



# **Prosodic features in spoken language identification**

*Sam Sučík*

**MInf Project (Part 1) Report**

Master of Informatics  
School of Informatics  
University of Edinburgh

2019



## Abstract

This report presents my work on the use of prosodic features for language identification using the recently proposed x-vector architecture. I discuss the differences between acoustic information and prosody and refer to past work that showed the usefulness of prosodic information when distinguishing between languages. For my experiments, I use the x-vector approach proposed by Snyder et al. (2018a), which uses a time-delay neural network (TDNN) to compute utterance-level embeddings that are subsequently processed by a light-weight classifier. While using 19 languages from the GlobalPhone corpus, I explore the use of popular acoustic features and two prosodic features: log energy and a continuous pitch curve extracted even for unvoiced speech using the algorithm proposed by Ghahremani et al. (2014). The acoustic and prosodic information is used in isolation as well as in combination – fusing the two types at the feature level and at the utterance-embedding level. I observe that the addition of prosodic information to standard acoustic features improve the performance – measured by the  $C_{primary}$  metric from NIST LRE 2017 – by as much as 37% and 28% for standard ( $\leq 10s$ ) and short ( $\leq 3s$ ) segments, respectively. My results also show that the energy and pitch information is very complementary and is best used in combination, concatenated frame-wise at the feature level. In particular, the prosodic information helps the system perform better for Slavic languages such as Bulgarian and Croatian, but also distinguish better between Asian languages like Korean and Japanese. I conclude that existing acoustic LID systems could benefit from the addition of a prosodic component which can be trained separately and fused at the utterance embedding level.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Paul Moore for productive collaboration while building the baseline system, Steve Renals for his supervision and optimism, and David Snyder for his advice. My thanks extends to Slávka Heželyová who supported me throughout the academic year, to Anna Colvile, and to Anita Klementiev.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	7
1.2	Aims . . . . .	8
1.3	Contributions . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	The task: spoken language recognition . . . . .	11
2.2	Shallow utterance-level approach to LID: i-vectors . . . . .	12
2.3	Less shallow approach: d-vectors . . . . .	13
2.4	Deep utterance-level approach: x-vectors . . . . .	14
2.5	Features used in language identification . . . . .	16
2.5.1	Acoustic features . . . . .	17
2.5.2	Prosodic features . . . . .	18
2.5.3	The continuous Kaldi pitch as a prosodic feature . . . . .	20
2.5.4	Illustrating the prosodic features used in this work . . . . .	22
<b>3</b>	<b>Data – GlobalPhone</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1	Overview of the GlobalPhone corpus . . . . .	23
3.2	Data partitioning . . . . .	24
3.3	Data preprocessing . . . . .	26
3.4	Dealing with invalid data . . . . .	28
3.5	Overview of the data used . . . . .	28
3.6	Main evaluation metric: $C_{primary}$ . . . . .	29
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	The Kaldi toolkit . . . . .	31
4.2	Kaldi recipes used in this work . . . . .	32
4.3	Choice of classifier . . . . .	33
4.4	Final architecture . . . . .	34
4.4.1	Feature computation . . . . .	34
4.4.2	Early fusion . . . . .	35
4.4.3	Feature vector post-processing . . . . .	35
4.4.4	The x-vector TDNN . . . . .	36
4.4.5	Extracting x-vectors . . . . .	37
4.4.6	Intermediate fusion . . . . .	37
4.4.7	The classifier . . . . .	38

4.5	Computing environment . . . . .	40
4.6	Hyperparameters . . . . .	40
<b>5</b>	<b>Experiments and discussed results</b>	<b>45</b>
5.1	The setup . . . . .	46
5.2	Comparing acoustic features . . . . .	46
5.3	Comparing and combining prosodic features . . . . .	47
5.4	Combining acoustic and prosodic features . . . . .	50
<b>6</b>	<b>Overall discussion and conclusions</b>	<b>53</b>
6.1	Overall comparison of different systems . . . . .	53
6.2	Analysis of language-specific performance of the best system . . . . .	53
6.3	Analysis of the potential of prosody . . . . .	57
6.4	Conclusions . . . . .	58
<b>7</b>	<b>Future work</b>	<b>61</b>
7.1	Possible directions . . . . .	61
7.2	Plan for Part 2 of the MInf project . . . . .	62
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Partitioning of the dataset</b>	<b>67</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Motivation

Spoken language identification (LID) is the task of classifying spoken utterances based on their language. Even though its applications range from voice assistants to automatic call routing, the primary use of language identification is in automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems: For example, a system generating video subtitles first needs to know which language the video contains in order to choose and apply the appropriate language-specific speech-to-text model.

The way typical LID or ASR systems process continuous speech is by cutting it into a sequence of short (only 20-40ms long) *frames* and computing from each frame a feature vector, thus turning a piece of speech into a number of numerical vectors which are then further processed. Most commonly, LID systems use the types of feature vectors tailored for speech-to-text use, the so-called *acoustic* features, capturing primarily the aspects of speech needed to reconstruct the phonemes or letters of the uttered words. While these acoustic features work well, they disregard a lot of additional information that goes beyond just the phonemic content: intonation, rhythm of the speech, stress patterns and a number of other properties – collectively called *prosody*. It is well known that prosody carries a lot of information not just about the speaker, their accent and dialect, but also about various characteristic phonological properties of the language they are speaking – making prosody-based features very attractive for LID.

Not much research in the area of language identification or automatic speech recognition has been done on the use of prosodic features, but most of the few studies report improved performance when – on top of using acoustic features – they additionally used prosodic information as well (Martinez et al., 2012; González et al., 2013; Metze et al., 2013). One reason why prosodic information has been mostly ignored is that the state-of-the-art LID systems were unable to model it well. Unlike the acoustic information about a phoneme produced at a particular moment, prosody surfaces mostly as *temporal variation* spanning the context of many frames (think of the pitch variation and how it creates the intonation of one’s speaking). Recently, however, LID architectures that can process frame sequences and capture such temporal trends have been

proposed, perhaps the most attractive one being the *x-vector* approach Snyder et al. (2018a). Additionally, since the successful works of Martinez et al., a novel algorithm for capturing pitch information has been proposed by Ghahremani et al. (2014) and successfully applied in ASR, but not in LID. I view this as a great opportunity for reviving the idea of using additional prosodic features to improve language identification performance.

## 1.2 Aims

The main aim of this work is to empirically analyse and evaluate the usefulness of prosodic features for language identification in the context of the novel x-vector approach to LID. To turn this abstract aim into concrete steps, I want to reproduce the x-vector architecture presented by Snyder et al. (2018a); research past use of prosody in LID and decide which prosodic aspects I want to capture using which feature types; decide how different feature types will be compared and combined; run experiments and analyse the results with main focus on the contributions of prosodic features – hopefully, providing explanations grounded in my knowledge of the phonology of languages as well as of the nature and limitations of both the architecture and the particular feature types used to capture prosody.

## 1.3 Contributions

The main contributions of my work are:

1. Discussing prosody and its potential in the context of LID and ASR – as well as the limitations of acoustic information; providing a brief overview of the most relevant recent work, including the Kaldi pitch-tracking algorithm (Ghahremani et al., 2014). (Section 2.5)
2. Discussing the x-vector approach, comparing and contrasting with more established state-of-the-art approaches. (Chapter 2, in particular Section 2.4)
3. Reproducing (with some variations) the LID x-vector architecture of Snyder et al. (2018a) by adapting a similar speaker verification implementation (Snyder et al., 2018b); creating a convenient implementation that will be open sourced and is very accessible for the research community due to being developed in the popular Kaldi toolkit. (Chapter 4)
4. Designing, executing and evaluating experiments that use 3 types of popular acoustic features and 2 justified prosodic features; including the fusion of acoustic and prosodic information at the early frame level as well as the abstract representation (x-vector) level. The system is easy to adapt for more feature types and additional means of combining them. (Chapter 5)



5. Analysis of the results, focusing on advantages and limitations of prosodic information overall and for particular languages, recommending a computationally attractive way of augmenting existing acoustic LID systems with a prosodic component. (Chapter 5, Chapter 6)



# Chapter 2

## Background

This chapter elaborates on the key concepts relevant to my work, as shown in this condensed description of the project: Exploring **spoken language identification** in the context of the recently proposed **x-vector** system (contrasted with the more established state-of-the-art **i-vector** approach, followed by the more novel **d-vector** systems), focusing on utilising **prosodic information** in addition to the standard **acoustic information**.

### 2.1 The task: spoken language recognition

Spoken language recognition means recognising the language of a speech segment. The task is similar to speaker recognition and, in the past, similar systems have been used for the two tasks. Importantly, recognition is typically realised as one of two different tasks:

- Identification (multi-class classification): answering the question "For a speech segment  $X$ , which one (from a number of supported targets) is its target (language or speaker)  $T_x$ ?"
- Verification (binary classification): "Is  $T_x$  the target (language or speaker) of the speech segment  $X$ ?"

Identification is more suitable for use cases with a small and stable set of possible targets – such as the set of supported languages. There, computing the probability of  $T_x$  being each of the target languages is feasible. Verification, on the other hand, is more suitable for cases where the set of possible targets less constrained – such as the large and changing set of possible speakers in speaker verification systems. There, it is often infeasible to compute the probability distribution over all possible values of  $T_x$ ; instead, the system typically focuses only on evaluating the probability of  $T_x$  being the hypothesised speaker. Throughout this work, I focus on *language identification* (LID) with a *closed set* of target languages (i.e. not including the option to identify a speech segment's language as unknown/other).

## 2.2 Shallow utterance-level approach to LID: i-vectors

This approach, with its numerous variations, has now been the state of the art for 8 years – since first introduced by Dehak et al. (2011) for speaker recognition and later applied by Martinez et al. (2011) in language recognition.




Figure 2.1. Language identification using a typical i-vector system.

The main components of a typical i-vector system, together with their use for prediction, are shown in Fig. 2.1. The universal background model (UBM) is a Gaussian mixture model (GMM) consisting of a large number (e.g. 2048) multivariate mixture components. The UBM is trained using the Expectation-Maximisation algorithm to model the observation space of frame-level feature vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  computed from all training utterances (typically 39-dimensional vector using the MFCC features, see Section 2.5.1). Given the trained UBM, an utterance  $X$  can be represented by a language- and channel-specific GMM supervector  $M$  as:

$$M_X = m + Tw_X \quad (2.1)$$

Here,  $m$  is the language- and channel-independent GMM supervector of the UBM (consisting of the stacked means of all mixture components).  $T$  is the *total variability matrix* – also called the i-vector extractor, and  $w_X$  is the *identity vector* (i-vector) of sample  $X$ . The total variability matrix  $T$  is “a matrix of bases spanning the subspace covering the important [language and channel] variability in the supervector space” (Martinez et al., p.862). Effectively,  $T$  projects between the high-dimensional GMM supervector space and the low-dimensional *total variability subspace* (also called the *i-vector space*). The i-vector  $w_X$  is then a low-dimensional set of factors projecting the supervector onto the total variability subspace base vectors. The i-vector extractor  $T$  is trained again using Expectation-Maximisation (for details see Mak and Chien (2016, p. 100)). Without providing too much detail, I highlight the aspect that is most relevant to my work: training  $T$  is based on calculating and further combining the 0<sup>th</sup>, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order statistics which are computed by *summing over the frames* of an utterance.

Once the i-vector extractor has been trained, any utterance can be represented by its i-vector. This enables training a relatively simple and fast classifier operating over the low-dimensional i-vectors. Different classifiers have been successfully used with the i-vector back end; for example, Martinez et al. initially tried using these, all achieving roughly equal performance:

1. a linear generative model – modelling the i-vectors of each language by a Gaus-

sian, with a shared full covariance matrix across all language-modelling Gaussians

2. a linear Support Vector Machine computing scores for all languages by doing binary classification in the one-versus-all fashion
3. a two-class logistic regression also doing one-versus-all classification.

At test time, a sequence of feature vectors for utterance  $X$  is projected using the UBM into the high-dimensional *supervector space*, producing  $M_X$ . Then,  $T$  is used to extract the utterance-level i-vector, which is processed by the classifier.

Despite producing utterance-level scores, I describe the i-vector pipeline as shallow because it aggregates frame-level information over time very early (when projecting  $X$  into the supervector space), effectively treating an utterance as a bag of frames and disregarding any temporal patterns spanning over multiple frames.

## 2.3 Less shallow approach: d-vectors

Introduced for speaker verification by Variani et al. (2014) and later adapted and applied to language identification by Tkachenko et al. (2016), this approach uses neural networks to extract frame-level information, which is then aggregated across frames to produce utterance- or language-level vectors. Importantly, nothing changes about the final classification stage itself: It is the differences in producing the vector representations what makes i-vectors, d-vectors and x-vectors differ from each other.

The biggest change introduced in d-vector systems compared to i-vectors is the notion of frame-level processing while considering each frame's temporal context, i.e. the sequence of a few preceding and following frames. While Variani et al. achieve this by simply feeding the feature vectors of the neighbouring frames together with the frame of interest into a standard deep neural network, Tkachenko et al. use a more suited architecture commonly used for processing temporal sequences in automatic speech recognition: the *time-delay neural network* (TDNN), first proposed by Waibel et al. (1995) and later presented by Peddinti et al. (2015) as a very suitable model for capturing long temporal context in ASR.

A TDNN works like a convolutional neural network (CNN) with 1-dimensional convolutions: only along the time axis, as opposed to the more common 2-dimensional convolutions in image CNNs. Fig. 2.2 shows a TDNN with three layers which processes information over 9-frame contexts. Note that each blue circle from any layer corresponds to the layer itself (a collection of neurons, i.e. *convolutional kernels*), and all blue circles drawn above each other as corresponding to a particular layer are in fact just one circle – the layer itself – sliding over multiple inputs. For example, the convolutional kernels from layer 1 are first applied to feature vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1$ - $\mathbf{x}_5$ , then to vectors  $\mathbf{x}_3$ - $\mathbf{x}_7$  and then to  $\mathbf{x}_5$ - $\mathbf{x}_9$ . Notice how the network is made more sparse by using *subsampling*, i.e. not using the connections drawn in light grey. A concise and commonly used description of the sketched architecture is shown in Tab. 2.1 (notice the




Figure 2.2. Example of a time-delay neural network.

difference between the interval and set notation); "layer context" meant relative to the preceding layer.

