



NUS
National University
of Singapore

| **Computing**

CS4248: Natural Language Processing

Lecture 6 — Word Embeddings

Announcements

- Project

- Progress report — Deadline: Mar 7, 11.59 pm
- Template available here: <https://bit.ly/cs4248-2320-iu-template>
(you don't have to use the template, but please use a 16:9 aspect ratio for your slides)

- Assignment 2

- Reminder — Deadline: Mar 14, 11.59 pm
- Goal: practice manual feature engineering
- To be fair, only certain technologies already covered are allowed

- Midterm Feedback Survey

- Deadline: Mar 14, 11.59 pm

Outline

- **Motivation**
- **Sparse Word Embeddings**
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- **NLP Ethics**

Motivation

- Recall from Lecture 4: Most NLP algorithms require
 - Numerical input
 - Standardized input } → Most common representation: **vectors** (a.k.a **embeddings**)
- So far: Vector Space Model (VSM)
 - Vector representation of documents
 - Document vector for document d_i
= column term-document matrix
(typically using weighting schemes, e.g., tf-idf)

How to represent words as vectors?

Term-Document Matrix

	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5
<i>car</i>	0	0	0.4	0	0.4
<i>cat</i>	0.22	0.29	0	0	0.22
<i>chase</i>	0.22	0.22	0.22	0	0
<i>dog</i>	0.29	0	0	0.29	0.22
<i>sit</i>	0	0	0	0	0.7
<i>tv</i>	0	0	0.4	0.4	0
<i>watch</i>	0	0	0	0.7	0

Representing Words — Traditional NLP

- Words as discrete symbols: **One-Hot Encoding**

- Length of vector = size of vocabulary V (number of unique words)
- Vector values: 1 if dimension reflects word, 0 otherwise

Note: VSM document vector = aggregation over word vectors (with some weighting, e.g., sum, tf-idf)

- Toy example

- $V = \{\overset{w_1}{\text{dog}}, \overset{w_2}{\text{cat}}, \overset{w_3}{\text{lion}}, \overset{w_4}{\text{bear}}, \overset{w_5}{\text{cobra}}, \overset{w_6}{\text{cow}}, \overset{w_7}{\text{frog}}, \dots\}$ *l.d.f.*

	w_1	w_2	w_3	w_4	w_5	w_6	w_7	w_8	w_9	...	$w_{ V }$
dog	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0
cat	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0
lion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0
bear	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	...	0
...

one-hot vector of "cat"

P.g. $|V|=204$

Symbolic Representation of Words — Limitation

"I saw a **cat**."

VS.


"I saw a **kitty**."

cat = [0 0 0 0 ... 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0]

kitty = [0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ... 0 0 0]

orthogonal
word vectors


cat \neq kitty



Symbolic Representation of Words — Limitation

- Problem: **No notion of similarity**

- Words are just labels without meaning
- Different words (syntax) → orthogonal word vectors (even for words with the same/similar meaning)



- Goal: Similar words (meaning) → similar word vectors

- Word vectors no longer just labels but also encode "some" meaning
- Improve basically all NLP tasks!

→ What are good embeddings, and how can we find them?

Distributional Hypothesis

"The meaning of a word is its use in the language."

(Wittgenstein, 1953)

"If A and B have almost identical environments [...], we say they are synonyms"

(Harris, 1954)



"You shall know a word by the company it keeps."

(Firth, 1957)

Quick Quiz

What do you think "**Fasulye**" is?

*I don't think **Fasulye** is already available on Blu-ray.*

*The best part about **Fasulye** was definitely the cast.*

*We're planning to see **Fasulye** on the next weekend.*

*The director of **Fasulye** clearly knew what he was doing.*

A ✓

a movie

B

a dish

C

a city

D (✓)

a show

Outline

- Motivation
- **Sparse Word Embeddings**
 - **Co-occurrence Vectors**
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

A Last Look at the Document-Term Matrix (DTM)

- Word vectors derived from DTM

- Assumption: context of word w
= set of documents containing w
- In principle, valid word vectors

doc. vec.
for d_4

	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5
<i>car</i>	0	0	0.4	0	0.4
<i>cat</i>	0.22	0.29	0	0	0.22
<i>chase</i>	0.22	0.22	0.22	0	0
<i>dog</i>	0.29	0	0	0.29	0.22
<i>sit</i>	0	0	0	0	0.7
<i>tv</i>	0	0	0.4	0.4	0
<i>watch</i>	0	0	0	0.7	0

word vector of "cat"

Quick Quiz: Why is this arguably not
a good choice for a word vector?

