

# LiPost: Improved Content Understanding With Effective Use Of Multi-Task Contrastive Learning

Akanksha Bindal\*, Sudarshan Ramanujam\*, Dave Golland\*, TJ Hazen\*,  
Tina Jiang\*, Fengyu Zhang, Peng Yan

LinkedIn Inc.

## Abstract

In enhancing LinkedIn's core content recommendation models, a significant challenge lies in improving their semantic understanding capabilities. This paper addresses the problem by leveraging multi-task learning, a method that has shown promise in various domains. We fine-tune a pre-trained, transformer-based LLM using multi-task contrastive learning with data from a diverse set of semantic labeling tasks. We observe positive transfer, leading to superior performance across all tasks when compared to training independently on each. Our model (LiPost) outperforms the baseline on zero shot learning and offers improved multilingual support, highlighting its potential for broader application. The specialized content embeddings produced by our model outperform generalized embeddings offered by OpenAI on LinkedIn's dataset and tasks. This work provides a robust foundation for vertical teams across LinkedIn to customize and fine-tune the LLM to their specific applications. Our work offers insights and best practices for the field to build on.

*Index Terms*— multitask training, nlp, ranking, retrieval, semantic understanding, in-context learning

## 1. Introduction

LinkedIn is the world's largest professional network with more than a billion users in more than 200 countries and territories worldwide [15]. At LinkedIn, we strive to create a thriving information exchange ecosystem connecting users with content that is valuable in their professional journey, learn new skills and discover new opportunities. In this context, posts are the most important item of information exchange between creators and consumers on the platform. It is crucial for state of the art recommendation models to have a rich representation of each post to improve its underlying semantic understanding capabilities.

The recent success of LLM pre-training [4, 5, 6] enables use cases without the need for manually labeled data. However, within industry these general pretrained embeddings only work up to a certain degree because of linguistic variability between the general pre-trained embeddings and the specific application. In this work, we apply pre-finetuning [3] on several tasks constructed from LinkedIn's rich economic data to tailor the model's understanding to better reflect the unique content within LinkedIn.

In this work we introduce how we built LiPost: LinkedIn's content understanding model which produces a rich, foundational representation of posts that is easily leveraged across diverse downstream applications, such as content recommendation and content search. We share a novel set of learnings and best practices when training our content understanding model, all aimed at improving performance in our downstream recommendation systems. The **contribution of this paper** consists of

- Our work demonstrates the value of faster iteration by leveraging improved offline content understanding evaluation metrics: LiPost is evaluated offline using semantic understanding metrics, with a specific focus on embedding based retrieval (EBR), to assess the quality of embeddings and identify areas for improvement (§5.1).
- Our results show that pre-finetuning on more datasets with different semantic tasks via multi-task training improves the generalization ability of the model on all the individual tasks as well as improved zero shot learning capabilities of the model (§5.2.1 and §5.2.2).

- Our work demonstrates improved multilingual capability of the new embeddings: LiPost is fine-tuned and evaluated on multiple languages to ensure that it can handle text in any language used on LinkedIn (§5.2.3).
- Our work demonstrates comparable performance with Open AI embeddings on LinkedIn datasets and tasks with significant compression which is critical for deploying our model at scale for LinkedIn’s content ecosystem (§5.2.4).
- Our work discusses real world performance improvements of our model on our product surface (§5.2.5).

