IN5550: Neural Methods in Natural Language Processing Sub-lecture 5.2 Count-based (explicit) vector semantic models

Andrey Kutuzov

University of Oslo

21 February 2023



Meaning is represented with vectors derived from frequency of word co-occurrences in some corpus.

 $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts (b, c, d...z).

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts  $(b, c, d...z)$ .
- $\triangleright$  Values of components are frequencies of words co-occurrences: ab, ac, ad, etc, resulting in a square 'co-occurence matrix'.

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts  $(b, c, d...z)$ .
- $\triangleright$  Values of components are frequencies of words co-occurrences: ab, ac, ad, etc, resulting in a square 'co-occurence matrix'.
- $\triangleright$  Words are vectors or points in a multi-dimensional 'semantic space'.

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts  $(b, c, d...z)$ .
- $\triangleright$  Values of components are frequencies of words co-occurrences: ab, ac, ad, etc, resulting in a square 'co-occurence matrix'.
- ▶ Words are vectors or points in a multi-dimensional 'semantic space'.
- $\triangleright$  Contexts are axes (dimensions) in this space.

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts  $(b, c, d...z)$ .
- $\triangleright$  Values of components are frequencies of words co-occurrences: ab, ac, ad, etc, resulting in a square 'co-occurence matrix'.
- ▶ Words are vectors or points in a multi-dimensional 'semantic space'.
- $\triangleright$  Contexts are axes (dimensions) in this space.
- $\triangleright$  Dimensions of a word vector are interpretable: they are associated with particular context words...
- $\blacktriangleright$  ...or other types of contexts: documents, sentences, even characters.

- $\triangleright$  Corpus vocabulary is V.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each word *a* is represented with a vector  $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}.$
- $\triangleright$  *a* components are mapped to all other words in V, its contexts  $(b, c, d...z)$ .
- $\triangleright$  Values of components are frequencies of words co-occurrences: ab, ac, ad, etc, resulting in a square 'co-occurence matrix'.
- ▶ Words are vectors or points in a multi-dimensional 'semantic space'.
- $\triangleright$  Contexts are axes (dimensions) in this space.
- $\triangleright$  Dimensions of a word vector are interpretable: they are associated with particular context words...
- $\blacktriangleright$  ...or other types of contexts: documents, sentences, even characters.
- $\triangleright$  Interpretability is an important property of sparse representations (could be employed in the Obligatory 1!).

### 300-D vector of 'tomato'





In this toy example,  $|V| = 300$ . Co-occurrence frequencies are normalized.

### 300-D vector of 'cucumber'





In this toy example,  $|V| = 300$ . Co-occurrence frequencies are normalized.

### 300-D vector of 'philosophy'





### 300-D vector of 'philosophy'





Can we prove that tomatoes are more similar to cucumbers than to philosophy?



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w\textbf{1},w\textbf{2})=\frac{w\textbf{1}\cdot w\textbf{2}}{|w\textbf{1}||w\textbf{2}|}
$$

(dot product of unit-normalized vectors)

(1)

Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w_1, w_2) = \frac{w_1 \cdot w_2}{|w_1||w_2|} \tag{1}
$$

(dot product of unit-normalized vectors)

 $\triangleright$  Similarity lowers as the angle between word vectors grows.



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w_1, w_2) = \frac{w_1 \cdot w_2}{|w_1||w_2|} \tag{1}
$$

- $\triangleright$  Similarity lowers as the angle between word vectors grows.
- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w\mathbf{1},w\mathbf{2}) = \frac{w\mathbf{1} \cdot w\mathbf{2}}{|w\mathbf{1}||w\mathbf{2}|}
$$
(1)



- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the same direction:  $cos = 1$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Vectors are orthogonal:  $cos = 0$



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w\mathbf{1},w\mathbf{2}) = \frac{w\mathbf{1} \cdot w\mathbf{2}}{|w\mathbf{1}||w\mathbf{2}|}
$$
(1)



- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the same direction:  $cos = 1$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors are orthogonal:  $cos = 0$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the opposite directions:  $cos = -1$



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w_1, w_2) = \frac{w_1 \cdot w_2}{|w_1||w_2|} \tag{1}
$$



- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the same direction:  $cos = 1$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors are orthogonal:  $cos = 0$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the opposite directions:  $cos = -1$ cos(tomato*,* philosophy) = 0*.*09



Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w\mathbf{1},w\mathbf{2}) = \frac{w\mathbf{1}\cdot w\mathbf{2}}{|w\mathbf{1}||w\mathbf{2}|}
$$
(1)



- $\triangleright$  Similarity lowers as the angle between word vectors grows.
- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the same direction:  $cos = 1$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors are orthogonal:  $cos = 0$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the opposite directions:  $cos = -1$ cos(tomato*,* philosophy) = 0*.*09  $cos(cuchmber, philosophy) = 0.16$

Semantic similarity between words is measured by the cosine of the angle between their corresponding vectors (takes values from -1 to 1).

$$
cos(w\mathbf{1},w\mathbf{2}) = \frac{w\mathbf{1}\cdot w\mathbf{2}}{|w\mathbf{1}||w\mathbf{2}|}
$$
(1)

(dot product of unit-normalized vectors)



- $\triangleright$  Similarity lowers as the angle between word vectors grows.
- $\triangleright$  Similarity grows as the angle lessens.
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the same direction:  $cos = 1$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors are orthogonal:  $cos = 0$
- $\triangleright$  Vectors point at the opposite directions:  $cos = -1$

cos(tomato*,* philosophy) = 0*.*09  $cos(cuchmber, philosophy) = 0.16$ cos(tomato*,* cucumber) = 0*.*66

**Question: why not simply use dot product?**

If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

**Hippocampus** (English Wikipedia co-occurrences):



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

**Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

1. cortex 0.83



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82
- 3. cerebellum 0.78



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82
- 3. cerebellum 0.78
- 4. neuron 0.76



If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82
- 3. cerebellum 0.78
- 4. neuron 0.76
- 5. gyrus 0.75

6. ...

(these words have the same co-occurrences as 'hippocampus')





If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82
- 3. cerebellum 0.78
- 4. neuron 0.76
- 5. gyrus 0.75

6. ...



(these words have the same

co-occurrences as 'hippocampus')

These lists themselves describe the 'hippocampus' meaning to a large extent.

If one can measure similarity between words, one can rank words by similarity to a target word!

Nearest semantic associates/neighbors

### **Hippocampus**

(English Wikipedia co-occurrences):

- 1. cortex 0.83
- 2. amygdala 0.82
- 3. cerebellum 0.78
- 4. neuron 0.76
- 5. gyrus 0.75

6. ...

amygdala hippocampus hypothalamus brainste cortex caraballum neuron

(these words have the same

co-occurrences as 'hippocampus') These lists themselves describe the 'hippocampus' meaning to a large extent. **Question: what do the edges in the graph denote?**

### Curse of dimensionality

 $\blacktriangleright$  In explicit count-based models, we can end up with very high-dimensional vectors (the size of vocabulary).

- $\blacktriangleright$  In explicit count-based models, we can end up with very high-dimensional vectors (the size of vocabulary).
- $\blacktriangleright$  These vectors are very sparse.

- $\blacktriangleright$  In explicit count-based models, we can end up with very high-dimensional vectors (the size of vocabulary).
- $\blacktriangleright$  These vectors are very sparse.
- $\triangleright$  One can reduce vector sizes to some reasonable values, and still preserve meaningful relations between them.

- In explicit count-based models, we can end up with very high-dimensional vectors (the size of vocabulary).
- $\blacktriangleright$  These vectors are very sparse.
- $\triangleright$  One can reduce vector sizes to some reasonable values, and still preserve meaningful relations between them.
	- $\triangleright$  e.g., by factorizing the co-occurrence matrix, using PCA or other dimensionality reduction techniques.

