

# LEVERAGING MULTILINGUAL SELF-SUPERVISED PRETRAINED MODELS FOR SEQUENCE-TO-SEQUENCE END-TO-END SPOKEN LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING

*Pavel Denisov, Ngoc Thang Vu*

Institute for Natural Language Processing (IMS), University of Stuttgart, Germany

## ABSTRACT

A number of methods have been proposed for End-to-End Spoken Language Understanding (E2E-SLU) using pretrained models, however their evaluation often lacks multilingual setup and tasks that require prediction of lexical fillers, such as slot filling. In this work, we propose a unified method that integrates multilingual pretrained speech and text models and performs E2E-SLU on six datasets in four languages in a generative manner, including the prediction of lexical fillers. We investigate how the proposed method can be improved by pretraining on widely available speech recognition data using several training objectives. Pretraining on 7000 hours of multilingual data allows us to outperform the state-of-the-art ultimately on two SLU datasets and partly on two more SLU datasets. Finally, we examine the cross-lingual capabilities of the proposed model and improve on the best known result on the PortMEDIA-Language dataset by almost half, achieving a Concept/Value Error Rate of 23.65%.

**Index Terms**— spoken language understanding, self-supervised learning, end-to-end, sequence-to-sequence, multilingual


## 1. INTRODUCTION

Spoken Language Understanding (SLU) is a common name for tasks combining speech and language processing to extract semantic concepts from spoken sentences, such as intents, slots, and named entities. This functionality is essential to various systems with a voice interface, including intelligent assistants and automatic call answering services. Traditionally, SLU has been decomposed to Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) and Natural Language Understanding (NLU) subtasks that are solved sequentially in a pipeline manner. In this scenario, ASR converts speech recording to text representation that is then processed by NLU. The advantage of a pipelined approach is that both ASR and NLU can be optimized independently using numerous datasets labelled for the corresponding tasks. The disadvantages are that: first, the text representation lacks paralinguistic information, such as prosody and punctuation in most cases, and in addition to that contains errors introduced by ASR and propagated to NLU; and second, sequential execution of ASR and NLU introduces a time lag that is not desirable in an interactive context. These

downsides motivated the community to work on the End-to-End (E2E) SLU methods that allow building a single model performing SLU task directly on speech input.

One of the critical challenges in E2E SLU is data sparsity since the availability of labelled datasets for SLU is even lower than for ASR or NLU. Transfer learning is a popular technique that alleviates the data sparsity problem for one task by learning from another related task. More recently, Self-Supervised Learning (SSL) methods demonstrate the possibility of gaining improvements even without requiring annotation for any task by training on unlabelled data of corresponding modalities, such as text [1] or speech [2].

Usually, SLU tasks are treated as a classification problem, either on the sequence level (Intent Classification (IC) [3]) or on the token level (Slot Filling (SF) [4] and Named Entity Recognition (NER) [5]). Few works, however, represent SLU tasks as generation problems [6, 7]. There are multiple examples of classification-based SLU systems utilizing SSL pretrained speech and text encoders [3, 8]. However, usage of SSL pretrained models in generation-based SLU systems is limited to speech encoders [9]. Aside from that, generation-based SLU descriptions are typically focused on one language only [10, 11]. We aim to close these two gaps by employing multilingual SSL pretrained speech and text models for solving SLU tasks in multiple languages via sequence-to-sequence modeling. In this work, we propose a unified architecture for building E2E SLU models and evaluate it on a diverse set of established SLU benchmarks. Our experiments demonstrate that multilingual SSL pretrained text-to-text model can be fine-tuned to solve token level NLU tasks in a generative way and this can be transferred to speech modality with the help of multilingual SSL pretrained speech encoder. Furthermore, we improve the NLU to SLU transferability by aligning the hidden representations of speech and text using a medium-sized multilingual ASR dataset and different training approaches: Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC), Attention Encoder-Decoder (AED) and a novel Modality Correlation (MC) objective. In several cases, our results are better than the best previously reported. We provide the implementation, configurations, data preparation and scoring scripts and pretrained models at <https://github.com/DigitalPhonetics/multilingual-seq2seq-slu>.



**Fig. 1.** General architecture of our SLU model. The speech encoder and text encoder are initialized from unchanged SSL pretrained models. The text decoder is initialized from an SSL pretrained model that is fine-tuned on the ground truth transcriptions of an SLU dataset. The Adaptor is trained from scratch on an SLU dataset or is pretrained on ASR data (section 2.2).

