
Concept Formation and Alignment in Language Models: Bridging Statistical Patterns in Latent Space to Concept Taxonomy

Mehrdad Khatir
Department of Computer Science
Virginia Tech
Arlington, VA, USA
khatir@vt.edu

Chandan K. Reddy
Department of Computer Science
Virginia Tech
Arlington, VA, USA
reddy@cs.vt.edu

Abstract

This paper explores the concept formation and alignment within the realm of language models (LMs). We propose a mechanism for identifying concepts and their hierarchical organization within the semantic representations learned by various LMs, encompassing a spectrum from early models like Glove to the transformer-based language models like ALBERT and T5. Our approach leverages the inherent structure present in the semantic embeddings generated by these models to extract a taxonomy of concepts and their hierarchical relationships. This investigation sheds light on how LMs develop conceptual understanding and opens doors to further research to improve their ability to reason and leverage real-world knowledge. We further conducted experiments and observed the possibility of isolating these extracted conceptual representations from the reasoning modules of the transformer-based LMs. The observed concept formation along with the isolation of conceptual representations from the reasoning modules can enable targeted token engineering to open the door for potential applications in knowledge transfer, explainable AI, and the development of more modular and conceptually grounded language models.

1 Introduction

Language models are rapidly approaching human-level language abilities. However, these advancements raise important concerns - on the one hand, despite their immense potential, language models are susceptible to unexpected and potentially harmful behaviors such as hallucination [21], stereotyping [25], misinformation [37], and leakage of sensitive training data [29]. On the other hand, the extent of their capabilities and the nature of their understanding is not yet known, thus capturing the attention of diverse groups, from policymakers to academics [3, 16, 18, 39]. While these issues may seem different, they both stem from a common concern - the "black box" nature. The limited ability to understand how they reach their outputs raises fears about their true capabilities, potential biases, and unintended consequences.

Researchers are actively studying the semantic representations learned by large language models (LLMs), aiming to understand the inner workings of language models. While initially used to study the learning dynamics of linguistic features and abstractions within LMs [26, 50], this research has expanded to explore how these models acquire and represent knowledge about the world. Some studies [1, 18, 38] have explored the ability of transformer-based models to learn representations of color, spatial, and temporal information. In contrast, other studies have raised concerns about the coherence and completeness of this knowledge [16]. The work of [39] even suggests that language models may lack a true conceptual understanding of the real world, echoing the "stochastic parrot"

critique [3]. This debate stems from the fundamental question of whether language models merely capture statistical patterns in language or truly grasp the underlying concepts they represent. There are so many works on the semantic relations of the tokens but limited research directly addresses the question of whether these relations are grounded in a conceptual understanding of the real world, or merely reflect co-occurrence patterns in language data [2, 28].

Objectives. To address the aforementioned gap, this paper investigates the process of concept formation in language models. We posit our work based on the argument that ‘Concepts’ are mental representations of categories, which group objects, events, or ideas based on shared features [45]. More generic concepts that correspond to broader categories and share fewer defining features. This is how the hierarchical categories/concepts are formed. In an unsupervised world, when there is no label, categories translate into clusters/communities. Then, similar to [28], we argue that if neural models of language are to have any knowledge about concepts, it ought to be reflected in their token/word embeddings. Thus, communities/categories need to form in the semantic space in which their most relevant category names are often closely related to concepts that describe that category. Note that, while we often form concepts based on categories, not every category will necessarily lead to a clear and distinct concept in the real world. This phenomenon, known as *concept alignment* [43] will be the focus of our quantitative analysis.

Methodology. Interpretability research traditionally use probing [36, 51]. Probing often involves evaluating models on specific, often artificial tasks designed to isolate particular linguistic phenomena. Probing results might be sensitive to the specific design choices of the probe tasks, such as the choice of dataset, prompts, or metrics, making it difficult to extrapolate conclusions to the model’s overall capabilities in real-world scenarios. Thus, while effective for specific domains, they have inherently limited ability to provide broader insights into the extent of models’ underlying representations and reasoning capabilities beyond specific tasks they are tuned for [48]. Therefore, we avoid using conventional probing, instead, we propose a concept extraction methodology based on graph creation (K-nearest neighbors), fuzzy weighting mechanism (borrowed from UMAP category theory [32]) and community/cluster detection algorithms to identify groups of highly interconnected data points, representing potential concepts. The performance of this approach hinges upon the existence of a meaningful, hierarchical structure within the input embedding layer. This method can potentially offer a deeper and more holistic understanding of the underlying knowledge encoded in these representations (as compared to probing).

Models Under Investigation. Using our proposed method, we investigate the embedding spaces of GloVe, a traditional statistical language model [40]; ALBERT, a transformer-based encoder language model [23]; and T5, a transformer-based autoregressive language model [42] to comprehend if concept formation occurs in any of these models.

Evaluation. In order to answer the question of "if concept formation happens in the semantic space," we evaluated the formed clusters against external references such as WordNet [34], Name Dataset [44], and country-state-city databases [11] for most of our evaluations. For clusters where open-source datasets were not available, we employed human annotators as an external reference. We observed that the process of concept formation can occur as early as the input embedding layer in transformer-based models. Considering that this observation hints at the existence of semantic memory in transformer-based models, we further investigate in Section 4.3 whether there is a separation between the identified semantic memory and the reasoning mechanisms. Specifically, we ask whether the model can still reason effectively with a modified semantic memory. This line of inquiry aims to deepen *our understanding of the relationship between knowledge representation and reasoning capabilities within transformer-based models.*

2 Semantic Representation Space

2.1 Concept formation, Representation Learning and Semantic Memory

A simplified model of human understanding can be described as a multi-step process in which the incoming sensory information is integrated and turned into a brain-constructed interpretation of external objects/stimuli. This results in a mental construct (or percept) [15]. Then, the newly formed mental construct gets compared, integrated, and associated with the existing knowledge already retained in the semantic memory. These connections help us to conceptualize and understand the new information based on what we already know (as shown in Figure 1). While diverse reasoning




Figure 1: Simplified steps on how external information is understood and retained. Upon understanding a newly encountered word/entity, it is typically stored in the semantic memory. The existence of semantic memory (on the left) allows the previously encountered words/entities to have a form of meaning even without requiring an external context. The scatter box on the right is the community (primarily associated with moving creatures) we extracted from the ALBERT model [23].

mechanisms exist, a common thread among them seems to be their reliance on and interaction with the semantic memory. This interaction likely leaves enduring traces within such a memory [5]. The integration of newly encountered mental constructs within an existing cognitive framework is often guided by their relations to established internal constructs [13]. This process facilitates the creation, refinement, or expansion of semantically similar clusters [27], implying a degree of inherent categorization¹.

