

Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Heidelberg

arXiv:2007.16006v1 [cs.CL] 23 Jul 2020

Master Thesis in Physics
submitted by

Lucas Rettenmeier

born in Aalen (Germany)

2020

Word Embeddings

Stability and Semantic Change

This Master Thesis has been carried out by Lucas Rettenmeier at the
Heidelberg Institute for Theoretical Studies under the supervision of
Prof. Dr. Michael Strube and Prof. Dr. Fred Hamprecht.

Abstract

Word embeddings are computed by a class of techniques within *natural language processing* (NLP), that create continuous vector representations of words in a language from a large text corpus. The stochastic nature of the training process of most embedding techniques can lead to surprisingly strong instability, i.e. subsequently applying the same technique to the same data twice, can produce entirely different results (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Wendlandt et al., 2018). In this work, we present an experimental study on the instability of the training process of three of the most influential embedding techniques of the last decade: **word2vec** (Mikolov et al., 2013), **GloVe** (Pennington et al., 2014) and **fastText** (Bojanowski et al., 2016). Based on the experimental results, we propose a statistical model to describe the instability of embedding techniques and introduce a novel metric to measure the instability of the representation of an individual word. Finally, we propose a method to minimize the instability – by computing a modified average over multiple runs – and apply it to a specific linguistic problem: The detection and quantification of *semantic change*, i.e. measuring changes in the meaning and usage of words over time.

Zusammenfassung

Word-Embeddings sind das Ergebnis einer Klasse von Methoden in der Computerlinguistik, mit denen kontinuierliche Vektordarstellungen von Wörtern einer Sprache aus einem großen Textcorpus konstruiert werden. Die stochastische Natur der Trainingsprozesse dieser Methoden kann zu überraschend großer Instabilität führen, das heißt, die zweimalige Anwendung einer Methode auf einen Textcorpus kann stark variierende Ergebnisse liefern (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Wendlandt et al., 2018). In dieser Arbeit präsentieren wir eine experimentelle Studie zur Instabilität der Trainingsprozesse drei der bedeutendsten Word-Embedding Methoden des letzten Jahrzehnts: **word2vec** (Mikolov et al., 2013), **GloVe** (Pennington et al., 2014) und **fast-Text** (Bojanowski et al., 2016). Auf Basis der experimentellen Resultate entwickeln wir ein statistisches Modell zur Beschreibung der Instabilität der Methoden und führen eine neue Metrik zur Messung der Instabilität der Vektordarstellung einzelner Worte ein. Schließlich erarbeiten wir ein Verfahren, um die Instabilität zu minimieren: Das Bilden eines modifizierten Mittelwerts über mehrere Trainingsläufe. Abschließend wird dieses Verfahren auf eine spezifische linguistische Problemstellung angewandt: Bedeutungswandel – das heißt Änderungen in der Bedeutung und Nutzung von Wörtern – zu erkennen und zu messen.

Contents

1	Prerequisites	1
1.1	Notation	1
1.2	Experimental Setup	2
1.2.1	Embedding Techniques	2
1.2.2	Corpora	8
1.2.3	Implementation	12
1.2.4	Comparison to Baseline on Word Analogy Tasks	12
1.2.5	Historical Corpora	15
2	The Stability of Word Embeddings	18
2.1	The Random Nature of Word Embedding Techniques	20
2.1.1	Random Orientation of Embedding Spaces	21
2.1.2	Rotation-Invariant Quantities	22
2.1.3	Distribution of the Cosine Similarity of Two Arbitrary Embeddings	22
2.2	Measuring Distances Between Embedding Spaces	28
2.2.1	Requirements for a Distance Metric	28
2.2.2	Nearest-Neighbor Based Approaches	29
2.2.3	Global Distance Metrics	41
2.3	Understanding the Instability	49
2.3.1	Instability of Individual Words	56
3	Minimizing the Instability	61
3.1	Model and Parameter Choices	61
3.2	Sample Average over Multiple Embedding Spaces	67

3.2.1	A Meaningful Average of Two Embedding Spaces	67
3.2.2	Increasing the Sample Size	72
3.2.3	Influence of Averaging on Stability and Quality	73
4	Semantic Change	79
4.1	Semantic Change Detection	80
4.2	Laws of Semantic Change	85
5	Discussion	91
A	<i>Supporting Content</i>	xi
A.1	<i>Minimum Sample Size to Evaluate the Consistency of $p_{@n}$</i>	xi
A.2	<i>Reducing the Complexity of the Prediction of $p_{@n}$</i>	xiii
A.3	<i>Probability of One Normally Distributed Random Variable to be Larger Than Another</i>	xiv
A.4	<i>Comparison of the Prediction and Observation of $p_{@n}$</i>	xv
A.5	<i>Prediction of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for $n > 1$</i>	xviii

Introduction

In the 1950s, linguists like Joos (1950), Harris (1954) and Firth (1957), formulated the *distributional hypothesis* – the idea, that words that frequently occur in the same contexts tend to have similar meanings. This was popularized by Firth’s claim “a word is characterized by the company it keeps”, which is widely accepted by linguists today.

Vector semantics, a key area within NLP research in the last decades, is based on this hypothesis: The aim is to learn representations, usually in the form of real-valued d -dimensional vectors, of the meaning of individual words (also called *embeddings* or *word vectors*) from their distributions in (large) text corpora. The first techniques to produce dense vectors that represent the meaning of words were introduced by Deerwester et al. (1989), and shortly later recast as **LSA**: Latent semantic analysis (Deerwester et al., 1990).

More than a decade later, Bengio et al. (2003) applied a neural network model, using the back-propagation technique of Rumelhart et al. (1986) to statistical language modelling, specifically, to the task of predicting a word given the two words to the left and to the right. too this approach, one does not only obtain the language model, but also the parameters of the model – dense word representations – that may be used for other, potentially unrelated, tasks. The approach was further improved by Bengio and Lecun (2007), Collobert and Weston (2008) and Mnih and Hinton (2009), but it took another decade before word embeddings started to rise to the level of relevance they inhibit today.

Research interest grew rapidly after (Mikolov et al., 2013) published a neural network-based model, called **word2vec**, that allowed very efficient training hence enabled the use of training corpora up to a size of 10^{11} words. Mikolov et al. (2013c) made the somewhat surprising observation, that these

distributed representations capture syntactic and semantic regularities in linear relationships. For example, the vector operation:

$$\vec{v}(\text{king}) - \vec{v}(\text{man}) + \vec{v}(\text{woman}) \quad (1)$$

yields a vector that is closer to the representation of **queen** than of any other word.

Thereafter, numerous models inspired by the approach of Mikolov et al. (2013) were published: Pennington et al. (2014) developed **GloVe**, a count-based method with a similar optimization objective to **word2vec**, which according to the authors, leverages the statistical information more efficiently than the prediction-based, neural network models. More recently, Bojanowski et al. (2016) introduced **fastText**, applying the **word2vec** model to sub-word structures (character- n -grams), instead of words.

This surge in research interest was accompanied and driven by an increasing number of downstream NLP applications that were found to benefit from the use of embeddings. Today, Jurafsky and Martin (2019) go as far as to say: “These representations are used in every NLP application that makes use of meaning”. A few prominent examples are text classification (Sebastiani, 2002; Lilleberg et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2015a), question answering (Tellex et al., 2003; Yih et al., 2014), named entity recognition (Katharina Sienčnik, 2015; Habibi et al., 2017) and information retrieval (Manning et al., 2008; Zuccon et al., 2015).

Today, contextualized embeddings like **ELMo** (Peters et al., 2018) and **BERT** (Devlin et al., 2018) – neural network-based models, that calculate the conditional representation of a word given its context – outperform the earlier models mentioned above on most tasks. One of the main advantages of these models is the ability to differentiate between different word senses of a homonym, e.g. the representation of the word **bank** will be vastly different for the two contexts listed below:

Context 1: He is sitting on the bank of the river.

Context 2: She made a deposit at the bank earlier this morning.

Non-contextualized embedding techniques, on the other hand, assign the same representation to the word **bank** in both contexts.

One task where non-contextualized word embeddings – despite their shortcomings – are still widely used today is the detection and measurement of *semantic change*, i.e. how the meaning of words changes over time (Tang, 2018; Kutuzov et al., 2018; Tahmasebi et al., 2018). Hamilton et al. (2016b) used **word2vec** embeddings, trained on historical corpora to derive statistical laws of semantic change, e.g. that less frequently used words tend to have higher rates of semantic change than more frequently used ones, but Dubossarsky et al. (2017) contested these findings and argued, that they are actually artifacts of the inherent instability of the embedding techniques.

The problem of the instability of embedding techniques, i.e. the variance between two models that are subsequently trained with the same technique on the same training corpus, was raised repeatedly in the last years (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Wendlandt et al., 2018). However, we found little research on how to minimize the instability and prevent the issues that are caused by it.

In this work, we examine the instability of different techniques for the training of non-contextualized word embeddings, propose a method to create more stable embeddings and apply our findings to the evaluation of semantic change in different languages.

In Chapter 1 the embedding techniques and text corpora that are relevant for our experiments, as well as conventions on notation are introduced.

In Chapter 2 we present the – to our knowledge – largest study to date on the stability of non-contextualized word embeddings: We performed experiments on three of the most popular methods for non-contextualized word embeddings in recent years (**word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText**), by performing multiple subsequent training runs on Wikipedia corpora in seven languages with numerous configurations – training more than 10,000 models in total. We were able to describe the resulting variability accurately with a simple statistical model and introduce a novel measure to quantify the distance between word embeddings, that circumvents several problems of the approaches used in most of the previous work. Finally, we propose a novel distinction between two types of instability, that yields insights on the internal structure of the different embedding techniques.

In Chapter 3 the influence of the choice of the embedding technique as well as hyper-parameter settings on the instability is described, before we propose a novel approach to reduce the instability of the embeddings – by averaging over aligned samples – that is supported by the statistical model introduced in Chapter 2 and delivered promising results in our experiments.

Finally, we apply this novel approach to two different problems in the context of semantic change – outlined in Chapter 4: Firstly, task 1 of the SemEval 2020 Workshop (Schlechtweg et al., 2020), where our best submission ranks 7th and 6th out of 34 participating teams, on the two sub-tasks respectively. And secondly, we used the instability-reducing approach to differentiate between true semantic change on a large historical corpus and the artifacts found by Dubossarsky et al. (2017) to confirm the *law of conformity* proposed by Hamilton et al. (2016b).

Chapter 1

Prerequisites

In this chapter, we introduce the embedding techniques and text corpora that are relevant for our experiments; as well as the conventions on notation that are used in this work.

1.1 Notation

- The *vocabulary*, i.e. the set of all words for which the respective model contains a representation is written as \mathcal{V} , and its size as $|\mathcal{V}| =: v$. If we refer to any word of the vocabulary, it is spelled in typewriter font, e.g. `cat`.
- Lowercase letters with arrows, like $\vec{u}, \vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ refer to row vectors of *dimension* d . A model represents every word $w \in \mathcal{V}$ of the vocabulary as a *word embedding* (or word vector) of this shape.
- We use *bold capital letters to denote matrices*, like an embedding space $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times d}$, i.e. the stack of embeddings (row vectors) of all words of the vocabulary, or a matrix-transformation $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.
- *Corpora*, i.e. collections of texts, including the specific preprocessing that was applied to them, are denoted as \mathcal{C} .
- *Embedding techniques*, like **word2vec**, **GloVe** or **fastText**, along with all the respective choices for the free parameters of these techniques are

denoted as \mathcal{T} .

- We use Greek capital letters for *probability distributions*; the Normal distribution is denoted as \mathcal{N} .
- Bold lowercase letters are used for *distance metrics* \mathbf{d} , which capture the difference between the embeddings of a word w in the two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j .

1.2 Experimental Setup

1.2.1 Embedding Techniques

All results and findings described below are based on the following experimental setup: We chose three of the most influential techniques for non-contextualized word embeddings in the last decade, namely **word2vec** (Mikolov et al., 2013b), **GloVe** (Pennington et al., 2014) and **fastText** (Bojanowski et al., 2016). As outlined in Table 1.1, these models cover three distinct classes of embedding techniques. For every technique, we used the latest implementations provided by the original authors. All models were trained with the default parameters¹ and a 300-dimensional embedding space.

Trained on	Count-Based	Prediction-Based
Words	GloVe (2014)	word2vec (2013)
Sub-Words		fastText (2016)

Table 1.1: Classification of the three different models for non-contextualized word embeddings that were used within the scope of this work. As one can see, all three models have distinct and qualitatively different characteristics.

¹For **word2vec** and **fastText**, the **skip-gram** setting was used. For **fastText**, one change was made to the default parameters: The initial learning rate **lr** was set to 0.1, as we found this setting to increase the score on word analogy tasks for most evaluated languages. And finally, when training **GloVe** on the English corpus, we had to restrict the number of iterations to 25, due to technical limitations.

1.2.1.1 word2vec

As mentioned before, the introduction of **word2vec** by Mikolov et al. (2013) lead to a surge of interest within NLP research in the distributed representations of words, or word embeddings.² The approach of Mikolov et al. (2013) – because of its model architecture – is far more efficient in the training of the embeddings than earlier prediction-based techniques, like the ones developed by Bengio et al. (2003) or Collobert and Weston (2008), hence enabling the use of larger training corpora, up to a size of 10^{11} words. This is reflected in a significant increase in the quality of the embeddings, compared to the earlier methods – as measured on word analogy and similarity tasks – and contributed to the increasing use of the representations in “every NLP application that makes use of meaning” (Jurafsky and Martin, 2019).

Mikolov et al. (2013) introduced two distinct flavors of the **word2vec** model: Continuous bag-of-words and skip-gram. We focus on the latter, since it was more commonly featured in previous work on instability and semantic change (Hamilton et al., 2016b; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018). The model architecture is illustrated in Figure 1.1: The input embedding $\vec{v}_i(w_t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the target word w_t is used to *predict* its context, i.e. the output embeddings $\vec{v}_o(w_{t+j}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the surrounding words, hence the model is classified as *prediction-based* (see Table 1.1).

The training of the input and output embeddings – which is based on iterating over all words of the corpus – is illustrated in Figure 1.1. For any pair³ of target word w_t and context word w_{t+j} the training objective is to *maximize the logarithm of the predicted probability* $p(w_{t+j} | w_t)$ to observe w_{t+j} in the context of w_t , which Mikolov et al. (2013) define – in the basic formulation of the model – as the normalized exponential function (*softmax*) of the dot product of the two embeddings:

$$p(w_{t+j} | w_t) = \frac{\exp[\vec{v}_o(w_{t+j}) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_t)^\top]}{\sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} \exp[\vec{v}_o(w) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_t)^\top]} \quad (1.1)$$

²Later, similar models were used to obtain representations of n -grams, byte-pairs, sentences and documents.

³The number of context words per target word, i.e. the size of the context is an adjustable parameter of the model. Typically, the $c = 5$ words before and after the target word are used.




Figure 1.1: Illustration of the skip-gram model architecture introduced by Mikolov et al. (2013). In the example, the input embedding $\vec{v}_i(w_t)$ of the target word w_t (**=sat**) is used to *predict* its context, i.e. the output embeddings $\vec{v}_o(w_{t+j})$ of the surrounding words. At any training step, the input and output embeddings are updated with the objective of maximizing $\log p(w_{t+j} | w_t)$.

However, since the evaluation of the denominator in the equation above requires calculating $v = |\mathcal{V}|$ vector products, this approach is computationally very expensive. The authors provide two more efficient alternatives to approximate $p(w_{t+j} | w_t)$: *Hierarchical softmax* and *negative sampling*. As mentioned above, all models in our experiments were trained with the default parameters, hence negative sampling was used. This is a modification of the *noise contrastive estimation* introduced by Gutmann and Hyvärinen (2012): The term $\sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} \exp [\vec{v}_o(w) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_t)^\top]$ in Equation (1.1) is estimated by randomly drawing k “noise words” from the vocabulary. With typical values of $5 \leq k \leq 25$, this approach is several orders of magnitude faster than the softmax approach. The optimization objective for every training step of the negative sampling model is to maximize the following expression (in this context, σ refers to the sigmoid function):

$$\log \sigma [\vec{v}_o(w_{t+j}) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_t)^\top] + \sum_{n=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{w_n \sim P_n(w)} \{ \log \sigma [-\vec{v}_o(w_n) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_t)^\top] \} \quad (1.2)$$

The second term is calculated by drawing k noise words w_n from the vocabulary, according to the noise distribution $P_n(w)$: The unigram distribution raised to the power $3/4$.⁴

Another measure introduced by the authors to improve the training efficiency is the *sub-sampling* of frequent words: Any appearance of a word w in the training corpus, whose frequency $f(w)$ exceeds a threshold t (typically $t \approx 10^{-5}$) is discarded with the probability $p_d(w)$:

$$p_d(w) = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{t}{f(w)}} \quad (1.3)$$

Apart from accelerating the training process, Mikolov et al. (2013) found this setting to significantly improve the quality of the learned embeddings of rare words.

Finally, after the training – which generally consists of several epochs over the full corpus with a continuously decreasing learning rate – is completed, the embedding $\vec{v}(w) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of any word w is defined as:

$$\vec{v}(w) := \vec{v}_i(w) \quad (1.4)$$

⁴Mikolov et al. (2013) found this shape of the noise distribution to significantly outperforms other conceivable approaches.

The output embeddings $\vec{v}_o(w)$ are discarded.

1.2.1.2 GloVe

Pennington et al. (2014) argued, that the **word2vec** technique presented above, poorly utilizes statistical information of the training corpus, since the embeddings are trained subsequently on word-context pairs, instead of global co-occurrence counts, such as methods like latent semantic analysis (**LSA**), introduced by Deerwester et al. (1990). However, given the desirable vector space properties of the **word2vec** embeddings, manifested in the best performance on word analogy and word similarity tasks of all techniques at the time, they proposed a global regression model with a similar optimization objective to the one used by Mikolov et al. (2013) and called it *Global Vectors for Word Representation* (**GloVe**).

In the first step, the global word-word co-occurrence matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{N}^{v \times v}$ is constructed from the training corpus, where the entry X_{kl} corresponds to the number of times the word w_l appears in the context of the target word w_k .⁵

The optimization objective of the technique is to minimize the following expression:

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^v f(X_{kl}) [\vec{v}_i(w_k) \cdot \vec{v}_o(w_l)^\top + b_i(w_k) + b_o(w_l) - \log X_{kl}]^2 \quad (1.5)$$

Where – similarly to **word2vec** – $\vec{v}_i(w_k)$ and $\vec{v}_o(w_l)$ refer to the input and output embeddings of the word w respectively; $b_i(w_k)$ and $b_o(w_l)$ are word-dependent bias terms. Pennington et al. (2014) define the *weighting function* $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as:

$$f = \begin{cases} (x/x_{\max})^\alpha & \text{if } x < x_{\max} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

With typical values of $x_{\max} = 100$ and $\alpha = 3/4$. Since $f(0) = 0$, this function allows zero entries in the co-occurrence matrix that correspond to $\log X_{kl} \rightarrow \infty$. In similar approaches like **LSA**, that do not have a weighting function, an artificial offset must be added to \mathbf{X} instead.

⁵In our experiments, a context of 15 words to the left and 15 words to the right of the target word, was used.

Intuitively, Equation (1.5) means, that we minimize $[\vec{v}_i(w_k) \cdot \vec{v}_o(w_l)^\top - \log X_{kl}]$ while allowing for a fixed bias per word and allowing larger deviations for pairs with fewer than x_{\max} co-occurrences.

Technically, the adaptive gradient method introduced by Duchi et al. (2011) is used to solve the optimization problem, considering only non-zero elements of \mathbf{X} , to obtain the embeddings $\vec{v}_i(w)$ and $\vec{v}_o(w)$ for every word $w \in \mathcal{V}$.

Finally, given that Equation (1.5) is invariant under the exchange of k and l , we expect the input and output embeddings to coincide – apart from random fluctuations. Hence, the authors define the vector representation $\vec{v}(w) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of any word w as:

$$\vec{v}(w) := \vec{v}_i(w) + \vec{v}_o(w) \quad (1.7)$$

1.2.1.3 fastText

The **fastText** technique, developed by Bojanowski et al. (2016) is based on the skip-gram model with negative sampling, introduced in Section 1.2.1.1. The authors claim, that one of the main limitations of this – and other popular models – is that they ignore the morphology of words, by assigning a distinct vector to each word. Hence, they propose to represent each word as a bag of character- n -grams, and to train vector representations of these character- n -grams. Compared to the conventional skip-gram model, the modified approach comes with faster training times, allows to compute representations for words that did not appear in the training data and achieves slightly higher scores on most word analogy tasks (Bojanowski et al., 2016).

In the model, each word w of the vocabulary is represented by a set of tokens $\mathcal{Z}(w)$ that contains all character- n -grams with $n_l \leq n \leq n_u$, as well as the word itself. The boundary symbols $<$ and $>$ are added to the beginning and end of the word to distinguish prefixes and suffixes. Taking the word **chair** as an example, with $n_l = 3$ and $n_u = 4$, the representation looks like this:

$$\text{chair} \rightarrow \underbrace{\{<\text{ch}, \text{cha}, \text{hai}, \text{air}, \text{ir}>\}}_{n=3 \text{ grams}}, \underbrace{\{\text{cha}, \text{chai}, \text{hair}, \text{air}>\}}_{n=4 \text{ grams}}, \underbrace{\{<\text{chair}>\}}_{\text{word}}$$

In practice, $n_l = 3$ and $n_u = 6$ are most commonly used. The representation $\vec{v}(w)$ of a word w is then defined as the sum of the vector representations $\vec{z}(g)$

of all n -grams $g \in \mathcal{Z}(w)$:

$$\vec{v}(w) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{Z}(w)} \vec{z}(g) \quad (1.8)$$

The training is similar to the skip-gram approach, with the same optimization objective – outlined in Equation (1.2). However, the calculation of the product of two word embeddings $\vec{v}_o(w_1)$ and $\vec{v}_i(w_2)$ is based on their sub-word embeddings:

$$\vec{v}_o(w_1) \cdot \vec{v}_i(w_2)^\top = \sum_{g_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(w_1)} \sum_{g_2 \in \mathcal{Z}(w_2)} \vec{z}_o(g_1) \cdot \vec{z}_i(g_2)^\top \quad (1.9)$$

And after every training step, the sub-word embeddings $\vec{z}_o(g)$ and $\vec{z}_i(g)$ are updated, instead of $\vec{v}_o(w)$ and $\vec{v}_i(w)$, as in the model of Mikolov et al. (2013).

