

ENCODER-DECODER WITH FOCUS-MECHANISM FOR SEQUENCE LABELLING BASED SPOKEN LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING

Su Zhu, Kai Yu

Key Laboratory of Shanghai Education Commission for Intelligent Interaction and Cognitive Engineering
SpeechLab, Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Brain Science and Technology Research Center
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
{paul2204,kai.yu}@sjtu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the framework of encoder-decoder with attention for sequence labelling based Spoken Language Understanding. We introduce BLSTM-LSTM as the encoder-decoder model to fully utilize the power of deep learning. In the sequence labelling task, the input and output sequences are aligned word by word, while the attention mechanism can't provide the exact alignment. To address the limitations of attention mechanism in the sequence labelling task, we propose a novel *focus mechanism*. Experiments on the standard ATIS dataset showed that BLSTM-LSTM with focus mechanism defined the new state-of-the-art by outperforming standard BLSTM and attention based encoder-decoder. Further experiments also showed that the proposed model is more robust to speech recognition errors.

Index Terms— Spoken language understanding, encoder-decoder, focus-mechanism, robustness.

1. INTRODUCTION

In spoken dialogue system, the Spoken Language Understanding (SLU) is a key component that parses user utterances into corresponding semantic concepts. The semantic parsing of input utterances in SLU typically consists of three tasks: domain detection, intent determination and slot filling. In this paper, we focus on the sequence labelling based slot filling task which assigns a semantic slot tag for each word in the sentence. The main challenges of SLU contain the performance improvement and its robustness to ASR errors.

Slot filling is a main task of SLU to get semantic slots and the associated value. Typically, slot filling would be treated as a sequence labelling (SL) problem to predict the slot tag for

each word in the utterance. As an example illustrated in Figure 1, the goal is to label the word “*Boston*” as the departure city, “*New York*” as the arrival city and “*today*” as the date. It is an alignment task.

Sentence	show	flights	from	Boston	to	New	York	today
Slots	O	O	O	B-FromCity	O	B-ToCity	I-ToCity	B-Date

Fig. 1. An example of ATIS sentence and the annotated slots.

Standard approaches to solve this problem include generative models, such as HMM/CFG composite models [1], hidden vector state (HVS) model [2], and discriminative or conditional models such as conditional random fields (CRFs) [3] and support vector machines (SVMs) [4]. Recently, motivated by a number of very successful continuous-space, neural network and deep learning approaches [5, 6], many neural network architectures have been applied to this task, such as simple recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [7, 8, 9], convolutional neural networks (CNNs) [10], long short-term memory (LSTM) [11] and the variations of different training criteria [12, 13]. The most recent papers use variations on LSTM sequence models, including encoder-decoder, external memory [14, 15].

Inspired by the success of attention mechanism [16] in the NLP field, we first apply an attention-based encoder-decoder [17] to treat the sequence labelling based SLU as the language translation problem. To consider not only the previous but also the future history, we first model the encoder by a bidirectional LSTM (BLSTM), and the decoder by a unidirectional LSTM. Attention mechanism scores how well the inputs around position A and the output at position B match, then makes a weighted averaging. While there are two main limitations of attention model in SL task: 1) The input and output in SL are aligned while attention model scores on the overall input words. 2) The alignment could be learned by attention model, but it is hard to approach it with limited annotated data in SLU (unlike Machine Translation in which

This work was supported by the Shanghai Sailing Program No. 16YF1405300, the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning, the China NSFC project No. 61573241 and the Interdisciplinary Program (14JCZ03) of Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China.

paired data is easier to be obtained). To address the limitation of attention mechanism in SL, we propose the focus mechanism which focuses on the aligned encoder hidden state.

2. RELATED WORKS

Recent research of slot filling has been focusing on RNN and its extensions. At first, [7] used RNN to beat CRF in the ATIS dataset. [8] tried bi-directional and hybrid RNN to investigate using RNN for slot filling. [11] introduced LSTM and deep LSTM architecture for this task and obtained improvement over RNN. [14] proposed RNN-EM which used an external memory architecture to improve the memory capability of RNN. [13] proposed to use ranking loss function to train bi-directional RNN.

Except the architectures of neural networks, many studies have been conducted to model the label dependencies. [10] proposed to combine CNN and CRF for sentence-level optimization. [8, 18] combined Elman-type and Jordan-type RNNs to consider the dependency on the last output label.

