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Abstract

Language agnostic and semantic-language information isolation is an emerging research direction for multilingual representations models. We explore this problem from a novel angle of geometric algebra and semantic space. A simple but highly effective method “Language Information Removal (LIR)” factors out language identity information from semantic related components in multilingual representations pre-trained on multi-monolingual data. A post-training and model-agnostic method, LIR only uses simple linear operations, e.g. matrix factorization and orthogonal projection. LIR reveals that for weak-alignment multilingual systems, the principal components of semantic spaces primarily encodes language identity information. We first evaluate the LIR on a cross-lingual question answer retrieval task (LAReQA), which requires the strong alignment for the multilingual embedding space. Experiment shows that LIR is highly effective on this task, yielding almost 100% relative improvement in MAP for weak-alignment models. We then evaluate the LIR on Amazon Reviews and XEVAL dataset, with the observation that removing language information is able to improve the cross-lingual transfer performance.

1 Introduction

Recently, large-scale language modeling has expanded from English to the multilingual setting (i.a., Devlin et al. (2019); Conneau and Lample (2019); Conneau et al. (2020)). Although these models are trained with language modeling objectives on monolingual data, i.e. without cross-lingual information, these multilingual systems exhibit impressive zero-shot cross-lingual ability (Hu et al., 2020b). These observations raise many questions and provide insight for multilingual representations learning. First, how is the language identity information and the semantic information expressed in the representation? Understanding their relations and underlying geometric structure is crucial for insights into designing more effective multilingual embedding systems. Second, how can we factor out the language identity information from the semantic components in representations? In many application, e.g. cross-lingual semantic retrieval, we wish to only keep the semantic information. Third, what is the geometric relation between different languages? Efforts have been made to answer these questions, e.g. Artetxe et al. (2020); Chung et al. (2020); Lauscher et al. (2020).

Such prior work has addressed the problem at training time. In this work, we systematically explore a post-training method that can be readily applied to existing multilingual models.

One of the first attempts in this research area, Roy et al. (2020), proposed two concepts for language agnostic models: weak alignment v.s. strong alignment. For multilingual systems with weak alignment, for any item in language $L_1$, the nearest neighbor in language $L_2$ is the most semantically “relevant” item. In the case of strong alignment, for any item in language $L_1$, the nearest neighbor in language $L_2$ is the most semantically relevant item. In the case of strong alignment, for any representation, all semantically relevant items are closer than all irrelevant items, regardless of their language. Roy et al. (2020) show sentence representations from the same language tend to cluster in weak-alignment system. Similar phenomena can be observed on other pre-trained multilingual models like mBERT, XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) and CMLM (Yang et al., 2020). Roy et al. (2020) provides carefully-designed training strategies for retrieval-like model to mitigate this issue in order to obtain language agnostic multilingual systems.

We systematically explore a simple post-training method we refer to as Language Information Removal (LIR), to effectively facilitate the language agnosticism in multilingual embedding systems. First introduced in Yang et al. (2020) to reduce same language bias for retrieval tasks, the method
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uses only linear algebra factorization and post-
training operation. LIR can be conveniently ap-
plied to any multilingual model. We show LIR
yields surprisingly large improvements in several
downstream tasks, including LAReQA, a cross-
lingual QA retrieval dataset (Roy et al., 2020);
Amazon Reviews, a zero-shot cross lingual evalua-
tion dataset; XEV AL, a collection of multilingual
sentence embedding tasks. Our results suggest
that the principal components of a multilingual
system with self-language bias primarily encodes
language identification information. Implementa-
tion for LIR is available at https://github.
.com/ziyi-yang/LIR.

2 Language Information Removal for
Self Language Bias Elimination

In this section we describe Language Information
Removal (LIR) to address the self language bias in
multilingual embeddings (Yang et al., 2020). The
first step is to extract the language identity informa-
tion for each language space. Given a multi-
lingual embedding system \( E \), e.g. multilingual
BERT, and a collection of multilingual texts \( \{t^i_L\} \),
where \( t^i_L \) denotes the \( i \)th phrase in the collection
for the language \( L \). We construct a language matrix
\( M_L \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) for language \( L \), where \( n \) denotes
the number of sentences in language \( L \) and \( d \) denotes
the dimension of the representation. The row \( i \) of
\( M_L \) is the representation of \( t^i_L \) computed by \( E \).

Second, we extract language identification compo-
nants for each language. One observation in mul-
tilingual systems is that representations from
the same language tend to cluster together (w.r.t rep-
resentations in other languages), even though these
representations have different semantic meanings.
This phenomenon is also known as “weak align-
ment” (Roy et al., 2020). The mathematical expla-
nation for this clustering phenomenon is that re-
presentations in the same language have shared vector
space components. We propose that these shared
components essentially represent the language iden-
tification information. Removing these language
components should leave semantic-related informa-
tion in the representations.

