

Explain, Edit, and Understand: Rethinking User Study Design for Evaluating Model Explanations

Siddhant Arora^{*1}, Danish Pruthi^{*1}, Norman Sadeh¹,
William W. Cohen², Zachary C. Lipton¹, Graham Neubig¹

¹ Carnegie Mellon University

² Google AI

{siddhana, ddanish, sadeh, zlipton, gneubig}@cs.cmu.edu, wcohen@google.com

Abstract

In attempts to “explain” predictions of machine learning models, researchers have proposed hundreds of techniques for attributing predictions to features that are deemed important. While these attributions are often claimed to hold the potential to improve human “understanding” of the models, surprisingly little work explicitly evaluates progress towards this aspiration. In this paper, we conduct a crowdsourcing study, where participants interact with deception detection models that have been trained to distinguish between genuine and fake hotel reviews. They are challenged both to simulate the model on fresh reviews, and to edit reviews with the goal of lowering the probability of the originally predicted class. Successful manipulations would lead to an adversarial example. During the training (but not the test) phase, input spans are highlighted to communicate salience. Through our evaluation, we observe that for a linear bag-of-words model, participants with access to the feature coefficients during training are able to cause a larger reduction in model confidence in the testing phase when compared to the no-explanation control. For the BERT-based classifier, popular *local explanations* do not improve their ability to reduce the model confidence over the no-explanation case. Remarkably, when the explanation for the BERT model is given by the (global) attributions of a linear model trained to imitate the BERT model, people can effectively manipulate the model.

Introduction

Owing to their remarkable predictive accuracy on supervised learning problems, deep learning models are increasingly deployed in consequential domains, such as medicine (Kim et al. 2019; Aggarwal et al. 2021), and criminal justice (Kleinberg et al. 2017). Frustrated by the difficulty of communicating what precisely these models have learned, a large body of research has sprung up proposing methods that are purported to *explain* their predictions (Doshi-Velez and Kim 2017; Lipton 2018; Guidotti et al. 2018). Typically, these so-called explanations take the form of saliency maps, attributing the prediction to a subset of the input features, or assigning weights to the features according to their salience. To date, while hundreds of such attribution techniques have been proposed (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin

2016; Hendricks et al. 2016; Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017; Smilkov et al. 2017), what precisely it means for a feature to be salient remains a point of conceptual ambiguity. Thus, many proposed techniques are evaluated only via visual inspection of a few examples where the highlighted features agree with the author’s (and reader’s) intuitions. Across papers, one common motivation for such attributions is to improve human “understanding” of the models (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016; Doshi-Velez and Kim 2017; Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017). However, whether these attributions confer understanding is seldom evaluated explicitly and there is relatively little work that characterizes what explanations enable people to do.

One suggestion to evaluate model understanding is to use *simulatability* as a proxy for understanding—i.e., if a participant can accurately predict the output of the model on unseen examples (Doshi-Velez and Kim 2017). Following this idea, a few prior studies examine if explanations help humans predict model output (Chandrasekaran et al. 2018; Hase and Bansal 2020). Such studies are typically divided into a training and a test phase. In the training phase, participants see a few input, output, explanations triples, and in the test phase, they are asked to guess the model output for unseen examples.¹ Many prior studies on evaluating model explanations have reached negative results, noting that they do not definitively aid humans in predicting model behavior on visual question answering (Chandrasekaran et al. 2018) and text classification tasks (Hase and Bansal 2020).

In this paper, we rethink the user design for evaluating model explanations for text classification tasks, and propose two key changes. First, we provide participants with **query access to the model**: they can alter input documents to observe how model predictions and explanations change in real time. Second, we extend the simulation task by prompting participants **to edit examples to reduce the model confidence** towards the predicted class. While prior work (Kaushik, Hovy, and Lipton 2019) prompts humans to edit examples for data augmentation, editing exercises haven’t been explored for evaluating explanations. This editing exercise allows us to capture detailed metrics, e.g., average con-

^{*}denotes equal contribution.

Copyright © 2022, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

¹Chandrasekaran et al. (2018) present model explanations during the testing phase, whereas Hase and Bansal (2020) do not include explanations at test time, as explanations could “leak” model output (see Pruthi et al. (2020); Jacovi and Goldberg (2021)).




Figure 1: Our user study, as shown to participants during the training phase: a) first, participants guess the model prediction; (b) next, they edit the review to reduce the model confidence towards the predicted class. Through highlights, we indicate the attribution scores produced by different techniques. Participants receive feedback on their edits, observing updated predictions, confidence and attributions, all in real time. The test phase does not include attributions but is otherwise similar to the training.

confidence reduced, which, as we shall later see, can be used to compare relative utility of different explanation techniques.