	LAYER CONTEXT	TOTAL CONTEXT
LAYER 1	$[t - 2, t + 2]$	5
LAYER 2	$\{t - 2, t, t + 2\}$	9
LAYER 3	$\{t\}$	9

Table 2.1. Example of architecture description of a TDNN (corresponds to Fig. 2.2).

In a d-vector system, a TDNN is trained to do direct frame-wise language identification; for this purpose, an additional softmax layer can be added to produce classification outputs. Often, between the convolutional layers and the output layer the architecture contains a few fully connected layers. After training, the classification layer is disregarded and a frame is instead represented by the activation values from the last hidden layer. The TDNN thus serves as a feature extractor, and the representations produced are referred to as *embeddings*. A d-vector representing an entire utterance is then simply the average of the embeddings of all frames from the given utterance.

Despite the naive averaging, utterances are no longer treated merely as bags of frames because each embeddings contains features extracted over short temporal window: 21-frame windows in the case of Tkachenko et al. and 41-frame windows used by Variani et al., making d-vectors less shallow than i-vectors.

## 2.4 Deep utterance-level approach: x-vectors

The x-vector approach, introduced last year by the John Hopkins University team first for speaker verification (Snyder et al., 2018b) and subsequently for language identification (Snyder et al., 2018a), can be viewed as an extension to d-vectors, producing

utterance-level embeddings even for variable-length speech segments. The architecture consists of (see also Fig. 2.3):

1. the context-aggregating TDNN layers operating at frame level (with the final context window of  $\pm 7$  frames),
2. a *statistics pooling layer* which computes the mean and the standard deviation over all frames, effectively changing a variable-length sequence of frame-level activations into a fix-length vector, and
3. an utterance-level part consisting of 2 fully connected bottleneck layers which extract more sophisticated features and compress the information into a lower-dimensional space, and an additional softmax output layer.




Figure 2.3. A high-level sketch of the x-vector TDNN from Snyder et al..

After the TDNN has been trained, embeddings extracted as the activations of the first bottleneck layer – named x-vectors – are then utterance-level representations and can be used directly as input for a final classifier. The biggest difference compared to the d-vector neural networks discussed in Section 2.3 is that the x-vector TDNN is trained to do not frame-level, but utterance-level classification. The utterance-level statistics (mean and standard deviation) are computed *as part of the network* and are further processed by the additional fully connected layers with non-linear activation functions. These bottleneck layers also make it possible to preserve a higher number of useful features after the statistics-pooling layer: By enabling the last frame-level layer to inflate the representations to 1500-D. The bottleneck layers then learn a transform back to the 512-dimensional space (high-dimensional vectors would be inconvenient for the final classifier) while extracting from the aggregated statistics the features most useful for utterance-level classification (not just for frame-level decisions).

Because of being an utterance-level classifier, the x-vector TDNN can be used directly as an end-to-end system, although Snyder et al. found that extracting x-vectors and

		LAYER CONTEXT	TOTAL CONTEXT	NUMBER OF UNITS
FRAME LEVEL	LAYER 1	$[t - 2, t + 2]$	5	512
	LAYER 2	$\{t - 2, t, t + 2\}$	9	512
	LAYER 3	$\{t - 3, t, t + 3\}$	15	512
	LAYER 4	$\{t\}$	15	512
	LAYER 5	$\{t\}$	15	1500
STATISTICS POOLING LAYER		$[1, T]$	UTTERANCE	3000-DIMENSIONAL OUTPUT
UTTER. LEVEL	BOTTLENECK 1	N/A	UTTERANCE	512
	BOTTLENECK 2	N/A	UTTERANCE	512
	SOFTMAX	N/A	UTTERANCE	L-DIMENSIONAL OUTPUT

Table 2.2. Description of the x-vector TDNN from Snyder et al. and used in this work.  $T$  is the number of frames in a given utterance. Table adapted from Snyder et al. (2018a, p. 106).

training a separate classifier to classify them yielded lightly better results. Perhaps an even stronger argument in favour of the two-stage process is that, by using an external light-weight classifier, one can easily change the set of supported languages without having to expensively re-train the TDNN. Snyder et al. showed that simply re-training the classifier is enough to gain very good results for languages the TDNN has not observed during training (although the results are indeed worse than those for observed languages).

The x-vector system consistently beat several state-of-the-art i-vector architectures, which is a particularly interesting finding because i-vector systems have for long been dominant despite the nowadays so "fashionable" and successful deep learning approaches. Even so, the 2-stage x-vector system using a simple classifier still dominates the end-to-end neural network alternative.

## 2.5 Features used in language identification

Historically, automatic speech recognition (ASR) has been the most important area of speech processing and it has driven forward other areas including language and speaker recognition. In particular, LID systems still exist mostly as part of ASR systems where the language of speech needs to be identified before attempting to transcribe the speech. Hence, data preprocessing and input feature types for LID systems often come from the ASR area. In particular, the feature extraction processes follow the ASR objectives: To extract the language- and speaker-*independent* information important for discriminating between different phonemes produced by a speaker's vocal tract. The feature types devised for this aim are termed *acoustic features*. However, these features can also be characterised by the information they disregard or at least to not capture explicitly: the language- and/or speaker-*dependent* information: intonation, stress, pitch



range, tone, and others, collectively referred to as *prosodic information*.

As this work focuses on exploiting prosodic information to improve LID, it is desirable to understand both acoustic and prosodic features: how they differ, why is prosody useful and how can prosodic information be modelled in systems that process frame sequences rather than isolated speech frames.

### 2.5.1 Acoustic features

The most commonly used acoustic feature type are the Mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs). These are coefficients that aim to characterise the shape of the vocal tract, which corresponds to characterising the spectral envelope of produced sounds or, in a way, to the actual phones produced. Without providing too much technical detail, I remind the reader of the main steps in computing MFCCs in Fig. 2.4 (for details, see for example Chapter 10 of Holmes and Holmes (2002)).




Figure 2.4. Main steps in computing the MFCC features including energy. Adapted from Shimodaira and Renals (2019, p. 10).

To capture local temporal trends going beyond the single frame level, computed features such as MFCCs are often augmented with frame-specific *dynamic* features – *delta cepstra* (also just *deltas* or  $\Delta$ ) and double deltas ( $\Delta\Delta$ ). These are simple approximations of the first and second derivatives of the original acoustic feature, and are computed for frame  $t$  like this ( $\mathbf{x}_t$  is the MFCC feature vector):

$$\Delta(t) = \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \quad \Delta\Delta(t) = \Delta(t+1) - \Delta(t-1) \quad (2.2)$$

using the context of  $\pm 2$  frames. Such dynamic features are justified especially in systems which apply the bag-of-frames approach, not extracting temporal trends (such as the standard i-vector architectures).

For modelling even longer-range trends specifically in the LID task, Torres-Carrasquillo et al. (2002) used an extension of simple deltas called the *shifted delta cepstra* (SDC) features – essentially, deltas computed at multiple points and stacked together. They can then be used as a new feature vector, or concatenated with the original MFCC vector. SDCs can be configured by setting their 4 parameters:  $N, d, p, k$  corresponding to a  $N$ - $d$ - $p$ - $k$ , a typical one being 7-1-3-7.  $N$  refers to the number of first cepstral coefficients taken into account (not necessarily the full MFCC vector),  $p$  denotes the distance between consecutive points at which deltas are computed,  $d$  determines the size of the window for computing deltas ( $d = 1$  corresponds to Eq. 2.2) and  $k$  is the number of points at which to compute deltas. The SDC terms for frame  $t$  and to be stacked together are then:

$$\Delta_{SDC}(t + ip) = \mathbf{x}_{t+ip+d} - \mathbf{x}_{t+ip-d} \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} \quad (2.3)$$

As with standard deltas, capturing long-range trends with SDCs can certainly be beneficial for i-vector systems. Ferrer et al. (2016) used an i-vector system with SDC features as the state-of-the-art baseline system for their novel experiments. Additionally – following the successful application of SDCs by Torres-Carrasquillo et al. in a pre-i-vector system, Sarma et al. (2018) report slightly better results with SDCs compared to using high-resolution MFCCs when training an i-vector architecture with a deep neural network UBM. Still, the usefulness of SDCs is not so clear in architectures inherently able to extract temporal trends.

Compared to the prosodic features described next, the discussed classic acoustic features have one clear advantage where the LID system is part of a bigger ASR pipelines: The two systems can share the same feature vectors without the need to compute additional features solely for the purpose of language identification.

## 2.5.2 Prosodic features

Prosody is about information other than that directly describing the produced phones; the standard elements of prosody are: intonation/tone, stress and rhythm (Prieto and Roseano, 2018). As discussed below, importantly, each of these elements can be used to differentiate between languages.

- *Intonation* and *tone* are perceived qualities typically associated with the variation of the physical quality called pitch, i.e. the fundamental frequency of vibration of the vocal folds ( $F_0$ ). The term 'tone' is used where pitch variation is contrastive (i.e. changes to it discriminate between different words): in the so-called *tonal languages*, such as Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai. In each of these languages, a small 'alphabet' of distinct tone levels or tone contours (also called *tonemes* (Trask, 2004)) can be observed as it conveys meaning. Intonation, on the other hand, denotes the non-contrastive pitch variation mostly associated with the speaker's emotions, language, dialect, social background, speaking style, and other factors (see, for example, the study by Grabe (2004) on the intonational differences between different British English dialects).

- *Stress* (also termed *accent*), despite being a somewhat ambiguous term, generally refers to the relative emphasis on certain syllables within a word or words within a sentence, realised as a variation in loudness (*dynamic accent*), pitch (*pitch accent*) or vowel length (*quantitative accent*). Specific *lexical* (intra-word, i.e. syllable-level) stress patterns or rules are often characteristic of a language. For instance, the within-word location of stress is fixed but different for Czech and Polish (*fixed stress*, see Goedemans and van der Hulst (2013a)), or describable by a set of rules in Arabic (*rule-based stress*, see Goedemans and van der Hulst (2013b)).
- *Rhythm* refers to regularity in sub-word unit lengths, with the most recognised theory of *isochrony* categorising languages into three types based on their rhythm: *syllable-timed* where all syllables have roughly equal durations (e.g. French or Turkish), *mora-timed* where all moras<sup>1</sup> have equal durations (e.g. Slovak or Japanese), and *stress-timed* languages, e.g. German and Arabic (here, the intervals between stressed syllables are of equal durations).

Before turning to bespoke alternative features for modelling prosody, it should be noted that some prosodic aspects can be captured by acoustic features like MFCCs. Because prosody surfaces as temporal variation, systems which extract information from frame sequences (such as TDNN-based systems) have the potential to capture it. MFCCs can be (and often are) used together with energy (see Fig. 2.4), which enables capturing dynamic accent. Even without using energy as part of MFCCs, the quantitative accent should be possible to capture because durations of vowels are preserved as a result of windowing extracting the frames at evenly spaced points of a speech waveform. Regarding rhythm, the duration regularity (isochrony) should be possible to capture for syllable-timed and mora-timed languages because syllable boundaries occur at phoneme boundaries, which are captured by acoustic features. For stress-timed languages, however, the units with equal durations are marked by stressed syllables, meaning that this regularity may not be fully captured – in particular if an energy measure is not included in MFCCs, or if the stress is realised as a variation in pitch rather than in loudness. Considering the prosodic aspects that acoustic features alone *could* theoretically capture, I conclude that the most important prosodic feature that can be deemed complementary to acoustic features and added to the input is pitch: to enable modelling pitch accent, tone, and language-specific intonation.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, extracting information from pitch for LID has been explored in the past – although the number of studies is very small compared to those using the conventional acoustic features. Long before i-vectors, Lin and Wang (2005) attempted to do language identification solely from the pitch contour. This was segmented into syllable-like units (around 100-200ms), each contour segment subsequently represented as the first few coefficients of its approximation by Legendre polynomials. Even though the results were far from those achieved by today’s systems, it was demonstrated that LID can be done on pitch information alone. Later, Martinez et al. (2012) successfully applied a similar approach to modelling energy and pitch contours within

---

<sup>1</sup>Mora is a basic timing unit; a long syllable having two moras and a short syllable having one mora. See Crystal (2008, p. 312) for a broader definition and discussion.

small segments, additionally trying to capture rhythm by providing the duration of voiced speech within the segment as an additional feature. Fusing such prosodic system with an acoustic i-vector system significantly improved the performance. Later, Metze et al. (2013) showed improvements in ASR on tonal (and partly on non-tonal) languages when augmenting MFCCs with custom-designed  $F_0$  variation features. Nevertheless, one disadvantage of using pitch persisted: The fact that  $F_0$  is typically considered to be only present in voiced sounds and undefined for unvoiced ones – making a pitch contour based on  $F_0$  discontinuous. While Martinez et al. (2012) effectively ignore this issue by discarding unvoiced frames and thus ending up modelling contours which indeed contain sudden jumps, the problem was addressed in a more elegant way recently by Ghahremani et al. (2014). They developed a pitch-tracking algorithm that approximates pitch values even for unvoiced regions and produces a continuous pitch contour. Adding this feature to MFCCs, the authors report improved ASR performance mainly on tonal languages. To the best of my knowledge, this feature type has not yet been used for language identification.

In this work, I explore two feature types that explicitly help to capture prosodic information: *energy* and *pitch*. I refer to these as the prosodic features.

- By energy I mean the logarithm<sup>2</sup> of the raw energy extracted in the MFCC pipeline right after windowing (as shown in Fig. 2.4). To isolate the effects of using this prosodic feature, I do not include it in any of the acoustic features used in this work. However, I do not exclude the 0<sup>th</sup> cepstral coefficient from MFCCs, even though it bears some loudness-related information; more specifically, it can be considered as "a collection of average energies of each frequency bands in the signal that is being analyzed" (Zheng and Zhang, 2000).
- By pitch I mean the continuous pitch (and features derived from it) extracted using the Kaldi pitch algorithm presented by Ghahremani et al.. Because this feature type is not well known, I elaborate on it in the next section.