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. SLU model

The proposed approach is outlined in Figure 1. Our SLU model combines SSL pretrained speech encoder and text-to-text encoder-decoder models. The raw speech input  $x$  is processed by the speech encoder that outputs an acoustic representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{Feat}}$ . The Adaptor maps the acoustic representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{Feat}}$  from the speech encoder to a quasi-graphemic representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PreEnc}}$  that resembles text token embeddings and is fed to the text encoder. Output of the text encoder  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PostEnc}}$  is decoded by the autoregressive text decoder producing an output hidden representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PostDec}}$  that is projected to text token logits used to produce an output text token sequence  $y$ . The speech and text encoder layers are initialized from the parameters of the general pretrained models without any changes. The text decoder parameters are first fine-tuned on the corresponding SLU dataset using the ground truth transcriptions as input and the SLU annotations as output, thus resulting in the text based NLU model. The text encoder is kept frozen during this step to ensure the transferability to the SLU model initialized from the general parameters. Only the Adaptor’s parameters have to be learned during the SLU training, and this motivates us to investigate the Adaptor pre-training.

### 2.2. Adaptor pretraining

Generally, the Adaptor pretraining aims to minimize the distance between the speech representation in the SLU model and the text representation in the SSL text model. As Figure 2 shows, this can be done on multiple levels of the neural network using various training strategies. We select three types of a text representation and the corresponding levels of the SLU model to extract a logically similar speech representation: (i) text token embeddings  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}}^{\text{PreEnc}}$  and the SLU Adaptor output  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PreEnc}}$ ; (ii) the hidden text representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}}^{\text{PostEnc}}$  after the encoder of the SSL text model and the hidden speech representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PostEnc}}$  after the text encoder of the SLU model; (iii) the output text representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}}^{\text{PostDec}}$  after the decoder of the SSL text model and the hidden speech representation  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}}^{\text{PostDec}}$  after the text decoder of the SLU model.

The Adaptor output can be aligned with the text token embeddings using the CTC loss function in the vein of LegoNN

approach [12]. While this is the most straightforward and computationally cheap way to pretrain Adaptor parameters in our framework, it might set an unnecessary strict target for the alignment because the text-to-text network has some level of robustness to noisy inputs and not all differences between text and speech representations are equally harmful for the prediction of the correct output.

Given this consideration, it might be better to pretrain the Adaptor in the full AED model while keeping all parameters except of the Adaptor in a frozen state. This way, the output of the decoder serves as a source of training signal and the Adaptor parameters receive only the relevant updates for the prediction of the correct output. The disadvantage of this approach is that the differences between the original decoder and a task specific NLU decoder used in a SLU model can hinder the transferability of the pretrained Adaptor output. It is fair to assume that the practical importance of this problem depends on the actual differences between the original and task specific decoders. These differences can be avoided by the parameter efficient tuning of the decoder [13].


Finally, any hidden speech representation can be trained directly on a hidden text representation as a target. In order to do that, we propose the modality matching approach. Its design is inspired by the cross-modal grounding methods [14, 15] and the Barlow twins loss [16]. First, we construct a speech-text correlation matrix:

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{Speech-Text}} = \mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}} (\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}})^{\top},$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Speech}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_{\text{max}} \times d_{\text{model}}}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_{\text{max}} \times d_{\text{model}}}$  are padded normalized hidden speech and text representations,  $L_{\text{max}} = \max(L_{\text{Speech}}, L_{\text{Text}})$  is the maximum length of the speech and text sequences and  $d_{\text{model}}$  is the hidden representation dimension in both modalities. The representations are zero-padded and normalized to Euclidean norm along each hidden representation vector. We mask out the loss for elements outside of  $L_{\text{Text}}$ , because the zero-dominated matrices caused convergence problems. This can be reduced to the truncation instead of the padding and masking, but we implement it that way because of the batching. A ground truth for  $\mathbf{C}_{\text{Speech-Text}}$  is set to be analogous text-text self-correlation matrix:

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{Text-Text}} = \mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}} (\mathbf{H}_{\text{Text}})^{\top}$$

During the training, we minimize the mean square error between  $\mathbf{C}_{\text{Speech-Text}}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{\text{Text-Text}}$ . The MC approach can