As mentioned above, this technique allows to obtain representations of words that did not occur in the training data, by calculating the sum over the respective character- n -grams. However – to ensure comparability with the word-based approaches – we did not make use of this functionality in our experiments.

1.2.2 Corpora

All our experiments on the stability of word embeddings, are based on models trained on Wikipedia corpora in one of seven different languages. Wikipedia is the largest free online encyclopaedia, available in more than 200 different languages. Because the articles are curated, high text quality is ensured. Please refer to Table 1.1 for a list of the languages along with the sizes of the respective corpora and vocabularies. Apart from English, which is a natural choice, the languages were selected based on two criteria:

- (I) Firstly, as one would naturally expect and Antoniak and Mimno (2018) have claimed, smaller corpora tend to be less stable than larger ones. Furthermore, we are interested in detecting semantic change over time, hence we need to train word embeddings for specific epochs, for which there are often only comparatively small corpora available. Therefore, the focus of our investigations is on languages with a limited size of training data.

- (II) Secondly, to ensure the validity of our preprocessing and training setup, we want to compare the quality of our embeddings in any language against published baselines. Word analogy tasks, i.e. datasets composed of word 4-tuples of the form *Man : Woman :: King : Queen* have become the de facto standard to evaluate the quality of non-contextualized word embeddings in recent years.

Hence, we selected the languages with the smallest sized Wikipedia, for which an analogy dataset as well as a baseline score for at least one of the three embedding techniques used in this work, which was trained on a comparable corpus, has been published.

Language	Shortcut	Tokens $[\times 10^6]$	Vocabulary $[\times 10^4]$
Hindi	HI	48	19
Finnish	FI	155	97
Chinese	ZH	215	96
Czech	CS	225	85
Polish	PL	469	137
Portuguese	PT	489	87
English	EN	4501	398

Table 1.2: Outline of the seven different Wikipedia corpora used to train word embeddings. The XML Wikipedia dumps that were used in our experiments were created on the 1st of September 2019. The most current ones can be obtained from <https://dumps.wikimedia.org/>. As per the default settings of our embedding models, only words with five or more occurrences are included in the vocabulary.

1.2.2.1 Preprocessing

As explained in more detail in Section 1.2.4, the scores published by Grave et al. (2018) are used as a baseline on the word analogy tasks for any language apart from English. To ensure that the scores are comparable, we follow the preprocessing pipeline outlined in their work, which consists of three steps:

Text Extraction The text content of the XML Wikipedia dumps is extracted

with a modified version of Matt Mahoney’s `wikifil.pl` script⁶. The most notable deviation from the original script is the following: Letters are not lowercased, which means in practice that capitalized and non-capitalized occurrences of a word (e.g. `The` and `the`) are presented to the embedding models as two distinct tokens.

Deduplication The second step of the pipeline comprises the removal of duplicate lines from the data. We used the tool published by Grave et al. (2018), which computes a hash of each line and removes all lines with identical hashes.⁷ Overall, around 20% of the data is removed in this step.

Tokenization Finally, the de-duplicated text data is tokenized. We used the Stanford word segmenter (Chang et al., 2008) for Chinese, the ICU tokenizer for Hindi, and the tokenizer from the Europarl preprocessing tools (Koehn, 2005) for the remaining languages.

1.2.2.2 Repeated Runs with Random Document Sampling

Finally, as we want to understand the nature of the random processes in the training of word embeddings, every model in every language was trained at least 128 times for three different types of document sampling. The three sampling methods *fixed*, *shuffled* and *bootstrapped*, which were introduced to this scope by Antoniak and Mimno (2018) are outlined in Table 1.3.

⁶<http://mattmahoney.net/dc/textdata.html>.

⁷While this approach might – in theory – lead to non-duplicate lines being deleted, the small probability associated with an incident of this sort means that the quality of the embeddings is not impaired.

Method	Description	Run 1	Run 2
fixed	Documents are sampled in <i>fixed</i> order, the variability of the resulting word embeddings is a result of the inherent random processes of the respective technique.	$d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3$	$d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3$
shuffled	Documents are randomly <i>shuffled</i> , to measure the influence of the document order on the variability of the embeddings.	$d_1 \ d_3 \ d_2$	$d_2 \ d_1 \ d_3$
boot-strapped	Documents are randomly sampled with replacement, to observe the variability due to the presence of individual documents.	$d_3 \ d_2 \ d_3$	$d_2 \ d_2 \ d_1$

Table 1.3: To examine the random nature of the different embedding techniques, we trained every model in every language at least 128 times for the three different types of document sampling listed above. This allows us to measure the influence of the document order, as well as the presence of individual documents on the variability of the resulting embeddings.

1.2.3 Implementation

We wrote a Python module to store, compare, and analyse word embedding spaces independent of the underlying technique. For the training, the original implementations of **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText** are called from within the module. The code is published on GitHub.⁸

1.2.4 Comparison to Baseline on Word Analogy Tasks

To validate the corpora, our preprocessing pipeline, and proper training of the respective models, we compare the performance on *word analogy tasks* with previously published baselines. Word analogy tasks are datasets composed of word 4-tuples of the form *Man : Woman :: King : Queen* and have become the de facto standard to evaluate the quality of non-contextualized word embeddings in recent years.

For English we use the dataset published by Mikolov et al. (2013), that of Svoboda and Brychcín (2016) for Czech, that of Chen et al. (2015) for Chinese, that of Venekoski and Vankka (2017) for Finnish, that of Hartmann et al. (2017) for Portuguese⁹, and finally the datasets proposed by Grave et al. (2018) for Hindi and Polish. For all languages listed above, apart from English, we use the scores published by Grave et al. (2018) on the same task as a baseline. The performance of the English embeddings is measured against the results of Bojanowski et al. (2016).

Tables 1.4 and 1.5 show the scores that we obtained in comparison to the different baselines. Following Grave et al. (2018), the vocabulary of each model was restricted to the 200,000 most frequent words from the training data before evaluating the model on the word analogy dataset.¹⁰ This means, that a fraction of the questions of the analogy tasks is not answered, as they contain out-of-vocabulary words. Therefore, to compare the reported scores one also

⁸<https://github.com/lucasrettenmeier/word-embedding-stability>

⁹The dataset consists of a European as well as a Brazilian variant, only the European variant was used in the scope of this work.

¹⁰Although Bojanowski et al. (2016) did not explicitly mention it, we confirmed with the authors that the scores they reported are also based on restricting the vocabulary to the 200,000 most frequent words.

needs to take the coverage, i.e. the percentage of answered questions, into account. Table 1.6 shows the comparison between our evaluation and the results published by Grave et al. (2018). Bojanowski et al. (2016) did not publish these numbers.

Overall, the scores we obtained on the word analogy tasks *agree with the previously published results*. Our most relevant observations are:

- The scores show a *significant variance* over the 128 runs on shuffled corpora. This supports the argument, that every time a score on a word analogy dataset – or any task that depends on word embeddings for that matter – is published, it should be obtained by *averaging over a sufficient number of subsequent runs*. The current practice in research is to provide only one number, without any information on its variance and our data indicates that this is insufficient.
- For most languages and techniques, our scores obtained are slightly higher than the ones reported previously, especially for the languages with comparatively little Wikipedia data (Hindi and Finnish). We attribute this improvement mainly to the fact, that we were able to use slightly larger corpora to train the embeddings, as new articles are written on Wikipedia daily while existing ones are edited and extended.
- Notable exceptions, i.e. cases, where our results are lower than previously published scores, are Chinese and English. For Chinese, we suspect a problem with the specific tokenization procedure to be the cause. In the case of English, we can only compare our scores to the ones published by Bojanowski et al. (2016), who used a different preprocessing that includes lowercasing the training data and did not report the coverage on the analogy tasks. Therefore, one cannot expect perfect accordance of the results.

Language	Bojanowski (2016)	Grave (2018)	This Work		
			μ	σ	<i>Best</i>
HI	-	10.6	17.06	0.46	18.24
FI	-	35.9	42.84	1.33	47.71
ZH	-	60.2	57.01	1.25	59.50
CS	-	63.1	62.90	0.55	64.36
PL	-	53.4	58.16	0.78	60.20
PT	-	54.0	56.52	0.42	57.67
EN	76.2	-	74.21	0.21	74.83

Table 1.4: Scores of our **fastText** models (skip-gram) on the word analogy tasks for different languages compared to the results published by Bojanowski et al. (2016) and Grave et al. (2018). The results of this work, noted in the rightmost column, state the mean μ , standard deviation σ , and highest score of 128 runs on independently shuffled corpora.

Language	Bojanowski (2016)	This Work		
		μ	σ	<i>Best</i>
CS	45.8	48.57	0.50	49.80
EN	73.9	71.89	0.20	72.35

Table 1.5: Scores of our **word2vec** models (skip-gram) on the word analogy tasks for different languages compared to the results published by Bojanowski et al. (2016). The results of this work, noted in the rightmost column, state the mean μ , standard deviation σ , and highest score of 128 runs on independently shuffled corpora.

	HI	FI	ZH	CS	PL	PT	EN
Grave (2018)	70.8	94.6	100.0	76.9	69.5	79.2	-
This Work	72.0	94.6	96.6	83.2	70.3	79.2	97.5

Table 1.6: Coverage of our models on the word analogy tasks for different languages compared to the results published by Grave et al. (2018).

1.2.5 Historical Corpora

As mentioned in the introduction, the second part of this work is focused on detecting and measuring *semantic change*, i.e. i.e. differences in the meaning of words between distinct time periods. In order to analyse these differences, historical corpora are required, i.e. at least two corpora in a given language, consisting of documents from separate epochs.

All our experiments on semantic change are based on two datasets: First, the Corpus of Historical American English, or COHA (Davies, 2015), a 400 million word corpus comprising documents written in American English between 1810 and 2010. And second, the dataset provided for Task 1 of the 14th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, taking place in Barcelona in the fall of 2020 (Schlechtweg et al., 2020): This dataset consists of documents in four different languages – English, German, Latin and Swedish – and the documents in each language are split into two distinct sets based on their date of origin. We outline the specifics of the two datasets in more detail in the sections below.

1.2.5.1 Corpus of Historical American English (COHA)

The Corpus of Historical American English contains 400 million words in more than 100,000 texts which date from the 1810s to the 2000s. The corpus contains texts from different genres, namely fiction, magazines newspapers and non-fiction books and is balanced by genre from decade to decade (Davies, 2015). The distribution of the text size over the 20 decades from 1810 to 2009 is illustrated in Table 1.7.

Because of its size, temporal range and robustness (genre-balanced, lemmatized), the corpus has been used regularly in previous work on semantic change (Hamilton et al., 2016b; Eger and Mehler, 2016; Kutuzov et al., 2018; Tahmasebi et al., 2018). We used the lemmatized version of the corpus and, hence, only applied minimal preprocessing – removing punctuation and lowercasing all words.

Decade	Tokens [$\times 10^5$]	Vocabulary [$\times 10^3$]
1810 – 1819	11	12
1820 – 1829	65	27
1830 – 1839	129	39
1840 – 1849	150	43
1850 – 1859	154	43
1860 – 1869	157	48
1870 – 1879	173	47
1880 – 1889	188	51
1890 – 1899	190	53
1900 – 1909	253	68
1910 – 1919	212	56
1920 – 1929	238	63
1930 – 1939	229	63
1940 – 1949	227	64
1950 – 1959	229	67
1960 – 1969	223	67
1970 – 1979	221	68
1980 – 1989	234	75
1990 – 1999	327	98
2000 – 2009	275	83

Table 1.7: The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) consists of documents from the 20 decades between 1810 and 2010 and comprises nearly 400 million words in total. The table shows the total number of tokens for each of the 20 decades, as well as the size of the respective vocabulary (any word with less than 5 appearances is discarded from the vocabulary).

1.2.5.2 SemEval 2020 Task 1: Unsupervised Lexical Semantic Change Detection

Task 1 of the SemEval 2020 workshop involves the unsupervised detection of semantic change on diachronic corpora in four different languages: English, German, Latin and Swedish. The full problem definition is outlined in Section 4.1. In this section, we focus exclusively on the corpora provided by the organizers for this task.

Table 1.8 illustrates the main properties of the corpora in the four different languages. The organizers did not compile the corpora from scratch but relied on existing ones: The English corpora are based on COHA (see Section 1.2.5.1). The German data is a combination of three newspaper corpora (Deutsches Textarchiv, Berliner Zeitung and Neues Deutschland). For Latin, the LatinISE corpus is used (McGillivray, 2012) and for Swedish, the KubHist corpus (Borin et al., 2012). We did not apply any specific preprocessing to the corpora.

Language	Time Period	Tokens [$\times 10^6$]	Vocabulary [$\times 10^3$]
English	$t_1 = 1810 - 1860$	65	23
	$t_2 = 1960 - 2010$	66	33
German	$t_1 = 1800 - 1899$	690	219
	$t_2 = 1946 - 1990$	697	265
Latin	$t_1 = 200 \text{ BC} - 0$	17	14
	$t_2 = 0 - 2000$	91	50
Swedish	$t_1 = 1790 - 1830$	671	278
	$t_2 = 1895 - 1903$	1086	251

Table 1.8: Properties of the diachronic corpora in English, German, Latin and Swedish that were provided for Task 1 of the SemEval 2020 workshop.

Chapter 2

The Stability of Word Embeddings

A glance into Table 1.4 should suffice to explain why understanding and quantifying the random nature of word embeddings is a pressing matter for research in NLP: Two word embedding models, trained with the same embedding technique and default parameters on basically identical, but independently shuffled Wikipedia corpora, can yield entirely different scores on the standard word analogy task of the respective language. Table 2.1 shows the full extent of this problem – the relative differences of the score of seemingly identical models can exceed 20%.

In the last few years, these scores were used on various occasions to argue that one embedding technique is superior to another (Mikolov et al., 2013b; Pennington et al., 2014; Levy and Goldberg, 2014; Bojanowski et al., 2016). However, in none of the work we know of, could we find more than one result on these tasks, obtained from the subsequent training of multiple models. This raises serious doubts on the significance of some of these results, and we recommend for any future research to report the mean and variance of the score over – at least five – subsequent runs.

Furthermore, since the largest value of word embeddings for NLP does not lie within the embeddings themselves, but in their use for various downstream tasks, this problem is amplified: It is hard to estimate the influence of the

Language	Lowest Score	Highest Score	Rel. Difference
HI	16.07	18.24	13.5 %
FI	38.63	47.40	22.7 %
ZH	52.55	59.50	13.2 %
CS	61.60	64.36	4.5 %
PL	55.44	60.20	8.6 %
PT	55.42	57.67	4.1 %
EN	73.74	74.83	1.5 %

Table 2.1: Lowest and highest scores on the word analogy tasks for different languages observed in 128 subsequent runs of **fastText** trained on independently shuffled Wikipedia corpora as outlined in Section 1.2.

variability of word embeddings on the performance on these downstream tasks. This makes it even more important to understand why and how unstable word embeddings are.

The origin of the randomness within the process of training word embeddings seems to be well understood: Yin and Shen (2018) pointed out that all popular techniques for non-contextualized word embeddings can be formulated as either *implicit or explicit matrix factorization*, i.e. the low-rank matrix approximation of a signal matrix. **LSA** (Deerwester et al., 1990; Landauer and Dumais, 1997) and **PPMI** (Levy and Goldberg, 2014) are examples for explicit matrix factorization, whereas **GloVe** (Pennington et al., 2014), just like skip-gram based methods, e.g. **word2vec** (Mikolov et al., 2013b) and **fastText** (Bojanowski et al., 2016) have been shown to implicitly perform matrix factorization. Whereas the signal matrix can in principle be unambiguously obtained from the corpus, the embedding space constructed by any of the techniques presented above, is only an *approximation of the semantic information captured in the corpus*.

Thus, any embedding space provides a somewhat distorted view on the semantics of the corpus it was derived from (Hellrich and Hahn, 2017). In practice, this distortion is the result of several random processes: First and foremost, the random initialization of an embedding vector for every word in the vocabulary. Second, the order in which the documents are processed during training

(this does not apply to count-based techniques). And finally, the random subsampling of frequent words, which could technically be omitted, but is very common in practice.

We could replace these random processes by deterministic alternatives; however, this would only replace the random distortion by a fixed one, thus creating a false sense of reliability.

In the following section, we study the influence of these random processes, or in other words, the *instability of word embedding spaces*. This instability is measured by the *variability of the embedding spaces*, that are derived in independent runs of the same technique on the same corpus.

2.1 The Random Nature of Word Embedding Techniques

The random nature of the creation of word embeddings implies, that any time an embedding technique \mathcal{T} with a specific set of parameters is applied to a corpus \mathcal{C} , an embedding space $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times d}$ (where v is the size of the vocabulary \mathcal{V} and d the dimension of the embeddings) is sampled from a probability distribution Ω :

$$\mathbf{V}_i \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) \quad (2.1)$$

We define instability as the variability of independently obtained embeddings of the same technique on the same corpus.

Now, we assume to have a *well-defined distance metric* \mathbf{d} which, given a word w (e.g. `cat`) as well as two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j returns a measure of the difference between the embedding of w in the two spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j . Then, the instability \mathcal{I} of the embedding of w in the distribution Ω can be written as the average of $\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$ over an infinite number of pairs $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j$ sampled from $\Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$:

$$\mathcal{I}(w, \Omega) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{N(N+1)} \sum_{i \neq j=0}^N \mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) \quad (2.2)$$

One could estimate this instability $\mathcal{I}(w, \Omega)$ in practice by drawing a sufficient number of samples \mathbf{V}_i from Ω (i.e. by applying the embedding technique \mathcal{T}

to the corpus \mathcal{C} multiple times), provided a metric \mathbf{d} as specified above, that measures the distance between two embeddings of the same word in different embedding spaces.

2.1.1 Random Orientation of Embedding Spaces

However, the inherent characteristics of word embeddings make it difficult to capture this distance: It is widely accepted today, that non-contextualized word embeddings are essentially invariant under rotations (Hamilton et al., 2016b; Artetxe et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2017; Yin and Shen, 2018). This means, that two embedding spaces are essentially identical – and can be substituted for one another in any practical application – if one can be obtained from the other by applying an orthogonal transformation $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{I}$.

For example, applying an orthogonal transformation $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ to an embedding space does not influence the cosine similarity of any two embeddings \vec{u}, \vec{v} which we denote as row vectors of size d :

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(\angle(\vec{u}\mathbf{A}, \vec{v}\mathbf{A})) &= \frac{(\vec{u}\mathbf{A})(\vec{v}\mathbf{A})^\top}{((\vec{u}\mathbf{A})(\vec{u}\mathbf{A})^\top) \cdot ((\vec{v}\mathbf{A})(\vec{v}\mathbf{A})^\top)} \\ &= \frac{\vec{u}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top\vec{v}^\top}{(\vec{u}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top\vec{u}^\top) \cdot (\vec{v}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top\vec{v}^\top)} \\ &= \frac{\vec{u}\vec{v}^\top}{(\vec{u}\vec{u}^\top) \cdot (\vec{v}\vec{v}^\top)} = \cos(\angle(\vec{u}, \vec{v})) \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

In practice, we observe that this rotation-invariance in combination with the random initialization means that every time an embedding space \mathbf{V}_i is sampled from the distribution $\Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ (i.e. on every run), *it is randomly oriented* (see Figure 2.1).

This is the reason why finding a metric $\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$ to measure the distance of the embeddings of one word w within two different spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j is not trivial: Simply applying a \mathbb{R}^n metric, like the *Euclidean distance* or the *cosine similarity* to the two different embeddings of w , namely $\vec{v}_i(w)$ and $\vec{v}_j(w)$ would not yield any meaningful result, because of the random orientation illustrated above.




Figure 2.1: Two-dimensional illustration of the random orientation of an embedding space over two consecutive runs of the same technique on the same corpus.

2.1.2 Rotation-Invariant Quantities

Therefore, it is no surprise that all previous work on quantifying stability is ultimately based on *rotation-invariant quantities* of the embedding spaces, i.e. quantities which remain unchanged under an orthogonal transformation (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a,b, 2017; Hellrich et al., 2019; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Chugh et al., 2018; Wendlandt et al., 2018; Pierrejean and Tanguy, 2018). We already demonstrated that the cosine similarity of two embeddings \vec{u} , \vec{v} is such a quantity – see Equation (2.3). However, it is important to be clear that the embeddings themselves are *not rotation-invariant* as $\vec{u} \neq \vec{u}\mathbf{A}$ for most $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ orthogonal.

A rotation-invariant quantity will *not be influenced by the random orientation* of the embedding space on every run. Therefore, it is expected to be consistent over multiple runs, i.e. to be constant apart from the anticipated random deviations. This allows us to compare the quantity over multiple runs and to use it to study the stability of the underlying technique.

2.1.3 Distribution of the Cosine Similarity of Two Arbitrary Embeddings

To get a better understanding of the inherent randomness of the process of constructing word embeddings from a corpus \mathcal{C} we examine the distribution of a rotation-invariant quantity, namely the cosine similarity of the embeddings \vec{v}_i

and \vec{v}_j of two arbitrary words w_i and w_j respectively.

