

How to Learn a New Language? An Efficient Solution for Self-Supervised Learning Models Unseen Languages Adaption in Low-Resource Scenario

Shih-Heng Wang¹, Zih-Ching Chen¹, Jiatong Shi², Ming-To Chuang¹, Guan-Ting Lin¹, Kuan-Po Huang¹, David Harwath³, Shang-Wen Li⁴, Hung-yi Lee¹

¹National Taiwan University, Taiwan ²Carnegie Mellon University, US
³The University of Texas at Austin, US ⁴FAIR, US

Abstract

The utilization of speech Self-Supervised Learning (SSL) models achieves impressive performance on Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR). However, in low-resource language ASR, they encounter the domain mismatch problem between pre-trained and low-resource languages. Typical solutions like fine-tuning the SSL model suffer from high computation costs while using frozen SSL models as feature extractors comes with poor performance. To handle these issues, we extend a conventional efficient fine-tuning scheme based on the adapter. We add an extra intermediate adaptation to warm up the adapter and downstream model initialization. Remarkably, we update only 1-5% of the total model parameters to achieve the adaptation. Experimental results on the ML-SUPERB dataset show that our solution outperforms conventional efficient fine-tuning. It achieves up to a 28% relative improvement in the Character/Phoneme error rate when adapting to unseen languages.

Index Terms: speech recognition, low resource ASR, adaptation, adapter, self-supervised learning

1. Introduction

Self-Supervised Learning models (SSL models) [1–6] pre-trained with speech-only data have achieved significant improvements for Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) in mainstream languages. [7–13]. However, employing SSL models on low-resource language ASR may encounter the problem of domain mismatch between pre-trained and low-resource languages [14]. Since SSL models are mostly pre-trained with high-resource languages, like English, they may not generalize well on those low-resource languages [15–17].

We aim to solve the mismatch problem when employing SSL models on low-resource language ASR. Typically, there are two applicable approaches: fine-tuning the SSL models with the low-resource language data and employing the SSL models as feature extractors for subsequent downstream models. [15, 18]. Fine-tuning the SSL model with the downstream model leads to better performance but suffers from high computation costs. Furthermore, the amount of target low-resource language data is extremely insufficient for large-scale model training. Therefore, it may lead to sub-optimal transfer performance due to over-parameterization. On the other hand, utilizing frozen SSL models as feature extractors could be a lower-cost option. However, it usually comes with poor performance, especially when the target low-resource language is unseen to the SSL model. Apart from these solutions, Adapters [19–21, 21–27], which are lightweight modules inserted in the pre-trained model, could be a preferable solution since it only fine-tunes limited amount of inserted parameters, achieving a balance between performance and computation




Figure 1: Pipeline of our solution. Before fine-tuning the adapter and downstream model (omitted in the figure) to each target language, we warm up them with Intermediate Adaptation.

cost. However, they could still encounter difficulties in transferring to an unseen language in low-resource scenarios due to domain mismatch.

Some existing works aim to solve the domain mismatch problem. For example, [28] introduces continual pre-training with the adapter. Nevertheless, its need for large-scale labeled data makes it unsuitable for low-resource scenarios. [29] leverages multiple adapters trained on high-source languages to enhance performance on low-resource languages. However, it requires multiple adapters at the same time during training and inference, becoming impractical as the number of languages increases. [30] presents a recipe to efficiently adapt models to a different domain. Nevertheless, they did not explore the cross-language adaptation.

To deal with the domain mismatch problem, we provide an efficient solution. Figure 1 shows the general pipeline of our solution. Our solution utilizes adapters to keep the computation cost low. To facilitate the adaptation, we add an **Intermediate Adaptation (IA)** before fine-tuning the adapter and downstream model on low-resource target languages. IA serves as a bridge between pre-trained languages and unseen target languages. During the IA, we utilize various adaptation algorithms to warm up the adapter and downstream model with high-resource source languages. These high-resource languages are selected to optimize the model’s transferability to unseen target languages. After IA, we can derive an enhanced initialization and perform Parameter-Efficient Fine-tuning (PEFT) [31] to fine-tune on each target language. Experimental results on the ML-SUPERB dataset [15] demonstrate that our solution outperforms conventional efficient fine-tuning. In the best case, it achieves up to a 28% relative improvement in the Char-

acter/Phoneme error rate when adapting to unseen target languages. Furthermore, we provide analysis for different SSL models and our proposed source language selection methods.