To remove the shared components, or the
language identification from the representations,
we leverage singular value decomposition (SVD)
which identifies the principal directions of a space.
We use SVD instead of PCA since SVD is more sta-
ble numerically (e.g. for Läuchli matrix). Specif-
ically, the SVD of a language matrix is
\[
M_L = U_L \Sigma_L V_L^T,
\]
where the columns of \( V_L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) are
the right singular vectors of \( M_L \). We take first \( r \)
columns of \( V_L \) as the language identification com-
ponents, denoted as \( e_L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r} \). Different values
of \( r \) are explored in the next experiments section.
Language identification components are removed
as follows. Given a multilingual representation \( e_L \)
in language \( L \), we subtract the projection of \( e_L \)
onto \( e_L \), i.e.

\[
e_L := e_L - c_L c_L^T e_L / \|e_L\|^2
\]

3 Experiments

In the following experiments, sentences used for
extracting principle components are sampled from
Wiki-40B (Guo et al., 2020). We use 10,000 sen-
tences per language. We notice performance ini-
tially increases as more sentences are used but
then is almost unchanged after \( n > 10,000 \). We
tried different samplings of \( \{t^i_L\} \) and text resources
other than Wiki-40B, e.g., Tatoeba (Artetxe and
Schwenk, 2019). The minimal differences in per-
formance suggest language components are stable
over different domains.

3.1 Cross-lingual Answer Retrieval

We first examine LIR on LAReQA, a cross-lingual
answer retrieval dataset containing 11 languages
(Roy et al., 2020). LAReQA consists of two re-
trieval sub-datasets: XQuAD-R and MLQA-R.
XQuAD-R is built by translating 240 paragraphs
in the SQuAD v1.1 dev set into 10 languages
and converting them to retrieval tasks following
the procedure from ReQA (Ahmad et al., 2019). Similarly, MLQA-R is constructed by converting MLQA (Lewis et al., 2020) to QA retrieval. In other words, each question in LAReQA has 11 relevant answers, one in each language. Two retrieval models with self language bias are presented in the LAReQA original paper, i.e. “En-En” and “X-X”. Specifically, the multilingual model “En-En” finetunes mBERT for QA retrieval on the 80,000 English QA pairs from the SQuAD v1.1 train set using a ranking loss. The model “X-X” trains on the translation (into 11 languages) of the SQuAD train set. In one training example, the question and answer are in the same language. Since given a question query, all positive examples are within-language, “En-En” and “X-X” exhibit strong self-language bias and weak-alignment property.

For evaluation, we first compute the language identification components with “En-En” and “X-X” models released by LAReQA. For testing, language identification component are removed from question and answer embeddings following Eq. (1). Results are shown in Table 1 and the evaluation metric is mean average precision (MAP) of retrieval. Detailed results for each language are provided in the appendix (Table 5). Simply applying LIR results in significant improvements, almost 100% relatively for “X-X” model on XQuAD-R. This huge boost reveals the algebraic structure for multilingual representation space: in weak-alignment multilingual system, the principal components primarily encode language information. In LAReQA, each language has one of the relevant answers. The performance improvement itself already indicates less language bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XQuAD-R</th>
<th>MLQA-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o LIR</td>
<td>En-En</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = 1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = 2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = 3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = 4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mean average precision (MAP) of model “En-En” and “X-X” with and without LIR.

3.2 Amazon Reviews

We further evaluate LIR on zero-shot transfer learning with Amazon Reviews Dataset (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010). In this subsection, we use multilingual BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) as the embedding model. Following Chidambaram et al. (2019), the original dataset is converted to a classification benchmark by treating reviews of more than 3 stars as positive and negative otherwise. We split 6000 English reviews in the original training set into 90% for training and 10% for development. A logistic classifier is trained on the English training set and then evaluated on English, French, German and Japanese test sets (each has 6000 examples) using the same trained model, i.e. the evaluation is zero-shot. The weights for mBERT are fixed. The representation of a sentence/phrase is computed as the average pooling of the transformer encoder outputs. LIR is applied in both training and evaluation stage using the corresponding language components.

Results presented in Table 2 show that removing the language components from multilingual representation is beneficial for cross-lingual zero-shot

Figure 2: PCA projections of English and Chinese embeddings on the XQuAD-R dataset, with and without LIR. The two subfigures on the left are reproduced by authors to follow Figure 5 in Roy et al. (2020).
transfer learning of mBERT. LIR is expected to leave only semantic-related information in the representation so that the logistic classifier trained on English should be conveniently transferred to other languages. Another interesting observation is that unlike semantic retrieval, the peak performance usually occurs at \( r > 1 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>en</th>
<th>de</th>
<th>fr</th>
<th>jp</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o LIR</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 1 )</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 2 )</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 3 )</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 5 )</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 8 )</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 10 )</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = 12 )</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Classification accuracy on Amazon Reviews Dataset.