**Fig. 2.** Investigated options for the Adaptor pretraining using pairs of speech recordings and text transcriptions. The Adaptor is optimized to predict the hidden representation of the speech that is as close to the hidden representation of the text as possible. Each Adaptor pretraining option refers to a combination of the hidden representation layer (PreEnc, PostEnc, PostDec) and the training method (MC, CTC, AED). The MC loss can be applied directly to the hidden representations of the speech and the text before the text encoder (b), after the text encoder (c) or after the text decoder (d). Alternatively, the hidden speech representation can be projected to the token logits via a regular linear transformation (Token Projection) allowing CTC training if the hidden speech representation is extracted before the text encoder (a) or AED training if the hidden speech representation is extracted after the text decoder (e).

**Table 1.** SLU benchmarks used for the evaluation. #Concepts denotes number of unique slot labels for SF or unique entity labels for NER.

	SLURP	SLUE	CATSLU	MEDIA	PM-Dom	PM-Lang
Samples (train/ dev/test)	120K/ 8.6K/ 13.0K	5.0K/ 1.7K/ 1.8K	7.0K/ 1.6K/ 5.8K	12.0K 1.2K/ 3.5K	5.8K/ 1.3K/ 2.8K	6.0K/ 1.9K/ 3.8K
Hours (train/ dev/test)	84.7/ 6.9/ 10.3	14.0/ 4.9/ 4.9	5.5/ 1.3/ 4.8	16.1/ 1.6/ 4.8	7.4/ 1.6/ 3.4	7.5/ 2.5/ 5.0
Language Tasks #Concepts	English IC, SF 56	English NER 7	Mandarin SF 54	French SF 143	French SF 34	Italian SF 124

be applied to the encoder outputs and therefore allows a trade-off between the two previously mentioned levels of the neural network. In addition, it can be employed as an alternative to the hard label based CTC and AED approaches applicable only at the specific levels of the neural network.

### 3. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

#### 3.1. Data

We assess the performance of the proposed method using the six established SLU benchmarks: SLURP [4], SLUE-VoxPopuli [5] (evaluating on the validation set), CATSLU [17], MEDIA [18], PortMEDIA-Domain and PortMEDIA-Language [19]. These datasets cover three SLU tasks in four languages belonging to three families and have medium to low resource data regimes. Details of the SLU datasets are given in Table 1. In addition to SF annotation, each utterance of SLURP is labeled with one out of 59 unique intents. We evaluate the SLU systems using the established metrics for each dataset: IC accuracy and SLU-F1 for SLURP, F1 and label-F1 for SLUE-VoxPopuli, accuracy and F1 for CATSLU, Concept Error Rate (CER) and Concept/Value Error Rate (CVER) for MEDIA, PortMEDIA-Domain and PortMEDIA-Language datasets. The SLU-F1 combines the slot label F1

with the word and character edit distances of the slot value [4]. The CER and CVER are based on the edit distance and are calculated the same way as the word error rate, but on the sequences of slot labels or slot labels combined with the values instead of words.

The Adaptor pretraining experiments are performed using subsets of Common Voice Corpus 9.0 [20] and WenetSpeech [21]. We select the 36 languages that are present in both XLS-R [22] and mBART50 [23] pretraining data and sample down the resulting training and validation subsets uniformly to 1000 and 20 hours respectively.

### 3.2. Training details

**NLU models** are obtained by fine-tuning the SSL text-to-text model on the ground truth transcriptions of each SLU dataset and its task specific outputs. After preliminary experiments the mBART50 Large model [23] was chosen because of its best scores. According to the original mBART50 approach, the language is encoded as a special token that is added at the beginning of the input sequence and is given as the initial output token to the decoder. Parameters of the model’s encoder and token embeddings are frozen.