We perform a crowdsourcing study using the proposed paradigm on a deception detection task, with machine learning models that are trained to detect whether hotel reviews are genuine or fake (Ott et al. 2011). In this task, the human performance is only slightly better than that of random guessing, while machine learning models are significantly more accurate, making it an interesting testbed for studying whether attributions help people to understand the associations employed by the models. In our study, the participant first guesses whether the given hotel review is classified as fake or genuine (see Figure 1). We then prompt the participant to edit the review such that the model confidence towards the predicted class is reduced. During the training phase, we present attributions by highlighting input spans. For instance, the attribution in Figure 1 suggests that the model associates tokens “My” and “family” with the fake class, perhaps indicating that fake reviews tend to mention external factors instead of details about the hotel. In our setup, a participant could test any such hypotheses, by editing the example and observing the updated predictions, outputs, and attributions immediately.

We seek to answer the question: Which (if any) attribution techniques improve humans’ ability to guess the model output, or edit the input examples to lower the model confi-

dence? From the evaluation methodology standpoint, we assess if the interactive environment with query access to the models makes it possible to distinguish the relative value of different attributions. For these research questions, we compare popular attribution techniques—LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016) and integrated gradients (Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017), against a no-explanation control.

Our evaluation reveals that (i) for both a linear bag-of-words model and a BERT-based classifier, none of the explanation methods definitively help participants to simulate the model’s output more accurately at test time (when explanations are unavailable); (ii) however, access to feature coefficients from a linear model during training enables participants to cause a larger reduction in the model confidence at test time; and (iii) most remarkably, feature coefficients and global cue words² from a linear (student) model trained to mimic a (teacher) BERT model significantly help participants to manipulate BERT. Additionally, we notice that participants respond to the highlighted spans, as over 40% of all the edits are performed on these spans. Our comparisons lead to quantitative differences among evaluated attributions, underscoring the efficacy of our paradigm.³

²Words that correspond to the largest feature coefficients.

³The code used for our study is available at: <https://github.com/sidhu001/Evaluating-Explanations>.

Related Work

We briefly discuss past attempts to evaluate explanation methods, both via user studies and automated metrics.

Model simulatability measures human ability to predict the model output on fresh examples. It is a prominent metric to evaluate explanation methods, and is treated as a proxy for model understanding (Doshi-Velez and Kim 2017). Using simulatability, a recent study evaluates five different explanation generation schemes for text and tabular classification tasks (Hase and Bansal 2020). Their study runs two different types of tests: (i) *forward simulation* which measures simulatability on unseen examples without explanations, after presenting participants 16 training examples with explanations; and (ii) *counterfactual simulation* which captures participants' ability to guess the model output of perturbed input examples while observing the true labels, predictions, and explanation for the original examples. The study concludes that for the text classification task, none of the five evaluated explanations definitively help participants better simulate the model in the forward simulation task (when explanations were provided only at training time). The participants in their study report found it difficult to retain the insights learned from the training phase during the testing phase. Another study examines the extent to which explanations from a VQA model help humans predict its responses and failures (Chandrasekaran et al. 2018). In their setup, visual saliency maps were provided both during the training and the testing phase. This study too leads to a similar conclusion: visual attributions do not help in simulating the VQA model. Another recent study measures simulatability of several regression models that estimate the value of real-estate listings (Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021). They observe that participants could simulate a linear model with 2 features but fail to simulate one with 8 features. They also note that participants could not correct model mistakes for any of the given models. Another paper investigates if humans could predict model output using explanations alone, and found erasure and attention-based explanations to be useful (Treviso and Martins 2020).

Our work differs with the above studies in a number of ways: none of the prior studies allow participants to test out models for inputs of their choice (query access). Additionally, we ask participants to edit examples with a goal to reduce the model confidence, in an attempt to identify adversarial examples. This exercise allows us to capture detailed metrics, including the average amount of confidence reduced and number of examples successfully flipped. Furthermore, we interleave the training and test phase thereby mitigating retention issues reported in (Hase and Bansal 2020).

There have been several **other user studies** that evaluate different aspects of explanations (Binns et al. 2018; Cai et al. 2019; Green and Chen 2019a,b; Yin, Vaughan, and Wallach 2019; Kunkel et al. 2019). Mohseni, Zarei, and Ragan (2021) categorize these efforts based on the goals they aim to achieve, the intended audience, and the evaluation metrics. Few studies measure if explanations enable participants to better predict the task output (i.e., the ground truth) instead of the model output—specifically, if explanations help participants gain sufficient insights to distinguish gen-

uine reviews from fake reviews (Lai and Tan 2019; Lai, Liu, and Tan 2020). Lertvittayakumjorn and Toni (2019) evaluate if explanations help in identifying the better performing model. Lastly, a recent study examines saliency maps for an age-prediction model, and concludes that none of the explanations impact human's trust in the model (Chu, Roy, and Andreas 2020).