Representation Learning and Concept Formation Representation learning is a fundamental aspect of language models, where the goal is to learn distributed representations (embeddings) for words or subword units that capture their semantic and syntactic relationships [4]. Early models like word2vec [33] utilized shallow neural networks to learn these embeddings from large text corpora. More recent models, such as Large Language Models (LLMs) like GPT-3 [30], employ transformer architectures with self-attention mechanisms [53], enabling more accurate and dynamic representation learning. From the distributional hypothesis, models can form "concepts" by identifying patterns and relationships within data, particularly through recognizing the approximate invariance of shared features across different data instances [13]. It should be noted that "concept formation" is a byproduct of the learning process, not a guaranteed outcome. Furthermore, the formed "concepts" might not always align with human-defined concepts. Thus, it is crucial to investigate and evaluate the nature of concept formation within models and their alignment with human understanding.

2.2 Evaluation Methods

The analysis, measurement, and interpretability of semantic representation learning in language models have been the subject of extensive research. Various methods have been proposed to evaluate how well these models capture semantic meaning.

Intrinsic evaluation methods, assess semantic representations by measuring word embedding similarity, comparing them to human judgments of relatedness, (e.g. [17, 33, 36, 51, 52]). While these methods provide valuable insights, they often suffer from the limitations that probing techniques impose, and may not fully capture how well a model forms conceptual hierarchies or grasps the full spectrum of semantic relationships, as word embeddings typically represent individual words rather than higher-level categories [9]. This limitation can hinder the evaluation of a model's ability to understand broader semantic relationships and its capacity for abstract reasoning.

¹This notion implies an interrelation between the recognition and categorization.

Another approach is to use *extrinsic evaluation methods*, which measure the performance of language models on downstream tasks that rely on semantic understanding, such as sentiment analysis, question answering, and machine translation [54, 55]. The performance on these tasks can indirectly indicate the quality of the learned semantic representations. The main challenge with using such extrinsic evaluation metrics to assess concept formation in the embedding space is that they do not directly measure the quality of the concepts themselves. Instead, they measure how well the model performs on specific tasks that rely on those concepts, which does not necessarily prove that the model has formed robust, human-like concepts. For instance, a model might accurately classify sentiment without truly grasping the nuances of emotions like sarcasm or irony [31].

In addition to evaluation metrics, researchers have also employed visualization methods to interpret learned representations. These methods often involve projecting high-dimensional embeddings into lower-dimensional spaces for visualization [46, 48]. However, several challenges arise with these approaches. Firstly, they offer indirect and subjective assessments of model understanding, lacking a quantitative basis for evaluation. Secondly, the dimensionality reduction process can lead to information loss [14, 56], potentially obscuring important nuances in the representations. Finally, different visualization techniques can produce conflicting results, making it difficult to reach definitive conclusions about the model’s true comprehension. To mitigate these shortcomings, we propose a concept extraction mechanism that identifies communities in higher-dimensional space. This approach enables both quantitative evaluation and mitigation of potential information loss incurred during dimensionality reduction.

3 Concept Extraction

As discussed in Section 2.1, identifying clusters or communities within the semantic representation space is a crucial initial step in evaluating concept formation. We prioritize community detection among clustering methods for the following reasons:

- **Alignment with Semantic Network Structure:** The underlying semantic representation, as detailed in Section 2.1, exhibits a network-like structure. Community detection algorithms are specifically designed to uncover such inherent community structures within networks, making them better suited to our task.
- **Unknown Number of Clusters:** Traditional clustering algorithms are often sensitive to the choice of the number of clusters or other clustering parameters [57]. In our case, we lack this prior knowledge and only assume that semantically similar words are closer in the representation space. Community detection methods do not necessitate a predetermined number of clusters.
- **High Dimensionality of Data:** The high dimensionality of the semantic representation space poses challenges for many clustering algorithms [57]. Community detection methods on the other hand, naturally circumvent this issue by transforming the high-dimensional space into a graph, where relationships between data points become more readily apparent.

This approach allows for a more effective and accurate identification of semantic clusters, reflecting the natural structure of the semantic representation space and facilitating a deeper understanding of concept formation.

3.1 Graph Construction

While categories themselves are not strict clusters, they may exhibit internal structure or fuzzy partitions based on shared features or relationships. Considering our discussion in the previous section, we seek a representation space where the structure of these categories is explicitly reflected in the geometry of the manifold. This requirement arises from the desire to directly manipulate and modify these clusters through geometric operations on the representation, opening up possibilities for Token Engineering within the language models.

Inspired by the effectiveness of the UMAP dimensionality reduction [32], we use the Nearest neighbor descent to find the K nearest neighbors for every token embedding in the embedding space and then use the following equations as the weight function of the edge between x_i and x_j nodes in the K -NN graph [32]:

$$\omega(x_i, x_j) = \exp\left(\frac{-\max(0, d(x_i, x_j) - \rho_i)}{\sigma_i}\right) \tag{1}$$

Algorithm 1: Louvain

Data: The initial input is a weighted network of all the nodes exist in the entire space.

Result: A set of hierarchical communities.

```
1 Community Detection;
2 Create a community list; assign a different community id to each node of the network;
3 while a local maxima of the modularity is not attained do
4   for each node  $i$  do
5     for each neighbor  $j$  do
6       evaluate the gain of modularity if  $i$  moved to the community of node  $j$ ;
7       keep the maximum gain and community id;
8     if the maximum gain is positive then
9       Move node  $i$  to the community with maximum gain.
10 Community Aggregation;
11 if Number of Communities  $> 1$  then
12   Reduce each community to a single node;
13 go to 1
```

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the distance function (cosine in our case) and ρ_i is calculated as:

$$\rho_i = \min\{d(x_i, x_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k, d(x_i, x_j) > 0\} \quad (2)$$

where k is the number of neighbors of node i . Finally, σ_i is calculated by setting the summation of weights of a node to be equal to a constant (i.e., $\log_2(k)$):

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \omega(x_i, x_j) = \log_2(k). \quad (3)$$

Building upon our theoretical arguments, the invariant representations (if they exist), should form fuzzy partitions that can be detected by the community detection algorithms. Thus, for the third step, we perform community detection.

3.2 Louvain Community Detection

The Louvain method is a widely used algorithm for community detection in large networks. It finds the communities by optimizing a metric called modularity. The modularity of a partition is a scalar value between -1 and 1 that measures how much more densely connected the nodes within a community are compared to how connected they would be in a random network. [6]. For a weighted graph, modularity is defined as:

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j} \left[A_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m} \right] \delta(c_i, c_j) \quad (4)$$

where A_{ij} represents the weight of the edge between i and j ; k_i is the sum of the weights of the edges attached to vertex i ; m is the sum of all of the edge weights in the graph; the δ -function $\delta(c_i, c_i)$ is 1 if $u = v$ and 0 otherwise; c_i is the community to which the nodes i belongs to.

Then, it aggregates the communities to identify hierarchical structures. In this phase, each community is considered as a single node and the links between the new nodes are calculated as the sum of the weight of the links between nodes in the corresponding two communities. More details are given in Algorithm 1.

3.3 Concept Extraction Algorithm

for our concept extraction algorithm, as the first step, we create and weight the adjacency graph using K -NN, UMAP-based weighing formula (mentioned in section 3.1), and then use Louvain [6] and label propagation [58] community detection algorithms.

Algorithm 2: Concept Extraction

Data: All tokens in the input embeddings.