**SLU models** are implemented in ESPnet-SLU toolkit [9] and follow its SLURP recipe. We use the weighted-sum of hidden states [24, 25] of XLS-R (0.3B) pretrained model [22] as speech features. The Adaptor module is technically organized as a VGG/Conformer based encoder [26, 27] followed by a convolutional Length Adaptor [28]. This design is based on the encoder architecture of ASR [25] and SLU [9] systems and demonstrated better results in our preliminary experiments compared to the direct fine-tuning of SSL speech encoders. Output of the Adaptor module is fed to the general mBART50 text encoder that is followed by the fine-tuned text decoder from the NLU model. As in NLU, both the text encoder and decoder are conditioned on the SLU dataset language by adding the special language token embedding at the beginning of the text encoder’s input sequence and by setting the special language token as the initial output of the text decoder. Conformer layers are configured with  $d_{\text{model}} = 1024$ ,  $d_{\text{ff}} = 4096$ ,  $d_h = 8$ ,  $E = 8$  and Conv kernel size of 31. The Length Adaptor contains a 1-dimensional convolutional layer with stride 2 and reduces the length of input sequence by factor of 2. Label smoothing with a penalty of 0.1, as well as 3-way speed perturbation [29] data augmentation method are utilized during the training. The training is done with Adam optimizer [30] with  $\beta_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.999$ ,  $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$  and warmup learning rate scheduler. Number of epochs and warmup steps, maximum learning rate and batch size are tuned individually for each SLU dataset.

**SLU Adaptor pretraining** is carried out with the configuration similar to the SLU model training. We set the maximum learning rate to  $5e-5$ , the number of warmup steps to 25k and the number of epochs to 30 with the early stopping after 3 epochs of no improvements in validation accuracy.

**Table 2.** Results of the NLU models on the ground truth transcriptions and the SLU models on the speech recordings (without Adaptor pretraining).

Dataset	Metrics	NLU	SLU
SLURP	IC Acc.↑	85.67	86.97
	SLU-F1↑	79.30	77.71
SLUE	F1↑	83.25	68.90
	label-F1↑	87.76	82.28
CATSLU	Acc.↑	82.56	63.87
	F1↑	73.48	48.33
MEDIA	CER↓	16.50	13.67
	CVER↓	19.09	16.28
PM-Dom	CER↓	23.49	21.43
	CVER↓	26.59	24.62
PM-Lang	CER↓	40.76	25.13
	CVER↓	43.93	29.11

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1. Baseline

Table 2 shows the results of the NLU models on the ground truth transcriptions and the baseline SLU results on the speech recordings. Each baseline SLU system is essentially the corresponding NLU model transferred to the speech modality using the SSL pretrained speech encoder as described in the section 2.1. The Adaptor’s parameters in the baseline SLU systems have to be trained from scratch using the speech recordings from the SLU datasets only. First of all, we note that the SSL text-to-text model can in principle be fine-tuned to perform various NLU tasks in a generative manner. Next, we observe that the gap between the NLU and SLU performance correlates with the amount of training data for the English benchmarks, which suggests that the low resource setting is an issue for our initial SLU model. On the other side, SLU performance is slightly better than the NLU performance for the French benchmarks and is much better for the Italian benchmark, despite the small amount of training data. This might be due to the encoder or token embeddings freeze during the NLU training: both French and Italian likely have smaller presence in the pretraining data of the original mBART50 model. Finally, the Mandarin benchmark demonstrates the large gap between the NLU and SLU performance, what we explain by the very small presence of Mandarin and related languages in the XLS-R pretraining.

### 4.2. Adaptor pretraining


A comparison of the Adaptor pretraining methods is given in Table 3. It is evident from these results that both medium and low resource benchmarks benefit from the Adaptor pretraining in general. Hard label loss appears to yield better

**Table 3.** Results depending on the layer and loss function for Adaptor pretraining and the average Relative Error Reduction (RER) compared to the error rate without Adaptor pretraining. The error rate is calculated by subtracting from 100 for the accuracy, SLU-F1, F1 and label-F1 metrics. The last two lines contain the results for the combined losses. Underlined numbers show the best scores for the individual losses (without combination). **Bold** numbers show the best overall scores.

