

# Do Multi-Sense Embeddings Improve Natural Language Understanding?

**Jiwei Li**

Computer Science Department  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305, USA  
jiwei@stanford.edu

**Dan Jurafsky**

Computer Science Department  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305, USA  
jurafsky@stanford.edu

## Abstract

Learning a distinct representation for each sense of an ambiguous word could lead to more powerful and fine-grained models of vector-space representations. Yet while ‘multi-sense’ methods have been proposed and tested on artificial word-similarity tasks, we don’t know if they improve real natural language understanding tasks. In this paper we introduce a multi-sense embedding model based on Chinese Restaurant Processes that achieves state of the art performance on matching human word similarity judgments, and propose a pipelined architecture for incorporating multi-sense embeddings into language understanding.

We then test the performance of our model on part-of-speech tagging, named entity recognition, sentiment analysis, semantic relation identification and semantic relatedness, controlling for embedding dimensionality. We find that multi-sense embeddings do improve performance on some tasks (part-of-speech tagging, semantic relation identification, semantic relatedness) but not on others (named entity recognition, various forms of sentiment analysis). We discuss how these differences may be caused by the different role of word sense information in each of the tasks. The results highlight the importance of testing embedding models in real applications.

## 1 Introduction

Enriching vector models of word meaning so they can represent multiple word senses per word type seems to offer the potential to improve many language understanding tasks. Most traditional embedding models associate each word

type with a single embedding (e.g., Bengio et al. (2006)). Thus the embedding for homonymous words like *bank* (with senses including ‘sloping land’ and ‘financial institution’) is forced to represent some uneasy central tendency between the various meanings. More fine-grained embeddings that represent more natural regions in semantic space could thus improve language understanding.

Early research pointed out that embeddings could model aspects of word sense (Kintsch, 2001) and recent research has proposed a number of models that represent each word type by different senses, each sense associated with a sense-specific embedding (Kintsch, 2001; Reisinger and Mooney, 2010; Neelakantan et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2014; Pina and Johansson, 2014; Wu and Giles, 2015; Liu et al., 2015). Such sense-specific embeddings have shown improved performance on simple artificial tasks like matching human word similarity judgments— WS353 (Rubenstein and Goodenough, 1965) or MC30 (Huang et al., 2012).

Incorporating multisense word embeddings into general NLP tasks requires a pipelined architecture that addresses three major steps:

1. **Sense-specific representation learning:** learn word sense specific embeddings from a large corpus, either unsupervised or aided by external resources like WordNet.
2. **Sense induction:** given a text unit (a phrase, sentence, document, etc.), infer word senses for its tokens and associate them with corresponding sense-specific embeddings.
3. **Representation acquisition for phrases or sentences:** learn representations for text units given sense-specific embeddings and pass them to machine learning classifiers.

Most existing work on multi-sense embeddings emphasizes the first step by learning sense spe-

cific embeddings, but does not explore the next two steps. These are important steps, however, since it isn't clear how existing multi-sense embeddings can be incorporated into and benefit real-world NLU tasks.

We propose a pipelined architecture to address all three steps and apply it to a variety of NLP tasks: part-of-speech tagging, named entity recognition, sentiment analysis, semantic relation identification and semantic relatedness. We find:

- Multi-sense embeddings give improved performance in some tasks (e.g., semantic similarity for words and sentences, semantic relation identification part-of-speech tagging), but not others (e.g., sentiment analysis, named entity extraction). In our analysis we offer some suggested explanations for these differences.
- Some of the improvements for multi-sense embeddings are no longer visible when using more sophisticated neural models like LSTMs which have more flexibility in filtering away the informational chaff from the wheat.
- It is important to carefully compare against embeddings of the same dimensionality.
- When doing so, the most straightforward way to yield better performance on these tasks is just to increase embedding dimensionality.

After describing related work, we introduce the new unsupervised sense-learning model in section 3, give our sense-induction algorithm in section 4, and then in following sections evaluate its performance for word similarity, and then various NLP tasks.

## 2 Related Work

Neural embedding learning frameworks represent each token with a dense vector representation, optimized through predicting neighboring words or decomposing co-occurrence matrices (Bengio et al., 2006; Collobert and Weston, 2008; Mnih and Hinton, 2007; Mikolov et al., 2013; Mikolov et al., 2010; Pennington et al., 2014). Standard neural models represent each word with a single unique vector representation.

Recent work has begun to augment the neural paradigm to address the multi-sense problem

by associating each word with a series of sense specific embeddings. The central idea is to augment standard embedding learning models like skip-grams by disambiguating word senses based on local co-occurrence— e.g., the fruit “apple” tends to co-occur with the words “cider, tree, pear” while the homophonous IT company co-occurs with words like “iphone”, “Google” or “ipod”.