The cosine similarity of the embeddings of the two words **cat** and **dog** for the 128 runs of **word2vec** we conducted on independently shuffled versions of the English Wikipedia is illustrated below:

First run:	$\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_1(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_1(\mathbf{dog}))] = 0.6805$
Second run:	$\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_2(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_2(\mathbf{dog}))] = 0.6840$
Third run:	$\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_3(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_3(\mathbf{dog}))] = 0.6782$
...	...
128 th run:	$\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_{128}(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_{128}(\mathbf{dog}))] = 0.6837$

These handful of results seem in line with our expectation, that the rotation-invariant cosine similarity will deviate around a particular value for the individual runs. We are interested in how this distribution looks like in more detail, i.e., if any particular shape can be recognized. Figure 2.2 shows a histogram of the distribution of $\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_i(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_i(\mathbf{dog}))]$ for the 128 runs we performed.




Figure 2.2: Distribution of the cosine similarity $\cos [\angle (\vec{v}_i(\mathbf{cat}), \vec{v}_i(\mathbf{dog}))]$ of the embeddings of the two words **cat** and **dog** for 128 runs of **word2vec** on independently shuffled versions of the English Wikipedia.

Given the comparably small size of 128 samples, we cannot draw any immediate conclusions on the shape of the underlying distribution, and producing more samples is very resource-intensive, as this requires a full run of **word2vec** on

the English Wikipedia corpus, which – at the time of our experiments, in the fall of 2019 – was equivalent to around 23 GB of raw text.

However, we can efficiently compute the same distributions for many word pairs, other than **cat** and **dog**, from the existing data. Visual inspection of these distributions leads us to two work hypotheses, that we examine with a statistical analysis below:

1. The cosine similarities $\cos[\angle(\vec{v}_i(w_1), \vec{v}_i(w_2))]$ and $\cos[\angle(\vec{v}_i(w_3), \vec{v}_i(w_4))]$ of any two non-overlapping pairs of words (w_1, w_2) and (w_3, w_4) are statistically independent of each other.
2. The cosine similarity $\cos[\angle(\vec{v}_i(w_1), \vec{v}_i(w_2))]$ of any word pair follows a Normal distribution.

To examine these hypotheses, we randomly sample 20,000 words w_1, w_2, \dots from the vocabulary of our models in any language and compute the cosine similarity for the 10,000 word pairs $(w_1, w_2), (w_3, w_4)$, etc. As we are not aware of a way to *prove* statistical independence in this situation, we examine a closely related measure to verify the first hypothesis: The correlation of the cosine similarity values for independent word pairs. Out of the 10,000 word pairs, we can construct 5,000 pairs of word pairs, and measure the significance value (or p -value) of the Spearman rank correlation test (Spearman, 1904) between the 128 samples of the cosine similarity of each pair. If the null hypothesis is correct, and the cosine similarity values for the different word pairs are not related to each other, we would expect a uniform distribution of the p -values in the interval $[0, 1]$. Figure 2.3 shows the distribution of the p -values for all languages and techniques described in Section 1.2. For every configuration, we observe a homogeneous distribution, which is a strong indicator that the null hypothesis is correct, and the *cosine similarities of arbitrary word pairs are independent of each other*.

Assuming the first hypothesis is valid, we can examine the second hypothesis with a statistical test on the normality of a given distribution: The Shapiro-Wilk test (Shapiro and Wilk, 1965). We calculate the significance of this test over the 128 samples for each of the 10,000 word pairs. If the null hypothesis is correct, and the cosine similarity values for the different word pairs are normally




Figure 2.3: Distribution of significance values (p) of the Spearman rank correlation test on the distribution for 5,000 independent pairs of cosine similarity values over 128 runs of **fastText** (skip-gram), **GloVe** and **word2vec** (skip-gram) in the languages outlined in Section 1.2.




Figure 2.4: Distribution of significance values (p) of the Shapiro-Wilk-Test on the distribution of the cosine similarity for 10,000 independent word pairs over 128 runs of **fastText** (skip-gram), **GloVe** and **word2vec** (skip-gram) in the languages outlined in Section 1.2.

distributed, one would again expect a uniform distribution of the p -values in the interval $[0, 1]$. Hence, the results in Figure 2.4 are a strong indicator that the cosine similarity values for any word pair for most languages and embeddings techniques follow a Normal distribution. The leftmost column of Figure 2.4 shows why we need to be careful with an absolute statement: The **word2vec** models, especially for Hindi and Finnish, show an accumulation of significance values in the leftmost interval, which implies a deviation from the normal distribution. Nevertheless, we can assume both statements above to hold in nearly all practical situations, as shown on multiple occasions in the sections below.

Finally, one can also obtain an illustration of the shape of the distribution of the cosine similarity values, by accumulating samples over different word pairs. This should not be seen as a mathematical proof, but rather as a graphical representation of our findings: Figure 2.5 shows this accumulation takes the shape of the well-known Gaussian bell curve.




Figure 2.5: Accumulated distribution of the cosine similarity over 10,000 word pairs for 128 runs of **GloVe** on independently shuffled versions of the Polish Wikipedia. The samples are “whitened” before accumulating them, i.e. the distributions for each of the 10,000 word pairs are shifted so that $\mu = 0$ and stretched until $\sigma^2 = 1$.

2.2 Measuring Distances Between Embedding Spaces

As outlined above, we metric that captures the distance of the embedding of a word between two embedding spaces, to quantify the instability of embedding techniques. In this section, we compare several established and novel approaches for this metric and decide on the one that is best suited for the task at hand.

2.2.1 Requirements for a Distance Metric

Before we look at a selection of different approaches for this distance metric, we want to establish a framework to evaluate and compare these approaches, i.e. a set of requirements that a metric should fulfil.

- (I) **Formal Criteria** The metric \mathbf{d} needs to assign a distance, i.e. a real number to the difference of the embeddings of a word w in the two spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j :

$$\mathbf{d} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \mapsto \mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \quad (2.4)$$

We demand that the codomain of the metric \mathbf{d} is limited to the interval $[0, 1]$, since this allows us to transform any distance metric \mathbf{d} into a corresponding *similarity metric* $\mathbf{s}_\mathbf{d}$ – and vice versa – with:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_\mathbf{d} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} &\rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \mapsto \mathbf{s}_\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \\ \mathbf{s}_\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) &= 1 - \mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

- (II) **Consistency** Some of the metrics introduced below have a free parameter $f \in M$ and there is no undisputed “right” choice for the value of this parameter. This means that the approach does not define one specific metric \mathbf{d} , but describes a class of metrics, comprising all possible choices of the free parameter:

$$\{\mathbf{d}_f \mid f \in M\} \quad (2.6)$$

This is not a problem per se, but if this is the case, we expect *the results based on different choices of the free parameter to be consistent* with one

another. This means, if we have two words w_1 and w_2 and two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_1 and \mathbf{V}_2 and the metric \mathbf{d}_{f_1} based on the choice f_1 for the free parameter, yields:

$$\mathbf{d}_{f_1}(w_1, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) > \mathbf{d}_{f_1}(w_2, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) \quad (2.7)$$

Then, we would expect the metric \mathbf{d}_{f_2} with $f_2 \neq f_1$ to give a consistent result:

$$\mathbf{d}_{f_2}(w_1, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) > \mathbf{d}_{f_2}(w_2, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) \quad (2.8)$$

In practice, we can check how well this requirement is fulfilled by calculating $\mathbf{d}_f(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$ for a set of randomly sampled words w and determining how well the order of the results is preserved over different values of f .

- (III) **Independence** Based on the observation, that several different approaches were already proposed for the task at hand, each with its strengths and weaknesses, it should be clear that there is no straightforward solution to measuring the distance between the embeddings of a word in two different spaces. Therefore, we may need to content ourselves with measuring a different quantity, that is somehow related to the distance. In this case, we want the measured quantity to be *largely independent of other factors* that are proven to be unrelated to the distance.

We do not claim that list of requirements is exhaustive, but it nonetheless constitutes a helpful framework that we apply to compare different approaches in the sections below.

2.2.2 Nearest-Neighbor Based Approaches

As mentioned above, all previous work on the instability of word embeddings is based on rotation-invariant quantities, and exclusively on the cosine similarity of two embeddings: The stability of the embedding of a specific target word w is quantified by *comparing the list of n nearest neighbors* of the target word (i.e. embeddings with the largest cosine similarity), over multiple runs (typically with $5 \leq n \leq 25$).

Two slightly different variants of how exactly the stability is calculated were proposed in the past: Firstly, by dividing the size of the overlap of the two lists with

n (Hellrich and Hahn, 2017; Wendlandt et al., 2018; Pierrejean and Tanguy, 2018).

We refer to this quantity as $p_{@n}$. Secondly, by calculating the Jaccard coefficient (Jaccard, 1912) of the two lists (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a,b; Hellrich et al., 2019; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Chugh et al., 2018), which we denote as $j_{@n}$. The principle is illustrated in Table 2.2.

The two metrics are rather similar and can be converted into each other. To illustrate this, let m denote the number of items that two lists of length n have in common. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{@n} = \frac{m}{n} &\iff m = n \cdot p_{@n} \\ j_{@n} = \frac{m}{n + (n - m)} &= \frac{m}{2n - m} = \frac{n \cdot p_{@n}}{2n - n \cdot p_{@n}} = \frac{p_{@n}}{2 - p_{@n}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Now we examine if these metrics fulfil the criteria introduced above.

target word: **momentum**

word	run # 1		run # 2	
	rank	cos	rank	cos
inertia	1	0.639	1	0.639
kinetic	2	0.630	3	0.613
momenta	3	0.626	2	0.615
energy	4	0.593	6	0.590
centripetal	5	0.586	5	0.592
mass-energy	6	0.581	9	0.575
vorticity	7	0.578	4	0.593
gravitational	8	0.577	7	0.587
angular	9	0.576	11	0.570
relativistic	10	0.572	16	0.564
eigenstate	11	0.571	18	0.563
spin	12	0.569	29	0.546
accelerating	13	0.568	17	0.564
eigenstates	14	0.566	14	0.565
velocity	15	0.564	8	0.582

Table 2.2: Most similar words to the target word **momentum** for two independent runs of **word2vec** (skip-gram, default parameters) trained on the English Wikipedia, with a reduced vocabulary size of 200,000 words.

In the example above, eight out of the ten most similar words from run 1 are again found in the top ten of run 2: Only **angular** and **relativistic** are dropped. This yields:

$$p_{@10} = \frac{8}{10} = 0.8 \quad j_{@10} = \frac{8}{12} \approx 0.667 \quad (2.9)$$

As soon as we extend the scope of the comparison to the fifteen most similar words, **angular** is again found in the list of both runs. But in addition to **relativistic**, the three words **eigenstate**, **spin** and **accelerating** are not found in the top fifteen of run 2, which means:

$$p_{@15} = \frac{11}{15} \approx 0.733 \quad j_{@15} = \frac{11}{19} \approx 0.579 \quad (2.10)$$

(I) Formal Criteria

Both metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ measure the similarity of the embedding of a word w between two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j . The minimum and maximum values the two metrics can assume are 0 and 1 respectively. Therefore, both fulfil the formal criteria for a *similarity metric* $\mathbf{s_d}$ as defined above, which allows us to transform them into a corresponding distance metric \mathbf{d} , with:

$$\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) = 1 - \mathbf{s_d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \quad (2.12)$$

which fulfil all formal criteria that we introduced above.

(II) Consistency

For both metrics that were previously used to measure the stability of word embeddings, $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$, one must pick an arbitrary value for n , i.e. the number of nearest neighbors, that are compared over subsequent runs. So far, there is no consensus on a value of n which is best suited for the task, as Figure 2.6 illustrates.




Figure 2.6: Illustration of the different values for n , the number of nearest neighbors of a target word, which were used in previous work to evaluate the stability of word embeddings with the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$.

We analyse the consistency of the metrics over different values of n , for **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText** embeddings trained on 16 independently shuffled versions of Wikipedia corpora in different languages as outlined in Section 1.2:

1. For each language, 1000 target words are randomly sampled from the joint vocabulary of all runs in the respective language.
2. For each of the runs, the 50 nearest neighbors by cosine distance are calculated for every target word.
3. Finally, the average of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for every target word at $n \in \{2, 5, 10, 25, 50\}$ is calculated over the 120 pairs that can be constructed out of the 16 runs taken into consideration for every language and technique. This reduces random fluctuations and allows to draw conclusions on the underlying distribution,¹ i.e. the mean values of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for every target word.

If $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ were to be considered *consistent over the free parameter n* , we would expect that a target word, which is identified as comparably stable based on $n = 5$, also ranks among the more stable words for $n = 50$. Table 2.3 shows the Spearman correlation (Spearman, 1904) of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for the 1000 target words between different values of n . We generally observe values significantly smaller than 1 and in some cases even less than 0.5, which indicates only a loose correlation between the metrics at different values of n .

Let us summarize the first problem we identified with using the nearest-neighbor based metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ to capture the stability of word embeddings: The metrics are inconsistent over the free variable n , namely the number of nearest neighbors that are evaluated, and so far there is no consensus on a particularly suitable value for n . This leaves us with large uncertainties when using the metrics.

¹We show in Appendix A.1 that the sample size of 16 subsequent runs is sufficient.

	$p_{@2}$	$p_{@5}$	$p_{@10}$	$p_{@25}$	$p_{@50}$		$j_{@2}$	$j_{@5}$	$j_{@10}$	$j_{@25}$	$j_{@50}$
$p_{@2}$	1	0.98	0.82	0.71	0.65	$j_{@2}$	1	0.99	0.82	0.72	0.66
$p_{@5}$		1	0.95	0.86	0.79	$j_{@5}$		1	0.95	0.86	0.79
$p_{@10}$			1	0.95	0.89	$j_{@10}$			1	0.95	0.89
$p_{@20}$				1	0.97	$j_{@20}$				1	0.97
$p_{@50}$					1	$j_{@50}$					1

Embedding Technique: **word2vec** (skip-gram)

	$p_{@2}$	$p_{@5}$	$p_{@10}$	$p_{@25}$	$p_{@50}$		$j_{@2}$	$j_{@5}$	$j_{@10}$	$j_{@25}$	$j_{@50}$
$p_{@2}$	1	0.67	0.56	0.47	0.42	$j_{@2}$	1	0.68	0.56	0.47	0.43
$p_{@5}$		1	0.83	0.69	0.63	$j_{@5}$		1	0.83	0.69	0.63
$p_{@10}$			1	0.86	0.77	$j_{@10}$			1	0.86	0.78
$p_{@20}$				1	0.93	$j_{@20}$				1	0.93
$p_{@50}$					1	$j_{@50}$					1

Embedding Technique: **GloVe**

	$p_{@2}$	$p_{@5}$	$p_{@10}$	$p_{@25}$	$p_{@50}$		$j_{@2}$	$j_{@5}$	$j_{@10}$	$j_{@25}$	$j_{@50}$
$p_{@2}$	1	0.56	0.42	0.33	0.29	$j_{@2}$	1	0.56	0.43	0.33	0.29
$p_{@5}$		1	0.78	0.61	0.53	$j_{@5}$		1	0.78	0.61	0.53
$p_{@10}$			1	0.83	0.72	$j_{@10}$			1	0.83	0.72
$p_{@20}$				1	0.94	$j_{@20}$				1	0.95
$p_{@50}$					1	$j_{@50}$					1

Embedding Technique: **fastText** (skip-gram)

Table 2.3: Spearman correlation of the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for 1000 target words for different values of $n \in \{2, 5, 10, 25, 50\}$ for **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText**, obtained as outlined in Section 2.2.2. For each of the techniques, we show the average of the correlation for all languages mentioned in Section 1.2.

(III) Independence

To determine if the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ are influenced by any quantities which are proven to be unrelated to the distance of the embeddings, we first need to understand what the metrics exactly capture. Therefore, we *attempt to predict the measurements of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$* for randomly sampled target words from different corpora \mathcal{C} and various embedding techniques \mathcal{T} , only based on a few assumptions about the underlying probability distribution $\mathbf{V}_i \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ of the embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i (please refer to Section 2.1 for more details).

As outlined in Section 2.1.3, the cosine similarity of the embeddings of any two words w_1 and w_2 in the embedding space \mathbf{V}_i – that we denote as $\cos(w_1, w_2)_i$ – follows a distinct probability distribution $\Psi(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w_1, w_2)$. The shape of this distribution is close to a *Normal distribution*:²

$$\cos(w_1, w_2)_i \sim \Psi(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w_1, w_2) \approx \mathcal{N}(\mu_{12}, \sigma_{12}^2) \quad (2.13)$$

Now we assume to know the parameters of this distribution, namely the mean and standard deviation for a specific target word w_t with every other word in the vocabulary:

$$\mathcal{P}(w_t) =: \{(\mu_{ts}, \sigma_{ts}) \mid w_s \in \mathcal{V}\} \quad (2.14)$$

In practice, we can estimate these parameters by sampling a set of embedding spaces $\{\mathbf{V}_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r\}$ from the distribution $\Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$, i.e. applying the same embedding technique \mathcal{T} to the corpus \mathcal{C} subsequently for r times. Then, we measure $\cos(w_t, w_s)_i$ for each run and finally use the formulas below to obtain the maximum-likelihood estimation of the parameters of the underlying Normal distribution:

$$\mu_{ts} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \cos(w_t, w_s)_i \quad \sigma_{ts} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r [\cos(w_t, w_s)_i - \mu_{ts}]^2} \quad (2.15)$$

An excerpt of an estimation of $\mathcal{P}(w_t)$ for an exemplary target word w_t is shown in Table 2.4.

²Since the values of the cosine similarity of two vectors are limited to the interval $[0, 1]$ whereas the Normal distribution is non-zero the real axis, this cannot be a true equality. However, we found that it is a good approximation for all practical purposes.

target word $w_t = \text{momentum}$

rank	query word	mean μ	std. σ	$p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s)$	$p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)$
1	inertia	0.650	0.010	0.867	0.991
2	momenta	0.633	0.011	0.124	0.801
3	kinetic	0.621	0.009	$9.24 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.204
4	centripetal	0.587	0.015	$1.14 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.39 \cdot 10^{-3}$
5	vorticity	0.584	0.011	$< 10^{-6}$	$1.56 \cdot 10^{-4}$
10	massless	0.567	0.011	$< 10^{-10}$	$< 10^{-6}$
50	spherically	0.527	0.011	$< 10^{-17}$	$< 10^{-12}$
100	inelastic	0.489	0.009	$< 10^{-64}$	$< 10^{-64}$
500	joule	0.386	0.012	$< 10^{-64}$	$< 10^{-64}$
1000	power	0.383	0.009	$< 10^{-64}$	$< 10^{-64}$

Table 2.4: Estimations of the parameters of the distribution $\Psi(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w_t, w_s)$ for the target word $w_t = \text{momentum}$ and different query words w_s , sorted by similarity. The estimation is based on 32 runs of **word2vec** (skip-gram) trained on the English Wikipedia, with a reduced vocabulary size of 200,000 words. The two columns on the right describe the predicted probability for the different query words to appear as the nearest neighbors of the target word based on Equations (2.22) and (A.15).

For any word $w_s \in \mathcal{V}$, let $p_{\#n}(w_t, w_s)$ denote the probability that w_s is one of the n nearest neighbors of w_t , for a randomly sampled embedding space $\mathbf{V}_i \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$. Deriving this probability is becoming increasingly complex for larger n so, for the moment, we focus on the special case $n = 1$: The probability that w_s is *the nearest neighbor* of w_t for any run i .³ This is the case if, and only if:

$$\cos(w_t, w_s)_i > \cos(w_t, w_{s'})_i \quad \forall w_{s'} \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t, w_s\} \quad (2.16)$$

For the sake of readability, we fix an arbitrary pair w_t, w_s and introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(w_t, w_s) &=: \tilde{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ \cos(w_t, w_{s'}) &=: x_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2) \quad \text{with } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v-2\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

To determine the probability $p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s)$, we need to integrate the joint probability distribution $p(\tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2})$ over the entire subspace of \mathbb{R}^{v-1} where the condition (2.16) is fulfilled. To be able to carry out this integration, we need to make one more assumption, namely that the different *random variables* $\tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2}$ are *independent*⁴. This allows us to write the joint probability distribution as:

$$p(\tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2}) = p(\tilde{x}) \cdot p(x_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(x_{v-2}) \quad (2.18)$$

Now, for a given value of \tilde{x} , all x_j can assume any value smaller than \tilde{x} , for condition (2.16) to hold, hence:⁵

$$p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{v-2} \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{x}} f(x_j, \mu_j, \sigma_j) dx_j \right] f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) d\tilde{x} \quad (2.19)$$

Where the $f(x, \mu, \sigma)$ denote the *probability density function* of the Normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 :

$$f(x, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right] \quad (2.20)$$

³Please refer to Appendix A.5 for an outlook on the derivation for $n > 1$.

⁴This assumption is backed by the observations we describe in Section 2.1.3.

⁵In practice, we can substitute the integration limits $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ for 0 and 1 respectively, since all probability distributions we have seen in our experiments are decreasing sufficiently fast.

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{x}} f(x_j, \mu_j, \sigma_j) dx_j &= \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{x}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right] dx_j \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{x_j - \mu_j}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_j} \right) \Big|_{-\infty}^{\tilde{x}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{\tilde{x} - \mu_j}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_j} \right) + 1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Inserting this back into Equation (2.19) leaves us with:

$$p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{v-2} \frac{1}{2} \left[\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{\tilde{x} - \mu_j}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_j} \right) + 1 \right] \right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\tilde{\sigma}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\tilde{x} - \tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right)^2 \right] d\tilde{x} \quad (2.22)$$

Although it is generally possible to derive closed-form expressions for these types of integrals, we found it more convenient to use numerical integration. While the evaluation of this integral looks rather resource-intensive at first glance, we show in Appendix A.2 that the relevant terms in Equation (2.22) will assume trivial values for most pairs of words, which renders the calculations considerably simpler.