## 2. Related Work

In recent years, pre-trained models such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), and more recently, models like GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and E5 (Liang et al., 2022), have demonstrated remarkable performance improvements across a variety of Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks [4, 6, 16, 17]. Recent studies have shown the effectiveness of fine-tuning models on multiple tasks to achieve better generalization and performance across all tasks. Aghajanyan et al. (2021) introduced MUPPET, which demonstrated that pre-fine-tuning on a diverse set of tasks could significantly improve the model's performance on individual tasks [3]. Contrastive learning has emerged as a powerful technique for training embeddings by distinguishing between similar and dissimilar pairs. Reimers and Gurevych (2019) proposed Sentence-BERT, which trains a Siamese network architecture to generate embeddings for sentence pairs, significantly improving performance on sentence similarity tasks [2]. Despite these advances, contrastive learning approaches can be sensitive to the quality of positive and negative pairs, and obtaining high-quality labeled data can be challenging. Models like XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) have shown that fine-tuning on multilingual data can lead to robust cross-lingual embeddings [18]. Greene et al. (2022) explored the performance of OpenAI's ADA embeddings, highlighting their performance on a multitude of tasks, underscoring their generalized nature [11].

However these models often face limitations when applied directly to specific domains such as recommendation systems due to the linguistic variability between the general pre-trained embeddings and the specialized application domain. This necessitates additional fine-tuning to achieve optimal performance in

domain-specific tasks. In our investigation, we encountered several challenges when trying to incorporate widely available architectures into production environments. These challenges included smaller context windows, limited linguistic variability in the topic ontology and high embedding dimension size resulting in increased latency for production scale recommendation systems.

In this paper, we build upon these foundational works by implementing a multi-task contrastive learning approach tailored to LinkedIn's unique content. By leveraging diverse semantic labeling tasks (§4), we enhance the model's semantic understanding (§5.2.1 and §5.2.2), improve multilingual support (§5.2.3), and achieve competitive performance with significant compression (§5.2.4). Our goal is to provide valuable insights into developing and deploying specialized embeddings in large-scale, real-world applications.

## 3. Modeling Architecture

In this section we first describe the single task training setup used for training content embeddings. This helps motivate the multitask model architecture in §3.2.

### 3.1. Single Task Model Architecture

We use contrastive learning for a single task [2]. Training data is composed of post pairs (P1, P2):

- **Positive pairs** (label = 1): P1 and P2 are topically related and should have similar embeddings  
Example: P1 & P2 are about bitcoin
- **Negative pairs** (label = 0): P1 and P2 are NOT related and should have different embeddings  
Example: P1 is about ML, P2 is about sports.




Figure 1: Single Task Contrastive Model Architecture

### 3.2. Multi-Task Model Architecture

We expand the single task setup to a multi-task training paradigm. One of the tasks (highlighted in red) is the single task contrastive learning architecture described in the previous slide. We simultaneously train for several tasks with a shared backbone, allowing semantic information to be efficiently learned within a single model. This has the potential to benefit all tasks. With this approach we can train an MT-LLM that has awareness of the semantics required for all the downstream vertical teams’ tasks without requiring that their full production models and training data is incorporated into the LLM training process.




Figure 2: Multi Task Contrastive Model Architecture

### 3.3 Multi-task Training Setup

Here is a walk-through of the multi-task training setup, described in [Figure 3]. The system consists of multiple GPUs, multiple datasets and multiple tasks.

- First, in one iteration, each GPU samples data from a particular dataset. Across all GPUs, data is interleaved from different datasets and tasks.
- Next, the flow runs through the task specific architecture and shared task architecture in parallel.
- Finally, the entire model is updated in one step.

This whole process is repeated every iteration.

We use 104M training samples coming from a combination of datasets described in §4.1 We use a 6 layer multi-lingual BERT(pre-trained on LinkedIn data from scratch using masked-language modeling) as the base model, with a total parameter size 89 M and Vocabulary size 135K [14]. We use 1 worker and 6 GPUs for training. We use a per GPU

batch size of 32 for siamese fine-tuning and shared embedding size of 50 due to strict latency requirements. We use a learning rate of 1 e-6 for reporting. All the experiments are run on a CentOS Linux machine with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4216 Cascade Lake CPU with 32 cores @ 2.10 GHz, 64 GB RAM and an NVIDIA Tesla V100 SXM2 @ 32 GB with CUDA Toolkit 11.7




Figure 3: Multi Task Training Setup used for training embeddings. In this image “arc” refers to architecture. It is shortened for viewability purposes.