For example Reisinger and Mooney (2010) and Huang et al. (2012) propose ways to develop multiple embeddings per word type by pre-clustering the contexts of each token to create a fixed number of senses for each word, and then relabeling each word token with the clustered sense before learning embeddings. Neelakantan et al. (2014) extend these models by relaxing the assumption that each word must have a fixed number of senses and using a non-parametric model setting a threshold to decide when a new sense cluster should be split off; Liu et al. (2015) learns sense/topic specific embeddings by combining neural frameworks with LDA topic models. Wu and Giles (2015) disambiguate sense embeddings from Wikipedia by first clustering wiki documents. Chen et al. (2014) turn to external resources and used a predefined inventory of senses, building a distinct representation for every sense defined by the Wordnet dictionary. Other relevant work includes Qiu et al. (2014) who maintains separate representations for different part-of-speech tags of the same word.

Recent work is mostly evaluated on the relatively artificial task of matching human word similarity judgments.

## 3 Learning Sense-Specific Embeddings

We propose to build on this previous literature, most specifically Huang et al. (2012) and Neelakantan et al. (2014), to develop an algorithm for learning multiple embeddings for each word type, each embedding corresponding to a distinct induced word sense. Such an algorithm should have the property that a word should be associated with a new sense vector just when evidence in the context (e.g., neighboring words, document-level co-occurrence statistics) suggests that it is sufficiently different from its early senses. Such a line of thinking naturally points to Chinese Restaurant Processes (CRP) (Blei et al., 2004; Teh et al., 2006) which have been applied in the related field of word sense induction. In the analogy of

CRP, the current word could either sit at one of the existing tables (belonging to one of the existing senses) or choose a new table (a new sense). The decision is made by measuring semantic relatedness (based on local context information and global document information) and the number of customers already sitting at that table (the popularity of word senses). We propose such a model and show that it improves over the state of the art on a standard word similarity task.

### 3.1 Chinese Restaurant Processes

We offer a brief overview of Chinese Restaurant Processes in this section; readers interested in more details can consult the original papers (Blei et al., 2004; Teh et al., 2006; Pitman, 1995). CRP can be viewed as a practical interpretation of Dirichlet Processes (Ferguson, 1973) for non-parametric clustering. In the analogy, each data point is compared to a customer in a restaurant. The restaurant has a series of tables  $t$ , each of which serves a dish  $d_t$ . This dish can be viewed as the index of a cluster or a topic. The next customer  $w$  to enter would either choose an existing table, sharing the dish (cluster) already served or choosing a new cluster based on the following probability distribution:

$$Pr(t_w = t) \propto \begin{cases} N_t P(w|d_t) & \text{if } t \text{ already exists} \\ \gamma P(w|d_{new}) & \text{if } t \text{ is new} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $N_t$  denotes the number of customers already sitting at table  $t$  and  $P(w|d_t)$  denotes the probability of assigning the current data point to cluster  $d_t$ .  $\gamma$  is the hyper parameter controlling the preference for sitting at a new table.

CRPs exhibit a useful “rich get richer” property because they take into account the popularity of different word senses. They are also more flexible than a simple threshold strategy for setting up new clusters, due to the robustness introduced by adopting the relative ratio of  $P(w|d_t)$  and  $P(w|d_{new})$ .

### 3.2 Incorporating CRP into Distributed Language Models

We describe how we incorporate CRP into a standard distributed language model<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>We omit details about training standard distributed models; see Collobert and Weston (2008) and Mikolov et al. (2013).

As in the standard vector-space model, each token  $w$  is associated with a  $K$  dimensional global embedding  $e_w$ . Additionally, it is associated with a set of senses  $Z_w = \{z_w^1, z_w^2, \dots, z_w^{|Z_w|}\}$  where  $|Z_w|$  denotes the number of senses discovered for word  $w$ . Each sense  $z$  is associated with a distinct sense-specific embedding  $e_w^z$ . When we encounter a new token  $w$  in the text, at the first stage, we maximize the probability of seeing the current token given its context as in standard language models using the global vector  $e_w$ :

$$p(e_w|e_{neigh}) = F(e_w, e_{neigh}) \quad (2)$$

$F()$  can take different forms in different learning paradigms, e.g.,  $F = \prod_{w' \in neigh} p(e_w, e_{w'})$  for skip-gram or  $F = p(e_w, g(e_w))$  for SENNA (Collobert and Weston, 2008) and CBOW, where  $g(e_{neigh})$  denotes a function that projects the concatenation of neighboring vectors to a vector with the same dimension as  $e_w$  for SENNA and the bag-or-word averaging for CBOW (Mikolov et al., 2013).

