# Beyond the Benchmarks: Linguistically-oriented analysis and generalisations in Neural Networks

Paola Merlo

Computational Learning and Computational Linguistics group (CLCL)

University of Geneva and University of Upssala

R&D course, Fall 2021







All speakers can understand a sentence never heard before, or derive the meaning of a word from its parts, and children can learn any language.

And yet, these basic linguistic skills have proven very hard to reach by computational models.

Successes of machine learning architectures are based on computationally expensive algorithms and prohibitively large amounts of data, in fact so prohibitive that they can be deployed in only a few non-representative languages.



: parle français



Output Probabilities

# Some properties of word embeddings, neural networks and how we study them

• Lexical similarity: Monolingual associations Rodriguez and Merlo, CoNLL 2020

> **Multilingual**: transfer effects in a multilingual lexicon. Merlo and Rodriguez, CoNLL 2019,

- Linguistically-informed notion of syntactic similarity: locality effects, also across languages. Merlo and Ackermann, CoNLL 2018; Merlo, BBNL 2019; Merlo, Renaud and An, in prep
- Other properties: **structural long distance agreement, verb alternations** (Linzen, Baroni, Gulordava et al, , Thrush et al, see reading list)

Word associations in monolingual spaces

- Rank
- Asymmetry of similarity
- Violation of the triangle inequality (or lack of transitivity)

Amos Tversky. 1977. Features of similarity. *Psychological review*, 84(4):327–352. T.L Griffiths, M. Steyvers, and J.B Tenenbaum. 2007. Topics in semantic representation. *Psychological review*, 114(2):211–244.

## Data

## Word embeddings:

- BERT (Devlin et al., 2018): in context and not in context
- Word associations: The University of South Florida free association, rhyme, and word fragment norms (Nelson et al., 2004)

Cue	Targets		
abdomen	stomach, belly, organ, body, muscle		
yell	shout, scream, whisper, loud, cheer		
saw	see, hammer, look, cut, tool		
rise	lift, fall, stand, wake, shine		
necessary	important, need, must, money, object		

# Association rank

Data

**Word embeddings**: BERT (Devlin et al., 2018): in context and not in context

**Word associations**: The University of South Florida free association, rhyme, and word fragment norms (Nelson et al., 2004)

	Unlemm	atized	Lemmatized		
Rank	Median	P@K	Median	P@K	
	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)	
1	4	13.02	3	24.18	
2	12	28.09	10	43.26	
3	35	43.64	27	55.86	
4	94	53.59	69	64.53	
5	230	61.62	157.5	69.94	

	YELL	ABDOMEN	SAXOPHONE	SAW	RISE	NECESSARY
Human associations	shout (1) scream (5) whisper (27) loud (189) cheer (194)	stomach (1) belly (4) organ (3399) body (4418) muscle (8368)	trombone (2) clarinet (3) trumpet (6) flute (8) guitar (10)	see (2) hammer (207) look (239) cut (294) tool (350)	lift (32) fall (37) stand (38) wake (72) shine (73)	important (22) need (27) must (263) money (11869) object (13096)
BERT predictions	shout yells yelled yelling scream	stomach abdominal torso belly groin	saxophonist <b>trombone</b> clarinet banjo harmonica	sees see seen seeing Saw	rises risen rising Rise rose	required needed essential unnecessary appropriate

Do cross-lingual word embeddings have the same structure as the bilingual lexicon?

## **Shared translation effects**

translation pairs

shared translation pairs

wood-legno wood-bosco

legno bosco

block-bloccobloccoblock-ceppobloccoblock-bloccarebloccoblock-ostacolareceppo

blocco ceppo blocco bloccare blocco ostacolare ceppo bloccare Hebrew English

Kli
English

Image: Constraint of the second seco

Cross-lingual models show higher mean similarity scores for L2-words that share a common L1 source than the monolingual model (p < 0.021).

Tamar Degani, Anat Prior, and Natasha Tokowicz. 2011. Bidirectional transfer: The effect of sharing a translation. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 23(1):18–28.

## **Beyond the lexicon: similarity and locality in syntax**

Neural networks work in practice, but do they work in theory? (Steedman, LTA 2018)

### Similarity and locality: Object relatives intervention and number

#### **Object relatives, singular** (МАТСН)

Jules sourit à l'étudiant que l'orateur endort <étudiant> sérieusement depuis le début. Jules smiles to the student that the speaker is putting seriously to sleep from the beginning.

#### **Object relatives, plural (MISMATCH)**

Jules sourit **aux étudiant**s que **l'orateur** endort <étudiants> sérieusement depuis le début. Jules smiles to **the students** that **the speaker** is putting seriously to sleep from the beginning.

#### **Completive**, singular

Jules signale à l'étudiant que l'orateur baille sérieusement depuis le début. Jules points out to the student that the speaker is yawning seriously from the beginning.

#### **Completive**, plural

Jules signale **aux étudiants** que **l'orateur** baille sérieusement depuis le début. Jules smiles to **the students** that **the speaker** is yawning seriously from the beginning.

Data kindly provided to us by Sandra Villata and Julie Franck in French. Our translations in Italian and English.

Julie Franck, S. Colonna S., and Luigi Rizzi. 2015. Task-dependency and structure dependency in number interference effects in sentence comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.



# **Conclusion and further research questions**

Current word embeddings have the same structure as **free association and the bilingual lexicon**.

Word embeddings and the similarity spaces they define **do not encode all properties in long-distance dependencies:** they can encode agreement but not intervention.

What other linguistic phenomena can we also study? Verb alternations?

What other languages can we use to replicate the results? How about Swedish?

Does the architecture we use make a difference? Does the use of attention make a difference?

## Thanks!

Any questions?