A variety of **automated metrics** to measure explanation quality have been proposed in the past. However, many of them can be easily gamed (Hooker et al. 2019; Treviso and Martins 2020; Hase et al. 2020) (see (Pruthi et al. 2020) for a detailed discussion on this point). A popular way to evaluate explanations is to compare the produced explanations with expert-collected rationales (Mullenbach et al. 2018; DeYoung et al. 2020). Such metrics only capture whether the produced explanations are plausible, but do not comment upon the *faithfulness* of explanations to the process through which predictions are obtained. A recently proposed approach quantifies the value of explanations via the accuracy gains that they confer on a student model trained to simulate a teacher model (Pruthi et al. 2020). Designing automated evaluation metrics is an ongoing area of research, and to the best of our knowledge, none of the automated metrics have been demonstrated to correlate with any human measure of explanation quality.

Evaluation through Iterative Editing

This section first describes our evaluation paradigm and discusses how it is different from prior efforts. We then introduce several metrics for evaluating model explanations.

Experimental Procedure

We divide our evaluation into two alternating phases: a training phase and a test phase. During the training phase, participants first read the input example, and are challenged to guess the model prediction. Once they submit their guess, they see the model output, model confidence and an explanation (explanation type varies across treatment groups). As noted earlier, several prior studies solely evaluate model simulatability (Hase and Bansal 2020; Chandrasekaran et al. 2018; Treviso and Martins 2020; Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021). We extend the past protocols and further prompt participants to edit the input text with a goal to lower the confidence of the model prediction. As participants edit the input, they see the updated predictions, confidence and explanations in real time (see Figure 1). Therefore, they can validate any hypothesis about the input-output associations (captured by the model), by simply editing the text based on their hypothesis and observing if the model prediction changes accordingly. The editing task concludes if the participants are able to flip the model prediction, or run out of the allocated time (of three minutes). The instructions for the study prohibit participants to edit examples in a manner that changes the meaning of the text (more details in the next section).

The test phase is similar to the training phase except for an important distinction: explanations are not available during testing so that we can evaluate the insights participants have acquired without the support of explanations. Holding

back the explanations at test time eliminates concerns that the explanations might trivially leak the output (see Pruthi et al. (2020) for a detailed discussions). In our study, after every two examples in the training stage, participants complete one test example. In contrast to past studies, where participants first review all the training examples before attempting the test examples, we show participants one test example after every two training examples. In the Hase and Bansal (2020) study, participants report that it was difficult to retain insights from the training phase during the later test round. Our interleaving procedure alleviates such concerns.

Metrics

While simulatability has been used as a proxy measure for model understanding (Hase and Bansal 2020; Chandrasekaran et al. 2018), we argue that simulating the model is a difficult task for people, especially after viewing only a few examples. Hence, we propose to compute detailed metrics that are based on participants’ ability to edit the example to lower the model confidence towards predicted class and to possibly flip model predictions. We believe that such metrics are finer-grained indicators for participant’s understanding of the model, since participants might not comprehend how different factors combine to produce the output, but they may identify a few input-output associations, which they can effectively apply in the manipulation exercise.

Based on this motivation, we measure three metrics (a) the simulation accuracy, (b) average reduction in model confidence, and (c) percentage of examples flipped. Following prior work (Chu, Roy, and Andreas 2020), we use mixed effects regression models to estimate these three quantities. For each experiment, a participant is randomly placed in one of the 5 cohorts. All participants in the same cohort see the same training and test examples, irrespective of the experiment. Further, across different cohorts, test examples differ (but we use a fixed set of examples for training). We use multiple cohorts so as to not rely on a few test examples for our conclusions. The mixed effects models include fixed effect term $\beta_{\text{treatment}}$ for each treatment and a random effect intercept α_{cohort} to determine the impact of the cohort to which a participant is assigned. Since mixture effect models can effectively handle random variability introduced due to different data samples and different participant cohorts, it is an appropriate choice to isolate the impact of each explanation type. The three mixed effects models can be described as

$$y_{\text{target}} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{treatment}} \times x_{\text{treatment}} + \alpha_{\text{cohort}} \times x_{\text{cohort}},$$

where the target corresponds to three evaluation metrics discussed above and β_0 is the intercept.

A Case Study of Deception Detection

We choose a deception detection task—distinguishing between fake and real hotel reviews (Ott et al. 2011)—as the backdrop for our crowdsourcing study. This is because prior studies have noted that humans struggle with this task while machine learning models are significantly more accurate. Our motivation for using this setup is that models exploit subtle, unknown and possibly counter-intuitive associations

Model	Accuracy
Human Accuracy (Ott et al. 2011)	≈ 60%
Logistic Regression	87.8%
BERT	89.8%

Table 1: Accuracy on the deception detection task.

to drive prediction, providing an interesting testbed to evaluate whether attributions communicate such associations. Further, since human accuracy is low for this task, the participants do not have preconceived notions that could potentially conflate with the simulation task. Therefore, this task makes an interesting testbed to characterize how much explanations help humans in understanding the input-output associations that deception detection models exploit. The study comprises 20 training, and 10 testing examples in total, and lasts for 90 minutes per participant.