Unlike traditional one-word-one-vector frameworks,  $e_{neigh}$  includes sense information in addition to the global vectors for neighbors.  $e_{neigh}$  can therefore be written as<sup>2</sup>.

$$e_{neigh} = \{e_{n-k}, \dots, e_{n-1}, e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+k}\} \quad (3)$$

Next we would use CRP to decide which sense the current occurrence corresponds to, or construct a new sense if it is a new meaning that we have not encountered before. Based on CRP, the probability that assigns the current occurrence to each of the discovered senses or a new sense is given by:

$$Pr(z_w = z) \propto \begin{cases} N_z^w P(e_w^z | \text{context}) & \text{if } z \text{ already exists} \\ \gamma P(w|z_{new}) & \text{if } z \text{ is new} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $N_z^w$  denotes the number of times already assigned to sense  $z$  for token  $w$ .  $P(e_w^z | \text{context})$  denotes the probability that current occurrence belonging to (or generated by) sense  $z$ .

The algorithm for parameter update for the one token predicting procedure is illustrated in Figure

<sup>2</sup>For models that predict succeeding words, sense labels for preceding words have already been decided. For models that predict words using both left and right contexts, the labels for right-context words have not been decided yet. In such cases we just use its global word vector to fill up the position.

---

01: **Input** : Token sequence  $\{w_n, w_{\text{neigh}}\}$ .  
02: Update parameters involved in Equ (3)(4) based on current word prediction.  
03: Sample sense label  $z$  from CRP.  
04: If a new sense label  $z$  is sampled:  
05:     - add  $z$  to  $Z_{w_n}$   
06:     -  $e_{w_n}^z = \operatorname{argmax} p(w_n|z_m)$   
07: else: update parameters involved based on sampled sense label  $z$ .

---

Figure 1: Incorporating CRP into Neural Language Models.

1: Line 2 shows parameter updating through predicting the occurrence of current token. Lines 4-6 illustrate the situation when a new word sense is detected, in which case we would add the newly detected sense  $z$  into  $Z_{w_n}$ . The vector representation  $e_w^z$  for the newly detected sense would be obtained by maximizing the function  $p(e_w^z|\text{context})$ .

As we can see, the model performs word-sense clustering and embedding learning jointly, each one affecting the other. The prediction of the global vector of the current token (line2) is based on both the global and sense-specific embeddings of its neighbors, as will be updated through predicting the current token. Similarly, once the sense label is decided (line7), the model will adjust the embeddings for neighboring words, both global word vectors and sense-specific vectors.

**Training** We train embeddings using Giga-word5 + Wikipedia2014. The training approach is implemented using skip-grams (SG) (Mikolov et al., 2013). We induced senses for the top 200,000 most frequent words (and used a unified “unknown” token for other less-frequent tokens). The window size is set to 11. We iterate three times over the corpus.

#### 4 Obtaining Word Representations for NLU tasks

Next we describe how we decide sense labels for tokens in context. The scenario is treated as a inference procedure for sense labels where all global word embeddings and sense-specific embeddings are kept fixed.

Given a document or a sentence, we have an objective function with respect to sense labels by multiplying Eq.2 over each containing token.

Computing the global optimum sense labeling—in which every word gets an optimal sense label—requires searching over the space of all senses for all words, which can be expensive. We therefore chose two simplified heuristic approaches:

- **Greedy Search:** Assign each token the locally optimum sense label and represent the current token with the embedding associated with that sense.
- **Expectation:** Compute the probability of each possible sense for the current word, and represent the word with the expectation vector:

$$\vec{e}_w = \sum_{z \in Z_w} p(w|z, \text{context}) \cdot e_w^z$$

#### 5 Word Similarity Evaluation

We evaluate our embeddings by comparing with other multi-sense embeddings on the standard artificial task for matching human word similarity judgments.

Early work used similarity datasets like WS353 (Finkelstein et al., 2001) or RG (Rubenstein and Goodenough, 1965), whose context-free nature makes them a poor evaluation. We therefore adopt Stanford’s Contextual Word Similarities (SCWS) (Huang et al., 2012), in which human judgments are associated with pairs of words in context. Thus for example “bank” in the context of “river bank” would have low relatedness with “deficit” in the context “financial deficit”.

We first use the Greedy or Expectation strategies to obtain word vectors for tokens given their context. These vectors are then used as input to get the value of cosine similarity between two words.

Performances are reported in Table 1. Consistent with earlier work (e.g., Neelakantan et al. (2014)), we find that multi-sense embeddings result in better performance in the context-dependent SCWS task (SG+Greedy and SG+Expect are better than SG). As expected, performance is not as high when global level information is ignored when choosing word senses (SG+Greedy) as when it is included (SG+Expect), as neighboring words don’t provide sufficient information for word sense disambiguation.