### 2.5.3 The continuous Kaldi pitch as a prosodic feature

Even though the original paper (Ghahremani et al., 2014) contains a detailed description of the Kaldi pitch algorithm (along with a working implementation as part of the Kaldi ASR toolkit), I provide an additional, more holistic view to give the reader an intuitive understanding of the algorithm and the features it produces (see Fig. 2.5). Perhaps the biggest contribution lies in abandoning the binary decision making about voiced/unvoiced speech, and only calculating pitch for the voiced frames. Instead, soft decisions are made based on the values of the normalised cross-correlation function (NCCF). For two pieces of digitised waveform separated by temporal distance  $l$  from each other and represented as vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{t,0}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{t,l}$ , the NCCF is computed as follows

---

<sup>2</sup>The use of logarithm is given solely by the Kaldi toolkit I use for feature extraction, although it is by no means an arbitrary design decision: Human perception of loudness is non-linear and logarithm is used also in the standard MFCC computation pipeline (see Fig. 2.4).




Figure 2.5. The steps of the Kaldi pitch algorithm.

(adapted from Ghahremani et al., Eq. 2):

$$\Phi_{t,l} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_{t,0}^T \mathbf{v}_{t,l}}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{v}_{t,0}^T \mathbf{v}_{t,0})(\mathbf{v}_{t,l}^T \mathbf{v}_{t,l}) + B}} \quad (2.4)$$

where normally  $B = 0$ , but the authors use a non-zero value to push the NCCF values towards 0 where the cross-correlation on its own is very low. By computing NCCF for different spacings  $l$  – called *lags* by the authors, and being effectively the periods of different hypothesised frequencies – one obtains continuous confidence values about the presence of the corresponding frequencies in the signal for the time position  $t$ . After computing these for all temporal positions, the algorithm finds the optimal continuous contour by minimising the proposed cost function (see Ghahremani et al., Eq. 4), which prefers higher NCCF values and penalises too low frequencies and too big frequency jumps.

Finally, the algorithm post-processes the raw pitch contour to provide these additional features:

1. A mean-normalised pitch contour, with the mean computed over 151-frame windows and weighted by a measure roughly corresponding to the log likelihood of a particular frame being voiced (i.e. putting more weight on voiced frames).
2. *Probability of voicing* (POV): A feature which is not a probability, but acts similarly and has been empirically found by the authors to provide improvements in ASR performance.
3. Delta-pitch terms, computed in the same way as the simple deltas in Eq. 2.2.

In this work, I work with all four feature types (the raw pitch contour and the three derived feature types) and refer to them collectively as the Kaldi pitch.

### 2.5.4 Illustrating the prosodic features used in this work

Having familiarised the reader with the two prosodic features I will use (the energy and the Kaldi pitch), I now illustrate them on a realistic example. Because the multi-lingual corpus used for this project does not contain English, I used the freely accessible sample utterance from the CSR-I (WSJ0) Complete corpus<sup>3</sup>, which has important characteristics such as the recording conditions and the speaking style the same as the corpus I later use (see Section 3.1).




Figure 2.6. The prosodic features I use in this project (together with the spectrogram and the fundamental frequency  $F_0$ ), illustrated on an English utterance. I manually created the time-aligned transcription for better understanding.

Fig. 2.6 shows the prosodic features on the English utterance. For clarity and comparison, I added the spectrogram as well as the discontinuous  $F_0$  contour – both generated in Praat (Boersma and Weenink, 2019). As expected, the  $F_0$  segments match the Kaldi pitch contour. Notice how the Kaldi pitch does not drop in unvoiced regions, but rather behaves like a smooth bridging between the regions. Also note that the POV values are effectively negated: High values corresponding to the regions where true  $F_0$  is absent and low values marking the voiced regions.

<sup>3</sup><https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC93S6A>

# Chapter 3

## Data – GlobalPhone

Because LID systems are often part of ASR systems, it makes sense to use the same datasets to train both. Additionally, however, the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) has been organising dedicated Language Recognition Evaluation<sup>1</sup> (LRE) challenges since 1996, providing multilingual datasets which are today the standard benchmark for evaluating language recognition systems (used also by Snyder et al. (2018a)). The NIST datasets, however, only focus on narrowband (8kHz) conversational telephone speech and include strong channel variability as a result of the uncontrolled recording environment, which makes it more difficult to analyse any observed effects and attribute them to particular language pair similarities or particular prosodic aspects. In this work, I use a relatively compact ( $\sim 400$  hours of speech) corpus which is in many aspects different from the NIST datasets.

### 3.1 Overview of the GlobalPhone corpus

The corpus I use is the GlobalPhone multilingual ASR corpus (Schultz et al., 2013), more precisely its newest version – updated in 2016 and covering 22 languages from around the world (see Fig. 3.1): Arabic (AR), Bulgarian (BG), Chinese-Mandarin (CH), Chinese-Shanghai (WU), Croatian (CR), Czech (CZ), French (FR), German (GE), Hausa (HA), Japanese (JA), Korean (KO), Brazilian Portuguese (PO), Polish, (PL), Russian, (RU), Spanish, (SP), Swahili (SWA), Swedish (SW), Tamil (TA), Thai (TH), Turkish (TU), Ukrainian (UA), and Vietnamese (VN). The corpus follows the style established for English by the Wall Street Journal-based corpora (Paul and Baker, 1992) such as the CSR-I (WSJ0) Complete corpus<sup>2</sup>. It consists of newspaper articles read by native speakers (around 100 speakers per language, each speaker producing about 20 minutes of audio by reading 3-5 articles), recorded as wideband (16kHz) audio in a controlled environment, using a close-talking microphone (in the case of GlobalPhone the Sennheiser microphone HD-440-6).

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/mig/language-recognition>

<sup>2</sup><https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC93S6A>



Figure 3.1. Languages of GlobalPhone as shown roughly at the location where they were recorded. Greyed out are Hausa, Swahili and Ukrainian – the three languages I did not use in this work due to corrupt data (see Section 3.4). Also notice that Russian was, in fact, recorded in Belarus, and Spanish in Costa Rica.

The controlled environment, speaking style and nature of the texts (all are major newspaper articles) make the data better suited for analysing effects of, for example, prosodic features: Any observed trends can be more reliably attributed to my controlled independent variables (such as the feature type) or to the known language differences. Another advantage of the GlobalPhone corpus is the rich vocabulary (compare with short telephone conversations in the NIST corpora). Finally, from a linguistic view, the corpus covers a wide range of language families and prosody-based categories, while also providing an interesting sample of related languages in the form of 5 Slavic languages (which the author – as a native speaker of Slovak – can relate to): Bulgarian, Czech, Croatian, Russian, and Ukrainian.

Unfortunately, the corpus does not cover spontaneous speech (which – as known in ASR – is much more challenging than read text). The extremely low channel variability is also a tight constraint and it is possible that, even if prosodic features improve LID performance on this dataset, the results will not necessarily generalise well to more realistic scenarios with greater channel variability and noise.

## 3.2 Data partitioning

GlobalPhone ships with a partitioning of each language’s data into training, evaluation and testing (in GlobalPhone documentation referred to as training, development and evaluation, respectively) sets, with the sizes of the 3 partitions being roughly 80%, 10%, 10%, respectively. However, for the purposes of the x-vector architecture, a 4-way partitioning is required:



1. training set – for training the x-vector TDNN,
2. enrollment set – for training the x-vector classifier,
3. evaluation set – for tuning the hyperparameters of both the TDNN and the classifier,
4. testing set – for final end-to-end evaluation on unseen data.

To create the desired 4-way partitioning, I allocated part of the training data for enrollment. This way, I preserved the original evaluation and testing, enabling fairer comparisons of my results with any other future works that use the GlobalPhone corpus. Because the classifier is typically a much simpler model (with many fewer learnable parameters) than the x-vector TDNN, I allocate only 1/8 of the training set for enrollment (splitting each language’s data in equal proportion). This way, my new training set accounts for roughly 70% of the whole corpus, while the 3 other sets are roughly 10% each.

Importantly, GlobalPhone<sup>3</sup> still misses partitioning for certain languages:

1. no partitioning for Czech, Polish, Tamil, Swahili, Ukrainian, Vietnamese and Wu,
2. incomplete partitioning for Arabic (incomplete evaluation and test sets), and for French, Japanese, Russian (missing evaluation sets for all three languages).

Note that a partitioning in this context is represented simply in the form of partition- and language-specific lists of speakers (identified by their speaker IDs). The ASR GlobalPhone Kaldi recipe<sup>4</sup> extends the original GlobalPhone partitioning to also cover Czech, French, Japanese, Polish, Russian, Swahili and Vietnamese. I utilise this partitioning in order to stay consistent with previous work using the recipe. For the rest of the languages with incomplete or missing partitioning (Arabic, Tamil, Ukrainian and Wu), I partitioned the data myself, following the same approach as the GlobalPhone authors – the only imposed constraint being: ”no speaker appears in more than one group [partition] and no article is read by two speakers from different groups” (Schultz, 2002, p. 348). This constraint, however, could only be satisfied for languages which contained speaker metadata information (i.e. which articles were read by the particular speaker). Because this metadata was missing for Bulgarian, French, German, Polish, Tamil, Thai and Vietnamese, the splitting of the original training set into training and enrollment portions (and, in the case of Tamil, the entire 4-way partitioning) for these languages was done solely on a random basis.

I automated the entire partitioning process such that it would never allow one speaker to appear in multiple sets. Further, the way I understand the declared 80%-10%-10% splitting is that it is the *numbers of speakers* for each languages that are split following this ratio (since there is roughly constant amount of data per speaker). Therefore, the way I realise the desired 4-way partitioning is based on distributing speakers in the desired 70%-10%-10%-10% ratio. Unfortunately, I had to somewhat relax the constraint

<sup>3</sup>as of newest version of its documentation I had access to: v4.1 from January 2016

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/tree/master/egs/gp/s5>

that the same article cannot appear in multiple sets. My implementation attempts to construct such ideal partitioning, but – if it cannot be constructed – the allowed number of article overlaps is iteratively increased (from 0, incrementing by 1) until a satisfying partitioning is found. From all the languages for which the partitioning was generated non-randomly, the following languages had non-zero article overlaps: Arabic (385), Turkish (16), and Wu (49).

For the final partitioning (after excluding languages and speakers with corrupt data, see the next section) is shown in Tab. A.1.

### 3.3 Data preprocessing

These are the preprocessing steps that were carried out either only once (the time-consuming ones), or repeatedly (once for each of my experiments) but without any changes. Although the Kaldi GlobalPhone recipe was used as a starting point, in the end, most of the used Shell scripts were heavily adapted or re-written from scratch.

**Converting data to .wav format** was the most time-consuming preprocessing step (taking more than 7 hours) and was done only once. The reason for this step is that the Kaldi toolkit requires .wav files for computing features, but the GlobalPhone audio files are in the Shorten (.shn) format. The conversion itself was done using the `shorten` and `sox` command-line tools. Even though this step could have been made a part of the feature computation pipeline itself – without the need to store all the .wav files – it would be time-consuming as the conversion would have to be repeated.

**Organising the data into partitions** was done symbolically (without re-organising the .wav files), hence taking very short. This made it possible for the step to be a part of the pipeline repeated separately for each experiment – or each time an utterance or a speaker was found to be unusable due to corrupt data and had to be excluded from the partitioning. Because the previous step did not create any data partitioning (i.e. all .wav files were only grouped by languages), in this step, for each partition, a list referring to the .wav files for that partition’s speakers across all languages was compiled (based on the files storing the partitioning described in Section 3.2). In addition to this list (named conventionally `vaw.scp`), a number of accompanying lists was generated as required by the conventions of Kaldi: `utt2spk` (mapping utterances to speakers), `utt2lang` (mapping utterances to languages), `utt2len` (mapping utterances to their lengths), and a number of further lists derived from these essential ones.

**Splitting longer utterances into shorter segments** was done to match the set-up used by Snyder et al. (2018a): Training set utterances were not split in this step because the x-vector TDNN splits them into chunks of at most 1000 frames (10s) at training time (see Section 4.4.4). Long enrollment set utterances were split uniformly into segments of length 30s, and evaluation and testing set utterances were split into 10s segments (and later also into 3s segments because the trained system in each experiment was additionally tested on 3s segments). Fig. 3.2 shows the length distribution in the training set (not affected by segmenting) while Fig. 3.3 shows the lengths distribution in other data partitions. Note that I did not discard the cut-offs from the utterance ends (even

though they were shorter than the desired lengths). Another downside of the uniform cutting is that utterances were split unnaturally – not necessarily on breaks, hence creating arbitrary edge boundaries not naturally found in speech. The reason why I chose to implement this way of splitting the utterances was its simplicity; in the future, this would be one of the design decisions I would challenge.




Figure 3.2. The length distribution in the training dataset whose utterances were not split in the preprocessing stages.




Figure 3.3. The lengths distribution in the enrollment set (where utterances were cut into segments of max. 30s, the evaluation set used for tuning the hyperparameters of the implementation (Section 4.6), and the testing sets for both the 10s and the 3s condition.

**Computing voice activity decision (VAD)** for all segments to identify and later discard the frames containing silence. This was computed using the VAD implementation found in Kaldi, using the parameter values from the speaker recognition x-vector recipe SRE16<sup>5</sup>, in particular the log-energy threshold of 5.5. Because in my experiments I

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/tree/master/egs/sre16/v2>, this is the recipe I adapted for LID in my implementation of the x-vector system.

wanted to frame-wise concatenate feature vectors of different feature types, I needed to make sure I would always discard the very same set of frames for all feature types. Hence, I computed VAD only once – on the MFCC feature vectors – and re-used it to discard silence frames throughout all experiments.