What Are Permissible Edits?

We ask participants not to alter the staying experience conveyed through the hotel review. If the review is positive, negative or mixed, then the edited version should maintain that stance. They are allowed to paraphrase and can remove or change information not relevant to the experience about the hotel. For instance, changing “My husband and I” to “We” is valid edit. However, inventing details that influence the experience about the hotel are not permitted (e.g., adding “The staff was unfriendly” is not allowed). To enforce these guidelines, we (1) discard submissions where the edit distances between the original and edited version is large⁴ and then (2) manually inspect the edits to reject submissions that violate our instructions.

Machine Learning Models

We consider two machine learning models for our experiments. The first is a linear logistic regression model with unigram TF-IDF features. The second model is a BERT-based classification model (Devlin et al. 2019). We train, or fine-tune, these models using the deception review dataset (Ott et al. 2011). We use the original train/validation/test splits, which are class balanced (i.e., exactly half of the reviews are genuine). For the logistic regression model, we select hyperparameters, i.e. regularization strength and regularization penalty, via a 10-fold cross-validation, whereas we use the default parameters of the BERT model. The accuracy of the two models is significantly higher than the estimated human performance on this task, which is around 60% (Table 1). We refer readers to (Ott et al. 2011) for details on the dataset and estimating human performance for this task.

Controls & Treatments

Participants are randomly placed into different control and treatment groups which vary based on the type of explanations offered and the choice of the machine learning model.

⁴We remove submissions where the word edit distance > 0.9 of the length of input review, or if half of original words are deleted.

Model	Treatments	Simulation Accuracy	Phase	Examples flipped (Percentage)	Avg. Confidence Reduced
Logistic Regression	Control	54.5 [51.0, 58.0]	Train	8.2 [5.4, 11.6]	8.0 [7.0, 9.0]
			Test	15.0 [10.8, 19.4]	5.9 [4.3, 7.8]
	Feature coefficients	53.1 [50.0, 57.0]	Train	36.7 [24.8, 49.3]	21.3 [19.5, 23.1]
			Test	16.0 [10.8, 21.6]	8.9 [7.2, 10.6]
BERT	Control	57.1 [54.0, 61.0]	Train	15.0 [11.6, 18.8]	10.7 [8.6, 12.8]
			Test	12.4 [7.6, 18.1]	9.2 [6.6, 11.9]
	LIME	56.4 [53.0, 60.0]	Train	14.4 [10.5, 19.5]	10.2 [8.2, 12.3]
			Test	7.7 [4.4, 11.3]	6.1 [4.1, 8.2]
	Integrated gradients	56.6 [54.0, 60.0]	Train	23.6 [19.4, 28.0]	16.5 [14.0, 19.2]
			Test	13.6 [8.2, 19.3]	10.4 [7.7, 13.3]
	Feature coefficients (from a linear student)	60.5 [57.0, 64.0]	Train	32.2 [27.1, 37.3]	22.6 [19.7, 25.6]
			Test	21.3 [15.7, 27.4]	14.9 [11.6, 18.4]
	+ global cues (from a linear student)	55.7 [51.0, 60.0]	Train	40.6 [32.0, 49.6]	29.9 [26.8, 33.0]
			Test	31.6 [23.2, 40.8]	23.6 [19.7, 27.6]

Table 2: We report human performance across different explanations in our study. None of the explanations help participants to simulate the models, whereas global explanations for the BERT model and feature coefficients for the logistic regression model help to reduce model confidence. Bold values indicate statistically significant differences as compared to the no-explanation control (p -value < 0.05). Square brackets indicate bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals. The simulation accuracy is computed together as participants see the explanations only after guessing the model predictions in both the train and test phase.

For both the linear logistic regression model and the BERT model, we run a control study without explanations. For the linear model, we use feature coefficients of unigram features as explanations in the treatment group. For the BERT model, we use the following explanation-based treatments.

Local explanation refer to techniques that produce explanations by observing how the model’s predictions change upon perturbing the input slightly. For the BERT classifier, we experiment with two widely-used local explanations: LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016) and integrated gradients (Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017). LIME produces an explanation using the feature coefficients of a linear interpretable model that is trained to approximate the original model in the local neighborhood of the input example. Integrated gradients are computed by integrating gradients of the log-likelihood of the predicted label along the line joining a starting reference point and the given input example. These explanations are presented to participants through highlights (see Figure 1).