To note, the proposed CRF models work a little better than earlier baselines, which gives some evidence that it is sufficiently strong to stand in for

Model	SCWS Correlation
SkipGram	66.4
SG+Greedy	69.1
SG+Expect	69.7
Chen	68.4
Neelakantan	69.3

Table 1: Performances for different set of multi-sense embeddings (300d) evaluated on SCWS by measuring the Spearman correlation between each model’s similarity and the human judgments. Baselines performances are reprinted from Neelakantan et al. (2014) and Chen et al. (2014); we report the best performance across all settings mentioned in their paper.

this class of multi-sense models and serves as a promise for being extended to NLU tasks.

**Visualization** Table 2 shows examples of semantically related words given the local context. Word embeddings for tokens are obtained by using the inferred sense labels from the Greedy model and are then used to search for nearest neighbors in the vector space based on cosine similarity. Like earlier models (e.g., Neelakantan et al. (2014)), the model can disambiguate different word senses (in examples like *bank*, *rock* and *apple*) based on their local context; although of course the model is also capable of dealing with polysemy—senses that are less distinct.

## 6 Experiments on NLP Tasks

Having shown that multi-sense embeddings improve word similarity tasks, we turn to ask whether they improve real-world NLU tasks: POS tagging, NER tagging, sentiment analysis at the phrase and sentence level, semantic relationship identification and sentence-level semantic relatedness. For each task, we experimented on the following sets of embeddings, which are trained using the word2vec package on the same corpus:

- Standard one-word-one-vector embeddings from skip-gram (50d).
- Sense disambiguated embeddings from Section 3 and 4 using Greedy Search and Expectation (50d)
- The concatenation of global word embeddings and sense-specific embeddings (100d).
- Standard one-word-one-vector skip-gram embeddings with dimensionality doubled (100d) (100d is the correct corresponding

baseline since the concatenation above doubles the dimensionality of word vectors)

- Embeddings with very high dimensionality (300d).

As far as possible we try to perform an apple-to-apple comparison on these tasks, and our goal is an analytic one—to investigate how well semantic information can be encoded in multi-sense embeddings and how they can improve NLU performances—rather than an attempt to create state-of-the-art results. Thus for example, in tagging tasks (e.g., NER, POS), we follow the protocols in (Collobert et al., 2011) using the concatenation of neighboring embeddings as input features rather than treating embeddings as auxiliary features which are fed into a CRF model along with other manually developed features as in Pennington et al. (2014). Or for experiments on sentiment and other tasks where sentence level embeddings are required we only employ standard recurrent or recursive models for sentence embedding rather than models with sophisticated state-of-the-art methods (e.g., Tai et al. (2015; Irsoy and Cardie (2014)).

Significance testing for comparing models is done via the bootstrap test (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994). Unless otherwise noted, significant testing is performed on one-word-one-vector embedding (50d) versus multi-sense embedding using Expectation inference (50d) and one-vector embedding (100d) versus Expectation (100d).

### 6.1 The Tasks

**Named Entity Recognition** We use the CoNLL-2003 English benchmark for training, and test on the CoNLL-2003 test data. We follow the protocols in Collobert et al. (2011), using the concatenation of neighboring embeddings as input to a multi-layer neural model. We employ a five-layer neural architecture, comprised of an input layer, three convolutional layers with rectifier linear activation function and a softmax output layer. Training is done by gradient descent with minibatches where each sentence is treated as one batch. Learning rate, window size, number of hidden units of hidden layers, L2 regularizations and number of iterations are tuned on the development set.

**Part-of-Speech Tagging** We use Sections 0–18 of the Wall Street Journal (WSJ) data for train-

Context	Nearest Neighbors
<b>Apple</b> is a kind of fruit.	pear, cherry, mango, juice, peach, plum, fruit, cider, apples, tomato, orange, bean, pie
<b>Apple</b> releases its new ipads.	microsoft, intel, dell, ipad, macintosh, ipod, iphone, google, computer, imac, hardware
He borrowed the money from <b>banks</b> .	banking, credit, investment, finance, citibank, currency, assets, loads, imf, hsbc
along the shores of lakes, <b>banks</b> of rivers	land, coast, river, waters, stream, inland, area, coasts, shoreline, shores, peninsula
Basalt is the commonest volcanic <b>rock</b> .	boulder, stone, rocks, sand, mud, limestone, volcanic, sedimentary, pelt, lava, basalt
<b>Rock</b> is the music of teenage rebellion.	band, pop, bands, song, rap, album, jazz, blues, singer, hip-pop, songs, guitar, musician