Finally, predicting $p_{@n}$ and hence also $j_{@n}$ for a target word w_t from the probabilities $p_{\#n}(w_t, w_s)$ for all relevant query words w_s is rather straightforward.⁶ The probability of any query word w_s to make the top- n -list of the target word in two subsequent runs, is given by the square of $p_{\#n}(w_t, w_s)$. The expected overlap is therefore:

$$p_{@n}(w_t) = \sum_{w_s \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t\}} p_{\#n}(w_t, w_s)^2 \quad (2.23)$$

The agreement between this theoretical prediction and the measurements of $p_{@n}$ for all languages and techniques included in our experiments (Pearson's $\rho > 0.95$) is outlined in Appendix A.4.

The derivation shows that the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ depend on two qualitatively different sets of parameters of the distribution of the word embeddings: The mean values μ , and the respective variances σ^2 . The nature of the Normal distribution implies, that the mean values μ are unrelated to the expected difference between the embeddings of a word w over multiple runs. Hence, the requirement of *independence* that is examined here, demands that $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ are independent of these values.

⁶As outlined in Section 2.2.2, one can derive $j_{@n}$ from $p_{@n}$.

However, we observe that this is not the case. In order to understand the influence of the mean values μ on the measurements of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$, we introduce a new quantity: The *structure factor* $\rho_{@n}(w_t)$ of a target word w_t at the threshold n . If we take any set of embedding spaces $\{\mathbf{V}_1^{(A)}, \mathbf{V}_2^{(A)}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{128}^{(A)}\}$ from our experiments, which are obtained by applying the technique $\mathcal{T}^{(A)}$ to *shuffled* versions of the corpus $\mathcal{C}^{(A)}$, we can estimate the parameters $\mu_{ij}^{(A)}$ and $\sigma_{ij}^{(A)}$ of the distribution of the cosine similarity of any pair of words $w_i, w_j \in \mathcal{V}_A$ and use these estimates to get a very accurate prediction of $p_{@n}^{(A)}(w_t)$ and $j_{@n}^{(A)}(w_t)$ for every target word w_t in the vocabulary, as illustrated in Figure A.2. Now, we assume to have an imaginary set of embeddings, called B , with the same vocabulary and identical means $\mu_{ij}^{(B)} = \mu_{ij}^{(A)}$, however with $\sigma_{ij}^{(B)} =: \gamma = \text{const.}$ for all word pairs $w_i, w_j \in \mathcal{V}_B$.⁷ We call this prediction, i.e. the expected overlap for a specific target word, if the embeddings are in principle identical to A , but the variance of the distribution Ψ for every word pair is constant, the *structure factor* $\rho_{@n}^{(A)}(w_t)$ of the target word.

The *structure factor* of a word w_t is unrelated to the expected distance of the embedding of w_t between different embedding spaces: It depends solely on the mean values μ and the constant γ . Figure 2.7 shows the measured overlap $p_{@1}$ against the structure factor $\rho_{@1}$ for 1000 randomly sampled target words over 128 runs of **fastText** on the Portuguese Wikipedia: Quite surprising, the two quantities, are nearly identical for all target words. As Table 2.5 shows, the same is true for all languages and embedding techniques we have tested, i.e.:

$$p_{@n}(w_t) \approx \rho_{@n}(w_t) \quad (2.24)$$

Hence, the requirement of *independence* is not fulfilled: On the contrary, the metrics $p_{@n}(w_t)$ and $j_{@n}(w_t)$ are *virtually identical to a quantity which is unrelated to the expected distance* of the embedding of w_t over multiple runs. Thus, we conclude that the metrics are practically independent of the distance itself.

⁷The specific value of γ that we use is the mean of $\sigma_{ij}^{(A)}$ over all word pairs.




Figure 2.7: Plot of the structure factor $\rho_{@1}(w_t)$ over the measurements of $p_{@1}(w_t) = j_{@1}(w_t)$, for 1000 randomly sampled target words w_t obtained from 128 runs of **fastText** on a Portuguese Wikipedia extract.

Language	word2vec	GloVe	fastText
HI	0.969	0.968	0.984
FI	0.976	0.995	0.974
ZH	0.977	0.990	0.985
CS	0.979	0.991	0.979
PL	0.976	0.989	0.968
PT	0.981	0.975	0.976
EN	0.975	0.973	0.985

Table 2.5: Pearson correlation coefficient between the structure factor $\rho_{@1}(w_t)$ and the measurements of $p_{@1}(w_t) = j_{@1}(w_t)$, for 1000 randomly sampled target words w_t obtained from 128 runs of **word2vec** (skip-gram), **GloVe** and **fastText** (skip-gram) on Wikipedia corpora in seven different languages.

2.2.3 Global Distance Metrics

We have shown in the previous section that nearest-neighbor based approaches, which were used in most of the previous work on the stability of word embeddings, have several flaws (for a summary, please refer to the conclusion at the end of this section). This observation was our initial motivation to look for other methods to quantify stability and finally led us to a metric that quantifies the distance between two embedding spaces and is sensitive to changes in the global structure: The Pairwise Inner Product (PIP) loss, introduced by Yin and Shen (2018).

2.2.3.1 The Pairwise Inner Product (PIP) Loss

The definition of the *PIP loss* as a metric to quantify the distance between two embedding spaces is based on the rotation-invariance of embedding spaces, which is outlined in Section 2.1.1: Two embedding spaces $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times d}$ are equivalent in regards to all practical purposes if one can be obtained from the other by applying an orthogonal transformation $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{I}$. If \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j are rotated versions of one another, we can write:

$$\exists \mathbf{A} \text{ orthogonal, with } \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V}_j \quad (2.25)$$

If this is given, one can see:

$$\mathbf{V}_j \mathbf{V}_j^\top = \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A})^\top = \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}_i^\top = \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top \quad (2.26)$$

The (k, l) -th entry of the matrix $\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top$, which Yin and Shen (2018) also call the PIP matrix, corresponds to the inner product between the embeddings of the words with index k and l respectively. If the word embeddings are normalized, i.e. $\vec{v} \vec{v}^\top = 1$ for all embeddings \vec{v} , these entries are identical to the *cosine similarities* of the word pairs.

Equation (2.26) shows, that if two embedding spaces are equivalent, their PIP matrices are equal. Hence, the PIP loss \mathbf{D}_{PIP} between the embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j is defined as the norm of the difference between their PIP matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{\text{PIP}} : \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \mapsto \mathbf{D}_{\text{PIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \\ \mathbf{D}_{\text{PIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) &= \|\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top - \mathbf{V}_j \mathbf{V}_j^\top\| = \sqrt{\sum_{w_k, w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \left(v_{ik} \vec{v}_{il}^\top - v_{jk} \vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Where \vec{v}_{ik} is the embedding of the word w_k in the space \mathbf{V}_i , i.e. the k -th row of the matrix \mathbf{V}_i . The sum in the equation above consists of $|\mathcal{V}|^2$ terms, i.e. it scales with the size of the vocabulary of the embeddings. To compare measurements between embeddings with different-sized vocabularies, we introduce the *reduced PIP loss*:

$$\mathbf{D}_{\text{rPIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) = \frac{1}{2 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \mathbf{D}_{\text{PIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \quad (2.28)$$

which measures the squared mean of the expression $\frac{1}{2} \left(\vec{v}_{ik} \vec{v}_{il}^\top - \vec{v}_{jk} \vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)$ over all word pairs.⁸

2.2.3.2 The Word-Wise PIP Loss

As mentioned several times in the sections above, we are interested in a metric \mathbf{d} that captures the distance of the embedding of one word w_k between two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j . While the PIP loss does not match this format, we can derive a metric of the desired shape from the (reduced) PIP loss, which we call the *word-wise reduced PIP loss* \mathbf{d}_{PIP} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \mapsto \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \\ \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) &= \frac{1}{2 \cdot \sqrt{|\mathcal{V}|}} \sqrt{\sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \left(\vec{v}_{ik} \vec{v}_{il}^\top - \vec{v}_{jk} \vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Here, in contrast to the (reduced) PIP loss, the word w_k is fixed; we obtain the mean of the expression $\frac{1}{2} \left(\vec{v}_{ik} \vec{v}_{il}^\top - \vec{v}_{jk} \vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)$ for the given w_k with all other words $w_l \in \mathcal{V}$ of the vocabulary.⁹

Intuitively, the word-wise reduced PIP loss of a word w_k between the embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j measures the mean squared difference in cosine similarity¹⁰ of the word w_k with all words in the vocabulary between the two spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j . As shown in theory (Section 2.1.1) and experiment (Section 2.1.3), the cosine similarity of any two words is a rotation-invariance property, hence expected to be stable over subsequent runs. Measuring the difference of this

⁸As shown in the sections below, the additional factor 2 is necessary to ensure the desired codomain $[0, 1]$.

⁹Technically there is no difference in excluding the target word w_k from \mathcal{V} or keeping it. As long as the embeddings are normalized, $\vec{v}_{ik} \vec{v}_{ik}^\top - \vec{v}_{jk} \vec{v}_{jk}^\top = 1 - 1 = 0$.

¹⁰Under the condition that the embeddings are normalized.

quantity between two embedding spaces thus makes a prospective candidate for the distance metric we are looking for. We want to note that while the use of this derivative of the PIP loss by Yin and Shen (2018) to measure stability is – to our knowledge – a novel approach, Eger and Mehler (2016) already used a similar metric to compare embeddings derived from different corpora.

2.2.3.3 Reducing the Computational Complexity

Before we begin to assess if the metric fulfils the requirements introduced above, let us introduce an approach to reduce the resource utilization for the computation of the metrics significantly: Both, the reduced PIP loss as well as the word-wise reduced PIP loss, measure the squared mean of the expression $\frac{1}{2} \left(\vec{v}_{ik} \vec{v}_{il}^\top - \vec{v}_{jk} \vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)$ over all possible pairs (with w_k fixed for the word-wise reduced PIP loss) of words from the vocabulary \mathcal{V} . Naturally, we expect this mean value to be independent of the vocabulary size. Hence, we can obtain a *proxy* of the (word-wise) reduced PIP loss by calculating the mean of this expression over a randomly sampled subset $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$. The time complexity of calculating the reduced PIP loss is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}|^2)$, that of the word-wise reduced PIP loss $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}|)$. Thus, sampling a random \mathcal{V}' with $|\mathcal{V}'| \ll |\mathcal{V}|$ yields a substantial reduction in complexity for both metrics.

One could argue that this introduces a free variable to this distance metrics, comparable to the scope n of the nearest neighbor approaches: the size of the subset \mathcal{V}' . However, we show in the section below that the metric is consistent over this variable, if \mathcal{V}' has a sufficiently large size ($\geq 10^3$ words).

(I) Formal Criteria

The definition of the *word-wise reduced PIP loss* in Section 2.2.3.2 matches the format of the distance metric we are looking for. However, we still need to verify that the codomain of \mathbf{d}_{PIP} coincides with the interval $[0, 1]$. From now on, we will assume that all word vectors are normalized, i.e. $\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_k^\top = 1 \quad \forall w_k \in \mathcal{V}$. If this is given, any two word vectors \vec{v}_k and \vec{v}_l fulfil:

$$\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top = \frac{\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top}{1 \cdot 1} = \frac{\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top}{(\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_k^\top) \cdot (\vec{v}_l \vec{v}_l^\top)} = \cos(\angle(\vec{v}_k, \vec{v}_l)) \quad (2.30)$$

We know that the codomain of the cosine function is $[-1, 1]$, hence for any set of normalized word embeddings $\vec{v}_k, \vec{v}_l, \vec{v}_m, \vec{v}_n$:

$$\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top - \vec{v}_m \vec{v}_n^\top \in [-2, 2] \implies \left(\frac{\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top - \vec{v}_m \vec{v}_n^\top}{2} \right)^2 \in [0, 1] \quad (2.31)$$

And since the mean of any set of real numbers will not fall short of the smallest or exceed the largest one:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{v \times d} \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \mapsto \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \quad (2.32)$$

(II) Consistency

The word-wise reduced PIP loss as defined in Equation (2.29), does not have any free parameters that could cause inconsistencies; hence this requirement is fulfilled.

However, when computing the metrics in practice, we generally do not calculate the mean over the whole vocabulary \mathcal{V} , but instead over a randomly sampled subset of words $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$ of fixed size $|\mathcal{V}'|$. In order to examine the consistency of \mathbf{d}_{PIP} over this free variable, given a sufficiently large size ($|\mathcal{V}'| \geq 10^3$ words), we ran the following experiments:

1. For each language and embedding technique described in Section 1.2, we sample 1000 target words randomly from the joint vocabulary of all runs in the respective language.
2. Now we randomly pick a pair of runs¹¹ over independently shuffled corpora and calculate the word-wise reduced PIP loss \mathbf{d}_{PIP} for every target word at different values of $|\mathcal{V}'| \in \{10^3, 10^4, 10^5, |\mathcal{V}|\}$.
3. Finally, we calculate the Spearman correlation of \mathbf{d}_{PIP} for the 1000 target words between different values of $|\mathcal{V}'|$.

The results – please refer to Table 2.6 – show that the metric is highly consistent over the different sizes of $|\mathcal{V}'|$, with all correlation values larger than 0.99 for $|\mathcal{V}'| \geq 10^4$.¹² Hence, our approach to increase the computational efficiency by

¹¹To ensure the statistical significance of the results, we picked 10 random pairs and ultimately calculate the mean Spearman correlation values over these pairs.

¹²Thus, we choose $|\mathcal{V}'| \geq 2 \cdot 10^4$ in practice.

	10^3	10^4	10^5	$ \mathcal{V} $
10^3	0.958	0.976	0.978	0.978
10^4		0.995	0.997	0.998
10^5			0.999	1.000
$ \mathcal{V} $				1

Embedding Technique: **word2vec** (skip-gram)

	10^3	10^4	10^5	$ \mathcal{V} $
10^3	0.961	0.979	0.981	0.981
10^4		0.996	0.998	0.998
10^5			1.000	1.000
$ \mathcal{V} $				1

Embedding Technique: **GloVe**

	10^3	10^4	10^5	$ \mathcal{V} $
10^3	0.949	0.971	0.974	0.974
10^4		0.994	0.997	0.997
10^5			0.999	1.000
$ \mathcal{V} $				1

Embedding Technique: **fastText** (skip-gram)

Table 2.6: Spearman correlation of the metrics \mathbf{d}_{PIP} for 1000 target words for different values of $|\mathcal{V}'| \in \{10^3, 10^4, 10^5, |\mathcal{V}|\}$ for **word2vec** (top), **GloVe** (middle) and **fastText** (bottom), obtained as outlined in Section 2.2.3. For each of the techniques, we show the average of the correlation over all languages mentioned in Section 1.2. One might ask why the values on the main diagonal are different from 1: This is the case, since we repeated the random sampling of the proxy words twice and calculated the correlation between these two samples. This helps to understand not only how stable the measures are over different numbers of proxy words, but also over subsequent runs with a fixed number of proxy words.

calculating the word-wise reduced PIP loss over a randomly sampled subset \mathcal{V}' does not interfere with the meaningfulness of the metric.

(III) Independence

Finally, we want to understand if the word-wise reduced PIP loss of a word w between two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j , is influenced by any quantities which are unrelated to the distance. Hence, similarly to Section 2.2.2, we attempt to predict \mathbf{d}_{PIP} simply based on the assumption that the cosine similarity of any two words w_1 and w_2 follows a Normal distribution:

$$\cos(w_1, w_2)_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{12}, \sigma_{12}^2) \quad (2.33)$$

Under this assumption, the expression $v_{ik}\vec{v}_{il}^\top - v_{jk}\vec{v}_{jl}^\top$ is just the difference of two Normally distributed random variables, which is again a Normal distribution (Lemons et al., 2002):

$$v_{ik}\vec{v}_{il}^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{kl}, \sigma_{kl}^2), v_{jk}\vec{v}_{jl}^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{kl}, \sigma_{kl}^2) \implies v_{ik}\vec{v}_{il}^\top - v_{jk}\vec{v}_{jl}^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2\sigma_{kl}^2) \quad (2.34)$$

Hence, we can write the expectation of \mathbf{d}_{PIP} for a word w_k over randomly sampled embedding spaces $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j$ as:¹³

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \rangle_{ij} &= \left\langle \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \left(v_{ik}\vec{v}_{il}^\top - v_{jk}\vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)^2} \right\rangle_{ij} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \left\langle \left(v_{ik}\vec{v}_{il}^\top - v_{jk}\vec{v}_{jl}^\top \right)^2 \right\rangle_{ij}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} 2\sigma_{kl}^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \sigma_{kl}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

This means, the expectation of the word-wise reduced PIP loss of a word w_k is a multiple of *the squared mean of the standard deviation of the cosine similarity between the target word and all other words of the vocabulary*. The variance σ_{kl} is a measure of the expected difference of the cosine similarity of the word pair w_k, w_l over two independent embedding spaces $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j$ sampled from the same probability distribution. Hence, the expectation of the word-wise reduced PIP loss is independent of any quantities that do not measure the distance

¹³In the last step we use the definition of the variance σ^2 for a randomly distributed variable $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, that yields $\langle x^2 \rangle = \mu^2 + \sigma^2$.

between the embedding spaces: The third and last *requirement of independence* is fulfilled.

Conclusion

In the last two sections, we introduced and compared two methods to measure the distance of a word w between two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j :

Nearest-neighbor based approaches Namely, measuring the percentage overlap (or Jaccard metric) of the n nearest neighbors (by cosine distance) of the word w in the two spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j .

Word-wise reduced PIP loss Which is defined as the squared mean of the difference in the cosine similarity of the word w with all other words of the vocabulary between the two spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j .

We find that nearest-neighbor based approaches were used in all previous work that attempts to quantify the stability of word embeddings (Hellrich and Hahn, 2016a,b, 2017; Hellrich et al., 2019; Antoniak and Mimno, 2018; Chugh et al., 2018; Wendlandt et al., 2018; Pierrejean and Tanguy, 2018). The word-wise reduced PIP loss is a novel measure, based on the PIP loss, introduced by Yin and Shen (2018).¹⁴

The comparison of these two methods with respect to the requirements for a distance metric that were introduced in Section 2.2.1 is summarized in Table 2.7. Whereas both types of metrics fulfil the necessary formal criteria, the nearest-neighbor based approaches are inconsistent over the chosen threshold value n and strongly – if not exclusively – depend on the structure factor of the embedding, which is unrelated to the distance between multiple runs. Some of these limitations were already touched upon by Pierrejean and Tanguy (2018) but they argued the convenience and simplicity of the measure justifies its use. However, we argue that the word-wise reduced PIP loss, which does not exhibit these problems and has lower computational complexity than the nearest-neighbor based metrics, is better suited for this task and – unless there are limitations to this metric that we overlooked – should be the method of choice

¹⁴As mentioned above, Eger and Mehler (2016) already used a similar metric to measure the difference between embeddings derived from different corpora.

in the future. In our studies on the stability of word embeddings in the following section, we will hence predominantly use the word-wise reduced PIP loss.

	n.n. based metrics	w.w.r. PIP loss
Formal criteria	Yes	Yes
Consistency	No	Yes
Independence	No	Yes
Complexity	$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{V}) \sim 10^6 - 10^8$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{V}') \sim 10^4$

Table 2.7: Comparison of the two types of approaches for a metric $\mathbf{d}(w, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$ to measure the distance between the embeddings of a word w in the two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j : nearest-neighbor based approaches and the word-wise reduced PIP loss.

2.3 Understanding the Instability

Now that we have a tool at hand to measure the distance between embedding spaces and individual embeddings within them – the reduced PIP loss and word-wise reduced PIP loss, we can finally tackle the task we set out to do at the beginning of this chapter: To quantify and understand the instability of word embeddings.

We begin by calculating the reduced PIP loss for 120 pairs of embedding spaces, composed of 16 subsequent runs with each type of document sampling (fixed, shuffled, and bootstrapped) for every language and embedding technique outlined in Section 1.2. The computations are based on a random sample of $|\mathcal{V}'| = 2 \times 10^4$ target words for every language. The results are summarized in Table 2.8.

		word2vec		GloVe		fastText	
		D_{rPIP}		D_{rPIP}		D_{rPIP}	
		$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$	$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$	$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$
HI	<i>fixed</i>	0.771	2.8	1.278	1.0	2.170	4.2
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.805	5.3	1.275	0.9	2.367	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	3.417	0.9	4.272	0.4	2.879	0.3
FI	<i>fixed</i>	0.611	0.9	1.564	1.0	1.743	1.5
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.665	2.5	1.558	1.2	1.963	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	3.258	1.2	4.108	0.4	2.483	0.7
ZH	<i>fixed</i>	0.653	0.7	1.560	1.3	2.117	0.5
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.634	2.1	1.543	0.9	2.428	0.6
	<i>bootstrap</i>	3.124	1.0	4.084	0.5	2.951	0.3
CS	<i>fixed</i>	0.661	2.4	1.416	1.3	1.819	1.7
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.543	2.5	1.417	1.4	2.044	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	2.987	0.8	3.938	0.4	2.544	0.2
PL	<i>fixed</i>	0.644	1.2	1.469	1.9	1.704	0.7
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.507	2.4	1.465	1.4	1.943	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	2.853	1.3	3.947	0.7	2.426	0.3
PT	<i>fixed</i>	0.702	0.9	1.334	1.1	1.828	0.9
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.609	2.9	1.352	1.7	2.059	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	3.063	1.1	4.065	0.7	2.575	0.2
EN	<i>fixed</i>	0.725	0.3	1.201	4.5	1.664	2.0
	<i>shuffle</i>	1.543	2.3	1.208	4.0	1.891	0.2
	<i>bootstrap</i>	2.883	0.8	4.672	1.8	2.388	0.6

Table 2.8: Reduced PIP loss \mathbf{D}_{rPIP} for different types of document sampling (fixed, shuffled, bootstrapped) and every language and embedding technique outlined in Section 1.2. The calculation of mean μ and standard deviation σ is based on 120 pairs of embeddings for each setting, composed of 16 independent runs, each based on a random sample of 2×10^4 target words. The values for **GloVe** trained on the English corpus must be treated with caution: As mentioned in Section 1.2, we had to restrict the iterations for these runs to 25. Therefore, the results are not directly comparable to the other languages.