2. Methodology

We focus on effectively adapting SSL models to each unseen target language in low-resource scenarios. As illustrated in Figure 1, before fine-tuning on each target language, we add an extra **Intermediate Adaptation (IA)** step. IA warms up the adapter and downstream model with source languages to facilitate adaptation to each unseen target language. After IA, we obtain an enhanced adapter and downstream model initialization (the green module in Figure 1). With this initialization, we apply PEFT to fine-tune the adapter and the downstream model on each target language (the red, orange, and purple adapter in Figure 1). It is important to note that the SSL model is frozen all the time, making our solution low-cost.

Here, we would like to give a general formulation of IA. Given model initialization $\theta = \theta_s \cup \theta_a \cup \theta_d$ (including frozen SSL model θ_s , randomly initialized adapter θ_a and downstream model θ_d) and source languages $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_M\}$ (\mathcal{S} is a set with M languages), the objective of the IA is to find an enhanced initialization $\hat{\theta}_a \cup \hat{\theta}_d$ (abbreviated into $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ for better readability, $\hat{\cdot}$ means the parameter is warmed up). In other words, IA can be formulated as

$$\hat{\theta}_{a+d} = \text{IA}(\theta, \mathcal{S}), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ is the initialization for performing PEFT on each target language in $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$ (\mathcal{T} is a set with N languages). The concrete form of $\text{IA}(\cdot)$ will be provided in the Section 2.2. To obtain $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ with the best adaptation result on \mathcal{T} , there are two problems to address: (1) What kinds of **source languages** \mathcal{S} (see Section 2.1) and (2) **adaptation algorithms** (see Section 2.2) can best facilitate the adaptation to unseen target languages \mathcal{T} ?

2.1. Source Language Selection

To identify source languages beneficial for adaptation to unseen target languages \mathcal{T} , we use the linguistic knowledge based on a linguistic tree [32]. As illustrated in Figure 2, we select source languages (“Luxembourgish”, “Ndebele”) linguistically close to target languages (“English”, “Swedish”) ¹, as they might share some acoustic traits [1]. In other words, we assume that warming up θ_{a+d} on languages similar to \mathcal{T} to get $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ may facilitate the final adaptation result on \mathcal{T} .

The detailed implementation of selecting source languages \mathcal{S} is explained here. Given target languages \mathcal{T} , we traverse the linguistic tree, exclude languages in \mathcal{T} , and select the top M most linguistically similar languages as \mathcal{S} . We define the linguistic-similarity function $\text{Sim}(\cdot)$ to \mathcal{T} using Lowest Common Ancestor (LCA):

$$\text{Sim}(l, \mathcal{T}) = \sum_{j=1}^N D(\text{LCA}(l, t_j)), \quad (2)$$

where l is the language in the linguistic tree, and D computes the depth of a node in the tree. A higher $\text{Sim}(l, \mathcal{T})$ value implies that the language l is linguistically closer to \mathcal{T} in the

¹We use well-known languages as examples for better readability. In low-resource language cases, we can still employ the same method.




Figure 2: Our source language selection process with the linguistic tree. Based on the topology of the example linguistic tree, we pick “Luxembourgish” and “Ndebele” instead of “Manx Gaelic” as source languages for IA because they are linguistically closer to our target languages “English” and “Swedish”.

tree. For example, in Figure 2, we pick the blue (“Luxembourgish”) and green (“Ndebele”) ones instead of the gray one (“Manx Gaelic”) because their depths of LCA (Germanic) to target languages are deeper than that of the gray one (Indo European).

2.2. Adaptation Algorithm

Appropriate selection of an adaptation algorithm in IA also has a huge impact on the final adaptation result. The adaptation algorithm finds $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ based on the θ and \mathcal{S} (see Eq. (1)). To find the adaptation algorithm with the best adaptation result, we explore two prominent algorithms:

Multitask Learning (MTL): Multitask Learning (MTL) seeks to optimize the initialization θ across all source languages \mathcal{S} simultaneously to get $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$. In other words, following the IA general form (see Eq. (1)), the optimization objective of MTL can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{a+d} = \text{IA}(\theta, \mathcal{S}) = \underset{\theta_a \cup \theta_d}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^M L(\theta, s_i), \quad (3)$$

where L denotes the ASR loss on each source language.