Table 2: Nearest neighbors of words given context. The embeddings from context words are first inferred with the Greedy strategy; nearest neighbors are computed by cosine similarity between word embeddings. Similar phenomena have been observed in earlier work (Neelakantan et al., 2014)

Standard (50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation( 50)
0.852	0.852 (+0)	0.854 (+0.02)
Standard (100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.867	0.866 (-0.01)	0.871 (+0.04)
Standard (300)		
0.882		

Table 3: Accuracy for Different Models on Name Entity Recognition. Global+E stands for Global+Expectation inference and Global+G stands for Global+Greedy inference. p-value 0.223 for Standard(50) verse Expectation (50) and 0.310 for Standard(100) verse Expectation (100).

ing, sections 19–21 for validation and sections 22–24 for testing. Similar to NER, we trained 5-layer neural models which take the concatenation of neighboring embeddings as inputs. We adopt a similar training and parameter tuning strategy as for POS tagging.

Standard (50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation (50)
0.925	0.934 (+0.09)	0.938 (+0.13)
Standard (100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.940	0.946 (+0.06)	0.952 (+0.12)
Standard (300)		
0.954		

Table 4: Accuracy for Different Models on Part of Speech Tagging. P-value 0.033 for 50d and 0.031 for 100d.

### Sentence-level Sentiment Classification (Pang)

The sentiment dataset of Pang et al. (2002) consists of movie reviews with a sentiment label for each sentence. We divide the original dataset into training(8101)/dev(500)/testing(2000). Word embeddings are initialized using the aforementioned types of embeddings and kept fixed in the learning procedure. Sentence level embeddings are achieved by using standard sequence recurrent neural models (Pearlmutter, 1989) (for details, please refer to Appendix section). The ob-

tained embedding is then fed into a sigmoid classifier. Convolutional matrices at the word level are randomized from  $[-0.1, 0.1]$  and learned from sequence models. For training, we adopt AdaGrad with mini-batch. Parameters (i.e.,  $L2$  penalty, learning rate and mini batch size) are tuned on the development set. Due to space limitations, we omit details of recurrent models and training.

Standard (50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation (50)
0.750	0.752(+0.02)	0.750(+0.00)
Standard (100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.768	0.765(-0.03)	0.763(-0.05)
Standard (300)		
0.774		

Table 5: Accuracy for Different Models on Sentiment Analysis (Pang et al.’s dataset). P-value 0.442 for 50d and 0.375 for 100d.

**Sentiment Analysis–Stanford Treebank** The Stanford Sentiment Treebank (Socher et al., 2013) contains gold-standard labels for each constituent in the parse tree (phrase level), thus allowing us to investigate a sentiment task at a finer granularity than the dataset in Pang et al. (2002) where labels are only found at the top of each sentence. The sentences in the treebank were split into a training(8544)/development(1101)/testing(2210) dataset.

Following Socher et al. (2013) we obtained embeddings for tree nodes by using a recursive neural network model, where the embedding for parent node is obtained in a bottom-up fashion based on its children. The embeddings for each parse tree constituent are output to a softmax layer; see Socher et al. (2013).

We focus on the standard version of recursive neural models. Again we fixed word embeddings to each of the different embedding settings described above<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, we adopted AdaGrad

<sup>3</sup>Note that this is different from the settings used in

with mini-batch. Parameters (i.e.,  $L2$  penalty, learning rate and mini batch size) are tuned on the development set. The number of iterations is treated as a variable to tune and parameters are harvested based on the best performance on the development set.

Standard (50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation (50)
0.818	0.815 (-0.03)	0.820 (+0.02)
Standard (100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.838	0.840 (+0.02)	0.838 (+0.00)
Standard(300)		
0.854		

Table 6: Accuracy for Different Models on Sentiment Analysis (binary classification on Stanford Sentiment Treebank.). P-value 0.250 for 50d and 0.401 for 100d.

**Semantic Relationship Classification** SemEval-2010 Task 8 (Hendrickx et al., 2009) is to find semantic relationships between pairs of nominals, e.g., in “My [apartment]<sub>e1</sub> has a pretty large [kitchen]<sub>e2</sub>” classifying the relation between [apartment] and [kitchen] as *component-whole*. The dataset contains 9 ordered relationships, so the task is formalized as a 19-class classification problem, with directed relations treated as separate labels; see Hendrickx et al. (2009) for details.

We follow the recursive implementations defined in Socher et al. (2012). The path in the parse tree between the two nominals is retrieved, and the embedding is calculated based on recursive models and fed to a softmax classifier. For pure comparison purpose, we only use embeddings as features and do not explore other combination of artificial features. We adopt the same training strategy as for the sentiment task (e.g., Adagrad, mini-batches, etc).