Besides local explanations, we experiment with **global explanations** that indicate common input-output associations that the models exploit. To obtain global explanations for the BERT model, we take inspiration from prior work on knowledge distillation (Liu, Wang, and Matwin 2018) to first train a linear *student* model using BERT predictions on unseen hotel reviews. Since the original dataset from Ott et al. (2011) contains only 1600 reviews, we mine additional 13.7K hotel reviews from TripAdvisor.⁵ Note that we only require the BERT predictions for these reviews, rather than the ground truth labels. The student model achieves a simulation accuracy of 88.2% on the downloaded set of reviews.

⁵To download additional reviews we follow a protocol similar to the data collection process used for the original dataset.

We then use the trained student model to identify the words with the highest feature weights associated with both the classes. We present the top-20 words for each class to participants during the training phase. Alongside these global cue words, we also highlight words in the input as per their feature coefficients of the student model. In a separate ablation study, we isolate the effect of these global cue words by removing them and only highlighting input tokens using the feature coefficients from the student.

Participant Details

We recruit study participants using Amazon Mechanical Turk platform. We use a lightweight recruitment study that consists of 2 examples (without explanations) to select participants. We ask participants to guess the model prediction and edit the example to reduce the model confidence. Participants who guess the model prediction within 5 seconds (which we believe is insufficient to read the review) are filtered out. We also remove participants who skip the editing exercise altogether, or whose edits are ungrammatical or alter the staying experience expressed in the review. For all our studies, we include workers who are residents in the United States, and have completed over 500 HITs in the past and with at least 99% approval rate. Workers selected from the recruitment test are encouraged to participate in the main study. For the main study, we pay the workers \$20 and award a bonus of 10 cents for each correct guess and 20 cents for every successful prediction flip. On an average, workers make 7.5 edits per review, and thus effectively see model predictions for 225 unique inputs. In total, we had 173 participants in our main study, with 25 in each of the treatment and control groups (except for one group, where 2 participants were disqualified later for violating our instructions).

Model	Treatments	Simulation Accuracy	Phase	Examples flipped (Percentage)	Avg. Confidence Reduced
Logistic Regression	Feature coefficients	2.3 [-2.1, 6.7]	Train	29.3 [16.5, 42.1]	13.8 [7.6, 19.9]
			Test	2.6 [-3.2, 8.4]	2.9 [-0.2, 6.0] *
BERT	LIME	-0.0 [-5.5, 5.4]	Train	-0.5 [-8.6, 7.6]	-0.3 [-6.4, 5.7]
			Test	-4.4 [-12.5, 3.7]	-2.9 [-8.6, 2.8]
	Integrated gradients	-1.2 [-9.9, 3.1]	Train	8.8 [0.6, 16.9]	6.7 [0.7, 12.6]
			Test	1.2 [-6.7, 9.1]	1.0 [-4.6, 6.6]
	Feature coefficients (from a linear student)	3.4 [-2.0, 8.8]	Train	17.1 [8.8, 25.4]	11.7 [5.7, 17.7]
			Test	7.3 [-0.8, 15.4] *	5.0 [-0.7, 10.7] *
Global cues (from a linear student)	-1.7 [-6.9, 3.6]	Train	25.6 [17.5, 33.7]	19.1 [13.3, 25.0]	
		Test	18.7 [10.8, 26.6]	14.3 [8.7, 19.9]	

Table 3: We report the fixed effect term $\beta_{\text{treatment}}$ relative to the control for the 3 target metrics. Bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals are in the parentheses. We observe that none of the explanations help participants simulate the models, whereas global explanations for the BERT model and feature coefficients for the logistic regression model definitively help participants reduce model confidence. Bold values indicate p-value < 0.05 compared to the control and * indicates p-value < 0.1 .

The total cost to conduct our study is about 4000 USD.

Results & Analysis

Do Explanations Help Humans Simulate Models?

First, we investigate if the query access to the model’s predictions and explanations during the training phase enables participants to understand the models sufficiently to simulate its output on unseen test examples. We do not find evidence of improved simulatability in Tables 2 and 3, where the simulation accuracy of participants—which is slightly better than random guessing—do not improve with access to explanations. While prior studies (Hase and Bansal 2020; Chandrasekaran et al. 2018) note similar findings, in our opinion, this is a stronger negative result for two reasons: first, in our study, participants can alter examples and observe model predictions and their explanations during the training phase. This exercise allows participants more access to predictions and explanations compared to prior studies. Second, even for linear models, which are thought to be inherently “interpretable,” explanations do not improve simulation accuracy. The explanations of linear bag-of-words model have not been examined for simulatability in the past.

Do Explanations Help Humans Perform Edits That Reduce The Model Confidence?

Next, we examine if participants gain sufficient understanding during the training phase to perform edits that cause the models to lower the confidence towards the originally predicted class. Here, we find that logistic regression coefficient weights help participants reduce the confidence of the logistic regression model: the average confidence reduced during the test phase, when they had access to explanations in training, is 3.0 points higher than the no-explanation control. This difference is statistically significant with a p-value < 0.05 . The benefits of such explanations during the training phase are large (over 13 points), which is unsurprising as the faithful explanations shown during the training phase can

guide participants to effectively edit the document to lower model confidence. During the training phase, they are able to statistically significantly flip more predictions, however, this ability does not transfer to the test phase.