Result: A set of hierarchical communities.

```
1 Create a community list. The initial community is the entire space;
2 for  $k=[\text{different neighbor sizes}]$  do
3   for all communities do
4     (1) Generate KNN graph of the community using the input embedding weights;
5     (2) Compute the edge weights of the graph using fuzzy simplex;
6     (3) Apply Louvain/Label-Propagation community detection;
7     (4) Add the identified communities to the list;
```

There are multiple viable strategies to extract hierarchical communities in our methodology; the first one is to use algorithms such as Louvain that inherently generate hierarchical communities [6]. However, the summation of the weights as a new weight in the community aggregation phase of Louvain algorithm skews the weighted graph in favor of merging smaller communities in the next phase. This detaches the community detection from the actual values in the semantic representation space (i.e. graph weights higher in the Louvain hierarchy no longer reflect the geometrical affinity of the nodes). Thus, for our concept extraction algorithm, we use 1-2 community aggregation and rather use KNN iteratively with different granularity for extracting hierarchical concepts (more details are described in Algorithm 2).

Note that we only use well-established methods such as K -NN, UMAP-based weighing formula, as well as Louvain [6] and label propagation [58] community detection algorithms to capitalize on the established generalizability of these algorithms. Although, as we show in the next sections that our method produces amazingly good categories, it should be noted that we intend to focus our analysis on “if the language model forms concepts” rather than creating the most optimal concept extraction mechanism. Thus, as an extension to this work, one can focus on further optimizing our proposed method. Notably, our concept extraction is algorithm-agnostic; alternatives could be readily employed.

3.4 Models Under Investigation

Using our proposed method, we investigated the embedding spaces of GloVe, ALBERT, and T5 to determine if concept formation occurs consistently across these diverse language models. We chose this spectrum of models to: (i) assess if our method for identifying concept formation is applicable across a wide range of architectures and training data, and (2) investigate whether the concept formation is a fundamental property of language representation, regardless of the specific model architecture or training data. We hypothesize that the language model with the least embedding layer dimension is more appropriate for our investigative analysis, because, when all other factors are held constant, models with more compact latent spaces generally produce more invariant representations [20]. Thus, for the detailed analysis and evaluations, we pick ALBERT² [23] as our primary target since it has the tightest latent space dimensionality.

Finally, we hypothesize that exploring the formation of such analogs early in the language model, potentially at the input embedding layer, could open the door to the possibility of knowledge-reasoning separation. Thus, we focus our investigation on this layer. More details about the models can be found in Appendix A.

4 Experiments and Discussions

Concept formation involves the creation of abstract internal representations through the clustering of inputs with shared features. While numerous intrinsic clustering metrics exist to assess cluster formation quality, their application to our use case is limited by two factors:

- The formed clusters are not situated within Euclidean space [7, 8, 24], rendering geometric properties such as cluster distances inadequate indicators of concept well-formedness and distinctiveness.

²We used open source Hugging Face albert-base-v2 and albert-xxlarge-v2 (<https://huggingface.co/albert>).

- Concepts inherently possess a degree of vagueness [19], thus metrics like compactness or separation do not reliably reflect the quality of formed concepts.

Consequently, to assess the quality of the formed concepts, we shift our focus to evaluating concept alignment, specifically examining both LM-LM and Human-LM alignment. LM-LM alignment allows for the generalization of our observations to other language models, while Human-LM alignment serves as an indicator of the quality and real-world interpretability of the formed concepts.

Concept Extraction Setup. We configured our algorithms to create k -NN graph iteratively for different values of k . This enables us to observe the communities/concepts formation at various granularities. Table 1 shows the number of identified clusters for $k = [100, 75, 50, 25, 12, 6]$.

Table 1: Number of communities with different granularities of nearest neighbors for ALBER, T5 and GloVe. For GloVe, we only used the subset of GloVe that present in Albert Vocab

Models	K settings						Vocab Size
	100	75	50	25	12	6	
T5	1	115	1203	4551	8137	9407	32000
Albert	8	133	1058	4442	7718	8626	30000
GloVe	9	207	1157	3521	6237	7200	25869

4.1 LM-LM alignment

To evaluate LM-LM alignment, we measure the community mapping across the language models under test. We define a mapping as the ratio of the successfully mapped communities from the embedding space of the language model with the smaller vocabulary to the language model with the larger vocabulary. Furthermore, we define *success* in mapping process as if the ratio of found tokens from source community in the destination community is greater than a certain threshold. thresholds greater than 0.5 imply at worst many-to-one mapping (when the number of tokens in the source and destination space are similar, it is more likely to imply one-to-one mapping). Such one-to-one mapping implies a direct concept alignment, and many-to-one mapping implies the source community is aligned with hierarchies of the destination concept.

This mapping score provides a quantitative measure of the degree to which the concept communities formed by one model can be translated to the other. To refine our analysis, we filtered the tokens to include only those that start with whitespace in T5 and ALBERT models. Empirically, this enhances the likelihood of associating the token with a word existing in the external world, thereby enhancing the validity of our concept alignment assessment. Note that to find the mappings we only used the token sets that are shared between the model pairs. That is 25869 for Albert/GloVe, 14861 for T5/GloVe and 5055 tokens for T5/Albert pairs.

Table 2 shows the pair-wise mapping score of the formed communities in the GloVe, Albert, and T5 embedding spaces. Our analysis reveals a high degree of alignment between semantic spaces, particularly for granular concepts, when using thresholds around 50-60%. This alignment is especially pronounced in the Albert/T5 pairing (both transformer-based models), where granular concepts exhibit a near perfect degree of alignment. While alignment persists for more abstract concepts (larger communities), the level of confidence decreases. For the ALBERT-GloVe and T5-GloVe pairings, a similar pattern of community mapping emerged, but the quality of the alignment was significantly lower compared to the ALBERT-T5 pairing. This suggests that while semantic alignment exists across different language models, the degree of alignment is influenced by the underlying model architecture and training data.

Table 2: Pair-wise Mapping score of the formed communities in the GloVe, Albert, and T5 embedding spaces.

Thre- shold	Albert		/	GloVe		T5		/	GloVe		T5		/	Albert	
	$K=75$	$K=50$		$K=25$	$K=12$	$K=6$	$K=75$		$K=50$	$K=25$	$K=12$	$K=6$		$K=75$	$K=50$
0.5	0.70	0.57	0.62	0.68	0.70	0.62	0.74	0.84	0.89	0.91	0.61	0.78	0.91	0.95	0.97
0.6	0.56	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.46	0.60	0.70	0.72	0.72	0.43	0.60	0.80	0.86	0.86
0.7	0.42	0.30	0.30	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.46	0.54	0.56	0.56	0.30	0.49	0.70	0.79	0.80
0.8	0.32	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.21	0.15	0.39	0.48	0.52	0.52	0.24	0.45	0.69	0.78	0.79
0.9	0.17	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.07	0.32	0.45	0.50	0.51	0.18	0.43	0.67	0.78	0.79

The aforementioned observations strongly support the generalization of LM-LM concept alignment. The high degree of alignment, particularly for granular concepts and between models with similar architectures (like ALBERT and T5), indicates a shared understanding of semantic relationships across these models. This opens up exciting possibilities for leveraging this alignment to improve model performance or transfer knowledge between models without the need for extensive retraining. However, further research is needed to explore the extent and limitations of this potential knowledge transfer, especially for more abstract concepts and between models with different architectures.