## 4. DATASETS

Research across the industry shows that fine-tuning a LLM on multiple tasks at once can help uplift performance in all the tasks [3]. We apply this learning to finetune our embeddings on data from multiple use cases at LinkedIn such as Content to interest, Storylines, hashtag, content search.

These datasets provide complementary views on the semantics of a post for example (the set of topics the content is tagged with via content to interest, or which hashtags are present in the text). These tags are used in defining equivalence classes for use in a contrastive learning setup. More details on each of the datasets can be found in Table 1.

Task Type	# Train	# Eval
Task 1: Interest	67M	33K
Task 2: Storyline	4M	6K
Task 3: Hashtag	26M	49K
Task 4: Search	8.7M	8K
Task 5: Intent	0M	200K

Table 1: Breakdown of MTL datasets. The table shows the number of datasets we used per task type and the number of samples in training and evaluation sets.

#### 4.1. Dataset: Interest

At LinkedIn, we have topic tagging models that classify text content into categories. These categories are human-interpretable and are organized into a rich ontology, which contains multiple interest categories grouped into broad branches.

#### 4.2. Dataset: Storyline

It consists of manually curated posts by human editors at LinkedIn. All posts within a category in this dataset are all about the same news topic. Since this is annotated by editors for a few years, it offers golden data which can be leveraged for training and evaluation. This dataset is available in over 50 languages, which we used to expand the multilingual capability of our embeddings to serve our diverse cohort of members.

#### 4.3. Dataset: Hashtag

We use hashtags within the post as a soft label for the content of the post. Since this dataset can be noisy, we further filter this data by picking high quality posts which have less than 3 hashtags and posts with Pointwise Mutual Information higher than a threshold value (0.7) between the post containing Hashtag  $h$  and engagement from followers following that hashtag  $h$ . This is available in all languages on LinkedIn platform.

#### 4.4. Dataset: Search

Content Search data provides a direct pair of text based on user query text and results clicked on text. For our application, we will filter on search sessions where users clicked on a relevant LinkedIn post for their query.

#### 4.5. Dataset: Intent

The Intent classifier is a foundational content understanding component that classifies activities into one of several user intents (e.g. share-knowledge-advice, seek-job-opportunity, motivate-or-inspire) based on the goal of the author of the activity. Since this task is orthogonal to the semantic capabilities of our model, we include this task only in our evaluation dataset to evaluate zero shot capabilities of our content embeddings.

### 5. RESULTS

We first discuss the offline metric used for evaluation. Our baseline for all experiments is a multilingual BERT model pre-trained on LinkedIn content – on an internal dataset of topic-tagged posts (§4.1) using contrastive learning. Then, we present the offline evaluation of LiPost on the individual task performance on held-out test data for the semantic tasks used in fine-tuning. Then we demonstrate the impact of LiPost online in LinkedIn’s main feed ranking algorithm. All numbers are reported for an average of three runs for every experiment.

#### 5.1. Offline Evaluation Metric

These embeddings are primarily used in embedding-based retrieval applications, and therefore we measure performance using a metric that is indicative of performance in the downstream use-cases. We form an evaluation dataset of triplets of posts consisting of (anchor, positive) pairs and randomly sampled negatives.

anchor	positive	negatives
$a_1$	$p_1$	$\{n_{11}, n_{12}, \dots, n_{1N}\}$
$a_2$	$p_2$	$\{n_{21}, n_{22}, \dots, n_{2N}\}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$a_M$	$p_M$	$\{n_{M1}, n_{M2}, \dots, n_{MN}\}$

Example:

$a_1$  = activity about ML

$p_1$  = another activity about ML

$\{n_{11}, n_{12}, \dots, n_{1N}\}$  =  $N$  (randomly sampled) activities that are NOT about ML

Figure 4: Evaluation Dataset Creation. We used our data to form an evaluation dataset of triplets consisting of (anchor, positive) pairs and randomly sampled negatives.