Observation 1: The variance of the measurements is small

The relative variance of the reduced PIP loss between different pairs of embedding spaces is rather small (between around 10^{-2} and 10^{-3}). The explanation for this can be found in our calculations in 2.2.3: As Equation 2.34 shows, the expectation of the word-wise reduced PIP loss is the squared sum over $|\mathcal{V}|$ samples of Gaussian probability distributions $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{kl}^2)$, with zero mean and variances σ_{kl}^2 . We consider the special case of constant variances ($\sigma_{kl} = \tilde{\sigma} \forall i$) for a second:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(w_k, \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{w_l \in \mathcal{V}} \sigma_{kl}^2} = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{V}|} \tilde{x}_i^2} \quad \text{with} \quad x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad (2.36)$$

The term on the right, i.e. the squared sum over $|\mathcal{V}|$ random variables following a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ corresponds to a Chi distribution with $|\mathcal{V}|$ degrees of freedom. The mean μ_k and variance σ_k^2 of the Chi distribution with k degrees of freedom are given by (Walck, 1996):

$$\mu_k = \sqrt{2} \frac{\Gamma((k+1)/2)}{\Gamma(k/2)} \quad \sigma_k^2 = k - \mu_k^2 \quad (2.37)$$

Where Γ is the gamma function. We can obtain an estimation of these parameters for large k through an expansion of the gamma function around $+\infty$:

$$\mu_k = \sqrt{k} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \quad \sigma_k^2 = k - (k - \mathcal{O}(1)) = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad (2.38)$$

Hence, the relative width of this distribution for large k scales with:

$$\frac{\sigma_k}{\mu_k} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (2.39)$$

For the word-wise reduced PIP loss, this means:

$$\frac{\sigma(\mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}})}{\mu(\mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}})} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{V}|}} \quad (2.40)$$

Since we typically deal with large vocabularies $|\mathcal{V}| > 10^5$, the relative width of this distribution converges to zero. This effect is even stronger for the reduced PIP loss, which equals the mean of the word-wise reduced PIP loss over all words of the vocabulary. This means in practice, that to get an accurate estimate of the overall instability of an embedding space, obtained by applying

the embedding technique \mathcal{T} to a corpus \mathcal{C} , it is sufficient to perform only two independent runs, and measure the reduced PIP loss between the two resulting spaces. The resources required to conduct 128 independent runs, as done in this work, should thus not prevent anyone from obtaining a practical understanding of the instability of any combination $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$. *Two subsequent runs on an independently shuffled corpus suffice in most cases.*

Observation 2: We can identify patterns of stability for the different techniques and sampling types that are consistent for all languages

Another, not quite surprising observation, is that the **GloVe** embeddings show no statistically significant difference in the distribution of the reduced PIP loss between *fixed* and *shuffled* document sampling. This technique contains one step, where the word co-occurrence matrix of the input text is randomly shuffled, hence even in the *fixed* setting, the data is shuffled implicitly. Therefore, we do not expect any difference in the distance of the embedding spaces between the *fixed* and the *shuffled* sampling.

Comparing the stability of our three embedding techniques for the different sampling types shows: For each of the three sampling types, we find a *distinct order, that is consistent over all seven languages*, as summarized in Table 2.9.

Sampling	Instability		
Method	<i>Small</i>	\longrightarrow	<i>Large</i>
fixed	word2vec	GloVe	fastText
shuffled	GloVe	word2vec	fastText
bootstrapped	fastText	word2vec	GloVe

Table 2.9: For any type of document sampling, we find that the order of stability of the different embedding techniques, as measured by the reduced PIP loss, is consistent over all languages.

For the *fixed* setting, **word2vec** is the most stable method, **GloVe** for the *shuffled* setting, and finally when training the embeddings on *bootstrapped corpora*, **fastText** is the most stable one. This leads us to the following interpretation: While **fastText** has the largest *intrinsic instability* of all methods, as seen for

the *fixed* and *shuffled* settings, it seems to be better at abstracting and capturing the semantic relationships of words within a language from a limited set of documents that is sampled from this language. And this abstraction is one of the main objectives when training word embeddings!

This capability is also demonstrated in the word analogy tasks in the different languages (see Table 2.10): **fastText** outperforms **word2vec** and **GloVe** in every language except for Finnish. And the results on the Finnish word analogy task set need to be treated with caution, as it consists of only around 10^3 tasks, around 20-times fewer than in any other language.

Language	word2vec		GloVe		fastText	
	Analogy Score		Analogy Score		Analogy Score	
	μ	σ	μ	σ	μ	σ
HI	14.45	0.38	8.19	0.24	17.06	0.46
FI	45.69	1.19	26.16	1.30	42.82	1.51
ZH	50.81	1.10	36.18	1.62	57.01	1.21
CS	48.54	0.57	41.80	0.50	62.89	0.55
PL	45.21	0.53	16.50	0.38	58.16	0.78
PT	50.48	0.32	33.26	0.38	56.52	0.42
EN	71.89	0.20	68.37	0.28	74.21	0.21

Table 2.10: Analogy scores for every language and embedding technique outlined in Section 1.2. The calculation of mean μ and standard deviation σ is based on 128 independent runs.

Further experiments are necessary to confirm these findings, and especially examine the correlation of the PIP loss over bootstrapped corpora with the performance of the embeddings on various downstream tasks. Our preliminary results allow for the following statement: If we want to compare the *quality of embeddings* produces by different techniques on one corpus, especially for languages where no analogy task set is available, the *reduced PIP loss* between multiple sets of embeddings that were trained on bootstrapped corpora *could be an indicator*.

Observation 3: We can differentiate between two main causes of the instability

We already used the term *intrinsic instability* in the section above to describe the PIP loss of an embedding technique over *fixed* or *shuffled* corpora. Even when the order of the documents within a corpus is randomly shuffled, the semantics of the different words of the vocabulary do not change. Therefore, one would expect that for an imaginary embedding technique, which has no method-induced instability at all, the PIP loss between embedding spaces trained on *fixed* and *shuffled* corpora is zero.

However, even for this perfectly stable technique, one would expect differences between embedding spaces trained on *bootstrapped* corpora – as these inhibit actual differences in the semantics of the words (for example one meaning of a homonym might be dropped through bootstrapping, while another one is amplified). Now, let us assume to have an embedding technique of great practical value, which is able to abstract the semantics of a language by training on a given corpus sampled from this language. Then one would expect these differences to be comparably small.

This assessment leads us to introduce the following distinction between two types of instability for an embedding technique \mathcal{T} trained on a corpus \mathcal{C} :

Intrinsic Instability The mean of the reduced PIP loss of a sample of embedding spaces obtained by applying the technique \mathcal{T} on independently *shuffled* versions of the corpus \mathcal{C} :

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) = \langle \mathbf{D}_{\text{rPIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) \rangle \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j \sim \Omega_{\text{shuf.}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) \quad (2.41)$$

This measure describes the instability of the technique \mathcal{T} trained on the corpus \mathcal{C} .

Extrinsic Instability The quadratic difference between the mean of the reduced PIP loss over *bootstrapped* samples and the intrinsic instability:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) = \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{D}_{\text{rPIP}}(\mathbf{V}_k, \mathbf{V}_l) \rangle - \mathcal{I}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{V}_k, \mathbf{V}_l \sim \Omega_{\text{boot.}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}) \quad (2.42)$$

This measure describes the instability of the technique \mathcal{T} towards variations in the corpus \mathcal{C} .

This distinction may be even more insightful on the level of individual words – see Section 2.3.1.

Observation 4: We observe a weak correlation between extrinsic instability, corpus and vocabulary size

Table 2.8 contains the results of the evaluation of the intrinsic instability for all techniques and languages. The values of the extrinsic instability can be found in Table 2.11 below.

Language	word2vec		GloVe		fastText	
	$\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$		$\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$		$\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$	
	$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$	$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$	$\mu \times 10^2$	$\sigma \times 10^4$
HI	2.901	3.4	4.077	0.5	1.639	0.6
FI	2.801	2.0	3.801	0.6	1.521	1.1
ZH	2.663	1.8	3.781	0.6	1.677	1.0
CS	2.557	1.8	3.674	0.7	1.515	0.5
PL	2.423	2.1	3.665	0.9	1.453	0.5
PT	2.606	2.2	3.833	1.0	1.546	0.5
EN	2.435	1.8	4.513	2.4	1.458	1.0

Table 2.11: Extrinsic instability for every language and embedding technique outlined in Section 1.2. The calculation of mean μ and standard deviation σ is based on 120 pairs of embeddings for each setting, composed of 16 independent runs, each based on a random sample of 2×10^4 target words. The value for **GloVe** trained on the English corpus must be treated with caution: As mentioned in Section 1.2, we had to restrict the iterations for these runs to 25. Therefore, the results are not directly comparable to the other languages.

To determine if there is a correlation between the extrinsic instability of a language with the word count and vocabulary size of the respective corpus (outlined in Table 1.2), we calculated Spearman’s ρ of $\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ with the quotient $|\mathcal{V}|/|\mathcal{C}|$

of vocabulary and corpus size for the three different embedding techniques:¹⁵

$$\rho_{\text{word2vec}} = 0.715, \quad \rho_{\text{GloVe}} = 0.143, \quad \rho_{\text{fastText}} = 0.536 \quad (2.43)$$

The extrinsic instability $\mathcal{I}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ seems to decrease with corpus size and increase with vocabulary size for **word2vec**, and **fastText**. For **GloVe**, we cannot confirm a correlation based on the data we have.

We intuitively expect a correlation like this; hence the values in Equation (2.43) are smaller than one might have thought. The correlation seems evident for **word2vec** (with a p value of 0.071), but less so for **fastText** ($p = 0.22$) and looks entirely random for **GloVe** ($p = 0.78$).¹⁶ Since these results are based on a rather small sample size of 7 languages/corpora, additional experiments are necessary to confirm or refute these findings and understand the phenomenon in detail.

2.3.1 Instability of Individual Words

What we found to be even more insightful than the analysis of the instability of embedding spaces, is to examine the instability of the embeddings of individual words over multiple runs. First, we extend our definitions of the intrinsic and extrinsic instability of embedding spaces to individual words, using the word-wise reduced PIP loss \mathbf{d}_{PIP} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w) &= \langle \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j, w) \rangle \\ \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w) &= \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{d}_{\text{PIP}}(\mathbf{V}_k, \mathbf{V}_l, w) \rangle - \mathcal{J}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j \sim \Omega_{\text{shuf.}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{V}_k, \mathbf{V}_l \sim \Omega_{\text{boot.}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$. Based on these definitions, we calculated the intrinsic and extrinsic instability for 2,000 randomly sampled words over 120 pairs of embedding spaces, for every language and embedding technique. Both quantities are plotted over the word frequency in Figure 2.8 for Hindi and 2.9 for Polish. The experiments yield several observations, that are outlined below.

¹⁵For **GloVe** the values for English were excluded from the calculation, since these runs are based on different model parameters, as outlined in Section 1.2.

¹⁶The p value measures the probability to observe the present correlation if the two datasets are in fact independent of each other – in other words, a small p value is a good indicator for true correlation.




Figure 2.8: Intrinsic instability $\mathcal{J}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w)$ and extrinsic instability $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w)$ for **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** on the Hindi Wikipedia corpus for 2,000 randomly sampled words as a function of word frequency. The calculation is based on 120 pairs of embeddings for each setting, composed of 16 independent runs, and the word-wise reduced PIP loss is calculated over 2×10^4 randomly sampled target words.




Figure 2.9: Intrinsic instability $\mathcal{J}_{\text{int}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w)$ and extrinsic instability $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, w)$ for **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText** on the Polish Wikipedia corpus for 2,000 randomly sampled words as a function of word frequency. The calculation is based on 120 pairs of embeddings for each setting, composed of 16 independent runs, and the word-wise reduced PIP loss is calculated over 2×10^4 randomly sampled target words.

Observation 1: The distribution of intrinsic/extrinsic instability over word frequency over is different for each technique, but similar for all languages

Figures 2.8 and 2.9 demonstrate this. Both show distinctive patterns for the intrinsic and extrinsic instability of the three different techniques, but as a whole, the two figures look much alike. All languages we examined in this work (see Section 1.2) show the same pattern, hence we conclude that the shape of the curves depends primarily on the technique and is only slightly affected by the corpus. Therefore, we argue, most of the observations below can be generalized to any corpus.

Observation 2: Intrinsic instability is constant over word frequency for all techniques

This observation might come as a surprise, as e.g. Wendlandt et al. (2018) claimed that word stability increases with frequency, which is a somewhat intuitive expectation. However, Hellrich and Hahn (2016b) made a similar observation for skip-gram embeddings trained on a German corpus.

The shape of the curves in Figures 2.8 and 2.9 indicates that the mean of the intrinsic instability for **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText**, is constant over the whole frequency interval. A statistical analysis – i.e. dividing the data into 20 batches by frequency and calculating the Spearman correlation between the mean values of the intrinsic stability and the mean frequency of the respective batch – supports this: For **GloVe** and **fastText**, we find no statistically significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) in any language. For **word2vec** on the other hand, we find a significant correlation, however, the change of the intrinsic instability over the whole frequency interval is still relatively small ($< 20\%$). The plots furthermore suggest that the variance of the instability increases for small frequencies, but this effect is visually enhanced in our plots by the abundance of low-frequency words in the vocabulary compared to high-frequency words.

Altogether we conclude that the intrinsic instability of words hardly depends on their frequency, at least for the techniques and languages examined in this work.

Observation 3: The extrinsic instability of word-based techniques decreases with word frequency

Whereas the intrinsic instability of low-frequency words is not significantly higher than for high-frequency words, the extrinsic instability of word-based embedding techniques (**word2vec**, **GloVe**) offers quite a different picture: The extrinsic instability decreases with word frequency.

Since any corpus – independent of its size – is only a snapshot of the respective language, this observation leads us to the somewhat expectable conclusion, that the quality of the embedding of a word based on **word2vec** and **GloVe**, i.e. how well it resembles the meaning of the word in the language as a whole and not only in the given corpus, increases with the word frequency.

Observation 4: The extrinsic instability of fastText (sub-word based) is constant over word frequency

For the sub-word based embedding technique **fastText** not only the intrinsic but also the extrinsic instability is independent of the word frequency. We suspect the following reason for this: Since the technique is implicitly learning sub-word embeddings and the embeddings of vocabulary words are derived from these, the number of training samples that are used to construct the embeddings of a word does not directly depend on the frequency of the word itself.

Combining the conclusion from above with this observation yields, that the quality of the **fastText** embedding of a word is not expected to decrease for rare words – hence we can expect especially the embeddings of low-frequency words to be superior to word-based approaches like **word2vec** and **GloVe**. This might explain why **fastText** seems to be able to better abstract from the corpus it was trained on to the underlying language, as shown in Section 2.3.

Chapter 3

Minimizing the Instability

Now that we developed a mathematical model to describe the randomness within embedding spaces (Section 2.1.3), decided on a method to quantify its extent (Section 2.2) and analysed different embedding techniques and languages, we turn our focus towards the potential actions one can take to minimize the effects of randomness on the embedding spaces.

3.1 Model and Parameter Choices

As outlined in the previous Chapter, the stability of a set of word embeddings trained on a corpus \mathcal{C} depends heavily on the choice of embedding technique. However, for each of the three types of document sampling we examined, a different technique was found to be the most stable one. Hence, we cannot make a generic proposal on which technique to use in order to minimize the instability of the embedding spaces; the specific scenario and objectives need to be considered.

Apart from the choice of technique itself, each implementation – at least the ones utilized for this work – offers a selection of configurable parameters, which can be further optimized to minimize the instability of the method: Hellrich et al. (2019) found a strong influence of down-sampling strategies on the instability of embeddings for the $\mathbf{SVD}_{\text{PPMI}}$ technique introduced by Levy et al. (2015). Yin and Shen (2018) write, that the PIP loss – i.e. our definition of instability – depends on the number of dimensions of the embedding spaces, and exhibits

a distinct minimum, depending on the corpus, for both **word2vec** and **GloVe**. We are interested in the correlation between training time and stability, i.e. in answering the question: Will the distribution of embeddings eventually converge, given sufficient training time? Due to limited resources, we had to restrict the experiments in this section to **word2vec** and **fastText** trained on Hindi, Finnish, Chinese, Czech, Polish and Portuguese Wikipedia Corpora (i.e. **GloVe**, as well as English are dropped). We can influence the training time for **word2vec** and **fastText** mainly through two parameters: The number of training epochs and the number of negative samples. Table 3.2 and Table 3.1 show the influence of these parameters on the reduced PIP loss measured between two subsequent runs on independently shuffled corpora. An increase in any of the two parameters over the default values yields a decrease in the PIP loss, hence more stable embeddings for both, **word2vec** and **fastText**. However, especially for **word2vec**, the PIP loss reaches a plateau at a certain point and does not further decrease – and can even increase – with longer training time. Altogether, we observe a positive effect when increasing the training time for **word2vec** and **fastText** on the stability of the embeddings. This is mirrored in the mean scores of the respective models on word analogy tasks – outlined in Tables 3.3 and 3.4.

H _I		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.79×10^{-2}	– 11.6	– 18.9
	10	– 14.0	– 18.6	– 19.7
	20	– 17.0	– 17.6	– 15.6
	40	– 15.0	– 12.3	– 8.9

F _I		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.65×10^{-2}	– 12.4	– 18.7
	10	– 9.4	– 17.9	– 20.2
	20	– 15.0	– 14.4	– 14.5
	40	– 11.6	– 9.4	– 5.6

Z _H		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.52×10^{-2}	– 12.6	– 18.1
	10	– 14.0	– 19.7	– 21.5
	20	– 18.0	– 19.4	– 17.7
	40	– 17.5	– 15.9	– 11.6

C _S		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.63×10^{-2}	– 12.9	– 16.9
	10	– 16.9	– 24.9	– 26.2
	20	– 23.0	– 25.3	– 24.0
	40	– 24.1	– 21.7	– 17.8

P _L		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.51×10^{-2}	– 12.0	– 17.0
	10	– 13.0	– 18.8	– 19.9
	20	– 17.3	– 18.2	– 16.6
	40	– 17.8	– 15.9	– 9.0

P _T		Negative Samples		
		5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.60×10^{-2}	– 11.0	– 15.0
	10	– 11.9	– 17.4	– 19.1
	20	– 17.0	– 18.6	– 17.6
	40	– 18.9	– 17.8	– 14.3

Table 3.1: Reduced PIP loss and percentage change due to increasing the training time – i.e. number of epochs and negative samples – of **word2vec** models in six different languages over the default. The depicted values correspond to the mean reduced PIP loss measured between four independent runs on shuffled corpora for each set of parameters in any language.

	H _I	Negative Samples				F _I	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	2.37×10^{-2}	− 0.8	− 1.7	Epochs	5	1.96×10^{-2}	− 1.6	− 3.4
	10	− 3.2	− 3.7	− 4.2		10	− 2.1	− 3.5	− 6.2
	20	− 7.9	− 8.4	− 8.1		20	− 6.5	− 8.9	− 10.4
	40	− 13.9	− 14.3	− 14.2		40	− 13.1	− 15.4	− 16.9
	Z _H	Negative Samples				C _S	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	2.05×10^{-2}	− 2.2	− 3.9	Epochs	5	2.43×10^{-2}	− 2.1	− 3.8
	10	− 4.9	− 6.2	− 8.5		10	− 5.0	− 6.6	− 8.0
	20	− 11.2	− 13.5	− 15.3		20	− 10.7	− 12.6	− 13.8
	40	− 19.6	− 21.5	− 22.1		40	− 18.4	− 20.1	− 21.1
	P _L	Negative Samples				P _T	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	1.94×10^{-2}	− 2.4	− 4.5	Epochs	5	2.06×10^{-2}	− 2.5	− 4.7
	10	− 5.5	− 8.1	− 10.3		10	− 5.8	− 8.4	− 10.1
	20	− 12.4	− 15.0	− 17.0		20	− 12.7	− 15.1	− 17.0
	40	− 21.0	− 23.3	− 18.8		40	− 21.0	− 23.1	− 18.2

Table 3.2: Reduced PIP loss and percentage change due to increasing the training time – i.e. number of epochs and negative samples – of **fastText** models in six different languages over the default. The depicted values correspond to the mean reduced PIP loss measured between four independent runs on shuffled corpora for each set of parameters in any language.