Co-Occurrence Vectors

- Basic idea

- Context of a word w = (small) window of words surrounding w
- Count how often a word w occurs with another (w.r.t. the context of w)

context

	w_1	w_2	w_3	...	$w_{ V }$
w_1					
w_2					
w_3					
...					
$w_{ V }$					

→ Term-Context Matrix

The Number of times w_j
was in the context of w_i

c_{ij}

Word vector of w_i


Term-Context Matrix — Toy Example

...has shown that the **movie** rating reflects to overall quality...

...the cast of the **show** turned in a great performance and...

...is to get **nlp** data for ai algorithms on a large scale...

...only with enough data can **ai** find reliable patterns to be effective...



	<i>aardvark</i>	<i>rating</i>	<i>story</i>	<i>data</i>	<i>cast</i>	<i>result</i>	<i>...</i>
<i>movie</i>	0	2	4	0	1	0	
<i>show</i>	0	6	3	0	2	1	
<i>nlp</i>	0	0	1	3	0	4	
<i>ai</i>	0	1	0	5	0	2	

movie \approx *show*

nlp \approx *ai*

Term-Context Matrix

$PMI = 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{independent}$

- Problems with raw counts: Often very skewed e.g. $PMI(\text{New, York}) = 0.8$
 - e.g., “the” and “of” are very frequent, but typically not very discriminative

→ Alternative: Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI)

- Do words w_i and w_j co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$PMI(w_i, w_j) = \log_2 \frac{P(w_i, w_j)}{P(w_i)P(w_j)} \longleftarrow \text{PMI can be } < 0, \text{ but no good intuition for negative values for word vectors}$$

→ Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI)

$$PPMI(w_i, w_j) = \max \left(\log_2 \frac{P(w_i, w_j)}{P(w_i)P(w_j)}, 0 \right)$$

PPMI Matrix — Toy Example


Assume this is the complete term-context matrix

	rating	story	data	cast	result
movie	2	4	0	1	0
show	6	3	0	2	1
nlp	0	1	3	0	4
ai	1	0	5	0	2

$$P(w=movie, c=cast) = 1/35 = 0.03$$

$$P(w=movie) = 7/35 = 0.2$$

$$P(c=cast) = 3/35 = 0.09$$



	rating	story	data	cast	result	P(w)
movie	0.06	0.11	0	0.03	0	0.20
show	0.17	0.09	0	0.06	0.03	0.34
nlp	0	0.03	0.09	0	0.11	0.23
ai	0.03	0	0.14	0	0.06	0.23
P(context)	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.09	0.20	

	rating	story	data	cast	result
movie	0.15	1.32	0	0.74	0
show	0.96	0.13	0	0.96	0
nlp	0	0	0.71	0	1.32
ai	0	0	1.45	0	0.32



$$PPMI(w=movie, c=cast) = \log_2 \frac{0.03}{0.09 \cdot 0.2} = 0.74$$

PPMI Word Vectors — Discussion

- Various refinements to handle (very) rare words

- Raise context probabilities
 - Use Add-1 Smoothing
- } similar effects

sparsity

- Consideration: Sparsity

- Matrix is of size $|V| \times |V|$ ($|V|$ typically between 20k and 50k)
- PPMI word vectors are very sparse (most vector entries are 0)

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - **Basic Idea**
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Why Dense Word Vectors?

- Important practical benefits of dense vectors

- More convenient features: less weights to tune, lower risk of overfitting
- Tend to generalize better than features derived from counts
- Tend to better capture synonymy than sparse vectors

Example sparse vector: [0 0 0 0 0.8 0 0 ... 0 0 0 0 1.2 0 ... 0 0]

(e.g., for the word "actor")

↑
"movie"

↑
"film"

Each word represents a distinct dimension;
fails to capture similarity between words

- Dense vector in practice


- Common dimensions: 100 to 1,000 entries
- Most to all vector elements are non-zero

Dense Word Vectors — Intuition

- Toy example: custom encoding with 2 dimensions
 - Each dimension represent a property shared between words


	furry	dangerous
dog	0.90	0.15
cat	0.85	0.10
lion	0.80	0.95
bear	0.85	0.90
cobra	0.0	0.80
cow	0.75	0.10
frog	0.05	0.05
...

