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Abstract

We propose a novel deliberation-based approach to end-to-end (E2E) spoken language understanding (SLU), where a streaming automatic speech recognition (ASR) model produces the first-pass hypothesis and a second-pass natural language understanding (NLU) component generates the semantic parse by conditioning on both ASR’s text and audio embeddings. By formulating E2E SLU as a generalized decoder, our system is able to support complex compositional semantic structures. Furthermore, the sharing of parameters between ASR and NLU makes the system especially suitable for resource-constrained (on-device) environments; our proposed approach consistently outperforms strong pipeline NLU baselines by 0.82% to 1.34% across various operating points on the TOSRv2 dataset. We demonstrate that the fusion of text and audio features, coupled with the system’s ability to rewrite the first-pass hypothesis, makes our approach more robust to ASR errors. Finally, we show that our approach can significantly reduce the degradation when moving from natural speech to synthetic speech training, but more work is required to make text-to-speech (TTS) a viable solution for scaling up E2E SLU.
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1. Introduction

Traditional Spoken Language Understanding (SLU) systems typically consist of two separate components. The automatic speech recognition (ASR) component generates transcription from audio, while the natural language understanding (NLU) component generates semantic information from the ASR hypothesis. This pipeline approach allows the two components to be developed separately, with ASR trained on labeled audio data and NLU trained on text-only data, leading to faster iteration speed and easier maintainability. On the other hand, this approach also comes with several limitations, such as being prone to error propagation from ASR to NLU, lack of acoustic information which limits NLU’s accuracy, and lack of parameter sharing which makes it difficult to bring SLU on-device.

End-to-end (E2E) SLU systems [1-2] attempt to overcome these limitations by going directly from audio to semantics. While this direction has shown promise, current E2E systems face three key challenges. Firstly, E2E systems are often treated as a black box of audio to semantics without the ability to output transcripts [1-5]. In practice, transcript generation is a requirement for many speech-based applications; in addition, having access to the transcripts is beneficial for debugging and understanding the system’s behavior. Secondly, E2E SLU often targets domain/intent prediction [1-2] or slot tagging [5], but does not appear to solve complex understanding use cases (e.g., composition) that text based systems are capable of [6,7]. Thirdly, certain E2E SLU solutions have been proposed that combine text and audio data via a neural interface to produce the semantic parse and thus retain the ability to output transcripts [6,7]. However, these systems are understudied (on-device) environments, how robust they are against speech variation and ASR errors, and how scalable they are to new domains given the reliance on audio training data.

In this work, we propose a novel deliberation-based approach to E2E SLU to address these challenges. Our method is inspired by deliberation-based two-pass E2E ASR [11], where a neural correction model is conditioned on both the acoustics and the first-pass hypothesis (often generated by a streaming ASR model) to produce the final transcript. Unlike in deliberation-based ASR, our second-pass model generates the semantic parse instead of a corrected version of the first-pass hypothesis. Our system naturally retains the ability to output transcripts via the first-pass streaming ASR model, thus addressing the first challenge. By formulating E2E SLU as a generalized decoder instead of a collection of classification models, we enable the system to support complex compositional semantic structures, addressing the second challenge. Our in-depth analysis reveals that the proposed approach consistently outperforms strong pipeline NLU baselines by 0.82% to 1.34% in accuracy under various operating points and is especially suitable for resource-constrained on-device environments. We demonstrate that our model’s implicit ability to rewrite the first-pass hypothesis makes it more robust against ASR errors compared to traditional pipeline NLU systems. Finally, we show that the system’s multimodal nature significantly lessens the degradation when shifting from natural speech to synthetic speech training data. However, more work is required to further close the gap and make text-to-speech (TTS) a viable solution for scaling up E2E SLU without collecting natural speech.