- In explicit count-based models, we can end up with very high-dimensional vectors (the size of vocabulary).
- $\blacktriangleright$  These vectors are very sparse.
- $\triangleright$  One can reduce vector sizes to some reasonable values, and still preserve meaningful relations between them.
	- $\triangleright$  e.g., by factorizing the co-occurrence matrix, using PCA or other dimensionality reduction techniques.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Can even reduce to the dimensionality of 2 or 1.
- $\triangleright$  Such reduced 'implicit' vectors are usually dense and have much more rights to be called 'word embeddings'.
- $\triangleright$  NB: still nothing 'neural' or 'deep' here!

An extreme case: 2-dimensional word embeddings:



High-dimensional word vectors reduced to 2 dimensions by the t-SNE algorithm

[\[Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008\]](#page-49-0)

An extreme case: 2-dimensional word embeddings:



High-dimensional word vectors reduced to 2 dimensions by the t-SNE algorithm

[\[Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008\]](#page-49-0)

Vector components  $(x \text{ and } y)$  are not directly interpretable any more, of course. An 'explicit' model turned to an 'implicit' one. Semantic information is distributed across the remaining dimensions.



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

### How to construct a count-based model

1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;
- 3. factorize the matrix with singular value decomposition (SVD) or Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality to  $d \ll |V|$ .



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;
- 3. factorize the matrix with singular value decomposition (SVD) or Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality to  $d \ll |V|$ .
- 4. Semantically similar words are still represented with similar vectors...



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;
- 3. factorize the matrix with singular value decomposition (SVD) or Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality to  $d \ll |V|$ .
- 4. Semantically similar words are still represented with similar vectors...
- 5. …but the matrix is no longer square, the number of columns is  $d$  and each row  $\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathbb{R}^{d}$ .
- 6. The word vectors are now dense and small: embedded in the  $d$ -dimensional space.



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

### How to construct a count-based model

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;
- 3. factorize the matrix with singular value decomposition (SVD) or Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality to  $d \ll |V|$ .
- 4. Semantically similar words are still represented with similar vectors...
- 5. …but the matrix is no longer square, the number of columns is  $d$  and each row  $\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathbb{R}^{d}$ .
- 6. The word vectors are now dense and small: embedded in the  $d$ -dimensional space.

For more details, see [\[Bullinaria and Levy, 2007\]](#page-49-1) and [\[Goldberg, 2017\]](#page-49-2).



Distributional models of this kind are known as count-based: Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), etc.

### How to construct a count-based model

- 1. compile full co-occurrence matrix on the corpus;
- 2. scale absolute frequencies with positive point-wise mutual information (PPMI) association measure;
- 3. factorize the matrix with singular value decomposition (SVD) or Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality to  $d \ll |V|$ .
- 4. Semantically similar words are still represented with similar vectors...
- 5. …but the matrix is no longer square, the number of columns is  $d$  and each row  $\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathbb{R}^{d}$ .
- 6. The word vectors are now dense and small: embedded in the  $d$ -dimensional space.

For more details, see [\[Bullinaria and Levy, 2007\]](#page-49-1) and [\[Goldberg, 2017\]](#page-49-2). But where is machine learning and neural networks? See sub-lecture 5.3! <span id="page-49-1"></span>F Bullinaria, J. A. and Levy, J. P. (2007).

Extracting semantic representations from word co-occurrence statistics: A computational study.

Behavior research methods, 39(3):510–526.

<span id="page-49-2"></span>Goldberg, Y. (2017). 冨 Neural network methods for natural language processing. Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies, 10(1):1–309.

<span id="page-49-0"></span>Van der Maaten, L. and Hinton, G. (2008). 讀 Visualizing data using t-SNE. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 9(2579-2605):85.