### 3.4 Dealing with invalid data

While carrying out the preprocessing steps, a lot of data was identified as corrupt:

- while converting .shn to .wav, converting all utterances for Hausa, Swahili and Ukrainian failed with the "No magic number" error thrown by the `shorten` tool<sup>6</sup>
- the following utterances were not converted due to the same error: 095\_29 for Bulgarian; 003\_2 for German; almost all utterances for speakers 015, 136, and up to 3 utterances for speakers 014, 017, 021, 022, 024, 026, 031, 036, 058, 139 in Portuguese; utterance 087\_102 in Russian; utterance 007\_77 in Turkish; and utterance 084\_122 for Vietnamese
- while computing VAD, the `compute-vad` binary throwing the "Empty feature matrix for utterance [utterance-ID]" error for utterances 058\_16 and 058\_18 in Portuguese

Naturally, the utterances which could not be converted were discarded. I also discarded the Portuguese speakers 015 and 136 altogether. Most importantly, the three problematic languages – Hausa, Swahili and Ukrainian – were not used any further, only the 19 remaining languages.

### 3.5 Overview of the data used

I present an overview of the data I ultimately used in my experiments – after discarding the invalid data. Tab. 3.1 shows the total data amounts for each language and partition. A detailed list of speakers contained in each partition (so that my partitioning can be replicated by other future works) is in Tab. A.1 in the appendix.

Notice that the data amount varies across languages for a given partition (i.e. languages are represented unequally in the corpus – compare Wu and Japanese), and even the declared 80%-10%-10% split from the original GlobalPhone partitioning is not too reliable in some cases – for instance Thai, German, Mandarin and Spanish – although, in other cases, it does result in a split close to the declared one (such as for Korean, Swedish and Turkish). Further, the per-speaker amounts of data are clearly not equal, see Wu where there are 6 training-set speakers vs 4 testing-set speakers, yet the testing set has a greater total amount of data than the training set. While attempting at a perfect

---

<sup>6</sup>reported also here: <https://wiki.inf.ed.ac.uk/CSTR/GlobalPhone>, although only for a few utterances

split is possible, instead, I appreciate the realism of certain languages being under-represented, and account for this in training the x-vector classifier (see Section 4.3 for details of how this is implemented).

	TRAINING	ENROLLMENT	EVALUATION	TESTING
AR	14.5	1.4	1.7	1.4
BG	15.1	2.0	2.3	2.0
CH	23.7	3.1	2.0	2.4
CR	10.5	1.6	2.0	1.8
CZ	23.7	3.1	2.4	2.7
FR	20.1	2.7	2.1	2.0
GE	13.2	1.7	2.0	1.5
JA	29.2	3.0	0.9	0.8
KO	14.6	2.2	2.2	2.1
PL	17.0	2.3	2.8	2.3
PO	20.8	1.9	1.6	1.8
RU	17.3	2.5	2.5	2.4
SP	16.1	2.3	2.1	1.7
SW	15.4	2.0	2.1	2.2
TA	10.7	2.2	1.1	1.3
TH	22.0	2.9	2.3	0.9
TU	11.6	1.7	2.0	1.9
VN	15.8	1.7	1.4	0.8
WU	1.0	0.8	0.7	1.1

Table 3.1. Amount of data (in hours) for each language and partition after excluding invalid data

### 3.6 Main evaluation metric: $C_{primary}$

The performance of a language identification model can be measured using various metrics: ranging from accuracy to multi-class cross-entropy to multi-class F1 score. I decided to use the primary metric of the 2017 NIST LRE:  $C_{primary}$ , which is also used by Snyder et al. (2018a) and in a slightly different version also by Martinez et al. (2012). The metric is defined in Sadjadi and Greenberg (2017) and I limit myself to highlighting its main characteristics.

First of all, similar to the F1 score, the metric takes into account not raw accuracy, but the number of misses (false negatives) and false alarms (false positives) for each language pair  $L_T, L_N$  separately ( $L_T$  being the true target language and  $L_N$  being a different (non-target) language). Additionally, the metric provides means of penalising misses or false alarms more, by setting their respective costs  $C_{miss}$  and  $C_{FA}$ .

As for the actual computation of  $C_{primary}$ , first, an average metric is computed across all languages, for each target language combining the miss rate and the false alarm rate with respect to all non-target languages:

$$C_{avg}(\beta) = \frac{1}{N_L} \left\{ \sum_{L_T \in L} P_{miss}(L_T) + \frac{1}{N_L - 1} \left[ \beta \times \sum_{L_T \in L} \sum_{L_N \in L \setminus L_T} P_{FA}(L_T, L_N) \right] \right\} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\beta$  combines the costs and the a priori probability of the target language  $P_{target}$  (set to take the values of 0.5 and 0.1):

$$\beta = \frac{C_{FA} (1 - P_{target})}{C_{miss} P_{target}} \quad (3.2)$$

In the NIST LRE 2017 plan, the costs of misses and false alarms are both set to 1. Then, as a result of the values of  $P_{target}$  (0.5 and 0.1), the two  $\beta$  values are  $\beta_1 = 1$  and  $\beta_2 = 9$ . Then,  $C_{primary}$  is computed as follows:

$$C_{primary} = \frac{C_{avg}(\beta_1) + C_{avg}(\beta_2)}{2} \quad (3.3)$$

# Chapter 4

## Implementation

In this chapter, I describe the entire architecture and computing environment. Importantly, for the early implementation stage, I teamed up with Paul Moore and a big part of the baseline system was implemented jointly – with his contributions. Naturally, in my writing, I focus more on parts which I developed independently, without Paul’s help. These are in particular: splitting utterances into shorter segments; early and intermediate fusion of different feature types; choosing and adapting the classifier; exploring the number of training epochs of the TDNN.

As a matter of fact, the codebase of this project consists primarily of adapted existing implementations. Nevertheless, I describe the architecture in detail. However, I make it explicit where the design or hyper-parameter decisions were made by myself (possibly in collaboration with Paul). In the rest of the cases, the reader should implicitly assume that the decisions were made by the authors of the original implementations and found to work well. Importantly, my work does not primarily focus on optimizing the architecture or hyperparameters – only on the different ways in which various feature types can be used and combined to improve LID performance.

### 4.1 The Kaldi toolkit

As hinted in earlier chapters, the system was implemented in the Kaldi toolkit<sup>1</sup>. First presented by its authors in (Povey et al., 2011) around the time i-vectors were first proposed, Kaldi is the most popular research toolkit for speech processing – originally developed for ASR, but nowadays also used for speaker and language recognition. As an actively maintained open-source toolkit, it reflects the state of the art research and contains working implementations of many accompanying published papers. (After all, the top-class research community significantly overlaps with the community of Kaldi developers.)

To understand what it means to implement an architecture like the one I use in Kaldi, one should understand and appreciate the three layers of code Kaldi contains:

---

<sup>1</sup><http://kaldi-asr.org/>

1. **Kaldi binaries** (written mostly in C++) provide low-level, task-specific functions, e.g. for computing MFCC features, training a generic neural network or computing VAD. The binaries typically require input and output in the specific Kaldi formats<sup>2</sup> and can be heavily customised by providing values for numerous parameters. Multiple binaries are often used sequentially to create a multi-step pipelines.
2. **Kaldi scripts** (written mostly in Bash) provide convenient implementations of more high-level steps combining multiple binaries, as well as code for data manipulation. In many cases, these scripts come with useful default values (for the binaries' parameters) empirically shown to work well.
3. **Kaldi recipes** are end-to-end implementations utilising the code from layers 1 and 2 and corresponding to particular studies or experiments, or just replicating a study with a different dataset. They typically come with one top-level script called `run.sh` which calls all other recipe-specific code (or code from layers 1 and 2) and can be run to replicate the study in question provided that one has the appropriate datasets available.

## 4.2 Kaldi recipes used in this work

My entire implementation is simply a new Kaldi *recipe* (see previous section) and – by the nature of Kaldi – it re-uses a lot of existing code, including the following Kaldi recipes:

- The GlobalPhone (GP) recipe<sup>3</sup>, corresponding to Lu et al. (2012), inspired my implementation of preprocessing the GlobalPhone corpus and connecting it with the rest of the architecture – however, with almost all the final code being heavily adapted or re-written altogether with respect to the recipe (see Section 3.3).
- The Speaker Recognition Evaluation 2016 (SRE16) recipe<sup>4</sup>, corresponding to Snyder et al. (2018b) contains an end-to-end speaker verification pipeline using x-vectors. This recipe forms the basis for my implementation because there is no published recipe corresponding to the LID x-vector paper (Snyder et al., 2018a), but the two papers by Snyder et al. use the very same x-vector architecture, only substantially differing in the choice of the subsequent classifiers. Fortunately, the LID x-vector paper provides enough information on aspects that are different SRE x-vector architecture, which makes it possible to replicate the x-vector LID system very closely.
- The LRE07 recipe<sup>5</sup>, corresponding to Sarma et al. (2018), provided me with scripts for training a logistic regression classifier for LID, which I adapted and connected with the x-vector system.

---

<sup>2</sup>for more information on Kaldi I/O see <http://kaldi-asr.org/doc/io.html>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/tree/master/egs/gp/s5>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/tree/master/egs/sre16/v2>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/tree/master/egs/lre07/v2>



Apart from the time spent on familiarising myself with Kaldi and understanding, adapting and integrating the enumerated recipes, I put the most effort into connecting the corpus with the x-vector architecture, implementing early and intermediate fusion, computing the various feature types, and building a robust end-to-end pipeline (within the `run.sh` script) which could be run without any changes either as a whole or step by step, only changing a simple configuration file to switch between different experiments.

### 4.3 Choice of classifier

As mentioned earlier, although the SRE16 Kaldi recipe provides a complete implementation of the x-vector TDNN architecture, it does not use the same classifier as the LID x-vector paper by Snyder et al.. Instead, it uses the Probabilistic Linear Discriminant Analysis (PLDA) model for *binary* classification (because the task is speaker *verification*). The LID x-vector paper, on the other hand, uses a multi-class classifier: more precisely, a GMM classifier trained using the Maximum Mutual information (MMI) criterion as presented by McCree (2014). Unfortunately, as I found out and confirmed with David Snyder, this classifier is not implemented in Kaldi (as of January 2019). While implementing the classifier by myself was an option, it would have consumed too much time and effort – whether implemented in Kaldi (including substantial changes to the Kaldi binaries), or separately (outside the toolkit). Bear in mind that my aim is to build *some* well-performing architecture that leverages the power of x-vectors and enables me to experiment with different feature types and fusion strategies. Hence, I decided to use a different classifier – ideally more established and implemented in Kaldi.

Recently, various types of classifiers have been used on top of i-vector and d-vector models, without a clear comparison – suggesting that the choice of classifier is not nearly as important as back end producing utterance-level vectors. While various varieties of Gaussian classifiers are popular (González et al., 2013; McCree, 2014; Plhot et al., 2016), other approaches such as Support vector machines (Tkachenko et al., 2016; Martinez et al., 2011) and logistic regression (Sarma et al., 2018; Martinez et al., 2011, 2012). I decided to use multi-class logistic regression as it is already implemented in Kaldi in the context of LID as part of the LRE07 recipe. Consulting my decision with David Snyder (2018) only assured me that this was a solid choice.

Of course, there are downsides to using this classifier. As McCree (2014) points out, unlike the discriminative logistic regression, a generative classifier (in this case GMM) can provide out-of-set rejection decisions. This, however, does not speak against logistic regression in my particular case as I do *closed-set* classification. Perhaps more serious inherent disadvantage is that logistic regression uses only linear decision boundaries – compare with GMMs with full covariance matrices, which can model more complex quadratic boundaries. The way this issue is addressed in Kaldi’s implementation is by making logistic regression a mixture model, i.e. modelling each class by multiple decision boundaries (for more details see Section 4.4). This way, more complex boundaries can be modelled in the observation space. Because training GMMs

with full covariance matrices is also known to be data demanding and computationally expensive, logistic regression might potentially be preferred where the classifier is to be trained on limited enrollment data: I refer to the findings of Snyder et al. that solid LID performance can be achieved even for languages unseen by the x-vector TDNN. This scenario, however, is not very relevant for LID systems which are parts of ASR systems – there, just training acoustic models for ASR requires amounts of data that would likely be sufficient even for a simple GMM with a full covariance matrix.

## 4.4 Final architecture




Figure 4.1. An end-to-end overview of my system. Note that the segmenting step does not apply to the x-vector TDNN training data. The fusion steps which can be omitted are highlighted in red while yellow marks the steps only performed at training time.

Fig. 4.1 shows the entire system and what the main steps in running it are. In what follows, I elaborate on each step that has not been described yet.

### 4.4.1 Feature computation

Throughout my experiments, the following feature types are used (as a refresher, see Section 2.5): MFCC, MFCC+ $\Delta$ + $\Delta\Delta$ , SDC, energy, and Kaldi pitch. For more details, see Section 5.1.

To enable frame-wise feature concatenation, all feature types were computed with the same frame width of 25ms and frame shift of 10ms. Windowing was done using the Povey window<sup>6</sup>, a slight variation of the commonly used Hamming window (Blackman and Tukey, 1958, p. 200); see Fig. 4.2 for a comparisons.

<sup>6</sup>the default windowing function in Kaldi, defined and implemented here: <https://github.com/kaldi-asr/kaldi/blob/master/src/feat/feature-window.cc#L109>




Figure 4.2. Comparison of the Hamming and Povey tapered windowing functions on a frame of length 25ms. (The frame length, however, does not make a difference, it is the different shapes of the windows that matter.)

While MFCC features were computed using the existing script `steps/make_mfcc.sh`, I adapted the script in order to conveniently compute the SDCs, MFCCs with deltas, and the Kaldi pitch. The energy feature was computed as a special case of the MFCC feature – by computing the raw log energy instead of the 0<sup>th</sup> cepstral coefficient, and discarding all remaining cepstral coefficients.