After training a candidate embedding model, we generate embeddings for all text in this evaluation dataset, and then calculate the average fraction of triplets where the distance between the anchor and positive instance is smaller than the anchor and negative instance.

*AvgFracTripletsWherePosIsCloser*: Fraction of triplets where the positive is closer to the anchor than the negative. (Larger is better.)

$$\frac{1}{MN} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N (1 \text{ if } \text{dist}(a_i, p_i) < \text{dist}(a_i, n_{ij}), \text{ else } 0)$$

## 5.2. Results

### 5.2.1. Finetuning a LLM on multiple tasks [3] at once helps uplift performance in all tasks

Model	↑E1: Interest	↑E2: Storylin e	↑E3: Hashtag
T1: Interest (baseline)	<b>0.88</b>	0.86	0.79
T2: Storyline	0.76	<b>0.93</b>	0.85
T3: Hashtag	0.79	0.93	<b>0.93</b>
Ours (LiPost)	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.93</b>

Table 2: We present the results for our MTL model compared to single task trained models evaluated on individual tasks. Bolded numbers signify LiPost vs. single task trained model, while an underline signifies the best number. All numbers are rounded down to the nearest decimal.

The results in Table 2 demonstrated that our model trained on a combination of data from various semantic labeling tasks shows better overall performance across all tasks. Compared to our baseline, the new embeddings show equal or better overall performance across all tasks.

### 5.2.2 We show that zero shot learning capabilities improve for these models.

Model	↑E4: Intent
T4: Intent	<b>0.69</b>
Ours (LiPost): [T1,T2,T3]	<b>0.72</b>

Table 3: We present the results for our MTL model compared to single task trained models evaluated on individual tasks including (zero shot) tasks not included in our final training. Bolded numbers signify LiPost vs. single task trained model, while an underline signifies the best number.

The results in Table 3 demonstrate zero shot learning capabilities for these models since they are trained only on data from [T1, T2, T3] but perform well on T4. On Task T4, our model outperforms the model trained with just data from T4.

### 5.2.3. Strong multilingual capability

Model	↑ Top (10) languages	↑ Top (50) languages
Baseline	0.888	0.862
Ours (LiPost)	0.934	0.945
Relative Improvement	5.2%	9.6%

Table 4: We present the results for our MTL model compared to our baseline model on 50 different languages on LinkedIn platform.




Figure 5: We present the results for our MTL model (in red) compared to our baseline (in blue) for top 10 languages on LinkedIn Platform.

In the LinkedIn ecosystem, there is a significant share of non-English text-based content which our members engage with. Ideally, we need a framework where the embeddings we generate capture the semantics irrespective of the underlying language. In Table 4, our embeddings demonstrate a relative improvement of 5.2% for top 10 languages on LinkedIn and an improvement of 9.6% across all languages in our evaluation dataset. The graph on the right demonstrates per language performance of our embeddings. The red bar shows consistent improvement over the baseline across all languages. We believe this gain comes from tasks in our dataset that have rich language diversity such as T2 (Storyline) and T3 (Hashtag)

### 5.2.4. Comparing performance with generalized Open AI embeddings

Model	↓Dim	↑T1: Interest	↑T2: Storyline	↑T3: Hashtag
BERT-base	768	0.69	0.90	0.77
ADA_001	1024	0.66	0.95	0.82
ADA_002 [10]	1536	0.89	0.95	0.89
E5-base-v2	768	0.84	<b>0.96</b>	0.87
E5-multilingual-bas e	1024	0.81	0.96	0.87
Baseline	50	0.88	0.86	0.79
<b>Ours (LiPost)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.93</b>

Table 5: We present the results for our MTL model compared to generalized embeddings from OpenAI evaluated on individual tasks over metric defined in (§4.1). Bolded numbers signify LiPost vs. SOTA Open AI embedding model, while an underline signifies the best number.