Case Sensitivity Analysis. The T5 model’s vocabulary preserves case information, enabling us to examine how formed concepts align with capitalization differences. We identified 4,328 tokens with varying case appearances (total of 8,887 tokens). We found that for highly granular concepts ($k=6$), 80% of these tokens belong to the same community. This ratio increases to 85% for $k=25$ before plateauing, suggesting that case variations generally do not significantly alter the semantic grouping of tokens. This finding supports the notion that the model learns to associate words with their meanings regardless of capitalization, particularly for more abstract or broader concepts (larger k values). However, the initial increase in alignment ratio with increasing k implies that case sensitivity might still play a minor role in differentiating highly specific or nuanced concepts.

4.2 Human-LM alignment

In the previous section, we established the concepts formed in LM models have a degree of alignment with respect to each other. To investigate human-LM alignment, in this section, we focus our analysis on the ALBERT model. While our empirical results are derived from ALBERT, the principles discussed are generalizable to other LLMs, given the LM-LM alignment established earlier (we include human-LM alignment evaluations for GloVe and T5 in Appendix B).

Concept Hierarchy Formation. When examining the broader perspective (i.e., $k=100$), the model primarily found groups of named entities (mostly names of people and places), adverbs, sub-words, some number symbols, and a super-community for ‘other vocabulary’ (appendix C, Figure 4 shows the overall concept hierarchies of the ALBERT vocab). Zooming in further (e.g., $k=75$), these communities revealed more specific clusters that are relatable to the real world. For instance, within named entities, clusters formed for personal vs. location names, even further pinpointing locations by country. Similarly, within the aforementioned super-community, sub-clusters emerged that mapped to various lifestyle aspects, including relationships, social structures, multimedia, and motile creatures. As the granularity level increases (approaching a smaller k value), clusters exhibit a stronger association with word forms.

Concept Alignments. To investigate the presence and extent of human-LM concept alignment, we systematically examine the model’s representations of distinct facets of the external world:

- **Numerical Concepts.** This category focuses on numerical values, facilitating a targeted analysis of intra-category relationships, such as value-based ordering.
- **Named Entities (Names and Locations).** Primarily comprising proper nouns, this category leverages readily available labeled datasets to validate alignment between the LM’s conceptual groupings and established knowledge bases. It also allows us to investigate if associative relations (e.g., country-nationality) influence community formation.
- **Social Structures.** This category reflects the LM’s approach to forming categories that encompass both abstract and concrete nouns, including roles, titles, and processes. This analysis can elucidate its ability to grasp and align complex relationships and concepts.

By analyzing these diverse facets, we aim to comprehensively evaluate the degree to which the LM’s internal representations align with human understanding of the external world.

4.2.1 Symbols-Numbers

At a high level, numbers and symbols are completely separated from the rest of the tokens in the embedding space. within themselves they form communities according to (i) years, (ii) integer values, (iii) tokens indicating monetary values (e.g., \$1), (iv) ratio/time (e.g., 2:1, 3:30), (v) fractions (e.g., $7/8$), (vi) large values (e.g., ‘100,000’), and (vii) percentages (e.g., 42%). Within these communities, integers form communities based on their hundreds. Within the embedding manifold, we analyzed

Table 3: Orderliness score of different communities of the numbers. Years refer to the cluster of numbers between 1816 - 2021. Support refers to the number of samples within the cluster.

Category	Top-1	Top-3	Top-5	Support
0-100	0.68	0.89	0.92	100
100-262	0.75	0.94	1.0	115
263-300	0.46	0.78	0.89	37
300-400	0.42	0.71	0.84	82
400+	0.53	0.75	0.83	110
Years	0.86	0.96	0.98	203

the spatial distribution of number sequences, particularly focusing on their sequencing. Since the embedding manifold is not guaranteed to be a Euclidean structure [7, 8, 24], conventional distance-based measures of order were not applicable. We define a point x as "locally ordered" on a manifold if it resides within the intersection of the k -nearest neighbor sets of both its immediate neighbors, $x + 1$ and $x - 1$. This localized approach captures the intuitive notion of orderliness within a small neighborhood on the manifold, rather than relying on a global ranking.

Orderliness Score. Table 3 presents the orderliness scores of the communities identified by our algorithm. The "top-1" score represents strict orderliness, where $x + 1$ lies exactly between x and $x + 2$ in the embedding space. The "top-3" and "top-5" scores measure relaxed orderliness, where $x + 1$ falls within the 3 or 5 nearest neighbors of both x and $x + 2$, respectively. As the results indicate, all detected communities exhibit a higher degree of local orderliness, regardless of the chosen level of strictness. This finding is significant because it suggests that language models may possess not only the ability to categorize heterogeneous input entities but also the capacity to construct meaning within smaller, internally consistent structures (internally homogeneous sub-structures). This implies the potential for LMs to move beyond simply classifying information to actively interpreting and generating meaning within specific contexts.




Figure 2: Visualization of the identified name and location communities of size larger than 10 entities. UMAP projection as well as kernel density estimate (KDE) plot is used for the visualization.

4.2.2 Names and Locations

Figure 2 visualizes the major identified communities of locations and human names. Generally, the formed clusters associate with specific regions or cultures and contain both location and personal names. Within these, even more granular sub-clusters emerge, characterized by distinct communities of location and personal names. Interestingly, we observed a degree of geographic ordering within the identified communities. As illustrated in Figure 2, there appears to be a general trend from east to west as we move across the communities from bottom-left to top-right. The leftmost communities are predominantly associated with Japanese locations and names, while those on the rightmost side are primarily linked to Europe and the United States. This suggests that the model’s internal representations in the input embedding layer may inherently capture geographical relationships.

To mitigate the subjectivity risk of assessing the semantic structure, we further used external datasets in our evaluations. For Names, we used name-dataset [44] which consists of a comprehensive set of names (730K first names and 983K last names), their associated genders, and their popularity rank for each country. For locations, we used the country-state-city database [11] which contains information on 250 countries, 5K+ states, and 150K+ cities. Table 4a shows the high-level communities that our approach detected. Most of the high-level communities are a mix of names/locations associated with certain geographical/cultural regions. Within these clusters, names and locations form distinct subclusters which we discuss in more detail in the following subsections.

Table 4: Evaluation of the location and name tokens for different hierarchy levels. 4a presents the precision for high-level communities, while 4b and 4c show the more granular communities formed within the detected communities in 4a

(a) Precision of the largest identified name and location communities with respect to name and location databases. Note that these are at a higher level in the cluster hierarchies. Table 4b shows the identified granular sub-clusters and their associated precision.