For the BERT model, neither LIME nor integrated gradients help participants flip more predictions at the test phase. Integrated gradients-based explanations are effective only during the training phase. In contrast, the feature coefficients, from a linear student model help participants reduce the model confidence of the BERT model—both at train and test time, demonstrating how associations from a simple student model can lead to actionable insights about the original BERT model. Including global cue words alongside feature coefficients markedly improves participant’s ability to manipulate the BERT model. This fact that among all the inspected methods, attributions from a linear student model are the most effective emphasizes the need to explicitly evaluate explanations with their intended users, instead of relying on the qualitative inspection of a few examples.

Another noteworthy result here is that we are able to quantitatively differentiate the effectiveness of different explanations using the “percentage of examples flipped” and “average confidence reduced” metrics from the editing exercise proposed in this paper. This contrasts with the the previously used simulatability metric, therefore, we recommend future studies on evaluation of interpretability techniques to consider (similar) editing tasks and metrics instead.

Do Participants Edit Tokens Highlighted As Explanations? Are Their Edits Effective?

One other benefit of our framework is that, in contrast to previous studies, it allows us to directly monitor whether participants are paying attention to the explanations, specifically by measuring how they respond to highlighted words. To do so, we record the fraction of times edits are performed on a word that is among the top-20% of highlighted words in a given input text. If there is no preference towards high-

Model	Treatments	First Edits		All Edits	
		Deletion	Substitution	Deletion	Substitution
Logistic Regression	Feature coefficients	48.5 [42.5, 54.6]	43.0 [38.3, 47.9]	40.4 [37.0, 43.8]	41.8 [39.2, 44.6]
BERT	LIME	56.8 [49.8, 63.7]	67.2 [62.8, 71.5]	39.2 [35.2, 43.2]	49.2 [46.1, 52.2]
	Integrated gradients	48.1 [42.0, 54.3]	50.8 [46.2, 55.4]	32.4 [29.2, 35.6]	45.9 [43.2, 48.6]
	Feature coefficients (from a linear student)	42.5 [36.6, 48.5]	47.1 [42.3, 52.0]	33.9 [30.5, 37.3]	42.4 [40.0, 44.8]

Table 4: The table records the percentage of first, and all, edits performed on words that are among the top 20% highlighted words in the review. Participants prefer editing highlighted words, indicating that they respond to the presented explanations. If participants were to uniformly edit the reviews, the top-20% highlighted words would receive about 20% of first and all edits.




Figure 2: Percentage of edits on the top-20% highlighted words and their contribution towards the confidence reduction. This plot indicates that (a) highlighted tokens receive a bulk of edits (compared to their quantity, which for the purposes of this experiment is 20%); and (b) edits performed on tokens highlighted via integrated gradients and feature coefficients are effective in reducing confidence.

lighted words, this value would be close to 20%. From Table 4, we see that the participants edit the highlighted words significantly more often, both with respect to first edits and all edits. For instance, across all explanations, for about 45-55% of examples, the first deleted or substituted word is a word among the top-20% of highlighted words.

We further analyze if the edits on the top-20% highlighted words are effective in reducing model confidence. In Figure 2, we plot the fraction of edits on highlighted words and their contribution in reducing model confidence. We compute their contribution by aggregating the fractional reduction in model confidence caused due to that edit. We inspect if these edits are more effective than those performed on the remaining words. We find that the edits on highlighted words are more effective, however, their effectiveness varies with different explanation types. Edits on words highlighted using integrated gradients and feature coefficients of the student model have larger contribution towards reducing model confidence than edits on the words highlighted via LIME. This result corroborates our previous findings suggesting that integrated gradients and feature coefficients from a student model are statistically significantly more helpful in reducing model confidence during the training phase

Do People Use Global Cues?

For the treatment group wherein we present participants feature coefficients and 40 global cue words from a linear student model as explanations for the BERT classifier, we determine the extent to which participants use the global cues. We report that around one in five edits utilizes global cues both during the training and the testing phase. The fraction of insertions that contain global cue words are 17.1% and 18.2% for training and testing respectively. Further, the percentage of deletions that contain these cue words are 21.2% in training and 23.7% in the testing phase. These results reveal that participants indeed incorporate global cue words while editing, and as shown in Tables 2 and 3, the edits performed when these cues are present are effective in lowering the model confidence and flipping predictions.