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML): MAML [33] is a commonly adopted algorithm in few-shot adaptation scenarios. Unlike MTL, MAML adopts a bi-level optimization process, which includes the inner and outer loop. Following the IA general form (see Eq. (1)), the optimization objective of MAML can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{a+d} = \text{IA}(\theta, \mathcal{S}) = \text{MAML}(\theta, \mathcal{S}), \quad (4)$$

where the MAML function is defined at Alg. 1. As shown in Alg. 1, in the while loop, we first sample a batch of data B_i from a source language $s_i \sim \mathcal{S}$. Next, we split the B_i into support set B_i^s and query set B_i^q . In the inner loop, we derive the language-specific model θ'_i with B_i^s . Last, we calculate the gradient using θ'_i and B_i^q to update θ . Until the ASR loss L of the outer loop converges, we adopt the θ_{a+d} as $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$.

2.3. Target Languages Fine-tuning

After deriving $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ with IA (see Figure 1), we fine-tune $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ to each target language. Specifically, Figure 1 illustrates that

Algorithm 1 MAML(θ, S)

Require: S : Source languages**Require:** θ : model parameters**Require:** α, β : inner & outer loop learning rate**Require:** f_θ : model function parametrized by θ

```
1: while not done do
2:   Sample a batch of data  $B_i$  from language  $s_i \sim S$ 
3:   Split the batch into support set  $B_i^s$  and query set  $B_i^q$ 
4:   for all  $B_i^s$  do
5:     Compute adapted parameters with gradient descent:
6:      $\theta'_i = \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} L_{B_i^s}(f_\theta)$ 
7:   end for
8:   Update  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \nabla_{\theta} L_{B_i^q}(f_{\theta'_i})$ 
9: end while
```

we fine-tune $\hat{\theta}_{a+d}$ to each target language $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$ to get $\{\theta_{a+d}^{t_1}, \theta_{a+d}^{t_2}, \dots, \theta_{a+d}^{t_N}\}$ (a set of N adapter and downstream model parameters).

3. Experimental Setups

3.1. Dataset

We evaluate our solution using ML-SUPERB [15], a benchmark for multilingual ASR with speech SSL models. ML-SUPERB is supported by 143 languages. For each language, ML-SUPERB provides 10-minute and 1-hour settings. The duration means the training data size employed in fine-tuning for each language. For evaluation metrics, we follow the ML-SUPERB settings to report the Character/Phoneme Error Rate (CER/PER).

3.2. Source and Target Languages

We use the ML-SUPERB dataset to construct the source and target language sets S and T . For target languages T , we build two target language sets: the **Seen Set** and the **Unseen Set**. Each of them has its corresponding source languages S using our proposed method (see Section 2.1). For the amount of training data, we use 10-minute and 1-hour settings for target languages while using the 1-hour setting for source languages.

Table 1 lists the source and target languages of the two sets. The explanation of the two sets are shown below:

Seen Set: This set is derived from MLSUPERB’s Monolingual Track, including 9 widely used languages (see Table 1 (I)). These languages are seen by some SSL models we use in the experiment. This set is intended for direct comparison with ML-SUPERB results and rapid validation.

Unseen Set. This set is derived from the ML-SUPERB Multilingual Track, including 20 endangered languages (see Table 1 (II)). This set evaluates the model’s adaptability to unseen languages, given that our SSL models did not previously see these languages during pre-training.

3.3. Model Configuration & Hyperparameter

SSL Model (θ_s). We employ three onboard pre-trained SSL models: HuBERT-base [8], mHuBERT-base [34], and XLSR-128 [9]. These models encompass various traits, including monolingual / multilingual, base / large size.

Adapters (θ_a). Adapters are lightweight modules inserted in neural networks that enable task-specific adaptations without modifying the original model’s parameters. Adapter modules are added to the second feed-forward layers of transformer layers in the SSL model, operating independently from the down-

Table 1: Detailed source & target languages of the Seen & Unseen Set (using ISO-639 code)

Target Language Set	Source Languages $M=10$	Target Languages
(I) Seen Set	ltz, nor, spa, por, oci, nld, glg, cat, ast, afr	eng, fra, deu, rus, swa, swe, jpn, cmn, xty
(II) Unseen Set	xho, ven, ssw, sot, sna, nso, nbl, nya, lug, kin	dan, epo, fr, tur, lit, srp, vie, tok, kaz, umb, zul, bos, ful, ceb, luo, kea, sun, tsn, tso, tos

Table 2: Percentage of tunable parameters. $100\% = \theta_s \cup \theta_a \cup \theta_d$

SSL	Tunable Parameters	
	Downstream Model θ_d	Adapter θ_a
HuBERT/mHuBERT(95M)	4.6M (4.6%)	0.7M (0.7%)
XLSR-128(317M)	4.6M (1.4%)	1.6M (0.5%)

stream model. The adapter implementation strictly adheres to the methodology in [24], specifically adopting the Houlsby adapter [20]. The bottleneck is set to 32.

Downstream Model (θ_d). The downstream model (θ_d) adopts a transformer architecture with the connectionist temporal classification (CTC) objective as outlined in the ML-SUPERB [15]. Both the model’s architecture and hyper-parameters follow the specifications in ML-SUPERB for a fair comparison. It is important to note that we reinitialize the CTC head of the downstream model after IA because the characters set of source languages are different from that of target languages.

Table 2 shows the percentages of the θ_a and θ_d parameters. Note that we always freeze the θ_s to make our solution low cost. **Adaptation Algorithms** (see Section 2.2). For the MAML, we adopt the first-order version (FOMAML) to save computation costs. For the MAML hyper-parameters, we set the $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.0001$, inner step = 1, and update the model using SGD in the inner loop and Adam in the outer loop. For the MTL, we set the learning rate to $1e-4$, using Adam optimizer.

3.4. Baselines

To prove the effectiveness of our pipeline, we adopt four common fine-tuning methods as our baselines: *Full FT*, *Freeze FT*, *PEFT*, and *Source & Target (S&T)-MTL*.

Full FT (θ_{s+d}): This is the SSL model fine-tuning baseline, where we fine-tune the θ_{s+d} on each target language in T , without initializing θ_a and IA. This method serves as the strong baseline due to its high computational and storage costs.

Freeze FT (θ_d): This is the widely-used fine-tuning baseline, where we freeze θ_s and fine-tune θ_d on each target language in T , without initializing θ_a and IA. This method is the default setting of ML-SUPERB.

PEFT (θ_{a+d}): This is the PEFT baseline. It freezes θ_s and fine-tunes θ_{a+d} on each target language in T , without IA.

S&T-MTL (θ_{a+d}): This is the baseline using the same amount of training data without two-stage training like IA. It involves jointly fine-tuning θ_{a+d} on both the S and T to get a multilingual model without further fine-tuning on each target language in T .

Table 3: Character/Phoneme Error Rate (CER/PER) of Seen Set and Unseen Set. The 10min and 1h are the amount of fine-tuning data for each target language. Pink rows are IA variants while green rows are strong baselines (see Section 3.4)

4. Result & Analysis

4.1. Main Result

Table 3 presents the results of our IA variants and baselines from the Seen Set and the Unseen Set. Remarkably, two IA variants (*IA-MAML*, *IA-MTL*) consistently outperform other baselines (*Freeze-FT*, *PEFT*, *S&T-MTL*) on both sets, while *IA-MTL* slightly outperforms *IA-MAML*. In the 10-minute and 1-hour setting, IA variants achieve substantial improvements. Compared with *PEFT* baseline, IA variants achieve up to 28% and 20% relative improvement. Impressively, when compared to a strong baseline like *Full-FT*, two IA variants either surpass or match *Full-FT* performance, but require less than 6% of the tunable parameters in *Full-FT*. Our results strongly support the effectiveness of IA in facilitating language adaptation.

Table 4: (a) Source language selection method comparison (b) Optimal number of source languages M using our method

(a)			(b)		
Source Language Selection Methods	CER / PER ↓		Source Language Number M	CER / PER ↓	
	10min	1h		10min	1h
Random $M = 5$	38.5	31.0	Proposed $M = 5$	35.9	29.5
Proposed $M = 5$	35.9	29.5	Proposed $M = 10$	34.8	28.9
Random $M = 10$	37.7	30.6	Proposed $M = 20$	33.3	27.9
Proposed $M = 10$	34.8	28.9	Proposed $M = 50$	33.5	28.2

4.2. Impact of SSL Model Pre-trained Languages

In this section, we discuss the adaptation result of SSL models to seen and unseen target languages (see Section 3.2).