Category	Precision	Support	Note
US/UK/AUS/NZ	0.882	1011	Human & Location Names
Male	0.854	946	Human Names
Female	0.866	552	Human Names
West-Asia	0.684	390	Human & Location Names
Hispanic/Latino	0.685	282	Human & Location Names
US	0.720	267	Location Names
Europe	0.739	215	Human & Location Names
East-Asia	0.741	178	Human & Location Names

(b) The precision of communities based on the identified categories with respect to name-database. First indicate categories of first names last indicates last names

Country	Overall Precision	Country Precision	Support	Note
USA/UK	0.857	0.725	211	First
UK/Canada	0.886	0.698	116	First
Saudi/Arabic	0.82	0.76	94	First
Spain/Mexico	0.977	0.78	87	First
USA/Hebrew	0.835	0.568	81	First
Italy/Swiss	0.887	0.625	80	First
Belgium/France	0.928	0.789	76	First
German/Sweden	1.0	0.709	55	First
German/Austria	0.962	0.717	53	First
India	0.82	0.56	39	First
Russian	0.896	0.724	29	First
France	0.9	0.737	76	Last
Mexico	0.951	0.855	83	Last
China	0.9	0.9	30	Last
Denmark	0.88	0.64	25	Last
Germany	0.95	0.95	20	Last
Japan	0.928	0.857	14	Last

(c) The precision of communities based on the identified categories with respect to the location database.

Country-Region	Precision	Support
United States	0.80	240
Germany	0.4125	80
France	0.409	66
Africa	0.69	55
India	0.58	50
Italy	0.590	44
Mexico	0.424	33
Spain	0.592	27
China	0.5	20
Japan	0.736	19
Philippines	0.46	15
Pakistan	0.461	13
Netherlands	0.636	11
North-Africa	0.8	10

Names. To determine whether the sub-clusters are associated with names, we pre-filtered the clusters that at least 70% of their tokens are in the top 1000 names (of any country), with gender confidence of above 0.8. We primarily use gender confidence to distinguish between first-name from last name clusters. Then we cross-referenced all identified name communities for all countries in the dataset and assigned the country name with the highest score ³ as the cluster names.

Table 4b shows the precision score of the identified granular communities. The first column shows the ratio of the community members that are indeed human names (overall precision), while the second column shows the ratio with respect to specific countries. It should be noted that the country-wise scores of the countries with similar cultures and languages were similar. The reported precision score shows a high degree of categorization based on the country/culture of origin.

It should be noted that we only included clusters with sizes larger than 10 and country-wise precision of larger than 0.5 due to space limitation. The list of identified cluster names goes far beyond the aforementioned table. Clusters such as character names from books, mythology, and car brand names were also identified which were not included due to space limitations.

Locations. It should be noted that, although the dataset is somewhat comprehensive, the LM token space associates only one token to each location, leading to an artificial decrease in precision for multi-token location names. Despite these limitations, we were able to identify communities within the input embedding space that are associated not only with the location category but also with specific regions/countries. The precision numbers in Table 4c suggest the model groups the locations with respect to the borders of the countries, which, to a certain degree, implies a subjective perception of geographical knowledge aligned with human perception (since it is evaluated against human annotated dataset). This finding suggests that the language model attempts to construct a human-like mental map ⁴, wherein it approximates borders and associates nationalities with specific clusters/communities. It should be noted that, due to space constraints, we only present the communities containing more than 10 entities ⁵. Note that dealing with multi-token location names is more challenging. For instance, "Carolina" was correctly clustered within the United States community by the LM, while our reference dataset misclassified it as a city in Brazil. Additionally, not all location names with English spellings are included in the dataset; for example, 'Wurtemberg' (or 'Nuremberg'), a region within Germany, is absent, leading to an artificial decrease in precision.

4.2.3 Social Structures

Our methodology identifies a cluster of 903 members with the theme of social structures. In order to have a reference dataset, we annotated the dataset using a combination of GPT-4 and human annotators ⁶. Since analyzing such concepts can accompany a degree of human subjectivity, we feed the datasets to GPT-4 and ask to identify the theme of each category (as shown in Table 5) for mitigating such uncertainty. In order to reduce subjectivity (we formed the class names based on the GPT-4 recommendation. Then, we asked GPT-4 and human annotator to classify each word with respect to given class names (we added another class named "Other" to avoid forcing the annotators to misclassification).

Then, we calculated the precision score of the identified clusters with respect to our annotated dataset. We see the precision scores shown in Table 5 as evidence that the model forms an idea on different aspects of social structure in its semantic memory. When it comes to more granular clusters ($k=25$), the sub-clusters are mostly word-forms or semantically similar words.

Intriguingly, the vocabulary model grouped words like "God" and "divinity" within the same community as concepts and structures associated with Christianity. Conversely, terms like "Islam," "Judaism," and "Talmud" formed a distinct cluster. This finding warrants further investigation to determine whether it reflects potential biases within the underlying semantic memory.

³For some clusters we picked the second highest country name if the scores were similar. Due to the cosmopolitan nature of countries like the USA, They tend result in a high score across the board.

⁴We refer the definition of the mental map to the [American Psychology Association dictionary] (<https://dictionary.apa.org/mental-map>). It is defined as "a mental representation of the world or some part of it based on subjective perceptions rather than objective geographical knowledge.

⁵The complete set of clusters is included as the supplementary material.

⁶A human annotator was used alongside GPT-4 to correct GPT-4 misclassifications. Label correction by a human happens faster than the label suggestion task. We estimated our approach is more time/cost-effective while resulting in the same quality annotations.

Table 5: The precision score of community members belonging to the identified categories.

Category	Precision	Support
Religious (Christianity)	0.818	258
Military and Law Enforcement	0.842	133
Administration and business	0.788	129
Political Ideologies/Movements	0.648	125
Monarchy and Aristocracy	0.64	107
Legislature and Election	0.736	80




Figure 3: Visualization of the social structure cluster and its associated identified sub-clusters.

Table 6: Huggingface ALBERT base model on GLUE, SuperGLUE, and SQUAD tasks. For the baseline, the model was finetuned without altering the embeddings. For the mid-point, the embedding layer entries are assigned the mid-point embedding of their associated community. We used [41] repo for benchmarking.

mid-point	GLUE								
Method/Tasks	mnli	mrpc	qnli	qqp	rte	sst	stsb	wnli	
baseline	0.827	0.841	0.902	0.858	0.765	0.915	0.872	0.549	
mid-point	0.849	0.865	0.910	0.875	0.783	0.922	0.890	0.563	
mid-point	SuperGLUE						SQUAD		
Method/Tasks	boolq	cb	copa	multirc	record	wic	wsc	v1 (f1)	v2 (f1)
baseline	0.622	0.512	0.59	0.350	0.586	0.595	0.528	83.72	70.9
mid-point	0.621	0.478	0.55	0.372	0.588	0.626	0.634	84.4	74.9

4.3 Knowledge-Reasoning Separation

Thus far, we have demonstrated that the LM constructs a knowledge base (mental representation) directly within its input embedding layer. Furthermore, we have established a degree of human-LM alignment in both hierarchical structure and semantic meaning.