ID	Adaptor pretraining	SLURP		SLUE		CATSLU		MEDIA		PM-Dom		PM-Lang		Average RER, %
		IC Acc.↑	SLU-F1↑	F1↑	label-F1↑	Acc.↑	F1↑	CER↓	CVER↓	CER↓	CVER↓	CER↓	CVER↓	
0	None	86.97	77.71	68.90	82.28	48.33	63.87	13.67	16.28	21.43	24.62	25.13	29.11	-
1	PreEnc MC	87.79	77.85	69.60	83.60	43.63	59.02	13.65	16.66	20.51	24.02	26.49	30.62	-3.15
2	PreEnc CTC	88.59	78.80	71.25	84.04	50.33	65.73	12.44	15.13	19.54	23.06	22.93	26.50	6.81
3	PostEnc MC	88.13	78.91	71.93	85.10	47.50	62.65	<u>12.31</u>	<u>15.07</u>	19.67	22.81	23.36	27.22	5.12
4	PostDec MC	88.93	79.22	<u>72.95</u>	86.56	50.52	65.84	12.60	15.25	<b>17.90</b>	<b>21.15</b>	22.52	26.06	9.95
5	PostDec AED	<b>89.33</b>	<b>80.08</b>	72.94	<b>86.57</b>	<b>54.54</b>	<b>69.24</b>	13.64	16.18	18.00	21.27	<b>21.88</b>	<b>25.04</b>	<b>12.63</b>
6	2 + 5	89.14	80.07	<b>73.07</b>	86.05	53.63	68.37	12.12	<b>14.71</b>	19.38	22.36	23.28	26.78	10.97
7	2 + 3 + 5	89.20	79.58	73.05	86.20	50.81	65.55	<b>12.11</b>	14.83	18.85	21.91	23.40	26.72	9.17

performance than the MC for all datasets on the PreEnc level and for three out of six datasets on the PostDec level. Interestingly, the PostDec level provides the best results on all datasets except MEDIA. Four out of these datasets contain the smallest amount of training sentences, therefore the changes in the decoder during the NLU fine-tuning are probably sufficiently small so that it is compatible with the Adaptor pre-trained with the general mBART50 decoder. SLURP dataset also works best with the PostDec AED pretrained Adaptor despite the largest amount of training sentences. Unlike the rest of the datasets, we observe the best scores on MEDIA for the PostEnc MC aligned Adaptor, possibly because the NLU fine-tuning on this task leads to the larger modifications in the mBART50 decoder, therefore reducing its compatibility with the general decoder. Visualization of the parameter differences in Figure 3 shows that the relative change lies in the higher range for the higher number of parameters after fine-tuning on MEDIA dataset compared to the other tasks. Additionally, we calculate the ratio of unique tokens from each SLU dataset that is seen during the pretraining, as shown in Table 4. It can be observed from these numbers that the AED method is more effective for the datasets with at least 95% unique test set tokens seen during the pretraining and the MC loss is more effective otherwise. The MEDIA dataset again stands out in this analysis with the lowest ratio of unique training set tokens seen in the pretraining, this might also explain the lower PostDec pretraining effectiveness.

After exploring the training approaches separately, we try to combine them by simply summing the loss outputs. No systems with the multitask pretrained Adaptor degrade considerably compared to the best system for each dataset, which indicates that different pretraining objectives regularize each other when combined. Although the multitask pretraining does not outperform any single objective pretraining, the combination of CTC and AED can be recommended as a trade-off solution when little is known about the SLU data.



**Fig. 3.** Distribution of the differences between the parameters of the original mBART50 decoder and the fine-tuned NLU decoders depending on the dataset. The difference is computed as a percentage of the original parameter value. A wider line indicates a larger number of parameters having certain difference.

**Table 4.** Influence of the SLU benchmark’s unique tokens seen in the Adaptor pretraining data on the best pretraining method for that SLU benchmark.

Dataset	Tokens seen in pretraining, %		Best pretraining method
	Train	Test	
SLURP	98.45	98.93	PostDec AED
SLUE	98.93	99.66	PostDec MC/AED
CATSLU	98.93	99.41	PostDec AED
MEDIA	91.59	93.38	PostEnc MC
PM-Dom	93.47	93.20	PostDec MC
PM-Lang	95.52	95.67	PostDec AED

**Table 5.** Effect of the languages of Adaptor pretraining data (PostEnc MC loss).

Dataset	Metrics	Pretraining languages	
		English	Multiple
SLURP	IC Acc.↑	<b>88.62</b>	88.13
	SLU-F1↑	<b>79.09</b>	78.91
SLUE	F1↑	<b>72.06</b>	71.93
	label-F1↑	84.40	<b>85.10</b>
CATSLU	Acc.↑	47.08	<b>47.50</b>
	F1↑	62.43	<b>62.65</b>
MEDIA	CER↓	12.88	<b>12.31</b>
	CVER↓	15.75	<b>15.07</b>
PM-Dom	CER↓	<b>19.65</b>	19.67
	CVER↓	23.55	<b>22.81</b>
PM-Lang	CER↓	23.71	<b>23.36</b>
	CVER↓	27.83	<b>27.22</b>

#### 4.2.1. Language of pretraining data

In order to examine the importance of the multilingual Adaptor pretraining, we experiment with the PostEnc MC approach but replace the training data with 1000 hours of English recordings sampled from the Common Voice corpus. The results are displayed in Table 5. While the differences with the multilingual pretraining are rather small, the results confirm that the Adaptor pretraining should at least include the languages corresponding to the downstream SLU tasks. Moreover, the spoken NER model on the English recordings is also improved by the multilingual Adaptor pretraining, what can be attributed to the relatively large amount of the loanwords in this task.