Standard (50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation (50)
0.748	0.760 (+0.12)	0.762 (+0.14)
Standard(100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.770	0.782 (+0.12)	0.778 (+0.18)
Standard(300)		
0.798		

Table 7: Accuracy for Different Models on Semantic Relationship Identification. P-value 0.017 for 50d and 0.020 for 100d.

(Socher et al., 2013) where word vectors were treated as parameters to optimize.

**Sentence Semantic Relatedness** We use the Sentences Involving Compositional Knowledge (SICK) dataset (Marelli et al., 2014) consisting of 9927 sentence pairs, split into training(4500)/development(500)/Testing(4927). Each sentence pair is associated with a gold-standard label ranging from 1 to 5, indicating how semantically related are the two sentences, from 1 (the two sentences are unrelated) to 5 (the two are very related).

In our setting, the similarity between two sentences is measured based on sentence-level embeddings. Let  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  denote two sentences and  $e_{s_1}$  and  $e_{s_2}$  denote corresponding embeddings.  $e_{s_1}$  and  $e_{s_2}$  are achieved through recurrent or recursive models (as illustrated in Appendix section). Again, word embeddings are obtained by simple table look up in one-word-one-vector settings and inferred using the Greedy or Expectation strategy in multi-sense settings. We adopt two different recurrent models for acquiring sentence-level embeddings, a standard recurrent model and an LSTM model (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997).

The similarity score is predicted using a regression model built on the structure of a three layer convolutional model, with concatenation of  $e_{s_1}$  and  $e_{s_2}$  as input, and a regression score from 1-5 as output. We adopted the same training strategy as described earlier. The trained model is then used to predict the relatedness score between two new sentences. Performance is measured using Pearson’s  $r$  between the predicted score and gold-standard labels.

Standard( 50)	Greedy (50)	Expectation (50)
0.824	0.838(+0.14)	0.836(+0.12)
Standard (100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.835	0.840 (+0.05)	0.845 (+0.10)
Standard(300)		
0.850		

Table 8: Pearson’s  $r$  for Different Models on Semantic Relatedness for Standard Models. P-value 0.028 for 50d and 0.042 for 100d.

## 6.2 Discussions

Results for different tasks are represented in Tables 3-9.

At first glance it seems that multi-sense embeddings do indeed offer superior performance, since combining global vectors with sense-specific vectors introduces a consistent performance boost

Standard(50)	Greedy(50)	Expectation(50)
0.843	0.848 (+0.05)	0.846 (+0.03)
Standard(100)	Global+G (100)	Global+E (100)
0.850	0.853 (+0.03)	0.854 (+0.04)
Standard(300)		
0.850		

Table 9: Pearson’s  $r$  for Different Models on Semantic Relatedness for LSTM Models. P-value 0.145 for 50d and 0.170 for 100d.

for every task, when compared with the standard (50d) setting. But of course this is an unfair comparison; combining global vector with sense-specific vector doubles the dimensionality of vector to 100, making comparison with standard dimensionality (50d) unfair. When comparing with standard (100), the conclusions become more nuanced.

For every task, the +Expectation method has performances that often seem to be higher than the simple baseline (both for the 50d case or the 100d case). However, only some of these differences are significant.

(1) Using multi-sense embeddings is significantly helpful for tasks like semantic relatedness (Tables 7-8). This is sensible since sentence meaning here is sensitive to the semantics of one particular word, which could vary with word sense and which would directly be reflected on the relatedness score.

(2) By contrast, for sentiment analysis (Tables 5-6), much of the task depends on correctly identifying a few sentiment words like “good” or “bad”, whose senses tend to have similar sentiment values, and hence for which multi-sense embeddings offer little help. Multi-sense embeddings might promise to help sentiment analysis for some cases, like disambiguating the word “sound” in “safe and sound” versus “movie sound”. But we suspect that such cases are not common, explaining the non-significance of the improvement. Furthermore, the advantages of neural models in sentiment analysis tasks presumably lie in their capability to capture local composition like negation, and it’s not clear how helpful multi-sense embeddings are for that aspect.

(3) Similarly, multi-sense embeddings help for POS tagging, but not for NER tagging (Table 3-4). Word senses have long been known to be related to POS tags. But the largest proportion of NER tags consists of the negative not-a-NER (“O”) tag, each of which is likely correctly labelable regard-

less of whether senses are disambiguated or not (since presumably if a word is not a named entity, most of its senses are not named entities either).

(4) As we apply more sophisticated models like LSTM to semantic relatedness tasks (in Table 9), the advantages caused by multi-sense embeddings disappears.

