

Contrastive Learning for Task-Independent SpeechLLM-Pretraining

Maike Züfle Jan Niehues
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany
{maike.zuefle, jan.niehues}@kit.edu

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) excel in natural language processing but adapting these LLMs to speech processing tasks efficiently is not straightforward. Direct task-specific fine-tuning is limited by overfitting risks, data requirements, and computational costs. To address these challenges, we propose a scalable, two-stage training approach: (1) A task-independent speech pretraining stage using contrastive learning to align text and speech representations over all layers, followed by (2) a task-specific fine-tuning stage requiring minimal data. This approach outperforms traditional ASR pretraining and enables the model to surpass models specialized on speech translation and question answering while being trained on only 10% of the task-specific data.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive capabilities in translation and language understanding tasks (OpenAI et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024). However, their reliance on written text limits their application to real-world scenarios, where communication often occurs through speech. Extending LLMs to spoken language could enable them to reason about and process spoken content effectively.

A straightforward approach is to use a cascaded pipeline (Shen et al., 2023) where speech is first converted to text using an automatic speech recognition (ASR) model, and the text is subsequently processed by an LLM. While simple, this approach has limitations: it cannot be trained end-to-end, ASR errors can propagate through the pipeline, and critical paralinguistic information, such as speaker features or noise, is lost during transcription.

To address these issues, recent works have proposed SpeechLLMs (Wang et al., 2024a; Tang et al.,

2024; Nguyen et al., 2024; Chu et al., 2024), which connect speech encoders to LLMs via a trainable projector in an end-to-end manner. However, training them effectively remains a key challenge due to the scarcity of labelled data for downstream tasks (Xu et al., 2023; Ünlü Menevşe et al., 2024).

Pretraining the SpeechLLM before finetuning on task-specific data can help overcome this challenge and reduce the need for large downstream datasets. A straightforward strategy is to use ASR data, training on the ASR task itself (Tang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024b). However, this might lead to overfitting to this pretraining task.

Our work introduces contrastive learning as a task-independent pretraining strategy for SpeechLLMs using ASR data. Contrastive learning aligns the representations of paired speech and text inputs while encouraging representations of unrelated inputs to remain distinct. We demonstrate that applying a contrastive loss to the representations after every layer and pretraining on just 400 hours of parallel speech-text data serves as an effective, task-agnostic foundation for SpeechLLMs.

To evaluate our approach, we finetune the pre-trained model on three downstream tasks: ASR, speech translation (ST), and speech question answering (SQA). We compare its performance against that of traditional ASR pretraining and next-word prediction (NWP) pretraining using mixed speech-text input. The contrastive strategy not only surpasses the other methods but also matches the performance of task-specific state-of-the-art (SOTA) models on nearly all metrics. We also analyse combinations of the pretraining methods to explore potential complementary interactions.

Scaling up contrastive pretraining to 1,400 hours yields additional performance gains, with our models surpassing specialized models and current SpeechLLMs. Even in simulated low-resource scenarios, where only 10% of downstream data is used for finetuning, our method consistently out-

<https://github.com/MaikeZuefle/contr-pretraining>




Figure 1: An overview of our two-stage training process. First we perform task-agnostic pretraining, by leveraging ASR data to calculate a contrastive loss over a selected set of layers. Then we finetune on task-specific data. The speech encoder and the LLM remain frozen (indicated by the snowflake), we only train the projector.

performs existing SpeechLLMs.

Our SpeechLLM architecture is simple yet flexible, consisting of a speech encoder, a projector, and an LLM. Only the projector is trained, making the model parameter-efficient and enabling maximum flexibility in adapting to the ever-evolving landscape of LLMs and speech encoders. Moreover, this approach preserves the LLM’s text-to-text capabilities, ensuring its functionality across both speech and text-based tasks. An overview of our approach is provided in Fig. 1.

The main contributions of our paper are:

1. We propose contrastive pretraining for SpeechLLMs, achieving state-of-the-art results in ST and SQA.
2. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our pre-training method in low-resource settings.
3. We provide a comprehensive analysis of contrastive learning for SpeechLLMs and its interaction with other pretraining methods.
4. We show that contrastive pretraining preserves a model’s ability to recognise paralinguistic speech features.

2 Related Works

SpeechLLMs. SpeechLLM architectures typically consist of three main components: a speech encoder, a pretrained language model, and a projector linking the two. Training strategies differ based on which components are finetuned.

Chu et al. (2024) adopt a comprehensive strategy by finetuning all components. Similarly, other works explore finetuning both the projector and the encoder, alongside applying Low-Rank Adaptation

(LoRA; Hu et al. 2022) to the LLM (Wu et al., 2023; Gong et al., 2024). In contrast, some methods freeze the LLM entirely, focusing on training only the encoder and projector (Wang et al., 2024b; Held et al., 2024). Several other approaches focus on finetuning the projector while introducing LoRA layers to the LLM, leaving the speech encoder and LLM frozen (Peng et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024). An even more lightweight approach freezes both the encoder and the LLM, finetuning only the projection layers (Wang et al., 2024a).

In this work, we use the latter approach, using a frozen speech encoder and LLM while finetuning only the projection layers. This preserves the text-to-text abilities of the LLM, while also being parameter efficient.

Text and Speech Alignment. While ‘alignment’ has various meanings (Hämmerl et al., 2024), in this work, we use it to refer to the process of creating meaningfully similar representations for text and speech. One approach to achieve this alignment is to directly finetune on the desired tasks without explicitly modelling alignment (Fang et al., 2024). An alternative is to use a downstream task to pretrain the SpeechLLM before finetuning on desired tasks, for example pretraining on ASR (Tang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024b) or ASR variants (Wang et al., 2024a).

Other works achieve alignment by encouraging paired speech and text embeddings closer together using an appropriate loss term. For example, Held et al. (2024) use an L2 loss on speech and text embeddings in addition to a KL-divergence loss on the output distributions, and Chuang et al. (2020) use a cosine distance loss between paired embeddings.

Optimal transport has also been used to align paired embeddings in encoder-decoder speech translation systems (Le et al., 2023; Tsiamas et al., 2024).

Contrastive training is another widely used approach, bringing parallel text and speech representations closer while pushing non-parallel representations apart. It has been used in knowledge distillation for spoken language understanding (Zhu et al., 2022; Cappellazzo et al., 2024), as an auxiliary loss for encoder-decoder ST systems (Ye et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2023), and for music (Manco et al., 2022). It has also been applied to classification tasks, such as emotion recognition (Sachidananda et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2024).

Other approaches mix text and speech in the input to help models learn both modalities. For example, Fang et al. (2022) align the output distributions of speech and mixed text-speech inputs, while Nguyen et al. (2024) and Peng et al. (2024) mix speech and text sequences for next-word prediction and question-answering tasks.

In this work, we leverage the previous success of contrastive learning on speech models and apply it to SpeechLLMs. We show how contrastive learning can be applied successfully in this new scenario and combined with other losses. In contrast to other works, we experiment with using optimal transport for the contrastive loss function and apply the loss to several hidden layers of the SpeechLLM.

3 Methods

We propose contrastive learning as a task-independent pretraining method to align speech and text representations, leveraging abundantly available ASR data. We compare with two ASR-based pretraining baselines: traditional ASR pretraining and next-word prediction with mixed text-speech spans, which we also introduce as a pretraining approach in this paper.