HuBERT-Base & mHuBERT: Here, we discuss whether IA benefits the adaptation of base-size and less multilingual SSL models. HuBERT-Base [8] is pre-trained on 1k hours of English data while mHuBERT-Base [34] is pre-trained on 14k hours from three European languages. In Seen Set & Unseen Set, most languages are unseen during the pre-training of these two models. Table 3 shows that IA does facilitate the adaptation of base size and less multilingual SSL models to unseen target languages. Our IA variants achieve at most 14.9% relative improvement compared with *PEFT* baseline.

XLSR-128: Here, we discuss whether IA benefits the adaptation of a large multilingual SSL model. XLSR-128 [9] is pre-trained on 400k hours of data in 128 languages. For XLSR-128, most languages in the Seen Set are seen, while those in the Unseen Set are mostly unseen during the pre-training. From Table 3, we can tell that IA improves the adaptation result in both sets. To be more specific, compared with *PEFT* baseline, our IA variants show at most 24.9% and 28.2% relative improvement on each set. This validates that IA does facilitate the adaptation of large multilingual SSL models to unseen target languages.

4.3. Effectiveness of Source Languages Selection Methods

Source language selection is critical in IA. To validate our selection methods (see Section 2.1), we compare our linguistic-knowledge-based method with randomly sampling source languages from the ML-SUPERB dataset. The experiments are conducted with $M = 5$ and $M = 10$ under the *IA-MTL* default settings on Seen Set². Table 4a shows that our proposed method outperforms random selection baselines in both settings, validating the effectiveness of our method.

Also, we provide experiments for the optimal number M of source languages. Table 4b illustrates the trend $M = \{5, 10, 20, 50\}$. The experiment result indicates that $M = 20$ achieves the best performance. Furthermore, we see no improvement when we increase M to 50. This suggests that languages chosen later, which are less linguistically similar to our target languages, contribute less to the adaptation to unseen target languages. Note that using more source languages takes more epochs for the model to converge in IA. Therefore, we set $M = 10$ instead of 20 as our default setting due to the computational constraint.

5. Conclusion & Limitation

In this work, we propose an efficient solution for adapting SSL models to unseen language in low-resource scenarios. Our solution adds an extra Intermediate Adaptation (IA) to warm up the adapter and downstream model initialization. With this enhanced initialization, the model can adapt to unseen target languages more easily. In our low-cost solution, only 1-5% of the total model parameters are modified to adapt to each language. Experiment results on the ML-SUPERB dataset show that our solution achieves up to a 28% relative improvement in CER/PER over conventional efficient fine-tuning. Additionally, our results validate the effectiveness of our source language selection method and our configuration of tunable parameters. Overall, our efficient solution contributes to the employment of SSL models on low-resource language ASR. For the limitation of our work, our source language selection method needs to know the target language set beforehand. Also, we lack explorations of second-order MAML and other types of adapters.

6. References

- [1] P. Wu, J. Shi, Y. Zhong *et al.*, "Cross-Lingual Transfer for Speech Processing Using Acoustic Language Similarity," *ASRU*, pp. 1050–1057, 2021.
- [2] O. Adams *et al.*, "Massively Multilingual Adversarial Speech Recognition," in *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, 2019, pp. 96–108.
- [3] W. Hou, Y. Dong, B. Zhuang *et al.*, "Large-Scale End-to-End Multilingual Speech Recognition and Language Identification with Multi-Task Learning," in *Interspeech*, 2020.
- [4] S. Khare and othersj, "Low Resource ASR: The Surprising Effectiveness of High Resource Transliteration," in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [5] H. Yadav and S. Sitaram, "A Survey of Multilingual Models for Automatic Speech Recognition," in *LREC*, 2022, pp. 5071–5079.
- [6] Q. Zhan *et al.*, "Cross-lingual Automatic Speech Recognition Exploiting Articulatory Features," in *APSIPA ASC*, 2019, pp. 1912–1916.
- [7] A. Baevski, Y. Zhou, A. Mohamed *et al.*, "wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12 449–12 460, 2020.