#### 4.4.2 Early fusion

By fusion I understand simply combining multiple sources of information – be it early utterance representations (feature vectors of different feature types), intermediate representations (in this case x-vectors) or even scores from multiple classifiers (perhaps each trained on x-vectors based on a different feature type). Early fusion here means combining the different feature types as early as possible in the whole pipeline: right after feature computation. For a simple example of early fusion see Martinez et al. (2012) who concatenate for each short speech segment the information about the pitch contour, the energy contour, and the voiced region duration. In this case, I created a script for frame-wise concatenation (splicing) two or more feature vectors for a given utterance. Such precise alignment was possible because I configured all feature types to be computed with the same frame length and frame shift.

#### 4.4.3 Feature vector post-processing

This comprises two steps unchanged from the SRE16 recipe and used in the x-vector LID paper (Snyder et al., 2018a):

1. Removing frames containing silence, using the voice activity decision (VAD). The only difference with respect to the SRE16 recipe is that the VAD is computed only once – using the MFCC features – and used for these and all other feature types (see also Section 3.3).

2. Mean-normalisation is performed by subtracting from each frame the mean over the surrounding 3s window. This is a technique commonly used for processing acoustic features. It preserves relative temporal trends in feature values and discards information about the absolute values. I decided to use it for all prosodic features as well. However, it is possible that capturing tone properties for languages with register tonal systems – i.e. those that mark tone using several flat tone *levels* instead of characteristic tone *shapes* – would better be realised by preserving the absolute values (without mean normalisation).

#### 4.4.4 The x-vector TDNN

Even though this part of the architecture was adapted from the SRE16 recipe without any major changes and is available as an open source, I still provide a description to help the reader appreciate the technical realisation of the core of an x-vector system. (Adding to what I wrote in Section 2.3 and Section 2.4.)

The TDNN's layers are described in Tab. 2.2; the network had 4.4-4.6M parameters (depending on the dimensionality of the input feature vectors). Each layer used the rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation function.

As for the handling of the training data, the first step was discarding utterances shorter than 5s. Looking back, this design decision of Snyder et al. (2018a) may have been challenged as it resulted in discarding 29% of my total number of training utterances. However, the effects of using very short training segments might potentially have a negative impact on the TDNN. After discarding short utterances, the rest of the training data was replicated 35x, randomly shuffled and distributed and saved into 70 training Kaldi archives, each archive corresponding to a training iteration and containing roughly 50,000,000 frames (feature vectors) each – around 140h of speech. This way, each training epoch consisted of processing 70 archives, which, however, translates to only 23 actual iterations as the training was using 3 parallel jobs, each processing one archive per iteration (see below for a description of the parallel training). The archives were processed in minibatches of 64 utterances, every minibatch shuffled in each iteration.

In the training phase, the TDNN was trained to directly classify each utterance as one of the 19 languages, the training objective function being multi-class cross-entropy. Each layer was using batch normalisation and, to prevent extreme parameter updates, the maximum parameter change per minibatch – measured as the Euclidean norm over the entire parameter vector of the network – was clipped to 2.0. The training uses several techniques developed or empirically found to be beneficial by the John Hopkins University team. (Most them are mentioned or summarised by Povey et al. (2014), even though the paper corresponds to the `nnet1` neural network implementation in Kaldi, while the SRE16 recipe uses the newer `nnet3` implementation (which contains some additional improvements).) The learning rule is the Natural gradient Stochastic gradient descent (NG-SGD) with momentum (using the coefficient of momentum value of 0.5), with the learning rate exponentially decaying across the training iterations from 0.001 to 0.0001. As a means of regularisation, weak dropout was used,

with the dropout rate varying according to the following schedule: 0 for the first 20% of training iterations, then increasing linearly to 0.1 for the following 30% and finally decreasing linearly until the value of 0 in the last iteration. Perhaps most importantly, the training was realised using 3 parallel jobs, hence speeding it up. The parallelisation translates into 3 model instances being run in parallel and their parameters synchronised (averaged) after each iteration (for more details, see Povey et al.). Note that the SRE16 recipe varied the number of parallel jobs throughout training linearly from 3 to 8, but the constant 3 jobs better suited my computational environment, hence I made this change to the SRE16 implementation.

As a side note, even though the TDNN is presented as processing variable-length utterances, it still has an upper limit on the utterance length given by the implemented maximum temporal context over which the convolutional filters of its first layer slide: 1000 frames (roughly 10s when using the standard frame shift of 10ms). This means that utterances longer than 10 seconds were split and processed separately. When using the trained TDNN for extracting x-vectors, a long utterance could this way result in multiple x-vectors. This, however, did not apply to my evaluation and testing data as those were segmented into utterances of maximum length 10s.

In terms of runtime, training the TDNN was the most time-consuming step: It took 19 hours (for details, see Section 4.6).

#### 4.4.5 Extracting x-vectors

In this step, 512-dimensional x-vectors were extracted for all enrollment utterances (to train the classifier), and for evaluation and testing utterances (to evaluate the system end-to-end). This step was adapted from the SRE16 recipe with only one change: I implemented discarding all utterances that were shorter than 100 frames (roughly 1s). I decided to implement this thresholding partly to not use segments that are unrealistically and unfairly short (compare with the typical length of 3s, 10s or even 30s), but also to address the issue of a small number of extremely short or corrupt audio files which were causing the Kaldi pitch-tracking binary to fail.

This step was relatively time-consuming: around 1.5h for the enrollment, evaluation and testing data combined when splitting the work into 32 jobs and running them 10 at any time (the limit of 10 given by the computing environment's limit on the number of Slurm jobs, see Section 4.5). Still, given the number of segments to be processed, the per-segment time is very low. With evaluation and testing segments being up to 10s long, I had 17212, 20349 and 18710 segments for enrollment, evaluation and testing, respectively, and the per-segment time was thus only around 100ms.

#### 4.4.6 Intermediate fusion

Intermediate fusion, as opposed to early fusion, combines utterance-level (not frame-level) representations (x-vectors) produced by multiple (up to 3) different x-vector TDNNs. The x-vectors are concatenated, creating a longer vector. In my case, the

different networks would have been trained on different feature types, and the fused vectors would be 1024- or 1536-dimensional.

The script for this step was written by me as the intermediate fusion is both an easy to implement and a seldom used strategy – typically, *late* fusion is performed, i.e. combining the final scores from different classifiers (see, for example, Snyder et al. (2018a); Martinez et al. (2012)).

#### 4.4.7 The classifier

As mentioned earlier, the multi-class logistic regression classifier trained to optimise multi-class cross-entropy was chosen and adapted from the LRE07 recipe. I adapted the scripts such that training and scoring could be done separately. This way, both the TDNN and the classifier could be trained, then evaluated end-to-end on the evaluation set used in turn to optimise the hyperparameters of the classifier, and finally the system would be used to only score the testing set utterances.

Importantly, the whitening and dimensionality reduction steps employed by Snyder et al. (2018a) were omitted as I deemed them important for their particular classifier set up, but not necessarily mine. I decided to only keep the one preprocessing step that was included in the LRE07 recipe: length-normalising the vectors before being processed by the classifier.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the classifier is the possibility to use it as a mixture model. Even though this functionality is open-sourced and built right into the `logistic-regression-train` Kaldi binary, I explain it so that the reader can appreciate the capabilities of the classifier as well as my later hyperparameter tuning. In order to train the classifier, one provides the following parameters: `max-steps` (the maximum number of iterations of the L-BFGS solver in training the model), `normalizer` (the L2 regularisation coefficient), `mix-up` (the desired number of decision boundaries used to model all classes), and `power` (explained later). Then, training the model comprises the following steps:

1. Train the classifier normally with  $L$  decision boundaries ( $L = 19$  being the number of classes) for `max-steps` iterations.
2. Determine which classes will be modelled by how many decision boundaries – attempting to end up with `mix-up` or fewer boundaries. In general, no class is modelled by more decision boundaries than the number of corresponding training samples, and bigger classes are modelled by more boundaries. Starting with  $L$  boundaries, iteratively, this number is incremented: In each iteration, the class currently with the biggest per-boundary occupancy is granted another boundary, where the per-boundary occupancy of class  $l$  is:

$$\frac{(\text{number of training samples for class } l)^{\text{power}}}{\text{number of boundaries for class } l}$$

Notice how the `power` parameter (when set to a value closer to 0) can effectively bring the class sizes closer together, thus causing the number of boundaries to

vary less with class sizes. Values closer to 1.0 (or bigger), on the other hand, cause bigger classes to be modelled by many more boundaries than small classes.

3. Clone the trained boundary from step 1 to create as many boundaries for each class as determined in step 2; adding some random noise to each clone to ensure that the added boundaries are distinct but still roughly based on the original boundary.
4. Train the extended model (now with up to `mix-up` boundaries) for additional `max-steps` iterations.

The trained classifier is then used to compute the posterior probability for a given  $x$ -vector  $x$  and a particular class  $l$ , by accumulating the contributions across the set of boundaries  $B_l$  modelling the given class, and scaling by the class prior  $p(l)$ :

$$p(l|x) \approx p(l) \sum_{b \in B_l} p(x|b) \quad (4.1)$$

Subsequently,  $x$ 's predicted class is taken to be the one with the maximum posterior.

As mentioned in Section 3.5, the enrollment set was imbalanced and some languages were over-represented while others were under-represented. The mechanism used in the LRE07 recipe to cope with such imbalance is computing scaling factors for the different languages and using these for re-balancing the classifier's priors after it has been trained. Given a value (typically between 0.5 and 1.0) of the parameter  $s$ , the prior for language  $l$  will be scaled by coefficient  $c$  computed as follows:

$$c_L = \left( \frac{C_{l,evaluation}}{C_{l,enrollment}} \right)^s \quad (4.2)$$

where  $C$  are the counts of utterances in language  $l$  in the respective data sets. In other words, if the distribution of languages in the enrollment set matches that in the evaluation set, all priors will be scaled by the same factor – effectively not being scaled – and the classifier's priors will reflect the distribution observed in the enrollment set. However, if the distributions do not match, the classifier's priors (driven by the enrollment set) will be corrected in the direction indicated by the distribution in the evaluation set. Of course, the evaluation set does not necessarily correctly reflect the language distribution in unseen data. Hence, by setting the  $s$  parameter to a value smaller than 1.0, correcting the priors can be made less reliant on the evaluation set's distribution. I keep the value of  $s = 0.7$  as used in the LRE07 recipe – particularly because this is not a parameter that could be tuned given one's data, only set to an empirically trusted value. The scaling factors used for rebalancing the classifier (in the 10s condition) are shown in Fig. 4.3. Clearly, languages such as Arabic and Croatian were identified as under-represented and the classifier will be re-balanced to prefer them more. The opposite goes for Japanese or Vietnamese.

Compared to training the TDNN, training the classifier (with the hyperparameter values found in Section 4.6) takes only around 3.5 minutes (in the 10s condition). Producing posteriors and computing the final results for the entire test set takes only around 4 seconds (using a single CPU), corresponding to inference time of only  $\sim 0.2$ ms/utterance.




Figure 4.3. Scaling factors used for adjusting the classifier’s priors based on the language distributions in the enrollment and evaluation set.

## 4.5 Computing environment

All experiments were carried out in the School of Informatics’ Teaching cluster<sup>7</sup>, using GPUs model GeForce GTX 1060 6GB, and CPUs model Intel Xeon E5-2620 v4 (2.10GHz). Note that the GPUs were only used in training the x-vector TDNN and in extracting x-vectors from the trained network – the two most time-consuming stages.

For running jobs requiring GPUs, the Slurm scheduler was used, configured such that a single user like me could only ever run at most 10 Slurm jobs at the same time. As a result of this restriction, in order to speed up my experiments, I set the number of parallel jobs used to train each x-vector TDNN to 3 – so that I could train as many as three TDNN networks in parallel. While the SRE16 recipe uses more jobs, decreasing this number could only help the quality of the final model<sup>8</sup>. Note that each Slurm job was allocated a separate GPU. Thus, each TDNN can be considered to have been trained using three GPUs of the abovementioned model.

## 4.6 Hyperparameters

The aim of this work is not to extensively tune the hyperparameters of the architectures; instead, I rely on values used in previous successful works of others (provided in the adapted recipes). However, there was a number of parameter which I decided to change or even fine-tune.

As discussed previously, I changed the number of parallel jobs used by the TDNN in its training, and imposed a minimum length on any utterances for which x-vectors would be extracted.

<sup>7</sup><http://computing.help.inf.ed.ac.uk/teaching-cluster>

<sup>8</sup>as hinted by Dan Povey at [https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/kaldi-help/\\_iyJP-1HkKM](https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/kaldi-help/_iyJP-1HkKM)



After initially training the TDNN for 3 epochs and seeing that it took over 8 hours, I decided to first tune the classifier’s hyperparameters. This way, the tuned classifier could be subsequently used for end-to-end evaluation of different TDNNs, enabling the tuning of the most important hyperparameter:  $E$  – the number of training epochs of the TDNN. As discussed previously, the classifier’s hyperparameters were `max-steps`, `mix-up`, `normalizer` and `power`. The last mentioned parameter I fixed to be of the default value 0.15 (also used by the LRE07 recipe) – meaning that the number of decision boundaries was only weakly dependent on the relative class size (in terms of the number of enrollment segments). The other three parameters were tuned using enrollment and evaluation x-vectors extracted from the baseline-case TDNN (i.e. using MFCC features and 10s enrollment segments) trained for 3 epochs. I carried out a 3-dimensional grid search, exploring the following value ranges:

- `max-steps`  $\in \{20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200\}$  (the default is 20, the LRE07 recipe uses 35)
- `mix-up`  $\in \{19, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 300\}$  (the default is 0, the LRE07 recipe uses 150 for 14 languages)
- `normalizer`  $\in \{0, 0.00001, 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01\}$  (the default is 0.0025, the LRE07 recipe uses 0.001)




Figure 4.4. Evaluation set  $C_{primary}$ ; the shown value is the best one across all explored values of the `max-steps` parameter.