The results in Table 5 show that compared to state-of-the-art open source models that are generalized embeddings, we achieve comparable performance with up **30X** compression. Given our latency needs, using ADA\_002 embeddings is not feasible for us. Compared to the previous version of OpenAI embeddings, ADA\_001, our LiPost embeddings show significant improvements on LinkedIn datasets.

### 5.2.5 Performance on Real World Product Surface

Our (LiPost) model is deployed in multiple domain applications at LinkedIn, resulting in significant production impact. Here we discuss the improvements to our Feed Ranking model. Online A/B experiments demonstrated significant improvement from LiPost versus our baseline model in our topline metrics, namely 0.1% relative increase in the number of user sessions visiting LinkedIn<sup>1</sup> and 0.21% relative increase in the number of professional interactors on LinkedIn<sup>2</sup>.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we discussed how we built an industrial scale content understanding model. We showed how embeddings trained on a combination of data from various semantic labeling tasks shows better overall performance across all tasks. We demonstrate the zero shot learning capabilities of these models. We also show the strong multilingual capability for these new embeddings. Finally, we compare these embeddings with the generalized embeddings from OpenAI, and show the value of compressed specialized embeddings. With this new effort, we offer vertical teams a foundational model to leverage in a variety of downstream applications.

## 6. Ethical Considerations

To incorporate fairness and mitigate bias in our predictions rendered to members, we evaluate the model's

---

<sup>1</sup> Collection of feed page views from a single user on the same device type within a set timeframe.

<sup>2</sup> Unique Users who take one or more import feed action

performance across different language groups and identify any disparities. The model can then be adjusted to reduce these disparities, such as by balancing the dataset or introducing additional data or features. Additionally, member data is anonymized or aggregated to protect individual member privacy.

## 7. Limitations

Post Embeddings are currently limited in the number of modalities (lacking image and video modality), small context window and limited to most common datasets and tasks. In further iterations we plan to introduce multimedia content, experiment with newer architectures, add additional tasks (skills data) and add online triplet mining.

## 8. References

- [1] A.B. Smith, C.D. Jones, and E.F. Roberts, "Article Title," *Journal*, Publisher, Location, pp. 1-10, Date.
- [2] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks", in Proceedings of EMNLP, pp. 3982–3992, 2019.
- [3] Armen Aghajanyan, Anchit Gupta, Akshat Shrivastava, Xilun Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sonal Gupta. Muppet: Massive multi-task representations with pre-fine tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11038*, 2021.
- [4] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- [5] P He, X Liu, J Gao, W Chen. *DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention*. ICLR 2021
- [6] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019b. *Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692.
- [7] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. *Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461.
- [8] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2019. *Exploring the limits of transfer learning with*



a unified text-to-text trans- former. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683.

of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[9] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. *Language models are unsupervised multi task learners*. OpenAI Blog, 1(8):9.

[10] Ryan Greene, Ted Sanders, Lilian Weng and Arvind Neelakantan. 2022. *New and Improved Embedding Model*, Open AI Blog.

[11] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2019. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text trans- former. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683*.

[12] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830*.

[13] Jiaming Shen, Maryam Karimzadehgan, Michael Bendersky, Zhen Qin, and Donald Metzler. 2018. Multi-Task Learning for Email Search Ranking with Auxiliary Query Clustering. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. ACM, 2127–2135*.

[14] Taku Kudo and John Richardson. SentencePiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing. doi: 10.18653/v1/D18-2012. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D18-2012>.

[15] Borisyyuk, Fedor, et al. "LiRank: Industrial Large Scale Ranking Models at LinkedIn." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06859* (2024).

[16] Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901.

[17] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2022a. Text embeddings by weakly supervised contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03533*, 2022.

[18] Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting*