

CONTINUAL LEARNING WITH EMBEDDING LAYER SURGERY AND TASK-WISE BEAM SEARCH USING WHISPER

Chin Yuen Kwok¹, Jia Qi Yip^{1,2} and Eng Siong Chng¹

¹ College of Computing and Data Science, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

² Alibaba Group, Singapore

kwok0062@e.ntu.edu.sg, jiaqi006@e.ntu.edu.sg, aseschn@ntu.edu.sg

ABSTRACT

Current Multilingual ASR models only support a fraction of the world’s languages. Continual Learning (CL) aims to tackle this problem by adding new languages to pre-trained models while avoiding the loss of performance on existing languages, also known as Catastrophic Forgetting (CF). However, existing CL methods overlook the adaptation of the token embedding lookup table at the decoder, despite its significant contribution to CF. We propose Embedding Layer Surgery where separate copies of the token embeddings are created for each new languages, and one of the copies is selected to replace the old languages embeddings when transcribing the corresponding new language. Unfortunately, this approach means LID errors also cause incorrect ASR embedding selection. Our Task-wise Beam Search allows self-correction for such mistakes. By adapting Whisper to 10 hours of data for each of 10 unseen languages from Common Voice, results show that our method reduces the Average WER (AWER) of pre-trained languages from 14.2% to 11.9% compared with Experience Replay, without compromising the AWER of the unseen languages.

Index Terms— speech emotion recognition (SER), automatic speech recognition (ASR), instruction-tuning, continual learning, catastrophic forgetting

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent advancements in training speech models involve utilizing millions of hours of multilingual ASR and translation labeled data, leading to the development of models supporting Massively Multilingual ASR (MMASR) which can transcribe over 50 languages [1]. Additionally, newer models such as Whisper [2] and MMS [3] are language-agnostic [4], where a single model is able to perform both language identification (LID) and ASR seamlessly so that users do not need to manually specify the language they are transcribing. Nevertheless, even the most diverse MMASR models are not able to support the vast number of languages spoken globally [5], and the additional requirements for language-agnostic MMASR




Fig. 1. Overview of our Embedding Layer Surgery. (A) Token embeddings are fed to the MMASR model decoder. (B) A separate lookup table is used to generate token embeddings for each language. (C) The lookup table is further split into two parts. One for special tokens and one for vocabulary tokens.

increases the difficulty of adding support for new languages after the initial pre-training.

To expand ASR support to additional languages, a naive solution is to adapt MMASR using only the new datasets containing the new languages. However, this causes catastrophic forgetting (CF) [6], where a model has degraded ASR performance on previously learned languages after adapting to new ones. Therefore, this necessitates Continual Learning (CL), a class of adaptation methods that aims to mitigate CF. There are numerous CL methods for model adaptation which includes Prototype-based [7], Regularization-based [8–10], Replay-based [11, 12], Optimization-based [13] and Dynamic-architecture-based [14] methods.

Specifically in the audio domain, prototype-based [15], replay-based [16], and regularization-based [17] methods are examined. In addition, model averaging [17, 18] and layer-wise regularization [19] approaches have also shown promise in CL for audio. However, limited focus has been given to CL for MMASR. While some works has shown success in mitigating CF by incremental fine-tuning [20], training a map-

ping matrix for task-specific weights [21], and performing weight averaging [22], they are not language-agnostic. Another work [23] has provided a comprehensive study of CL baseline methods for MMASR, indicating potential areas for improvement.

Notably, existing MMASR CL approaches overlook adaptation of the token embedding lookup table [24] at the decoder, because they mostly focus on non-language-agnostic MMASR models. However, the lookup table is important in the context of language-agnostic MMASR CL, as it contains the additional language ID token embeddings to perform LID. After adapting the model to new languages, these tokens are highly biased towards identifying any input audio as one of the new languages, causing CF in LID of the pre-trained languages. A second problem is that language-agnostic MMASR heavily relies on the accuracy of LID, as an LID error may cause the model to transcribe in the wrong language.

To address CF in the token embedding lookup table during CL, we propose Embedding Layer Surgery where separate copies of the token embeddings are created for each new language, and one of the copies is selected to replace the old languages embeddings when transcribing the corresponding new language. This allows the embeddings for the existing languages to be maintained, ensuring that they will not be overwritten after adapting to new languages. In addition, task-wise beam search is proposed to address the error propagation from language confusion. Our contributions are three-fold. We show that 1) using language-specific token embeddings can reduce forgetting, 2) a model can remain language-agnostic by using our Embedding Layer Surgery, and 3) LID can be enhanced by task-wise beam search, which in turn improves language-agnostic MMASR performance.

2. PROPOSED METHOD

We use Whisper [2] as the pre-trained MMASR model and adapt it to the ASR and LID datasets of the new languages. LID adaptation is needed as it allows the model to transcribe in a language-agnostic setting [4], where instead of manually prompting Whisper to control the transcribed language, the model can use LID to automatically determine what language it should be transcribing.

To prevent catastrophic forgetting (CF) on previously learnt (old) languages while adapting to new languages, Experience Replay (ER) is used where a subset of the datasets containing the old languages are mixed with the new language adaptation dataset so the model can rehearse on old languages ASR tasks.

Additionally, we propose to further mitigate CF by using a separate text embedding lookup table [24] for each new languages and splitting the lookup table into two parts as shown in the bottom-right part of Figure 1.

Finally, we propose task-wise beam search as shown in Figure 3 to retain a list of candidates of different languages




Fig. 2. Overview of our language-agnostic decoding pipeline. Left: Manual selection of the language-specific token embedding lookup table is required to transcribe in the correct language. Right: A MMASR model first leverage the language-shared special token embedding lookup table as described in Figure 1 to identify the language of the input audio, then automatically select the language-specific vocabulary token embedding lookup table for transcription.

during beam search to enhance the ASR and LID performance in the language-agnostic setting.

2.1. Whisper Model for Language-agnostic MMASR

Whisper [2] is used as the pre-trained MMASR model for adaptation. It supports 75 languages and also supports LID. It uses the Transformer attention-based encoder-decoder architecture and decodes in an auto-regressive manner. We select this model because while [25] shows that Whisper performs similarly with XLS-R [26] in terms of averaging both the seen and unseen languages WER, [23] shows that Whisper surpasses WavLM [27] overall in MMASR CL and [28] shows that Whisper performs better than wav2vec 2.0 models [29] and WavLM [27] for LID. The Whisper decoder is preferred over the Large Language Models (LLM) based decoder [30] for ASR as the latter does not support LID to the best of our knowledge.

2.2. Experience Replay

A naive approach to mitigate CF is to retrain a model from scratch on a combination of all the previously learnt tasks' datasets and the new task's dataset. However, this is computationally expensive and it is not always possible to acquire all

Table 1. Proportion of Whisper’s tokens that appear in the ten hours train set of each new language.

language	rw	eo	kab	lg	mhr
coverage (%)	6.4	7.9	4.5	4.6	2.8
language	ckb	ab	kmr	fy-NL	ia
coverage (%)	0.4	1.4	3.9	5.6	7.9

the previous tasks’ dataset. As such, Experience Replay (ER) methods aim to remind a model of previously learnt tasks by mixing only a small amount of the old tasks’ data [11], instead of all the data, with the new task’s dataset during adaptation. The goal is to minimize:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)\sim D_B}[\ell(y, f_\theta(x))] + \beta * \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)\sim D_{\hat{A}}}[\ell(y, f_\theta(x))] \quad (1)$$

where D_B is the new task B dataset, ℓ is the classification loss, f_θ is the model function parameterized by θ , $D_{\hat{A}}$ is a subset of the old task A dataset and β is a hyper-parameter balancing the trade-off between the terms. Equation 1 can be easily extended to settings with more than 1 old task by adding extra terms for each old task correspondingly.

2.3. Separate Token Embedding

The adaptation of the token embedding lookup table [24] at the decoder is prone to forgetting [31]. This is because Whisper shares its tokens between languages. When the model is adapted to new languages, the token embeddings [32] are also updated with word semantic information of the new language. This may overwrite the old languages semantics and cause forgetting.

Specifically, a token embedding lookup table is a matrix $A \in \mathcal{R}^{E \times U}$ where E is the embedding dimension and U is the number of tokens in the model’s vocabulary. Given that a Transformer decoder takes in the embeddings of the K previously decoded tokens to predict the next token and $V = [v_1, \dots, v_K]$ contains K columns of U -dimension one-hot vector [33] of the decoded tokens. Then the token embeddings input $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{E \times K}$ feeding to the Transformer decoder is:

$$Z = A \times V \quad (2)$$

To mitigate forgetting in the token embeddings, we propose to create a separate copy of the token embeddings for each new language as shown in Figure 1B and keep the original token embeddings for the old languages, such that the new languages embeddings can be adapted without modifying the original ones. The token embeddings for a new language are stored in a separate lookup table $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{E \times J}$ where $J < U$ is the number of tokens used by the new language. The proportion of Whisper’s tokens used by each new language is shown in Table 1




Fig. 3. Overview of our task-wise beam search. During Decoding, the MMASR model first predicts the language ID of the input audio and decode the audio in the top $N = 2$ scoring languages to generate N hypothesis. Finally, the hypothesis with the highest ASR score is selected as the ASR output.

2.4. Language-agnostic Dynamic Architecture

Although using language-specific token embeddings reduces forgetting, it is not language-agnostic. As shown in Figure 1A, the ASR decoder takes in a sequence of token embeddings to predict the next token. Figure 1B shows that a different token embedding lookup table is used for different languages. We further propose to split the lookup table into a language-shared Special Token (ST) part and a language-specific vocabulary part as shown in 1C. This is because the top-left part of Figure 2 shows that normally if a language-specific text embedding layer is used, manual selection of the language-specific lookup table is required before transcription and the MMASR system is not language-agnostic. The right part of the figure shows that if the lookup table is split, the model can first perform LID using the language-shared ST part and then automatically select the language-specific vocabulary part for transcription. As such, the decoding is language-agnostic as the model can infer the language label by itself.

2.5. Task-wise beam search

The language-agnostic ASR performance highly relies on the accuracy of LID [28, 34–36] as wrong LID predictions may lead to transcription in the wrong language. To improve the LID and the language-agnostic ASR performance, we propose task-wise beam search, where we retain a list of candi-

dates of different languages during beam search [37] to improve its diversity [38].

Specifically as shown in Figure 3, an attempt to decode an audio in three languages is shown in decoding paths (DP) 1-3 respectively. First, the model performs LID by generating an LID token. Then DP1 is pruned as the LID token “ZH” gives a low score of 0.1. Only languages DE and EN, which have the top $N = 2$ LID scores are kept and transcribed in DP2 and DP3. Next, the log probabilities of the transcribed tokens are summed to produce an ASR score for each language. Finally, the hypothesis in DP 3 is preferred over DP2 as its ASR score is higher.

In addition, we empirically find that Whisper may sometimes output blank hypothesis or output hypothesis in a different language than the one specified in the model’s prompt. To increase the stability of our decoding method, it is important that we disable the task-wise beam search for a specific audio if we find that a decoding path has fewer than M_{len} words, or has more than $M_{overlap}$ overlapped words with other paths.

3. EXPERIMENT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Dataset and Model Details

We implement our CL methods based on the popular SpeechBrain [39] toolkit and CL-MASR [23].

Following previous works [21, 23], we evaluate our method on a subset of the widely used large-scale CommonVoice dataset [40]. We follow CL-MASR [23] to extract the data subsets. They consists of ten languages unseen by Whisper and ten seen languages. Each language contains 10 hours of data for training, 1 for validation, and 1 for testing. For Chinese, traditional Chinese characters are converted to simplified Chinese. We adapt small and large-v2 variants of Whisper in two CL settings: 1) Adapt to one unseen language and test forgetting on one seen language, 2) Adapt to ten unseen languages sequentially and test forgetting on ten seen languages, and a maximum of six days are required utilizing an NVIDIA A40 GPU.

For each unseen language, we adapt the 2 variants of Whisper for 2 epochs with a train batch size of 4. Only the weights of the Whisper decoder is updated and the encoder is frozen [23]. For ER, the replay data size is one hour for each new language. We use AdamW [41] as the optimizer and a variant¹ of the ReduceLRonPlateau² learning rate (LR) scheduler. Validation is done at an interval of 1/32 epoch. We sweep through the hyper-parameters to tune them for all methods.

We refer to our methods as 1) ER-E-B, which is ER with separate token embeddings and task-wise beam search, and 2)

¹https://speechbrain.readthedocs.io/en/latest/_modules/speechbrain/nnet/schedulers.html#NewBobScheduler

²https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/generated/torch.optim.lr_scheduler.ReduceLRonPlateau.html

ER-E, which is ER with separate token embeddings only. We set $N = 2$, $M_{len} = 5$ and $M_{overlap} = 3$.

3.2. Results and Discussion




Fig. 4. WER of adapting whisper-large-v2 sequentially to 10 new languages of varying difficulties and test forgetting on 10 pretrained languages in the language-agnostic setting. “Unadapted” means the unadapted model.

We present the results for both whisper-small and whisper-large-v2 models. Table 2 shows the result of adapting Esperanto and Interlingua for whisper-small. Full fine-tuning (FT) can improve WER for the target languages, but incurs CF. In contrast, all Continual Learning (CL) baseline methods significantly reduce CF, reducing AWER by 27.2-66.9% relatively compared with FT. Among these baseline methods, ER performs better in overall performance, though EWC and MAS has better results for English and Esperanto for language-aware results. However, AVG performs less well relative to ER, as task-specific layers are not used as in [22].

Results show that our methods outperform all CL baselines and improve upon FT result by 61.7 – 69.6%. Forgetting is further mitigated compared with all CL baselines while our method can maintain similar WER for the newly adapted languages. Furthermore, our ER-E-B method has almost no forgetting in English and German even in the more difficult language-agnostic setting.

Lastly, we adapt whisper-large-v2 sequentially to the 10 new languages of varying difficulties and plot the results in Figure 4. Our method ER-E-B outperforms the best CL baseline ER and reduces the AWER of pretrained languages from 14.2% to 11.9% without compromising the AWER of new languages. We do not compare with dynamic-architecture-based methods as they are not language-agnostic.

3.3. Ablation study

We further perform ablation studies for Task-wise Beam Search and Separate Token Embedding. For the experiments, we adapt whisper-small to a new language Esperanto (eo) and test forgetting on a pretrained language English (en). Table 3 shows that for Task-wise Beam Search, it consistently improves performance for ER and ER-E methods in the language-agnostic setting by up to a relative 8.3% AWER.

Table 2. WER of adapting Whisper-small to new languages Esperanto (eo) and Interlingua (ia), and test forgetting on pretrained language English (en) and German (de) respectively. Language-agnostic [4] results are obtained without manually specifying the language to transcribe, and vice versa for language-aware results.