Notation. Let $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times N}$ represent a text sequence with N tokens, where each token is embedded into a H -dimensional space. The speech sequence is embedded into M vectors, with $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times M}$. Note that usually $M > N$.

3.1 Contrastive Training

Contrastive training brings representations of matched speech-text pairs closer whilst pushing representations of mismatched pairs apart.

Harnessing both matched and mismatched pairs is often a very efficient way of using a dataset and

allows one to leverage abundantly available ASR data.

In this paper, we employ the InfoNCE loss (van den Oord et al., 2019) similar to other works (Manco et al., 2022). InfoNCE loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}} = -\frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{i \in B} \log \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\text{sim}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)}{\tau}\right)}{\sum_{j \in B} \exp\left(\frac{\text{sim}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_j)}{\tau}\right)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes a similarity measure, \mathbf{s}_i and \mathbf{t}_i denote speech and text embeddings respectively for the i -th example in the batch, and τ is the temperature parameter controlling the sharpness of the similarity scores. Summing over B in the denominator includes the aligned speech-text pair $(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)$, as well as negative (contrastive) pairs. We choose to use all contrastive pairs within a mini-batch to allow for an efficient implementation.

The contrastive loss can also be calculated for multiple layers throughout the network and then summed. Fig. 1 illustrates this setup. We find that this gives the best results (see Section 5).

We adopt two different similarity measures:

Cosine Similarity. One way to compute $\text{sim}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)$ is to use cosine similarity. Since the length of the speech sequences, M , is typically much larger than the length of the text sequences, N , we cannot directly compute cosine similarity on the entire sequence. Instead, we average the embeddings over the sequence length to obtain a single embedding for each (Ye et al., 2022). We denote this pretraining strategy with *contr-cos*.

Wasserstein Distance. To avoid aggregating the sequences, we can leverage the Wasserstein (or Optimal Transport) distance between two sequences (Peyré and Cuturi, 2019; Le et al., 2023). In our case, the Wasserstein distance involves finding the optimal way to "transport" mass from one normalized set of embeddings to another, enabling us to compute the alignment between text and speech embeddings of differing lengths.

More precisely, the optimal transport distance is calculated as follows: a mass of $1/N$ is placed at each text embedding location (points in a H -dimensional space) and we want to move this total mass of 1 to the M speech embedding locations, $1/M$ to each. There is a cost C_{ij} associated with moving a unit of mass from location t_i to location s_j for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. The cost is given by the L^p distance in the embed-

ding space. This can be written as:

$$d_{\text{Wasser}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = \min_{\mathbf{Z}} \{ \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) \odot \mathbf{Z} \}, \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{1}^N = \mathbf{1}^N / N, \mathbf{Z}^T\mathbf{1}^M = \mathbf{1}^M / M, \mathbf{Z} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{Z} is the transportation matrix with row and column sums $\frac{1}{N}$ and $\frac{1}{M}$ respectively, $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})$ is the cost matrix for sequences \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{t} , $\mathbf{1}^N$ denotes a vector of 1’s, and \odot denotes the entrywise dot product. For a more detailed description, we refer the reader to [Le et al. \(2023\)](#).

Using the Wasserstein distance in the loss is expensive, so we resort to an upper-bound approximation that can be efficiently computed using the Sinkhorn algorithm ([Sinkhorn and Knopp, 1967](#)).

We use the negative distance as the similarity measure for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}$ and denote this pretraining strategy with *contr-wasser*.

3.2 Other Pretraining Approaches

We evaluate our contrastive pretraining by comparing it to traditional ASR pretraining and a mixed text-speech NWP pretraining approach.

ASR Pretraining. We use task-specific finetuning on the ASR task, i.e. following the ASR-instruction prompt, for pretraining ([Tang et al., 2024](#); [Wang et al., 2024b](#)) and use it as a baseline.

Mixed Next Word Prediction. Inspired by [Nguyen et al. \(2024\)](#), who add mixed NWP to their finetuning data mix for downstream tasks,

we propose mixed text and speech NWP as a pretraining strategy.

We mix text and speech embeddings across randomly selected spans in the sequence, maintaining coherence with word boundaries. A sample sequence might look as follows: $t_0^0, t_1^0, s_2^1, s_3^1, s_4^2, s_5^2, s_6^2, t_7^3$, where superscripts represent word boundaries, and subscripts represent subwords within the text or speech embedding. Since speech embeddings typically differ in length from text embeddings, we compute the NWP loss exclusively on text tokens. Details on how we select the speech and text spans are provided in [Appendix A](#).

We also experiment with using these mixed sequences for contrastive learning: instead of aligning speech and text, we align mixed text-speech representations with text representations.

4 Experiments

Our experiments follow a two-stage training strategy: first, we perform text-speech alignment pre-

training using ASR data to adapt the model to handle speech. In the second stage, we finetune the model jointly on a mix of task-specific data. This approach leverages abundant ASR data to reduce reliance on large task-specific datasets, enabling effective adaptation even in low-resource settings.

4.1 Model Architecture

Our SpeechLLM architecture consists of three core components: a speech encoder, a text-based LLM, and a projector bridging the two. We select HuBERT ([Hsu et al., 2021](#)) as our speech encoder due to its ability to process audio inputs longer than 30 seconds, which is crucial for SQA tasks. Recent research ([Hassid et al., 2024](#); [Nguyen et al., 2024](#)) has demonstrated strong performance with HuBERT variants. We specifically utilize the facebook/hubert-large-1s960-ft variant. We use Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct ([Dubey et al., 2024](#)) as our LLM. As a projector, we choose Q-Former ([Li et al., 2023](#)), a window-level query Transformer, which already proved successful for other SpeechLLMs ([Tang et al., 2024](#); [Held et al., 2024](#)).

For contrastive learning, we compare speech and text embeddings without the use of system prompts. This creates a positional mismatch between contrastive pretraining and finetuning. To address this potential overfitting problem, we experiment with varying the absolute starting position in the positional embeddings through random sampling for each example during pretraining.

4.2 Training Parameters

In both pretraining and task-specific finetuning, we keep the LLM and speech encoder frozen, adjusting only the speech projector, which has 42.5 million parameters. Training is conducted on four NVIDIA A100-SXM4-40GB GPUs. ASR pretraining takes approximately 9h, contrastive pretraining with cosine similarity over all layers takes around 5h. The task-specific finetuning takes around 30h with 100% of the data. Detailed training parameters and model specifics are listed in [Appendix B](#).

4.3 Data

Pretraining. For pretraining, we use the English portion of the widely-used MustC-v1 ([Di Gangi et al., 2019](#)) data (approximately 400 hours) to demonstrate effective performance with limited data. MustC includes TED talks with diverse speakers, accents, and topics, along with manually curated transcriptions. Additionally, we test pretrain-

ing on a larger dataset, adding the M-version of Gigaspeech (Chen et al., 2021) to our pretraining data, which includes 1,000 hours of speech from audiobooks, podcasts, and YouTube videos.

Finetuning. We jointly finetune and evaluate our contrastive pretraining method on three diverse tasks covering a range of speech-text model abilities: Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR), Speech Translation (ST), and Speech Question Answering (SQA). For ASR and ST, we use the MustC-v1 dataset for training and testing. As before, English transcriptions serve as the ASR data, and we use language pairs en-de, en-fr, en-it, and en-es for ST. For question answering, we use Spoken-SQuAD (Lee et al., 2018), an English dataset based on Wikipedia, derived from the Stanford Question Answering Dataset (Rajpurkar et al., 2016, SQuAD).

