |
| Label: | delete_timer |
| Distance: | 1.1686 |
| Train 2: | Pause the egg timer |
| Label: | pause_timer |
| Distance: | 1.2166 |
| Train 3: | Stop the new timer |
| Label: | pause_timer |
| Distance: | 1.2331 |
| Train 4: | stop the timer 7 am to 9 am. |
| Label: | pause_timer |
| Distance: | 1.2342 |
| Train 5: | Start the stopwatch every weekday. |
| Label: | create_timer |
| Distance: | 1.2346 |
| Train 6: | mute the countdown please tomorrow morning at 10pm |
| Label: | pause_timer |
| Distance: | 1.2471 |

Table 5: Examples of Nearest Samples on MTOP (en-es) dataset.

| Task | Dataset | Lang(s) | Instruction | #Labels |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|--|----------------|
| Intent Detection | SNIPS (Coucke et al., 2018) | en | classify an intent from an utterance | 3 |
| | Multi-NLU (Schuster et al., 2019) | en, es | | 12 |
| | MTOP (Li et al., 2021) | en, es, de, fr | | 3-27 |
| Question Classification | TREC (Li and Roth, 2002) | en | classify a label from a question | 6 |
| Sentiment | SST-2 (Wang et al., 2018) | en | classify a sentiment from an utterance | 2 |

Table 6: Tasks and Datasets.

| Task | Overlap Rate (%) |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| SNIPS | 1.61 |
| Multi-NLU | |
| English (en) | 31.08 |
| Spanish (es) | 13.41 |
| MTOP | |
| English (en) | 1.00 |
| French (fr) | 1.71 |
| German (de) | 1.90 |
| Spanish (es) | 2.86 |
| TREC | 1.49 |
| SST2 | 0.56 |

Table 7: Sample Overlap Rate.