Following the success of attention based models in the NLP field, [19] applied the attention-based encoder-decoder to slot filling task but without LSTM cells. [15] proposed encoder-labeler architecture with two LSTMs which are encoder LSTM and labeler LSTM but without BLSTM as encoder. The encoder-labeler model gets the best performance of 95.66% F_1 -score in ATIS dataset.

For a full investigation, we combine BLSTM which considers the past and future information with the powerful encoder-decoder model to introduce a BLSTM-LSTM encoder-decoder in SLU.

3. PROPOSED MODELS

As a competitive baseline, CRF models the label relations. By considering the past inputs only, unidirectional LSTM can't solve long distance dependencies on the future inputs. BLSTM addressed it with two unidirectional LSTMs: a forward pass which processes the original input word sequences; a backward pass which processes the reversed input word sequences. To learn the advantages of these models, we are going to introduce a BLSTM-LSTM encoder-decoder architecture.

3.1. BLSTM-LSTM + Attention

We followed the encoder-decoder from [16] based on RNN. To consider not only the previous history but also the future history, we use BLSTM as the encoder and LSTM as the decoder.

An important extension of encoder-decoder is by adding an attention mechanism. We adopted the attention model from [17]. The only difference is that we use BLSTM as encoder in advance. The encoder reads the input sentence

$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{T_x})$ and generates T_x hidden states by BLSTM:

$$\begin{aligned} h_i &= [\overleftarrow{h}_i, \overrightarrow{h}_i] \\ \overleftarrow{h}_i &= f_l(\overleftarrow{h}_{i+1}, x_i) \\ \overrightarrow{h}_i &= f_r(\overrightarrow{h}_{i-1}, x_i) \end{aligned}$$

where \overleftarrow{h}_i is the hidden state of backward pass in BLSTM and \overrightarrow{h}_i is the hidden state of forward pass in BLSTM at time i .

The decoder is trained to predict the next semantic label y_t given the all input words and all the previously predicted semantic labels $\{y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(y_t | y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}; \mathbf{x}) &= g(s_t) \\ s_t &= f_d(s_{t-1}, y_{t-1}, c_t) \\ c_t &= q(s_{t-1}, h_1, \dots, h_{T_x}) \end{aligned}$$

where g refers to the output layer (often with softmax) and s_t is the hidden state of decoder LSTM at time t , with f_d set as LSTM unit function. c_t denotes the contextual information in generating label y_t according to different encoder hidden states, which is typically implemented by an attention mechanism [16], e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{T_x} \alpha_{ti} h_i \\ \alpha_{ti} &= \frac{\exp(a(s_{t-1}, h_i))}{\sum_{j=1}^{T_x} \exp(a(s_{t-1}, h_j))} \end{aligned}$$

where a is a feed-forward neural network. s_0 is initialized with \overleftarrow{h}_1 . To apply it in SL task, we enforce the output sequence generated by decoder to get the same length of the input words sequence.

3.2. Focus mechanism




Fig. 2. Illustration of attention and focus mechanism.

As referenced in the section of introduction, attention mechanism is facing with two limitations in sequence labelling based SLU task. To address this problem, we proposed the focus mechanism which only considers the aligned

encoder hidden state, i.e. $\alpha_{ti} = 0$, if $t \neq i$; $\alpha_{ti} = 1$, if $t = i$. Thus,

$$c_t = h_t$$

So we don't need to learn the alignment by attention model. The encoder-decoders with attention and focus mechanisms are illustrated as figure 2.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Experimental Setup

We used the ATIS corpus which has been widely used as a benchmark by the SLU community. In ATIS, the sentence and its semantic slot labels are in the popular in/out/begin (IOB) representation. An example sentence is provided in figure 1. The training data consists of 4978 sentences and 56590 words. Test data consists of 893 sentences and 9198 words. We use randomly selected 80% of training data for model training and the remaining 20% for validation [9].

In addition to ATIS, we also apply our models on a custom Chinese dataset from the car navigation domain which contains 8000 utterances for training, 2000 utterances for validation and 1944 utterances for testing. Each word has been manually assigned a slot using IOB schema. Not only the natural sentences, the top hypothesis of each utterance produced from the automatic speech recognition (ASR) is also evaluated. These ASR top outputs have a word error rate (WER) of 4.75% and a sentence error rate (SER) of 23.42%.

We report the F_1 -score on the test set with parameters that achieved the best F_1 -score on the validation data. We deal with unseen words in the test set by marking any words with only one single occurrence in the training set as $\langle unk \rangle$.