	H _I	Negative Samples				F _I	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	14.5	+ 1.2	+ 2.0	Epochs	5	45.7	+ 1.4	+ 2.7
	10	+ 4.5	+ 5.7	+ 5.8		10	+ 3.6	+ 5.6	+ 7.1
	20	+ 7.4	+ 8.3	+ 9.3		20	+ 5.6	+ 6.9	+ 8.7
	40	+ 9.6	+ 10.8	+ 11.7		40	+ 7.3	+ 7.8	+ 9.5
	Z _H	Negative Samples				C _S	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	48.5	+ 1.9	+ 2.7	Epochs	5	50.8	+ 5.0	+ 6.4
	10	+ 1.7	+ 3.5	+ 4.6		10	+ 7.1	+ 10.4	+ 11.6
	20	+ 1.4	+ 2.7	+ 3.9		20	+ 8.9	+ 12.3	+ 12.8
	40	+ 1.1	+ 2.0	+ 3.0		40	+ 8.9	+ 12.4	+ 14.7
	P _L	Negative Samples				P _T	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	45.2	+ 1.7	+ 4.2	Epochs	5	50.5	+ 1.5	+ 2.8
	10	+ 2.6	+ 5.0	+ 7.0		10	+ 2.1	+ 3.4	+ 4.6
	20	+ 4.0	+ 5.7	+ 7.9		20	+ 2.6	+ 3.7	+ 4.7
	40	+ 4.8	+ 5.8	+ 8.3		40	+ 2.7	+ 3.8	+ 4.6

Table 3.3: Scores on word analogy tasks and change due to increasing the training time – i.e. number of epochs and negative samples – of **word2vec** models in six different languages over the default. The depicted values correspond to the mean score of four independent runs on shuffled corpora for each set of parameters in any language.

	H _I	Negative Samples				F _I	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	17.1	+ 2.8	+ 4.9	Epochs	5	42.8	+ 4.2	+ 4.9
	10	+ 4.4	+ 6.7	+ 8.9		10	+ 4.5	+ 5.8	+ 7.8
	20	+ 7.0	+ 9.5	+ 12.0		20	+ 6.4	+ 9.2	+ 10.0
	40	+ 9.6	+ 12.0	+ 13.6		40	+ 10.0	+ 12.2	+ 12.7
	Z _H	Negative Samples				C _S	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	57.0	+ 2.8	+ 5.2	Epochs	5	62.9	+ 0.4	+ 0.2
	10	+ 2.8	+ 5.6	+ 6.7		10	− 1.8	− 1.3	− 1.5
	20	+ 5.0	+ 7.3	+ 8.8		20	− 3.9	− 3.9	− 4.0
	40	+ 5.3	+ 7.8	+ 8.9		40	− 6.9	− 6.6	− 6.1
	P _L	Negative Samples				P _T	Negative Samples		
		5	10	20			5	10	20
Epochs	5	58.2	+ 2.2	+ 3.4	Epochs	5	56.5	+ 1.4	+ 2.9
	10	+ 2.7	+ 4.0	+ 4.3		10	+ 2.0	+ 3.0	+ 3.9
	20	+ 2.0	+ 3.1	+ 4.3		20	+ 2.4	+ 3.4	+ 4.3
	40	+ 1.3	+ 2.9	+ 3.5		40	+ 2.4	+ 3.5	+ 4.1

Table 3.4: Scores on word analogy tasks and change due to increasing the training time – i.e. number of epochs and negative samples – of **fastText** models in six different languages over the default. The depicted values correspond to the mean score of four independent runs on shuffled corpora for each set of parameters in any language.

3.2 Sample Average over Multiple Embedding Spaces

We have shown in Section 2.1.3, that embedding spaces derived from subsequent runs of a technique \mathcal{T} over shuffled versions of a corpus \mathcal{C} follow a particular probability distribution: The cosine similarity of any pair of words w_k and w_l is normally distributed, with a characteristic mean μ_{kl} and variance σ_{kl} for every pair of words.

Furthermore, the experiments presented in Sections 2.3 and 3.1 demonstrated that a higher quality of embedding spaces (as measured by their performance on word analogy tasks) seems to correlate with a lower mean variance σ_{kl} , and hence lower (reduced) PIP loss.

These two findings prompted us to try a novel approach to increase the quality of word embeddings: If we could compute a meaningful average of the embeddings over multiple runs on fixed, shuffled or bootstrapped corpora, we would expect the mean variance σ_{kl} to decrease, and thus the quality of the embeddings to increase. This idea is supported by recent work on machine learning for image processing (Cireřan et al., 2012); Izmailov et al. (2018) found that “averaging weights lead to wider optima and better generalization” for various neural network architectures. This could be particularly valuable for the task we will tackle in the following chapter – detecting semantic change – since the variance of the embeddings in the individual corpora leads to errors when measuring the difference of the embeddings between distinct corpora.

3.2.1 A Meaningful Average of Two Embedding Spaces

We begin by looking for a meaningful average over two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j , trained by applying the same technique \mathcal{T} on two independently shuffled versions of a corpus \mathcal{C} .

The first problem we encounter is the random orientation of embedding spaces (see Figure 2.1), hence naively averaging over the embeddings does not yield meaningful results. However, since the random orientation is the result of the rotation-invariance of embedding spaces, we can make use of this characteristic and “align” the embeddings with another, before averaging. This alignment of

embedding spaces was first proposed almost simultaneously by Kulkarni et al. (2015) and Zhang et al. (2015b) to compare the embeddings of words trained on different corpora. We follow the approach of Hamilton et al. (2016b), i.e. solving the orthogonal Procrustes problem:

$$\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{I}} \|\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{V}_j\| \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is an orthogonal matrix that corresponds to rotating \mathbf{V}_i to minimize the Frobenius norm between $\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A}$ and \mathbf{V}_j . The solution can be obtained efficiently using the SVD-based approach from Schnemann (1966).

Using this transformation, we define the *aligned average* \mathbf{M}_{ij} of the two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j as:

$$\mathbf{M}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A}_{ij} + \mathbf{V}_j) \quad (3.2)$$

The distribution of the cosine similarity of the embeddings of two words w_k and w_l in the embedding space \mathbf{M}_{ij} , i.e. their dot product – assuming normalized vectors – reads:

$$\vec{m}_{ij}(w_k) \cdot \vec{m}_{ij}^\top(w_l) = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{v}_i(w_k) \mathbf{A}_{ij} + \vec{v}_j(w_k)) \cdot \frac{1}{2} (\vec{v}_i(w_l) \mathbf{A}_{ij} + \vec{v}_j(w_l))^\top \quad (3.3)$$

For the sake of readability, we continue with the notation $\mathbf{A} := \mathbf{A}_{ij}$, $\vec{v}_{k,l} := \vec{v}_i(w_{k,l})$ and $\vec{u}_{k,l} := \vec{v}_j(w_{k,l})$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{m}_{ij}(w_k) \cdot \vec{m}_{ij}^\top(w_l) &= \frac{1}{4} (\vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \mathbf{A}^\top \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} \vec{u}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top + (\vec{u}_k + \vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} - \vec{v}_k \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{A}^\top \vec{v}_l^\top \\ &\quad + (\vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} + \vec{u}_k - \vec{u}_k) \vec{u}_l^\top] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top) + \frac{1}{4} [(\vec{u}_k - \vec{v}_k \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{A}^\top \vec{v}_l^\top + (\vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} - \vec{u}_k) \vec{u}_l^\top] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top) - \frac{1}{4} (\vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} - \vec{u}_k) (\mathbf{A}^\top \vec{v}_l^\top - \vec{u}_l^\top) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top + \vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top) - \frac{1}{4} (\vec{v}_k \mathbf{A} - \vec{u}_k) (\vec{v}_l \mathbf{A} - \vec{u}_l)^\top \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

The result is quite intuitive: The first term is the mean of the cosine similarity of the words w_k and w_l in the two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j respectively; the second term corresponds to the variance introduced by the numerical alignment of the two embedding spaces.

We know that both $\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_l^\top$ and $\vec{u}_k \vec{u}_l^\top$ are sampled from the same Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{kl}, \sigma_{kl}^2)$, hence the first term is a Gaussian with mean $\tilde{\mu}$ and variance $\tilde{\sigma}^2$:

$$\tilde{\mu} = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{kl} + \mu_{kl}) = \mu_{kl} \quad \tilde{\sigma}^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\sigma_{kl}^2 + \sigma_{kl}^2} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{kl}^2 \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore, we find in our experiments, that the second term is again a Normal distribution, with zero mean and a variance smaller than $\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{kl}^2$, for all languages and techniques examined in this work.

Altogether, this means that the distribution of the dot product $\vec{m}_{ij}(w_k) \cdot \vec{m}_{ij}^\top(w_l)$ of the embeddings of the words w_k and w_l in the aligned average space \mathbf{M}_{ij} has the same mean, but a smaller variance, than the distributions in the original spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j .

This is an indicator that averaging over embedding spaces might be beneficial for their quality: It seems like the cosine similarities are converging towards the mean of the underlying distribution.

3.2.1.1 Normalization and the Bias-Variance Trade-off

We made one – as we realized during our experiments – rather naive assumption in the section above, namely, that the aligned average of two normalized vectors is still normalized. However, as illustrated in Figure 3.1, the aligned average is not only not normalized, but the length distribution is systematically lopsided. Since the two normalized vectors $\vec{v}_j(w_k)$ and $\vec{v}_i(w_k) \mathbf{A}_{ij}$ are generally not parallel, the triangle inequality yields that the length of $\vec{m}_{ij}(w_k)$ can only be smaller (or equal, in case of two parallel vectors) to 1.

To calculate the cosine similarity of the embeddings of any two words w_k and w_l in the aligned average space \mathbf{M}_{ij} , the result of Equation (3.4) must be divided by the length of the vectors $\vec{m}_{ij}(w_k)$ and $\vec{m}_{ij}(w_l)$, which are generally smaller than 1, hence the distribution of the cosine similarity is displaced towards larger values than in the original spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j .

Hence, we find that averaging leads to a *bias-variance trade-off*: The variance of the cosine similarity distribution in the aligned average spaces is smaller than in the original ones, however, the means are systematically biased towards larger values. This is illustrated in Figure 3.2. For the embeddings and techniques




Figure 3.1: Illustration of the normalization problem that occurs when we average over aligned embedding spaces. If the two vectors $\vec{v}_{\text{dog}^{(1)}}$ and $\vec{v}_{\text{dog}^{(2)}}$ are normalized and not parallel, the length of their average $\frac{1}{2}(\vec{v}_{\text{dog}^{(1)}} + \vec{v}_{\text{dog}^{(2)}})$ is smaller than 1.

examined in this work, we found the differences of μ_{kl} and σ_{kl} between the aligned average space \mathbf{M}_{ij} and the two original spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j (averaged over 10,000 randomly sampled word pairs) to fall within the following limits:

$$\frac{1}{1.39} < \frac{\langle \sigma_{kl} \rangle^{\mathbf{M}}}{\langle \sigma_{kl} \rangle^{\mathbf{V}}} < \frac{1}{1.28} \quad 1.01 < \frac{\langle \mu_{kl} \rangle^{\mathbf{M}}}{\langle \mu_{kl} \rangle^{\mathbf{V}}} < 1.22 \quad (3.6)$$

Before we analyse the effect of this trade-off on the quality of the embeddings, we want to find a way to average over samples that consist of more than two arbitrarily oriented embedding spaces.




Figure 3.2: Distribution of cosine similarities for 5,000 randomly sampled word pairs over 128 runs of **fastText** embeddings trained on independently shuffled versions of the Finnish Wikipedia. The column on the left shows the distribution for the 128 individual models, the column on the right shows the distribution for the 64 embedding spaces we computed as an aligned average over two models each. The histograms in the top row depict the cumulated centred distribution over all word pairs. The variance of the averaged models is significantly smaller than that of the original ones. The bottom row shows the distribution of the mean values of the cosine similarity of the different word pairs; with the expected bias towards higher values. Table 3.5 illustrates these distributions for a specific example.

3.2.2 Increasing the Sample Size

A naive method – and our own initial approach – to compute the aligned average over a set $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{V}_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r\}$ of $r > 2$ embedding spaces is illustrated in Figure 3.3: We randomly select one embedding space $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathcal{S}$, calculate the closest orthogonal transformation \mathbf{A}_{ij} – using Equation (3.1) – from any other space $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ to \mathbf{V}_j , and define the aligned average as:

$$\mathbf{M} = \frac{1}{r} \left(\mathbf{V}_j + \sum_{j \neq i=1}^r \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{A}_{ij} \right) \quad (3.7)$$

However, both our experiments and a theoretical analysis yield that this ap-




Figure 3.3: Illustration of a naive and discarded approach to calculate the aligned average over more than two embedding spaces.

proach creates more random variations than it can reduce. The result depends heavily on the initial, random choice of \mathbf{V}_j and the sum of the deviations from transforming the embeddings of the $r - 1$ remaining embedding to \mathbf{V}_j can cause substantial variations in the resulting space \mathbf{M} .

We have shown in Section 3.2.1 that the aligned average \mathbf{M}_{ij} of two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{V}_j exhibits smaller variances σ_{kl} of the cosine similarities of arbitrary word pairs w_k and w_l than the original spaces – but also some bias. Since this was found to be true for any set of initial embedding spaces, we can extend the finding to an approach for averaging over more than two spaces: By averaging only two spaces at a time – in a binary-tree fashion (see Figure 3.4).




Figure 3.4: Illustration of the tree-based approach used to calculate the aligned average over more than two embedding spaces.

3.2.3 Influence of Averaging on Stability and Quality

We have applied the approach outlined in the previous sections to *compute the aligned average over 128 independent runs* on fixed, shuffled and bootstrapped corpora for all techniques and languages¹ outlined in Section 1.2.

Using the tree-based approach outlined in Section 3.2.2, and storing all intermediate spaces computed in the process, means that for every language, technique, and sampling method we have 128 initial spaces, 64 2-fold average spaces, 32 4-fold average spaces, etc., and finally, one embedding space that constitutes the average over all 128 initial spaces.

Figure 3.5 illustrates the reduced PIP loss measured between pairs of spaces at different levels of the averaging process. We observe a strong decline of the reduced PIP loss, close to the theoretical limit, i.e. the course one would expect if the deviations caused by the orthogonal transformation of one embedding space into another – the second term in Equation 3.4 – would vanish. Hence, averaging over aligned embedding spaces trained in multiple runs seems to reduce the random noise inherent to the training process of any embedding technique.

Table 3.5 contains an anecdotal illustration of the increased stability of the averaged embeddings: It comprises the 15 nearest neighbors of the target word **momentum** for two embedding spaces, each the aligned average over 32 subsequently trained models on independently shuffled versions of the English

¹Except for English, which was omitted due to limited computational resources.




Figure 3.5: Mean reduced PIP loss observed between pairs of averaged embeddings of different sample sizes, as a fraction of the mean reduced PIP loss of the individual models. For every technique, the decrease in reduced PIP loss is close to the theoretical lower limit, i.e. what we would expect, if the deviations caused by the orthogonal transformation of one embedding space into another vanish.

Wikipedia. Table 2.2 holds the same comparison for two of the initial models. For the average-based models, one can observe less variations in the ranking, smaller differences between the cosine similarity values and the bias towards higher similarities outlined in Section 3.2.1.1.

However, *more stable embeddings are not necessarily better* suited for the use in downstream tasks. As outlined in the beginning of Chapter 2, the inherent random processes of any embedding technique could be replaced by deterministic alternatives, which would only create a false sense of reliability. Hence, we need to determine if the embeddings compiled by averaging have a higher quality, as measured by their score on word analogy tasks. Figure 3.6 shows the improvements in the score for **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText** models for increasing sample size. The results for all languages that were examined in this work are compiled in Table 3.6.

For **GloVe**, one can see an increase in score compared to the individual runs, for all languages, up to a sample size of 32. Increasing the size further does not yield significant improvements, the score plateaus. For **word2vec** we observe a similar behaviour – although the relative increase in score is smaller than for **GloVe** – for all languages except Chinese. Finally, for **fastText**, the results are mixed: We see a strong increase of the score for Hindi and Finnish, with a significant decrease for Chinese, on the other hand.

One possible reason for this observation is that **fastText** embeddings – in contrast to **word2vec** and **GloVe** – are sub-word based. The approach we have chosen is based on naively averaging over the embeddings of vocabulary words, however. Hence, averaging over the underlying sub-word embeddings might be the more promising approach for **fastText**.

target word: momentum

word	run # 1		run # 2	
	rank	cos	rank	cos
inertia	1	0.662	1	0.668
momenta	2	0.651	2	0.648
kinetic	3	0.632	3	0.633
centripetal	4	0.608	4	0.608
vorticity	5	0.603	5	0.606
gravitational	6	0.596	6	0.599
energy	7	0.594	7	0.598
mass-energy	8	0.594	8	0.594
accelerating	9	0.590	9	0.591
flux	10	0.589	11	0.588
angular	11	0.587	10	0.589
massless	12	0.586	12	0.585
velocity	13	0.584	14	0.584
eigenstate	14	0.583	13	0.585
decelerating	15	0.583	20	0.574

Table 3.5: Most similar words to the target word **momentum** for two embedding spaces, each the aligned average over 32 subsequently trained models on independently shuffled versions of the English Wikipedia, with a reduced vocabulary size of 200,000 words. Although we argue against the use of nearest-neighbor based metrics to quantify the instability of word embeddings, they can be used to illustrate the increase in stability over the models depicted in Table 2.2:

$$p_{@10} = 0.9, \quad j_{@10} \approx 0.818, \quad p_{@15} \approx 0.933, \quad j_{@15} \approx 0.875 \quad (3.8)$$




Figure 3.6: Mean score on the word analogy tasks in Hindi, Czech and Portuguese for **word2vec**, **GloVe**, and **fastText** models, as a function of the averaging sample size. The y -axis measures the relative difference of the score, compared to the individually trained models.

Language	word2vec	GloVe	fastText
HI	+ 1.8	+ 1.1	+ 5.9
FI	+ 1.0	+ 3.1	+ 8.1
ZH	− 0.2	+ 6.4	− 3.9
CS	+ 1.8	+ 2.7	+ 0.1
PT	+ 0.9	+ 2.9	+ 0.1
PL	+ 0.9	+ 2.6	+ 1.9

Table 3.6: Difference in the mean score on the word analogy task between the 128 models trained in individual runs and the 16 models computed by averaging over 8 samples each.

Conclusion

In our experiments on six different languages, we found that increasing the training time of **word2vec** and **fastText**, i.e. the number of epochs and negative samples, generally reduces the instability (as measured by the PIP loss), and improves the quality (as measured by the score on word analogy tasks) of the trained word embeddings. However, this general observation does not strictly hold in all scenarios – increasing the training time can also have the opposite effect. We do not argue to have a satisfactory explanation for these mixed observations.

Furthermore, we introduced a novel method to compute a meaningful average over several embedding spaces. This method proved to be efficient in reducing the instability of the embeddings and – for most, but not all combinations of technique and language – also increasing the quality of the embeddings.

Chapter 4

Semantic Change

The meaning of words in a language can change severely over time, reflecting complex developments in the respective society. “Examples include both changes to the core meaning of words (like the word *gay* shifting from meaning *carefree* to *homosexual* during the 20th century) and subtle shifts of cultural associations (like *Iraq* or *Syria* being associated with the concept of *war* after armed conflicts had started in these countries)” – Kutuzov et al. (2018).

Understanding these changes has long been a topic of interest in linguistic research: In one of the earliest works on this topic, Bral (1899) documented and categorized semantic shifts. Over the past decade this field has changed dramatically through the use of prediction-based word embedding techniques (Tang, 2018; Kutuzov et al., 2018; Tahmasebi et al., 2018). Kim et al. (2014) were the first to use prediction-based (**word2vec**) embeddings to trace diachronic shifts, and after Zhang et al. (2015b) and Kulkarni et al. (2015) proposed a method to align word embeddings trained on different corpora (see Section 3.2.1), many followed this approach (Hamilton et al., 2016b,a; Dubossarsky et al., 2017).

The approach can be summarized as follows: First, one obtains the embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_{t_1} and \mathbf{V}_{t_2} by applying the same embedding technique \mathcal{T} on two corpora \mathcal{C}_{t_1} and \mathcal{C}_{t_2} from different epochs t_1 and t_2 :

$$\mathbf{V}_{t_1} \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}_{t_1}) \qquad \mathbf{V}_{t_2} \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}_{t_2}) \qquad (4.1)$$

Next, the two embedding spaces \mathbf{V}_{t_1} and \mathbf{V}_{t_2} are aligned by solving the orthogonal Procrustes problem, that yields the orthogonal transformation $\mathbf{A}_{t_1 t_2}$

corresponding to the closest match between $\mathbf{V}_{t_1} \mathbf{A}_{t_1 t_2}$ and \mathbf{V}_{t_2} – see Equation (3.1). Finally, the semantic change $\Delta_{t_1 t_2}$ of a word w between the epochs t_1 and t_2 is defined as the cosine distance¹ of the two word vectors $\vec{v}_{t_1}(w) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{t_1 t_2}$ and $\vec{v}_{t_2}(w)$, i.e.:

$$\Delta_{t_1 t_2}(w) = \text{cos-dist} [\vec{v}_{t_1}(w) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{t_1 t_2}, \vec{v}_{t_2}(w)] \quad (4.2)$$

Applying this approach to 20 decades of documents in American English, Hamilton et al. (2016b) proposed multiple *Statistical Laws of Semantic Change*, e.g. that more frequently used words change slower than less frequently used ones, but Dubossarsky et al. (2017) contested these findings and argued that they are products of the inherent instability of the embedding techniques.

In this chapter, we employ diachronic word embeddings, utilizing the understanding of the stability of word embeddings outlined in Chapter 2, along with the methods introduced in Chapter 3 to minimize the instability in order to differentiate between model artifacts and actual semantic shifts.

4.1 Semantic Change Detection

The large methodological changes in research on semantic change that are outlined in the section above, prompted Schlechtweg et al. (2020) to call for a competition on semantic change detection: Task 1 of the 14th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, taking place in Barcelona, Spain in September 2020 comprises the unsupervised detection of lexical semantic change.

