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Abstract

Emotion Recognition (ER) aims to classify human utterances into different emotion categories. Based on early-fusion and self-attention-based multimodal interaction between text and acoustic modalities, in this paper, we propose a multimodal multitask learning approach for ER from individual utterances in isolation. Experiments on the IEMOCAP benchmark show that our proposed model performs better than our re-implementation of state-of-the-art and achieves better performance than all other unimodal and multimodal approaches in literature. In addition, strong baselines and ablation studies prove the effectiveness of our proposed approach. We make all our codes publicly available on GitHub.[1]
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1. Introduction

Humans express emotions implicitly in conversations, in addition to the explicit message that they convey. The task of Emotion Recognition (ER) aims at identifying these implicit emotions, which proves to be one of the key components of better human-computer interaction systems.

Humans tend to express emotions in a variety of ways including body language, facial expressions, choice of words, tone of voice, and more. A variety of systems have been proposed for Speech Emotion Recognition (SER), including systems that exploit spectral, prosodic, or voice quality-based features in speech. With the recent advancement of deep learning-based end-to-end systems, high-level features learned through deep neural networks have outperformed such hand-engineered features. For speech specifically, the use of features learned through self-supervision has shown great success in the recent past.

Though in a conversational setting with spoken utterances speech might provide some of the most important signals for identifying the emotion in an utterance, the main challenge behind using speech as the sole modality for ER is that both low-level and high-level features easily overfit to noise or signals irrelevant to the task. In recent work, researchers have successfully exploited emotion signals present in the modalities of vision and text through high-level features obtained from representation models, with many systems even proposing the fusion of representations from multiple modalities. Some datasets have in fact shown better performance on modeling text over speech because though acted scenes or improvisations by professional actors may include several important prosodic and acoustic cues important to ER, in a conversation with a more natural setting, these cues might be absent. In such cases, the topic of the conversation, the semantics of the past and future utterances, or the discourse between the speakers might prove to be better signals for ER.

In this work, we propose the use of both speech and its corresponding text transcript for ER in spoken utterances. To achieve this, we first adopt the use of a powerful pre-trained contextualized representation models for both the text and speech modalities separately, where we use the RoBERTaBASE architecture [1] as the sentence encoder and wav2vec-2.0 as the speech encoder. Second, to better capture the implicit alignments between words and speech frames, we propose the use of a multimodal interaction module (MMI). MMI essentially couples the standard Transformer layer with a cross-modal attention mechanism to produce a speech-aware word representation and a word-aware speech representation for each input word. Next, we concatenate the utterance representation obtained from the speech encoder module and the MMI module to classify the emotion expressed behind each utterance. Finally, to largely eliminate the bias of the textual context and to better take into account the natural monotonic alignment between the acoustic modality and the textual modality, we propose to solve automatic speech recognition as an auxiliary task. Our MMI module adds minimal extra model parameters over a wav2vec-2.0 speech encoder and achieves state-of-the-art results on the IEMOCAP benchmark. To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose a novel end-to-end multimodal multi-task learning (MTL) framework for speech emotion recognition. We propose to use a multimodal interaction module to capture the inter-modality dynamics between words and speech frames. Through experiments, we show that our framework achieves state-of-the-art ER results on the standard IEMOCAP [2] dataset, on the 5-fold cross-validation setup.

- Through ablation study and strong unimodal baselines we verify the effectiveness of each modality and the MTL approach.

2. Related Work

The task of Emotion Recognition (ER) aims at identifying emotional states from different signals expressed by a human at each turn during a conversation. ER as a downstream task has been thoroughly studied in the past, including systems that consider each individual utterance separately or take into consideration the context of the conversation. In this section, we will discuss primarily the former, including unimodal and multimodal approaches for the same.

2.1. Unimodal Emotion Recognition

Speech as a modality is one of the most studied in the task of ER and is commonly known as SER. There is a considerable amount of literature on SER. Early research focused on extracting low-level features like mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs) and Filter Banks (FBanks) or hand-engineered features like speaker rate, voice quality, etc. These features were then fed to machine learning classifiers and which proved to perform relatively well in terms of classification accuracy. Thanks to deep learning, deep neural networks have achieved a considerable boost in SER performance and can handle raw waveforms or low-level features directly without the need for hand-engineered features.