Paralinguistic Feature Analysis. We also analyse whether contrastive pretraining harms a model’s ability to capture paralinguistic features, such as speaking pace or noise. We use the *mls-eng-speaker-descriptions* dataset (Pratap et al., 2020; Lacombe et al., 2024; Lyth and King, 2024), which involves reasoning about speaking rate, gender, background noise, and other features.

More information about the train and test sets can be found in Appendix C and details on prompts in Appendix D.

4.4 Evaluation

We report the following evaluation metrics: WER (Word Error Rate, using `jiwer`) for ASR, sacreBLEU (Post, 2018) and COMET₂₂^{DA} (Rei et al., 2020) for ST, and exact match accuracy (EM) and F1 score for SQA. Scores for ST are averaged over the language pairs. Moreover, we calculate the average across the three tasks using WER, COMET, and F1 scores. Since these scores have different ranges, care has to be taken when averaging. We therefore normalize the scores using lower (lb) and upper (ub) bounds as detailed in Section 4.5. We then calculate the normalized average as follows:

$$\text{Norm. Avg.} = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} \frac{\text{score}(t) - \text{lb}(t)}{\text{ub}(t) - \text{lb}(t)}, \quad (3)$$

where T is the set of tasks, and $\text{score}(t)$ is the model’s score on task t .

4.5 Baselines

We compare our approach against four baselines: (1) Firstly, we take three SOTA models, each spe-

cialized on one of the three tasks to set a goal for our models. Specifically, we use Whisper (Radford et al., 2022) for ASR, Seamless (Communication et al., 2023) for ST, and You et al. (2022) for SQA¹. These SOTA results also serve as an upper bound for normalizing the respective scores when calculating the overall (normalized average) performance scores. (2) As the second baseline, we use the cascaded HuBERT-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct model, which also serves as the lower bound for calculating overall performance scores.

Our primary objective is to assess the impact of contrastive pretraining. To do so, we need a controlled environment, where we keep the model architecture, data, and training setup as consistent as possible. To this end, we include two additional baselines using our training setup: (3) No pretraining and (4) Standard ASR pretraining.

5 Results

The goal of our experiments is to find the best setup for using contrastive learning for SpeechLLMs. We investigate various contrastive pretraining losses and where to apply them, combinations with other pretraining losses, and the impact of additional data. We then compare our best-performing model to recent SpeechLLMs. Finally, we investigate how text-speech alignment affects the detection of paralinguistic features.

5.1 Contrastive Pretraining

Contrastive Loss on the Embedding Layer. We apply contrastive pretraining to the embedding layer using either Wasserstein loss (*contr-wasser-emb*) or cosine similarity loss (*contr-cos-emb*). Models are then jointly finetuned on three downstream tasks using 10% of the data to simulate low-resource settings (Table 1).

Our contrastive pretraining models consistently outperform the cascaded Hubert+Llama and no-pretraining baselines across all metrics. In ST and SQA tasks, they also surpass standard ASR pretraining, by over 5% in SQA. However, ASR-pretrained models remain better for ASR tasks. Interestingly, while contrastive models exhibit lower test-set contrastive loss on the embedding layer, the losses for no-pretraining and ASR-pretraining are similar despite a large performance gap.

Contrastive Loss on Different Layers. Keeping with the low-resource setting, we investigate

¹More recently, Manakul et al. (2024) report SQA results for Gemini-1.5-Pro, which underperforms You et al. (2022).

FT Data	Model	ASR		ST		SQA		Contr loss on test		Norm. avg.↑
		WER↓*	BLEU↑	COMET↑*	EM↑	F1↑*	cos.	wasser.		
N/A	Specialized	6.54	30.99	80.02	64.19	77.10	N/A	N/A	100	
N/A	HuBERT + Llama	18.38	19.85	73.92	36.15	54.76	N/A	N/A	0	
100%	no pretrain	12.09	28.84	79.94	62.39	74.44	1.37	1.26	79.96	
10%	no pretrain	23.78	19.87	69.72	31.35	41.86	1.38	1.36	-57.40	
	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.82	75.70	49.48	63.36	1.37	1.30	39.93	
	contr-cos-emb	13.98	25.47	76.32	55.10	68.72	0.97	0.72	46.34	
	contr-wasser-emb	15.99	26.10	77.09	55.04	68.17	1.08	0.62	44.02	
	contr-cos-all	13.06	27.19	78.29	60.48	73.90	1.08	0.91	67.39	
	contr-wasser-all	12.92	29.07	80.52	64.04	77.26	1.07	0.64	85.02	

Table 1: Results of models with no pretraining, ASR pretraining, and contrastive pretraining using cosine similarity (*contr-cos*) or Wasserstein distance (*contr-wasser*) on embedding (-*emb*) or all (-*all*) layers, followed by fine-tuning on a 10% subset of task-specific data. The specialized baselines are Whisper (Radford et al., 2022) for ASR, Seamless (Communication et al., 2023) for ST, and You et al. (2022) for SQA. Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).




Figure 2: Analysis of a contrastive pretraining performed on different layers. We report the normalized average over tasks as in Eq. (3) for contrastive pretraining and finetuning on 10% of task-specific data. The last point on the x-axis refers to contrastive pretraining using the loss sum over all layers.

calculating the contrastive loss at different LLM layers. Figure 2 demonstrates that applying contrastive loss to deeper layers significantly increases downstream performance, with improvements of up to 20% for cosine similarity loss and 40% for Wasserstein loss.

Further analysis reveals that deeper layers benefit ST and SQA the most, while improvements for ASR are less consistent. We analyse both contrastive loss and task performance across layers in detail in Appendix E. To address positional mismatches between pretraining and finetuning (detailed in Section 4.1), we experiment with position shifts during pretraining. However, these do not consistently improve performance.

Contrastive Loss on All Layers. Although Fig. 2 shows a clear advantage to applying the contrastive loss to deeper layers, the best layer to use is

not consistent. Therefore, we also explore using a summed loss over all (multiples of 5) layers in Table 1. The methods *contr-cos-all* and *contr-wasser-all* achieve normalized task averages of 67.39 and 85.02, respectively, significantly outperforming the ASR-pretraining baseline and the *contr-emb* models. *Contr-wasser-all*, despite using only 10% of the finetuning data, even matches the performance of the specialized models on two out of three tasks and surpasses the no pretraining model finetuned on 100% of the task-specific data. This highlights the suitability of contrastive pretraining for scenarios with limited task-specific data.

5.2 Mixed-Text-Speech Input

The previous section shows that contrastive learning is an effective pretraining strategy, outperforming ASR pretraining. We now analyse, whether

Model	ASR	ST	SQA	Norm.
	WER \downarrow *	COMET \uparrow *	F1 \uparrow *	avg. \uparrow
no pretrain	23.78	69.72	41.86	-57.40
ASR pretrain	12.21	75.70	63.36	39.93
contr-cos-emb	13.98	76.32	68.72	46.34
+ mixed	14.26	76.61	68.40	46.61
contr-wasser-emb	15.99	77.09	68.17	44.02
+ mixed	14.70	75.05	61.48	26.53
contr-cos-all	13.06	78.29	73.90	67.39
+ mixed	17.63	73.83	55.12	2.14
mixed-nwp	15.27	76.05	67.68	39.67

Table 2: Comparison of models pretrained on mixed speech-text input and finetuned on 10% of the task-specific data.

aligning mixed speech-text and text sequences can further enhance performance.