Method	Language-aware WER (%)					Language-agnostic WER (%)				
	en	de	eo	ia	avg	en	de	eo	ia	avg
Unadapted	14.57	14.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	14.57	14.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
FT	68.99	64.83	18.04	12.31	41.0 _{-00.0%}	90.55	88.40	18.04	12.31	52.3 _{-00.0%}
<i>CL baselines</i>										
AVG [22]	16.20	17.94	38.96	16.53	22.4 _{-45.4%}	18.37	26.55	40.00	16.53	25.4 _{-51.4%}
LwF [10]	16.04	16.81	22.20	14.82	17.5 _{-57.3%}	74.96	40.07	22.18	14.82	38.1 _{-27.2%}
EWC [8]	15.62	23.78	19.21	13.31	18.0 _{-56.1%}	39.87	41.12	19.21	13.34	28.4 _{-45.7%}
MAS [9]	15.64	18.29	20.14	12.42	16.7 _{-59.3%}	88.91	21.97	20.14	12.46	35.9 _{-31.4%}
A-GEM [13]	18.15	18.10	18.74	12.42	16.9 _{-58.9%}	19.09	18.68	18.91	12.68	17.3 _{-66.9%}
DER [12]	17.13	16.31	19.54	13.66	16.7 _{-59.3%}	56.95	23.59	20.25	13.66	28.6 _{-45.3%}
ER [11]	15.64	16.65	20.34	12.94	16.4 _{-60.0%}	18.26	17.20	20.45	13.14	17.3 _{-66.9%}
<i>our methods</i>										
ER-E	14.48	14.34	20.32	13.58	15.7 _{-61.7%}	17.97	14.98	20.49	13.97	16.9 _{-67.7%}
ER-E-B	14.48	14.34	20.32	13.58	15.7 _{-61.7%}	14.83	14.69	20.34	13.55	15.9 _{-69.6%}

Table 3. Ablation study of Task-wise Beam Search.

Method	WER (%)		
	en	eo	avg
ER	18.26	20.45	19.4
+ Task-wise Beam Search	16.34	20.32	18.3
ER-E	17.97	20.49	19.2
+ Task-wise Beam Search	14.83	20.34	17.6

We hypothesize that the above improvement is caused by the decrease in LID errors. To verify this, we therefore plot the LID confusion matrix for the above experiments. As shown in Figure 5, most LID errors in the language-agnostic setting originate from incorrectly identifying English audios as Esperanto. Task-wise beam search reduces such errors by more than 40% for ER and 60% for ER-E.

Additionally, Table 4 shows that adding Separate Token Embedding to ER reduces AWER from 16.4 to 15.7. Most of the reduction comes from reducing WER in English and German. We hypothesize that sharing sub-word token embeddings between languages causes forgetting in the languages, and using a language-specific embedding layer can mitigate it. As an alternative, we question whether only updating the sub-word token embeddings that appeared in the new language dataset and freezing the other embeddings can also reduce forgetting. We call this method ER-E-part. The results show that ER-E part can also reduce forgetting to some degree. However, we emphasize that ER-E-part only works when the token set of the new language dataset does not cover too much of the pre-trained model token set, while ER-E does

Table 4. Ablation study of Separate Token Embedding.

Method	WER (%)				
	en	de	eo	ia	avg
ER-E	14.48	14.34	20.32	13.58	15.7
ER-E-part	14.96	14.56	19.88	14.12	15.9
ER	15.64	16.65	20.34	12.94	16.4

not have such limitation.




Fig. 5. LID Confusion matrix on Esperanto (eo) and English (en) using Whisper-small adapted with ER (left) and ER-E (right). The results after adding task-wise beam search are shown in parenthesis.