Conclusion

A common argument for providing explanations is that they (ought to) improve human’s understanding about a model; however, many prior studies note that they do not improve their ability to simulate the model (which is primarily used as a proxy for model understanding). In this work, we extend the prior evaluation paradigm by instead asking participants to edit the input examples with an objective to reduce model confidence towards the predicted class. This exercise allows us to compute detailed metrics, namely, the average confidence reduced and the percentage of examples flipped. We evaluate several explanation techniques for both a linear model and BERT-based classifier. Similar to past findings, we first note that for both these models, none of the considered explanations improve model simulatability. We also find that participants with access to feature coefficients during training can force a larger drop in the model confidence *during testing*, when attributions are unavailable. Interestingly, for BERT-based classifier, global cue words and feature coefficients, obtained using a linear student model trained to mimic its predictions, prove to be effective. These results reveal that associations from a linear student model could provide insights for a BERT-based model, and importantly, the editing paradigm could be used to differentiate the relative utility of explanations. We recommend future studies on evaluating interpretations to consider similar metrics.

Acknowledgements

We thank Michael Collins, Mansi Gupta, Bhuwan Dhingra and Nitish Kulkarni for their feedback. In addition, we acknowledge Khyathi Chandu, Aakanksha Naik, Alissa Ostapenko, Vijay Viswanathan, Manasi Arora and Rishabh Joshi for painstakingly testing the user interface of our study.

References

- Aggarwal, R.; Sounderajah, V.; Martin, G.; Ting, A., Daniel S. W. and Karthikesalingam; King, D.; Ashrafi, H.; and Darzi, A. 2021. Diagnostic accuracy of deep learning in medical imaging: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *NPJ Digital Medicine*.
- Binns, R.; Kleek, M. V.; Veale, M.; Lyngs, U.; Zhao, J.; and Shadbolt, N. 2018. 'It's Reducing a Human Being to a Percentage': Perceptions of Justice in Algorithmic Decisions. In Mandryk, R. L.; Hancock, M.; Perry, M.; and Cox, A. L., eds., *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2018, Montreal, QC, Canada, April 21-26, 2018*, 377. ACM.
- Cai, C. J.; Reif, E.; Hegde, N.; Hipp, J. D.; Kim, B.; Smilov, D.; Wattenberg, M.; Viégas, F. B.; Corrado, G. S.; Stumpe, M. C.; and Terry, M. 2019. Human-Centered Tools for Coping with Imperfect Algorithms During Medical Decision-Making. In Brewster, S. A.; Fitzpatrick, G.; Cox, A. L.; and Kostakos, V., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2019, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, May 04-09, 2019*, 4. ACM.
- Chandrasekaran, A.; Prabhu, V.; Yadav, D.; Chattopadhyay, P.; and Parikh, D. 2018. Do explanations make VQA models more predictable to a human? In Riloff, E.; Chiang, D.; Hockenmaier, J.; and Tsujii, J., eds., *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, 1036–1042. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chu, E.; Roy, D.; and Andreas, J. 2020. Are visual explanations useful? a case study in model-in-the-loop prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.12248*.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 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)*, 4171–4186. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- DeYoung, J.; Jain, S.; Rajani, N. F.; Lehman, E.; Xiong, C.; Socher, R.; and Wallace, B. C. 2020. ERASER: A Benchmark to Evaluate Rationalized NLP Models. In Jurafsky, D.; Chai, J.; Schluter, N.; and Tetreault, J. R., eds., *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, 4443–4458. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Doshi-Velez, F.; and Kim, B. 2017. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608*.
- Green, B.; and Chen, Y. 2019a. Disparate Interactions: An Algorithm-in-the-Loop Analysis of Fairness in Risk Assessments. In danah boyd; and Morgenstern, J. H., eds., *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAT* 2019, Atlanta, GA, USA, January 29-31, 2019*, 90–99. ACM.
- Green, B.; and Chen, Y. 2019b. The Principles and Limits of Algorithm-in-the-Loop Decision Making. *Proc. ACM Hum. Comput. Interact.*, 3(CSCW): 50:1–50:24.
- Guidotti, R.; Monreale, A.; Ruggieri, S.; Turini, F.; Giannotti, F.; and Pedreschi, D. 2018. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 51(5): 1–42.
- Hase, P.; and Bansal, M. 2020. Evaluating Explainable AI: Which Algorithmic Explanations Help Users Predict Model Behavior? In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5540–5552. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hase, P.; Zhang, S.; Xie, H.; and Bansal, M. 2020. Leakage-Adjusted Simulatability: Can Models Generate Non-Trivial Explanations of Their Behavior in Natural Language? In Cohn, T.; He, Y.; and Liu, Y., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Online Event, 16-20 November 2020*, volume EMNLP 2020 of *Findings of ACL*, 4351–4367. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hendricks, L. A.; Akata, Z.; Rohrbach, M.; Donahue, J.; Schiele, B.; and Darrell, T. 2016. Generating Visual Explanations. In Leibe, B.; Matas, J.; Sebe, N.; and Welling, M., eds., *Computer Vision - ECCV 2016 - 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV*, volume 9908 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 3–19. Springer.
- Hooker, S.; Erhan, D.; Kindermans, P.; and Kim, B. 2019. A Benchmark for Interpretability Methods in Deep Neural Networks. In Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Beygelzimer, A.; d'Alché-Buc, F.; Fox, E. B.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 9734–9745.
- Jacovi, A.; and Goldberg, Y. 2021. Aligning Faithful Interpretations with their Social Attribution. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 9: 294–310.
- Kaushik, D.; Hovy, E.; and Lipton, Z. C. 2019. Learning the Difference that Makes a Difference with Counterfactually-Augmented Data. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Kim, M.; Yun, J.; Cho, Y.; Shin, K.; Jang, R.; Bae, H. J.; and Kim, N. 2019. Deep Learning in Medical Imaging. *Neurospine*, 657–668.
- Kleinberg, J.; Lakkaraju, H.; Leskovec, J.; Ludwig, J.; and Mullainathan, S. 2017. Human decisions and machine predictions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 237–293.
- Kunkel, J.; Donkers, T.; Michael, L.; Barbu, C.; and Ziegler, J. 2019. Let Me Explain: Impact of Personal and Impersonal