The LSTM neural networks we implement is the same as [20]. As described earlier, the encoder-decoder model consists of a BLSTM for encoder and a LSTM for decoder. For training, we randomly initialized parameters of networks in accordance with the uniform distribution $(-0.2, 0.2)$. We used the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) for updating parameters. For generalization, we used *dropout* with a dropout rate of 0.5.

For encoder-decoder, we use the left-to-right beam search for decoding with beam size of 2 empirically. We tried different learning rates ranging from 0.004 to 0.04 like grid-search. We kept it for 100 epochs, and saved the parameters that gave the best performance on the validation set which is measured after each training epoch.

4.2. Results on the ATIS Dataset

Table 1 shows the results on ATIS dataset. For all architectures, we set the dimension of word embedding to 100 and the number of hidden units to 100, too. We only use the current word as input without any context words. BLSTM which considers not only the past and the future history outperforms

Architectures	Mechanism	F_1 -score (%)
LSTM	-	93.40
BLSTM	-	95.43
BLSTM-LSTM	attention	92.73
	focus	95.79

Table 1. Experimental results on ATIS dataset.

Architectures	F_1 -score
CRF [8]	92.94
simple RNN [7]	94.11
CNN-CRF [10]	94.35
LSTM [11]	94.85
RNN-SOP [18]	94.89
Deep LSTM [11]	95.08
RNN-EM [14]	95.25
Bi-RNN with Ranking Loss [13]	95.47
Encoder-labeler Deep LSTM [15]	95.66
BLSTM-LSTM (focus)	95.79

Table 2. Comparison with published results on ATIS.

LSTM (+2.03%). The *attention based BLSTM-LSTM* model got lower F_1 -score than *BLSTM* (-2.7%). We think the reason is that sequence labelling problem is a task whose input and output sequences are aligned. With limited data, it is hard to learn the alignment accurately by attention mechanism. We try to expand the training data of ATIS by randomly replacing the value of each specific slot in sentences, to 10 times of the original scale, the BLSTM-LSTM with attention gets 95.19% F_1 -score, while other methods didn't benefit from the expanded training set as we have tried.

By considering the alignment of SL task, *BLSTM-LSTM with focus* increased F_1 -score from 92.73% to 95.79% and got 0.36% improvement (significant level 10%) in comparison with *BLSTM*. We think it has two advantages; 1) the initialization of hidden state of decoder LSTM with \hat{h}_1 provides a sentence leveraging features; 2) label dependency in the decoder.

Compared with the published results on ATIS, our method outperforms the previously published F_1 -score as illustrated in Table 2. Table 2 summarizes the recently published results on the ATIS slot filling task and compares them with the results of our proposed methods. Our proposed model gets the state-of-the-art performance ¹.

¹There are other published results that achieved better performance by using Name Entity features, e.g [8] achieved 96.24% F_1 -score. The NE features are annotated and really strong. If only using NE features, BLSTM obtained 97.00% F_1 -score. So it would be more meaningful to use only lexicon features.

Architectures	Mechanism	Natural	ASR
CRF	-	94.55	91.51
LSTM	-	79.90	74.25
BLSTM	-	95.33	91.23
BLSTM-LSTM	attention	95.65	91.76
	focus	96.60	93.08

Table 3. F_1 -scores of natural sentence and top hypothesis from ASR on Navigation dataset.

4.3. Results on Chinese Navigation Dataset

To investigate the robustness of BLSTM-LSTM architectures with attention or focus mechanism, we do the additional experiments on the Chinese navigation dataset described earlier. We also use only the current word as LSTM input, except that CRF used a context window size of 5. We train the model by natural sentences (correctly) and test it on not only natural sentences (correctly) but also top hypotheses from ASR (with recognition errors).

Table 3 shows the results. CRF baseline seems competitive to BLSTM, due to the sentence-level optimization of output. The LSTM gets a really bad result. Since the main challenge in this dataset is detecting longer phrases like location name (the length varies from 1 to 24 words). It suffers from long distant dependency on the past and future inputs. Immediately, BLSTM solved this problem.