Mixed Contrastive Pretraining. We adapt our approach to use mixed speech-text sequences (*contr-*-*+mixed*). Using the *contr-cos* loss on the embedding layer, our model matches the performance of standard contrastive pretraining, outperforming both no pretraining and ASR pretraining (Table 2). However, with the *contr-wasser* loss results degrade significantly. Consequently, we continue with *contr-cos-all+mixed* to test the loss across all layers. This model also significantly underperforms its non-mixed counterpart. Further ablations of contrastive pretraining with mixed speech-text inputs do not yield additional improvements (detailed results, including BLEU and EM scores, are provided in Appendix F).

Mixed NWP. We also propose using a next-word prediction (NWP) objective with mixed speech-text inputs (*mixed-nwp*) for pretraining, inspired by Nguyen et al. (2024). While this approach surpasses the no pretraining and ASR pretraining baselines (Table 2, last row), it remains inferior to contrastive pretraining.

5.3 Combining losses

We now explore the potential of combining the previous pretraining objectives.

Contr. + ASR Loss. We find that combining the ASR pretraining loss with the contrastive losses on the embedding layer leads to improved performance for ASR and SQA, as seen in Table 3. Similarly, this enhances the performance of the *contr-*-all* models, closing the gap between our contrastive pretrained models and ASR pretraining on ASR.

Contr. + mixed-NWP Loss. In contrast, combining the mixed-NWP loss with the contrastive

Model	ASR	ST	SQA	Norm.
	WER \downarrow *	COMET \uparrow *	F1 \uparrow *	avg. \uparrow
ASR pretrain	12.21	75.70	63.36	39.93
contr-cos-emb	13.98	76.32	68.72	46.34
+ asr loss	13.18	76.89	69.23	52.47
contr-wasser-emb	15.99	77.09	68.17	44.02
+ asr loss	13.19	77.4	70.79	57.54
contr-cos-all	13.06	78.29	73.90	67.39
+ asr loss	11.68	78.94	76.40	78.58
contr-wasser-all	12.92	80.52	77.26	85.02
+ asr loss	11.23	80.26	77.57	88.80

Table 3: Comparison of models pretrained on a combination of contrastive and ASR losses and then finetuned on a 10% subset of task-specific data.

losses does not yield further improvements. Detailed results are provided in Appendix G.

5.4 Additional pretraining data

In the previous sections, we use Must-C ASR data for pretraining. Given the abundance of ASR data, we expand our pretraining dataset by incorporating GigaSpeech (Chen et al., 2021), effectively tripling the amount of data. The results demonstrate the significant impact of larger-scale pretraining.

Low-resource setting. As before, we use the 10% finetuning subset to simulate the low-resource scenario. In preliminary experiments with lightweight contrastive pretraining on the embedding layer (Appendix H), we find that increasing the pretraining data leads to much larger improvements in the normalized average with *contr-cos* loss (+33) than with *contr-wasser* loss (+6.10). Therefore, we use *contr-cos* for subsequent experiments, where we perform contrastive learning on all layers with and without ASR loss, as these settings yielded the best results in the previous sections. As shown in Table 4, both models *contr-cos-all+giga* and *contr-cos-all+asr+giga* achieve an overall improvement of more than 20 points compared to the same models trained with less pretraining data, reaching 97.43 and 102.3 points respectively. Remarkably, despite being finetuned on only 10% of the task-specific data, these models surpass both specialized models, the Seamless model (Communication et al., 2023) for ST and the You et al. (2022) model for SQA. Moreover, they outperform the ASR-pretraining baseline even on the ASR task.

Benchmarking our best variants. We also evaluate our best-performing models in a higher resource setting. We finetune *contr-cos-all+giga*

FT Data	Model	ASR		ST		SQA		Contr loss on test		Norm.
		WER \downarrow *	BLEU \uparrow	COMET \uparrow *	EM \uparrow	F1 \uparrow *	cos.	wasser.	avg. \uparrow	
N/A	Specialized	6.54	30.99	80.02	64.1	77.1	N/A	N/A	100	
N/A	BLSP-lslm-7b	44.51	28.70	78.68	5.60	21.82	N/A	N/A	-96.72	
N/A	Qwen2-Audio-7b	12.03	21.57	74.81	27.79	46.75	N/A	N/A	10.79	
10%	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.82	75.70	49.48	63.36	1.37	1.30	39.93	
	+ giga	12.16	27.44	78.38	62.23	73.40	1.37	1.31	69.72	
	contr-cos-all	13.06	27.19	78.29	60.48	73.90	1.08	0.91	67.39	
	+ giga	10.94	29.95	81.21	65.58	79.32	1.06	0.71	97.43	
	contr-cos-all + asr	11.68	27.61	78.94	64.16	76.40	1.08	0.91	78.58	
	+ giga	11.12	29.90	81.29	72.43	82.63	0.98	0.65	102.30	
100%	ASR pretrain	10.28	30.31	80.98	70.06	81.01	1.37	1.22	100.53	
	+ giga	11.48	30.46	81.03	72.41	82.73	1.37	1.23	100.02	
	contr-cos-all	12.56	30.69	81.48	71.93	82.70	1.25	1.02	99.36	
	+ giga	9.31	31.36	81.98	75.28	84.74	1.10	0.83	114.29	
	contr-cos-all + asr	10.04	30.82	81.56	72.57	82.72	1.19	1.03	106.94	
	+ giga	10.03	31.54	81.99	76.25	85.01	1.10	0.79	112.76	

Table 4: Comparison of pretraining only on Must-C data or the combination with the bigger Giga dataset (+giga). We compare our models against BLSP (Wang et al., 2024a) and the Qwen2-Audio-7B-Instruct model (Chu et al., 2024). Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).

and *contr-cos-all+asr+giga* on 100% of the task-specific data. As expected, this leads to even stronger results. But while the ASR loss provides significant improvements in the low-resource settings, when finetuning with 100% of the available data, the contrastive loss alone performs on par with the combined approach. We hypothesize that the ASR loss is more sensitive to the out-of-domain Giga pretraining data than the contrastive loss, leading to no improvement on the ASR task.

We compare these models against `blsp_lsm_7b` (Wang et al., 2024a), which has a similar architecture to ours in that it trains only the projector while keeping other components frozen, and `Qwen2-Audio-7b-Instruct` (Chu et al., 2024), a strong baseline SpeechLLM. Notably, BLSP is finetuned on Must-C translation data, whereas for all other tasks, BLSP and Qwen2-Audio results reflect zero-shot performance. Across all tasks, our model outperforms both of these SpeechLLMs.

5.5 Impact of text-speech alignment on capturing paralinguistic features

Speech data is much richer than a sequence of words, and the pretrained speech encoder (HuBERT) might capture additional paralinguistic features. By aligning the richer speech embeddings more closely with text embeddings, the pretraining methods we explore could potentially train the

projector to discard these additional features. To assess whether this occurs, we finetune our models on paralinguistic classification tasks before and after pretraining. In addition, we use the speech encoder with a linear classification head as a baseline.