2d word embed.



What about "movie", "dignity", "cake", ...?

Dense Word Vectors — Intuition



$$\cos(\text{frog}, \text{lion}) \approx 1$$

Using suitable similarity metric

- $\text{sim}(w_{\text{lion}}, w_{\text{bear}}) = 1.54$
- $\text{sim}(w_{\text{lion}}, w_{\text{cow}}) = 0.70$

This notion of similarity between words is what we are after!

- Problems with custom encoding

- How to decide on the dimensions?
- How to decide on the values?

Manual assignment simply impractical/impossible!

→ Need for automated methods

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - **Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)**
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Basic Approaches


- Popular alternatives (but not covered here)
 - Singular Value Decomposition (SVD; matrix factorization)
 - Brown Clustering
- Neural Network-based Methods
 - Inspired by (Neural) Language Models
 - Learn embeddings as part of the process of word prediction
 - Typically fast & easy to train
 - In the following: Word2Vec

Word2Vec encompasses 2 network architectures: **CBOW** & **Skip-gram**

Word2Vec: CBOW & Skip-Gram

Continuous Bag of Words (CBOW)


Given context → Predict word



Context = window of words surrounding the middle word


Skip-gram

Given word → Predict context



CBOW — Predicting a Word from Context

"watching funny _____ on netflix"




What seem like good predictions?

across movies ✓
lectures quickly
old clowns
shows ✓ of
stairs cars
cakes ✗ apples ✗

CBOW — Predicting a Word from Context

"watching funny _____ on netflix"




What seem like good predictions?

across movies quickly
lectures old clowns
shows of
stairs cars apples
cakes

Skip-Gram — Predicting a Word from Context

" _____ *movies* _____ "




What seem like good predictions?

funny banana
cinema in street
road ticket boring
lectures seat

Skip-Gram — Predicting a Word from Context

" _____ *movies* _____ "



What seem like good predictions?

funny banana
cinema in
road street
ticket boring
lectures seat

Outline


- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - **Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)**
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Word2Vec — Basic Setup (CBOW & Skip-gram)

- Define two matrices

- $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$ input embedding matrix
- $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |V|}$ output embedding matrix
- Given a word w_i , let $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $u_i \in \mathcal{U}$ be the input and output embedding of w_i

Note that Word2Vec learns 2 embeddings for each word!




Word2Vec — Basic Setup (CBOW & Skip-gram)


- Prediction task: 1 input word w_i , 1 output word w_o (both as one-hot vectors)

- $w_i^T \cdot V \rightarrow v_i$ (note: one-hot vector multiplied with a matrix is just a row "lookup")


- $\text{softmax}(v_i^T \cdot U)$ \rightarrow Probability $P(w|w_i)$ for all $w \in V$



Word2Vec — CBOW (window size $m=2$)



Word2Vec — Skip-Gram (window size $m=2$)



Training Objective — Loss Function

Continuous Bag of Words (CBOW)

$$L = -\log P(w_c \mid \underbrace{w_{c-m}, \dots, w_{c-1}}_{\text{context before } w_c}, \underbrace{w_{c+1}, \dots, w_{c+m}}_{\text{context after } w_c})$$

Sum up vectors of context words (BoW!)

$$= -\log P(u_c \mid \tilde{v}), \text{ with } \tilde{v} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\substack{-m \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq 0}} v_{c+j}$$

"some" aggregate

sum

softmax

$$P(u_c \mid \tilde{v}) = \frac{\exp(u_c^T \cdot \tilde{v})}{\sum_{j=1}^{|V|} \exp(u_j^T \cdot \tilde{v})}$$

\approx

Skip-gram

$$L = -\log P(\underbrace{w_{c-m}, \dots, w_{c-1}, w_{c+1}, \dots, w_{c+m}}_{\text{context}} \mid \underbrace{w_c}_{\text{target}})$$

Utilize conditional independence (BoW!)
+ laws of logarithms

$$= - \sum_{\substack{-m \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq 0}} \log P(u_{c+j} \mid v_c)$$

single word vector

$$P(u_{c+j} \mid v_c) = \frac{\exp(u_{c+j}^T \cdot v_c)}{\sum_{j=1}^{|V|} \exp(u_j^T \cdot v_c)}$$