2. Deliberation-Based End-to-End SLU

Our proposed deliberation approach to E2E SLU is depicted in Figure 1, where a separately trained ASR model is used to obtain the initial hypothesis given some audio input. The ASR model is assumed to be a variant of Recurrent Neural Network Transducer (RNN-T) [12], the most popular streaming E2E ASR solution currently. Note that our approach can be easily modified to support other E2E ASR architectures. An important design choice in our system is that the ASR component remains frozen. This guarantees that the system can still generate transcripts at the same level of accuracy and latency, thus ASR remains general-purpose and can be shared with other tasks. This is especially important for on-device processing since we can reuse ASR parameters for downstream tasks, thus reducing the memory and computation requirement.

*Equal contribution.
The initial ASR hypothesis is fed to the RNN-T predictor (analogous to a language model) to obtain the text embedding \( \text{emb}_{\text{text}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \), where \( T \) is the text embedding length and \( D \) is the embedding dimension. Similarly, the audio is fed to the RNN-T encoder (analogous to an acoustic model) to obtain the audio embedding \( \text{emb}_{\text{aud}} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times D} \), where \( A \) is the audio embedding length and \( D \) is the embedding dimension. For simplicity, we assume that the text and audio embeddings have the same dimension; if not the case, we can achieve this with a simple projection layer. In practice, \( \text{emb}_{\text{text}} \) and \( \text{emb}_{\text{aud}} \) are cached during ASR decoding and do not need to be re-computed.

The **Fusion** module then combines \( \text{emb}_{\text{text}} \) and \( \text{emb}_{\text{aud}} \) into a single embedding \( \text{emb}_{\text{fused}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{emb}_{\text{attn}} &= \text{MH}\{\text{emb}_{\text{text}}, \text{emb}_{\text{aud}}, \text{emb}_{\text{aud}}\} \\
\text{emb}_{\text{stack}} &= \text{Stack}(\text{emb}_{\text{text}}, \text{emb}_{\text{aud}}) \\
\text{emb}_{\text{fused}} &= \text{Linear}(\text{emb}_{\text{attn}})
\end{align*}
\]

Here \( \text{emb}_{\text{attn}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \) is the output of multi-head attention (MHA) [13] with \( \text{emb}_{\text{text}} \) as query and \( \text{emb}_{\text{aud}} \) as key and value. \( \text{emb}_{\text{attn}} \) can be viewed as a semantically-induced version of the audio embeddings. \( \text{emb}_{\text{stack}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 2D} \) is obtained by concatenating \( \text{emb}_{\text{text}} \) and \( \text{emb}_{\text{aud}} \) in the feature dimension, and \( \text{emb}_{\text{fused}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \) is the result of projecting \( \text{emb}_{\text{stack}} \) down to the original embedding dimension \( D \). This fusion method empirically performed the best compared to various approaches we experimented with, including embedding concatenation in time and cross-attention interface [7]. \( \text{emb}_{\text{fused}} \) effectively combines text and audio signal into a single embedding while keeping the sequence length compact (typically \( T \ll A \)).

\( \text{emb}_{\text{fused}} \) is further encoded by a **Pooling** module consisting of \( N \) transformer layers, before being fed to a transformer **Decoder** to generate the target semantic parse. Critically, to avoid requiring our model to regenerate every token, we introduce a **pointer-generator head** [8][4]. Given the decoder state for the current timestep \( d_t \) and encoder outputs \( e \), the copy head computes (1) probability of generating a new token \( g_t \) through a softmax layer (2) probability of copying a token from the input \( c_t \) by relying on MHA weights and the attention vector \( \omega_t \), and (3) a mixing probability \( P_{\text{copy}} \) to mix the copy and generation distribution to the final output token distribution \( o_t \):

\[
\begin{align*}
&g_t = \text{Softmax}(d_t) \\
&c_t, \omega_t = \text{MH}\{e, d_t, d_t\} \\
&P_{\text{copy}} = \text{Linear}([d_t, \omega_t]) \\
&o_t = P_{\text{copy}} \cdot g_t + (1 - P_{\text{copy}}) \cdot c_t
\end{align*}
\]

In training, the loss is backpropagated from the target down to the NLU components, while the ASR blocks remain frozen. Unlike traditional NLU models, our proposed approach is theoretically able to correct ASR errors in the NLU pass, as demonstrated in Figure[1] where “Jock” is corrected to “Jacques”.