BLSTM-LSTM with focus-mechanism outperforms BLSTM on both natural sentences and top hypotheses from ASR significantly (significant level 5%). It seems BLSTM-LSTM encoder-decoder with focus mechanism are more robust to ASR errors. The reason maybe that the label dependency in the decoder helps omit the error transformed from the encoder. CRF also models label dependency and outperforms BLSTM with parsing ASR outputs.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented an application of BLSTM-LSTM encoder-decoder with attention and focus mechanism to SLU slot filling task. The BLSTM-LSTM architecture with focus mechanism achieved the state-of-the-art result on ATIS dataset and shows robust to the ASR errors on a custom dataset. We also find that the attention mechanism need much more data to learn the alignment, while focus mechanism has considered the alignment property of sequence labelling problem. In future, we want to investigate BLSTM-LSTM with focus mechanism to other sequence labelling tasks (e.g. part-of-speech tagging). Further, we plan to use attention based BLSTM-LSTM for solving SLU task with unaligned data.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Ye-Yi Wang, Li Deng, and Alex Acero, "Spoken language understanding," *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 16–31, 2005.
- [2] Yulan He and Steve Young, "A data-driven spoken language understanding system," in *IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding*. IEEE, 2003, pp. 583–588.
- [3] John Lafferty, Andrew McCallum, and Fernando CN Pereira, "Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data," in *ICML*, 2001.
- [4] K Taku and M Yuji, "Chunking with support vector machine," in *Proceedings of North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics*, 2001, pp. 192–199.
- [5] Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, "Recurrent neural network based language model.," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2010, vol. 2, p. 3.
- [6] Tomas Mikolov, Wen-tau Yih, and Geoffrey Zweig, "Linguistic regularities in continuous space word representations.," in *HLT-NAACL*, 2013, pp. 746–751.
- [7] Kaisheng Yao, Geoffrey Zweig, Mei-Yuh Hwang, Yangyang Shi, and Dong Yu, "Recurrent neural networks for language understanding.," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2013, pp. 2524–2528.
- [8] Grégoire Mesnil, Xiaodong He, Li Deng, and Yoshua Bengio, "Investigation of recurrent-neural-network architectures and learning methods for spoken language understanding.," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2013, pp. 3771–3775.
- [9] Grégoire Mesnil, Yann Dauphin, Kaisheng Yao, Yoshua Bengio, Li Deng, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Xiaodong He, Larry Heck, Gokhan Tur, Dong Yu, et al., "Using recurrent neural networks for slot filling in spoken language understanding," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 530–539, 2015.
- [10] Puyang Xu and Ruhi Sarikaya, "Convolutional neural network based triangular crf for joint intent detection and slot filling," in *Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding (ASRU), 2013 IEEE Workshop on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 78–83.

- [11] Kaisheng Yao, Baolin Peng, Yu Zhang, Dong Yu, Geoffrey Zweig, and Yangyang Shi, “Spoken language understanding using long short-term memory neural networks,” in *Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT), 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 189–194.
- [12] Kaisheng Yao, Baolin Peng, Geoffrey Zweig, Dong Yu, Xiaolong Li, and Feng Gao, “Recurrent conditional random field for language understanding,” in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 4077–4081.
- [13] Ngoc Thang Vu, Pankaj Gupta, Heike Adel, and Hinrich Schütze, “Bi-directional recurrent neural network with ranking loss for spoken language understanding,” 2016.
- [14] Baolin Peng, Kaisheng Yao, Li Jing, and Kam-Fai Wong, “Recurrent neural networks with external memory for spoken language understanding,” in *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pp. 25–35. Springer, 2015.
- [15] Gakuto Kurata, Bing Xiang, Bowen Zhou, and Mo Yu, “Leveraging sentence-level information with encoder lstm for natural language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.01530*, 2016.
- [16] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio, “Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*, 2014.
- [17] Oriol Vinyals, Łukasz Kaiser, Terry Koo, Slav Petrov, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey Hinton, “Grammar as a foreign language,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015, pp. 2755–2763.
- [18] Bing Liu and Ian Lane, “Recurrent neural network structured output prediction for spoken language understanding,” in *Proc. NIPS Workshop on Machine Learning for Spoken Language Understanding and Interactions*, 2015.
- [19] Edwin Simonnet, Nathalie Camelin, Paul Delglise, and Yannick Estve, “Exploring the use of attention-based recurrent neural networks for spoken language understanding,” in *Machine Learning for Spoken Language Understanding and Interaction NIPS 2015 workshop (SLUNIPS 2015)*, Montreal (Canada), 11 dec. 2015.
- [20] Alex Graves, “Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0850*, 2013.