With recent advances in self-supervised learning (SSL), pre-trained SSL features, like Natural Language Processing (NLP) approaches, have achieved state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance in various downstream speech processing tasks like Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR), Phone Recognition (PER), Speaker Identification (SID), etc. A comprehensive study can be found here. The current state-of-the-art on SER also uses wav2vec-2.0 as the speech encoder and solves the SER task together with ASR as an auxiliary task by minimizing the CTC loss of the network. A recent study also reveals how supervised MTL on SSL pre-trained features can help benefit the performance of a downstream task when the auxiliary task is chosen properly. Inspired by this, we also choose ASR as our auxiliary task for improving representations learned by our model for our final task of ER.

Other unimodal approaches include using just text or features extracted from facial expressions for ER in human conversations.

2.2. Multimodal Emotion Recognition

For multimodal approaches, the most common combination of modalities includes speech and text. Early studies in this area focused on late fusion of multimodal representations. Though this methodology is simple and effective at modeling modality-specific interactions but not cross-modal interactions. Early fusion to explore inter-modality interactions have also been explored. However, in general, early fusion also suppresses modality-specific interactions and does not outperform late fusion methods in emotion recognition. Researchers have proposed cross-modal attention (CMA) mechanisms. With CMA, features from one modality are allowed to attend to the other and the interaction between the sequences from the two modalities enables the system to extract the most useful features for emotion recognition. While use product attention, with recent advances in NLP and the rise of self-attention, the use of self-attention based CMA mechanisms for ER has been gaining traction. The architecture we propose in this paper uses stacked CMA modules as an integral component which results in a unique multimodal interaction framework, for the modalities of speech and text. We are partly inspired by for our architecture.

3. Proposed Methodology

3.1. Problem Formulation

Suppose we have a dataset \( D \) with \( N \) utterances \( \{u_1, u_2, u_3, \ldots, u_N\} \) and its corresponding labels \( \{y_1, y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_N\} \). Here we assume each utterance \( u_i \) has both speech cues \( a_i \) and text cues \( t_i \) available where \( u_i \in (a_i, t_i) \). \( t_i \) can be ASR transcripts or human-annotated transcripts. We formulate the task of ER as assigning an emotion label \( y_i \) to each utterance \( u_i \), where \( y_i \) denotes the probability distribution that the utterance belongs to one of the \( J \) unique emotions being studied in the dataset.

3.2. Feature Encoder

3.2.1. Contextualized Speech Representations

For encoding speech to obtain high-level contextualized representations we use a pre-trained wav2vec-2.0 as our raw wave encoder. Wav2vec-2.0 is based on the transformer architecture and pre-trained in a self-supervised fashion by solving a contrastive task and minimizing the InfoNCE loss. We use the pre-trained checkpoint released by Facebook, pre-trained on 960 hours of LibriSpeech and use the wav2vec-2.0-base architecture for all our experiments. Wav2vec-2.0 outputs \( J \) hidden states and we denote the \( j^{th} \) hidden state or contextualized embeddings from the raw audio input \( a_i \) of utterance \( u_i \) as \( e_i^j \), where \( e_i^j \in \mathbb{R}^{768} \). \( J \) depends on the length of the raw audio file and the CNN feature extraction layer of wav2vec-2.0 which extracts frames from the raw audio with a stride of 20ms and hop size of 25ms. In our experiments, we always keep the CNN feature extraction layer parameters frozen and train only the self-attention-based context encoder while E2E SER fine-tuning.

3.2.2. Contextualized Word Representations

We use RoBERTABASE from the transformers family as our contextualized text encoder to encode the transcript of the utterance and obtain rich contextualized token representations. RoBERTA as a text encoder has been used extensively in ER literature. For each input transcript, we first tokenize the input utterance and add extra starting and ending tokens, \( <s> \) and \( </s> \) respectively. For a total of \( M \) tokens, the \( m^{th} \) contextualized embedding for each token in text transcript \( t_i \) of utterance \( u_i \) is denoted by \( e_i^m \in \mathbb{R}^{768} \). We use RoBERTa only as a feature extractor and do not train it while fine-tuning our model.