The organizers provide corpora from two distinct epochs in each of the following four languages: English, German, Latin and Swedish. The corpora are described in more detail in Section 1.2.5.2. The competition consists of two tasks: a classification task and a ranking task, both on the same two corpora in each language, and the same set of 30 to 50 target words per language. The goal of the classification task is to decide which of the target words have lost or gained senses between the two epochs, whereas the goal of the ranking task is to sort the target words according to their degree of semantic change.

The submitted solutions for each task are evaluated against annotations by experts (native speakers for English, German and Swedish, and scholars of Latin

¹The term cosine distance refers to 1 minus the cosine similarity.

for Latin). The annotations were produced using the framework developed by Schlechtweg et al. (2018), i.e. by ranking the relatedness of pairs of the usage of one word w in two different contexts (an example provided by the authors is illustrated in Table 4.1). Schlechtweg et al. (2018) asked five annotators to evaluate the use relatedness of more than 1000 use-pairs of different words and found an inter-annotator agreement (measured by Spearman’s ρ) of between 0.57 and 0.68. This demonstrates that there are limits to the performance of any model on these tasks, since even human experts do not fully agree on a “single version of the truth”.

<u>Target Context 1:</u>	<u>Target Context 2:</u>
<i>Ein Donnerwetter in Paris ist mit so vielen Verdrieslichkeiten verknüpft, da ichs hier anführen mu.</i>	<i>Der andre observirte schärfer mit dem Ausruf: „Donnerwetter, sollte ich mich irren!“</i>

Table 4.1: A pair of use-pair of the German word *Donnerwetter*, with a small relatedness, as evaluated by humans (Schlechtweg et al., 2018).

We employed the following approach for the two tasks: We trained **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings on 32 shuffled, as well as 32 bootstrapped versions of the corpora from both epochs in all four languages. Out of these embedding spaces, we produced multiple models that were evaluated on the two tasks:

1. *Individual runs* (IR) trained on shuffled, as well as bootstrapped corpora.
2. The *aligned average* (AA) of the 32 embeddings trained on shuffled and bootstrapped² corpora, as introduced in Section 3.2.
3. The *ensemble average* (EA) of the 32 embeddings trained on shuffled and bootstrapped corpora, as proposed by Antoniak and Mimno (2018): Here, we independently apply each of the 32 models to the tasks at hand and

²Training embedding spaces on bootstrapped versions of a corpus might lead to partially disjoint vocabularies. In this case, we compute the average for all words that occur in both vocabularies and keep the original embeddings for all words that occur only in one of the two vocabularies.

Corpus	Human Annotations		Word Embeddings	
	Rank	Word	Rank	Word
English $t_1 = 1810 - 1860$ $t_2 = 1960 - 2010$	1	plane	1	plane
	2	tip	2	prop
	3	prop	3	graft
	4	graft	4	record
	5	record	5	player
German $t_1 = 1800 - 1899$ $t_2 = 1946 - 1990$	1	abgebrüht	1	Engpa
	2	Ohrwurm	2	Ohrwurm
	3	Engpa	3	artikulieren
	4	abbauen	4	Sensation
	5	ausspannen	5	abbauen
Latin $t_1 = 200 \text{ BC} - 0$ $t_2 = 0 - 2000$	1	pontifex	1	sanctus
	2	imperator	2	titulus
	3	beatus	3	adsumo
	4	sacramentum	4	sacramentum
	5	titulus	5	beatus
Swedish $t_1 = 1790 - 1830$ $t_2 = 1895 - 1903$	1	medium	1	konduktr
	2	krita	2	antya
	3	motiv	3	medium
	4	ledning	4	central
	5	granskare	5	aktiv

Table 4.2: The five words with the largest semantic change between the two epochs t_1 and t_2 in the four different languages, out of the set of target words of the respective language. The results in the rightmost column correspond to an aligned average over 32 runs of **fastText** on bootstrapped corpora.

Model	Type	Size	Sampling	Task 1: Binary		Task 2: Ranking	
				<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>
word2vec	IR	1	shuffle	0.644	0.018	0.487	0.018
			bootstrap	0.635	0.020	0.467	0.018
	AA	32	shuffle	0.615	< 0.004	0.483	< 0.002
			bootstrap	0.651	< 0.007	0.465	< 0.008
	EA	32	shuffle	0.657	< 0.003	0.491	< 0.008
			bootstrap	0.642	< 0.006	0.485	< 0.005
GloVe	IR	1	shuffle	0.585	0.009	0.258	0.025
			bootstrap	0.589	0.016	0.223	0.046
	AA	32	shuffle	0.580	< 0.003	0.241	< 0.006
			bootstrap	0.600	< 0.010	0.311	< 0.019
	EA	32	shuffle	0.584	< 0.001	0.267	< 0.005
			bootstrap	0.587	< 0.001	0.275	< 0.009
fastText	IR	1	shuffle	0.653	0.017	0.431	0.025
			bootstrap	0.638	0.023	0.408	0.034
	AA	32	shuffle	0.650	< 0.001	0.471	< 0.007
			bootstrap	0.674	< 0.002	0.483	< 0.005
	EA	32	shuffle	0.644	< 0.011	0.458	< 0.007
			bootstrap	0.637	< 0.011	0.448	< 0.007

Table 4.3: Results of different **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** models on the two tasks of the semantic change detection outlined in Section 4.1. The accuracy of the binary classification of the target words is reported for Task 1, and Spearman’s ρ between the ranking produced by the model and the human annotation for Task 2 (averaged over the four languages in both cases). For each of the three embedding techniques, we report the mean and standard deviation of six different models: The individual runs (IR) over shuffled and bootstrapped corpora, the aligned average (AA) over the 32 runs (see Section 3.2) and the ensemble average (EA) proposed by Antoniak and Mimno (2018). The standard deviations for the AA and EA models, are calculated on size-16 models (we can only produce one size-32 model) and hence an upper limit to the true standard deviation. The overall best-performing model is the aligned average over a set of 32 **fastText** embeddings trained on bootstrapped corpora.

finally average over the 32 sets of results (for the classification in Task 1, the majority vote is used).

For each of the models and languages, we calculate the semantic change for any word that appears in the corpus of both epochs t_1 and t_2 , as outlined in Equation (4.2). The ranking of the semantic change of the target words (Task 2) is computed directly from this measure. For the binary classification (Task 1), we compute a model dependent threshold τ and assume that every target word that exceeds this threshold has gained or lost a sense between the two epochs.³

The performance of the different models on the two tasks is outlined in Table 4.3; Table 4.2 illustrates the results of our best-performing model on the ranking task.

The standard deviations of the scores of the individual runs (see Table 4.3) emphasize once more a recommendation already made in Chapter 2: When reporting any score on an NLP task that is based on word embeddings, the mean and standard deviation over – at least five – subsequent runs should be provided. For **word2vec**, the ensemble average over shuffled corpora yields the highest overall score, but most of the scores fall within the 3σ -confidence interval⁴ of each other, hence the significance of this result is not entirely clear. For **GloVe** and **fastText**, the aligned average over bootstrapped corpora produces the highest scores, for **fastText** the differences between this and any other model exceed 3σ and can therefore be considered significant. Comparing the different models over all three embedding techniques, we consider the *aligned average over embeddings trained on bootstrapped corpora* to be the most promising approach to detect semantic change – it also yields the highest overall score (with **fastText** embeddings).

The scores of this model on the two tasks in each of the four languages is presented in Table 4.4: The results for German and Swedish are significantly

³In preliminary experiments we found that the threshold $\tau = \mu + \sigma/2$ performs well, where μ and σ are mean and standard deviation of the semantic change of all words appearing in both corpora.

⁴The confidence intervals are based on the standard deviation of the mean σ_μ ; in Table 4.3 only the standard deviation of the distribution σ is reported. σ_μ is given by σ/\sqrt{n} , with $n = 32$ for the models of size 1 and $n = 2$ for the models of size 32.

better, than for English and Latin. This is not only true for the best-performing model, but for virtually any model we tried. A likely explanation for this can be found in Table 1.8: The size of the training corpora for German and Swedish is more than 10 times larger than for English and Latin.

Language	Task 1: Binary	Task 2: Ranking	Average
English	0.703	0.356	0.530
German	0.750	0.679	0.714
Latin	0.500	0.300	0.400
Swedish	0.742	0.597	0.670

Table 4.4: Scores of our best-performing model (aligned average over 32 **fast-Text** embeddings trained on bootstrapped corpora) on the two tasks in the four different languages.

The models our team submitted during the official evaluation phase – when the annotated results were not yet published, i.e. verifying the models was not possible – had severe problems, hence we could not produce any meaningful contributions within the official competition. In the post-evaluation phase, i.e. after the annotations were published, our best submission ranks – as of June 11th, 2020 – 7th on Task 1 and 6th on Task 2 out of 34 participating teams (each team can submit an arbitrary number of models).⁵ Given the comparably small size of the test sets, it is fair to say our models are generally competitive, but they do not quite reach the state-of-the-art. We have to wait until September to find out how the better-performing models are built.

4.2 Laws of Semantic Change

Based on a study of **PPMI**, **SVD** and **word2vec** embeddings trained on different historical corpora, Hamilton et al. (2016b) proposed the *law of conformity*: Rarely used words exhibit – on average – higher rates of semantic change than more frequently used words. However, Dubossarsky et al. (2017) contested the

⁵The leaderboard is publicly visible at <https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/20948#results> – our submission was made under the team name `#hitsters`.

validity of these findings, by showing that the same correlation is observed in a control condition, i.e. on a corpus that is randomly split into multiple batches, which are then treated like different epochs of a genuine historical corpus.

In this section, we apply the instability-reducing technique of averaging over aligned embedding spaces, introduced in Section 3.2, to the genuine historical COHA corpus, as well as a randomly composed control corpus. Thus, we try to differentiate between true semantic change as found on a genuine historical corpus and the intrinsic variability also observed on a randomly composed corpus, to put the *law of conformity* proposed by Hamilton et al. (2016b) to the test.⁶

We trained **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings on 32 shuffled and bootstrapped versions of the 20 decades of the historical COHA corpus, that was also used by Hamilton et al. (2016b) and Dubossarsky et al. (2017). For the control condition, we repeated this procedure on a randomized historical corpus, which was compiled by accumulating the texts of the 20 decades of the COHA corpus and randomly splitting it into 20 batches. Out of the 32 embedding spaces for each decade/batch and type of document sampling, we computed the aligned average of size 2,4,8,16 and 32.

Then, the semantic change $\Delta(w, t)$ of every word w between the epoch t and $t+1$ – if the word appears at least 500 times both epochs – is computed based on Equation (4.2). Following the previous work, the rate of semantic change, as well as word frequency is log-transformed and standardized: The variables are then denoted as $\tilde{\Delta}$ and \tilde{f} respectively. Figure 4.1 shows the semantic displacement of words between the 1990s and the 2000s as a function of their frequency.

The influence of word frequency on semantic change is – again following the previous work – treated with a linear mixed effects model:

$$\tilde{\Delta}(w, t) = \beta_0 + \beta_f \tilde{f}(w, t) + z(w) + \varepsilon(w, t) \quad (4.3)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}(w, t)$ is the (log-transformed and standardized) rate of semantic change of the word w between the temporal epochs t and $t+1$, β_0 is the fixed intercept, β_f is the fixed effect of word frequency, $z(w) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ is a random, time-

⁶Hamilton et al. (2016b) and Dubossarsky et al. (2017) furthermore examined the influence of polysemy and prototypicality on the rates of semantic change. However, Dubossarsky et al. (2017) showed that neither of these word properties significantly improves the explained variance by the fixed effects, hence we place our focus on the effect of frequency.




Figure 4.1: Semantic Displacement – measured as the normalized log of the cosine distance of **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings of individual words from the 1990s to the 2000s – over Word Frequency. The models correspond to individual runs of the embedding techniques on the respective decades of the COHA corpus.

independent, intercept for word w and $\varepsilon(w, t)$ is an error term associated with the individual measurement.

The fixed-effect predictor coefficient for frequency β_f , as well as the fraction of variance explained⁷ for the different embedding techniques, is plotted against the sample size of the aligned average in Figure 4.2: The difference in the variance explained by frequency is significantly increasing through averaging for all three embedding techniques.

The numerical results are summarized in Table 4.5. Dubossarsky et al. (2017) found only an 8 % difference in the variance explained by frequency between the genuine historical corpus and the control condition, and concluded, that the effect of frequency on the rate of semantic change “may be real, but to a far lesser extent than had be claimed”. We argue, that averaging over aligned samples, hence reducing the intrinsic instability of word embedding models – as shown in Section 3.2.3 – yields clearly distinct results for the genuine historical corpus and the random control condition. The difference in explained variance by frequency for the 32-fold average models are 31 %, 37 % and 27 % for **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText**, respectively. The fixed-effect coefficient β_f , which Hamilton et al. (2016b) placed in the interval $[-1.26, -0.27]$ is restricted to:

$$\beta_f = [-0.75, -0.58] \tag{4.4}$$

in our experiments.

⁷Variance explained is the generalized R^2 for linear mixed effect models as defined by Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2013).




Figure 4.2: Fixed effect coefficient β_f and variance explained by frequency of the mixed linear effects model as a function of the sample size of the aligned average of **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings trained on shuffled corpora.

Model	Size	Coefficient β_f		Expl. Variance	
		<i>Genuine</i>	<i>Random</i>	<i>Genuine</i>	<i>Random</i>
word2vec	1	−0.57	−0.26	30 %	7 %
	32	−0.58	+0.02	31 %	0 %
GloVe	1	−0.76	−0.58	61 %	45 %
	32	−0.74	−0.41	62 %	25 %
fastText	1	−0.53	−0.35	20 %	11 %
	32	−0.75	−0.29	35 %	8 %

Table 4.5: Fixed effect coefficient β_f and variance explained by frequency of the mixed linear effects model for individual runs of **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText**, as well as the aligned average over 32 embeddings spaces trained on shuffled corpora.

Conclusion

Our experiments on Task 1 of the SemEval 2020 workshop showed, that word embeddings, trained on diachronic corpora, are a valid tool for detecting semantic change – as judged by human experts – and are competitive with the state-of-the-art. We found that the performance of this approach can be significantly improved by using the aligned average of multiple embedding spaces trained independently on bootstrapped versions of the corpus.

Furthermore, the minimization of the intrinsic instability of the embedding techniques through this approach enables to make the distinction between true semantic change and artifacts produces by the inherent instability of the embedding techniques. The values in Table 4.5 show differences of around 30% of variance explained by frequency between the genuine historical corpus and the control condition – for **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings. This supports the *law of conformity*: Word frequency correlates negatively with the rate of semantic change of a word.

Chapter 5

Discussion

In this last chapter, we briefly discuss what we deem the most important results presented in this work and place them in the greater context of NLP research.

We could reproduce the findings of Hellrich and Hahn (2016a,b, 2017); Hellrich et al. (2019); Antoniak and Mimno (2018); Chugh et al. (2018); Wendlandt et al. (2018); Pierrejean and Tanguy (2018), that the training processes of prediction-, as well as count-based non-contextualized word embeddings exhibit significant instability. The extent of this instability, that we found even for comparably large corpora might still come as a surprise to the reader. For example, out of 128 **fastText** models (Bojanowski et al., 2016), trained on independently shuffled versions of the Polish Wikipedia (470 million words), the relative difference in the score on the Polish word analogy dataset published by Grave et al. (2018), between the best and worst performing models were close to 10% (see Table 2.1). This supports the case, that every time a score on a word analogy dataset – or any task that depends on word embeddings for that matter - is published, *the results of at least five independent runs should be reported*. The current practice in research is to provide a single score, without information on its variance; our data indicates that this is insufficient.

The large number of experiments we conducted – in total, over 10,000 embedding models were trained – allow us to conclude that the distribution of the cosine similarity of any word pair over multiple runs of the same technique on independently shuffled corpora can be *closely approximated by a normal distri-*

bution (see Section 2.1.3). We found this to be true for **word2vec**, **GloVe** and **fastText** embeddings, trained on any of the corpora outlined in Section 1.2.2. This might not come as a surprise, but the observation is helpful in understanding the observed variability. In particular, it made us question the validity of nearest-neighbor based metrics, used in most of the previous work, to measure the instability of the embedding of a word w over multiple runs. The *word-wise PIP loss*, based on the PIP loss of Yin and Shen (2018), was proposed as an alternative.

Furthermore, the Gaussian nature of the instability suggests that averaging might help to reduce it. We used the methods developed by Kulkarni et al. (2015) and Zhang et al. (2015b) and later modified by Hamilton et al. (2016b) to “align” two sets of embeddings and proposed a novel method to compute the aligned average over multiple embedding spaces. We found that this approach comes with a bias-variance trade-off, i.e. while the embeddings clearly converge through averaging (see Figure 3.5), hence we can in fact minimize the instability, this does not always result in a higher quality of the embeddings, as measured by their score on word analogy tasks (see Table 3.6). Therefore, less instability is not necessarily better.

Applying this method to the task of detecting and quantifying semantic change produced significantly better results than the individual runs for **fastText** and **GloVe** embeddings. For **word2vec** embeddings, the ensemble average over bootstrapped corpora proposed by Antoniak and Mimno (2018) lead to the best results. Their approach captivates through its simplicity, but the computational expense is a significant drawback: One needs to store several embedding models and apply each of them individually to the respective downstream task.

Finally, training several embedding models on 20 decades of historical American English, showed that the proposed averaging procedure significantly reduces the observed, artificial, effect of frequency in a control condition introduced by Dubossarsky et al. (2017), whereas the effect of frequency found in the genuine historical corpus was not diminished for **word2vec** and **GloVe**, and even increased for **fastText** (see Figure 4.2). We argue that this supports the *law of conformity*, proposed by Hamilton et al. (2016b) at least for historical American English between 1800 and 2000.

Nevertheless, several questions concerning the instability of NLP models in general, remain unanswered: Specifically, the influence of the instability on more complex downstream tasks, and furthermore, the extent of the instability of more recently developed attention-based language models, like **ELMo** and **BERT**.

Bibliography

- L.C. Andrews and Society of Photo-optical Instrumentation Engineers. 1998. *Special Functions of Mathematics for Engineers*. Oxford science publications. SPIE Optical Engineering Press.
- Maria Antoniak and David Mimno. 2018. Evaluating the stability of embedding-based word similarities. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:107–119.
- Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, and Eneko Agirre. 2016. Learning principled bilingual mappings of word embeddings while preserving monolingual invariance. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2289–2294, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Janvin. 2003. A neural probabilistic language model. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:1137–1155.
- Yoshua Bengio and Yann Lecun. 2007. *Scaling learning algorithms towards AI*. MIT Press.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *CoRR*, abs/1607.04606.
- Danushka Bollegala, Kohei Hayashi, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. 2017. Learning linear transformations between counting-based and prediction-based word embeddings. *PLOS ONE*, 12:e0184544.

- Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y. Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam Kalai. 2016. Man is to computer programmer as woman is to homemaker? debiasing word embeddings. *CoRR*, abs/1607.06520.
- Lars Borin, Markus Forsberg, and Johan Roxendal. 2012. Korp — the corpus infrastructure of språkbanken. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’12)*, pages 474–478, Istanbul, Turkey. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Michel Bral. 1899. *Essai de smantique*. Hachette, Paris.
- Pi-Chuan Chang, Michel Galley, and Christopher D. Manning. 2008. Optimizing chinese word segmentation for machine translation performance. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, StatMT 08, page 224232, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinxiong Chen, Lei Xu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Huanbo Luan. 2015. Joint learning of character and word embeddings.
- Mansi Chugh, Peter A. Whigham, and Grant Dick. 2018. Stability of word embeddings using word2vec. In *Australasian Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Dan C. Cireşan, Alessandro Giusti, Luca M. Gambardella, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2012. Deep neural networks segment neuronal membranes in electron microscopy images. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2*, NIPS12, page 28432851, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston. 2008. A unified architecture for natural language processing: Deep neural networks with multitask learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML 08, page 160167, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Mark Davies. 2015. Corpus of Historical American English (COHA).

- Scott Deerwester, Susan T. Dumais, George W. Furnas, Thomas K. Landauer, and Richard Harshman. 1990. Indexing by latent semantic analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 41(6):391–407.
- Scott C. Deerwester, Susan T. Dumais, George W. Furnas, Richard A. Harshman, Thomas K. Landauer, Karen E. Lochbaum, and Lynn A. Streeter. 1989. Computer information retrieval using latent semantic structure. (US Patent 4839853 A).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805.
- Haim Dubossarsky, Daphna Weinshall, and Eitan Grossman. 2017. Outta control: Laws of semantic change and inherent biases in word representation models. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1136–1145, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. 2011. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(61):2121–2159.
- Steffen Eger and Alexander Mehler. 2016. On the linearity of semantic change: Investigating meaning variation via dynamic graph models.
- J. Firth. 1957. A synopsis of linguistic theory 1930-1955. In *Studies in Linguistic Analysis*. Philological Society, Oxford. Reprinted in Palmer, F. (ed. 1968) *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth*, Longman, Harlow.
- David Freedman, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 2007. Statistics (international student edition). *Pisani, R. Purves, 4th edn. WW Norton & Company, New York*.
- Yoav Goldberg and Omer Levy. 2014. word2vec explained: deriving mikolov et al.’s negative-sampling word-*CoRR*, abs/1402.3722.
- Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Prakhar Gupta, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2018. Learning word vectors for 157 languages. In *Proceedings of*

the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018), Miyazaki, Japan. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).

Michael U. Gutmann and Aapo Hyvärinen. 2012. Noise-contrastive estimation of unnormalized statistical models, with applications to natural image statistics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:307–361.

Maryam Habibi, Leon Weber, Mariana Neves, David Luis Wiegandt, and Ulf Leser. 2017. Deep learning with word embeddings improves biomedical named entity recognition. *Bioinformatics*, 33(14):i37–i48.