#### 4.2.2. Scaling up Adaptor pretraining

We select the best performing configuration (PostDec AED) and run the Adaptor pretraining on our full ASR dataset comprising of 7000 hours. It can be seen from Table 6 that the additional pretraining data improves the results in almost all cases indicating a scaling potential of our method. In order to compare our E2E SLU with the pipeline approach, we transcribe the SLU datasets using the PostDec AED model trained on 7000 hours and subsequently fine-tune and evaluate the NLU models in these ASR transcriptions. As the comparison with the pipeline results in Table 6 shows, our E2E SLU approach can offer more accurate predictions given the same training data and pretrained models as the pipeline. Moreover, Table 6 shows the comparison of our best result with the previous work. The proposed approach demonstrates overall competitive results with the exception of CATSLU dataset. Our systems outperform the previous results on four datasets according to the metrics that evaluate predictions with variable length and large vocabulary (SLU-F1, CVER), and only on two datasets if we take into account the metrics that evaluate either a single element from a small predefined set of values (IC accuracy) or a sequence of such elements (CER).

**Table 6.** Scaling up the Adaptor PostDec AED pretraining with additional data and comparison with the pipeline approach and with the prior work.

Dataset	Metrics	Data, hours		Pipeline	Prior work
		1K	7K		
SLURP	IC Acc.↑	89.33	90.04	64.88	<b>90.07</b>
	SLU-F1↑	80.08	<b>80.66</b>	54.78	79.90 [31]
SLUE	F1↑	72.94	75.47	63.57	<b>77.20</b>
	label-F1↑	86.57	88.14	76.66	<b>88.70</b>
CATSLU	Acc.↑	54.54	56.34	38.46	<b>86.30</b>
	F1↑	69.24	71.07	58.49	<b>92.56</b>
MEDIA	CER↓	13.64	12.07	29.51	<b>11.20</b>
	CVER↓	16.18	<b>14.57</b>	33.45	17.20 [34]
PM-Dom	CER↓	18.00	<b>17.90</b>	44.80	21.90
	CVER↓	21.27	<b>21.08</b>	51.52	35.90 [35]
PM-Lang	CER↓	21.88	<b>21.50</b>	49.53	26.18
	CVER↓	<b>25.04</b>	<b>25.04</b>	54.62	39.28 [35]

**Table 7.** Results of transfer learning from MEDIA (French) to PM-Lang (Italian).

Metrics	No transfer	Zero-shot	Fine-tuning
CER↓	21.50	64.93	<b>20.30</b>
CVER↓	25.04	71.64	<b>23.65</b>

This suggests that for tasks with a larger prediction space, the generative capabilities of our model are more important.

### 4.3. Cross-lingual SLU

Our SLU approach is mostly multilingual, so the model is highly likely to have cross-lingual capabilities. The PortMEDIA-Language benchmark is specifically designed to evaluate this aspect because it uses the same SF tags as the MEDIA corpus, but is recorded in Italian instead of French. Similarly to [8], we experiment with our best MEDIA model and evaluate it on PortMEDIA-Language test set without any modification and after fine-tuning on the PortMEDIA-Language training set. The results shown in Table 7 outperform by a large margin most of the zero-shot results reported in Table 3 of [8] and all of the fine-tuning results reported in Table 5 of [8]. On top of that, our fine-tuning numbers are better than any previously reported.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