3.3. Multimodal Interaction Module

Our Multimodal Interaction Module (MMI) consists of 3 Cross Modal Encoder (CME) blocks annotated as \( B, C \) and \( D \) in Fig. Each of these 3 CME blocks is constructed similar to a generic transformer layer, where each is composed of an \( h \)-head CMA module, residual connections and feed-forward layers. In this section, we discuss in detail the purpose and working of each of the 3 CME blocks and the acoustic gate \( E \).

3.3.1. Speech-Aware Word Representations

As shown in Fig to learn better token representations with the guidance of the associated spoken utterance, we feed wav2vec-2.0 embeddings \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times J} \) as queries and RoBERTa embeddings \( T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times M} \) as keys and values into CMA module B as follows:

\[
CMA(A, T) = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{W_k A^T [W_k T]}{\sqrt{d/m}} \right) [W_v T]^T
\]
where $\{W_{q1}, W_{k1}, W_{v1}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d/m \times h}$ denote the query, key and value weight matrices respectively for the $i^{th}$ attention head. The final output representation of the CME block $B$ is now $P = (p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1})$.

Next, to address the fact that each generated representation $p_i$ in the previous block correspond to the $i^{th}$ acoustic embedding and not the token embedding, we feed $P$ to another CME block $C$, which treats the original RoBERTa embeddings $T$ as queries and $P$ as keys and values. Finally, we now obtain the final Speech-Aware Word Representations as $R = (r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_{j-1})$.

### 3.3.3. Word-Aware Speech Representations

To obtain the word-aware speech representations and align each word to its closely related frame or wav2vec-2.0 embeddings we make use of another CME block $D$ by treating $T$ as queries and $A$ as keys and values. The final representations obtained from the block can be denoted as $Q = (q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{j-1})$. Phoneme alignment has been long studied in speech science and acoustics and we hypothesize that this step is important so that each word can assign relative importance to the frames or embeddings important or not important to it.

### 3.3.3. Acoustic Gate

Speech frames might encode redundant information like random noise and other redundant speech cues. Thus it is important to implement an acoustic gate $g$ which can dynamically control the contribution of each speech frame embedding. Following previous work, we implement an acoustic gate $g$ as follows:

$$
g = \sigma \left( W_g^T [R; Q] + B_g \right)$$

where $W_g \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a weight matrix, $B_g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the bias, and $\sigma$ is the element-wise sigmoid function.

Post this step, we concatenate the speech-aware word representations and word-aware speech representations to obtain our final cross-modal MMI representations $R = [Q; R]$ and pass it through a linear transformation $f(\cdot)$ which down-projects $M$ to again a $d$ dimensional space.

### 3.4. CTC Layer, Emotion Prediction Layer and Multi-task Learning

As mentioned earlier, we train our model under a MTL framework where we solve two tasks in parallel, ASR and ER. For ASR we calculate the CTC loss and for ER we calculate CrossEntropy loss.

For calculating the CrossEntropy with ground-truth emotion labels, we mean pool and concatenate the embeddings from our wav2vec-2.0 speech encoder and MMI module to obtain a final embedding which is then passed through a linear transformation and softmax activation function as follows:

$$\hat{y} = \text{softmax} \left( W_p [mp(A); mp(M)] + B_p \right)$$

where $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the single vector representation for each utterance, $W_p \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$ is a weight matrix, $\text{softmax}(\cdot)$ denotes the softmax activation function, and $\text{mp}(\cdot)$ denotes the
mean pooling operation across the embedding axis. Post this step, CrossEntropy is calculated by:

\[ \mathcal{L}_{CE} = \text{CrossEntropy}(\hat{y}_i, y_i) \tag{4} \]

Next, to calculate the CTC loss we first pass the embeddings from the wav2vec-2.0 encoder through a linear layer as follows:

\[ \hat{t} = \text{softmax} \left( W^T A + B_c \right) \tag{5} \]

where \( \hat{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times V} \) and \( J \) is the number of speech frames output by the wav2vec-2.0 CNN feature extractor and \( V \) is the size of our vocabulary or the number of unique characters and symbols in our corpus and an extra blank token. \( W_c \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times V} \) and \( B_c \) is the added bias. Post this step, we calculate the CTC loss as follows:

\[ \mathcal{L}_{CTC} = \text{CTC}(\hat{t}, t) \tag{6} \]

where \( t_i \in \{ t_0, \cdots , t_c, \cdots , t_N \} \) we utilize a pre-processed version of \( t_i \) where we remove all punctuation and convert all characters to uppercase.