Now, we are interested to see the extent to which the knowledge learned during pretraining is modular and separable from the reasoning mechanisms employed by the language model in downstream tasks. For example, can the knowledge learned during the pretraining phase be selectively removed or modified without significantly impacting the model’s performance on finetuning? The modularity can also impact the effectiveness of Language Model Inversion [35, 49] techniques, which aim to extract private information such as names or other sensitive details learned during the pre-training⁷. To investigate this, we selected GLUE, SuperGLUE, and SQUAD benchmarks as downstream tasks to assess language model performance. We then systematically removed within-community information

⁷For example, if knowledge is found to be highly modular, it may be possible to develop targeted interventions that obscure or remove specific sensitive information without significantly impacting the model’s overall performance on downstream tasks.

by calculating and assigning the embedding space center (mid-point value) of each community to all its members. For example, in a community of names like "James," "John," and "Alex," all members would share the same embedding. Table 6 shows the results on major LM benchmarks GLUE, SuperGLUE, and SQUAD for the ALBERT base model. Although our experiment does not prove the separation of knowledge and reasoning, it indicates that at least the granular information acquired during the pretraining is not required for the model’s performance on the aforementioned LM benchmarks. This is significant because it opens the door for embedding engineering of private or harmful information that is learned during the pretraining.

5 Limitations and Risks

Limitations: The model forms the conceptual communities that are meaningful but its priority is not exactly the same as that of humans. The model vocabulary is a contributing factor to the way the model prioritizes the formation of conceptual clusters in its embedding layer. For example, the number of English names is much higher than the other languages and this has caused the model to form high-level communities (e.g., $k=75$) specified for names vs. less frequent names/locations a high-level community contains the combination of regions personal and location names. This limits our method to associate the KNN resolution with the abstraction level of the extracted concepts/categories.

Risks: This work provides detailed information about (1) the formed clusters/concept in the input embedding layer, and (2) the separation of memory from reasoning in ALBERT. As the methodology can also be applied to other models, it can potentially facilitate more advanced adversarial attacks and content manipulation in language models.

6 Conclusion and Future Works

This research focused on concept formation and alignment across different language models (LMs) and between LMs and humans. We propose a concept extraction mechanism that uncovers the emergence of distinct conceptual communities within the entire embedding space. This approach gives a more holistic view of conceptual representation than examining specific samples, as it explores the full landscape of concepts embedded within the models.

We examined GloVe, ALBERT, and T5 LMs and found that all of them form communities that can be aligned with the external world categories/concepts. We further investigated various aspects of the emergent conceptual communities, ranging from their numerical sequencing to the interrelationships and associations found within the blend of concrete and abstract concepts. Across various language models and types of concepts, distinct communities emerge in the embedding space. These communities demonstrate a significant alignment with human-understandable concepts, suggesting that statistical patterns, rather than specific architectures, or conceptual domains, drive concept formation across LMs. However, the quality and alignment of the formed concepts is a function of the architectural choices, training data, and tokenization schemas.

We further observed that concept formation in transformer-based LMs occurs as early as the input embedding space. This suggests that the input embeddings themselves encode substantial semantic information, contrary to traditional views where meaning emerges later. Moreover, the emergent concepts within the input embedding layer exhibit a degree of separation from subsequent transformer layers.

Early concept formation has several implications, opening exciting avenues for future line of works:

- **Knowledge transfer across tasks and models:** By identifying and leveraging shared conceptual structures across different tasks and models, early concept formation can enable more efficient transfer learning and reduce the need for extensive retraining on new tasks.
- **Improving model architectures, training, and evaluation:** Understanding how concepts emerge early in the model can inform the design of architectures that better capture and represent meaning, leading to improved performance and interpretability. This knowledge can also guide the development of more effective training techniques and evaluation metrics.
- **Mitigating training data information leakages and reducing biases:** Early concept formation can be utilized to identify potential biases and information leakages in the input embedding layer. This opens the door to the development of token embedding engineering techniques to mitigate these biases without requiring re-train.

References

- [1] Mostafa Abdou, Artur Kulmizev, Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Ellie Pavlick, and Anders Søgaard. Can language models encode perceptual structure without grounding? a case study in color. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 109–132, 2021.
- [2] Emily M. Bender and Alexander Koller. Climbing towards NLU: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5185–5198, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.463. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.463>.
- [3] Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '21*, page 610–623, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450383097. doi: 10.1145/3442188.3445922. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>.
- [4] Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8): 1798–1828, 2013.
- [5] Jeffrey R Binder and Rutvik H Desai. The neurobiology of semantic memory. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 15(11):527–536, 2011.
- [6] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.
- [7] Xingyu Cai, Jiayi Huang, Yuchen Bian, and Kenneth Church. Isotropy in the contextual embedding space: Clusters and manifolds. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2020.
- [8] Boli Chen, Yao Fu, Guangwei Xu, Pengjun Xie, Chuanqi Tan, Mosha Chen, and Liping Jing. Probing bert in hyperbolic spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.03869*, 2021.
- [9] Billy Chiu, Anna Korhonen, and Sampo Pyysalo. Intrinsic evaluation of word vectors fails to predict extrinsic performance. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Evaluating Vector-Space Representations for NLP*, pages 1–6, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W16-2501. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W16-2501>.
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [11] Darshan Gada. Countries states cities database. <https://github.com/dr5hn/countries-states-cities-database>, 2018.
- [12] Philip Gage. A new algorithm for data compression. *The C Users Journal*, 12(2):23–38, 1994.
- [13] Peter Gärdenfors. Primary cognitive categories are determined by their invariances. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:584017, 2020.
- [14] Bernhard C Geiger and Gernot Kubin. Relative information loss in the pca. In *2012 IEEE information theory workshop*, pages 562–566. IEEE, 2012.
- [15] E.B. Goldstein. *Sensation and Perception*. Cengage Learning, 2009. ISBN 9780495601494. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=2tW91BWeNq4C>.

- [16] Yuling Gu, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, and Peter Clark. Do language models have coherent mental models of everyday things? In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1892–1913, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.106. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.106>.
- [17] Nishant Gurnani. Hypothesis testing based intrinsic evaluation of word embeddings. In Samuel Bowman, Yoav Goldberg, Felix Hill, Angeliki Lazaridou, Omer Levy, Roi Reichart, and Anders Søgaard, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Evaluating Vector Space Representations for NLP*, pages 16–20, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W17-5303. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W17-5303>.
- [18] Wes Gurnee and Max Tegmark. Language models represent space and time. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jE8xbmvFin>.
- [19] James A Hampton. Typicality, graded membership, and vagueness. *Cognitive Science*, 31(3): 355–384, 2007.
- [20] Irina Higgins, Loic Matthey, Arka Pal, Christopher Burgess, Xavier Glorot, Matthew Botvinick, Shakir Mohamed, and Alexander Lerchner. beta-VAE: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Sy2fzU9gl>.
- [21] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- [22] Taku Kudo and John Richardson. SentencePiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing. In Eduardo Blanco and Wei Lu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 66–71, Brussels, Belgium, November 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D18-2012. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D18-2012>.
- [23] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [24] Marc Law, Renjie Liao, Jake Snell, and Richard Zemel. Lorentzian distance learning for hyperbolic representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3672–3681. PMLR, 2019.
- [25] Paul Pu Liang, Chiyu Wu, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Towards understanding and mitigating social biases in language models. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6565–6576. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/liang21a.html>.
- [26] Nelson F. Liu, Matt Gardner, Yonatan Belinkov, Matthew E. Peters, and Noah A. Smith. Linguistic knowledge and transferability of contextual representations. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1073–1094, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1112. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1112>.
- [27] Bradley C Love and Todd M Gureckis. Models in search of a brain. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 7(2):90–108, 2007.