Training Objective — Intuition

- Main objective for Skip-gram (for CBOW it's just "mirrored")

We want to maximize this

$$P(u_{c+j} \mid v_c) = \frac{\exp(u_{c+j}^T \cdot v_c)}{\sum_{j=1}^{|V|} \exp(u_j^T \cdot v_c)}$$

$P(u_{c+j} \mid v_c)$ larger
↑
Dot product $u_{c+j}^T \cdot v_c$ is higher
↑
Vectors u_{c+j} and v_c are more similar

- Goal of training

- Make vectors of center words close to vectors of their context words

→ Vectors of words with similar contexts will be close

Main goal

Intermediate goal

Getting the Word Embeddings

- Learning \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V}
 - Minimize loss using Gradient Descent (or similar optimization technique)
 - All trainable / learnable parameters are in \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} $\rightarrow \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}\} = \Theta$
- Which are the final embeddings? (recall, both matrices contain embeddings for each word)
 - Use only \mathcal{U}
 - Use only \mathcal{V}
 - Use average of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V}

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - **Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)**
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Word2Vec — Real-World Example (but on a very small scale)

This was a good movie. I really liked it

• Setup & training

- 50k movie reviews from IMDB

(Source: <https://ai.stanford.edu/~amaas/data/sentiment/>)

- Dataset preparation (window size $m=2$)

Now-word removal, lowercase, lemmatization,
consider only 20k most frequent words

Treat all whole dataset as a single string
(i.e., context windows cross sentence boundaries)

"watching funny movie on netflix"

x	y
watch funny on netflix	movie

→ 1 CBOW sample

data

x	y
movie	watch
movie	funny
movie	on
movie	netflix

→ 2m Skip-gram samples

PyTorch implementation of CBOW and Skip-gram

```
5 class CBOW(nn.Module):
6
7     def __init__(self, vocab_size, embed_dim):
8         super(CBOW, self).__init__()
9         self.embeddings = nn.Embedding(vocab_size, embed_dim)
10        self.linear = nn.Linear(embed_dim, vocab_size)
11
12    def forward(self, contexts):
13        x = self.embeddings(contexts)
14        x = x.mean(axis=1)
15        x = self.linear(x)
16        x = F.log_softmax(x, dim=1)
17        return x
```


```
5 class Skipgram(nn.Module):
6
7     def __init__(self, vocab_size, embed_dim):
8         super(Skipgram, self).__init__()
9         self.embeddings = nn.Embedding(vocab_size, embed_dim)
10        self.linear = nn.Linear(embed_dim, vocab_size)
11
12    def forward(self, inputs):
13        x = self.embeddings(inputs)
14        x = self.linear(x)
15        x = F.log_softmax(x, dim=1)
16        return x
```

Word2Vec — Real-World Example



Results for CBOW


T-SNE for dimensionality reduction (300 to 2 dims)



Word2Vec — Real-World Example

Results for Skip-gram

T-SNE for dimensionality reduction (300 to 2 dims)




Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - **Negative Sampling**
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Word2Vec — Negative Sampling

- Observation regarding training performance

- Basic training objective includes a Softmax
- Normalization over entire(!) vocabulary
(to ensure a valid probability distribution of outputs)
- Each sample potentially tweaks all(!) weights
(all elements in embedding matrices \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{U})

$$P(u_{c+j} \mid v_c) = \frac{\exp(u_{c+j}^T \cdot v_c)}{\sum_{j=1}^{|V|} \exp(u_j^T \cdot v_c)}$$


→ **Negative Sampling** (in the following: **SGNS** — Skip-Gram with Negative Sampling)

- Convert training from a word prediction task to a binary classification task

Word2Vec — Negative Sampling

- Negative sampling — illustration

- Window size $m=2$

"watching funny movie on netflix"

Data samples for (basic) Skip-gram

x	y
movie	watch
movie	funny
movie	on
movie	netflix

} $2m$ samples

Data samples for SGNS

x	y
(movie, watch)	1
(movie, funny)	1
(movie, on)	1
(movie, netflix)	1
(movie, cake)	0
(movie, nlp)	0
(movie, soccer)	0
(movie, barely)	0
(movie, cluster)	0
(movie, morpheme)	0
(movie, traffic)	0
(movie, nimble)	0

} $2m$ positive samples

} $2mk$ negative samples

Does this look familiar?