### 3. Experimental Setup

#### 3.1. SLU Dataset and Evaluation Procedure

To evaluate the scale and robustness of our approach, we evaluate our models on the spoken version of the popular open-source NLU benchmark, Task-Oriented Semantic Parsing (TOPv2) [15]. This dataset consists of eight domains across: alarm, messaging, music, navigation, timer, weather, reminder, and event, with both flat and compositional parse structures as shown in Table 1. The dataset is divided into three splits: **train** (125k utterances, valid for hyperparameter tuning (17k utterances), and **test** for evaluation (39k utterances). For the spoken version of TOPv2, referred to as Spoken Task-Oriented Parsing (STOP) [1], we collected speech data through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) where each utterance was spoken by one speaker. The final corpus consists of 864 speakers and 171 hours of speech.

We evaluate SLU models with **Exact Match (EM)** [15], which measures the accuracy of the hypothesis against the reference annotation with an exact string match (punctuation and casing are ignored). To be counted as correct, both the parse structure and the slot content transcription must be correct. For example, given the reference "[IN:PLAY_MUSIC [SL:PLAYLIST Jacques] [SL:TYPE station]]", the hypothesis "[IN:PLAY_MUSIC [SL:PLAYLIST Jock Eagles] [SL:TYPE station]]" is incorrect. A **STOP** will be released in future work.
and an embedding dimension of 224. Finally, the module consists of 2 transformer encoder layers with 8 attention heads. The decoder non-autoregressive architecture [22] with span pointer NLU baseline only allows training on the reference text since the model generates spans (indices into the input) instead of tokens. We train the models using Cross Entropy loss with 0.1 label smoothing and SpecAugment applied on the raw audio features (before going through the encoder), with training hyperparameters optimized on STOP valid.

Our deliberation models use the first-pass ASR hypothesis as the input text for training. We also explore duplicating every utterance with ASR error and use both the hypothesis and reference for training. This union strategy teaches the model how to handle ASR errors while ensuring full coverage of the TOPv2 training text. Note that the pipeline span pointer NLU baseline only allows training on the reference text since the model generates spans (indices into the input) instead of tokens.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Pipeline vs. Deliberation

As seen in Table 2, our proposed deliberation approach significantly outperforms the pipeline baseline on all three devices, with the absolute EM improvement ranging from 0.82% to 1.34%. The EM gap between pipeline and deliberation is the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASR</th>
<th>NLU</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>EM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>70.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>70.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>70.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>68.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>69.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>64.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>65.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Pipeline vs. deliberation SLU results on STOP test. Text indicates whether the model is trained using the first-pass ASR hypothesis (Hyp), the reference text (Ref), or the union of both (Union). All models have ~5M parameters.

3We experimented with many hypothetical budgets and the trends were similar; we consider only these scenarios in the paper for brevity.
largest for D1, which suggests that our approach is more beneficial when the base ASR model is stronger. Both pipeline and deliberation methods are heavily dependent on ASR quality: the more accurate ASR is, the better NLU performs and vice versa. The overall results confirm that our deliberation-based approach is especially suitable for when computational resources are limited, such as on-device. For server-side processing, the pipeline approach benefits significantly from text-based pre-training (e.g., from RoBERTa); the same benefit may not extend to the multimodal deliberation model. We will explore pre-training for deliberation systems in future work.

Comparing deliberation’s text-only systems, training on both the ASR hypothesis and reference text performs better than just the former for all three devices. This suggests that while it is important to train the model on ASR hypotheses, it is also important to expose the model to as much text data as possible.

Among the modalities of deliberation, text and audio fusion consistently performs better than either text-only or audio-only, and text-only consistently performs better than audio-only. However, the advantage of fusion becomes smaller as the base ASR model gets weaker, with the EM improvement over text-only, and audio fusion is able to significantly reduce the degradation due to TTS training; however, the final EM still lags behind the EM degradation is 1.62% for D1 vs. 3.60% for D3. Text encoders cannot generalize from TTS data as effectively (e.g., the EM degradation is 1.62% for D1 vs. 3.60% for D3). Text-only baselines reducing from 0.83% for D1 to just 0.14% for D3. This means that as the quality of the audio embeddings decreases, they no longer offer complementary benefits over the text embeddings. We will explore methods to improve the audio embedding quality of small ASR models in future work.