²Source languages $M=5$ {cat, mar, guj, kan, tam}, $M=10$ {nbl, ssw, ven, mal, ben, mri, sot, nep, sin, jav}, ISO-639 code

- [8] W.-N. Hsu *et al.*, “HuBERT: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [9] A. Babu, C. Wang, A. Tjandra *et al.*, “XLS-R: Self-supervised Cross-lingual Speech Representation Learning at Scale,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022, pp. 2278–2282.
- [10] Y.-A. Chung *et al.*, “W2v-BERT: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training,” in *ASRU*, 2021, pp. 244–250.
- [11] “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.
- [12] A. Mohamed *et al.*, “Self-supervised speech representation learning: A review,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1179–1210, 2022.
- [13] J. Shi, H. Inaguma, X. Ma, I. Kulikov, and A. Sun, “Multi-resolution huBERT: Multi-resolution speech self-supervised learning with masked unit prediction,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2024.
- [14] A. Seth, L. V. Prasad, S. Ghosh, and S. Umesh, “Analyzing the factors affecting usefulness of self-supervised pre-trained representations for speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.16973*, 2022.
- [15] J. Shi *et al.*, “ML-SUPERB: Multilingual Speech Universal Performance Benchmark,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 884–888.
- [16] Z. Liu, J. Spence, and E. Prudhommeaux, “Studying the impact of language model size for low-resource ASR,” in *ACL*, 2023.
- [17] S. Singh *et al.*, “A Novel Self-training Approach for Low-resource Speech Recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05269*, 2023.
- [18] S. wen Yang, P.-H. Chi, Y.-S. Chuang *et al.*, “SUPERB: Speech Processing Universal Performance Benchmark,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 1194–1198.
- [19] B. Lester *et al.*, “The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning,” in *EMNLP*, 2021, pp. 3045–3059.
- [20] N. Houlsby *et al.*, “Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP,” in *ICML*, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.
- [21] C.-L. Fu *et al.*, “AdapterBias: Parameter-efficient token-dependent representation shift for adapters in NLP tasks,” in *Findings of NAACL*, 2022, pp. 2608–2621.
- [22] X. L. Li and P. Liang, “Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation,” in *ACL*, 2021, pp. 4582–4597.
- [23] E. Ben Zaken, Y. Goldberg, and S. Ravfogel, “BitFit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked language-models,” in *ACL*, 2022, pp. 1–9.
- [24] Z.-C. Chen *et al.*, “Exploring efficient-tuning methods in self-supervised speech models,” in *SLT*, 2023, pp. 1120–1127.
- [25] C. Zih-Ching *et al.*, “Chapter: Exploiting Convolutional Neural Network Adapters for Self-Supervised Speech Models,” in *ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [26] B. Thomas *et al.*, “Efficient Adapter Transfer of Self-Supervised Speech Models for Automatic Speech Recognition,” in *ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 7102–7106.
- [27] S. Udupa *et al.*, “Adapter pre-training for improved speech recognition in unseen domains using low resource adapter tuning of self-supervised models,” in *Interspeech 2024*, 2024, pp. 2529–2533.
- [28] S. Kessler, B. Thomas, and S. Karout, “An Adapter Based Pre-Training for Efficient and Scalable Self-Supervised Speech Representation Learning,” in *ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 3179–3183.
- [29] W. Hou *et al.*, “Exploiting adapters for cross-lingual low-resource speech recognition,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 317–329, 2021.
- [30] B. Li *et al.*, “Efficient domain adaptation for speech foundation models,” in *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [31] S. Mangrulkar, S. Gugger, L. Debut, Y. Belkada, S. Paul, and B. Bossan, “Peft: State-of-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods,” <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>, 2022.
- [32] X. Li *et al.*, “Zero-shot learning for grapheme to phoneme conversion with language ensemble,” in *Findings of the ACL*, 2022, pp. 2106–2115.
- [33] C. Finn *et al.*, “Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ser. ICML’17, 2017, p. 1126–1135.
- [34] A. Lee, H. Gong, P.-A. Duquenne *et al.*, “Textless Speech-to-Speech Translation on Real Data,” in *NACCL*, 2022, pp. 860–872.