(5) Doubling the number of dimensions is sufficient to increase performance as much as using the complex multi-sense algorithm. (Of course increasing vector dimensionality (to 300) boosts performance even more, although at the significant cost of exponentially increasing time complexity.) We do larger one-word-one-vector embeddings do so well? We suggest some hypotheses:

- though information about distinct senses is encoded in one-word-one-vector embeddings in a mixed and less structured way, we suspect that the compositional nature of neural models is able to separate the informational chaff from the wheat and choose what information to take up, bridging the gap between single vector and multi-sense paradigms. For models like LSTMs which are better at doing such a job by using gates to control information flow, the difference between two paradigms should thus be further narrowed, as indeed we found.
- The pipeline model proposed in the work requires sense-label inference (i.e., step 2). We proposed two strategies: GREEDY and EXPECTATION, and found that GREEDY models perform worse than EXPECTATION, as we might expect<sup>4</sup>. But even EXPECTATION can be viewed as another form of one-word-one-vector models, just one where different senses are entangled but weighted to emphasize the important ones. Again, this suggests another cause for the strong relative performance of larger-dimensioned one-word-one-vector models.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we expand ongoing research into multi-sense embeddings by first proposing a new version based on Chinese restaurant processes that achieves state of the art performance on simple

<sup>4</sup>GREEDY models work in a more aggressive way and likely make mistakes due to the non-global-optimum nature and limited context information



word similarity matching tasks. We then introduce a pipeline system for incorporating multi-sense embeddings into NLP applications, and examine multiple NLP tasks to see whether and when multi-sense embeddings can introduce performance boosts. Our results suggest that simply increasing the dimensionality of baseline skip-gram embeddings is sometimes sufficient to achieve the same performance wins that come from using multi-sense embeddings. That is, the most straightforward way to yield better performance on these tasks is just to increase embedding dimensionality.

Our results come with some caveats. In particular, our conclusions are based on the pipelined system that we introduce, and other multi-sense embedding systems (e.g., a more advanced sense learning model or a better sense label model or a completely different pipeline system) may find stronger effects of multi-sense models. Nonetheless we do consistently find improvements for multi-sense embeddings in some tasks (part-of-speech tagging and semantic relation identification), suggesting the benefits of our multi-sense models and those of others. Perhaps the most important implication of our results may be the evidence they provide for the importance of going beyond simple human-matching tasks, and testing embedding models by using them as components in real NLP applications.

## 8 Appendix

In sentiment classification and sentence semantic relatedness tasks, classification models require embeddings that represent the input at a sentence or phrase level. We adopt recurrent networks (standard ones or LSTMs) and recursive networks in order to map a sequence of tokens with various length to a vector representation.

**Recurrent Networks** A recurrent network successively takes word  $w_t$  at step  $t$ , combines its vector representation  $e_t$  with the previously built hidden vector  $h_{t-1}$  from time  $t - 1$ , calculates the resulting current embedding  $h_t$ , and passes it to the next step. The embedding  $h_t$  for the current time  $t$  is thus:

$$h_t = \tanh(W \cdot h_{t-1} + V \cdot e_t) \quad (5)$$

where  $W$  and  $V$  denote compositional matrices. If  $N_s$  denote the length of the sequence,  $h_{N_s}$  represents the whole sequence  $S$ .

**Recursive Networks** Standard recursive models work in a similar way by working on neighboring words by parse tree order rather than sequence order. They compute the representation for each parent node based on its immediate children recursively in a bottom-up fashion until reaching the root of the tree. For a given node  $\eta$  in the tree and its left child  $\eta_{\text{left}}$  (with representation  $e_{\text{left}}$ ) and right child  $\eta_{\text{right}}$  (with representation  $e_{\text{right}}$ ), the standard recursive network calculates  $e_\eta$ :

$$e_\eta = \tanh(W \cdot e_{\eta_{\text{left}}} + V \cdot e_{\eta_{\text{right}}}) \quad (6)$$

**Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)** LSTM models (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) are defined as follows: given a sequence of inputs  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_x}\}$ , an LSTM associates each timestep with an input, memory and output gate, respectively denoted as  $i_t$ ,  $f_t$  and  $o_t$ . We notationally disambiguate  $e$  and  $h$ , where  $e_t$  denote the vector for an individual text unit (e.g., word or sentence) at time step  $t$  while  $h_t$  denotes the vector computed by the LSTM model at time  $t$  by combining  $e_t$  and  $h_{t-1}$ .  $\sigma$  denotes the sigmoid function.  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{4K \times 2K}$ . The vector representation  $h_t$  for each time-step  $t$  is given by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} i_t \\ f_t \\ o_t \\ l_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \\ \sigma \\ \sigma \\ \tanh \end{bmatrix} W \cdot \begin{bmatrix} h_{t-1} \\ e_t \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

$$c_t = f_t \cdot c_{t-1} + i_t \cdot l_t \quad (8)$$

$$h_t^s = o_t \cdot c_t \quad (9)$$

## 9 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Sam Bowman, Ignacio Cases, Kevin Gu, Gabor Angeli, Sida Wang, Percy Liang and other members of the Stanford NLP group, as well as anonymous reviewers for their helpful advice on various aspects of this work. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the NSF via award IIS-1514268, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Deep Exploration and Filtering of Text (DEFT) Program under Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) contract no. FA8750-13-2-0040. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF, DARPA, AFRL, or the US government.