The results demonstrate that models with contrastive and ASR-based pretraining perform comparably to the plain HuBERT model in predicting paralinguistic annotations, indicating that alignment-focused pretraining does not significantly affect the retention of paralinguistic information. Detailed accuracy results are presented in Table 12 in Appendix I. In addition, Table 13 shows that incorporating these features as auxiliary finetuning tasks does not notably alter model performance.

6 Conclusion

We introduce a contrastive learning-based pretraining strategy for SpeechLLMs, aligning text and speech embeddings in a parameter-efficient manner. This approach establishes an effective task-agnostic foundation for SpeechLLMs and demonstrates state-of-the-art performance across multiple downstream tasks, even when little finetuning data is available.

Importantly, this pretraining method preserves the model’s ability to understand paralinguistic information, offering a promising path forward for advancing SpeechLLMs.

7 Limitations

While our work provides valuable insights into pre-training of LLMs, it has some limitations that offer opportunities for future research:

More Expensive Training Scenarios: Our study focuses on a lightweight and flexible approach, keeping the LLM and speech encoder frozen while fine-tuning only the projector. Although this minimizes computational costs, future research could explore scenarios where the LLM and encoder or adapter layers are also fine-tuned, potentially unlocking additional capabilities.

Limited Incorporation of Meta-Speaker data: We analyze whether contrastively pretrained models, designed to align speech and text, retain their ability to capture meta-speech information such as speaker characteristics or noise. While we find that these models do not lose this capacity, extending this analysis to generation tasks where such meta-speech features influence the output would provide a deeper understanding of their impact.

Low-resource Scenarios: Our study simulates low-resource settings by using subsets of the fine-tuning data, finding that models perform well even with only 10% of the task-specific data. However, extending this analysis to truly low-resource languages or tasks would offer richer insights into the model’s adaptability and performance under resource constraints.

Analysis of Contrastive Examples: In this work, we use all contrastive pairs within a mini-batch to maintain an efficient implementation. However, an alternative approach could involve selecting contrastive examples that are more challenging by ensuring they are closer to the positive examples, as demonstrated by [Ye et al. \(2022\)](#).

Potential Risks Enabling Language Models to understand speech makes them more easily and widely accessible. However, this also lowers the barrier for the potential misuse of these models. In addition, SpeechLLMs can reproduce biases seen in the training data. We try to minimize this risk by not training the LLM, so any safeguard measures trained into the LLM also apply to the SpeechLLM. However, the model could still be affected by adversarial attacks.

Acknowledgments

This work has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101135798,

project Meetween (My Personal AI Mediator for Virtual MEETtings BetWEEN People). We gratefully acknowledge Poland’s high-performance Infrastructure PLGrid ACC Cyfronet AGH for providing computer facilities.

References

- Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2020. [wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 12449–12460. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Umberto Cappellazzo, Enrico Fini, Muqiao Yang, Daniele Falavigna, Alessio Brutti, and Bhiksha Raj. 2024. [Continual contrastive spoken language understanding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 3727–3741, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guoguo Chen, Shuzhou Chai, Guanbo Wang, Jiayu Du, Wei-Qiang Zhang, Chao Weng, Dan Su, Daniel Povey, Jan Trmal, Junbo Zhang, Mingjie Jin, Sanjeev Khudanpur, Shinji Watanabe, Shuaijiang Zhao, Wei Zou, Xiangang Li, Xuchen Yao, Yongqing Wang, Yujun Wang, Zhao You, and Zhiyong Yan. 2021. [Gigaspeech: An evolving, multi-domain asr corpus with 10,000 hours of transcribed audio](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2021*.
- Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu, Qian Yang, Haojie Wei, Xipin Wei, Zhifang Guo, Yichong Leng, Yuanjun Lv, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. [Qwen2-audio technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10759.
- Shun-Po Chuang, Tzu-Wei Sung, Alexander H. Liu, and Hung-yi Lee. 2020. [Worse WER, but better BLEU? leveraging word embedding as intermediate in multi-task end-to-end speech translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5998–6003, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seamless Communication, Loïc Barrault, Yu-An Chung, Mariano Cora Meglioli, David Dale, Ning Dong, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Hady Elsahar, Hongyu Gong, Kevin Heffernan, John Hoffman, Christopher Klaiber, Pengwei Li, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Alice Rakotoarison, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Guillaume Wenzek, Ethan Ye, Bapi Akula, Peng-Jen Chen, Naji El Hachem, Brian Ellis, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Justin Haaheim, Prangthip Hansanti, Russ Howes, Bernie Huang, Min-Jae Hwang, Hirofumi Inaguma, Somya Jain, Elahe Kalbassi, Amanda Kallet, Ilya Kulikov, Janice Lam, Daniel Li, Xutai Ma, Ruslan Mavlyutov, Benjamin Pelloquin, Mohamed Ramadan, Abinesh Ramakrishnan, Anna Sun, Kevin Tran, Tuan Tran, Igor Tufanov, Vish Vogeti, Carleigh Wood, Yilin Yang, Bokai Yu, Pierre Andrews, Can

Balioglu, Marta R. Costa-jussà, Onur Celebi, Maha Elbayad, Cynthia Gao, Francisco Guzmán, Justine Kao, Ann Lee, Alexandre Mourachko, Juan Pino, Sravya Popuri, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, Paden Tomasello, Changhan Wang, Jeff Wang, and Skyler Wang. 2023. [SeamlessM4T: Massively multilingual & multimodal machine translation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.11596.

Mattia A. Di Gangi, Roldano Cattoni, Luisa Bentivogli, Matteo Negri, and Marco Turchi. 2019. [MuST-C: a Multilingual Speech Translation Corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2012–2017, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Alonsoius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Milon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmert van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Celebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Pranjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan,

Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Sweeney, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaç, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong,

- Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhota, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabsa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Her-moso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Mun-ish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pa-van Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dolla, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratan-chandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Mah-eswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lind-say, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agar-wal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiao-jian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. **The llama 3 herd of models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Qingkai Fang, Shoutao Guo, Yan Zhou, Zhengrui Ma, Shaolei Zhang, and Yang Feng. 2024. Llama-omni: Seamless speech interaction with large language mod-els. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.06666*.
- Qingkai Fang, Rong Ye, Lei Li, Yang Feng, and Mingxuan Wang. 2022. **STEMM: Self-learning with speech-text manifold mixup for speech translation**. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7050–7062, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuan Gong, Hongyin Luo, Alexander H. Liu, Leonid Karlinsky, and James R. Glass. 2024. **Listen, think, and understand**. In *The Twelfth International Confer-ence on Learning Representations*.
- Katharina Hämmerl, Jindřich Libovický, and Alexan-der Fraser. 2024. **Understanding cross-lingual Alignment—A survey**. In *Findings of the Associa-tion for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 10922–10943, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Hassid, Tal Remez, Tu Anh Nguyen, Itai Gat, Alexis Conneau, Felix Kreuk, Jade Copet, Alexandre Defossez, Gabriel Synnaeve, Emmanuel Dupoux, Roy Schwartz, and Yossi Adi. 2024. **Textually pretrained speech language models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.13009.
- William Held, Ella Li, Michael Ryan, Weiyan Shi, Yanzhe Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2024. **Distilling an end-to-end voice assistant without instruction train-ing data**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.02678.
- Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Tsai, Kushal Lakhota, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed. 2021. **Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hid-den units**. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, PP:1–1.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. **LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models**. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ludwig Kurzinger, Dominik Winkelbauer, Lujun Li, Tobias Watzel, and Gerhard Rigoll. 2020. **Ctc-segmentation of large corpora for german end-to-end speech recognition**. In *International Conference on Speech and Computer*.
- Yochai Lacombe, Vaibhav Srivastav, and Sanchit Gandhi. 2024. Data-speech. <https://github.com/ylacombe/dataspeech>.
- Phuong-Hang Le, Hongyu Gong, Changhan Wang, Juan Pino, Benjamin Lecouteux, and Didier Schwab. 2023. **Pre-training for speech translation: Ctc meets optimal transport**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2301.11716.
- Chia-Hsuan Lee, Szu-Lin Wu, Chi-Liang Liu, and Hung-yi Lee. 2018. Spoken squad: A study of mit-igating the impact of speech recognition errors on listening comprehension. *Proc. Interspeech 2018*, pages 3459–3463.

- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. 2023. [Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Dan Lyth and Simon King. 2024. [Natural language guidance of high-fidelity text-to-speech with synthetic annotations](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.01912.
- Potsawee Manakul, Guangzhi Sun, Warit Sirichotedumrong, Kasima Tharnpipitchai, and Kunat Pipatanakul. 2024. [Enhancing low-resource language and instruction following capabilities of audio language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.10999.
- Iliaria Manco, Emmanouil Benetos, Elio Quinton, and György Fazekas. 2022. Contrastive audio-language learning for music. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR)*.
- Tu Anh Nguyen, Benjamin Muller, Bokai Yu, Marta R. Costa-jussa, Maha Elbayad, Sravya Popuri, Christophe Ropers, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Robin Algayres, Ruslan Mavlyutov, Itai Gat, Mary Williamson, Gabriel Synnaeve, Juan Pino, Benoit Sagot, and Emmanuel Dupoux. 2024. [Spirit lm: Interleaved spoken and written language model](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.05755.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rameev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. 2024. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Siqi Ouyang, Rong Ye, and Lei Li. 2023. [WACO: Word-aligned contrastive learning for speech translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3891–3907, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yifan Peng, Krishna C. Puvvada, Zhehuai Chen, Piotr Zelasko, He Huang, Kunal Dhawan, Ke Hu, Shinji

- Watanabe, Jagadeesh Balam, and Boris Ginsburg. 2024. [Voicetextblender: Augmenting large language models with speech capabilities via single-stage joint speech-text supervised fine-tuning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.17485.
- Gabriel Peyré and Marco Cuturi. 2019. [Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science](#). *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11:355–206.
- Matt Post. 2018. [A call for clarity in reporting BLEU scores](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 186–191, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vineel Pratap, Qiantong Xu, Anuroop Sriram, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Ronan Collobert. 2020. [MIs: A large-scale multilingual dataset for speech research](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2012.03411.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2022. [Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.04356.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1606.05250.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vin Sachidananda, Shao-Yen Tseng, Erik Marchi, Sachin Kajarekar, and Panayiotis Georgiou. 2022. [Calm: Contrastive aligned audio-language multirate and multimodal representations](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2202.03587.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2023. [Hugging-GPT: Solving AI tasks with chatGPT and its friends in hugging face](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Richard Sinkhorn and Paul Knopp. 1967. [Concerning nonnegative matrices and doubly stochastic matrices](#). *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 21:343–348.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Ahmed Murtadha, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. 2023. [Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2104.09864.
- Changli Tang, Wenyi Yu, Guangzhi Sun, Xianzhao Chen, Tian Tan, Wei Li, Lu Lu, Zejun MA, and Chao Zhang. 2024. [SALMONN: Towards generic hearing abilities for large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ioannis Tsiamas, Gerard Gállego, José Fonollosa, and Marta Costa-jussà. 2024. [Pushing the limits of zero-shot end-to-end speech translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 14245–14267, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Merve Ünlü Menevşe, Yusufcan Manav, Ebru Arisoy, and Arzucan Özgür. 2024. [Dealing with data scarcity in spoken question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 4449–4455, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2019. [Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1807.03748.
- Francesco Verdini, Pierfrancesco Melucci, Stefano Perna, Francesco Cariaggi, Marco Gaido, Sara Papi, Szymon Mazurek, Marek Kasztelnik, Luisa Bentivogli, Sébastien Bratières, Paolo Meriardo, and Simone Scardapane. 2024. [How to connect speech foundation models and large language models? what matters and what does not](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.17044.
- Chen Wang, Minpeng Liao, Zhongqiang Huang, Jintian Lu, Junhong Wu, Yuchen Liu, Chengqing Zong, and Jiajun Zhang. 2024a. [Blsp: Bootstrapping language-speech pre-training via behavior alignment of continuation writing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.00916.
- Xiong Wang, Yangze Li, Chaoyou Fu, Yunhang Shen, Lei Xie, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Long Ma. 2024b. [Freeze-omni: A smart and low latency speech-to-speech dialogue model with frozen llm](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.00774.
- Jian Wu, Yashesh Gaur, Zhuo Chen, Long Zhou, Yimeng Zhu, Tianrui Wang, Jinyu Li, Shujie Liu, Bo Ren, Linqun Liu, and Yu Wu. 2023. [On decoder-only architecture for speech-to-text and large language model integration](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.03917.
- Chen Xu, Rong Ye, Qianqian Dong, Chengqi Zhao, Tom Ko, Mingxuan Wang, Tong Xiao, and Jingbo Zhu. 2023. [Recent advances in direct speech-to-text translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI '23*.
- Rong Ye, Mingxuan Wang, and Lei Li. 2022. [Cross-modal contrastive learning for speech translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5099–5113, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, Fenglin Liu, Shen Ge, Xian Wu, and Yuexian Zou. 2022. [End-to-end spoken conversational question answering: Task, dataset and](#)

model. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1219–1232, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jianing Zhou, Ziheng Zeng, Hongyu Gong, and Suma Bhat. 2024. [CLASP: Cross-modal alignment using pre-trained unimodal models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11518–11531, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yi Zhu, Zexun Wang, Hang Liu, Peiyang Wang, Mingchao Feng, Meng Chen, and Xiaodong He. 2022. [Cross-modal transfer learning via multi-grained alignment for end-to-end spoken language understanding](#). In *Interspeech 2022*, pages 1131–1135.

A Mixed Next Word Prediction

For alignment between text and speech, we utilize the forced alignment algorithm described by Kurzinger et al. (2020), which leverages wav2vec 2.0 (Baevski et al., 2020).

We then randomly select spans from a sequence and assign them either text or speech embeddings, ensuring that sequences begin with text or speech equally often. Because speech embeddings are generally longer than text embeddings for the same content, we select spans of 2 to 5 words for speech and 4 to 10 words for text, inspired by Nguyen et al. (2024) who use a similar distribution. However, unlike Nguyen et al. (2024), we do not introduce modality-specific tokens, as their framework uses these tokens to predict speech output — a capability we do not require.

In the alignment process for speech and text, the aligner generates timestamps for each word. If there is a pause between words, this pause is typically excluded from the alignment. However, to prevent the model from encountering unexpected silence or noise before a word during fine-tuning, we include any preceding silence or noise in the audio segment before the word.

B Hyperparameters and Model Details

All hyperparameters, model and training parameters are listed in Table 5.