4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we present ER-E-B, a CL method that outperforms ER methods in mitigating CF and ablation study has shown the effectiveness of our proposed language-agnostic dynamic architecture, task-wise beam search and separate token embedding.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] V. Pratap, A. Sriram, P. Tomasello, A. Hannun, V. Liptchinsky, G. Synnaeve, and R. Collobert, “Massively multilingual asr: 50 languages, 1 model, 1 billion parameters,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03001*, 2020.
- [2] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, T. Xu, G. Brockman, C. McLeavey, and I. Sutskever, “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 28 492–28 518.
- [3] V. Pratap, A. Tjandra, B. Shi, P. Tomasello, A. Babu, S. Kundu, A. Elkahky, Z. Ni, A. Vyas, M. Fazel-Zarandi *et al.*, “Scaling speech technology to 1,000+ languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13516*, 2023.
- [4] A. Datta, B. Ramabhadran, J. Emond, A. Kannan, and B. Roark, “Language-agnostic multilingual modeling,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 8239–8243.
- [5] K. Katzner and K. Miller, *The languages of the world*. Routledge, 2002.
- [6] Y. Zhai, S. Tong, X. Li, M. Cai, Q. Qu, Y. J. Lee, and Y. Ma, “Investigating the catastrophic forgetting in multimodal large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10313*, 2023.
- [7] P. Janson, W. Zhang, R. Aljundi, and M. Elhoseiny, “A simple baseline that questions the use of pretrained-models in continual learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04428*, 2022.
- [8] J. Kirkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quan, T. Ramlho, A. Grabska-Barwinska *et al.*, “Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks,” *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 114, no. 13, pp. 3521–3526, 2017.
- [9] R. Aljundi, F. Babiloni, M. Elhoseiny, M. Rohrbach, and T. Tuytelaars, “Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 139–154.
- [10] Z. Li and D. Hoiem, “Learning without forgetting,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2935–2947, 2017.
- [11] D. Brignac, N. Lobo, and A. Mahalanobis, “Improving replay sample selection and storage for less forgetting in continual learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 3540–3549.
- [12] P. Buzzega, M. Boschini, A. Porrello, D. Abati, and S. Calderara, “Dark experience for general continual learning: a strong, simple baseline,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 15 920–15 930, 2020.
- [13] A. Chaudhry, M. Ranzato, M. Rohrbach, and M. Elhoseiny, “Efficient lifelong learning with a-gem,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00420*, 2018.
- [14] A. Mallya, D. Davis, and S. Lazebnik, “Piggyback: Adapting a single network to multiple tasks by learning to mask weights,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 67–82.
- [15] U. Michieli, P. P. Parada, and M. Ozay, “Online continual learning in keyword spotting for low-resource devices via pooling high-order temporal statistics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12660*, 2023.
- [16] U. Cappellazzo, D. Falavigna, and A. Brutti, “An investigation of the combination of rehearsal and knowledge distillation in continual learning for spoken language understanding,” in *Proceedings of INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 735–739.
- [17] S. Vander Eeckt *et al.*, “Rehearsal-free online continual learning for automatic speech recognition,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2306, 2023.
- [18] Z. Yang, D. Ng, X. Li, C. Zhang, R. Jiang, W. Xi, Y. Ma, C. Ni, J. Zhao, B. Ma *et al.*, “Dual-memory multimodal learning for continual spoken keyword spotting with confidence selection and diversity enhancement,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023.
- [19] Z. Wang, F. Hou, and R. Wang, “Clrl-tuning: A novel continual learning approach for automatic speech recognition.”
- [20] B. Li, R. Pang, Y. Zhang, T. N. Sainath, T. Strohman, P. Haghani, Y. Zhu, B. Farris, N. Gaur, and M. Prasad, “Massively multilingual asr: A lifelong learning solution,” in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6397–6401.
- [21] Z. Yu, Y. Zhang, K. Qian, C. Wan, Y. Fu, Y. Zhang, and Y. C. Lin, “Master-asr: achieving multilingual scalability and low-resource adaptation in asr with modular learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 40 475–40 487.
- [22] S. V. Eeckt *et al.*, “Weight averaging: A simple yet effective method to overcome catastrophic forgetting in automatic speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.15282*, 2022.