Fig. 4.4 shows the best result across all numbers of training iterations for each combination of `mix-up` and `normalizer`, showing rather clearly that `normalizer=0.001` (also used by the LRE07 recipe) is the optimal value within the explored range. Fixing this parameter and plotting just the performance against the number of mixture components `mix-up` (see Fig. 4.5) led me to the conclusion that `mix-up` should be chosen as 50 or 100. Further plotting the performance as varying with the number of mixture components for each number of training iterations separately (Fig. 4.6) shows how not just worse but also unstable the performance is for lower number of iterations. Thus, I decided to use `max-steps=200` and – even though it seems to not make a big difference – I fixed `mix-up` at the best performing value of 100.

Then, I tuned  $E$ . In particular, I wanted to reach a reasonable compromise between too long training runtimes and too low evaluation set performance.  $E$  was tuned in the




Figure 4.5. Evaluation set  $C_{primary}$  varying with the number of mixture components of the classifier.




Figure 4.6. Evaluation set  $C_{primary}$  varying with the number of mixture components for each explored number of training steps.

baseline condition, i.e. using MFCC features and 10s evaluation segments. The system was evaluated end-to-end, using the optimal values of the classifier established above. The results are summarised in Fig. 4.7. Clearly, the early epochs are the most important, but the performance (in terms of  $C_{primary}$ ) also plateaus fairly quickly: beyond 10 training epochs and, when measured by accuracy, it even starts becoming worse, indicating that the TDNN probably starts to overfit the training data. AS the compromise value of  $E$ , I decided to use the "elbow" point of the  $C_{primary}$  plot in Fig. 4.7, where  $E = 7$ . This implies the training runtime of around 19 hours to train a single x-vector TDNN.




Figure 4.7. Evaluation set performance and training runtime for varying number of training epochs  $E$  of the TDNN.



# Chapter 5

## Experiments and discussed results

In this chapter, I describe the experiments that I carried out, in the order they were designed. I provide raw results followed by a discussion of the experiment. For overall discussion, focusing more on relating my work to past studies and suggesting the directions for further research, see Chapter 6. However, my ability to compare my results with those of others is limited: To the best of my knowledge, this is the first work using the GlobalPhone corpus for LID, and the commonly used NIST LRE corpora differ in many ways (as discussed in Chapter 3).

The aims of my experiments can be summarised into the following key points:

1. Compare the different types of acoustic features in the context of the x-vector system. Dynamic features – be it simple delta terms or the more sophisticated SDCs – were designed primarily to help frame-level models to capture temporal contexts. The x-vector TDNN, on the other hand, does capture such contexts explicitly. Therefore, a question I ask is whether the more sophisticated acoustic features can still improve performance compared to simple MFCCs.
2. Evaluate the usefulness of prosodic features alone. Even though there is no good reason to use only the prosody (i.e. to not consider acoustic features at all), I believe that building a system that uses only prosodic features can help me better understand and analyse the nature and value of the prosodic information.
3. This is my ultimate aim: to evaluate the effect of using both acoustic and prosodic information – combined in different ways.

Throughout all experiments, I use  $C_{primary}$  as the main metric – staying consistent with the latest LRE 2017 challenge and the work of Snyder et al. (2018a). In the tables with results, the best result in terms of the  $C_{primary}$  value is always put in bold face. Additionally, I also report accuracy and later show confusion matrices as these are easier to intuitively grasp and reason about.

## 5.1 The setup

As for the feature type, the default was the MFCC features of 23 dimensions without energy (same as Snyder et al. (2018a)). The other two acoustic features were derived from the computed MFCCs and designed such that their dimensionalities would be roughly the same (for a fairer comparison):

- the MFCC+ $\Delta$ + $\Delta\Delta$  features were 69-dimensional, using 23 first-order and 23 second-order delta terms,
- the SDC features were 72-dimensional, using the 9-1-3-7 configuration, i.e. computed at 7 locations using the first 9 cepstral coefficients and discarding the rest of the coefficients.

I made the decision to compute the MFCC features using the Kaldi default of 23 Mel filters, and on the frequency range of 20-7800Hz inspired by the Kaldi manual<sup>1</sup>.

As for the prosodic features, the energy was computed from the MFCCs and was simply a 1-dimensional feature vector per frame. The Kaldi pitch was 5-dimensional, computed using the default parameter values of the Kaldi `compute-kaldi-pitch-feats` binary, in particular using  $B = 7000$  (see Eq. 2.4), the penalty factor for frequency jumps of 0.1, and `min-f0` = 50Hz. I changed the `max-f0` from the default of 400Hz to 500Hz, same as the upper  $F_0$  limit used by Lin and Wang (2005).

In addition to the default 10s condition (i.e. testing segments being of length  $\leq 10$ s), I also evaluate the systems on  $\leq 3$ s testing segments (the 3s condition). On these shorter segments, the systems will certainly perform worse, but the results are important because optimising LID performance on short segments is valuable and important for: online processing (where we want to identify the language as soon as possible), low-resource settings, settings with frequent code switching, and similar scenarios where the segment to be processed is very short.

## 5.2 Comparing acoustic features

In this experiment, I compare systems trained on the three types of acoustic features and evaluated on the testing segments in both the 10s and the 3s conditions.

FEATURE	10s		3s	
	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY
MFCC	0.0660	0.943	0.148	0.875
MFCC+ $\Delta$ + $\Delta\Delta$	0.0567	0.952	<b>0.138</b>	0.886
SDC	<b>0.0543</b>	0.953	0.158	0.868

Table 5.1. Comparing the systems trained on acoustic features.

The results are presented in Tab. 5.1. Just looking at the accuracy values (all above 85%), all systems perform very well (remember that naive majority class guessing

<sup>1</sup>[http://kaldi-asr.org/doc/feat.html#feat\\_mfcc](http://kaldi-asr.org/doc/feat.html#feat_mfcc)

would yield accuracy of only roughly  $1/19 = 5.3\%$ ). Clearly, both simple deltas and SDCs improve on the performance achieved by simple MFCCs in the 10s condition – in this case by 14% and 18%, respectively. The relative gain is smaller in the 3s condition. The observed improvement answers my earlier question about the usefulness of dynamic features in the era of models which process sequences of frames: Clearly, these features still have something to offer. If nothing else, extending the temporal context by the means of dynamic features may remain a computationally cheaper alternative to increasing the context by changing the TDNN architecture.

Interestingly, SDCs make the performance worse in the 3s condition. I hypothesise that this can be attributed to the relatively big temporal context of SDCs. To compute the SDC feature vector for a frame, a context of -1 and +19 frames<sup>2</sup> is required, while computing the simple deltas only requires a context of  $\pm 2$  frames. This means that – for a  $\leq 3$ s segment – a big portion of the SDC vectors will be only partially computed: For a 200-frame segment (roughly 2s), the SDCs are incomplete for 20 frames (10%) while MFCC+ $\Delta$ + $\Delta\Delta$  will be incomplete only for 4 frames (2%). Although this hypothesis would require further research, for now I conclude that, for very short segments, dynamic features computed over long contexts should be used with care. Ideally, features requiring shorter contexts – such as simple deltas or even MFCCs without deltas – would be used.

### 5.3 Comparing and combining prosodic features

This experiment focuses on comparing systems trained on the two prosodic features, as well as systems where the Kaldi pitch and energy was combined via early and intermediate fusion.

FEATURE	10s		3s	
	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY
PITCH	0.327	0.732	0.526	0.575
ENERGY	0.307	0.748	0.520	0.578
PITCH + ENERGY (EARLY)	<b>0.154</b>	0.872	<b>0.314</b>	0.743
PITCH + ENERGY (INTERMEDIATE)	0.180	0.851	0.347	0.712

Table 5.2. Comparing the systems trained on prosodic features and their combinations.

In line with the results of Lin and Wang (2005) and Martinez et al. (2012), prosodic information on its own is enough for a relatively well performing LID system – in this case, achieving accuracy of over 87% on 10s segments and over 74% on 3s segments. Even though the  $C_{primary}$  score is worse by around 150% compared to the best acoustic system, it is still impressive: Imagine a human trying to distinguish between languages just from ”how they sound” – without being able to comprehend any of the words or even phones produced. Unsurprisingly, energy and pitch seem to be capturing different and complementary information, which results in big performance improvements

<sup>2</sup>for a  $N$ - $d$ - $p$ - $k$  SDC configuration, the context is  $-d$  and  $+(p \times (k - 1) + d)$

when the two features are combined (relative improvement of roughly 50% and 40% for the 10s and 3s conditions, respectively, when compared to the use of energy or pitch in isolation).

The early fusion gains consistently better results than intermediate fusion. I relate this observation to the fact that pitch and energy are inherently tied in the realisation of prosodic variables like stress and intonation. As a result of this tight relationship, extracting x-vectors from pitch and energy information separately (in the case of the intermediate fusion) can be compared to doing extraction from two incomplete contours: Naturally, both of the resulting two x-vector kinds will be of poor quality, and fusing them will change little about this. Extracting x-vectors from the pitch and energy information combined, on the other hand, can be thought of as extracting more abstract information from one complete contour (complete in that it contains both the pitch and the energy component of the intonation and stress patterns), thus resulting in good quality x-vectors.




Figure 5.1. The confusion matrix for the best prosodic system (energy + pitch combined using early fusion) in the 10s condition. Each cell shows the fraction of all segments labelled as the true language which were classified as the predicted language. Values under 1% are not shown and logarithmic colour scale is used for better readability.

To analyse the prosodic features in more detail, I visualise the confusion matrix for the best-performing prosodic system in the 10s condition (see Fig. 5.1). Among the most easily confused language pairs (with the matrix entries above 5%), most can be explained by their shared language genus<sup>3</sup>: pairs of Slavic languages (Polish-Bulgarian, Bulgarian-Polish, Russian-Croatian, Czech-Polish, Croatian-Russian), Chinese languages (Mandarin-Wu), and Romance languages (Portuguese-Spanish). An interesting example is Portuguese being confused with Slavic languages like Polish, Russian or Croatian – corresponding to the known phenomenon of Portuguese “sounding like”

<sup>3</sup>Genus denotes a language grouping more fine-grained than language families; for instance, the Slavic genus is part of the Indo-European language family.



Slavic languages. This can be related to the similar characteristic use of sibilant sounds, vowel reduction (resulting in clusters of consonants) and stress-timed rhythm in Portugal as well as the Slavic languages<sup>4</sup>. Still, a good number of confused pairs is difficult to explain phonologically, mainly Arabic-Turkish, Swedish-Spanish, and Tamil being confused for Spanish and Turkish. For these cases, I go back to Fig. 4.3 and hypothesise that the reason is the high scaling of priors for Turkish and Spanish (along with other languages such as Croatian, Arabic, and Wu), which can surface in the classifier being biased in favour of these languages.




Figure 5.2. Visualisation of the space of the testing set x-vectors extracted from the best prosodic TDNN. Languages from the same genus use the same shape: circle – Slavic, star – Romance, cross – Chinese, pentagon – Germanic.

For added insights into the nature of the prosodic x-vector representation space, I use the t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbour Embedding (t-SNE) technique<sup>5</sup> to visualise the

<sup>4</sup>To a curious reader I recommend this video focusing on phonological similarities between Portuguese and Russian/Polish: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pik2R46xobA>

<sup>5</sup>Originally proposed by Maaten and Hinton (2008), but I use the implementation from the scikit-

testing set x-vectors (in the 10s condition) extracted from the best prosodic TDNN, see Fig. 5.2. In particular, the way the language clusters are split into visible sub-clusters very strongly correlates with the number of different dominant dialects present in the GlobalPhone data for the given language<sup>6</sup>: The Northern and Southern Vietnamese dialects; the Smaalaenska, Goeteborgska and Oelaenska Swedish dialects; the Anatolian and Standard Turkish dialects; the Seoul and Chonnam Korean dialects; the Bosnian, Standard Croatian, and Zagreb Croatian; and the numerous Mandarin and Japanese dialects. This observation suggests that the prosodic features are useful for *dialect identification*. After all, it comes as no surprise: As I mentioned earlier, intonation – among other prosodic variables – often characterises the different dialects of a language.

## 5.4 Combining acoustic and prosodic features

Having shown the individual performances of acoustic and prosodic systems, this experiment finds out whether – and to what extent – the acoustic and prosodic information is complementary, i.e. leading to improved performance when combined. For each acoustic feature type, I combined it with (one or both) prosodic features using either early or intermediate fusion. Notice that – for obvious reasons – the pipeline does not allow the two prosodic features to be fused at the intermediate (x-vector) level and then combined with an acoustic system at the early level. However, three feature types can be combined all at the feature level (early fusion), or the two prosodic features (combined at any of the two levels) can be combined with an acoustic system at the intermediate level.

FEATURE COMBINATION			10s		3s	
			$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY
MFCC	+	PITCH	0.0693	0.941	0.153	0.871
		ENERGY	0.0581	0.952	0.137	0.888
		PITCH + ENERGY	0.0562	0.954	0.136	0.889
MFCC+ $\Delta+\Delta\Delta$	+	PITCH	0.0577	0.950	0.134	0.886
		ENERGY	0.0523	0.957	0.129	0.895
		PITCH + ENERGY	0.0544	0.956	0.139	0.888
SDC	+	PITCH	0.0559	0.952	0.159	0.867
		ENERGY	<b>0.0401</b>	0.967	<b>0.128</b>	0.896
		PITCH + ENERGY	0.0484	0.960	0.137	0.888

Table 5.3. Combining acoustic and prosodic features (early fusion used in all instances).

Tab. 5.3 shows the results for systems in which an acoustic system and a prosodic one were combined using early fusion, while Tab. 5.4 refers to the systems in which

learn toolkit: <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.manifold.TSNE.html>.