Our SpeechLLM architecture consists of three core components: a speech encoder, a text-based LLM, and a projector bridging the two. We select facebook/hubert-large-ls960-ft (Hsu et al., 2021) as our speech encoder, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024) as our LLM and Q-Former (Li et al., 2023) as the projector.

HuBERT has an apache-2.0 license, the llama model has a llama3.1 license. We adhere to both license requirements, when using the models for research.

For contrastive learning, we compare speech and text embeddings without the use of system prompts. This creates a positional mismatch between contrastive pretraining and fine-tuning. When using ROPE embeddings (Su et al., 2023), this impacts contrastive pretraining at layers beyond the embedding layer. To address this potential overfitting problem, we experiment with varying the absolute starting position in RoPE by randomly sampling it during pretraining for each example.

training parameters	Q-Former Num Query Token	4
	Q-Former Num Hidden Layers	4
	Q-Former Num Attention Heads	13
	Q-Former Seconds per Window	1/3
	per device batch size	10
	gradient accumulation steps	2
	num GPUs	4
	learning rate	1e-4
	warmup ratio	0.03
	optimizer	adamw_torch
	learning rate scheduler type	cosine
	model max length	2048
	gradient clipping	1
pretraining specific	num epochs	5
	contrastive τ cos + wasser	0.1
	contrastive τ nwp	0.5
	sinkhorn loss p	2
	sinkhorn loss blur	0.5
finetuning	num epochs	2

Table 5: Hyperparameters for the trainings, which are conducted on four NVIDIA A100-SXM4-40GB GPUs, mostly following Verdini et al. (2024)

C Data

We fine-tune and evaluate our contrastive pretraining method on three tasks: Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR), Speech Translation (ST), and Speech Question Answering (SQA).

For ASR and ST, we use the MustC v1 dataset (Di Gangi et al., 2019). We use the en-de portion as English ASR data, and we use language pairs en-de, en-fr, en-it, and en-es for ST. We exclude examples longer than 45 seconds for training and use the *tst-common* and *tst-he* test sets for evaluation.

For question answering, we use Spoken-SQuAD (Lee et al., 2018), which is based on Stanford Question Answering Dataset (Rajpurkar et al., 2016, SQuAD). To allow for higher batch sizes during training, we exclude examples exceeding 150 seconds.

For pretraining, we use the MustC ASR data (approximately 400 hours), but also experiment with adding the M-version of Gigaspeech (Chen et al., 2021), which includes 1,000 hours of speech from audiobooks, podcasts, and YouTube.

Contrastive pretraining aligns text and speech, which could potentially lead to the loss of paralinguistic features in the embeddings. Therefore, we also train and test our models on *mls-eng-speaker-descriptions* (Pratap et al., 2020; Lacombe et al., 2024; Lyth and King, 2024). We use the *mls-eng-speaker-descriptions* train and test set. The available training data is quite large, so we subsample it to make training feasible. Since the test set is pre-

defined, we sample the training data such that the test data size is 5% of the data. We let the model predict the following features: Speaking rate, gender, noise, reverberation, speech monotony, SDR noise, and PESQ speech quality.

Details on prompts can be found in Appendix D.

D Prompts

In this sections we report the prompt we used for the different tasks during inference. During training, for each example, the prompt is sampled from a list of multiple prompts. Here, we report the prompts used for testing, for the training prompts, we refer the reader to our codebase.

Task	Prompt
ASR	Can you transcribe this audio?
SQA	Listen to the audio and answer this question:

Table 6: ASR and SQA prompts used for inference. We finetuned on a range of different prompts, please refer to our codebase for these.

Prompt
en Can you translate this audio from <sl> into <tl>?
fr Pouvez-vous traduire cet audio de <sl> en <tl>?
it Puoi tradurre questo audio da <sl> in <tl>?
es ¿Puedes traducir este audio de <sl> al <tl>?
de Können Sie dieses Audio von <sl> zu <tl> übersetzen?


Table 7: ST prompts used for inference. We finetuned on a range of different prompts, please refer to our codebase for these. For <sl> the source language is added, for <tl> the target language is added.

Prompt
Evaluate the audio file and provide details in the following order: speaking rate, gender, noise level, reverberation, speech monotony, SDR noise, and PESQ speech quality. Format the response as: <speaking_rate>, <gender>, <noise>, <reverberation>, <speech_monotony>, <sdr_noise>, <pesq_speech_quality>.


Table 8: Prompts for the MLS speaker description dataset used for inference. We finetuned on a range of different prompts, please refer to our codebase for these.

E Contrastive Loss over Multiple Layers

This section analyses contrastive pretraining over multiple layers. Fig. 3 shows the contrastive loss in the pretraining phase. The later the layer, the lower the contrastive loss, with an exception of the embedding layer. For cosine contrastive training, these




(a) Loss during contr-cos-pretraining




(b) Loss during contr-wasser-pretraining

Figure 3: Contrastive loss during pretraining performed on multiple layers for models trained with contrastive average loss (left) and contrastive wasserstein loss (right).


differences are significantly bigger than for wasserstein contrastive training. Fig. 4 shows the finetuning performance on 10% on task-specific data after pretraining on different layers for the tasks ASR, ST and SQA. Here the losses for pretraining seem to correlated mostly with the performance of the model after finetuning: Models perform better after contrastive pretraining at later layers. However, for ASR, this trend is not so noticeable.




(a) ASR: contr-cos pretrained




(b) ASR: contr-wasser pretrained




(c) ST: contr-cos pretrained



(d) ST: contr-wasser pretrained



(e) SQA: contr-cos pretrained



(f) SQA: contr-wasser pretrained

Figure 4: Analysis of a contrastive pretraining performed on multiple layers for different tasks. The performance is reported after finetuning on 10% of the task specific data. The last point on the x-axis refers to contrastive pretraining using the loss sum over all layers.

FT Data	Model	ASR	ST		SQA		Norm.
		WER*	BLEU	COMET*	EM	F1*	avg.
10%	no pretrain	23.78	19.869	69.722	31.345	41.859	-57.401
	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.822	75.702	49.478	63.358	39.934
10%	contr-cos-emb + mixed	14.26	25.96	76.605	51.968	68.395	46.614
	contr-wasser-emb + mixed	14.7	24.145	75.045	48.012	61.48	26.531
	mixed-contr-cos-last	19.02	23.023	73.92	46.285	58.557	3.859
	mixed-contr-wasser-last	16.03	23.09	74.14	43.835	58.201	12.947
	contr-cos-all + mixed	17.63	22.901	73.828	42.149	55.117	2.136
10%	mixed-nwp with punctuation	15.76	24.229	75.085	47.651	61.36	23.586
	mixed-nwp without punctuation	15.27	25.224	76.05	53.574	67.678	39.667
	mixed nwp without punctuation + giga	14.91	26.071	77.172	56.988	70.935	51.673

Table 9: Ablation studies for models with mixed speech and text input. Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).

F Mixed Speech-Text Inputs

We experiment with mixed speech-text input as described in Section 3.2, and report results in Table 9.

We test contrastive pretraining with mixed speech-text input (contr-*+mixed) and find that aligning the representation on the embedding layer works best (however, contrastive learning without mixed input still works better). We also experiment with mixed speech-text next word prediction (nwp). Here, removing punctuation seems to help the model understand the NWP task better. Finally, we also combine the NWP task with calculating the contrastive loss and summing the two losses, which also does not seem to help the model to align text and speech embeddings.