- [28] Li Lucy and Jon Gauthier. Are distributional representations ready for the real world? evaluating word vectors for grounded perceptual meaning. In Mohit Bansal, Cynthia Matuszek, Jacob Andreas, Yoav Artzi, and Yonatan Bisk, editors, *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Language Grounding for Robotics*, pages 76–85, Vancouver, Canada, August 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W17-2810. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W17-2810>.
- [29] N. Lukas, A. Salem, R. Sim, S. Tople, L. Wutschitz, and S. Zanella-Beguelin. Analyzing leakage of personally identifiable information in language models. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 346–363, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, may 2023. IEEE Computer Society. doi: 10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179300. URL <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179300>.
- [30] Ben Mann, N Ryder, M Subbiah, J Kaplan, P Dhariwal, A Neelakantan, P Shyam, G Sasstry, A Aspell, S Agarwal, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [31] Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3428–3448, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1334. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1334>.
- [32] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction, 2020.
- [33] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [34] George A. Miller. WordNet: A lexical database for English. In *Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 8-11, 1994*, 1994. URL <https://aclanthology.org/H94-1111>.
- [35] John Morris, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Vitaly Shmatikov, and Alexander Rush. Text embeddings reveal (almost) as much as text. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12448–12460, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.765. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.765>.
- [36] Timothy Niven and Hung-Yu Kao. Probing neural network comprehension of natural language arguments. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4658–4664, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1459. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1459>.
- [37] Yikang Pan, Liangming Pan, Wenhui Chen, Preslav Nakov, Min-Yen Kan, and William Wang. On the risk of misinformation pollution with large language models. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1389–1403, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.97. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.97>.
- [38] Roma Patel and Ellie Pavlick. Mapping language models to grounded conceptual spaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [39] Hao Peng, Xiaozhi Wang, Shengding Hu, Hailong Jin, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Qun Liu. Copen: Probing conceptual knowledge in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5015–5035, 2022.

- [40] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. GloVe: Global vectors for word representation. In Alessandro Moschitti, Bo Pang, and Walter Daelemans, editors, *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar, October 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/D14-1162. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D14-1162>.
- [41] Jason Phang, Phil Yeres, Jesse Swanson, Haokun Liu, Ian F. Tenney, Phu Mon Htut, Clara Vania, Alex Wang, and Samuel R. Bowman. jiant 2.0: A software toolkit for research on general-purpose text understanding models. <http://jiant.info/>, 2020.
- [42] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- [43] Sunayana Rane, Polyphony J Bruna, Iliia Sucholutsky, Christopher Kello, and Thomas L Griffiths. Concept alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08672*, 2024.
- [44] Philippe Remy. Name dataset. <https://github.com/philipperemy/name-dataset>, 2021.
- [45] Lance J Rips, Edward E Smith, and Douglas L Medin. Concepts and categories: Memory, meaning, and metaphysics. *The Oxford handbook of thinking and reasoning*, 1:177–209, 2012.
- [46] Anna Rogers, Olga Kovaleva, and Anna Rumshisky. A primer in bertology: What we know about how bert works. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8: 842–866, 2021.
- [47] Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In Katrin Erk and Noah A. Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1715–1725, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1162. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P16-1162>.
- [48] Rita Sevastjanova, Aikaterini-Lida Kalouli, Christin Beck, Hanna Schäfer, and Mennatallah El-Assady. Explaining contextualization in language models using visual analytics. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 464–476, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.39. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.39>.
- [49] Congzheng Song and Ananth Raghunathan. Information leakage in embedding models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 377–390, 2020.
- [50] Ian Tenney, Patrick Xia, Berlin Chen, Alex Wang, Adam Poliak, R Thomas McCoy, Najoung Kim, Benjamin Van Durme, Samuel R Bowman, Dipanjan Das, et al. What do you learn from context? probing for sentence structure in contextualized word representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [51] Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4593–4601, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1452. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1452>.
- [52] Avijit Thawani, Biplav Srivastava, and Anil Singh. SWOW-8500: Word association task for intrinsic evaluation of word embeddings. In Anna Rogers, Aleksandr Drozd, Anna Rumshisky, and Yoav Goldberg, editors, *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Evaluating Vector Space Representations for NLP*, pages 43–51, Minneapolis, USA, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-2006. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W19-2006>.

- [53] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [54] Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*, 2018.
- [55] Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [56] Yingfan Wang, Haiyang Huang, Cynthia Rudin, and Yaron Shaposhnik. Understanding how dimension reduction tools work: An empirical approach to deciphering t-sne, umap, trimap, and pacmap for data visualization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(201):1–73, 2021. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-1061.html>.
- [57] Dongkuan Xu and Yingjie Tian. A comprehensive survey of clustering algorithms. *Annals of data science*, 2:165–193, 2015.
- [58] Xiaojin Zhu and Zoubin Ghahramani. Learning from labeled and unlabeled data with label propagation. *ProQuest Number: INFORMATION TO ALL USERS*, 2002.

A Models Under Investigation

A.1 ALBERT

ALBERT (A Lite BERT) [23] is a transformer-based model for language representation learning, designed to be more efficient than its predecessor, BERT [10]. While it shares the same basic architecture as BERT, it incorporates two main key modifications:

- **Factorized embedding parameterization.** The benefit of factorized embedding parameterization in ALBERT is the significant reduction in the number of parameters compared to models like BERT. In BERT, the word embedding size (E) is tied to the hidden layer size (H), leading to a large embedding matrix as H increases. ALBERT instead factorizes this embedding into two smaller matrices, one projecting token ID vectors to a lower-dimensional space (E) and another projecting from this space to the hidden layer (H). This allows H to be much larger than E without increasing the parameter count of the embedding layer substantially, resulting in a more efficient use of parameters. This is particularly beneficial for large models, where memory limitations can hinder training and deployment.
- **Cross-layer parameter sharing.** Parameter sharing acts as a form of regularization, preventing the model from overfitting to specific layers or features in the data. This can lead to improved generalization performance on unseen data.

Note that reducing the number of parameters and sharing information across layers can force the model to learn more general representations, thus indirectly contributing to better concept formation. **Datasets.** ALBERT is pretrained on English text datasets, namely the English Wikipedia and BookCorpus, using self-supervised learning objectives.

Tokenization. It uses Sentencepiece tokenizer [22] on the uncased corpus with a vocabulary size limit of 30K tokens.