- Explanations on Trust in Recommender Systems. In Brewster, S. A.; Fitzpatrick, G.; Cox, A. L.; and Kostakos, V., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2019, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, May 04-09, 2019*, 487. ACM.
- Lai, V.; Liu, H.; and Tan, C. 2020. “Why is ‘Chicago’ deceptive?” Towards Building Model-Driven Tutorials for Humans. In *Proceedings of CHI 2020*, 1–13. ACM.
- Lai, V.; and Tan, C. 2019. On human predictions with explanations and predictions of machine learning models: A case study on deception detection. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 29–38. ACM.
- Lertvittayakumjorn, P.; and Toni, F. 2019. Human-grounded Evaluations of Explanation Methods for Text Classification. In Inui, K.; Jiang, J.; Ng, V.; and Wan, X., eds., *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*, 5194–5204. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lipton, Z. C. 2018. The mythos of model interpretability. *Queue*, 16(3): 31–57.
- Liu, X.; Wang, X.; and Matwin, S. 2018. Improving the interpretability of deep neural networks with knowledge distillation. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, 905–912. IEEE.
- Mohseni, S.; Zarei, N.; and Ragan, E. D. 2021. A multidisciplinary survey and framework for design and evaluation of explainable AI systems. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiiS)*, 11(3-4): 1–45.
- Mullenbach, J.; Wiegrefe, S.; Duke, J.; Sun, J.; and Eisenstein, J. 2018. Explainable Prediction of Medical Codes from Clinical Text. In Walker, M. A.; Ji, H.; and Stent, A., eds., *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)*, 1101–1111. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ott, M.; Choi, Y.; Cardie, C.; and Hancock, J. T. 2011. Finding Deceptive Opinion Spam by Any Stretch of the Imagination. In Lin, D.; Matsumoto, Y.; and Mihalcea, R., eds., *The 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Proceedings of the Conference, 19-24 June, 2011, Portland, Oregon, USA*, 309–319. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- Poursabzi-Sangdeh, F.; Goldstein, D. G.; Hofman, J. M.; Wortman Vaughan, J. W.; and Wallach, H. 2021. Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–52.
- Pruthi, D.; Bansal, R.; Dhingra, B.; Soares, L. B.; Collins, M.; Lipton, Z. C.; Neubig, G.; and Cohen, W. W. 2020. Evaluating Explanations: How much do explanations from the teacher aid students? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00893*.
- Ribeiro, M. T.; Singh, S.; and Guestrin, C. 2016. “Why should i trust you?” Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 1135–1144.
- Smilkov, D.; Thorat, N.; Kim, B.; Viégas, F.; and Wattenberg, M. 2017. Smoothgrad: removing noise by adding noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03825*.
- Sundararajan, M.; Taly, A.; and Yan, Q. 2017. Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks. In Precup, D.; and Teh, Y. W., eds., *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 3319–3328. PMLR.
- Treviso, M. V.; and Martins, A. F. T. 2020. The Explanation Game: Towards Prediction Explainability through Sparse Communication. In Alishahi, A.; Belinkov, Y.; Chrupala, G.; Hupkes, D.; Pinter, Y.; and Sajjad, H., eds., *Proceedings of the Third BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP, BlackboxNLP@EMNLP 2020, Online, November 2020*, 107–118. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yin, M.; Vaughan, J. W.; and Wallach, H. M. 2019. Understanding the Effect of Accuracy on Trust in Machine Learning Models. In Brewster, S. A.; Fitzpatrick, G.; Cox, A. L.; and Kostakos, V., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2019, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, May 04-09, 2019*, 279. ACM.