Finally, we minimize the sum of the two, weighted by a hyper-parameter \( \alpha \) as \( \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{CE} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{CTC} \). During inference, to obtain the final emotion label \( y_i \) for utterance \( u_i \) we simply perform \( \text{argmax}(\hat{y}) \).

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset

Following much of the prior art in SER literature, we train and evaluate all our models on the IEMOCAP dataset [2]. IEMOCAP contains approximately 12 hours of speech from a total of 10 speakers, all of which comes from 5 scripted sessions, acted by professional actors. To keep our dataset settings consistent to prior-art and for a fair comparison, we evaluate our models on utterances assigned to one of the five emotions: Happy, Angry, Neutral, Sad and Excited and merge all samples labelled with Excited to Happy. For evaluation, we follow the five-fold cross-validation approach, where at each fold we leave one session out as the test set and take the average of the weighted accuracy obtained at each fold.

4.2. Baselines and Compared Methods

We build unimodal baselines with just text and speech modalities, where the text baseline uses RoBERTa as the contextualized text encoder followed by a single linear layer and softmax activation for classification. For the unimodal speech baseline we use an exactly similar setup but replace our encoder with pre-trained wav2vec-2.0-base, pre-trained on 960hrs of LibriSpeech [27].

We compare our model with other methods in literature evaluated on either of the 5-fold or 10-fold cross-validation setups, including unimodal and multimodal approaches. All results have been taken from literature. We only re-implement the current state-of-the-art approach [28] under the 5-fold cross-validation setup for a fair comparison.

4.3. Experimental Setup

We use the PyTorch framework to build, train and evaluate all our models. All pre-trained text and speech encoders were downloaded from the Huggingface library [29]. Since we use the \textit{base} architectures for both RoBERTa and wav2vec-2.0, our \( d \) effectively takes a value of 768. We trained and evaluated all our models with a batch-size of 2 and accum-grad of 4 for a total of 100 epochs. For training, we kept the learning rate constant at \( 1e^{-4} \) which worked well for all our setups. For our multi-task learning setup we trained our models with \( \alpha \in \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\} \). All our experiments were conducted on a single Nvidia RTX 3090 GPU.

4.4. Experimental Results

In Table 1 we report the average weighted accuracy of our MMER model, averaged across 5-folds, compared against all our benchmarks and prior-art. We see a considerable drop in performance for [28] when re-implemented on the 5-fold CV setup. As we see, MMER achieves SOTA on the IEMOCAP benchmark with the closest being [30] where the author uses 2 contextualized speech encoders resulting in more than double the number of parameters as ours. MMER benefits from minimal trainable parameter addition over [28] or a simple wav2vec-2.0. The value of \( \alpha \) that works best for us is 0.1 and we see a drop in performance of about 1% on removal of the auxiliary CTC task (\( \alpha = 0 \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimodal Prior-art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu et al. [31]</td>
<td>10-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajjad et al. [32]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu et al. [33]</td>
<td>10-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>72.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. [34]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>70.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. [35]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>73.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappagari et al. [36]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>70.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peng et al. [37]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Prior-art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morais et al. [38]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>77.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. [39]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>74.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padi et al. [40]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>75.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makiuchi et al. [41]</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai et al. [42]</td>
<td>10-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>78.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baselines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa\textsc{base}</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{t}</td>
<td>69.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wav2vec-2.0</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai et al. \textsc{-}(Ours)</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>73.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMER (alpha = 0)</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>76.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMER (alpha = 0.001)</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>76.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMER (alpha = 0.01)</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>76.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMER (alpha = 0.1)</td>
<td>5-fold</td>
<td>{a,t}</td>
<td>77.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose MMER, a novel multi-task multimodal approach for ER from spoken utterances. MMER outperforms all other unimodal and multimodal approaches in literature and achieves SOTA on the 5-fold cross-validation evaluation scheme on the IEMOCAP benchmark. As part of future work, we would like to investigate newer architectures and better auxiliary tasks that improve performance on ER benchmarks.
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