We propose a unified E2E SLU approach based on the multilingual SSL pretrained speech and text-to-text models and evaluate it on multiple SLU benchmarks. The evaluation results are comparable to or better than the previously reported, but apply to a more diverse set of the SLU benchmarks. The pretraining on the medium amount of ASR data using the popular CTC and AED and the novel MC approaches helps to improve the scores across the board and allows outperforming the best-known configurations in several cases, suggesting that the proposed model can be improved further.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] M. Lewis, Y. Liu, N. Goyal, M. Ghazvininejad, A. Mohamed, O. Levy, V. Stoyanov, and L. Zettlemoyer, “BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2020, pp. 7871–7880.
- [2] A. Baevski, Y. Zhou, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12 449–12 460, 2020.
- [3] P. Denisov and N. T. Vu, “Pretrained Semantic Speech Embeddings for End-to-End Spoken Language Understanding via Cross-Modal Teacher-Student Learning,” *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 881–885, 2020.
- [4] E. Bastianelli, A. Vanzo, P. Swietojanski, and V. Rieser, “SLURP: A Spoken Language Understanding Resource Package,” in *Proc. EMNLP*, 2020, pp. 7252–7262.
- [5] S. Shon, A. Pasad, F. Wu, P. Brusco, Y. Artzi, K. Livescu, and K. J. Han, “SLUE: New Benchmark Tasks for Spoken Language Understanding Evaluation on Natural Speech,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2022*, pp. 7927–7931.
- [6] S. Rongali, B. Liu, L. Cai, K. Arkoudas, C. Su, and W. Hamza, “Exploring Transfer Learning For End-to-End Spoken Language Understanding,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, 2021, pp. 13 754–13 761.
- [7] V. Pelloin, N. Camelin, A. Laurent, R. De Mori, A. Caubrière, Y. Estève, and S. Meignier, “End2End Acoustic to Semantic Transduction,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2021*, pp. 7448–7452.
- [8] G. Laperrière, V. Pelloin, M. Rouvier, T. Stafylakis, and Y. Estève, “On the Use of Semantically-Aligned Speech Representations for Spoken Language Understanding,” in *Proc. SLT, 2023*, pp. 361–368.
- [9] S. Arora, S. Dalmia, P. Denisov, X. Chang, Y. Ueda, Y. Peng, Y. Zhang, S. Kumar, K. Ganesan, B. Yan, N. T. Vu, A. W. Black, and S. Watanabe, “ESPnet-SLU: Advancing Spoken Language Understanding through ESPnet,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2022*, pp. 7167–7171.
- [10] M. He and P. N. Garner, “The Interpreter Understands Your Meaning: End-to-end Spoken Language Understanding Aided by Speech Translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09652*, 2023.
- [11] V. Sunder, S. Thomas, H.-K. J. Kuo, B. Kingsbury, and E. Fosler-Lussier, “Fine-grained textual knowledge transfer to improve rnn transducers for speech recognition and understanding,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2023*, pp. 1–5.
- [12] S. Dalmia, D. Okhonko, M. Lewis, S. Edunov, S. Watanabe, F. Metze, L. Zettlemoyer, and A. Mohamed, “LegoNN: Building Modular Encoder-Decoder Models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03318*, 2022.
- [13] X. L. Li and P. Liang, “Prefix-Tuning: Optimizing Continuous Prompts for Generation,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2021, pp. 4582–4597.
- [14] Y. Zhang, M. Choi, K. Han, and Z. Liu, “Explainable Semantic Space by Grounding Language to Vision with Cross-Modal Contrastive Learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 18 513–18 526, 2021.
- [15] K. Khorrami and O. Räsänen, “Evaluation of Audio-Visual Alignments in Visually Grounded Speech Models,” in *Proc. Interspeech, 2021*, pp. 2996–3000.
- [16] J. Zbontar, L. Jing, I. Misra, Y. LeCun, and S. Deny, “Barlow twins: Self-supervised learning via redundancy reduction,” in *Proc. ICML, 2021*, pp. 12 310–12 320.
- [17] S. Zhu, Z. Zhao, T. Zhao, C. Zong, and K. Yu, “CATSLU: The 1st Chinese Audio-Textual Spoken Language Understanding Challenge,” in *2019 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, 2019, pp. 521–525.
- [18] L. Devillers, H. Maynard, S. Rosset, P. Paroubek, K. McTait, D. Mostefa, K. Choukri, L. Charnay, C. Bousquet, N. Vigouroux, *et al.*, “The French MEDIA/EVALDA Project: the Evaluation of the Understanding Capability of Spoken Language Dialogue Systems,” in *LREC*, 2004.