"watch" is a context word of "movie"

"nlp" is NOT a context word of "movie"

In-Lecture Activity ⁹ ^{13.55} (+~~10~~ min break)

- Question: Which negative samples are arguably more useful?
 - Post your solution to the Canvas Discussion

watch movie on reflex

(movie, with)	0
(movie, nlp) ✓	0
(movie, on)	0
(movie, barely)	0
<u>(movie, cluster)</u> ✓	0
(movie, morpheme) ✓	0
(movie, traffic)	0
(movie, the)	0

Word2Vec — Negative Sampling

- Selection of negative samples

- Essentially at random (error of picking a "wrong" negative sample is negligible)
- To increase probability of rare words: Sampling using (α -)weighted unigram frequency

↳ handle sparsity

#occurrences of word w_i

$$P_\alpha(w_i) = \frac{Count(w_i)^\alpha}{\sum_{w \in V} Count(w)^\alpha}$$

Probability of word w_i to be selected as a negative sample

$0 < \alpha \leq 1$

SGNS — Training Objective

$$P(+|c, m) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(u_m^T v_c)}$$

Let's assume this a given mini batch B

(movie, watch)	1
(movie, funny)	1
(movie, on)	1
(movie, netflix)	1
(movie, cake)	0
(movie, nlp)	0
(movie, soccer)	0
(movie, barely)	0
(movie, cluster)	0
(movie, morpheme)	0
(movie, traffic)	0
(movie, nimble)	0

B_{pos}

B_{neg}

$$L = -\log \left[\prod_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} P(+|c, m) \cdot \prod_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} P(-|c, m) \right]$$

$$= -\log \left[\prod_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} P(+|c, m) \cdot \prod_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} (1 - P(+|c, m)) \right]$$

$$= - \left[\sum_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} \log P(+|c, m) + \sum_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} \log (1 - P(+|c, m)) \right]$$

$$\log ab = \log a + \log b$$

SGNS — Training Objective

$$1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a}} = \frac{1 + e^{-a}}{1 + e^{-a}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a}} = \frac{e^{-a}}{1 + e^{-a}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^a}$$

Let's assume this a given mini batch B

(movie, watch)	1	} B_{pos}
(movie, funny)	1	
(movie, on)	1	
(movie, netflix)	1	
(movie, cake)	0	} B_{neg}
(movie, nlp)	0	
(movie, soccer)	0	
(movie, barely)	0	
(movie, cluster)	0	
(movie, morpheme)	0	
(movie, traffic)	0	
(movie, nimble)	0	

$$L = - \left[\sum_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} \log \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-u_m^T v_c)} + \sum_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-u_m^T v_c)} \right) \right]$$

$$= - \left[\sum_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} \log \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-u_m^T v_c)} + \sum_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} \log \frac{1}{1 + \exp(u_m^T v_c)} \right]$$

$$= - \left[\sum_{(c,m) \in B_{pos}} \log \sigma(-u_m^T v_c) + \sum_{(c,m) \in B_{neg}} \log \sigma(u_m^T v_c) \right]$$

SGNS — Parameters

- Sampling method to generate negative samples
 - e.g., subsampling to ignore very frequent words
- Number k of negative samples (per positive sample)
 - $2 \leq k \leq 5$ for large text
 - $5 \leq k \leq 20$ for small text.


Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - **Basic Properties**
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics


Word Embeddings — (Desired) Properties

- Vector differences yield semantic relationships → linear substructures

$$v(\text{king}) - v(\text{man}) + v(\text{woman}) \approx v(\text{queen})$$





$$v(\text{France}) - v(\text{Paris}) + v(\text{Berlin}) \approx v(\text{Germany})$$



Word Embeddings — (Desired) Properties

- Other meaningful linear substructures



Note: Getting these semantic relationships prohibit the use of stemming to lemmatization!

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- **Dense Word Embeddings**
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - **Practical Considerations & Limitations**
- NLP Ethics

Word2Vec — Practical Considerations & Limitations

- Data preprocessing steps

- Choice of tokenizer
- Case-folding (yes/no)
- Stemming/lemmatization (yes/no)
- Stopword removal (yes/no)
- Cross-sentence contexts (yes/no)

- Parameters

- Window size m
- Number of negative samples (e.g., $2mk$ for Skip-gram)

Word2Vec — Practical Considerations & Limitations

- Unable to represent phrases
 - *"New York", "snow cat", "ice cream", "land mine", "hot dog", "disc drive", etc.*
- Unable to handle polysemy and part of speech
 - Polysemy: multiple meanings for the same word
 - Part of speech: the same word used as noun, verb, or adjective

non
verb / noun


adj
verb

```
1 word2vec_wikipedia.wv.most_similar("light", topn=10)
```

```
[('lights', 0.5668156743049622),  
 ('illumination', 0.5530915260314941),  
 ('glow', 0.5415263175964355),  
 ('sunlight', 0.5396571159362793),  
 ('lamp', 0.5024341344833374),  
 ('flame', 0.48772770166397095),  
 ('lamps', 0.47849947214126587),  
 ('dark', 0.4764614701271057),  
 ('luminous', 0.4740492105484009),  
 ('lighting', 0.47177615761756897)]
```

Word2Vec — Practical Considerations & Limitations

- Distributional representation does not capture all semantics
 - Common case: words with opposite polarity (sentiment) → Why?



Word2Vec — Practical Considerations & Limitations

- Embeddings dependent on application / dataset

Dataset: Wikipedia

```
1 word2vec_wikipedia.wv.most_similar("house")
```

```
[('mansion', 0.7079392075538635),  
 ('cottage', 0.6541333198547363),  
 ('farmhouse', 0.6259987950325012),  
 ('barn', 0.5747625827789307),  
 ('bungalow', 0.5724436044692993),  
 ('townhouse', 0.567018449306488),  
 ('houses', 0.5506472587585449),  
 ('parsonage', 0.5426527857780457),  
 ('tavern', 0.5370140671730042),  
 ('summerhouse', 0.5307810306549072)]
```

old-timey

Dataset: Google News

```
1 word2vec_googlenews.wv.most_similar("house")
```

```
[('houses', 0.7072390913963318),  
 ('bungalow', 0.6878559589385986),  
 ('apartment', 0.6628996729850769),  
 ('bedroom', 0.6496936678886414),  
 ('townhouse', 0.6384080052375793),  
 ('residence', 0.6198420524597168),  
 ('mansion', 0.6058192253112793),  
 ('farmhouse', 0.5857570171356201),  
 ('duplex', 0.5757936239242554),  
 ('apartment', 0.5690325498580933)]
```

modern

Word2Vec in Practice

(credits to Google <https://code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec/>)

- Architecture:

- Skip-gram: slower, better for infrequent words
- CBOW (fast)

- Training:

- Hierarchical softmax: better for infrequent words
- Negative sampling: better for frequent words, better with low dimensional vectors

- Sub-sampling of frequent words

- can improve both accuracy and speed for large data sets (useful values are in range $1e-3$ to $1e-5$)

- Dimensionality of the word vectors

- usually more is better, but not always

- Context (window) size

- For skip-gram usually around 10, for CBOW around 5

← empirical observation

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- Dense Word Embeddings
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

NLP Ethics — Why this Topic?

- Real-world NLP applications have real-world impacts
 - Wide range of very common and popular services based on NLP we all use
(online search / information retrieval, machine translation, chatbots, text summarization, etc.)
 - Many NLP applications making decisions affecting people's lives
(e.g., what content we see — or don't see — on social media → Think about it: What is needed for that?)
- Language does not exist in isolation
 - Natural language → humans gave, give, and will give meaning to written and spoken word
 - Humans have different knowledge, beliefs, biases, preconceptions, etc.

*"The common misconception is that language has to do with words and what they mean.
It doesn't. It has to do with people and what they mean."*

(Clark & Schober, 1982)

Dual Use and Adversarial NLP (a.k.a. Malicious NLP)

(Arguably) Useful

Authorship attribution
(NLP/AI meets Linguistic Forensics)

Historical documents,
ransom notes, plagiarism

Text Generation

Fake content detection

User content analysis
social media

Personalized content
and recommendations

Censorship

Censorship evasion

(Potentially) Harmful

Authors of political dissent


Fake content generation

Privacy intrusion,
"over-personalized" content
(e.g., echo chambers / filter bubbles)

More robust censorship

(Unintentionally) Harmful NLP

- Biased humans/society → biased data → biased model
 - NLP models are very likely to pick up such biases
 - Example: machine translation



Hungarian is an example of a gender-neutral language

Biased NLP Technologies

- Biases identified in many NLP tasks/technologies

- Bias in Word Embeddings (Bolukbasi et al. 2017; Caliskan et al. 2017; Garg et al. 2018)
- Bias in Language identification (Blodgett & O'Connor. 2017; Jurgens et al. 2017)
- Bias in Visual Semantic Role Labeling (Zhao et al. 2017)
- Bias in Natural Language Inference (Rudinger et al. 2017)
- Bias in Coreference Resolution (Rudinger et al. 2018; Zhao et al. 2018)
- Bias in Automated Essay Scoring (Amorim et al. 2018)
- Bias in Machine Translation (Prates et al. 2019)

■ Bias in LLMs

Bias in Word Embeddings

- Recall: Desired properties of word embeddings


$$v(\text{king}) - v(\text{man}) + v(\text{woman}) \approx v(\text{queen})$$

$$v(\text{France}) - v(\text{Paris}) + v(\text{Berlin}) \approx v(\text{Germany})$$



job male female job

$$v(\text{programmer}) - v(\text{man}) + v(\text{woman}) \approx v(\text{homemaker})$$



Bias in Sentiment Analysis

- Simple sentiment analysis

- Sentiment lexicon + word embeddings (replace pos/neg words with their pretrained embedding)
- Train a model to predict word sentiments (input: word vectors; target: sentiment label)

Looks alright

```
text_to_sentiment("this example is pretty cool")  
3.889968926086298
```

```
text_to_sentiment("this example is okay")  
2.7997773492425186
```

```
text_to_sentiment("meh, this example sucks")  
-1.1774475917460698
```

Yeah, well...

```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Italian food")  
2.0429166109408983
```


```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Chinese food")  
1.4094033658140972
```

```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Mexican food")  
0.38801985560121732
```

Bias in Sentiment Analysis

- Here: Looking at common first names
 - more specifically: word vectors of names

	sentiment	group
mohammed	0.834974	Arab/Muslim
alya	3.916803	Arab/Muslim
terryl	-2.858010	Black
josé	0.432956	Hispanic
luciana	1.086073	Hispanic
hank	0.391858	White
megan	2.158679	White



In-Lecture Activity (5 min)

- Question: ^{How} ~~Why~~ would you go about avoiding or removing biases in word embeddings?
 - Just brainstorm possible approaches but also try to briefly justify them
 - Post your idea(s) to the Canvas Discussion

```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Italian food")  
2.0429166109408983
```

```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Chinese food")  
1.4094033658140972
```

```
text_to_sentiment("Let's go get Mexican food")  
0.38801985560121732
```

Towards Debiasing — Measuring Bias

- How to check if your word embeddings contain biases?

- Example: gender biases

- Approach: find nearest occupations to "*he*" and "*she*"

(e.g. the word vector for "homemaker" is very close to the word vector of "she")

common female occupations

vs.

common male occupations

Extreme *she*

1. homemaker

2. nurse

3. receptionist

4. librarian

5. socialite

6. hairdresser

7. nanny

8. bookkeeper

9. stylist

10. housekeeper

Extreme *he*

1. maestro

2. skipper

3. protege

4. philosopher

5. captain

6. architect

7. financier

8. warrior

9. broadcaster

10. magician

Towards Debiasing — Measuring Bias

- Identifying biases using analogies

- Approach: Find pairs of words (x, y) that minimize:

to ensure that x and y are
semantically similar "enough"

$$\cosine(v(\textit{she}) - v(\textit{he}), v(x) - v(y)) \quad \text{if } \|v(x) - v(y)\| \leq \delta$$

Gender stereotype she-he analogies

sewing-carpentry	registered nurse-physician	housewife-shopkeeper
nurse-surgeon	interior designer-architect	softball-baseball
blond-burly	feminism-conservatism	cosmetics-pharmaceuticals
giggle-chuckle	vocalist-guitarist	petite-lanky
sassy-snappy	diva-superstar	charming-affable
volleyball-football	cupcakes-pizzas	lovely-brilliant

Gender appropriate she-he analogies

queen-king	sister-brother	mother-father
waitress-waiter	ovarian cancer-prostate cancer	convent-monastery