William L. Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. 2016a. Cultural shift or linguistic drift? comparing two computational measures of semantic change. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2116–2121, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.

William L. Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. 2016b. Diachronic word embeddings reveal statistical laws of semantic change. *CoRR*, abs/1605.09096.

Zellig S. Harris. 1954. Distributional structure. *$i_i WORD_i / i_i$* , 10(2-3):146–162.

Nathan Hartmann, Erick R. Fonseca, Christopher Shulby, Marcos Vinícius Treviso, Jéssica S. Rodrigues, and Sandra M. Aluísio. 2017. Portuguese word embeddings: Evaluating on word analogies and natural language tasks. *CoRR*, abs/1708.06025.

Johannes Hellrich and Udo Hahn. 2016a. An assessment of experimental protocols for tracing changes in word semantics relative to accuracy and r. In *Proceedings of the 10th SIGHUM Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities*, pages 111–117, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Johannes Hellrich and Udo Hahn. 2016b. Bad Company—Neighborhoods in neural embedding spaces considered harmful.

- In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 2785–2796, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- Johannes Hellrich and Udo Hahn. 2017. Don’t get fooled by word embeddings- better watch their neighborhood. In *Digital Humanities*.
- Johannes Hellrich, Bernd Kampe, and Udo Hahn. 2019. The influence of down-sampling strategies on SVD word embedding stability. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Evaluating Vector Space Representations for NLP*, pages 18–26, Minneapolis, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Dmitry P. Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2018. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *CoRR*, abs/1803.05407.
- Paul Jaccard. 1912. The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone.1. *New Phytologist*, 11(2):37–50.
- Martin Joos. 1950. Description of language design. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 22(6):701–707.
- Daniel Jurafsky and James H. Martin. 2019. *Speech and Language Processing*, third edition.
- Scharolta Katharina Sienčnik. 2015. Adapting word2vec to named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 20th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics (NODALIDA 2015)*, pages 239–243, Vilnius, Lithuania. Linköping University Electronic Press, Sweden.
- Yoon Kim, Yi-I Chiu, Kentaro Hanaki, Darshan Hegde, and Slav Petrov. 2014. Temporal analysis of language through neural language models. In *Proceedings of the ACL 2014 Workshop on Language Technologies and Computational Social Science*, pages 61–65, Baltimore, MD, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Philipp Koehn. 2005. Europarl: A Parallel Corpus for Statistical Machine Translation. In *Conference Proceedings: the tenth Machine Translation Summit*, pages 79–86, Phuket, Thailand. AAMT, AAMT.
- Vivek Kulkarni, Rami Al-Rfou, Bryan Perozzi, and Steven Skiena. 2015. Statistically significant detection of linguistic change. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, WWW 15, page 625635, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Andrey Kutuzov, Lilja Øvrelid, Terrence Szymanski, and Erik Velldal. 2018. Diachronic word embeddings and semantic shifts: a survey. In *COLING*.
- Thomas K. Landauer and Susan T. Dumais. 1997. A solution to plato’s problem: The latent semantic analysis theory of acquisition, induction, and representation of knowledge.
- D.S. Lemons, P. Langevin, and A. Gythiel. 2002. *An Introduction to Stochastic Processes in Physics*. Johns Hopkins Paperback. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O. Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014. Neural word embedding as implicit matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3:2177–2185.
- Omer Levy, Yoav Goldberg, and Ido Dagan. 2015. Improving distributional similarity with lessons learned from word embeddings. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:211–225.
- J. Lilleberg, Y. Zhu, and Y. Zhang. 2015. Support vector machines and word2vec for text classification with semantic features. In *2015 IEEE 14th International Conference on Cognitive Informatics Cognitive Computing (ICCI*CC)*, pages 136–140.
- Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. 2008. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, USA.

- Barbara McGillivray. 2012. LatinISE corpus. LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1301.3781.
- Tomas Mikolov, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Christian Puhersch, and Armand Joulin. 2018. Advances in pre-training distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukás Burget, Jan Honza Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Interspeech*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Quoc V. Le, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013a. Exploiting similarities among languages for machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1309.4168.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013b. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *CoRR*, abs/1310.4546.
- Tomas Mikolov, Wen-tau Yih, and Geoffrey Zweig. 2013c. Linguistic regularities in continuous space word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 746–751, Atlanta, Georgia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andriy Mnih and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2009. A scalable hierarchical distributed language model. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, pages 1081–1088. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Shinichi Nakagawa and Holger Schielzeth. 2013. A general and simple method for obtaining r^2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4:133–142.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. *CoRR*, abs/1802.05365.
- Bénédicte Pierrejean and Ludovic Tanguy. 2018. Predicting word embeddings variability. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 154–159, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David E. Rumelhart, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Ronald J. Williams. 1986. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature*, 323:533–536.
- Dominik Schlechtweg, Barbara McGillivray, Simon Hengchen, Haim Dubossarsky, and Nina Tahmasebi. 2020. SemEval-2020 Task 1: Unsupervised Lexical Semantic Change Detection. In *To appear in Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dominik Schlechtweg, Sabine Schulte im Walde, and Stefanie Eckmann. 2018. Diachronic usage relatedness (DURel): A framework for the annotation of lexical semantic change. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 169–174, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Schnemann. 1966. A generalized solution of the orthogonal procrustes problem. *Psychometrika*, 31(1):1–10.
- Fabrizio Sebastiani. 2002. Machine learning in automated text categorization. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 34(1):147.

- S. Shapiro and M. B. Wilk. 1965. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3-4):591–611.
- Samuel L. Smith, David H. P. Turban, Steven Hamblin, and Nils Y. Hammerla. 2017. Offline bilingual word vectors, orthogonal transformations and the inverted softmax. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- C. Spearman. 1904. The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 100(3/4):441–471.
- Lukás Svoboda and Tomáš Bryhcín. 2016. New word analogy corpus for exploring embeddings of czech words. *CoRR*, abs/1608.00789.
- Nina Tahmasebi, Lars Borin, and Adam Jatowt. 2018. Survey of computational approaches to diachronic conceptual change. *CoRR*, abs/1811.06278.
- Xuri Tang. 2018. A state-of-the-art of semantic change computation. *Natural Language Engineering*, 24(5):649676.
- Stefanie Tellex, Boris Katz, Jimmy Lin, Aaron Fernandes, and Gregory Marton. 2003. Quantitative evaluation of passage retrieval algorithms for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Informaion Retrieval*, SIGIR 03, page 4147, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Viljami Venekoski and Jouko Vankka. 2017. Finnish resources for evaluating language model semantics. In *Proceedings of the 21st Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 231–236, Gothenburg, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christian Walck. 1996. Hand-book on statistical distributions for experimental-ists.

- Laura Wendlandt, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld, and Rada Mihalcea. 2018. Factors influencing the surprising instability of word embeddings. *CoRR*, abs/1804.09692.
- Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, and Christopher Meek. 2014. Semantic parsing for single-relation question answering. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 643–648, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zi Yin. 2018. Understand functionality and dimensionality of vector embeddings: the distributional hypothesis.
- Zi Yin and Yuanyuan Shen. 2018. On the dimensionality of word embedding. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 887–898. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015a. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS15, page 649657, Cambridge, MA, USA. MIT Press.
- Yating Zhang, Adam Jatowt, Sourav Bhowmick, and Katsumi Tanaka. 2015b. Omnia mutantur, nihil interit: Connecting past with present by finding corresponding terms across time. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 645–655, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guido Zuccon, Bevan Koopman, Peter Bruza, and Leif Azzopardi. 2015. Integrating and evaluating neural word embeddings in information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 20th Australasian Document Computing Symposium*, ADCS 15, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Appendix A

Supporting Content

A.1 Minimum Sample Size to Evaluate the Consistency of $p_{@n}$

To prove that the sample size of 16 subsequent runs is sufficient to draw conclusions on the underlying distribution and the values in Table 2.3 are not a result of the inherent variations of the embeddings, we repeat the experiment described in Section 2.2.2 with another set of 16 independent runs. We denote the evaluation of the two metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ on the same target words, for this set of runs, as $\underline{p_{@n}}$ and $\underline{j_{@n}}$. The Spearman correlations between $\underline{p_{@n}}$ and $p_{@n}$, as well as $\underline{j_{@n}}$ and $j_{@n}$, i.e. the consistency of the results over the two independent experiments are shown in Table A.1. All correlation values are higher than 0.92, which shows that the chosen sample size of 16 runs is indeed sufficient to conclude the underlying distribution.

	<u>$p_{@2}$</u>	<u>$p_{@5}$</u>	<u>$p_{@10}$</u>	<u>$p_{@25}$</u>	<u>$p_{@50}$</u>		<u>$j_{@2}$</u>	<u>$j_{@5}$</u>	<u>$j_{@10}$</u>	<u>$j_{@25}$</u>	<u>$j_{@50}$</u>
$p_{@2}$	0.93					$j_{@2}$	0.93				
$p_{@5}$		0.96				$j_{@5}$		0.96			
$p_{@10}$			0.98			$j_{@10}$			0.98		
$p_{@25}$				0.99		$j_{@25}$				0.99	
$p_{@50}$					0.99	$j_{@50}$					0.99

Embedding Technique: **word2vec** (skip-gram)

	<u>$p_{@2}$</u>	<u>$p_{@5}$</u>	<u>$p_{@10}$</u>	<u>$p_{@25}$</u>	<u>$p_{@50}$</u>		<u>$j_{@2}$</u>	<u>$j_{@5}$</u>	<u>$j_{@10}$</u>	<u>$j_{@25}$</u>	<u>$j_{@50}$</u>
$p_{@2}$	0.92					$j_{@2}$	0.92				
$p_{@5}$		0.95				$j_{@5}$		0.95			
$p_{@10}$			0.97			$j_{@10}$			0.97		
$p_{@25}$				0.99		$j_{@25}$				0.99	
$p_{@50}$					0.99	$j_{@50}$					0.99

Embedding Technique: **GloVe**

	<u>$p_{@2}$</u>	<u>$p_{@5}$</u>	<u>$p_{@10}$</u>	<u>$p_{@25}$</u>	<u>$p_{@50}$</u>		<u>$j_{@2}$</u>	<u>$j_{@5}$</u>	<u>$j_{@10}$</u>	<u>$j_{@25}$</u>	<u>$j_{@50}$</u>
$p_{@2}$	0.94					$j_{@2}$	0.94				
$p_{@5}$		0.97				$j_{@5}$		0.97			
$p_{@10}$			0.99			$j_{@10}$			0.99		
$p_{@25}$				0.99		$j_{@25}$				0.99	
$p_{@50}$					0.99	$j_{@50}$					0.99

Embedding Technique: **fastText** (skip-gram)

Table A.1: Spearman correlation of the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for 1000 target words for different values of $n \in \{2, 5, 10, 25, 50\}$ for **word2vec** (top), **GloVe** (middle) and **fastText** (bottom) between two sets of 16 independent runs, obtained as outlined in Section 2.2.2. For each of the techniques, we show the average of the correlation for all languages mentioned in Section 1.2.

A.2 Reducing the Complexity of the Prediction of $p_{@n}$

As described in Section 2.2.2, we rely on numerical integration when predicting $p_{@1}$ with Equation 2.22. Whereas this looks very resource-intensive at first glance, we can show that the relevant terms in the equation assume trivial values for most pairs of words, which renders the calculations considerably simpler.

A specific example from Table 2.4 helps to illustrate this. We look at two words: Firstly, the – on average – nearest neighbor $w_{\#1} = \text{inertia}$ of the target word $w_t = \text{momentum}$ and secondly, the word with the 100th largest mean cosine similarity, $w_{\#100} = \text{inelastic}$. Now we want to estimate $p_{\#1}(w_t, w_{\#100})$, i.e. the probability that a word which usually ranks around position 100, ends up on rank 1 for one run. We can get an upper bound for this probability, by evaluating a weaker condition – the probability that $\cos(w_t, w_{\#100})$ is larger than $\cos(w_t, w_{\#1})$.

This probability, for a target word w_t and the query words w_s and $w_{s'}$, again assuming both cosine similarities are independent and normally distributed, is given by (please refer to Appendix A.3 for the derivation):

$$p[\cos(w_t, w_s) > \cos(w_t, w_{s'})] = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{\mu_{ts} - \mu_{ts'}}{\sqrt{2(\sigma_{ts}^2 + \sigma_{ts'}^2)}} \right) \right] \quad (\text{A.1})$$

With the values from Table 2.4 we find:¹

$$p[\cos(w_t, w_{\#100}) > \cos(w_t, w_{\#1})] = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \operatorname{erf}(A)] \approx 2.74 \times 10^{-33} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\text{with } A = \frac{0.489 - 0.650}{\sqrt{2(0.009^2 + 0.010^2)}} \approx -8.46 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

And this is an upper bound on the probability $p_{\#1}(w_t, w_{\#100})$, thus:

$$p_{\#1}(w_t, w_{\#100}) \leq 2.74 \times 10^{-33} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This shows that the probability (2.22) will practically be zero for most query words w_s . Hence, for any practical calculations of the probabilities in Equation

¹The vocabulary size of the models illustrated in Table 2.4 was restricted to 200,000 to simplify the calculations for this demonstrative example. However, this leads to a higher stability than we generally observe in practice.

(2.22), we can disregard most words of the vocabulary, and reduce the scope to the nearest neighbors of the target word.²

A.3 Probability of One Normally Distributed Random Variable to be Larger Than Another

Two random variables x and y both follow a normal distribution:

$$x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_x, \sigma_x) \quad y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_y, \sigma_y) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Now we want to calculate $p(x > y)$, i.e. the probability, that if we randomly sample the value x_i from $\mathcal{N}(\mu_x, \sigma_x)$ and y_i from $\mathcal{N}(\mu_y, \sigma_y)$, the condition $x_i > y_i$ is fulfilled.

First, let us introduce the variable $z := x - y$. We know that the *difference of two normally distributed random variables is again a normal distribution* (Lemons et al., 2002), i.e. $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_z, \sigma_z)$ with the parameters:

$$\mu_z = \mu_x - \mu_y, \quad \sigma_z = \sqrt{\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

As $x > y \iff z > 0$, we can determine $p(x > y)$ by integrating the distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_z, \sigma_z)$ from 0 to $+\infty$:

$$p(x > y) = p(z > 0) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_z} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{z - \mu_z}{\sigma_z}\right)^2\right] dz \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This non-trivial integral of the normal distribution yields the Gaussian error function (Andrews and of Photo-optical Instrumentation Engineers, 1998):

$$p(x > y) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\mu_z}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_z}\right) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\mu_x - \mu_y}{\sqrt{2(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2)}}\right) \right] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The course of the function and its strong convergence is illustrated in Figure A.1.

²In practice, we evaluate (A.1) for all words in the vocabulary for a given target word w_t and disregard any query word w_s in the subsequent calculation if $p[\cos(w_t, w_s) > \cos(w_t, w_{\#1})]$ is smaller than a certain threshold – usually 1.0×10^{-5} .




Figure A.1: Illustration of the expression in Equation A.8, and its strong convergence based on the Gaussian error function.

A.4 Comparison of the Prediction and Observation of $p_{@n}$

In order to test the assumptions and the subsequent derivation of $p_{@n}$ in Section 2.2.2, we compare the measurements of $p_{@1} = j_{@1}$ with the expectation based on Equation (2.23) for various sets of embeddings. For every technique and language outlined in Section 1.2, we randomly sample 1000 sampled target words, measure the overlap $p_{@1}$ over 128 runs on independently shuffled corpora and predict the same property based on the estimation of the Gaussian parameters. Figure A.2 shows the agreement between prediction and observation for 128 runs of **fastText** on the Portuguese Wikipedia. In Table A.2, one can see the Pearson correlation coefficient ρ (Freedman et al., 2007) between prediction and measurement for the 1000 target words in every language and technique. In all our experiments, predictions and observations agree ($\rho > 0.95$), which indicates that the derivations above, as well as the underlying assumptions, are valid.

As mentioned before, predicting the overlap for larger n is becoming increasingly complex: The derivation of the prediction of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for $n = 2$ is outlined in Appendix A.5. Figure A.3 shows the prediction and observation of $p_{@n}$ for $n = 2$ for 200 target words from **fastText** embeddings obtained from the Finnish




Figure A.2: Plot of the predicted against the observed values of $p_{@1} = j_{@1}$ for 1000 randomly sampled target words, obtained from 128 runs of **fastText** on a Portuguese Wikipedia extract. Aside from the expected random fluctuations, prediction and observation coincide approximately, which suggests that our theory and the underlying assumptions on the distribution of the embedding spaces are – in good approximation – valid. However, since most of the data points (blue) fall below the bisection of the coordinate axes (red), the prediction seems to have a slight systematic error in overestimating $p_{@1} = j_{@1}$. Since we only use the nearest neighbors of the target word in our prediction (to increase the computational performance) we would expect to overestimate the stability, but we cannot say with certainty that this is the only reason for the observed difference between prediction and measurement.

Language	word2vec	GloVe	fastText
HI	0.969	0.968	0.984
FI	0.976	0.995	0.974
ZH	0.980	0.988	0.989
CS	0.978	0.992	0.983
PL	0.980	0.991	0.970
PT	0.983	0.978	0.984
EN	0.975	0.973	0.985

Table A.2: Pearson correlation coefficient between prediction and measurements of $p_{@1}(w_t) = j_{@1}(w_t)$, for 1000 randomly sampled target words w_t obtained from 128 runs of **word2vec** (skip-gram), **GloVe** and **fastText** (skip-gram) on Wikipedia corpora in seven different languages.




Figure A.3: Plot of the predicted against the observed values of $p_{@2}$ for 200 randomly sampled target words w_t , obtained from 128 runs of **fastText** on a Finnish Wikipedia extract.

Wikipedia. Similar to $n = 1$, the two quantities match rather well. Altogether, we are not aware of a reason to expect any different outcome for $n > 1$ and will therefore, for sake of simplicity, continue to focus on $n = 1$.

A.5 Prediction of $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ for $n > 1$

In this section, we give an outlook on how the metrics $p_{@n}$ and $j_{@n}$ can be predicted from the parameters μ_{ij}, σ_{ij} of the Normal distributions of the cosine similarities $\cos(w_i, w_j) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}) \quad \forall w_i, w_j \in \mathcal{V}$, for the case $n > 1$. We specifically show how the case $n = 2$ can be derived from $n = 1$ and hence provide the instruments to handle any value of n in an iterative manner.

Let $p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)$ denote the probability that w_s is one of the two nearest neighbors of w_t , for one randomly sampled embedding space $\mathbf{V}_k \sim \Omega(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$. Naturally, this is the sum of the probabilities $p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s)$, i.e. of w_s being the nearest neighbor and $p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)$ – the chance that w_s is exactly the second closest word to w_t by cosine distance:

$$p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s) = p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s) + p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Equation (2.22) already yields the first term, hence we only need to derive $p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)$: If w_s is the second nearest neighbor of the target word, there is exactly one word, which we call w_n , that is closer to the target word. In principle, this could be any word of the vocabulary and to obtain $p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)$ we need to derive the sum of the probability of all possible constellations, i.e. for all $w_n \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t, w_s\}$. For any word w_n , we are therefore interested in the probability of the case:

$$\cos(w_t, w_n) > \cos(w_t, w_s) > \cos(w_t, w_{s'}) \quad \forall w_{s'} \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t, w_s, w_n\} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

For the sake of readability, we fix an arbitrary pair w_t, w_s and introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(w_t, w_n) &=: \bar{x}_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mu}_n, \bar{\sigma}_n^2) \\ \cos(w_t, w_s) &=: \tilde{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ \cos(w_t, w_{s'}) &=: x_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2) \quad \text{with } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v-3\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

To determine the probability $p_{\#1,2}(w_t, w_s, w_n)$ that a triple of words w_t, w_s, w_n fulfils condition (A.11), we need to integrate the joint probability distribution $p(\bar{x}_n, \tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2})$ over the respective subspace of \mathbb{R}^{v-1} . Here we need the assumption of independence for the random variables $\bar{x}_n, \tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2}$ once more.³ Then:

$$p(\bar{x}_n, \tilde{x}, x_1, \dots, x_{v-2}) = p(\bar{x}_n) \cdot p(\tilde{x}) \cdot p(x_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(x_{v-2}) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Now, for a given value of \bar{x}_n , \tilde{x} can assume any value smaller than \bar{x}_n , while the x_j need to be smaller than \tilde{x} . This means:

$$p_{\#1,2}(w_t, w_s, w_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\bar{x}_n} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{v-3} \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{x}} f(x_j, \mu_j, \sigma_j) dx_j \right] f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) d\tilde{x} \right\} f(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\mu}_n, \bar{\sigma}_n) d\bar{x}_n \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Where the $f(x, \mu, \sigma)$ denote the *probability density function* of the Normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Using Equation (2.21) yields:

$$p_{\#1,2}(w_t, w_s, w_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\bar{x}_n} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{v-3} \frac{1}{2} \left[\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{\tilde{x} - \mu_j}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_j} \right) + 1 \right] \right\} f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) d\tilde{x} \right) f(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\mu}_n, \bar{\sigma}_n) d\bar{x}_n \quad (\text{A.14})$$

To compute this, we use numerical integration. Finally:

$$p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s) = p_{\#1}(w_t, w_s) + \sum_{w_n \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t, w_s\}} p_{\#1,2}(w_t, w_s, w_n) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

And this allows us to predict the metric $p_{\#2}$ for the target word w_t as:

$$p_{\#2}(w_t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{w_s \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_t\}} [p_{\#2}(w_t, w_s)]^2 \right) \quad (\text{A.16})$$

³See Section 2.1.3 for evidence on the validity of this assumption.

Erklärung:

Ich versichere, dass ich diese Arbeit selbstständig verfasst habe und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt habe.

Heidelberg, den 23. Januar 2022

.....