- [23] L. Della Libera, P. Mousavi, S. Zaiem, C. Subakan, and M. Ravanelli, “Cl-masr: A continual learning benchmark for multilingual asr,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16931*, 2023.
- [24] W. R. Huang, T. N. Sainath, C. Peyser, S. Kumar, D. Rybach, and T. Strohman, “Lookup-table recurrent language models for long tail speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.04552*, 2021.
- [25] A. Rouditchenko, S. Khurana, S. Thomas, R. Feris, L. Karlinsky, H. Kuehne, D. Harwath, B. Kingsbury, and J. Glass, “Comparison of multilingual self-supervised and weakly-supervised speech pre-training for adaptation to unseen languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12606*, 2023.
- [26] A. Conneau, A. Baevski, R. Collobert, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning for speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13979*, 2020.
- [27] S. Chen, C. Wang, Z. Chen, Y. Wu, S. Liu, Z. Chen, J. Li, N. Kanda, T. Yoshioka, X. Xiao *et al.*, “Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1505–1518, 2022.
- [28] K. Praveen, B. Radhakrishnan, K. Sabu, A. Pandey, and M. Shaik, “Language identification networks for multilingual everyday recordings,” 2023.
- [29] A. Babu, C. Wang, A. Tjandra, K. Lakhotia, Q. Xu, N. Goyal, K. Singh, P. von Platen, Y. Saraf, J. Pino *et al.*, “Xls-r: Self-supervised cross-lingual speech representation learning at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09296*, 2021.
- [30] C. Tang, W. Yu, G. Sun, X. Chen, T. Tan, W. Li, L. Lu, Z. Ma, and C. Zhang, “Salmonn: Towards generic hearing abilities for large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13289*, 2023.
- [31] G. Arora, A. Rahimi, and T. Baldwin, “Does an lstm forget more than a cnn? an empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in nlp,” in *Proceedings of the The 17th Annual Workshop of the Australasian Language Technology Association*, 2019, pp. 77–86.
- [32] K. Ethayarajh, “How contextual are contextualized word representations? comparing the geometry of bert, elmo, and gpt-2 embeddings,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00512*, 2019.
- [33] D. Karani, “Introduction to word embedding and word2vec,” *Towards Data Science*, vol. 1, 2018.
- [34] J. Mishra, J. N. Patil, A. Chowdhury, and S. M. Prasanna, “End to end spoken language diarization with wav2vec embeddings.”
- [35] R. Li, Z. Xie, H. Xu, Y. Peng, H. Liu, H. Huang, and E. S. Chng, “Self-supervised learning representation based accent recognition with persistent accent memory.”
- [36] B. Vachhani, D. Singh, and R. Lawyer, “Multi-resolution approach to identification of spoken languages and to improve overall language diarization system using whisper model,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2023, 2023, pp. 1993–1997.
- [37] C. Y. Kwok, J. Q. Yip, and E. S. Chng, “Improved alignment for score combination of rnn-t and ctc decoder for online decoding,” in *Text, Speech, and Dialogue: 27th International Conference, TSD 2024, Brno, Czech Republic, September 9–13, 2024, Proceedings, Part II*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2024, p. 70–80. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-70566-3_7
- [38] A. K. Vijayakumar, M. Cogswell, R. R. Selvaraju, Q. Sun, S. Lee, D. Crandall, and D. Batra, “Diverse beam search: Decoding diverse solutions from neural sequence models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02424*, 2016.
- [39] M. Ravanelli, T. Parcollet, P. Plantinga, A. Rouhe, S. Cornell, L. Lugosch, C. Subakan, N. Dawalatabad, A. Heba, J. Zhong *et al.*, “Speechbrain: A general-purpose speech toolkit,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04624*, 2021.
- [40] R. Ardila, M. Branson, K. Davis, M. Henretty, M. Kohler, J. Meyer, R. Morais, L. Saunders, F. M. Tyers, and G. Weber, “Common voice: A massively-multilingual speech corpus,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06670*, 2019.
- [41] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Decoupled weight decay regularization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.