## References

- Yoshua Bengio, Holger Schwenk, Jean-Sébastien Senécal, Frédéric Morin, and Jean-Luc Gauvain. 2006. Neural probabilistic language models. In *Innovations in Machine Learning*, pages 137–186. Springer.
- David M. Blei, Thomas L. Griffiths, Michael I. Jordan, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. 2004. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16.
- Xinxiong Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2014. A unified model for word sense representation and disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1025–1035.
- 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*, pages 160–167. ACM.
- Ronan Collobert, Jason Weston, Léon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. 2011. Natural language processing (almost) from scratch. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2493–2537.
- Bradley Efron and Robert J Tibshirani. 1994. *An introduction to the bootstrap*. CRC press.
- Thomas S Ferguson. 1973. A bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The annals of statistics*, pages 209–230.
- Lev Finkelstein, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Yossi Matias, Ehud Rivlin, Zach Solan, Gadi Wolfman, and Eytan Ruppín. 2001. Placing search in context: The concept revisited. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 406–414. ACM.
- Iris Hendrickx, Su Nam Kim, Zornitsa Kozareva, Preslav Nakov, Diarmuid Ó Séaghdha, Sebastian Padó, Marco Pennacchiotti, Lorenza Romano, and Stan Szpakowicz. 2009. Semeval-2010 task 8: Multi-way classification of semantic relations between pairs of nominals. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Semantic Evaluations: Recent Achievements and Future Directions*, pages 94–99. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Eric H Huang, Richard Socher, Christopher D Manning, and Andrew Y Ng. 2012. Improving word representations via global context and multiple word prototypes. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Long Papers-Volume 1*, pages 873–882. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ozan Irsoy and Claire Cardie. 2014. Deep recursive neural networks for compositionality in language. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2096–2104.
- Walter Kintsch. 2001. Predication. *Cognitive Science*, 25(2):173–202.
- Yang Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Maosong Sun. 2015. Topical word embeddings. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Marco Marelli, Luisa Bentivogli, Marco Baroni, Raffaella Bernardi, Stefano Menini, and Roberto Zamparelli. 2014. Semeval-2014 task 1: Evaluation of compositional distributional semantic models on full sentences through semantic relatedness and textual entailment. *SemEval-2014*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *INTERSPEECH*, pages 1045–1048.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Andriy Mnih and Geoffrey Hinton. 2007. Three new graphical models for statistical language modelling. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 641–648. ACM.
- Arvind Neelakantan, Jeevan Shankar, Alexandre Passos, and Andrew McCallum. 2014. Efficient non-parametric estimation of multiple embeddings per word in vector space. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Bo Pang, Lillian Lee, and Shivakumar Vaithyanathan. 2002. Thumbs up?: Sentiment classification using machine learning techniques. In *Proceedings of the ACL-02 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing-Volume 10*, pages 79–86. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Barak A Pearlmutter. 1989. Learning state space trajectories in recurrent neural networks. *Neural Computation*, 1(2):263–269.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D 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.
- Luis Nieto Pina and Richard Johansson. 2014. A simple and efficient method to generate word sense representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6045*.
- Jim Pitman. 1995. Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability theory and related fields*, 102(2):145–158.

- Lin Qiu, Yong Cao, Zaiqing Nie, and Yong Rui. 2014. Learning word representation considering proximity and ambiguity. In *Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Joseph Reisinger and Raymond J Mooney. 2010. Multi-prototype vector-space models of word meaning. In *NAACL*.
- Herbert Rubenstein and John B Goodenough. 1965. Contextual correlates of synonymy. *Communications of the ACM*, 8(10):627–633.
- Richard Socher, Brody Huval, Christopher D Manning, and Andrew Y Ng. 2012. Semantic compositionality through recursive matrix-vector spaces. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 1201–1211. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Y Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D Manning, Andrew Y Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Kai Sheng Tai, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2015. Improved semantic representations from tree-structured long short-term memory networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00075*.
- Yee Whye Teh, Michael I. Jordan, Matthew J. Beal, and David M. Blei. 2006. Hierarchical dirichlet processes. *Journal of the american statistical association*, 101(476).
- Zhaohui Wu and C. Lee Giles. 2015. Sense-aware semantic analysis: A multi-prototype word representation model using wikipedia. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.