### 3.3 XEVAL

We have tested LIR on cross-lingual benchmarks in previous sections. In this section, we apply LIR in XEVAL, a collection of multilingual sentence representation benchmark (Yang et al., 2020). The training set and test set of XEVAL are in the same language (i.e. the evaluation is not cross-lingual). Benchmarks on XEVAL include Movie Reviews (Pang and Lee, 2005), binary SST (sentiment analysis, Socher et al. (2013)), MPQA (opinion-polarity, Wiebe et al. (2005)), TREC (question-type, Voorhees and Tice (2000)), CR (product reviews, Hu and Liu (2004)), SUBJ (subjectivity/objectivity, Pang and Lee (2004)) and SICK (both entailment and relatedness (Marelli et al., 2014)). For this evaluation, we use mBERT as the base multilingual encoder. Still the weights of mBERT are fixed during training and only downstream neural structures are trained. The training, cross-validation and evaluation uses SentEval toolkit (Conneau and Kiela, 2018).

Results are presented in Table 3. The metric is the averaging performance across 9 datasets mentioned above. Introducing LIR is beneficial on German, Spanish, French and Chinese. We also notice that for English dataset, removing principal components actually hurts the performance. This observation also echoes with findings in previous English sentence embedding works, e.g. Yang et al. (2019b). We speculate this is because English data are dominant in mBERT training data. Therefore mBERT representations exhibit similar behaviors with monolingual English sentence embeddings.

### 3.4 Application to Models without Self-Language Bias

In previous sections, we have shown the great effectiveness of LIR on weak-alignment systems. As an additional analysis, we examine LIR on multilingual models without self language bias, i.e. models “X-X-mono” and “X-Y” introduced in the original LAReQA paper. Model “X-X-mono” is modified from “X-X” by ensuring that each training batch is monolingual so that in-batch negative and positive examples are in the same language. In model “X-Y”, questions and answers are allowed to be translated to different languages, which directly encourage the model to regard answers in different languages from the question as correct. With such designs in training, “X-X-mono” and “X-Y” are shown to be without self-language bias, i.e. semantically relevant representations are closer than all irrelevant items, regardless of their languages.

The evaluation process is similar as in Section 3.1. Results are presented in Table 4. Applying LIR leads to a slight performance decrease for X-X-mono. While the drop in X-Y is notable and we suspect this is because the training process for X-Y avoids, by design, self-language bias. Rather, the principal components of X-Y contain essential semantic-related information for the retrieval task. This result is not negative and actually support our argument, since for “strong alignment” multilingual systems, principal components should both contain semantic and language-related information. Then removing principal components will hinder the semantic retrieval. For weak-alignment models, removing just the first component should be adequate for cross-lingual retrieval (table 1). For tasks like classification and sentiment analysis (tables 2 and 3), the optimal number of components to remove seems to vary on different datasets.

### 4 Related Work & Our Novelty

Different training methods have been proposed to obtain language agnostic representations. LASER (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019) leverages translation pairs and BiLSTM encoder for multilingual sen-
Table 4: Mean average precision (MAP) of “X-X-\textit{mono}” and “X-Y” models without language bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>XQuAD-R</th>
<th>MLQA-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-X-\textit{mono}</td>
<td>X-Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o LIR</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 2$</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 3$</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 4$</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper, we investigate the self-language bias in multilingual systems. We explore a simple method “Language Identity Removal (LIR)”. This method identifies and removes the language information in multilingual semantic space by singular value decomposition and orthogonal projection. Compared with Yang et al. (2020), the novelty of this work is two-fold. First, it is unclear in Yang et al. (2020) whether the assumption (i.e. principal components contain language information) holds true for both weak and strong-alignment multilingual models. In this work we clearly show that it is valid for weak-alignment models (Section 3.1). However, for strong-alignment systems, the assumption is not quite true (Table 4). Second, in Yang et al. (2020), the evaluation is only conducted on Tatoeba, a semantic retrieval dataset. While in this work, evaluations are more comprehensive. Besides the cross-lingual retrieval dataset LAReQA, our experiments include cross-lingual zero-shot learning (Section 3.2) and monolingual transfer learning (Section 3.3). These extra results establish the effectiveness of LIR beyond the domain of semantic retrieval.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the self-language bias in multilingual systems. We explore a simple method “Language Identity Removal (LIR)”. This method identifies and removes the language information in multilingual semantic space by singular value decomposition and orthogonal projection. Although as a simple and linear-algebra-only method, LIR is highly effective in several downstream tasks, including zero-shot transfer learning, sentiment analysis, etc. Especially for cross-lingual retrieval, introducing LIR increases the performance of weak-alignment multilingual systems by almost 100% relatively in MAP.
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A Experimental results for each language of model “X-X” on LAReQA

Here we provide the detailed experiment results of each language on the XQuAD-R dataset. The multilingual encoder is model “X-X”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>w/o LIR</th>
<th>$r = 1$</th>
<th>$r = 2$</th>
<th>$r = 3$</th>
<th>$r = 4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Experimental results for each language of model “X-X” on the XQuAD-R dataset.