A.2 T5

T5, or Text-to-Text Transfer Transformer, is a transformer-based architecture that casts all natural language processing (NLP) tasks into a text-to-text format. This means the model takes text as input and generates text as output, regardless of the specific task. At its core, T5 is an encoder-decoder model with the following key components:

- **Encoder:** This component takes the input text and processes it into a sequence of hidden representations. It uses multiple transformer layers, each consisting of self-attention mechanisms and feedforward neural networks.
- **Decoder:** This component generates the output text auto-regressively, conditioned on the encoder's hidden representations. It also uses multiple transformer layers with self-attention and feedforward networks, as well as cross-attention mechanisms to attend to specific parts of the input sequence.

Datasets. T5 is pre-trained on a massive dataset called C4 (Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus), which contains around 750 GB of clean English text.

Tokenization. It uses Sentencepiece tokenizer on the cased corpus with a vocabulary size limit of 30K tokens.

A.3 GloVe

GloVe (Global Vectors for Word Representation) is a method for obtaining vector representations for words. Unlike context-based models like transformer-based LM models, GloVe leverages global word co-occurrence statistics across a corpus to learn word vectors. The GitHub repository⁸ provides an implementation of the GloVe model for learning word representations (word vectors or embeddings). We used the default embedding provided by the python API⁹.

Tokenization. They used Stanford tokenizer¹⁰, a form of BPE tokenization scheme [12, 47] that

⁸<https://github.com/stanfordnlp/GloVe>

⁹Common Crawl (840B tokens, 2.2M vocab, cased, 300d vectors, 2.03 GB download), and a context window size of 10.

¹⁰<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tokenizer.shtml>

constructs unigram counts from a corpus, and optionally thresholds the resulting vocabulary based on total vocabulary size (2.2M ¹¹ most frequent words in the case of GloVe embeddings) or minimum frequency count [40].

B Human-LM Alignments For Glove, T5

We performed our concept extraction algorithm on Glove, ALBERT, and T5 models. We observed that concept formation happens in all the models, however, the quality of the formed concepts is better in ALBERT model. Glove embeddings contain more than 200K tokens, in order to enable apple-to-apple comparison with ALBERT, we found the intersection of these tokens with the huggingface Albert-base-v2 token set, and, applied our concept extraction algorithm. We the formed clusters have weak correlation with the concepts formed in ALBERT model ¹² (they similarities are stronger for concrete names/entities).

Tables 7 and 8 show the T5 location and name communities detected by our algorithm. High precision numbers for these cluster indicate clear concept formation. However, since the pretrained HuggingFace T5 uses cased token set for the pretraining, the number of tokens in associated with location and names are much smaller than T5 and Glove.

Tables 9 and 10 show the GloVe location and name communities detected by our algorithm. Although, it shows the categories are formed in GloVe embeddings as well, the numbers suggests the quality of the formed categories have less quality than both ALBERT and T5 counterpart.

Table 7: Location communities founds in T5 tokens. Note that most of the communities are member of 0_0_5, and 0_0_13 super communities.

	Precision	Support	Cluster Name
USA	0.843	159	0_0_5_4
Britain/Ireland	0.843	118	0_0_5_5
Africa/South-America	0.672	64	0_0_13_2
Germany	0.619	21	0_0_13_0_0
Australia	0.842	19	0_0_5_10
France	0.867	15	0_0_13_0_2
Canada	1.000	13	0_0_5_14
Balkan	0.833	12	0_0_13_1_1
Indochina	0.818	11	0_0_13_3_1
Benelux	0.700	10	0_0_13_0_3
Canada	0.778	9	0_0_5_24
India	0.750	8	0_0_13_4_0
Romania	0.714	7	0_0_22_1_4
Central Europe	0.800	5	0_0_13_0_5
Israel/Palestine	0.800	5	0_0_13_5_3
Arab Countries	0.800	5	0_0_13_5_5
Nordic	0.750	4	0_0_13_1_6
Baltic	1.000	4	0_0_13_1_8

¹¹2196016 cased tokens

¹²if we assume Glove-ALBERT mapping exists between two clusters if more than half of their members are equivalent, %69 percent of the Glove clusters have a corresponding ALBERT cluster for K=6.

Table 8: Name communities found in T5 tokens. Note that most of the communities are member of 0_0_5 super community.

Gender	Overall Precision	Detected Country	Country Precision	Support	Cluster Name
Male	0.942	United States	0.962	209	0_0_5_0
Female	0.888	United States	0.858	162	0_0_5_3
Last Name	0.904	United States	0.914	198	0_0_5_1
Male	0.837	France	0.612	49	0_0_5_7
Male	0.909	Peru	0.758	33	0_0_5_8
Mix	0.960	Germany	0.84	25	0_0_5_9
Male	0.846	Russian/Italy	0.615	13	0_0_5_15
Politician Names	1.0	N/A	N/A	14	0_0_5_13

Table 9: Location communities found in the subset Glove tokens that exists in Albert Vocab.

Country	Precision	Support	Cluster Names
US	0.674	522	0_4
UK	0.626	174	0_8
Europe	0.513	39	0_3_8
China	0.625	32	0_3_10
Italy	0.720	25	0_3_14
Philippines	0.556	18	0_3_15
Spain	0.722	18	0_3_15
Japan	0.688	16	0_3_16
France	0.857	14	0_3_9_0
Africa	0.750	12	0_3_3_1
Indochina	0.600	10	0_3_11_1
Netherlands	0.833	6	0_3_17_0

Table 10: Name communities found in the subset Glove tokens that exists in Albert Vocab.

Country	Overall Precision	Country Precision	Gender	Support	Cluster Name
USA	0.835	0.555	female	575	0_2_1
UK	0.695	0.641	male	223	0_2_0_0
USA	0.737	0.337	male	95	0_2_6
Italy	0.942	0.692	male	52	0_2_4_1
Mexico/Colombia	0.889	0.711	male	45	0_2_4_2
Mexico/Peru	0.844	0.6	male	45	0_2_4_3
Austria	0.897	0.793	male	29	0_2_3_3
US/Nigeria	0.821	0.429	male	28	0_2_0_1_2
Russia	0.926	0.481	male	27	0_2_3_4
Saudi Arabia	0.8	0.84	male	25	0_1_6_1
Switzerland/Belgium	1	0.846	male	13	0_2_3_0_0
UAE	0.727	0.727	male	11	0_1_6_3
Saudi-Arabia	0.8	0.7	male	10	0_1_6_0_1
Germany	0.917	0.75	no-gender	12	0_2_3_2_2
UK/Canada	0.917	0.33	no-gender	12	0_2_0_1_5
UAE	0.6	0.467	no-gender	15	0_1_6_2

C Extracted Concept Hierarchies

Figure 4 shows the overall structure of hierarchical communities extracted by our proposed method. The cluster names were suggested by GPT-4 and corrected by a human supervisor. The green blocks are the ones that are discussed in this paper.




Figure 4: Visualization of the hierarchical Communities from ALBERT. The green blocks show the clusters that being evaluated and discussed in this paper.