G Combined Losses

This section explores the combination of different losses. We combine 1) ASR and contrastive loss and 2) NWP and contrastive loss. The result can be found in Table 10. While 1) leads to significant improvements, 2) does not seem to work together.

H Adding more pretraining data

We analyze the effect of contrastive pretraining with more data, adding the Giga dataset to our pretraining data. Results for finetuning on 10% of the data can be found in Table 11.

I Impact of text-speech alignment of capturing paralinguistic features.

Speech data is much richer than a sequence of words, and the pretrained speech encoder (Hu-

BERT) might capture additional paralinguistic features. However, contrastive and ASR pretraining could potentially lead to discarding these paralinguistic features, when pulling speech embeddings closer to text embeddings. To assess this, we finetune our models on paralinguistic classification tasks before and after pretraining. We also compare our models against a HuBERT + linear head baseline, to assess which features the encoder captures in the first place.

To this end, we use the *mls-eng-speaker-descriptions* train and test set (Pratap et al., 2020; Lacombe et al., 2024; Lyth and King, 2024). This dataset contains classification tasks for rate, gender, background noise, and other features (more details in Appendix C).

The results demonstrate that models with contrastive and ASR-based pretraining perform comparably to the plain HuBERT model in predicting paralinguistic annotations, indicating that alignment-focused pretraining does not significantly affect the retention of paralinguistic information. Table 12 shows the accuracies for the different classification tasks for the different models.

In a second step, we assess whether adding paralinguistic features during training (again using the *mls-dataset*), influences the models performance on downstream tasks. We finetune on a 10% subset of finetuning data to simulate a low-resource scenario. We find that including the paralinguistic data does not lead to significantly different results, which is not surprising given that the tasks that we test do not rely on paralinguistic information. Results can be found in Table 13.

FT Data	Model	ASR		ST		SQA		Norm.
		WER↓*	BLEU↑	COMET↑*	EM↑	F1↑*	avg.↑	
10%	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.822	75.704	49.478	63.358	39.934	
10%	contr-cos-emb	13.98	25.474	76.322	55.1	68.719	46.339	
	+ asr loss	13.18	25.773	76.892	56.124	69.229	52.467	
	+ mixed + nwp	14.68	25.282	76.175	48.855	63.922	36.406	
	contr-wasser-emb	15.99	26.096	77.085	55.04	68.166	44.024	
	+ asr loss	13.19	26.552	77.4	59.016	70.79	57.544	
	+ mixed + nwp	16	23.98	74.593	45	59.113	16.868	
10%	contr-cos-all	13.06	27.188	78.285	60.482	73.9	67.388	
	+ asr loss	11.68	27.608	78.94	64.157	76.396	78.577	
	+ mixed + nwp	22.08	23.16	74.195	48.474	62.126	2.073	
	contr-wasser-all	12.92	29.072	80.522	64.036	77.258	85.017	
	+ asr loss	17.63	29.064	80.26	66.727	77.565	70.784	
	+ mixed + nwp	15.72	24.13	74.993	51.205	64.254	27.515	

Table 10: Comparison of models with combinations of alignment losses. Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).

FT Data	Model	ASR		ST		SQA		Contr loss on test		Norm.
		WER↓*	BLEU↑	COMET↑*	EM↑	F1↑*	cos.	wasser.	avg.↑	
N/A	Specialized	6.54	30.99	80.02	64.1	77.1	N/A	N/A	100	
N/A	BLSP-lslm-7b	44.51	28.70	78.68	5.60	21.82	N/A	N/A	-96.72	
N/A	Qwen2-Audio-7b	12.03	21.57	74.81	27.79	46.75	N/A	N/A	10.79	
10%	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.82	75.70	49.48	63.36	1.37	1.30	39.93	
	+ giga	12.16	27.44	78.38	62.23	73.40	1.37	1.31	69.72	
	contr-cos-emb	13.98	25.47	76.32	55.10	68.72	0.97	0.72	46.34	
	+ giga	14.24	28.76	80.18	63.94	76.60	0.97	0.47	78.45	
	contr-wasser-emb	15.99	26.10	77.09	55.04	68.17	1.08	0.62	44.02	
	+ giga	16.36	26.47	77.59	58.05	71.09	1.06	0.58	50.12	
	contr-cos-all	13.06	27.19	78.29	60.48	73.90	1.08	0.91	67.39	
	+ giga	10.94	29.95	81.21	65.58	79.32	1.06	0.71	97.43	
	contr-cos-all + asr	11.68	27.61	78.94	64.16	76.40	1.08	0.91	78.58	
	+ giga	11.12	29.90	81.29	72.43	82.63	0.98	0.65	102.30	

Table 11: Comparison of pretraining only on Must-C data or the combination with the bigger Giga dataset (+giga). We compare our models against BLSP (Wang et al., 2024a) and the Qwen2-Audio-7B-Instruct model (Chu et al., 2024). Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).

Model	Speaking Rate	Gender	Noise	Reverberation	Speech Monotony	SDR Noise	PESQ Speech Quality	Avg.
random	14.29	50.00	14.29	20.00	20.00	16.67	16.67	22.25
HuBERT + Class. Head	57.38	64.69	27.89	28.12	39.35	42.85	27.22	41.07
no pretrain	57.07	64.26	<u>27.62</u>	27.38	37.60	33.86	<u>23.72</u>	38.79
ASR pretrain	57.23	<u>57.95</u>	28.87	29.05	36.35	<u>30.19</u>	<u>21.86</u>	<u>37.36</u>
contr-cos-all	56.46	62.17	28.60	29.27	<u>35.39</u>	34.17	24.12	38.60
contr-wasser-all	56.12	62.30	28.26	27.57	37.70	34.25	24.30	38.64
contr-cos-all + asr	<u>55.00</u>	61.29	28.73	<u>26.24</u>	<u>35.29</u>	<u>30.94</u>	24.86	<u>37.48</u>
contr-wasser-all + asr	56.86	<u>59.62</u>	28.31	29.21	36.64	40.25	26.37	39.61

Table 12: Accuracy in % results for different meta-speech categories on the mls-eng-speaker-descriptions dataset. Bold results are the best or not significantly worse than the best, underlined results are the weakest or not significantly worse than the weakest result using pairwise t-test ($p < 0.01$).

FT Data	Model	ASR	ST		SQA		Norm.
		WER \downarrow *	BLEU \uparrow	COMET \uparrow *	EM \uparrow	F1 \uparrow *	avg. \uparrow
10%	ASR pretrain	12.21	24.822	75.704	49.478	63.358	39.934
	+ meta	12.11	24.91	75.702	49.472	63.31	40.154
10%	contr-cos-all	13.06	27.188	78.285	60.482	73.9	67.388
	+ meta	13.53	27.099	78.213	61.024	74.745	66.932
	contr-wasser-all	12.92	29.072	80.522	64.036	77.258	85.017
	+ meta	11.97	29.283	80.475	66.124	78.25	88.915
10%	contr-cos-all + asr	11.68	27.608	78.94	64.157	76.396	78.577
	+ meta	12.01	27.817	78.917	63.112	75.981	76.903
	contr-wasser-all + asr	11.23	29.064	80.26	66.727	77.565	88.802
	+ meta	11.16	29.342	80.547	65.402	78.26	91.604

Table 13: Comparison of models with and without pretraining, and with and without meta-speaker data in the finetuning process (on 10%). Metrics with * contribute to the normalized average as in Eq. (3).