<sup>6</sup>I gathered the dialect information from the speaker metadata files of the GlobalPhone corpus. Note that no dialect details were present for Bulgarian, Wu, Czech, French, German, Polish, Russian, Tamil and Thai

FEATURE COMBINATION		10s		3s	
		$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY	$C_{primary}$	ACCURACY
MFCC	PITCH	0.0624	0.950	0.138	0.886
	ENERGY	0.0556	0.956	0.149	0.878
	PITCH + ENERGY (EARLY)	0.0382	0.968	0.107	0.910
	PITCH + ENERGY (INTERMEDIATE)	0.0501	0.958	0.132	0.890
MFCC+ $\Delta+\Delta\Delta$	PITCH	0.0467	0.961	0.120	0.900
	ENERGY	0.0508	0.960	0.140	0.886
	PITCH + ENERGY (EARLY)	<b>0.0343</b>	0.971	<b>0.0993</b>	0.918
	PITCH + ENERGY (INTERMEDIATE)	0.0511	0.959	0.129	0.895
SDC	PITCH	0.0622	0.949	0.142	0.881
	ENERGY	0.0674	0.947	0.167	0.864
	PITCH + ENERGY (EARLY)	0.0376	0.968	0.114	0.906
	PITCH + ENERGY (INTERMEDIATE)	0.0545	0.954	0.139	0.883

Table 5.4. Combining acoustic and prosodic systems using intermediate fusion (the combinations of 2 prosodic features used early or intermediate fusion).

acoustic and prosodic information was combined at the intermediate (x-vector) level. Regardless of the fusion type, combining acoustic and prosodic information clearly improves the performance. The best system uses *both* prosodic features combined as a pair at the feature level (early fusion), which is not surprising, having compared the prosody-only systems in Section 5.3. For combining acoustic information with prosody, however, intermediate fusion improves on early fusion by 14% and 22% in the 10s and 3s conditions, respectively. While this phenomenon needs to be investigated further, I hypothesise that the TDNN was not able to combine acoustic and prosodic features well because of their different nature: Besides representing very different properties of speech, the features also differ in their level of abstraction. While the pitch and energy features are very close to the raw values capturing the corresponding prosodic contours, MFCCs (and derived features) have gone through many sophisticated transforms in order to be low-dimensional and decorrelated. To investigate this hypothesis, an acoustic feature much closer to the original power spectrum could be used, such as the Mel filter bank features (in essence, these are an intermediate stage features in the MFCC pipeline, see Fig. 2.4).

Most importantly, the best acoustic system is largely outperformed by the best combined system: the relative improvement in terms of  $C_{primary}$  is 37% and 28% for the 10s and 3s conditions, respectively. This is more than twice the improvement reported by Martinez et al. (2012) after fusing a prosodic i-vector system modelling pitch, energy and duration with a then state-of-the-art acoustic i-vector system (they report the relative improvement of 15.24% and 10.93% for the 10s and 3s conditions). I attribute this big difference in improvements primarily to the better suitability and power of a temporal context aggregating model like TDNN. Remember that the i-vector system applies the bag-of-frames approach, which has to be compensated for by more sophisticated feature engineering: In this case, Martinez et al. for each frame approximated the local pitch and energy contours by Legendre polynomials, whose coefficients served as the feature values for the given frame.

I hypothesise that another possible reason why prosody improved performance much more in my case is the channel difference between the NIST LRE 2009 dataset<sup>7</sup> used by Martinez et al. and the GlobalPhone corpus I used. The lower sampling rate (8kHz) of the LRE data should not make a big difference – the usual pitch range is  $\leq 500\text{Hz}$ . The varied and noisy recording environment (the LRE 2009 data consists of telephone speech and radio broadcast conversations), on the other hand, can in my opinion pose a challenge for extracting good-quality prosodic information, and I plan to explore this phenomenon in my future work.

My last point relates to the decision to not use energy as part of the MFCC features (in line with the work of Snyder et al. (2018a)). One could object that energy is often used with MFCCs and excluding it makes the prosodic systems perform worse. My results confirm this: When comparing the MFCC results from Tab. 5.1 and the corresponding results of MFCCs with energy added at feature level (Tab. 5.3), the energy brings a relative improvement of 12% (7.4% in the 3s condition). This improvement suggests significant usefulness of energy on top of the information captured by the 0<sup>th</sup> cepstral coefficient. I believe, however, that my decision to use MFCC features without energy was justified as I wanted to analyse how much useful information the different prosodic features capture when compared to acoustic features.

---

<sup>7</sup><https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2014S06>

# Chapter 6

## Overall discussion and conclusions

In this chapter, I provide an overall discussion of my results and findings in the context of past research, elaborate more on the limitations of my work, and draw conclusions.

### 6.1 Overall comparison of different systems

First, let me summarise the overall comparison of prosodic and acoustic systems and their combinations with the help of Fig. 6.1. The combination of pitch and energy combined at feature level provides the best performance in combines acoustic+prosodic systems across both conditions, and is also the best prosodic feature in prosody-only systems. The relative improvements are bigger in the 10s condition than in the 3s condition – in line with the observations of Martinez et al. (2012). Interestingly, the TDNN is unable to combine the pitch and acoustic information well, resulting in unchanged or slightly worse performance when acoustic features are combined with pitch at the feature level. All in all, the results make me believe that prosody can be easily utilised to improve the performance of existing state-of-the-art LID systems. By training a separate additional TDNN on pitch and energy information, one does not have to re-train any of the acoustic deep models. It is enough to re-train the classifier to consider the acoustic and prosodic embeddings together.

### 6.2 Analysis of language-specific performance of the best system

Now, let me analyse the performance of the best model (on the 10s condition) considering the previously discussed phonological similarities between language pairs, but also the gender and data amount imbalances in the data partitions I use. The confusion matrix in Fig. 6.2 shows that the most confusing language pair types were very similar to those observed and discussed previously in Section 5.3:




Figure 6.1. Final comparison of all acoustic+prosodic combinations in the 10s (top) and 3s (bottom) condition, where the acoustic and prosodic information is combined at the feature (early) level (left) and at the x-vector (intermediate) level (right).

- pairs from the same language genus: Portuguese-Spanish, Polish-Bulgarian, Czech-Polish, Wu-Mandarin,
- Portuguese with Slavic languages: Portuguese-Russian, Croatian-Portuguese,
- Swedish-Spanish, as discussed previously and attributed to the classifier biased towards Spanish.

In order to compare the performance of the best system on single languages, I compute and plot the (multi-class) F1 score based on the raw confusion matrix whose thresholded version was presented in Fig. 6.2. The scores are shown in Fig. 6.3. Even though all scores are above 0.91, there are still significant differences between some languages. In particular, the best performance in terms of F1 is observed for Mandarin, French, German, Tamil and Thai, while the worst performance is on Portuguese,




Figure 6.2. The confusion matrix for the best overall system in the 10s condition. Each cell shows the fraction of all segments labelled as the true language which were classified as the predicted language. Values under 1% are not shown and logarithmic colour scale is used for better readability.




Figure 6.3. The F1 scores for each language computed from the results of the best system (10s condition).

Croatian, Spanish and Polish. I hypothesise that these differences may be linked to a mismatch between the genders in the enrollment set (which the classifier was trained on) and in the testing set, and plot this information<sup>1</sup> in Fig. 6.4. Just by observing the plotted trends, I conclude that I cannot clearly relate and attribute the performance differences to the gender ratio mismatch between the enrollment and testing data. For example, the mismatch is large for Mandarin and German, but effectively negligible for French and Thai – and yet their F1 scores are the highest. The mismatch is also not distinctively higher (relative to other languages) for Portuguese, Croatian or Spanish.

In my next attempt at explaining the performance differences, I turn to the unbalanced data amounts as discussed previously in the context of adjusting the classifier's prior beliefs. If a language was – *relative to its presence in the unseen test data* – under-

<sup>1</sup>The information about speakers' gender was taken from the speaker metadata files, same as the dialect information in Section 5.3. The information was unavailable for speakers of Tamil and Polish.




Figure 6.4. The gender balance (shown in terms of the percentage of speakers being female) for each language, compared for the enrollment and testing set speakers.

represented in the enrollment set and then over-represented in the evaluation set, the classifier's prior would have been scaled down for that language, making the classifier biased against it – and resulting in that language's test-set samples being unfairly classified as other languages (false negatives). On the other hand, if a language's relative presence was the same in the evaluation and testing sets, then adjusting the prior based on the evaluation set's statistics would not result in any unfair behaviour on the test.




Figure 6.5. The data amount balance between the evaluation and testing set (based on numbers from Tab. 3.1): Each column presents the relative change in a language's relative presence between the evaluation and testing data, i.e. a positive value of 25% means that the language's relative presence increased by 25% when going from the evaluation to the testing set. Note: The relative presence of a language in a set is the amount of the language's data (in hours) expressed as a percentage of the set's total data.

Fig. 6.4 shows the data amount imbalances between the evaluation and testing set for each language. Going back to the scaling factors presented in Fig. 4.3, these were making the classifier most positively biased for Arabic, Croatian, Spanish, Turkish and Wu, and the most negatively biased for Japanese and Vietnamese. However, based on Fig. 6.5, all but two of the mentioned languages actually have their relative presence very similar in the evaluation and testing sets and therefore the prior belief adjustment does not explain the possible performance drops of the final system on the testing set samples of these languages. The only two languages which have both strongly scaled priors *and* large differences between their presence in the evaluation and testing data, are Wu and Vietnamese. However, the F1 scores for these two languages are very good (0.992 and 0.978, respectively), leading me to the conclusion that the classifier's



possible unfairness did not have a strong effect. Thus, my conclusion is I was not able to attribute the differences in performance to the gender or data amount imbalances present in the data. Perhaps, some languages are simply harder to identify than others by their very nature.

### 6.3 Analysis of the potential of prosody

Finally, let me analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the prosodic information in the context of its use in combination with acoustic information. First, I ask: Which languages (or language pairs) are the most challenging ones for a prosody-only system, compared to the best system? To provide an answer, I visualise the differences between the best combined system and the best prosodic system in Fig. 6.6. It is a difference between the two system's full confusion matrices, thresholded to highlight the most important cells, and with the diagonal entries multiplied by -1 such that negative cells would in all cases mean that the prosody-only system performed worse. Further, I ask: In which cases does prosody help the most? To answer this question, I present in Fig. 6.7 the difference between the best overall system and the best acoustic system.

I observe that prosody alone struggles the most with Polish, Tamil, Russian, Bul-




Figure 6.6. Difference of the confusion matrices for the best overall system and the best prosodic system (10s condition). The main diagonal was multiplied by -1. Negative numbers show where the best overall system performed better. Values between -1% and 1% are not shown for better readability.

garian, Arabic, Swedish, and Portuguese, with most confusing pairs being the Slavic languages. In all cases, adding acoustic information helps the performance. On the other hand, prosody is the most helpful for improving LID performance on Bulgarian, Korean, Czech, Croatian and Turkish, helping to distinguish better between Bulgarian and Portuguese, and between Croatian, Czech, Polish vs Russian. Interestingly, adding




Figure 6.7. Difference of the confusion matrices for the best overall system and the best acoustic system (10s condition). The main diagonal was multiplied by -1. Negative numbers show where the best overall system performed better. Values between -1% and 1% are not shown for better readability.

prosodic information can – in a very small number of cases – lead to slightly worse performance: In particular for the Portuguese-Russian pair and for Swedish in general. However, the positive effects largely outweigh the negative ones.

## 6.4 Conclusions

In this work, I have successfully applied the recently proposed x-vector approach of extracting utterance-level embeddings (Snyder et al., 2018a) to 19 languages from the GlobalPhone corpus. Traditionally, *acoustic* features – be it MFCCs, SDCs or even bottleneck features extracted from an ASR DNN (see Snyder et al. (2018a)) – are used in language identification systems. In an attempt to explore the potential of *prosodic* information in the context of the novel x-vector approach, I used two types of prosodic features to capture intonation, tone, stress and rhythm of speech: energy (extracted in the process of computing the MFCC features) and a continuous pitch feature extracted using the algorithm from Ghahremani et al. (2014). (To the best of my knowledge, I am the first to apply this pitch-tracking approach in the context of language identification.) In addition to training systems on just one acoustic or prosodic feature type, I used two ways of combining the features: at the raw feature level and at the level of the utterance embeddings (x-vectors).

I found that the best performance is achieved when acoustic information is combined with both types of prosodic information: In terms of the  $C_{primary}$  metric, I observed relative improvements of 37% on  $\leq 10s$  segments (absolute value:  $C_{primary} = 0.0343$ ) and 28% on  $\leq 3s$  (short) segments (absolute value:  $C_{primary} = 0.0993$ ), compared to

the best system that used only acoustic features. While the absolute results are much better than those reported by Snyder et al. (2018a), they are not comparable – because I used a dataset with much less channel variation, recorded in much more controlled and clean conditions. Comparing mine with the results of a similar past study carried out using i-vector systems (Martinez et al., 2012), I find that the relative improvement in my work is more than twice bigger. This difference I explain in terms of the x-vector approach’s much better ability to capture temporal trends (which are crucial in modelling prosody), compared to i-vector architectures.

I also conclude that the energy and pitch information are highly complementary and should be used together. Ideally combined as early as possible – at the raw feature level. I found that such prosodic combination works the best when further combined with acoustic information at the abstract representation level of x-vectors. This observation leads me to believe that existing acoustic language identification systems could benefit from considering prosodic information, without the need to re-train the most computationally expensive back end components responsible for producing utterance-level embeddings. Instead, an additional TDNN can be trained on the prosodic features, and a new classifier would then be re-trained on combined acoustic and prosodic embeddings.

While my results are very promising, it should be noted that even with the addition of prosodic features, certain language pairs are still confusing; especially Slavic languages, which are also sometimes confused with Portuguese – due to their phonological similarities.

Another important limitation of prosodic features goes back to the nature of prosody itself: It captures a lot of speaker-, dialect- and accent-dependent information. Thus, systems trained using prosodic information are arguably more prone to discriminating against speakers under-represented in the training data. In particular, such systems might be particularly discriminatory when applied to the speech of non-native speakers or speakers of rare dialects. On the other hand, this makes prosody particularly well suited for speaker recognition.



# Chapter 7

## Future work

### 7.1 Possible directions

I acknowledge that my work has by no means exhausted the potential of exploring prosody in the context of LID. A natural continuation of this project would see the use of *late* fusion – the popular method which combines the final scores from multiple classifiers (Martinez et al., 2012; Gelly et al., 2016; Plchot et al., 2016). Perhaps even more importantly, in order for the research to be fully relevant given the recent research, the potential of prosody should be examined not in the context of standard acoustic features and their variations invented with i-vector systems in mind; instead, the bottleneck features – a more abstract feature type extracted from ASR DNNs and reported to outperform MFCCs in LID by over 30% (Snyder et al., 2018a) – should be tried.

An important limitation of this work – and one that naturally leads to a direction for my future research – is the choice of dataset. The GlobalPhone corpus is well suited for an initial work like this. The low channel variation and clean recording conditions make it easier to analyse the potential and nature of prosody, without having to worry about observed effects being in fact caused primarily by the variation in the corpus. For more relevant and realistic research, however, a more realistic corpus is desirable – and certainly a more challenging one. Looking at the almost perfect confusion matrix produced by my best system (Fig. 6.2), there is little room for improvement using this data – the corpus is simply too easy for language identification. By using for example the NIST LRE corpora which – as of LRE 2017 – feature not just telephone and broadcast speech, but also speech from a great variety of videos from the internet (the VAST corpus, see Tracey and Strassel (2018)), this research would gain more value and relevance.

Last but not least, as the performance on longer segments improves, the more challenging LID from *short segments* is becoming more and more relevant: In online settings such as emergency call routing or voice assistants, in scenarios with frequent code switching, or in large-scale ASR where identifying the language faster can make a big difference in terms of resources (for example in transcribing videos for a portal

like YouTube). While my results are rather clear for  $\leq 10$ s speech segments, short segments might render certain feature types less favourable (see the observed performance fall observed for the SDC features), and the effects caused by unnatural segment boundaries become more important. Therefore, exploring prosody specifically in the context of very short, arbitrarily cut speech segments is another possible direction for research.

## 7.2 Plan for Part 2 of the MInf project

My plan for the second year of this project has as its main objective bringing the work closer to a realistic setting. In particular, this will include:

1. The use of more realistic (varied) data for evaluating the potential of prosodic information: the VAST corpus and possibly other NIST LRE corpora; and data containing non-native speakers of English as well as a variety of dialects (the AMI (McCowan et al., 2005) and Fischer (Cieri et al., 2004) corpora).
2. Focusing on short segments ( $\leq 3$ s) and comparing different segmentation strategies: in particular uniform segmentation and energy-based segmentation (i.e. segmenting on pauses). González et al. (2013) report better results when extracting prosody from very short fixed-length syllable-like segments (uniform segmentation) compared to segments extracted based on energy valleys. However, I want to explore segments which are much longer than the typical syllable length of 100-200ms.

# Bibliography

- Blackman, R. B. and Tukey, J. W. (1958). The measurement of power spectra from the point of view of communications engineering – part i. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 37(1):185–282.
- Boersma, P. and Weenink, D. (2019). Praat: doing phonetics by computer [computer program]. version 6.0.49. <http://www.praat.org/>.
- Cieri, C., Miller, D., and Walker, K. (2004). The Fisher corpus: a resource for the next generations of speech-to-text. In *LREC*, volume 4, pages 69–71.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell, 6<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Dehak, N., Kenny, P., Dehak, R., Dumouchel, P., and Ouellet, P. (2011). Front-end factor analysis for speaker verification. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 19:788–798.
- Ferrer, L., Lei, Y., McLaren, M., and Scheffer, N. (2016). Study of senone-based deep neural network approaches for spoken language recognition. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 24:105–116.
- Gelly, G., Gauvain, J.-L., Lamel, L., Laurent, A., Le, V.-B., and Messaoudi, A. (2016). Language recognition for dialects and closely related languages. In *Odyssey*, pages 124–131.
- Ghahremani, P., BabaAli, B., Povey, D., Riedhammer, K., Trmal, J., and Khudanpur, S. (2014). A pitch extraction algorithm tuned for automatic speech recognition. *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 2494–2498.
- Goedemans, R. and van der Hulst, H. (2013a). Fixed stress locations. In Dryer, M. S. and Haspelmath, M., editors, *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
- Goedemans, R. and van der Hulst, H. (2013b). Weight-sensitive stress. In Dryer, M. S. and Haspelmath, M., editors, *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
- González, D. M., Lleida, E., Ortega, A., and Miguel, A. (2013). Prosodic features and formant modeling for an ivector-based language recognition system. *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 6847–6851.

- Grabe, E. (2004). Intonational variation in urban dialects of English spoken in the British Isles. *Regional variation in intonation*, pages 9–31.
- Holmes, J. and Holmes, W. (2002). *Speech Synthesis and Recognition*. Taylor & Francis, Inc., Bristol, PA, USA, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Lin, C.-Y. and Wang, H.-C. (2005). Language identification using pitch contour information. *IEEE ICASSP*, 1:I/601–I/604.
- Lu, L., Ghoshal, A., and Renals, S. (2012). Maximum a posteriori adaptation of subspace Gaussian mixture models for cross-lingual speech recognition. In *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 4877–4880. IEEE.
- Maaten, L. v. d. and Hinton, G. (2008). Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(Nov):2579–2605.
- Mak, M.-W. and Chien, J.-T. (2016). Interspeech 2016 tutorial: Machine learning for speaker recognition. [http://www1.icsi.berkeley.edu/Speech/presentations/AFRL\\_ICSI\\_visit2\\_JFA\\_tutorial\\_icsitalk.pdf](http://www1.icsi.berkeley.edu/Speech/presentations/AFRL_ICSI_visit2_JFA_tutorial_icsitalk.pdf).
- Martinez, D., Burget, L., Ferrer, L., and Scheffer, N. (2012). ivector-based prosodic system for language identification. In *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 4861–4864. IEEE.
- Martinez, D., Plhot, O., Burget, L., Glembek, O., and Matějka, P. (2011). Language recognition in iVectors space. In *Interspeech*.
- McCowan, I., Carletta, J., Kraaij, W., Ashby, S., Bourban, S., Flynn, M., Guillemot, M., Hain, T., Kadlec, J., Karaikos, V., et al. (2005). The AMI meeting corpus. In *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Methods and Techniques in Behavioral Research*, volume 88, page 100.
- McCree, A. (2014). Multiclass discriminative training of i-vector language recognition. In *Odyssey*, pages 166–172.
- Metze, F., Sheikh, Z. A. W., Waibel, A., Gehring, J., Kilgour, K., Nguyen, Q. B., and Nguyen, V. H. (2013). Models of tone for tonal and non-tonal languages. In *IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding*, pages 261–266.
- Paul, D. B. and Baker, J. M. (1992). The design for the Wall Street Journal-based CSR corpus. In *Proceedings of the workshop on Speech and Natural Language*, pages 357–362. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peddinti, V., Povey, D., and Khudanpur, S. (2015). A time delay neural network architecture for efficient modeling of long temporal contexts. In *Sixteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- Plhot, O., Matejka, P., Fér, R., Glembek, O., Novotný, O., Pešán, J., Veselý, K., Ondel, L., Karafiát, M., Grézl, F., et al. (2016). BAT system description for NIST LRE 2015. In *Odyssey*.
- Povey, D., Ghoshal, A., Boulianne, G., Burget, L., Glembek, O., Goel, N., Hannemann, M., Motlicek, P., Qian, Y., Schwarz, P., Silovsky, J., Stemmer, G., and Vesely, K.



- (2011). The Kaldi speech recognition toolkit. In *IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding*. IEEE Signal Processing Society.
- Povey, D., Zhang, X., and Khudanpur, S. (2014). Parallel training of DNNs with natural gradient and parameter averaging. *arXiv*, abs/1410.7455.
- Prieto, P. and Roseano, P. (2018). *Prosody: Stress, rhythm, and intonation*, pages 211–236. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329541457\\_Prosody\\_Stress\\_rhythm\\_and\\_intonation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329541457_Prosody_Stress_rhythm_and_intonation).
- Sadjadi, O. and Greenberg, C. (2017). NIST 2017 language recognition evaluation plan. <https://www.nist.gov/document/lrel7-evaluation-plan>.
- Sarma, M., Sarma, K. K., and Goel, N. K. (2018). Language recognition using time delay deep neural network. *arXiv*, abs/1804.05000.
- Schultz, T. (2002). Globalphone: a multilingual speech and text database developed at Karlsruhe University. In *ICSLP*, pages 345–348.
- Schultz, T., Vu, N. T., and Schlippe, T. (2013). GlobalPhone: A multilingual text & speech database in 20 languages. *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 8126–8130.
- Shimodaira, H. and Renals, S. (January 17, 2019). Speech signal analysis: ASR lectures 2&3. <http://www.inf.ed.ac.uk/teaching/courses/asr/2018-19/asr02-signal-handout.pdf>.
- Snyder, D. (December 24, 2018). Language identification with x-vectors: Choice of classifier [online forum comment]. <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/kaldi-help/v6Uh7avv-cY>.
- Snyder, D., Garcia-Romero, D., McCree, A., Sell, G., Povey, D., and Khudanpur, S. (2018a). Spoken language recognition using x-vectors. In *Odyssey*, pages 105–111.
- Snyder, D., Garcia-Romero, D., Sell, G., Povey, D., and Khudanpur, S. (2018b). X-vectors: Robust DNN embeddings for speaker recognition. *IEEE ICASSP*, pages 5329–5333.
- Tkachenko, M., Yamshinin, A., Lyubimov, N., Kotov, M., and Nastasenkov, M. (2016). Language identification using time delay neural network d-vector on short utterances. In *SPECOM*, pages 443–449. Springer.
- Torres-Carrasquillo, P. A., Singer, E., Kohler, M. A., Greene, R. J., Reynolds, D. A., and Deller, J. R. (2002). Approaches to language identification using Gaussian mixture models and shifted delta cepstral features. In *Interspeech*.
- Tracey, J. and Strassel, S. (2018). VAST: A corpus of video annotation for speech technologies. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*.
- Trask, R. L. (2004). *A dictionary of phonetics and phonology*. Routledge. Entry for "toneme".
- Variani, E., Lei, X., McDermott, E., Moreno, I. L., and Gonzalez-Dominguez, J.

- (2014). Deep neural networks for small footprint text-dependent speaker verification. pages 4052–4056.
- Waibel, A., Hanazawa, T., Hinton, G., Shikano, K., and Lang, K. J. (1995). Phoneme recognition using time-delay neural networks. *Backpropagation: Theory, Architectures and Applications*, pages 35–61.
- Zheng, F. and Zhang, G. (2000). Integrating the energy information into MFCC. In *ICSLP*.

# Appendix A

## Partitioning of the dataset

	TRAIN	ENROLLMENT	EVALUATION	TESTING
AR	57	017, 023, 056, 104, 105, 114, 135	014, 030, 047, 067, 109, 115, 137	011, 012, 027, 050, 051, 055, 066
BG	56	042, 048, 056, 065, 088, 104, 107	051, 055, 058, 084, 090, 100, 106	040, 059, 063, 068, 095, 109, 110
CH	98	004, 005, 012, 034, 035, 036, 045, 048, 052, 053, 057, 120, 126	028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043, 044	080, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 086, 087, 088, 089
CR	63	001, 010, 018, 026, 029, 032, 074, 092, 093	033, 034, 035, 036, 046, 048, 051, 053, 054, 057	037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043, 044, 045, 047
CZ	72	005, 009, 031, 033, 034, 036, 053, 061, 071, 072	083, 085, 087, 089, 091, 093, 095, 097, 099, 101	084, 086, 088, 090, 092, 094, 096, 098, 100, 102
FR	74	009, 028, 030, 031, 033, 052, 064, 065, 070, 076	082, 083, 084, 085, 086, 087, 088, 089	091, 092, 093, 094, 095, 096, 097, 098
GE	58	015, 017, 046, 056, 058, 065, 074	001, 002, 003, 004, 008, 010	018, 020, 021, 026, 029, 073
JA	119	002, 021, 037, 048, 051, 053, 057, 064, 086, 201, 202, 206, 209, 221	009, 031, 046, 081, 091	006, 025, 045, 047, 088, 101
KO	70	018, 030, 043, 044, 057, 065, 074, 078, 079, 090	006, 012, 025, 040, 045, 061, 084, 086, 091, 098	019, 029, 032, 042, 051, 064, 069, 080, 082, 088
PL	70	008, 018, 032, 076, 083, 085, 088, 096, 099	005, 011, 012, 030, 040, 041, 046, 063, 090, 097	001, 004, 009, 023, 031, 033, 043, 044, 050, 098
PO	75	070, 071, 106, 109, 117, 120, 128, 146, 148, 150	064, 072, 102, 103, 104, 132, 133, 134	135, 137, 138, 139, 142, 143, 312
RU	84	017, 023, 035, 041, 088, 101, 114, 115, 119, 121, 123	005, 033, 042, 065, 078, 097, 103, 106, 110, 122	002, 027, 036, 063, 069, 092, 102, 104, 109, 112
SP	72	037, 041, 048, 059, 060, 064, 074, 083, 098, 099	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010	011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018

SW	70	001, 013, 023, 070, 072, 077, 078, 080, 084	045, 046, 047, 048, 049, 066, 067, 068, 069	040, 041, 042, 043, 044, 060, 061, 062, 063, 064
TA	35	022, 028, 038, 047	003, 030, 035, 039	001, 005, 033, 037
TH	73	001, 005, 027, 031, 041, 065, 067, 077, 083	023, 025, 028, 037, 045, 061, 073, 085	101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108
TU	69	010, 017, 044, 048, 049, 051, 064, 091, 093, 096	001, 002, 003, 005, 006, 008, 013, 014, 015, 016, 019	025, 030, 031, 032, 037, 039, 041, 046, 056, 063
VN	103	012, 029, 031, 036, 043, 050, 053, 070, 077, 118, 119, 128	200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208	102, 103, 106, 110, 113
WU	6	008, 011, 013, 015	002, 004, 006, 017	001, 003, 005, 009

Table A.1. The partitioning of each language's speakers into the 4 partitions. For enrollment, evaluation and testing sets, speaker IDs are shown. For the training set, the rest of the speakers was used and only the number of speakers is shown.