4.2. Robustness to ASR Errors

One major appeal of deliberation models is their ability to rewrite the initial hypothesis in the NLU pass, which makes the system more robust to ASR errors. We quantify ASR robustness in Table 3 by splitting the EM results into two buckets, one containing utterances with no ASR error and one with at least one error. As can be seen, all deliberation variants significantly outperform the pipeline NLU baseline on utterances with ASR errors, at the cost of underperforming on correctly transcribed utterances. The audio-only deliberation model performs the best on the error bucket since it bypasses the initial hypothesis completely. The text-only model, by contrast, performs better on the error-free bucket but worse on the error bucket since it does not have access to the audio. The fusion of text and audio features provides a good balance between the two, trading off some ASR robustness in return for better performance on error-free utterances. Future work will focus on improving the numbers for both buckets, possibly by unifying deliberation-based ASR and span pointer-based NLU in a single framework.

Table 4 shows some examples where the fusion deliberation model was able to recover from ASR errors.

Table 3: EM results on STOP test for D1, broken down by whether or not there is an ASR error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLU</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>ASR Error No (29k utts)</th>
<th>ASR Error Yes (10k utts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>85.45</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>39.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Example utterances where the fusion deliberation model for D1 was able to recover from ASR errors.

Reference | ASR Hypothesis
---|---
get rid of the reminder... | garrett of the reminder...
... the tamer Hosny show | ... the tamer Hose kneve show
... joshua radin concert... | ... joshua rad in concert...
message jessica on line... | message jessica online...
sad react to that message | sadriette to that message

4.3. Scaling E2E SLU with Synthetic Speech

One of the biggest limitations of E2E SLU compared to the traditional text-only NLU is the former’s reliance on audio training data, as collecting natural speech is often significantly more expensive than collecting text data. Thus, it is usually more difficult and time-consuming to scale E2E SLU to new domains. With its many advances in recent years, text-to-speech (TTS) offers a potential solution to the scalability of E2E SLU by replacing natural speech with synthetic speech for model training. We explore this possibility with deliberation models by replacing the STOP’s natural speech with synthetic speech generated by our in-house TTS engine. Each utterance is synthesized using a randomly chosen voice among eight available voice profiles, together with a randomly adjusted pitch and speaking rate to further increase the speaker diversity.

The results for training with synthetic speech are summarized in Table 5. Audio-only systems appear particularly sensitive to the mismatch in audio training data, and weaker KNN-T encoders cannot generalize from TTS data as effectively (e.g., the EM degradation is 1.62% for D1 vs. 3.60% for D3). Text and audio fusion is able to significantly reduce the degradation due to TTS training; however, the final EM still lags behind the text-only EM from Table 2. These results suggest that while deliberation makes TTS-based training more viable due to the combination of text and audio features, more work is required to make E2E SLU scalable using purely TTS-generated speech. We will explore this direction further in future work.

Table 5: Deliberation SLU results on STOP test when using natural vs. synthetic (TTS-generated) speech for training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASR Modality</th>
<th>EM (Natural)</th>
<th>EM (TTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>67.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>71.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>65.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>69.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>66.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed a novel deliberation-based approach to E2E SLU which fuses text embeddings (derived from the first-pass ASR hypothesis) with audio embeddings to generate the target semantic parse. We demonstrate that our proposed approach is able to significantly outperform strong pipeline baselines across three on-device operating points, is more robust to ASR errors, and makes TTS-only training more viable. For future work, we plan to explore pre-training strategies for deliberation, improve the audio embedding quality of small ASR models, unify our approach with deliberation-based ASR and span pointer-based NLU, and further push the results on pure TTS training sets to make E2E SLU more scalable.
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