Towards Debiasing — Identify Gender Subspace

- Which "direction" of the 300-dim embedding space encodes gender?
 - Approach: Pick top pairs of gender words → interpret difference as direction(s) of gender
 - Problem: Language is "messy" → differences point not exactly in the same direction(s)

$\vec{\text{she}} - \vec{\text{he}}$ → some vector
 $\vec{\text{her}} - \vec{\text{his}}$ → some vector
 $\vec{\text{woman}} - \vec{\text{man}}$
 $\vec{\text{Mary}} - \vec{\text{John}}$
 $\vec{\text{herself}} - \vec{\text{himself}}$
 $\vec{\text{daughter}} - \vec{\text{son}}$
 $\vec{\text{mother}} - \vec{\text{father}}$
 $\vec{\text{gal}} - \vec{\text{guy}}$
 $\vec{\text{girl}} - \vec{\text{boy}}$
 $\vec{\text{female}} - \vec{\text{male}}$

Principal Component
Analysis (PCA)

"clean" direction
for gender



Use top PCs (principal components, vectors in the embedding space) as gender subspace

Towards Debiasing — Identify Gender-Neutral Words

- Split vocabulary into gender-neutral words (N) and gender-specific words (S)
 - Manually identify a set of gender-specific words → training data
(we are interesting in N , but there are much more gender-neutral words, so that's easier)
 - Train a binary classifier to predict if a word (vector) is gender-neutral or gender-specific
 - Generate N and S by predicting the class for each word (vector)

she → he
king vs queen

Towards Debiasing — Embedding Transformation

Frobenius norm:

$$\|A\|_F^2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|^2}$$

- Goal: Transform embeddings to remove gender bias

- Idea: Find a transformation matrix T that transforms the embedding matrix W

- Approach: Find T by minimizing

$$\min_T \underbrace{\|(TW)^T(TW) - (W^TW)\|_F^2}_{\substack{\text{inner products of} \\ \text{embeddings \textcolor{blue}{after}} \\ \text{transformation}}} + \lambda \underbrace{\|(TN)^T(T\textcolor{blue}{B})\|_F^2}_{\substack{\text{transformed} \\ \text{gender-neutral} \\ \text{word vectors}}}$$

inner products of embeddings before transformation
transformed gender-subspace

Keep difference (here: Frobenius norm) small — preserve the original embeddings as much as possible!

Minimal if gender subspace removed from vectors of gender-neutral words

$T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ still large

Outline

- Motivation
- Sparse Word Embeddings
 - Co-occurrence Vectors
 - Discussion & Limitations
- Dense Word Embeddings
 - Basic Idea
 - Word2Vec (CBOW & Skipgram)
 - Negative Sampling
 - Basic Properties
 - Practical Considerations & Limitations
- NLP Ethics

Summary

- (Dense) word embeddings

- Core component of many to most NLP applications
(particularly applications based on neural network solutions)
- Dense vectors automatically learned from data
- Support a intuitive notion of similarity between words
(words with similar meanings → words have similar word vectors)

- NLP ethics

- Like with all technologies: **use** and **misuse** (accidentally or maliciously)
- Focus here: biases in word embeddings (due to biases in the data, due to biases in society)

Pre-Lecture Activity for Next Week

- Assigned Task

- Post a 1-2 paragraph answer to the following question in the [Pre-Lecture] discussion
- Watch the panel discussion of the recent Generative AI, Free Speech, & Public Discourse (Available on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/live/BBhewsinQwU?si=ODkIpYiqOCLZh8xD&t=8659>)



Relate an opinion by one of the panelists to the lecture materials presented today. Why did you pick this opinion to highlight and what is your own opinion on it?

Side notes:

- We will talk about this in the next lecture
- You can just copy-&-paste others' answers or use AI Tools, but please consider your original stance and opinion too

Solutions to Quick Quizzes

- Slide 9: A (or maybe D)
 - It should be clear from the example sentences (i.e., the surrounding words)
 - Arguably best indicators: *cast*, *Blu-ray*, *director*
- Slide 11:
 - These word vectors do not reflect the Distributional Hypothesis
 - Here: 2 words are similar if they appear in many shared documents
- Slide 38
 - For example, the words "*scary*" and "*funny*" very similar → bad for sentiment analysis
 - "*scary*" and "*funny*" are similar because they are often used in the same context (movie description)
 - Distributional Hypothesis does not capture all aspects of a word (e.g., polarity)