- [19] F. Lefevre, D. Mostefa, L. Besacier, Y. Esteve, M. Quignard, N. Camelin, B. Favre, B. Jabaian, and L. M. R. Barahona, “Leveraging study of robustness and portability of spoken language understanding systems across languages and domains: the PORTMEDIA corpora,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’12)*, 2012.
- [20] R. Ardila, M. Branson, K. Davis, M. Kohler, J. Meyer, M. Henretty, R. Morais, L. Saunders, F. Tyers, and G. Weber, “Common Voice: A Massively-Multilingual Speech Corpus,” in *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 2020, pp. 4218–4222.
- [21] B. Zhang, H. Lv, P. Guo, Q. Shao, C. Yang, L. Xie, X. Xu, H. Bu, X. Chen, C. Zeng, *et al.*, “WenetSpeech: A 10000+ Hours Multi-domain Mandarin Corpus for Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2022*, pp. 6182–6186.
- [22] A. Babu, C. Wang, A. Tjandra, K. Lakhota, Q. Xu, N. Goyal, K. Singh, P. von Platen, Y. Saraf, J. Pino, *et al.*, “XLS-R: Self-supervised Cross-lingual Speech Representation Learning at Scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09296*, 2021.
- [23] Y. Tang, C. Tran, X. Li, P.-J. Chen, N. Goyal, V. Chaudhary, J. Gu, and A. Fan, “Multilingual translation with extensible multilingual pre-training and finetuning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00401*, 2020.
- [24] S.-w. Yang, P.-H. Chi, Y.-S. Chuang, C.-I. J. Lai, K. Lakhota, Y. Y. Lin, A. T. Liu, J. Shi, X. Chang, G.-T. Lin, *et al.*, “SUPERB: Speech processing Universal PERFORMANCE Benchmark,” *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, pp. 1194–1198, 2021.
- [25] X. Chang, T. Maekaku, P. Guo, J. Shi, Y.-J. Lu, A. S. Subramanian, T. Wang, S.-w. Yang, Y. Tsao, H.-y. Lee, *et al.*, “An Exploration of Self-Supervised Pretrained Representations for End-to-End Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. ASRU, 2021*, pp. 228–235.
- [26] A. Gulati, J. Qin, C.-C. Chiu, N. Parmar, Y. Zhang, J. Yu, W. Han, S. Wang, Z. Zhang, Y. Wu, *et al.*, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for Speech Recognition,” *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 5036–5040, 2020.
- [27] P. Guo, F. Boyer, X. Chang, T. Hayashi, Y. Higuchi, H. Inaguma, N. Kamo, C. Li, D. Garcia-Romero, J. Shi, *et al.*, “Recent Developments on ESPnet Toolkit Boosted by Conformer,” in *Proc. ICASSP, 2021*, pp. 5874–5878.
- [28] X. Li, C. Wang, Y. Tang, C. Tran, Y. Tang, J. Pino, A. Baevski, A. Conneau, and M. Auli, “Multilingual speech translation from efficient finetuning of pretrained models,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2021, pp. 827–838.
- [29] T. Ko, V. Peddinti, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “Audio augmentation for speech recognition,” in *Sixteenth annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2015.
- [30] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2015.
- [31] H. Xu, F. Jia, S. Majumdar, H. Huang, S. Watanabe, and B. Ginsburg, “Efficient Sequence Transduction by Jointly Predicting Tokens and Durations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06795*, 2023.
- [32] Y. Peng, S. Arora, Y. Higuchi, Y. Ueda, S. Kumar, K. Ganesan, S. Dalmia, X. Chang, and S. Watanabe, “A Study on the Integration of Pre-trained SSL, ASR, LM and SLU Models for Spoken Language Understanding,” in *Proc. SLT, 2023*, pp. 406–413.
- [33] C. Wang, S. Dai, Y. Wang, F. Yang, M. Qiu, K. Chen, W. Zhou, and J. Huang, “ARoBERT: An ASR Robust Pre-Trained Language Model for Spoken Language Understanding,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 1207–1218, 2022.

- [34] S. Ghannay, A. Caubrière, S. Mdhaffar, G. Laperrière, B. Jabaian, and Y. Estève, “Where are we in semantic concept extraction for Spoken Language Understanding?” In *International Conference on Speech and Computer*, 2021, pp. 202–213.
- [35] A. Caubrière, N. Tomashenko, A. Laurent, E. Morin, N. Camelin, and Y. Estève, “Curriculum-Based Transfer Learning for an Effective End-to-End Spoken Language Understanding and Domain Portability,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 1198–1202.